THE
CREATION, FALL,
. . AND . .
DELUGE

BY
The Rev. A. H. FINN
Author of "The Unity of the Pentateuch"

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LIMITED,
LONDON ∴ AND ∴ EDINBURGH.

Prefatory Note.

THE fifteen chapters which follow were originally published as a series of articles in the "Life of Faith," and it is by the kind permission of the Editor that they are now reprinted in book form.

To these have been appended two addresses delivered at a Bible Conference in Manchester, dealing in somewhat fuller detail with the Creation and the Fall.

The chief aim of the articles which form the main part of this volume is to elucidate what the Hebrew original of Genesis i.-ix. actually state concerning the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, while incidentally refuting certain critical arguments and objections.

CONTENTS.

The Creation, Fall and Deluge.

CHAPTER I.

"IN the Beginning" : with severe yet stately simplicity the wonderful record opens. So does St. John, with evident reference to these words, open his account of the new Creation when the Word of God came into the world which was made by Him in order to become the second Adam.

It is a matter for some little regret that our English compels us to insert the word "the," which is not found either in the Hebrew or the Greek. Yet it might convey a wrong impression if we were to read "In beginning," for then "beginning" might be taken as a participle, whereas the original Hebrew is a noun, a modification of the word for "head." It does not stand for action, "in commencing," but for a name, the name of an epoch, "In" or "At Commencement."

This Commencement, however, is relative, not absolute, for even then God was. Behind the Beginning, before Time began, there must have been an Eternity, just as there will be an Eternity when Time shall be no more. We cannot understand it, we cannot conceive it, yet so we feel it must be.

Here the Christian doctrine, which is so often cavilled at, sheds light on the darkness of that mystery. The Jewish and Moslem conception of the Unity of God leaves Him before creation in solitary, awful loneliness: the Christian belief that Unity means Union, not One alone, but Three in One, makes that abyss of antecedent Eternity glow with a glory of life and love. That belief is justified by the wording of the original in Genesis, for "Elohim" is a plural form, neither singular nor dual, and yet the verb "created" is in the singular, showing that the Plurality is not a diversity of differing Beings, but a real and essential Unity.

What a wealth of meaning underlies the restrained terseness of the statement, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"! It is simply positive, not controversial, and yet negatives many a false notion. There was a Beginning; there is no Eternity of Matter, an idea altogether refuted by modern Science. There is a God, not a multiplicity of warring gods nor a blind impersonal Fate. The universe is His handiwork, not self-existent; distinct from Him and not part of Himself. He "created" it, called it into being, and in Him "all things consist," stand together, established in a common unity (Col. i. 17).

"Create" does not always mean "make out of nothing." God "created man" (Gen. i. 27), but it was by forming him "of the dust of the ground" (c. ii. 7). In Num. xvi. 30 we read, "if the Lord create a new creation" (see R.V. margin), but that was in the earth opening her mouth to swallow up the rebels alive. It does

mean the introduction of something before unknown, some new element or power. So St. Paul says, "if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature" (R.V. m., "it is a new creation"), "the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor. v. 17). None the less in Gen. i. 1 "create" can only be taken in the strict sense of calling into being out of nothing, for that which was created was "the heavens and the earth," and that includes everything that now is, except the Creator Himself.

After this initial statement there is an impressive pause.

The state of the earth described in ver. 2 was not its condition at the original formation, for we learn (Isa. xlv. 18) that the Lord Who formed the earth and made it "created it not a waste (Heb. Tohu), He formed it to be inhabited." Therefore, the statement, "the earth was waste and void (Tohu v'Bohu)," must be taken to mean "*became* waste and void," and the wording allows, if it does not compel, this meaning.

If the sentence referred to the original state of the earth, the word "was" would not be expressed in Hebrew, which would read simply, "and the earth waste and void." The verb which is introduced is the one which is so often translated "it came to pass," and Dr. Driver himself, commenting on ver. 5, says that there it is equivalent to the Greek ἐγένετο, became, and not ἦν, was.

What the interval may have been, how the "waste and void" condition was brought about, whether by some terrific convulsion of Nature or in connection with the fall of the angels (as some think), we do not know, and surmise is futile. One thing alone seems certain—namely, that this

was not the primeval chaos it has sometimes been considered.

It was a time of "darkness upon the face of the deep," and yet of continuous Divine action: "the Spirit of God was brooding (or hovering) upon the face of the waters," as a bird broods over her young, first to bring them to life, and afterwards to protect ("as an eagle . . . fluttereth over her young," Deut. xxxii. 11).

Unwilling to admit the existence of a personal "Spirit of God," Jewish interpreters take advantage of a possible meaning of the words, and render the expression by "a wind of God," that is to say, a mighty wind. That can hardly be the true interpretation, for a *mighty* wind cannot be said to brood or flutter. Besides, the same expression is used elsewhere where this rendering is utterly out of the question; for instance, in Exod. xxxi. 3, concerning Bezaleel, "I have filled him with the Spirit of God." No! it is no tempest of violence agitating the waters that is set before us here. Though the earth had become desolate and empty, and darkness lay heavy over the deeps, yet, silently but with creative power, the Lord and Lifegiver was energising.

Then follows the Word of Power—"and God said."

We cannot suppose that an audible utterance of articulate words was needed. Once more St. John interprets for us when of "the Word"—the outward expression of Will and Thought—he tells us that "by Him were all things made," as we are taught to confess in the Nicene Creed. Not a spoken, but a living Word avails to create. The Father wills; the Spirit quickens; the Word operates. Thus in Creation the Three are One.

From this point onwards we have to take into consideration the record which modern research has been able to decipher in the successive strata of the earth's crust, and there are many who are firmly persuaded that the Scriptural account is not in accordance with the facts disclosed by Geological Science.

It is a right and healthy instinct which leads to the comparison of God's Word with God's Work, but in that comparison we have need to exercise a double caution. (1) We must be careful not to read into the Word more than is actually stated in the original, nor to be misled by interpretations, however much they may be sanctioned by long usage; (2) we must bear in mind that our knowledge of the Work is at best still very imperfect, and that it is as easy to misinterpret the records of that Work as those of the Word.

It is, moreover, a capital mistake in considering evdence to fix the attenton on points in which the witnesses seem to differ, to the exclusion of all the points in which they agree. Indeed, for arriving at the truth, the agreement of witnesses is of more real importance than their disagreement.

Now the very fact that the Scriptural account of the process by which this world was brought into its present condition is capable of being brought into any sort of comparison with the Scientific, is of considerable importance as showing that there is at least some ground common to both. More than that, in the Scriptural account there are none of the absurd imaginings which put other cosmogonies out of court at once; no Atlas bearing the world on his shoulders, no supporting elephant standing on the back of a tortoise.

Next, it is especially noteworthy that Scripture does not (as sometimes mistakenly asserted) describe an instantaneous creation of all things appearing simultaneously. It describes the Work as proceeding by six great stages, and that an orderly progression from the lower to the higher; from the inanimate to the animate, from vegetation to animal life, and from the mere animal to the complex life of man. In this it is in absolute accord with the teachings of modern Science.

Even in details there are more points of agreement than is generally recognised, when the six stages recorded in Genesis are compared with the teachings of Geology.

I. Light. That the first stage was the introduction of light to dispel the darkness that was upon the face of the deep is, of course, not recorded, nor could be, in the testimony of the rocks, but at least is not contradicted by any known fact, or even by any theory of Science.

II. Firmament, to divide the waters from the waters. Here, again, the rocks are necessarily silent, but it is objected that the sky is represented as a solid vault, "capable of supporting the masses of water confined above." That may be the idea conveyed by our word "firmament," derived from the Latin, which represents the Greek Stereoma, something made solid, but is not the necessary meaning of the Hebrew *Raki'a*. That certainly comes from a verb which is sometimes used for beating out metals, but its root idea is spreading out, extending, and thus making thin. In Exodus xxxix. 3 it is said that the workmen "did beat—*Raka'oo*—the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires" (rather, into threads), in order to work it into the priestly vestments. Clearly, to get work-

able threads of gold, the metal must have been made into very thin plates, and no such thin plating would suffice to sustain the weight of the waters above. Since the verb means to stretch out, to expand, the noun may fairly be represented by "expanse," and that in no way conflicts with the Scientific teaching that what we call the sky is only the expanse of air surrounding the earth. That, as we know, does separate the masses of watery vapour in the clouds from the waters beneath.

III. (*a*) Emergence of dry land from the waters. Geology also teaches that the earliest known strata are sedimentary, deposited under water; that these have undergone a process of upheavel; and that the next strata show "ripple-marks" at the meeting of land and water.

(*b*) Prevalence of vegetation. Geology shows an amazing wealth of vegetable life in the carboniferous period.

IV. Luminaries. This, again, would leave no record in the rocks, and just here Geology finds strata that are pecularily barren of remains.

V. Swarms of living creatures in the waters, including creatures of great length (R.V. "great sea-monsters"), and winged fowl. So Geology shows an age of "monster reptiles and birds." This is all the more striking because there is no obvious reason for associating the inhabitants of the air with those of the waters, yet Scripture agrees with Science in this.

VI. (*a*) Land animals, domestic and wild; and (*b*) man. Geology, mammals, extinct and modern, and man.

The Scripture stages are followed by a cessation of creative activity, and Geology knows of no new types since the appearance of mankind.

In all this we not only have a number of features common to both accounts, but we have them arranged in precisely the same order. This agreement cannot possibly be due to coincidence; it cannot be attributed to any human knowledge at the time Genesis was written; and no other account of the origin of the world shows anything even remotely resembling it. No comparison of the teachings of Science with the statements of Scripture can be considered satisfactory if it fails to take into account this most remarkable measure of agreement.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT then are the points in which it is asserted that the Biblical account is inconsistent with modern scientific knowledge? The principal, if not the only ones, are four in number.

(1) *Time.* Genesis speaks of six "days": Geology requires immensely long ages.

We have seen that between the original creation of heaven and earth, and the subsequent desolation of the earth, there was an interval of unknown length, and it is quite possible that the Geologic ages belong to that interval, while the six days were only periods of reconstruction. But the correspondence of the order in Genesis to the order revealed by Geology would rather indicate that the "days" correspond to the Geologic ages.

What then are we to understand by the word "day"? Must it mean the limited period of twenty-four hours, or can it have an extended meaning?

Certainly in Scripture "day" is sometimes used for an indefinite period; for instance: "the day of vengeance" (Isaiah lxi. 2): "the day of small things" ((Zech. iv. 10): "the day of salvation" (2 Cor. vi. 2): "the day of redemption" (Eph. iv. 30). Night and day are not taken literally in St. John ix. 4: "We must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work"; or in

Romans xiii. 12 : " The night is far spent, and the day is at hand."

Again, three whole " days " elapsed before the sun and moon were made rulers of the day and night. Those who contend that the work of the Fourth day was the actual formation of the sun and moon must surely be debarred from maintaining that the previous " days " were determined by our present measures of time. Since, also, the seventh day of rest has already lasted some thousands of years, it is only reasonable to conclude that the other six days were similar periods of great length.

Yet it is further argued that, as it is specified that " evening and morning " made up a " day," this must mean a single natural day. But, again, these phenomena are thrice mentioned before the work of the Fourth day, and can, therefore, hardly refer to what we now mean by evening and morning. They can only mean that a period of gradually deepening darkness and inaction, and a period of gradually increasing light and activity, together made up the period termed a " day."

II. *Order.* Genesis puts Vegetation on the Third day, Fishes and Birds on the Fifth, and Animals on the Sixth ; Geology finds traces of both animal and vegetable life in the earliest periods.

For this to be a discrepancy, it is necessary to assume that Genesis records the first apearances of animal and vegetable life, however lowly, whereas it is clear from the language employed that periods of abundant life are intended. That does agree with Geology, which places the profusion of the Carboniferous period considerably earlier than the age of saurians and birds in the Jurassic period, and that, again, earlier than the age of mammals

in the Tertiary periods. Moreover, the limitations of knowledge and language must be taken into consideration. Those earlier traces of animal and vegetable life are of exceedingly humble organisms. What could the old world know of "Eozoon Canadense," or "protozoa"? What Hebrew words are there for "mollusks, corals, and crustaceans"?

III. *Sun and Moon.* Genesis records the making of the "great lights" on the Fourth day, long after the creation of the earth: Astronomy shows us this world as a very small member of a vast system, whose formation must, at the least, have been coeval with the formation of the earth.

It is insisted that the *making* of the great lights must mean their first formation, and that this, later than the forming of the world, is astronomically impossible.

But the very first verse records the creation of "the heaven" before the earth became desolate. That was not the "firmament," which God called "heaven," for that only came in afterwards on the Second day. The creation of "the heaven" must surely include those worlds which we still call "heavenly bodies," and convey the same idea as our phrase, "the starry heavens."

Further the word for "lights" means light-bearers, luminaries; and the word "made," when followed by some office or function, means "appointed,"* as when we say such an one was *made* Governor of such a province. Thus ver. 16 may rightly be translated "God appointed the two great luminaries, the greater luminary to rule the day, and the lesser luminary to rule the night: the stars also."

* See Driver's "Genesis," page 25.

Would that be contrary to the conclusions of Astronomical Science?

There are reasons for thinking that the light-bearing envelope of the sun, which is still far removed from its solid body, was once spread out to a much greater distance, possibly beyond the orbit of this world. When that was the case, there could be no alternations of day and night as we now know them, and the moon would not "rule the night." That condition of diffused light and heat is exactly what would be required for the kind of vegetation which flourished so luxuriantly when the coal measures were formed. If after that period the light was gradually concentrated within the earth's orbit, the sun rays could only fall on half the surface of the earth at a time, producing the alternation of day and night, and also would be reflected from the moon. This would precisely constitute the sun and moon "luminaries," ruling the day and night, and would occur after the great outburst of vegetation of the Third day, just as described in Genesis.

IV. *Evolution.* Genesis seems to describe the various stages as independent acts of creation: Science is considered to show a uniform process of evolution from the lowest to the highest by infinitesimal gradations.

Here it is necessary to note that in Genesis i. the word "create" only occurs three times—(1) the original calling into existence of heaven and earth; (2) the making of the "great sea monsters"; (3) the forming of man. On the other hand, the phrases "let the waters under the heavens be gathered together" (ver. 9)—"let the earth put forth grass" (ver. 11)—"let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures" (ver. 20,

R.V., marg.)—" let the earth bring forth the living creature " (ver. 24)—" The LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground " (ii. 7), all point to the utilisation of previously existing material.

The real difference is that the Scientific theory of Evolution, as commonly understood, is a somewhat mechanical process, dependent on survival of the fittest, natural selection, or sexual selection. That (apart from other objections) is not sufficient to account for a uniform progression in only one direction, viz., that of steady improvement; nor does it account for the cessation of evolutionary development since the appearance of man. The Scriptural record, placing the whole under the direction of a Supreme Mind and Will, does account both for the uniform tendency and for its cessation at a particular point.

The alleged discrepancies between Science and Scripture, then, turn on—

(*a*) The meaning of the two words " day " and " made " (in ver. 16);

(*b*) The assumption that Scripture records the earliest appearance of animal and vegetable life;

(*c*) The assumption that the six stages of Genesis were independent creations.

To each of these objections reasonable answer can be given, and it can hardly be held that these are sufficient to outweigh the remarkable and more numerous points of agreement.

The most that can fairly be urged is that the account in Genesis is so worded as to be open to a wrong interpretation, and has actually been to a great extent misunderstoood. But then it must be remembered that even a Divine revelation can only be conveyed to human minds in human language, and in such fashion as to be intelligible to those

who receive it. To a great extent, Science has had to coin its own vocabulary to express its discoveries, and even modern languages were not adequate until very recent times to set out Scientific conclusions with Scientific precision. How much less, then, an ancient tongue like Hebrew? In what terms could the marvels of wireless telegraphy or X-ray photographs have been stated 150 years ago? The most that could have been done in the then state of knowledge would have been to state something of the results in words that were then understood, and so guardedly as not to be scouted as utterly incredible.

How, then, could the people of Moses' time, or even of Ezra's, be told of the nebular theory, or of the diurnal revolution of the earth on its axis? If such things could have been stated at all, they would not have been understood, and would have been rejected as contrary to the evidence of our senses. The only way possible was to state the important truths in child-like fashion, yet in language so carefully chosen as to indicate to the fuller knowledge of later ages that the reality was not unknown.

That is exactly what we find.

CHAPTER III.

THERE remains one more assertion to be considered, namely, that the Hebrew account is in reality only a modified form of a Babylonian myth.

Dr. Driver ("Genesis," p. 30) says: "There are *material* resemblances between the two representations, which are too marked and too numerous to be explained as chance coincidences. The outline, or general course of events, is the same in the two narratives."

We will take first this "outline, or general course of events."

In the Hebrew: (1) God creates heaven and earth; (2) the earth becomes desolate, and darkness is upon the face of the deep (T'hom); (3) Light introduced; (4) a "firmament" to divide waters from waters; (5) division of land and sea; (6) prevalence of vegetation; (7) sun and moon made rulers of day and night; (8) prevalence of aquatic creatures and birds; (9) prevalence of land animals; (10) formation of man to replenish and subdue the earth.

In the Babylonian: (1) Apsu (the abyss) begetter of heavens and land, and Tiamat (sea) mother of them both, together form a watery waste; (2) the gods are created; (3) Apsu and Tiamat combine to resist the new gods; (3) the gods appoint Marduk their champion, who arms himself with winds and lightnings; (4) Marduk fights Tiamat, seizes

her in a net, and cuts her in two; (5) he sets up one half as a covering of heaven, and stations a guard to keep the waters from issuing; (6) he founds E-sharra ("a poetical designation of the earth"), the city of the gods; (7) he makes stations for the great gods, appoints the year, months, and days, makes the moon-god shine forth, and entrusts to him the night; (8) creation of vegetation (possibly. Part of the tablet is missing); (9) Marduk makes man of his own blood and bone, to serve the gods; (10) the gods address a hymn to Marduk.*

How can it be said that these outlines are "the same"?

At the very outset, the Babylonian is no account of the creation of heaven and earth; the "begetter" and "mother" of both are already in existence, while it is "the gods" who are afterwards "created." Then about half of the Babylonian narrative has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew, and nearly as much of the Hebrew does not appear in the Babylonian. The Hebrew outline shows an orderly advance from the lower to the higher: the Babylonian is confused, imperfect (*e.g.*, nothing is said of the origin of the animals, and that the origin of vegetation was mentioned is, at present, only a conjecture), and shows no such progression.

What, then, are the "material" resemblances which are to prove that the Hebrew must have been derived from the Babylonian? Dr. Driver specifies exactly four (p. 30):—

(1) "The same abyss of waters at the beginning, denoted by almost the same word."

"Abyss of waters" is a rather curious phrase, and it would seem that "abyss" is inserted here

* See Driver's "Genesis," pp. 27-30.

because the Babylonian account has it, although it does not quite correspond to the Hebrew "the deep." There is some resemblance between T'hom and Tiamat, but hardly enough to call them "almost the same word." Dr. Driver calls Tiamat "the deep" or "the sea," but admits that "in the sequel she is personified as a gigantic monster"; and Dr. Pinches, the well-known Assyriologist, says "Tiamat (or Tiawat), the Dragon of Chaos." Also not Tiamat, but Apsu, is "the abyss." In the Hebrew, T'hom does not come "at the beginning," but after the creation of heaven and earth and the desolation of the earth: in the Babylonian, Apsu and Tiamat together are the parents of heaven and land. It requires some straining of both accounts to make out anything like an identity.

(2) "The separation of this abyss afterwards into an upper and a lower ocean."

Elsewhere (p. 29) Dr. Driver gives a somewhat different version of what the Babylonian account says:—"The carcass of the monster he (Marduk) split into two halves, one of which he fixed on high, to form a firmament supporting the waters above it." This is not quite the same as separating an abyss into two oceans; and even in this Dr. Driver has not adhered to what is actually said. He has introduced the word "firmament," whereas the Babylonian tablet says "a covering for the heaven," nor does it say that this supported "the waters above it," but that a guard was stationed and commanded "not to let its waters issue forth." So Tiamat was not "an abyss of waters," but a "monster" whose carcass could be split in half; and was not separated into "an upper and a lower ocean," but one half was made "a covering for

the heaven," nothing being said as to what became of the other half. It is scarcely necessary to add that in the Hebrew nothing whatever is said about the separation of T'hom into oceans, or that any part of it was made a " firmament."

(3) " The formation of heavenly bodies and their appointment as measurers of time."

It is at least questionable whether either account speaks of the " formation " of the heavenly bodies, but both certainly refer to them as measurers of time. Only there is this difference, that the Babylonian lays a good deal of stress on the stars (only casually mentioned in the Hebrew), and speaks of the " moon-god," not the moon.

(4) " And the creation of man."

Both accounts place the making of man last, but with a significant difference. According to Genesis, God makes man " in His own image," but " of the dust of the ground " : according to the Babylonian Marduk makes man out of his own blood and bone.

Of the four selected instances of resemblance, it is very doubtful whether the first two present any similarity at all, and in the other two the resemblances are combined with striking differences. That affords but a slender foundation for the very positive assertion that the one account must have been derived from the other, especially considering how vastly the two differ in all other respects.

It is instructive to notice the difference in the treatment of the two questions—(*a*) Is the Genesis account of Creation contrary to Science? and (*b*) Was it derived from the Babylonian account? Those who assert that both must be answered in the affirmative, in dealing with (*a*) concentrate their attention on a few points which seem to present differences, and ignore a good deal of remarkable

similarity; in dealing with (*b*) they make the most of a few points in which there is some measure of resemblance, and ignore a large amount of dissimilarity. The truer reasoning would be the exact converse of this. When it is a question whether two accounts are *consistent*, it is the amount of agreement that is most important; but when it is a question whether one account is *derived* from the other, it is precisely the differences that ought to be considered. Still, such resemblances as do exist are not to be ignored or minimised. How far would those which have been noted serve as a foundation for the Hebrew account?

"The Babylonian epic," according to Dr. Driver (p. 30), is disfigured by "an exuberant and grotesque polytheism." The derived version is to be characterised by "a severe and dignified monotheism," so all these puerilities have to be cleared away. Accordingly, the narrations which form so large a part of the Babylonian story—the creation of the gods, their consultations and choice of Marduk as a champion, his combat with Tiamat, the hymn of the gods to Marduk—all these are altogether abandoned. What skeleton of facts remains? (1) A primeval watery waste, partly due to Tiamat; (2) the cleaving of Tiamat into two parts, of which one is set up as a covering for the heaven, whence the waters are not to be allowed to issue forth; (3 the ordaining of measures of time, regulated by the stars and the moon-god; (4) the creation of vegetation; (5) the creation of man. These then reappear in the Hebrew as (1) the existence of T'hom—but not at the beginning; (2) the formation of a "firmament" to divide the waters from the waters; (3) the prevalence of vegetation; (4) the "formation" of sun, moon, and stars as measurers of time; (5) the creation of man.

But these alone would form a very meagre outline for the story of Creation, and the Hebrew contains a great deal more. The original creation of heaven and earth, the desolation of the earth, the calling of light into play, the division of land and sea, the swarming of life in the waters, the peculiar association of creatures of great length with bird-life, the subsequent prevalence of land animals—none of these are found in the Babylonian narrative: whence did the Hebrew derive them? Why does the Hebrew depart from the Babylonian order in placing vegetation before the appointing of luminaries? How comes it that these additional particulars are so fitted in as to form a regular sequence? How, above all, comes it that this sequence is a steady ascent from the lower to the higher, so remarkably agreeing with the conclusions of a Science which did not begin to exist till a couple of millenniums later? Are we to suppose that those who evolved or framed the Hebrew account had a clearer perception of Scientific facts than their contemporaries and their successors for many generations after?

Surely, until all this can be satisfactorily accounted for, we are justified in refusing to believe that the simple, restrained dignity of Genesis could possibly have been derived from the verbose and grotesque absurdities of the Babylonian myths.

No! when we note in how many particulars the Scripture account has been confirmed by the facts revealed from the examination of records indelibly engraven in the very structure of the world, the only reasonable conclusion is that the Word which so truly describes the Work must be due to Him who was Himself the great Artificer.

CHAPTER IV.

THE first three verses of chapter ii. belong to the preceding account of God's work; they narrate the completion of that work, and the cessation of activity which followed.

The extent of the work is here defined somewhat more fully than in chaper i. 1: to "the heavens and the earth" is now added "and all their host," using the very word which afterwards acquired such especial significance in the title "the Lord of Hosts"—of Sabbaoth. In later days, a misdirected worship was offered to "the host of heaven," and the term no doubt signified the whole aggregate of sun, moon, and stars—the sum total of all the celestial worlds. Here they are associated with all the hosts of earth's teeming populations as forming one great army, an ordered array, subordinate and subject to the will of the supreme Lord.

When it is said that all these were "finished," something more than merely "ended" is meant: the idea is that of perfect completion. So when all the magnificence of the wilderness Sanctuary was prepared and ready in every detail, we read—"Thus was *finished* all the work of the Tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting" (Exodus xxxix. 32). So when the Great High Priest had completed the work of redemption by offering the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction," He cried aloud to heaven and earth, "It is finished." In this thought of complete perfection

Scripture is again confirmed by Science, for the more closely by aid of microscope and telescope we scrutinise God's work, the more we are compelled to acknowledge how exquisitely and perfectly all is "finished."

In verse 2 there is a curious difference of reading, the Hebrew stating that God finished His work "on the seventh day," while both Samaritan and Septuagint have "on the sixth day." Apparently it was thought that as God rested on the seventh day, the work must have ended the day before, and therefore it would be misleading to say that God finished His work on the seventh day, as though something yet remained over to be completed. Of course, the Hebrew really means that God had already completed and ended His work when "the evening" ushered in the seventh day, and therefore the alteration to "sixth" is altogether unnecessary.

The word for "rested" is "Sabbathed," that is, desisted or ceased from work. There is no suggestion of leaving off from fatigue, or of any need for recuperation, as is the case in man's rest from toil. Nor is there any idea of desisting from every kind of activity, as though God then became and remained wholly passive.

We have it on the highest authority—that of the Word Himself "by Whom all things were made"—and in reference to the very question of work done on the Sabbath-day, that "My Father worketh even until now, and I work" (St. John v. 17). It was only the special work of creation and development that ended on the seventh day. God's power is still needed, and has always been needed, for maintaining and directing that which He made.

Here we may notice the remarkable expression at the end of verse 3. In the English Revised Version it is rendered "which God had created and made," but the literal Hebrew is "which God created *to make*," *i.e.*, in order to make, for the purpose of making. A distinction is drawn between the "creating," the original bringing into existence, and the subsequent "making" or developing traced in the work of the six days.

As in the record of Creation, so in the institution of the Sabbath, it is asserted that the Hebrews are indebted to Babylonia, that the Sabbath was "of Babylonian origin."*

In a certain tablet, a word "*shabattum*" is defined as "day of rest of the heart"; and in a religious calendar for two of the Assyrian months, five days—the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th—were specified as days on which the king was forbidden to do certain things, such as eating food prepared by fire, offering sacrifice, putting on royal dress, or holding court. It is not known that these days were called "shabattum," nor (except the 19th) did they affect any but the king. The points of resemblance, then, are only two—(1) the word "*shabattum*"; (2) the intervals of seven days. But as regards the former, the "day of rest of the heart" is said to mean a day when the gods (not men) rested from their anger (not from work); and as regards the latter, the days (which may not have been "sabbaths" at all) were days of the month not coinciding with any particular day of the week, and were not of general observance. Two of the details which might seem to be resemblances are in reality differences—(*a*) on the forbidden days, the Babylonian king was not to eat food

* See Driver's "Genesis," page 34.

" prepared by fire," *i.e.*, must only eat things uncooked; on the Sabbath the Israelites were forbidden to use fires (Exodus xxxv. 3) for any purpose whatever, but might (and do) use food prepared the previous day; (*b*) the Babylonian king might not offer sacrifice; the Jewish Sabbath was a day for additional sacrifices (Numbers xxviii. 9, 10).

Altogether, the differences are so profound that there is little reason for connecting the Biblical Sabbath with the Babylonian customs. It is quite as likely that the " shabattum " was a reminiscence of a primeval Sabbath perverted to heathen superstition, as that the Hebrews adopted a Babylonian institution which they " stripped of its superstitious and heathen associations."

Since it was the seventh day which God blessed and hallowed, and that day was specified in the Fourth Commandment, why do Christians keep the first day of the week?

There is no doubt that this observance of the first day is traceable to Apostolic times (Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 2), and the Apostles were devout Jews who would not consider themselves justified in modifying a Divine command simply to commemorate the Resurrection, any more than the Ascension would justify keeping the fifth day, or the Crucifixion would entitle them to transfer the Sabbath to the sixth day. The only thing which could induce them to change a Divine ordinance (one, too, which was held in especial reverence by the Jews) would be a Divine command, and that could only have been conveyed to them by the

Son of Man, who was also "Lord of the Sabbath Day" (St. Matthew xii. 8). We may believe with confidence that for the observance of the first instead of the seventh day we have the authority of Him to Whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been given (St. Matthew xxviii. 18).

The change of day thus authorised carries with it a change of meaning. The seventh day is associated with the thought of rest after labour; the first, with a renewal of life and activity.

Both, however, are dominated by a still higher motive. Even in the old dispensation, cessation from toil was not the primary consideration: the command is "Remember (in Deuteronomy, 'Watch heedfully') the Sabbath day to keep it *holy*," and "Thou shalt not do any work" is only the method of securing that sanctity. Now, "holy" means separate and dedicated to God, and that must still be the characteristic of the Christian "Lord's day." If the observance of one day in seven were solely, or even chiefly, enjoined in order that man might renew energies exhausted by work, then there might be reason in contending that this can be secured by remaining in bed or by indulging in harmless amusement. But when it is realised that the deeper import of the day is consecration, such pleas cannot be urged. It must be a day separate from the other six in being devoted to God and not to self. It is a tribute to the King of kings of one-seventh of our time, just as the tithe is a tribute of one-tenth of our means. It will still be a day of rest, for it will mean laying aside all unnecessary work, and

all work for our own worldly interests and advantage. More than that, it will be of inestimable benefit to man, in affording leisure for the higher thoughts and higher aims too often crowded out by the cares and occupations of the week. God claims the day as a recognition of His sovereign rights, yet in His lovingkindness so claims it that it secures for us our highest interests, both temporal and eternal. Still, for us, the chief consideration should not be our own advantage. It is not our own day to use as we think best: it is "the Lord's day."

CHAPTER V.

WITH ver. 4 we commence a new section. The style changes, and the personal name of God—Jehovah—is introduced, and from this it has been argued that this part is derived from a source other than that of the previous chapter. Moreover, it is urged that here we have an altogether different account of Creation from that in chap. i., coming from an early age when picturesque stories of the origin of all things were current, and when God was thought of and spoken of very much as if He were a man, in what is called "anthropomorphic" language. According to this, the account in chap. i. really belongs to a much later period than chap. ii., having been framed at a time when man had learnt to realise how far greater God is than man, and how different in nature; and therefore spoke of Him more reverentially and were more chary of using His Name. We shall be in a better position to consider all this when we have seen what this section actually tells us.

"These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created."

It is often contended that this clause (the first half of ver. 4) does not belong to what follows, but must be the "subscription," the closing sentence of the preceding account, because it sums up what has gone before. It is a summary, but a summary of the kind which is often used to introduce a fresh subject, as when modern

writers begin a new chapter with some such phrase as "Such was the course of events when—" or "The foregoing is an account of what led up to—." In a recent publication, Professor Naville compares a set of cuneiform tablets to a course of lessons, and says: "Anyone who has had any practice in teaching knows that he will often begin a lesson by a very short recapitulation of the one before, so as to place his hearers in the train of thought with which he is engaged, or may well repeat his conclusions or a quotation from any part, yet without going over all that he had said in the previous lesson, and above all without necessarily following the order which the subject required when he had to follow its development from the very start. He may take an idea or a fact from any part and repeat it with fuller details in order to make it the central point of his disquisition." Just such a "very brief recapitulation" we have in the first part of ver. 4, and there is no sufficient reason for divorcing that sentence from the clause that follows, "in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven." On the contrary, there are links which connect the two together.

"Generations" may seem at first sight a strange word to apply to the heavens and the earth, but when we bear in mind that in chap. i. the "making" is represented as a long series of processes of development subsequent to the "creating," we can see that "generations" is not an inapt term to describe this gradual process. Then it becomes clear how carefully the words have been chosen:—"These are the generations (the stages of derivation) of the heavens and the earth when they were (had been) created, in the

day that the Lord God made earth and heaven." It is an expansion of the preceding phrase (ver. 3), which God created in order to "make," and "made" is not a synonym for "created."

It is to be noticed that the whole period of the "six days" of chap. i. is here summed up as "the day," another indication that in these chapters "day" is not used in a limited sense. A still more important point is that, whereas in the former part of the verse we have "the heavens and the earth," at the end we have "earth and heavens." If this were a copyist's error, accidentally transposing the words,* the definite article would not have been omitted, and, besides, a distinct meaning can be traced in the inversion. Chap. i. is the account of the creation and developing of the whole universe, and there "the heavens" naturally stand first; but this verse is the transition to the history of this particular world. Therefore, it begins with the same order as the previous chapter, and closes with "earth" first and "heaven," as it were, in the background. We might almost paraphrase the verse as meaning: The foregoing are the stages by which the heavens and the earth were brought into their present condition after their first creation, during the period in which the Lord God was fashioning them: now we have to turn to the history of what took place on earth, and that, therefore, takes the first place with "heaven" following after. But then this deliberate alteration of the phrase shows that the whole verse is a unity, and not (as often asserted) a piecing together of fragments from different sources.

* The Samaritan and LXX. have evidently supposed it to be such a mistake, and have corrected it to "heavens and earth," as at the beginning of the verse.

The Revised Version has placed a full stop at the end of ver. 4, and begins ver. 5 as a separate sentence, rendering the latter by "And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up." The Greek, however, carries on the sense from ver. 4 into ver. 5, reading, "In the day when the Lord God made the heaven and the earth, and every green thing of the field before it became (γενέσθαι, came into being) upon the earth, and every herb of the field before it sprung up," which agrees fairly well with the Authorised Version.

Now this rendering is certainly nearer to the original, for the Revised "no plant of the field was yet in the earth" would in Hebrew be expressed quite differently from the wording we have. Also the close of a verse does not necessarily imply a full stop and a fresh sentence, as may be seen later on in the chapter where verses 16, 17 are clearly connected together (see also chap. iii. verses 14, 15 and 17, 18, 19).

The more accurate translation of the Hebrew, then, represents that the Lord God made the plants and herbs of the field at the same time as He made the earth and heaven, though they did not appear or spring up till afterwards; and the rest of the verse gives reasons for the non-appearance of this class of vegetation, (*a*) absence of rain, (*b*) absence of human cultivation. The latter reason, in conjunction with the phrase "of the field," shows that only cultivated plants are here intended, for certainly "a man to till the ground" was not needed for wild growths or forest trees. Also the absence of rain does not mean that the earth was utterly dry—"too dry, in fact, to support vegetation," as Dr. Driver asserts ("Genesis,"

page 35)—for verse 6 continues, "but there went up a mist from the earth." Even if the Greek "a fountain," or the Assyrian "overflow"* be substituted for "mist," the rest of the verse, "and watered the whole face of the ground," shows that the failure of these plants to spring up was not due to lack of moisture. It is, therefore, not correct to assert that this chapter places the creation of vegetation after the formation of man. *All* vegetation is not alluded to, but only the herbs and plants "of the field"; and of these, and these alone, it is said that, though God made them when He made the heavens and the earth, yet they did not make their appearance on the earth till regular rains and the tilling of the earth by human agency facilitated their springing up.

Now, the vaporous condition in lieu of rain mentioned in ver. 6 agrees precisely with the conditions which must have prevailed during the Carboniferous period, when, indeed, vegetation was luxuriant, but only vegetation of the wild kinds, "chiefly tree-ferns and large mosses (flowerless plants), pines, and cycads" (Sir J. W. Dawson, quoted by Driver, "Genesis," page 21). Perhaps, also, this later development of the food-producing vegetation may be indicated in chap. i., for there the verse (29) which speaks of vegetable food for man and beast comes after the creation of man (ver. 27).

Verse 6 explains how the absence of rain was compensated for by the prevalence of a moisture-laden mist; ver. 7 tells how cultivation was provided for by the formation of man, and it is to this that the previous verses have been leading up, as the main subject of what follows.

* Driver, "Genesis," p. 37.

In i. 27 we are simply told that God "created" man. Here we are given fuller detail, and are taught that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," and "formed" means fashioned, moulded, as a potter moulds clay. Yet this does not require that man was built up directly out of the dust without any intervening process, as a child might make a figure out of mud. When it is said that a ship is built of iron, that does not mean that lumps of iron have been simply placed together to form a ship. The ore has to be smelted, and plates rolled, and rivets formed before construction can even begin. In the same way, all that is meant here is that the ultimate material of which the human frame is composed is to be found in the dust of the earth, and we know how largely mineral elements, carbon, calcium, and phosphorus, enter into the composition of our bodies. If ever it should be proved (as it never yet has been proved) that man was evolved out of some anthropoid ape, it would simply mean that the fashioning of which Genesis speaks was a longer and more complicated process than appears at first sight, but none the less it would be true that the original material was "the dust of the ground."

The passage we are considering tells us that man was thus formed or fashioned, but says nothing of any pre-existing model or type to which his form corresponded. It is chap. i. which informs us that "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him" (i. 27). The word "image"—Tselem—and the other word, "likeness"—D'mooth—used in ver. 26, are certainly used elsewhere of material resemblance, and there is no authority for referring them solely to mental or moral qualities. It may be true enough that the

"gift of self-conscious reason" is possessed by man and by no other animal (Driver, "Genesis," page 15), but it is altogether out of keeping with the words used to insist that the image and likeness of God can only mean this, and nothing else.

Are we then to conclude that Genesis i. 26, 27 represents God as having an actual material form, after which the human form was modelled? This is a subject on which it behoves us to think and speak with great caution and reverence, being especially careful not to be "wise above that which is written"; yet there are indications to guide us. It was "three men" that Abraham saw and entertained (Genesis xviii. 2). Two of these were angels (xix. 1), but to the third is given the sacred name, the Lord Jehovah (xviii. 1, 13, 17-33). Jacob wrestled with "a man," and yet said that he had seen God "face to face" (Genesis xxxii. 24, 30). It was "a man" who stood over against Joshua (Joshua v. 13), but He is not only the "Captain (Prince) of the host of the Lord"; to Him also is given the Divine name (vi. 2). The "Angel of the Lord" who appeared to Gideon (Judges vi.) and to Manoah and his wife (Judges xiii.) was certainly in human form (vi. 22; xiii. 6, 10, 11), and yet accepted Divine honours, and is identified with God and the Lord (vi. 14, 16, 22 23; xiii. 22, 23). It is further noticeable that the angels, who are sometimes called "sons of God," are always represented as appearing in human form, both in the Old and the New Testaments.

There is, then, ground for believing that long before "the Word was made flesh" there was a Divine Being who was seen "in the likeness of men," and hence it is at least allowable to think that this human form belonged to the Son of God

even at the Creation, and that it was in this Image and after this likeness that man was fashioned.

This would account for the passages in Genesis iii. which represent that the Lord God walked "in the garden" and talked with Adam, Eve, and the serpent. It would also account for passages which speak of "seeing God" (Exodus xxiv. 10; Isaiah vi. 1), and of beholding "the form—T'moonah (similitude)—of the Lord" (Numbers xii. 8), though in His Divine Essence it is true that "no man hath seen God (the Father) at any time" (St. John i. 18).

When it is said that man became "a living soul," that in itself does not imply any special pre-eminence over the animals, for the same phrase is used of the living creatures in the waters (i. 20), and of birds and beasts (ii. 19). The distinction between human and animal life lies in the breathing into the nostrils of man "the breath of life," a phrase which reappears in the fuller form "the breath of the spirit of life" (Genesis vii. 22).

CHAPTER VI.

MAN having been formed, the preparation of an abode for him is next noticed: "The Lord God planted a garden (Greek, paradise) in Eden eastward" (ver. 8), more fully defined in ver. 9: "The Lord God caused to spring up out of the ground every tree desirable to the sight and good for food." It is quite misleading to call this the "creation of vegetation." Planting is not creating: Noah did not create the vines when he "planted a vineyard" (Genesis ix. 20). Vegetation in general is not mentioned, but only trees remarkable for beauty or fruit, and "caused to spring up" points to development rather than origination.

The general situation of Eden is clearly indicated as being in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, but the exact position is altogether doubtful. The rivers Pison and Gihon are not now known, and the countries Havilah and Cush cannot be certainly identified. Then, too, it is stated that the river which watered the garden was "from thence" parted into four heads. It is generally assumed that this means the separation of the river into four outlets, and a comparison has been drawn with the delta of the Nile.

But the word "heads" would rather suggest sources than outlets; and, moreover, the two rivers whose names are still known, the Tigris (Hiddekel) and the Euphrates, do not diverge from a common source, but converge into a single stream.

Although, then, Dr. Driver declares ("Genesis," page 39, note 2) that " it is most unnatural to suppose " that the words describe the " *upward* course above the garden," since the river is described as being parted into different " heads " after watering the garden, it would seem that the writer (contrary to our ideas) does trace the course of the river back to the streams which converged to form it. In that case the site of the garden would have to be sought below the confluence of the four streams, and not in the fertile plain of Mesopotamia.

The precise locality, which has quite possibly now been changed beyond recognition, is of small importance. The main point is that the first home of mankind is described as a " garden " of beauty and fertility—a " Paradise of delight," as the Greek has it, taking advantage of a possible meaning of " Eden." Such a Paradise of loveliness and life the Saviour promised to the penitent criminal hanging on the " accursed tree."

Yet the man was not placed in the garden to enjoy it in idleness; he was (verse 15) put there to " till "* it and to guard (or watch over) it. Even then he had duties to perform and responsibilities to discharge. Work, then, was not originally a curse, nor is it that even now, though it has become more of a burden in consequence of the Fall. Man's energies were given to him to use, not to leave rusting in neglect, and some of our purest pleasures are found in the employment of our faculties of body and mind. The tiller of the soil, the artizan, the artist, the poet, the scientific investigator, the philosopher, all can find true delight

* The word here is the same as in v. 5, and literally means " to serve," and is used of the service of the Israelites in Egypt (Exod. i. 14), and connected with the word for a " bond-servant."

in the exercise of their skill, and in the accomplishment of work well and thoroughly performed, even as God "saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good."

Along with the positive duty to work and watch there was a negative injunction. Freely might the man eat of every tree of the garden except one: of the tree of knowledge he must not eat on pain of death. Why was this exception made? If this tree had in it such possibilities of mischief, why was it placed there at all? Why should not man have been surrounded with all that is good without any possibility of doing wrong?

We have always to bear in mind that the purposes of God are far wider than we can conceive, and that man is not the sole object of His care. It is possible that the whole history of mankind, from the Creation to the very end, is intended to show others, as well as ourselves, that the highest happiness of all is only to be attained by free and willing acceptance of God's loving guidance. Freedom is only possible where the power of choice is allowed, and, if only good had been provided, no power of choice could exist. Yet the mercy of God reduced the danger to the narrowest limits: only one tree out of very many was forbidden. It is too often imagined that God's laws mainly consist of prohibitions. It is true that the Ten Commandments are mostly in the form "Thou shalt not," but side by side with these, even in the Old dispensation, and far more in the New, there is a much larger measure of positive injunctions, while in both Covenants the supreme commands are love to God and love to man.

Further, God's prohibitions are never arbitrary. The one thing forbidden to Adam was that which could do him harm. It is the same with all that God forbids. Though we may not always be able to perceive it, He only withholds from us those things that are injurious. We can see this plainly in the prohibition of such things as murder and theft; less clearly, perhaps, as to idolatry or profanity; and there may be some things in which we do not see any danger at all. Yet must we accept it as essentially part of God's truth that everything which He forbids is evil and must be eschewed.

As yet the man was "alone" in the sense that he had no companion "like to himself." The animals and birds, indeed, had been, like himself, fashioned out of the ground (ver. 19), and his first exercise of the power of speech was in giving them names (ver. 20), but none of these were in the full sense "like to himself," or an adequate companion for him. To provide this, the man himself is thrown into a state of unconsciousness, a portion of himself* is separated and built up into a woman, to be a "help meet (that is, suitable) for him." Man, then, is represented as having been formed sexless, or bi-sexual, as seems to be suggested in chapter i. 27, "God created man in His own image . . . male and female created He them." Potentially the human being originally united the elements of both sexes, and afterwards these were divided. Hence the woman is part of the man himself, "bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (ver. 23), and therefore a sharer with him of "the image of God." Hence, also, the sanctity of the marriage-tie, closer, even, than the

* A *side*, not a rib: the word is used of the sides of the Tabernacle (Ex. xxvi. 18, 20) and of its Courts (Ex. xxvii. 9-13).

relation of parent and child, in that the twain become " one flesh " (ver. 24).

It is surely very remarkable that such an ideal of the status of woman, and such a conception of marriage, differing so widely from the ideas prevalent in the East, should be set forth as the original condition according to the Divine intention. Woman, then, is neither the slave nor the rival of man, but his " help "; not on an absolute equality, but still his associate, his partner, like to himself, in the full dignity of humanity, and therefore in the likeness of God Himself.

We can now see the true relation of this chapter to the previous one. Here there is not an independent and discordant account of creation—the word " create " is not once used after ver. 3; the origin of vegetation in general is never alluded to, only the development of food-bearing plants and trees being noticed; the formation of animals and birds (not that of fishes or aquatic creatures) is mentioned solely as to their relation to man, and not as to the time of their origin. The interest is entirely centred in man, his formation, his home, his occupation, his food, his companion. The whole account is an expansion in detail of what is summarily told in chap. i. verses 26, 27. Dr. Driver himself ("Genesis," page 3) allows that this view is admissible " in the abstract," and, if so, it is a false system of interpretation which insists on every point which can be represented as a difference in order to make out that there are two inconsistent accounts. The very fact that the word " create " (particularly noted by critics as characteristic of chap. i) does not appear in this part of chap. ii., instead of being taken as a mark of different authorship, ought to show that the subject is differ-

ent, and that, therefore, the order here is not an "order of creation" at all.

Then, too, the altogether different scope of this later part accounts for—may we not fairly say, requires?—the change of style. In the former part, we have what may be called a bird's-eye view of an enormous expanse of history, in which details are necessarily disregarded, and only the great landmarks are sketched in merest outline. For that, a terse, pregnant style is absolutely needed. When only a single portion of that outline is treated so as to occupy nearly the same space, the scale being different the treatment will also be different. A map of a country is very much of a skeleton in which even a great city will appear as little more than a dot; a map of that city will show streets, public buildings, bridges, and the like. If the course of a nation's history is condensed into a single chapter, it will read almost like a catalogue; the detailed account of one episode of that history in a subsequent chapter will take the form of a narrative.

The account in chap. ii. then takes up the closing, crowning stage of the tremendous series of developments outlined in chap. i., and portrays this in ample detail. To treat it as an account of creation in general is to miss altogether its purport. Having man for its central theme, it and the two following chapters palpitate with human interest. Dealing with God's relation to man, it purposely introduces the personal name of God which indicates His relation to humanity, and uses language which represents His actions in terms of human signifi-

cance rather than the impersonal phrases which are appropriate to His operations in nature. It is surely the height of unreason to require that a narrative like this should be told with the same severe brevity as the previous condensed summary, and with precisely the same vocabulary. Rather ought we to admire the skill displayed in adapting the means employed to serve the end in view.

In the first chapter we have the architect's design, plain and ungarnished, of a stupendously great edifice: the second is the artist's glowing picture of one especial chamber as the setting and background for the portrait of the chosen inmate.

CHAPTER VII.

A FEW simple words at the close of chap. ii. indicate the childlike unconscious innocence of the first human beings:—"They were, the pair of them, naked and were not ashamed of themselves." On that follows chap. iii., the account of how they lost their innocence by eating of the forbidden fruit* at the instigation of the serpent, and were expelled from their garden home.

On the face of the narrative there are some very obvious difficulties which are often put forward. How could a serpent talk? How could the fruit of a tree impart the knowledge of good and evil? Because of these, it is often asserted that the narrative cannot be understood literally, and must be considered a piece of ancient folk-lore, a purified Babylonian myth, or (at best) an "allegory."

Here again it is only right to examine what is actually said before we make up our minds as to how it is to be understood.

In the first place, it is to be noted that it is not "a serpent" which is spoken of, but "the serpent." No doubt in ver. 1—"Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field"—this may be taken generically as meaning that serpents in general are wilier than all other animals, just as we say "the lion is the king of

* There is, of course, no reason for identifying this with an apple or any other fruit now known.

beasts," not intending any lion in particular, but using " the lion " for the whole genus of lions. But the very next verse, " he said to the woman," must refer to an individual, and throughout the whole chapter it is always " the serpent " who speaks, is answered, and finally is condemned as an individual—" Because thou hast done this thing, cursed art thou."

It is also possible to take it that " the serpent " was the only serpent then existing, the parent of the whole serpent tribe, as Adam and Eve are represented as the parents of all mankind. But this would be to read into the narrative a good deal more than is said, and moreover would be inconsistent with what is recorded in chap. i. 24-25, where the making of reptiles ("everything that creepeth upon the ground ") is placed before the creation of man.

It is therefore, to say the least of it, allowable, and really more consistent with the language employed, to understand " the serpent " as indicating a particular individual, in some way distinguished from all others.

Again, it is often taken for granted that the narrative represents the serpent as not crawling on the ground until after his condemnation, and it is argued that any other attitude is a physical impossibility owing to the conformation of the creature. A word of protest must here be entered against the use of language, sometimes heard, which can only have the effect of casting ridicule on Scriptural statements. It is nothing short of offensive to speak of the impossibility of believing in " the serpent walking on its tail." There is not a word in the narrative to warrant the implication that Scripture suggests such a preposterous absurdity. Coarse caricatures of what is really said

may suit the frothy harangues of park orators, but are altogether unworthy of anyone who has the least respect for the religious beliefs of millions (not Christians only), to say nothing of reverence for the Bible. At best, the idea that the serpent is represented as having any other mode of progression but creeping can only be an inference from the sentence of condemnation, "upon they belly shalt thou go," as though that could only mean "Hitherto thou hast been erect: for the future thou must go upon thy belly as a mark of degradation."

But there is not a word about any previous erect attitude, no hint of any other mode of progression, and "shalt thou go" does not in the least imply that this was something altogether new. In chap. ii. 24, Dr. Driver ("Genesis," page 43), takes the very same tense that is here used as a present, not a future, and renders "therefore *doth* a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave," instead of "shall leave—shall cleave." It would therefore be perfectly legitimate to maintain that iii. 14 may be translated "upon thy belly thou goest and dust thou eatest." But, quite apart from that, it would quite satisfy the statement of the text if the crawling on the ground, always characteristic of the serpent, was thenceforward to be taken as the outward sign of the curse just pronounced upon him.

The question, Who now believes in the talking serpent? though the contemptuous tone is in doubtful taste, is not so unfair, for the Bible does assert that the serpent talked. Of course, it is not asserted or implied that all serpents had the power of speech at that time; only that this particular serpent on this particular occasion did actually speak. Unless we are prepared to deny that there

is any power which can enable an animal to utter intelligible words, there can be nothing unreasonable in believing that an evil power may have made use of a serpent to convey tempting suggestions. There is nothing in the narrative which requires us to believe that the serpent was able to speak or did speak by his own unaided faculties, or that the insidious temptation was of his own devising. What possible motive could a mere reptile have had for involving humanity in evil, or, however crafty it might have been, how could it have had the knowledge displayed in its assertions? On the face of it, the narrative implies intelligence greater than that of man, and malicious animus against the human race. Beyond a question the supernatural is involved, but are we to pronounce the supernatural impossible?

The construction in this verse is precisely the same as in i. 2. Ordinarily, in Hebrew the verb comes before the subject, but in these verses, and occasionally elsewhere, the subject is put first and the verb follows. Where this is the case, the purpose appears to be to disconnect the statement which follows from what has gone before in point of time, and also to emphasise the fresh subject. In this way it is possible that there may have been a considerable interval (undefined) between the time of Adam and Eve's innocence and the time of their temptation. Also, it is possible that here (as in i. 2) " was " is to be taken in the sense " became." If so, then it would mean that this particular serpent was not more " subtil " than other animals by nature (there is no reason for considering serpents more crafty than other wild animals—e.g., fox), but " became " so by the influence of the crafty spirit which used it as the agent of temptation.

Then, as regards the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, that no such tree is now known to exist is no proof that none ever has existed; it may be that God in mercy has withdrawn both that and the tree of life from this world. To the question, How can any material fruit impart a perception of right and wrong? there is a possible answer. There are some vegetable products, such as opium, Indian hemp, and cocaine, which do produce extraordinary effects temporarily on the mental powers, and eventually, if persisted in, affect the moral sensibilities as well. It is, therefore, not inconceivable that there might be a vegetable substance capable of affecting our moral perception immediately. But there is a more important question to be asked: What authority is there for supposing that the forbidden fruit had any such power in itself? In chap. ii. 9, it is called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and in ii. 17, man is forbidden to eat of it, as that would entail death. So far there is no assertion that the fruit had any occult power over the moral faculty. In chap. iii. 5, the serpent asserts, "In the day that ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." In iii. 6, the woman saw (that is, perceived) "that the tree was to be desired to make one wise," but she cannot have ascertained this from its appearance; it can only be that she accepted the serpent's statement as to the effect, and therefore considered it to be desirable. In iii. 7, it is said that after eating, "the eyes of them both were opened," which certainly does not mean that their physical eyes were previously shut or blind; only that their mental perception was now enlarged. Why must this be attributed to any peculiar property of the fruit? The moral result, the power of

distinguishing between right and wrong, was the consequence—the immediate consequence—of the eating, but why may not that be because the act of eating was an act of disobedience, and not because of any mysterious power in the fruit?

The " opening of the eyes " immediately results in the awakening of shame; " they knew that they were naked." Is not that exactly the effect of an act of disobedience, especially of a *first* act of disobedience? In infants the perception of the distinction between right and wrong is dormant (" your children which this day have no knowledge of good or evil," Deut. i. 39); obedience is the first lesson to be learnt, and shame is unknown. With the first act of conscious disobedience the feeling of shame begins to start into life.

The difficulty in believing that the eating of a material fruit could have any moral effect really lies in the assumption that the effect was produced by some property residing in the fruit itself, and that is nowhere asserted in the Genesis narrative. Attribute the moral effect to a moral cause, the act of disobedience, and the difficulty vanishes.

So far the argument has been limited to showing that, so long as we confine ourselves to what is actually said in the narrative there is no real reason why " serpent " and " tree " should not be taken literally. Yet it is not absolutely necessary to insist on interpreting them literally.

It is often asserted that this narrative is an " allegory," but that word is open to objection as likely to convey a wrong impression. St. Paul (Gal. ii. 22, 24), finds an " allegory " in the history of Hagar and Sarah, but he certainly did not consider that history in any degree fictitious, or doubt that those persons had really existed, or that the events recorded of them had really occurred.

He does assert that underlying the history there is a deep spiritual meaning, and if that were all that would be understood by calling the narrative of Gen. iii. an "allegory," there would be little to which objection could be taken. But nowadays the word "allegory" has come to mean, and is generally taken to mean, an entirely imaginary story invented to convey a moral. That word, therefore, altogether begs the real question at issue, *viz.*, whether in this chapter we have only a product of human imagination, however beautiful and instructive, or a true account of an actual occurrence.

Still, a true account of a real occurrence may be clothed in figurative language, and figurative, symbolic language abounds in Holy Scripture. We have just had an instance in this very chapter in the phrase "their eyes were opened," which no one would dream of understanding absolutely literally. When our Lord Himself says "I am the Vine" or "I am the Door," we do not take either word in the strict literal sense, but understand that He is speaking of a real relationship of which the vine or the door is a figure or emblem. We may not then utterly reject the possibility that the language of Genesis may also be to some extent figurative; that the "tree" and the "serpent" may stand for some reality best pictured by these symbols. More than that, there is some reason for thinking that these words are elsewhere used figuratively. When St. John twice in the Revelation (xii. 9, xx. 2), calls the Devil "the old Serpent," there can be little doubt that he teaches that the real deceiver of Adam and Eve was no mere ophidian, but "the Father of lies," the Tempter. In the same way, "the tree of life" in Rev. xxii. 2, in all probability stands for a figure of some spiritual reality. Those, then

(and there are many earnest believers), who find it difficult to take the wording as strictly literal ought not to be accused of tampering with God's Word when they hold that by " serpent " we are to understand Satan, perhaps assuming the outward appearance of a serpent, and that " tree " is a figure of speech for some reality which we may not now be able to identify. What those who believe that in the Bible we have God's revelation of truth cannot admit is that in the narrative of Gen. iii. we have nothing better than ancient folk-lore, or a purified myth, Babylonian or Phœnician, only valuable as teaching by fable important spiritual truths.

Whether the language is to be interpreted as strictly literal or as in some degree figurative, the important matter is to recognise that it is a true history of a real crisis in the history of man which did actually occur, and has in very deed affected the whole of human nature.

The narrative of the Temptation is linked to the previous chapter by a play on words which cannot be reproduced in English. The word for " naked " in chap. ii. 25 (the Greek makes this verse the commencement of chap. iii.) is almost the same as the word for " subtil " in iii. 1, and in iii. 10, 11 the Samaritan makes it actually identical in form. The nakedness of the man and his wife is thus brought into sharp contrast with the craftiness of the serpent-Tempter, and that craft is brought into strong relief by the character of his utterances.

His opening question insinuates that God's commands are unreasonable, by exaggerating the injunction to refrain from the fruit of one tree into a prohibition of the fruit of all the trees. Even the woman in correcting this misrepresentation com-

mits the same fault when she adds "Neither shall ye touch it" to the command, "Ye shall not eat of it." There is as much danger in unduly enlarging God's commands as there is in subtracting from them, and that is the reason for the warning twice repeated (Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32), "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it."

This was precisely the error committed by the scribes and Pharisees in our Lord's day. In their zeal for the Law they thought to make "a fence" about it by elaborating further restrictions, such as the minute regulations for keeping the Sabbath or removing leaven at the Passover. By so doing they and their successors the Rabbis "bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders" (S. Matthew xxiii. 4). The caution against this unauthorised extension of Divine commands is not superfluous now in Christian days. We need to be careful not to go beyond what God and Christ have ordered or forbidden lest in so doing we make sad the hearts of those whom He has not made sad.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE next stage in the process of temptation lay in the skilful use of half-truths which are so much the more dangerous because the element of truth makes it all the more difficult to detect the admixture of falsehood.

Just as there was some measure of truth in the Tempter's claim that the authority and glory of the Kingdoms of the world had been delivered unto him (St. Luke iv. 6) since our Lord Himself calls him " the prince of this world " (St. John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11), so there was something of truth in the assertion " Ye shall not surely die," and in the seductive promise " Your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." In the mere letter of the word it was true that they did not die (in the ordinary sense) on the day they transgressed, but lived long lives afterwards; and it was true that their eyes were opened. None the less it was also true that in their disobedience they did immediately incur the spritual and moral death of alienation from God, and thus " sin entered into the world, and death through sin " (Romans v. 12); and their eyes were opened, but it was to their shame, and to the perception of evil. It has sometimes been objected that the Biblical statements seem to represent that death was unknown in the world until after the sin of Adam and Eve, whereas the record of the rocks show that from the first there were carnivorous animals, so that long before man

came into existence death was as common as life. But the Bible narrative takes it for granted that Adam did know something of death, otherwise the warning " in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die " would have had no meaning for him; also, the death threatened was not the death of the body, for ver. *22* requires that it would have been possible for man to " live for ever," even after he had come to the knowledge of good and evil. Those who make this objection have failed to take into account that in Scripture life often means something much higher than mere animal existence, and death something much more terrible than the termination of that existence.

The first part of the serpent's assertion was a daring, flat contradiction of God. He had said, " Ye shall surely die "; the serpent said, " Ye shall not surely die." That ought to have been enough to put the woman on her guard, but instead she was foolish enough to take the word of the serpent rather than that of God.

The second part declared that what God had forbidden was in reality a benefit; that by His prohibition He was not guarding them from harm but denying them a great advantage, which would place them on an equality with Himself by opening their eyes. As the first part denied His truthfulness, so this denied His goodness.

In ver. 6 the English rendering " to make one wise " is not quite satisfactory, for wisdom is more than discernment: there is in it something of a moral quality which enables one not only to distinguish but to make a right choice. Many are clear-sighted enough to perceive differences in the courses of action which are open to them, who are yet utterly unwise in the choice they make.

Accordingly the word here used is not that which stands for gaining wisdom in the true sense, but only the lesser faculty of perception or intelligence. The knowledge of good and evil was not the advantage Eve supposed it to be. It was an increase of knowledge, but of knowledge that was injurious rather than helpful.

The possibility of acquiring an insight into things hidden has always had a great fascination for the human mind, and at the present the pursuit of the occult, the desire to penetrate the mysteries of the future or to enter into communication with the departed, is widely prevalent. All the more, therefore, is the warning needed, "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God" (Deut. xxix. 29), and God's people were strictly forbidden to have among them any who lay claim to secret knowledge or who seek to the dead (Deut. xviii. 11; the English rendering "a wizard or a necromancer" obscures the significance of the words employed). The medium, the clairvoyant, and the adept are only the more dangerous to meddle with if they are above the suspicion of mere trickery. That in no way implies that God keeps back from us any knowledge that is really to our advantage, for it is immediately in connection with this prohibition to practise the arts of augury and divination that the promise occurs: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet" (Deut. xviii. 15). That Prophet has been raised up in the Person of Him whom, even more truly than Moses, "the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv. 10), and He has revealed to us all that it is expedient for us to know about the future and the life beyond the grave.

Besides revealing to themselves their own nakedness, the effect of the opening of their eyes on the

man and his wife was to make them shrink from and hide themselves from the "presence of the Lord God." Their guilt has taught them to dread instead of welcoming the approach of their Maker. It is, however, not correct to assert that the garden "is evidently regarded as His accustomed abode" (Driver, "Genesis," page 36). On the contrary, the narrative rather implies that He was not always present therein. Nor does the wording require that "the sound of His footsteps is heard" (*ib.*). Where the context demands it, the word Kol sometimes means "sound," just as we might speak of the *voice* of the wind or the sea, but much more frequently means "voice" (as in ver. 10, "I heard Thy voice") and "walking," the same word that is used of Enoch and Noah who "walked" with God does not mean "treading."

The Lord questions the culprits, not because He did not know, but in order to elicit their confession. Then as Judge He passes sentence of condemnation.

On the serpent a curse is pronounced: he is treated as morally responsible, another indication that no mere reptile is intended. In Hebrew there are three words which are rendered by "curse"; (1) Kalal, connected with the idea "to make light of, to despise" (used of Hagar despising Sarah, Genesis xvi. 4, 5); it is the word used of the man who "curseth his father or his mother" (Exodus xxi. 17, Lev. xx. 9); (2) Kabah, to injure by imprecation, used of Balaam's incantations (Numbers xxiii. 4, &c.) and a cognate word of "blaspheming" God's name (Lev. xxiv. 11, 16); (3) Arar, to devote to wrath; it is the word used in the denunciations of Deut. xxvii. 15-26, whch do not refer to any human condemnation but to God's judgment

on the sins specified. (1) and (3) are distinguished in Genesis xii. 3; "him that curseth (kalal) thee will I curse (arar)," so that it might almost be rendered "him that despiseth thee will I condemn." Kalal and Kabah are used of human maledictions: Arar of God's sentence of judgment.

It is this sentence of judgment which is pronounced upon the serpent, of which the grovelling attitude and creeping movement should thenceforward be the outward sign, and, in addition to this, a condition of irreconcilable enmity is decreed. This, however, does not refer to warfare between the human and serpent races, for, in the first place, it is to be "between thee and the *woman*," not mankind in general; and, secondly, "thy seed and her seed" are treated as individuals, not races, in what immediately follows. Literally translated, that sentence reads, "He (emphatic) shall bruise (or crush) thee as to the head, and thou (emphatic) shalt bruise (or crush) him as to the heel." There may be some allusion to the inability of serpents to attack much above the level of the ground (cf. chap. xlix. 17, "an adder that biteth the horse's heels"), whereas man can crush the head, where the venom is found. Clearly, however, the passage points to an individual contest between the Serpent himself ("thee-thou," not "thy seed") and the Seed of the woman, in which the former is to inflict some lesser injury, and the latter to achieve a final and conclusive victory. That has only been realised in the supreme conflict when the powers of evil inflicted an apparently mortal injury on "the Son of Man" in the Crucifixion, and by the Resurrection He was finally manifested to "destroy the works of the devil."

The sentence pronounced on the woman was two-fold: (1) a great increase of pain in child-bearing; (2) subordination to her husband. Whereas, originally, she was to be his "help" and companion, now the status alloted to her is "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

The sentence pronounced on man is also that of increased pain (the same word being used in ver. 17 as that to the woman in ver. 16; "travail" might be used in both places), due to the labour required for obtaining necessary food. Formerly he had work to do in cultivating the ground; now this is turned into arduous toil; "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

Dr. Driver in his notes argues that in both cases the increase of pain could not have been due to the sin of Adam and Eve—"we cannot suppose that the sin of Adam affected directly the physical productivity of the earth" ("Genesis," page 49). Of course not, nor does the account in Genesis assert anything of the kind. What is asserted is that the additional pain was inflicted by God as a punishment for sin. The altered conditions were brought about by God's judicial decree ("I will greatly multiply thy sorrow," ver. 16), not by the sin.

No "curse" is pronounced on either man or woman, as upon the serpent. They are punished as being guilty, but they are treated rather as accessories, the chief severity being reserved for the instigator of the crime. A "curse" is pronounced on the ground because of man ("for thy sake," *i.e.*, on thine account) to make it the instrument of his punishment by being rendered in some respects less fertile. "Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee" does not mean that such

growths were previously unknown. It may mean that they were now given increased vitality, enabling them to persist and spring up in greater profusion, to all appearance spontaneously. It certainly seems to be implied that before man's disobedience the fruits of the earth could have supplied all his needs easily and without excessive labour. As the penalty of his misdeeds, the power of the earth to produce edible fruits was, by Divine decree, narrowed and restricted, while the tendency to bring forth useless or noxious growths was increased.

The sentence pronounced was to be life-long; "all the days of thy life," and that is further defined (ver. 19) as "until thy return to the ground." The explanation suggests that, though death was not unknown as regards the animals, man did not know or realise what would be the effect on his own body, namely, that it would involve resolution into the original constituents. The fact has become so familiar to us that we are apt to take the words as a matter of course, yet it is evident on consideration that the warning must have had a profound significance for one who had till then no experience of human death and its effects. Is it likely that a thought so far from obvious should have found its way into a mere myth, or that it would have occurred to the framer of an allegory to insert it?

"And the man called his wife's name Eve, because she was (or became) the mother of all living" (ver. 20). The name Eve represents the Hebrew Chavvah, which means Life. Here the LXX., in order to preserve the connection with the explanation which follows, translates the name by the Greek word for life, zoe, but in iv. 1 the name

is turned into Greek letters as Heua or Heva, whence we get our English forms Eve and Eva.

At this time Eve had not become the mother of any, and Adam could hardly have known that she would become a mother at all. This verse, therefore, supplies one out of many instances in which Scripture does not adhere to a strict chronological order, but follows out a thought to its ultimate conclusion. The announcement of the meaning of death suggests by contrast the propagation of life.

"The mother of all living," of course, refers to human life alone. At one time it was argued that the differences between the various races of men are so great that they could not possibly be all descended from a single pair. Nowadays, however, Scientific opinion has more and more come round to the view that the deeper human characteristics of mind and body do point to a unity of origin agreeing with the statements of Scripture (see Acts xvii. 26; Romans v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22).

When the man and woman became conscious of their unclothed state, an instinct of modesty led them to cover their nakedness, but it was only with flimsy girdles of leaves. That instinct is now recognised and approved, and God himself provides them with more durable apparel of skins (ver. 21). The word "made" here does not necessarily require that He did the actual work of fashioning the garments, any more than Moses saying "I made an ark" (Deut. x. 3) means that he himself did the work, since we know (Exodus xxxvii. 1) that Bezaleel was the artificer. The truth of the statement would be amply satisfied if Adam and Eve made the skin clothing at God's command and under His direction.

A further consequence of man's disobedience was that he had to be driven out of Eden, yet this was not altogether a punishment. When the true, the higher and spiritual life had been so vitiated at its source, it would have been no mercy to afford man the means of prolonging existence indefinitely. "Mere everlastingness," says Professor Drummond ("Natural Law in the Spiritual World," page 220), "might be no boon. Even the brief span of the temporal life is too long for those who spend its years in sorrow." It was for the sake of man himself that he was debarred from access to the tree of life. A single partaking of the fruit of knowledge was enough to commence the disastrous working of death, but it does not follow that a single tasting of the tree of life would have conferred immortality. It would be quite in accord with what is said if man was driven out lest he should *continue* to take of the tree of life, and by repeatedly eating of it ward off the approach of death.

"The Man" (here including both Adam and Eve) was driven out, and, to prevent the possibility of return, guards—"the Cherubim and the flame (or flash) of the whirling sword"—were stationed ("caused to dwell") at the approach. He was sent forth "to till the ground from whence he was taken," a distinction being drawn between this and "the garden of Eden" (ver. 23).

Man was first formed "of the dust of the ground" (ii. 7), and afterwards taken and placed in the garden which the Lord God had planted (ii. 8); now he is sent forth from the garden to return to the "ground from whence he was taken." In the garden he was to till it, apparently with

ease; now he was with painful labour to till the ground which on his account lay under a curse.

The main subject of this chapter is Sin and Suffering. Chapter I tells us how the worlds came to be; chap. ii. how man come into being; chap. iii. how man came to be sinful and sorrowful. We know only too well that the world is full of pain and evil. How did that come to pass? Was it always so? Scripture says, No; just as the world was not created void and waste, but afterwards fell into that condition, so man was not formed inclined to evil and subject to pain, but afterwards became so. What was the cause of this sad change? Scripture tells us that it was because man did not believe and trust in God, and therefore disobeyed the one prohibition laid upon him. Yet that error was not due to his own innate perversity; it was brought about by the intervention of a being other than himself. That being was "subtil"—cunning and crafty—more than any animal ("beast" here, perhaps, suggests a lower idea than the Hebrew "living thing" conveys). By his craftiness, he succeeds in persuading the woman that God's command was unreasonable; that so far from entailing any evil consequence, disregard of His precept would secure a great and splendid advantage. Dazzled by this prospect, the woman accepts his assertion, and takes that which was forbidden, and the man at her instance does the like. By so doing, both of them lost their happy unconsciousness of evil, and, being thus corrupted, had to be deprived of their privileges, and brought upon themselves the sentence of pain and trouble.

It can hardly be denied that this furnishes an adequate and reasonable explanation of the in-

coming of sin and sorrow, but it is more than that. It is a vindication of God. It shows Him as throughout just, yet merciful and loving. He creates man innocent and happy, places him amid delightful surroundings, and provides him with a suitable companion. Desiring from him the free, loving, trustful obedience of a child, not the helpless subservience of a machine or the enforced submission of a slave, God leaves to man a power of choice, yet not without serious warning of the fatal consequences of a wrong choice. When that wrong choice has been made, the Judge pronounces a sentence of punishment on the culprits, yet reserves the severest condemnation for the Tempter, not for his deluded victims, for whom there is a promise of final triumph over the enemy to be achieved by their own Offspring. Even the exclusion of the guilty ones from their former home was really merciful in saving them from an unending existence in pain. Surely this sets before us the presentation of a Creator supreme in goodness and truth. What other explanation of the sorrowful condition of humanity is possible? Are we to believe that man was never innocent and happy, always sin-stricken and suffering from the very first? That would be to deem the Maker of man unjust and unkind; or else to consider man to be the sport of blind, relentless forces. That would empty the history of mankind of any purpose and rob the future of all hope.

What estimate are we, then, to form of the truth of the Scripture narrative? Nowadays we are often told that these early chapters of Genesis are "myths," human speculations attempting to account for the existing state of things; not authoritative accounts of what really occurred, but

beautiful and instructive stories inherited from an unenlightened age. Of what value would those be? What kind of myth ever enshrined so noble and inspiring a view of human pain and wrong? If we call the narrative an "allegory," who was the framer of so wise a tale, and whence did he derive the insight it displays? The Bible account of the incoming of pain and evil into the world is the only one consistent with a belief in a Good and Wise Creator. Its very simplicity, coupled with so much profound meaning, should be a guarantee of its truth.

CHAPTER IX.

FROM the parent the narrative passes on to the progeny—the man begets sons; disobedience develops into crime.

What interval there may have been is not indicated. The sons may have been born within a year or two after the expulsion of Eden, but we have always to bear in mind that in Scripture incidents are sometimes brought together that did not immediately concur in point of time.

Many Scriptural names are significant (for instance, "Eve," chap. iii. 20), but the names Cain and Abel are altogether doubtful. As Hebrew words no appropriate meaning can be attached to them, and to explain one by an Arabic word (*Kayin*—smith) and the other by an Assyrian word (*Ablu*—son) is very much guess-work. The names are not said to have been given by either parent. Adam gave the name Eve, and Eve gave the name Seth (ver. 25), but here it is only said "She brought forth Cain . . . she added to bring forth his brother Abel," almost as if the names belonged to them necessarily. Nor is Eve's utterance given as the origin or explanation of the name Cain. There is some likeness between the name and the word rendered "I have gotten," but it is not suggested that this was the reason for selecting the name. All that is stated is "and she bare Cain, and said," as though playing on words after the name was given. In English, this might be represented by "She bare Cain, and said, I have

gained." Also the exact meaning of what she said is not certain. The Hebrew Eth which stands before "the Lord" often means "with" (paraphrased in A.V. by "from," in R.V. "with the help of," in LXX. "by means of"), but also very often is the rather emphatic particle indicating the accusative case. Hence Eve's utterance may mean "I have gotten a man (even) the Lord," as though she believed her offspring in some sense Divine, possibly with reference to the promised Seed.

Another point not made clear is that "she added to bring forth" might possibly imply that Cain and Abel were twins, or it may mean that Abel was born after a considerable interval, even extending to many years.

Then we are informed of the occupations of the brothers: "Abel became a shepherd of sheep, and Cain became a tiller of the ground." That the elder should take up the duty imposed on his father (ii. 15) is natural enough, but how or why the younger became a keeper of sheep is left untold. Clearly, however, both must have passed out of childhood.

Verse 3, "And it came to pass at the end of days" (the English, "the process of time," is hardly definite enough) probably indicates another long interval, during which both must at least have attained to manhood. As Adam is stated to have been 130 when Seth was born (Chap. v., ver. 3), it is quite likely the interval was very long.

This introduces the offerings of the brothers: "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering (a gift, Minchah, the word afterwards used of the meal offering which accompanied the burnt offering) to the Lord, and Abel brought, he also (very emphatic), from the firstlings

of his flock and from their fat (parts)." The exact form of the offerings and the manner of offering is not specified, but the mention of the fat, choicest parts (those afterwards appointed to be offered on the altar in the peace-offering) shows that in Abel's case the animals were slain.

What prompted these offerings? Was it "a spontaneous feeling of gratitude for the gifts of the earth" (Driver, "Genesis" 64)? or was it that they had been taught to offer to God as a duty? The fact that both brought offerings makes it more likely that they had been taught, especially considering the disposition shown by Cain. Then the acceptance of one offering and rejection of the other must have been shown in some outward way, since Cain knew and recognised it, though we are not informed about it. Why was the difference made? "It can hardly have lain," says Dr. Driver ("Genesis," 64), "in anything except the difference of spirit and temper actuating the two brothers." Why not? The simple way in which the bringing of offerings is taken for granted as a matter of course shows that this is not an account of the *origin* of sacrifice. Now we know that in later days the sacrifice of life was, by the Divine will, appointed to be the way of approach to God, and that, even before that, it was known and practised by Noah and the patriarchs. Why may it not have been prescribed to Adam? and, if so, the nature of the offering was probably also prescribed. We are told that the Lord God "made coats of skins," and the skins must have been obtained from dead animals. The meaning would be far deeper if they were procured from animals that Adam had been taught to offer in sacrifice.

In that case, Cain's error would lie in direct disregard of the Divine will, accounting one kind of offering as good as another, and perhaps arguing that the fruit of his labour was quite as worthy as that of his brother's. Dr. Driver urges (page 64) that Cain's anger was "in itself a sufficient indication that his frame of mind was not what it should have been. There must have been in his purpose some secret flaw which vitiated his offering." That does not follow. Wounded pride at the rejection of his offering would quite account for his anger without any previous "flaw in his purpose." More than that: was this the first and only time that offerings were made? It was "at the end of days" that these were brought. Are we to take it that in all the interval there had been no thought of offering? that all of a sudden, after possibly a lapse of years, this "spontaneous feeling of gratitude" arose simultaneously in the hearts of both brothers? The wording "Cain brought . . . Abel, he also, brought" may quite well imply a habit of bringing. If, then, the offering of the fruits of the ground was rejected, not once but again and again, it is easy to understand that repeated mortifications would at last culminate in downright exceeding anger and sullenness (ver. 5). In the same way, "If thou doest well" in ver. 7 is not equivalent to "hast a right and sincere purpose"; it may refer to action rather than purpose, to compliance with a direct command.

If, then, Adam was taught after the Fall that, because of sin, the approach to God must be made through the sacrifice of animal life, much that is obscure becomes clear. The clothing made of skins would be the outward symbol of atonement (the Hebrew word for *atone* means *cover*): Abel's

occupation of tending sheep is accounted for; the bringing of offerings would be in accordance with Adam's teaching; the rejection of Cain's offering would be on account of his wilful disobedience to a Divine precept. That would be a simple reason, according with the primitive character of the narrative much better than an anticipation of the "prophetic teaching that it is not the gift, but the spirit in which the gift is offered, which determines its value in the sight of God" (Driver; "Genesis," 64, 65). Simple obedience was required of Adam and Eve; it is only reasonable to think that simple obedience was also required of Cain and Abel.

It is, of course, true that the initial step, the enjoining of sacrifice on Adam, is not recorded, but then we have seen that in the whole narrative much is left unsaid. Where so much is left uncertain, it is rash to dogmatise, but at least we are justified in thinking that the view which accounts for all the various stages in the simplest manner is more likely to be the true one.

This view, moreover, helps to give a plainer meaning to ver. 7, which has been found difficult by so many. The LXX., reading the Hebrew words in a different manner, gives a translation which is not very clear, but appears to mean, "Is it not, if thou didst rightly offer, but didst not rightly distinguish, that thou didst sin? Be at rest." Dr. Driver ("Genesis," 65) gives an elaborate explanation.

"*If thou doest well, i.e.*, hast a right and sincere purpose, it will show itself in thy countenance, *shall there not be lifting up*? viz., of thy countenance, it will not be downcast and sullen, but bright and open: *and if thou doest not well*, hast sinister, envious thoughts, *sin is* then near at hand, *couch-*

ing like some wild animal *at the door, and unto thee is its desire,* it is eager to spring upon and overpower thee, *but thou shouldest rule over it,* conquer the rising temptation before it is too strong for thee, and subdue it."

Plausible as this may sound, it certainly reads a great deal into the text which is not expressed, and there are objections to some of the renderings. (1) To "lift up the countenance" is a common idiom for to "accept, receive favourably" (Genesis xxxii. 20, "peradventure he will accept me," lit. "lift up my face"); (2) the Hebrew word for "couch" usually means lying at rest, not couching to spring (see Genesis xlix. 9, 14, and of flocks of sheep, xxix. 2; also Psalm xxiii. 2); (3) the paraphrase of the last clause, referring it to sin, introduces a subtle, far-fetched idea, and misses the true force. The whole sentence, only changing the pronouns, is all but identical with that addressed to Eve (iii. 16). Only fourteen verses intervene, and it is but reasonable that passages so nearly alike and so close together should be understood in the same way. To Eve it is said, "Unto thy husband shall be thy desire, and he (emphatic) shall rule over thee"; to Cain it is said, "Unto thee shall be his desire, and thou (emphatic) shalt rule over him." Both sentences must refer to the subordination of one person to another.

Taking the view that the real subject is the right sacrifice to offer, and bearing in mind that the word for "sin" often means "an offering for sin," the verse literally rendered affords a simple and intelligible sense. "Is it not that if thou doest well, there is acceptance? And if thou doest not well, at the door (ready to hand) a sin-offering

lieth: and unto thee shall be his (Abel's) desire, and thou shalt rule over him." Well-doing is assured of acceptance; ill-doing can easily be atoned for. When that is purged by the right offering, the subordination of the younger to the elder follows as a matter of course, and there will be no room for envy or anger.

In ver. 8 there is, in the Hebrew, a broken sentence, "And Cain said unto his brother——." Both Samaritan and LXX. here supply "Let us go into the field," and it is commonly taken for granted that the two requisite words have dropped out of the Hebrew text. But these two words are not such as are likely to be omitted accidentally, while the insertion could obviously be suggested by what follows, "and it came to pass when they were in the field." It is more than probable that the Samaritan and LXX. have supplied what seemed to complete the sense just as they have done in Exodus xxxii. 32, where they have inserted "forgive" after the broken sentence, "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin——." Moreover, at the end of Exodus xix. 25 there is a broken sentence precisely parallel to the one here, "and Moses went down unto the people and said unto them ——." In both cases supply mentally "that which the Lord said unto him," and the sense will be complete. It would be quite natural for Cain to repeat to Abel what had been said to him, especially the last sentence, referring to the relation between the brothers. Whereas if Cain really said, "Let us go into the field," it implies that he deliberately led Abel away to some spot where he could kill him unobserved (Driver; "he tempts his brother into a solitary place," page 65), which involves premeditation and treachery. The narrative as it

stands in Hebrew leaves it possible that Cain was overcome by sudden temptation on finding they were alone together, his still smouldering resentment bursting into a flame of fury. The crime of fratricide, even in a moment of passion, is revolting enough without making out that it was deliberately planned.

As the Lord questioned Adam and Eve, so now He questions Cain to elicit confession, not to obtain information, for on Cain petulantly denying that he knows where Abel is, the Lord's reply shows that He was fully aware of what had happened. In Cain's denial, the English, "Am I my brother's keeper?" which has become so familiar, does not convey the full vigour of the original. The word here is "watchman," as in Psalm cxxvii., "the watchman waketh but in vain," implying constant vigilance (not the same word as "a keeper of sheep," ver. 2), and is emphatic by its position—"The *watchman* of my brother am I?"

Adam's reply to the question, "Where art thou?" shows something of shame and fear, and is met with a comparatively lenient sentence. Cain's answer to the question, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" is defiant and impenitent, and is met with increased severity: "Cursed art thou," not the ground. The ground, which he had hitherto tilled, is now to refuse him any return for his labour; it is "from the ground" that he is accursed.

Henceforth he is to be "a fugitive and a wanderer" (the Greek inaccurately, "groaning and trembling"). The word for "fugitive" is a very strong one, conveying the idea of aimless straying from side to side (cf., Psalm cvii. 27,

"they *stagger* like a drunken man"). The Hebrew alliteration—Na'a v' Nad—might be reproduced as "reeling and roving shalt thou be in the earth."

In ver. 13, the Greek makes Cain say, "Greater is my fault than can be forgiven me," and the Hebrew, "Greater is mine iniquity than can be lifted" might bear this meaning; but the next verse shows that he is only complaining of the severity of the doom pronounced upon him. It is not a penitent acknowledgment of grievous sin; it is a protest against the justice of the sentence. Driven from off the face of the ground, he protests, he would be hidden from the face of the Lord, a wandering vagabond, and an outlaw, whom any that found him might kill with impunity. There is no justification for asserting that here "Jehovah's presence is supposed to be confined to the garden and its precincts; beyond these limits he will be hidden from His face" (Driver, "Genesis," 66, 67). The Hebrew literally is "from *upon* the face of the ground." He was not, therefore, driven from a particular locality, nor is that idea to be found in the sentence pronounced upon him. The decree was that he was cursed from the ground in that it should no longer yield its strength to him. He was driven from off the face of the ground in the sense that he was now debarred from his former settled occupation of tilling it. Nor does "from Thy face shall I be hid" mean that he would be "deprived of the protection which, according to ancient ideas, proximity to a sanctuary conferred even upon a murderer" (ib.). No idea of distance enters into the thought. The "face" of the Lord means His favourable regard, as in the

blessing, "The Lord make His face to shine upon thee" (Numbers vi. 25), or the prayer, "Hide not Thy face from me" (Psalm xxvii. 9), and to be "hidden from His face" simply means to be excluded from His favour. So also, "Cain went out from the presence of (*lit.*, from before) the Lord" (ver. 16) does not mean that the presence was "regarded as confined to the garden and its precints." As the Lord had been present to confront Adam and Eve, so He was present to confront and condemn Cain, and it was from that presence that the guilty one "went forth."

CHAPTER X.

IT has been asked, Who could there have been to slay Cain? And answer has been made (Driver "Genesis," 67), "According to the existing Book of Genesis, it is plain that there could have been no one." So far, Genesis has only mentioned Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel. Considering how much there is that is not told us, it is hardly safe to assume that no others were yet in existence; but even if it were so, surely Cain might have anticipated that others would be born. Did he suppose that there never would be any other human beings beside his father, his mother, and himself?

So, too, it is sometimes asked, What was the "mark" which the Lord set upon Cain? The R.V. translates more correctly: "The Lord appointed a sign for Cain"; but on this Driver asserts (page 67) that this was a sign "for his protection, which, to have the effect intended, must have been something attaching to his person." It would be still more accurate to translate by "the Lord appointed *to* Cain a sign that not anyone ('lest any' conveys more than is expressed in the original) finding him should smite him." That would mean that the sign was to Cain, not to the finder, an assurance that he should not be smitten. That might be something quite external to him, just as the rainbow was given to Noah as the sign of the Covenant that the earth should not again be destroyed by a flood of waters.

Cain's descendants. Verse 17 tells us abruptly of Cain having a wife: who could she have been? If the human race did spring from a single pair, it is evident that the earliest marriages must have been between brother and sister. As the race multiplied, alliances between close kindred were forbidden; but even as late as Abraham's time marriage with a half-sister was considered allowable (chap. xx. 12). Now, between Abel's birth and his death there must have been ample time for a daughter to be born and to reach a marriageable age. No such birth is mentioned, but generally speaking there is little notice taken in the Pentateuch of the birth of daughters.

Even if this was not the case, there is no note of time in ver. 17. Cain's marriage may have been long after he settled in the land of Wandering (Nod)—quite long enough for him to marry a sister born after Seth, when we know (chap. v. 4) that Adam had "sons and daughters." Just as nothing is told us of Cain's wife, so also nothing is said of the wives of Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, or Methushael, and of Lamech's wives only the names. Who or what they were is passed over as of no importance, nor is anything said of their families, except the name of one son, until we reach Lamech.

We are also told of Cain that "he builded a city" (more literally "became the builder of a city"). By this we are not to understand a great city like Babylon, Nineveh, or Rome. The Hebrew "Ir" is often used of what we should consider quite a small place; but it does probably mean a walled town as distinguished from an open village (Lev. xxv. 29, 31). The statement follows immediately on the notice of the birth of Enoch; but that does not

require that the building took place about the same time. The mention of the son Enoch suggests the thought of the town named after him, and the building may not have been begun until there were enough of Cain's descendants to need it.

Of Lamech, we are told that he had two wives; but it is too much to say that he "introduces polygamy." It is the first recorded instance of polygamy, and that is all.

Of Lamech's sons, Jabel was the "father" (progenitor) of tent-dwelling cattle-owners, and Jubal "of all such as handle the harp and pipe," *i.e.*, stringed and wind instruments, probably quite rude and primitive affairs, such as a lute with few strings and a shepherd's reed pipe, and there is no reason why these should not have been formed at a very early period. Tubal-cain was a "forger (hammerer) of every cutting instrument of brass (or copper) and iron." It is not actually asserted, though from the analogy of his brothers it may reasonably be inferred, that he was the first to do this, and certainly there is nothing to suggest that he was the discoverer of "the art of smelting and forging" these metals. All that is said is that he made use of these metals to make "cutting instruments."

If, then, Tubal-cain was the first to introduce edge-tools of metal, it follows that any cutting before his time must have been with instruments made with some other substance. Something must have been used to fashion Adam's coats of skin and to slay Abel's lambs. Thus, from Adam's days to those of Lamech, a period of unknown length may correspond to that Stone Age for which Dr. Driver asserts (page 68) "the narrative of the present chapter leaves no room."

Upon this follows Lamech's utterance to his wives, which has been called "The Song of the Sword." Dr. Driver pictures it thus (page 70):—"Lamech returning, we may suppose, from some deed of blood, and brandishing his weapon in his hand, boasts before his wives—as an Arab chief, it is said, will do still—of what he has done; and expresses his delight at the means which he now possesses of avenging effectually bodily injuries. . . . Lemech boasts that he has requited a (mere) wound or bruise (Exodus xxi. 25, where 'stripe' = 'bruise' here), inflicted upon him, with death."

The picture is vigorously drawn, and is likely to impress the imagination of readers; but how much of it has any real foundation? In its favour it can be said that (1) the "song" follows almost immediately after the mention of cutting instruments; (2) the R.V. rendering: "I have slain a man for wounding me and a young man for bruising me," is no doubt admissible; (3) the seventy-and-sevenfold avenging can be taken as boastful. On the other hand (1) there is no mention of a sword, and the "brandishing his weapon" is sheer imagination: there is not a word in the text to suggest either of these; (2) the rendering: "I have slain a man to my wounding and a young man to my hurt" (A.V. and R.V. marg.), is at least equally admissible (though Driver says it "may be disregarded"), has the support of the Greek translators, and, in the writer's opinion, is more in accordance with the Hebrew wording; (3) to speak of a *mere* wound or bruise may fit the English words but not the Hebrew: in Exodus xxi. 25 "wound" and "stripe" are classed with serious bodily injuries, and of the two "stripe" (or bruise) is the stronger; (4) the idea of boasting has to be read

into the text: the simple phrases are unlike those a boaster would use, and, indeed, "Hear my voice . . . hearken unto my speech" (cf. Numbers xxiii. 18; Deut. xxxii. 1, 2) suggest solemn warning rather than glorying, while the allusion to Cain points to guilt rather than achievement.

The account of Cain's descendants ends abruptly with this utterance, so that this forms a climax to which the meagre fragment of genealogy is merely an introduction. Ver 15 tells of the seven-fold avenging of Cain; ver. 24 of the seventy-sevenfold avenging of Lamech. There is a deliberate setting of one against the other, and there would be no sense in breaking off at this point on a note of exultation.

The whole tendency of the chapter so far has been to trace the rapid development of evil: Adam's folly is followed by Cain's crime; Cain's single murder by Lamech's double guilt. We seem to hear the voice of guilty horror and dread, not of vainglorious boasting.

Birth of Seth.—Here again, as so often, there is no note of time, but it is tolerably evident that the writer, having traced the thought of Cain's crime to the still greater crime of his descendant, now returns to an earlier, and a considerably earlier, period. Six generations of Cain's line have been enumerated, and it cannot be seriously supposed that the birth of Seth did not take place till Tubal-Cain was old enough to become a metal worker. This going back to a previous event is common enough in most histories, only in the Scriptural histories it is done without the warning which a modern historian would think it necessary to insert. In reading the Bible, therefore, it has to be borne in mind that the placing of one narrative

after another does not always mean that the events happened in that order.

The birth of Seth, then, probably took place soon after the death of Abel, as seems to be implied in Eve's exclamation; "God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel." In this the use of the expression "another seed" instead of "another son" is remarkable, and can hardly be anything but a reference to the promised "seed of the woman." It would appear that at the birth of each son Eve thought that this might be the looked-for Seed who should win man's victory over the Tempter-enemy. In the case of Cain and Abel, the idea had been proved fallacious by the death of one and the departure into exile of the other. With the birth of Seth the hope revived, yet not to be realised till after long, weary ages.

To Seth succeeded Enosh (frail man), and with him began the calling upon the Name of the Lord. This does not mark the beginning of the use of the name Jehovah, nor the beginning of "the formal and public worship of God" by using the name in invocations. In Exodus xxxiii. 19, xxxiv. 5, the very same phrase is used of the Lord Himself (literally, "I will call on the Name of the Lord . . . and he called on the name of the Lord"), where it can only mean (as our translation renders it) *proclaim* the Name. Thus the chapter which has been mainly occupied with the shame and guilt of Cain's line now contrasts the glory of Seth's in that his sons not only worshipped the Lord (Cain and Abel did that by their offerings), but also made known that name to others, as did Abraham and Isaac in later days (Genesis xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxi. 33, xxvi. 25).

The whole chapter is a notable example of the method, too often overlooked, of the Scriptural writers. We are apt to read the narratives as though they were a systematic and full account of all that happened set out in regular order. Instead, we find a comparatively few events—often separated by long intervals of time about which we are told nothing—not always arranged in chronological sequence. There has evidently been made a selection out of much which might have been told, and must have been told if it had been the writer's aim to give a complete history, and that selection implies a designed plan in the writer's mind. What that plan was we are not informed; the facts are simply stated, and we are left to gather for ourselves from the general trend what was the purpose the writer had in view.

In this chapter it is plain that the main purpose is to delineate the rapid growth and development of evil, but in addition there appears to be some intention to mark that this growth of evil is not inconsistent with a considerable advance in what men call progress. It is significant that the building of a walled town, the invention of musical instruments, and the practice of working in metals are ascribed to Cain and his descendants. Not, of course, that such things are in any way evil in themselves, or that they do not promote the welfare of mankind, but the thought (much needed nowadays) is suggested that progress in civilisation, refinements in art, ingenious developments of mechanical contrivances are not sufficient to secure man's true happiness if divorced from obedience to God's will, and from recognition of the true name and nature of the Lord.

CHAPTER XI.

BY the word "generations" and the phrases "in the day that God created" . . . "in the day when they were created," the commencement of chap. v. is closely linked to chap. ii. 4, and, like that verse, it recurs to an earlier statement in order to develop it more fully. As ii. 4 refers to i. 1 to link the creation of the heavens and the earth with the formation of man, so v. 1, 2 looks back to i. 27 to connect the creation of man with the development of the human race.

The first two verses, then, mark the commencement of a fresh section, but, more than that, the whole chapter is really in the nature of an introduction. It bridges over an interval of more than 1,600 years without any history, merely a genealogy which is scarcely more than a list of names and ages. The real interest is only taken up again with the beginning of chap. vi., setting out the causes leading to the wholesale corruption of mankind, which called for the terrible but cleansing visitation of the Flood.

For such a brief summary the narrative style of chapters ii.-iv. would be altogether unsuitable Even in modern histories, especially those written with a special purpose—legal, political, ecclesiastical, or military—it is not uncommon to find fairly long periods passed over with the briefest mention of incidents and persons, in order to bring into bolder relief events of particular importance. It

would be unreasonable to expect that condensed accounts like these should be written in the same picturesque fashion as the more detailed parts. Even less reasonable would it be to argue that the varying style must be due to a difference of authorship.

More than that, the wording here differs slightly but significantly from that in similar passages elsewhere. In chap. ii. 4 the form is "These are the generations of ——," and that is also used to introduce other genealogies (those of Noah x. 1, Shem xi. 10; Ishmael xxv. 12; Esau xxxvi. 1). Here, and here only, it is "This is the book (or roll) of the generations." That may mean that what follows is an extract from an already existing pedigree-roll, which would fully account for the peculiar precision and formality of the chapter.

The line of descent given is that from the man whom God created in His own image after His likeness, and the thought is carried on in ver. 3, which states that Adam "begat in his own likeness, after his image." That line begins with Seth, treated as if he were the "first-born," though he was not that, but he would naturally be the heir, since Abel was dead and Cain driven away. This beginning with Seth and Enosh agrees with iv. 25, 26, and, moreover, follows naturally thereon. The train of thought runs directly on from chap. iv to chap. v. The notice of Abel's death and Cain's departure was needed to explain why Adam's line was carried on through a son, younger than either. From Cain's crime the increase of evil is traced down to the deeper guilt of Lamech, and, that being reached, the history reverts to the earlier period to explain how the place of murdered Abel was taken by Seth, and how the

service of Jehovah was continued by Seth's son, Enosh. Now, the narrator is concerned to hurry on to the next great epoch, the Deluge, and is content to do so by merely indicating the lapse of time in the list of Seth's descendants.

Not only has it been asserted that chap. iv. is from a source different to that from which chap. v. is taken, but the difference has been accentuated by maintaining that the list of Cain's descendants in one and the list of Seth's descendants in the other are only varied forms of a single original. That would have the effect of throwing discredit on both, and also on whoever put the two together, since he would have combined as two different things what are really different forms of the same tradition.

Those who hold this theory rely on the similarity of names: Enoch and Lamech occur in both lists; Kenan, in Hebrew, is the same as Cain with the last letter doubled; Jared only differs from Irad by dropping the first letter (which, however, is a strong guttural); Mehujael and Mahalalel, Methushael and Methushelah, though there are differences more marked in Hebrew than in English, have enough in common to make it possible that they are variations of a common original. As regards half the names, there are sufficiently marked differences, and there are other differences to be accounted for. (*a*) One list has six decendants of Adam, where the other has nine; (*b*) in both chapters Seth is Adam's son, and in chap. iv. Cain is also Adam's son, and, therefore, Seth's elder brother; he can hardly be the same as Kenan, who was Seth's grandson; (*c*) in chap. iv. Enoch is Cain's son; in chap. v. Enoch is Kenan's great grandson; (*d*) in chap. iv. Lamech has three sons,

Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain; in chap. v. Lamech has only one son, Noah, and it is Noah who has three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet; (*e*) the names which are somewhat alike in form differ widely in meaning; (*f*) the two lists differ in the character of the people, Cain's line being marked by evil, and Seth's by piety (Driver, "Genesis," 80, "as we now possess them, the two lists have a different character impressed upon them"); (*g*) the late writers to whom chap. v. is attributed must have been acquainted with the source containing chap. iv.; are they likely to have given recognition to a form of the tradition differing from the other in so many respects?

Like the account of Creation in chap. i., the list in chap. v. is said to be derived from Babylonia. Genesis has "ten patriarchs before the Flood, and according to Berossus the Babylonians told similarly of ten kings who reigned before the Flood" (Driver, "Genesis," 80). Besides the agreement as to the number (ten), it is alleged that there are points of agreement concerning the individuals. Regarding four of these, the similarity is found in the names; that is, that the Hebrew names correspond to the Babylonian words represented by the Greek of Berossus. Now, in two of these four, the resemblance is found in the meaning of the names (*e.g.*, Enosh in Hebrew and "amilu" in Babylonian both mean "man"); in the other two it is in the form of the names, not their meaning; and, to make out even this much, it has to be assumed that both Greek and Hebrew have considerably altered the Babylonian name (*e.g.*, that the Greek Amegalurus represents Amilalarus, and the Hebrew Mahalalel represents Amilalil).

Apart from the four whose names are thought to be alike, there are two who are identified "on independent grounds."

(*a*) Noah is said to be the same as Xisuthros. Certainly these two names are not in the least alike, but each stands 10th in the list, and is the one in whose life-time the Flood occurred. In addition to this measure of similarity, it is claimed that the Flood stories told about these two are strikingly similar.

But the Babylonian Flood story is not told by Berossus about Xisuthros: it is found in the Gilgamesh epic about Ut-Napishtim. It is therefore necessary to connect Xisuthros with Ut-Napishtim, and that is done in the following manner. It is asserted that Xisuthros is only the Greek way of writing the Babylonian Hasis-atra: Hasis-atra is only an inversion of Atra-hasis: Atra-hasis is said to be another name for Ut-Napishtim. The connection is rather round-about, and there are some weak points in it. It is a plausible guess that Xisuthros represents Hasis-atra, but it is not more than that: the inversion Hasis-atra is not actually found, and is simply guessed at to form a link between Xisuthros and Atra-hasis: the identification of Atra-hasis with Ut-Napishtim rests on slender grounds. Fragments exist of older Babylonian tablets in which an Atra-hasis is said to have been preserved from a flood by entering a ship; and Atra-hasis occurs once in the Ut-Napishtim story, rather as an epithet ("very clever") than as a name. With these uncertainties at each step of the process, the identification of Xisuthros with Ut-Napishtim (and therefore with Noah) is not very secure.

(*b*) Enoch, the seventh from Adam, is said to be the same as the seventh Babylonian King "Edor-

anchus or Euedorachus," who can hardly be different from "Emmeduranki, a legendary King of Sippar" (Driver, "Genesis," 78).

Here again we have something of a resemblance, rather than an actual identity, between the Greek name and the Babylonian, while the Hebrew for Enoch—Chanokh—has nothing in common with Emmeduranki except the letters n, k. What then are the "independent grounds" for identifying the two?

(1) Enoch probably means "instructed," and he "walked with God": Emmeduranki held intercourse with a god "who taught him the secrets of heaven and earth, and instructed him in various forms of divination."

(2) Enoch's years were 365, the number of days in a solar year: Emmeduranki was in the service of the sun-god.

"Enoch may thus be reasonably regarded as a Hebraized Emmeduranki" (page 78).

The latter of the two reasons given strikes one as unusually far-fetched, while the former is not very strong.

The total amount of agreement between the two lists, then, amounts to this:—there are ten names in each, and both end with the Flood; out of the ten pairs of names, two are thought to agree in meaning; two (with the help of a little conjecture) may possibly agree in form; two more, differing wholly in name, are supposed to be identified on "independent" (and somewhat doubtful) grounds; no agreement of any kind is even attempted to be traced for the remaining four. It takes some ingenuity, eked out with guess-work, to reconcile these two lists.

There is yet one more point to consider. By adding up the ages assigned to the patriarchs when a son was born to them, and Noah's age when the Flood came, we get a total of 1,656 years from Adam to the Deluge. The total of the reigns of the Babylonian kings comes to what Dr. Driver aptly calls "the portentous period" of 432,000 years. Now there was a measure of time called a "soss," equalling five years, and of these 86,400 would equal the aforesaid "portentous period." Also, by a little manipulation, 1,656 years can be made out to equal 86,400 weeks. Hence, M. Oppert, the French Assyriologist, "inferred that the two periods rested upon a common basis." This would mean that there was an ancient tradition or record which mentioned a period leading up to the Flood, designated as 86,400 units of some kind or other: the Hebrews took these units as weeks, and somehow reduced that to 1,656 years, while the Babylonians took the unit to be a "soss" of five years, and thus obtained their total of 432,000. Why the Hebrews should have hit upon weeks at all; how they made out that 86,400 weeks are equal to 1,656 years; why they should have divided that total into ten curiously unequal portions, and taken each portion to represent the age of a man at his son's birth; why the Babylonians should have chosen the "soss" as their unit; why they should have divided their total into ten irregular portions differing entirely from the Hebrew division; and why they should have supposed these portions to represent the reigns of kings; all these are questions the answers to which are discreetly left to the imagination. Also it is to be noticed that the "common" basis of 86,400 does not appear in either account, but has to be obtained in

both cases by calculation; the totals 1,656 and 432,000 have to be obtained by addition; and the Babylonian enumeration is by the "sar" of 3,600 years, not by the "soss." Putting all this aside, there are two points to be considered. (1) 1,656 years can only be made out equal to exactly 86,400 weeks by the artificial device of splitting up the total into 72 periods of 23 years, taking the normal year as 365 days, and adding five extra days (for leap years) to each period of 23 years. If the total 1,656 is taken as the basis of calculation, and one extra day allowed for every four years, the result will be 86,407 weeks, five days, which rather spoils the symmetry. The reverse process of turning 86,400 weeks into exactly 1,656 years (which is what the Hebrews are supposed to have done) would be still more elaborate.

(2) The ages assigned to the patriarchs are clearly given in round numbers. Were there never any odd days, weeks, or months left out of count? Or are we to suppose that in every case the son was always born on the patriarch's birthday? Of course, the Babylonian figures are still more obviously round numbers, in which nothing less than a "sar" is noticed. In both cases, the precise totals cannot be relied on, and therefore the identification vanishes.

One is almost ashamed to spend so much time over such a fantastic calculation, yet it becames necessary sometimes to show what very illusory statements are gravely put forward.

Some might also object that the calculation is based upon the figures in the present Hebrew, from which both Samaritan and Septuagint differ, the former showing 1,307 years, and the latter 2,262 instead of 1,656. There are reasons, however, for preferring the Hebrew account.

For each patriarch three figures are given: (a) age at birth of son; (b) years lived after; (c) total length of life. Taking the nine names, Adam to Lamech, in six cases the Samaritan agrees with the Hebrew in every respect, while the LXX. differs as to (a) and (b), but agrees in the total (c). In two other cases it is the LXX. which agrees with the Hebrew, while the Samaritan differs entirely. In the last case, Lamech, all three texts differ in every respect.

Now, in the Hebrew the ages under (a) decrease steadily from Adam, 130, to Enoch, 65, excepting only Jared, 162. Under (b) the years lived after the son's birth are given at 800 or more (except Enoch, 300). Leaving out Jared, the LXX. has in every case 100 years more under (a), and 100 years less under (b), so that the total is the same as the Hebrew. In the three cases where the Hebrew age under (a) is already more than 100, the LXX. agrees (only adding six in the case of Lamech). It is evident that the LXX. figures make the proportion between the ages under (a) and (b) less unequal, and, therefore, follow a definite system.

The Samaritan follows the opposite plan, and instead of increasing the ages under (a), have diminished those three which exceed 100 to keep them to the same level as the others, at the same time giving smaller figures under (b), so that the totals under (c) also show a steady decrease. Here also system is discernible, and there is another fact pointing in the same direction. According to the Samaritan, Lamech was 53 when Noah was born, and lived 600 years after, making a total of 653 years, exactly the number assigned to Methuselah after Lamech's birth. Also the 600 years after Noah's birth exactly equal Noah's age at the

Flood. Thus both Methuselah and Lamech die in the same year, and that the year of the Flood. This can hardly be due to coincidence, and suggests that the ages of both Methuselah and Lamech have been intentionally altered to bring about this result.

Since then the Hebrew table of ages is quite inartificial, while the other two show symmetry obtained by systems proceeding in opposite directions from it; and since the Hebrew is (except as to Lamech, where all differ) confirmed by one or other of its rivals in every detail, the probability is strong that the Hebrew figures are the true ones, and the others have been altered from them. It may be added that similar characteristics (but on slightly different lines) are found in the ages given for the patriarchs who lived after the Flood.

It is remarkable that, while so many variations are found as to all the others, the three texts are absolutely agreed about the ages assigned to Noah and Shem, and all the more remarkable because the details about Noah are so unusual. In all the other cases the age at the son's birth is very noticeably *less* than the number of years lived after, and never exceeds 190. Noah is said to have been 500 when his son was born, and that is 50 years *more* than the remainder of his life. It looks as though the ages in these two cases were so familiarly known that those who did not scruple to alter the others could not venture to take liberties with these.

If, then, the Hebrew figures correctly represent the original, the question remains, can we believe in the prolonged lives they specify? Can we believe that before the Flood the average length of life (leaving out the exceptional case of Enoch) was about 900 years? Dr. Driver says, roundly,

"Longevity, such as is here described, is physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body" (page 75). What grounds he may have had for this uncompromising assertion the writer is unable to guess. At any rate, the Biblical figures compare very favourably with the Babylonian, which make out that some kings reigned for as much as 64,800 years, and the very shortest reign was 10,800!

One suggested explanation of the statistics, viz., that for years we should read months, may be at once dismissed. It might pass when applied to the total length of life, since it would mean that Methuselah was a little over 80 at his death, and the shortest life (Enoch) was over 30 years; but it will not do at all when applied to the age at the birth of a son, for we cannot suppose that Mahalelel and Enoch were fathers before they were six years old. That would certainly be "physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body."

The estimate of possible longevity has altered a good deal within recent years. It is not so very long since there were some who strenuously denied that anyone had ever lived to be 100, and now cases of centenarians are frequently reported. It has been asserted (but the writer cannot vouch for this) that an authority on physiology gave it as his deliberate opinion that, if accident and preventible disease were excluded, there was no reason why men should not live to be 1,000; and Isaiah seems to have contemplated that when he predicted that "the child shall die an hundred years old," and as the days of a tree are the days of my people" (Isaiah lxv. 20, 22). We know so little of the conditions of life before the Deluge that it is unsafe to

lay it down dogmatically that greatly prolonged lives were then impossible, and Scripture consistently represents that after the Deluge the length of human life steadily decreased until, after Terah, no one reached the age of even 200. It is not a case of legends of "abnormally protracted lives" in prehistoric times with a sudden fall to "normal" conditions when history dawns; the representation is that of very long lives in the earliest stages of the human race, when existence must have been very simple, and a gradually diminishing power of vitality as time went on.

The bare list of names and ages in chap. v. is only diversified by two scraps of information about individuals. (1) Of Enoch we are told that he "walked with God." The particular form of the verb might almost be rendered "set himself to walk," conveying the idea of deliberate and conscious conformity to the Divine will. Also, it is not merely "with God," but, for the first time, the definite article is inserted, "*the* God," an expression elsewhere used to distinguish the true God from other so-called gods (see Deut. iv. 35, "The Lord He is *the* God; there is none else beside Him").

Though it is not definitely asserted, it has always been believed that Enoch was translated without dying, and no doubt the phrase "he was not, for God took him," in such marked contrast to the "and he died" asserted of all the others, is intended to convey the meaning that Enoch did not die. The only other instance in all the Bible of a man who did not see death is Elijah, and this has led many to think that these two will return to earth as the "two witnesses" mentioned in Rev. xi. 3-12. (2) Of Lamech we are told that he called his son's name "Noah, saying, This same shall

comfort us for our work (*lit.*, from our doings) and for the toil (*lit.*, from the pain, or travail; the word used in iii. 16, 17) of our hands because of (from) the ground which the Lord hath cursed," the only instance except Seth where the giving of the name is attributed to the parent. There is some resemblance between the name Noach and the verb nachem, comfort, but it is no way suggested that the name is derived from the verb, or that the saying is an " explanation " of the name. As in the case of Cain (and a good many later instances), it is simply said that, the name being given, the parent utters an exclamation, in which there is a play on the name, just as we might imagine a mother nowadays calling her child Richard, and fondly saying, " We are greatly enriched."

Lamech refers, both in the word " toil " and in the following, " the ground which the Lord hath cursed," to the sentence pronounced on Adam, which suggests that he (and perhaps his forefathers) had taken up the task of Adam in tilling the ground. Possibly it may even mean that Seth, as Adam's heir, had followed the occupation forfeited by Cain. There seems also a deliberate purpose in closing the list of Seth's descendants with this utterance of Lamech by way of contrast with the utterance of the other Lamech which closes the list of Cain's descendants. That is darkened by the shadow of guilt and vengeance; this is brightened by the hope of comfort and relief from the curse. Then it would imply that the writer of chap. v. was fully aware of the contents of chap. iv., or, rather, that one mind planned both chapters. It would also imply that the two Lamechs were distinct individuals, and, therefore, that the two lists are not variants of one original.

CHAPTER XII.

CHAPTER vi. 1-4: The list of Cain's descendants in chap. iv. is followed by a short notice of Seth and Enosh, going back to an earlier period. In like manner, the list of Seth's descendants is followed by a short passage, also returning to a previous time, to account for the corrupt state of the world in Noah's time. As introducing the narrative of the Deluge, this also is written in narrative style, not in the curt genealogy phrases.

The meaning of this passage largely depends on what is to be understood by (1) "the sons of God" in ver. 2, and (2) the word "Nephilim" in ver. 4. As to (1), it is asserted that "sons of God" elsewhere denotes "semi-divine, supra-mundane beings," namely, angels, as the Greek translation has it; and to support this, reference is made to Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Daniel iii. 25, 28; Psalms xxix. 1, and lxxxix. 6. And as to (2), Nephilim occurs again in Numbers xiii. 33 in connection with the gigantic race of the sons of Anak, and in both passages the Greek has "giants." Hence, Dr. Driver concludes (page 83) that, "Understood in accordance with the only legitimate canons of interpretation, the passage can mean only that semi-divine or angelic beings contracted unions with the daughters of men; and we must see in it an ancient Hebrew legend . . . the intention of which was to account for the origin of a supposed race of prehistoric giants." No doubt this is in

accordance with the canons of interpretation which insist on judging the early Hebrew Scriptures by the legendary traditions of other races, though even these are constrained to admit that in the most important respects the Hebrew narratives are on a far higher level, and this should surely require that they should be interpreted accordingly. Also it is in accordance with the views of those who maintain that chapters v. and vi. 1-8 are derived from different sources; otherwise the reasonable canon of interpretation would be that a passage must be understood in conformity with its immediate context, and not judged by what is found in other text books far removed.* Now, in vi. 4 the expression is not simply "sons of God," but "sons of *the* God," agreeing with ver. 22, 24 (of Enoch) and vi. 9 (of Noah); and that is not found in the other Old Testament references, except in Job. i. 6, ii. 1. Then, too, Nephilim is found nowhere else, except in Numbers xiii. 33, and the meaning "giants" is only inferred from its being there applied to a gigantic folk. But for this, it would only be natural to connect Nephilim with the very common word Naphal, he fell, and that would give an intelligible sense in both places.

Taking, then, vi. 1-4 as connected with what goes before and what follows after (the marked expression "the God" being the connecting link), there is a continuous train of thought. Seth's line begins with Enosh, when the proclaiming of the Name of the Lord began; half-way down comes Enoch, who "walked with the God," and the list closes with Noah, who also "walked with the

* It is pertinent to note that, according to the critics themselves, Gen. vi. 1-8 is from the early Jehovist history, while Job, Daniel, and the Psalms belong to a much later period.

God." The whole line is associated with the service of the true God. How came it, then, that only Noah "found grace in the eyes of the Lord"? For that, not only Cain's descendants, but all the rest of Seth's family, must have become corrupt, and that is sufficiently accounted for by the inter-marriages between the two lines. Seth's family could rightly be called "the sons of the God," not only because of their association with His service, but because they were descended from the one who was begotten in the likeness and after the image of Adam, who was made in the image and likeness of God (cf. St. Luke iii. 38, "Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God"). The rest of mankind (and there were other "sons and daughters" of Adam besides Cain and Seth, ver. 4) are simply designated "men." Dr. Driver (page 83) objects that these are "arbitrary interpretations of the words" without "any support in the text," and would give "a narrower sense" to "men" in ver. 2 than it bears in ver. 1. But the interpretation of "the sons of the God" as the family of Seth does find support in vers. 22, 24, vi. 9 when vi. 1-8 is not isolated from its context; and "men" in both verses will have the same sense when it is remembered that ver. 1 really takes up the thread dropped at iv. 24, for the time when "men began to multiply on the face of the ground" must refer to a time much earlier than that of Noah. Dr. Driver also objects that it is not "apparent why the inter-marriage of two races, each descended from a common ancestor, should have resulted in a race characterised "either by gigantic stature or . . . by abnormal wickedness." The "gigantic stature" disappears if "Nephilim" does not mean giants; nothing is said about "abnormal

wickedness," though it is said, vi. 5, "the wickedness of man was great." The inter-marriage of a God-fearing race, even though descended from a common ancestor, with those who had forsaken "the God" for other deities, is only too likely to produce children following their mother's ideas and practices, and gradually deteriorating even into great wickedness and continually evil imaginations. Further, if "Nephilim" may be taken to mean "fallen ones," ver. 4 does not necessarily mean that these resulted from the inter-marriage of the two races. What is actually said is, "The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also thereafter, when the sons of the God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them." This may quite legitimately be taken to mean that "fallen ones," apostates from the true God, were in the earth in those earlier days when men began to multiply in the earth, and even after that continued to be when the inter-marriages between the two races had taken place. The verse goes on: "These (emphatic, but 'the same' is a little too strong) were the mighty men (not 'giants,' as in the LXX.), which were of old, men of the Name." If the last phrase can be taken as "men of renown" (but in Numbers xvi. 2 "men of renown" is literally "men of name" without the definite article), then the whole sentence may be referred, as it usually is, to the Nephilim. With the significant article, however, a different meaning is suggested, namely, "the Name" of the Lord proclaimed by Enoch, and the reference will be to the nearer "sons of God," not to the more distant fallen ones. Then the clause will be by way of contrast to what has gone before, as much as to say, Fallen ones, fallen

away from the service of God, there were in the days of old, and still remained, yet *these* were the true heroes of old, namely, the men of the Name of the Lord.

Instead, then, of "ancient legend" or "unassimilated mythology" about "prehistoric giants" resulting from unions between "semi-divine, supra-mundane beings" with human females, chap. vi. 1-4 can fairly be read as a straightforward explanation of how even the "sons of the (true) God" became so corrupted by intermarrying with "daughters of men" who did not "walk with the God" that eventually only Noah was found faithful. One view makes the passage a stray fragment, having no particular relation with its context on either side, foolish in its legendary character, and out of keeping with the pure monotheism of the rest of the book: the other view makes it the necessary connecting link between what goes before and what follows after, takes into consideration the force of words that have been disregarded, and gives it a dignity worthy of the lofty teaching of the whole book. Which is the more in accordance with reasonable canons of interpretation?

So far verses 1, 2 have been taken in conjunction with ver. 4, leaving out ver. 3, which Dr. Driver pronounces "very difficult and uncertain," even going so far as to assert that the simple truth is "that both textually and exegetically the verse is very uncertain, and that it is impossible to feel any confidence as to its meaning" (page 84). None of the three elaborate explanations considered by him allows for the possibility that "My spirit" in this verse, like "the Spirit of God" in i. 2, may refer to a Personal Agent, only referring it to a "vital" or "ethical" principle. No wonder the verse is

found difficult. Taking the Spirit as personal, the verse reads "and the Lord said" (in consequence of the inter-marriages just mentioned) "My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever; in straying he is flesh (that is to say, *frail*, not *sensual*; see Driver, page 84): yet his days shall be 120 years." There is no reason for referring the last clause to the normal limit of human life, since (except by the violent expedient of referring every other statistical statement to another and later document) the narrative furnishes many examples of much longer lives in after times. It is much more natural (with all due deference to Dr. Driver's authority) to take it in connection with the preceding "shall not strive with man for ever" as indicating the limit of forbearance. The frail propensity to stray alludes to the weakness of the "sons of God" in choosing wives from those who were already astray. The striving is by persuasion, not by putting forth strength which would involve overruling the gift of free choice. That striving by persuasion must not be endless, therefore a limit is set.

Where is the difficulty and uncertainty? Can no confidence be placed in this meaning? It is simple enough, filling in the gap between the ill-advised marriages of ver. 2, and the continued existence of "fallen ones" in ver. 4, and leading up to the exhaustion of the Divine patience in verses 5-7. The general and progressive corruption of the mass of mankind, arising from these ill-assorted marriages between faithful and unfaithful, makes it necessary to set a limit to the Divine patience, and the tacit warning of the narrative is that explicitly set forth by St. Paul; "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers" (2 Cor. vi. 14).

CHAPTER XIII.

THE Bible account of the Deluge is said to be "composite," that is, made up of fragments from two different accounts, patched together; to be only a modified version of a Babylonian legend; and to be "unhistorical," that is, a description of an event that cannot possibly have taken place. Here again, as in the case of chapters i. and ii., it will be as well to see what the narrative, as it stands, actually states before examing the charges made against it.

The opening section (vi. 5-8) is admittedly part of, and intimately connected with, the preceding passage (vers. 1-4) which describes the degeneration of even "the sons of God," and refers to a period (ver. 3) 120 years before the Flood.

Literally rendered the passage would run:

"Now the Lord perceived that the evil of the man (*i.e.*, mankind as in ver. 1) was multiplied in the earth, and every fashioning of the devices of his heart was only evil all the day: and it grieved the Lord that He had made the man in the earth, and He was pained at His heart: and the Lord said, I will wipe away the man whom I created from off the face of the ground, from man unto beast, unto creeping thing, and unto the bird of heaven, for I am grieved that I made them. Yet Noah found favour in the eyes of the Lord."

In this there are some niceties of language worthy of notice: "the man," standing for the whole race, is set in sharp contrast to "the God" (v.

22, 24; vi. 2, 4, 9, 11); "evil" (twice in ver. 5) is the same word as in "the knowledge of good and evil," ii. 17; "multiplied" (the same word as in the primal blessing "Be fruitful and multiply," i. 28), refers to quantity, not enormity, indicating widespread evil, not "abnormal wickedness"; "fashioning" is the word used of the forming of man (ii. 7), and "devices" is the word used of Bezaleel's skill ("to devise devices," Exodus xxxi. 4); the two together conveying the idea of moulding and bringing into form subtly conceived thoughts.

In verses 6, 7 the English "repent" is misleading: the root idea of the Hebrew word is (1) sorrow; then (2) sorrow for another, sympathy; then (3) the consolation that sympathy will bring, in which sense it occurs in ver. 29, "This same shall comfort us" (as also in "Comfort ye, comfort ye, My people," Isaiah xl. 1). There is, then, no suggestion that the evil of man caused a change of mind and purpose on the part of the Lord, as "repent" seems to imply: the word only speaks of the Lord's sorrow at the sin of man, and that, a sorrow of sympathy issuing eventually in consolation. This is further emphasised by the next phrase, "He was pained," for this verb is connected with the word for "pain" in iii. 16, 17 ("I will greatly multiply thy *pain* . . . in *pain* shalt thou eat of it"), and recurring again in ver. 29, "This same shall comfort us . . . for the pain of our hands." As the penalty of sin was "pain" to woman and to man, so the evil of man causes "pain" to the heart of God. As the "pain" of Eve was to be that of conception and birth, and that of Adam the toil of obtaining the fruits of the earth, so the "pain" of God's

heart was to culminate in the Birth of Bethlehem, and the agonised work of Redemption on Calvary.

The word rendered "destroy" (ver. 7 and vii. 5) is found in Moses' prayer, "blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book," Exodus xxxii. 32; in the direction to the priest to "blot out" the curses with the water of bitterness, Numbers v. 23; and in the Penitent's prayer "blot out my transgressions," Psalm li. 1. Hence it is proposed that here also it should be rendered "blot out" as in R.V. margin. But that rendering would be impossible in 2 Kings xxi. 13; "I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside-down." This meaning, "wipe away," would suit the other passages, is also found in the Arabic, and is specially appropriate here to the utter removal of man from the face of the ground. There is a reason for using "ground" in this connection (instead of earth" as in ver. 6), for it reminds us that the man—ha-Adam—was originally taken from the ground—ha-Adamah—(ii. 7) from which he is now to be swept away. But while there is here an allusion to the wording of chapter ii., there is also an allusion to chapter i. in the distinction that man is the one "whom I have created" (i. 27), whereas the animals are those "I have made" (i. 25). It is to be noticed that in this short section of only four verses there are distinct allusions to chapters i. and v., both of them chapters supposed to be taken from a different and much later source.

The section closes with a brief mention of the exception to the general sentence of extermination in the person of Noah, who "found favour in the eyes of the Lord."

The general subject of the passage being the wickedness of man, and the consequent sentence of

death on man (the animals being only brought in as suffering in consequence of his misdeeds—"from man unto beast," &c.—cf. Romans viii. 20), the personal Name indicating God's relation to man is used throughout.

The gist of these verses, then, is that the Lord, in His grief that the multiplying of mankind has issued in evil also being multiplied and spread, decrees, as the only hope for the race, that the tainted generation must be wholly "wiped away."

There is no suggestion that the decree was at this time made known to any one: it is simply determined in the Divine counsels. Nor is there as yet any hint as to how the decree is to be carried out.

Another section (said to be derived from a different source) begins at ver. 9, and continues to the end of the chapter. There is first a summary of Noah's character, a mention of his sons, and a notice of the state of the earth at this period (9-12). Then follows a communication from God to Noah containing (1) a warning of the coming destruction, ver. 13; (2) a command to build an ark with some details as to its size and form, verses 14-16; (3) the reason for needing this structure—the destruction will be by the agency of *water*, ver. 17; (4) the purpose of the ark—by Divine covenant, it will be for the preservation of Noah, his family, and animals in pairs, verses 18-20; (5) a command to lay in a store of necessary provisions, ver. 21. The whole concludes with a brief statement that Noah did as he was commanded.

The estimate of Noah at the commencement is intimately connected with the statement of the previous verse (8), furnishing, as it does, the explanation of why Noah found favour "in the eyes of the

Lord." His preservation was not due to any capricious favouritism: it was the righteous recognition and reward of a faithfulness unique in a faithless world, and at the same time afforded the possibility of a new and favourable start for the human race. He was "a righteous man" (upright in conduct), perfect (whole-hearted) among his contemporaries (a different word from "generations" at the beginning of the verse): "Noah walked with (set himself to behave according to the will of) the God."

The mention of Noah's sons takes up the thread of the history at the point where it was dropped in chap. v. 32. Chapter v. bridges the gap of 1,000 years with the table of descent in Seth's family: vi. 1-8 is a parenthetic retrospect indicating the progresive deterioration of the human race, to the point where the limit of the Divine patience was fixed at 120 years (*i.e.*, 20 years before the birth of Noah's sons, for Noah was 500 when they were born, and 600 when the Flood came), and to that period belongs the Divine determination to "wipe away" mankind. In ver. 10, then, we have the indication that the parenthesis is ended, and the history resumed where it had been broken off, but that is 20 years later than the decree of ver. 7. It is no unmeaning repetition of chap. v. 32.

Meanwhile, the contagion of evil had spread and deepened. Before, it was only the evil of mankind that had "multiplied"; now, it is "the earth" which has become corrupt and filled with violence, for "all flesh (not man alone) had corrupted his way upon the earth." As the evil has increased, so the needed purification must be yet more drastic, and this is made clear by the language employed. God now announces to Noah, "The end of all flesh

is come before Me . . . behold Me destroying them with the earth," and this word "destroy" is only another form of the word "corrupt." The destruction must be co-extensive with the violence wrought; corruption itself must be brought to corruption; ruin must be laid in ruins.

This can be no mere "duplicate" of what is recorded in ver. 7. Then, the decree was formed in the Divine mind: now, it is communicated to man. Then, man was the chief object of condemnation: now, it is "all flesh" together "with the earth." Then, it was "wiping away" man from the face of the ground: now, it is utter destruction that is contemplated. The change of word is absolutely required to convey the more terrible meaning. Moreover, there is an interval of time between the two. The Divine determination to "wipe away" mankind was made twenty years before the birth of Noah's sons: the announcement to Noah was made after their birth. How long after, we are not told; but it is quite possible that the announcement was delayed till the sons were old enough to assist their father in the heavy work of making the ark.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE warning of impending calamity is immediately followed by the injunction to make an ark. We are so familiar with the idea that this was a vessel intended to float upon the waters that we are apt to overlook the probability that this command would seem very strange to Noah. There has been no hint so far that anything in the way of navigation had been attempted, and even if there had been some use of rafts or rude canoes those would be so different from this huge structure that men might well be puzzled to know what purpose it could be meant to serve. The weight, too, would be so great that the idea of its floating might well be scouted as irrational. Then, again, why should it be covered inside and out with bitumen? As yet nothing had been said of the nature of the impending destruction.

Here, again, the wording is notable. The word for ark, Tebah (not that used for the "ark" of the covenant, which is Aron), is said to be of Egyptian origin. How comes an Egyptian word to be in a post-exilic version of a Babylonian story? On the lips of Moses, educated in Egypt, it would be natural enough, especially as it was in a Tebah of papyrus reeds that the infant Moses was laid (Exodus ii. 3, 5). Also, the meaning of "gopher" is altogether uncertain; various guesses have been made as to what kind of wood this was, and the Septuagint translators were so much at a loss that

they have substituted a word meaning "quadrangular," thinking, no doubt, of squared timbers.

The first intimation that the coming destruction would be by means of water is found in ver. 17: "And I myself (emphatic) behold Me bringing the *Mabbul,* waters upon the earth," and this explains the previous requirement that the Ark was to be doubly protected by bitumen. Again an unusual word is introduced. *Mabbul* is only used of the Deluge, but that it means "flood" is quite uncertain. Dr. Driver suggests (p. 88) that it "may be derived from the Assyrian *nabâlu,* to destroy," and the Greek translators render it by "cataclysm." It may, then, signify a destruction of any kind, but here defined by the added "waters" (the Hebrew does not allow of the translation "the flood *of* waters": the words are in apposition), and this also suits the phrase in vii. 6, which should be rendered "and the *Mabbul* was (or became) waters upon the earth."

This influx of waters is to be so tremendous as "to destroy (bring to corruption) all flesh wherein is the breath (or spirit) of life, from under heaven; all that is in the earth shall expire," yet not all without exception, for "I will establish (raise up and make to stand) My covenant with thee" (ver. 18). Noah and his family are to enter the Ark, evidently to preserve them from the destruction, and not only are human beings to be preserved; pairs of animals of every kind, male and female, are also to be brought "to keep them alive with thee" (vers. 19, 20). That these will be so preserved depends upon a "covenant," an undertaking or promise on the part of God (the first ever made with man) which stands firm and unchangeable.

That the catastrophe was not immediately imminent is clear, for the Ark had yet to be built; that when it did come it would last a long time is clear from the command (ver. 21) to lay in a store of all kinds of provisions.

So tremendous a visitation, affecting "the earth" and "all flesh," could only be effected by Almighty Power, and therefore throughout this section it is not the Lord, the Fashioner of man, who speaks, but Elohim, the mighty Creator of heaven and earth.

Verse 22 merely states that Noah did "according to all that God commanded him," but consider what that involves. He had been told to make a vessel 450 feet long, 75 wide, and 45 in height; it was to be in three stories, and those again subdivided into chambers (Heb.: "nests"); the whole was to be overlaid with bitumen, inside and out; a supply of food for eight human beings and a large number of animals had to be collected and stored. It must have taken a very long time to accomplish this gigantic task, especially as there is no reason to suppose that Noah had any assistance outside his own family. Is it too much to conclude that all this must have occupied a great part of the century between the birth of Shem and the coming of the Flood? That was the period "when the long-suffering of God waited . . . while the Ark was a-preparing" (1 St. Peter iii. 20), whilst the rest of mankind were "eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage" (St. Matt. xxiv. 38).

When, then, Noah was told, "Come thou and all thy house into the ark" (vii. 1), all this work must have been completed, and it becomes manifest that what follows cannot be (as has been asserted) a "duplicate" version of vi. 17-21 taken from the

other source. It is a different command given at an altogether different time, and it is not reasonable to expect that the terms should be absolutely identical. When the former command was given the coming of the destruction was yet far distant, and the wording is correspondingly general. The destruction will be by means of waters, but how they will come is not specified, nor when they will come, and of the animals it is only said that they are to be pairs, male and female. When the ark of refuge is actually ready, then details are given: the precise date and manner of the Flood is made known (" yet seven days, and I am causing it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights," ver. 4); concerning the animals, it is now prescribed that of a particular class, and that the most important and useful—the " clean " animals, fit for food and for sacrifice—not single pairs, but seven pairs are to be taken. There is no discrepancy or contradiction here: it is simply an amplification in fuller detail of what had at first been broadly stated.

When the laying waste of the world was the theme, the title of Power—Elohim—was used; now that the preservation of life, and particularly that of the faithful family, is the more prominent topic, the Name that indicates God's relation to man is reverted to. The change of appellation corresponds to the varying thought, and is no proof of difference of authorship.

There is another peculiarity of expression which is put forward as marking a difference of source. Where vi. 19 uses the ordinary phrase, " male and female " of the animals, vii. 2 has, twice, a phrase which, literally translated, means " a man and his wife " (Dr. Driver renders it by " Each and his mate "). The very next verse (3), and also ver. 9

have the ordinary " male and female " (only these are supposed to have been inserted by the compiler), while Exod. xxv. 20, xxvi. 3, 5, 6, xxxvii. 9, passages attributed to the same source as vi. 19, have phrases closely corresponding to those in vii. 2. Moreover, in this verse the peculiar phrase has a distinct meaning. Of the " clean " beasts, Noah is to take " seven and seven, each and his mate," that is, he is not allowed to take any seven males and any seven females, but is to choose those that were already mated; and the same restriction is applied to the single pair of " beasts that are not clean "; so that we have here another modification in detail of the general terms used in vi. 19.

That the two passages are not independent of one another is further shown by the fact that " thee have I seen *righteous* before Me in this *generation* " (vii. 1), is a marked verbal allusion to " Noah was a *righteous* man, perfect in his *generation* " (vi. 9).

Verse 5 has a brief statement, like that of vi. 22, of Noah's obedience, but this time there is added (vers. 6-9) a short summary of how he precisely did what he was told. It is couched in the baldest of terms, merely giving his age in round numbers, and stating the bare facts that he and his family, and the animals (two and two, and male and female) entered the ark according to the command. It should be noticed, however, that ver. 7 says that they did so " from the face of (something more than " because of ") the waters of destruction." That suggests that the entry was not immediately on the command being given, but when the waters had already begun to appear.

On this follows the account of the coming of the Flood. It was precisely " at (not after) the seven days " foretold—and now the exact month and day

of the year in Noah's life are specified—" on this day," this particular day, " were cleft asunder all the fountains of the great deep, and the windows (perhaps, better, gates, floodgates: Greek " cataracts ") of heaven were opened, and (in consequence) the heavy-rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights " (vers. 11, 12).

The " great deep " is the ordinary term for the ocean, and the " fountains of the great deep " point to a tremendous uprushing of oceanic waters, perhaps of the nature of a tidal wave. Together with this, there was the opening of the sluices of the skies, causing a heavy downfall of rain such as would now be called a cloud-burst, heavier even than the torrential rains of the tropics, and a cloud-burst that lasted, not an hour or two, but continuously day and night for nearly six weeks. It was on the very day that this commenced—ver. 13 continues, stating plainly what ver. 7 suggests—that Noah, his family, and the animals entered the ark, the six days between the warning and the commencement of the storm having been taken up, no doubt, with final preparations.

The verses, 13-16, which describe their entry certainly repeat what was shortly told in vers. 7-9, but they do so at greater length (in half as many words again), and with added details (*e.g.*, the addition " every bird, every wing " in ver. 14). There is even a touch of something like pictorial description. The breaking up of the " fountains of the great deep," the opening of heaven's floodgates suggest, in terse, vivid phrase, the terror and fury of the onrushing waters: in sharp contrast, the careful details of the entry set before us no wild rout of panic-stricken fugitives, but a methodical, orderly array—Noah and his sons, the four women,

the various classes of animals (beasts, domestic cattle, creeping things, birds), each "after his kind," two and two, male and female. Those who see in this nothing but an unnecessary repetition of what has already been stated, set out in a "stereotyped prosaic" style which revels in minute detail, must surely be a little blind to the literary qualities of the narrative.

When all have entered, their absolute safety in the ark is secured, not by the foresight or care of Noah, but by Divine power, "the Lord shut after him." Again the Name of mercy and providential care is reverted to. There is no need to cut these three words away from their context, and assign them to a different source.

Verses 17-20 describe the rising of the waters in three stages.

The "destruction" (not the rain only, but the combination of that with the influx of "the great deep") was forty days upon the earth, and the effect of this was—

(1) The waters increased, and lifted the ark off the earth, ver. 17;

(2) The waters were mighty ("prevailed"), and increased exceedingly, so that the ark went forward on the surface, ver. 18;

(3) The waters were mighty, "exceedingly, exceedingly," so that the high hills were covered to the depth of 15 cubits (half the height of the ark). Hence the ark would pass over the summits of these hills if, as is likely, it drew 10 cubits of water (one-third of its height, 15 ft.).

Verses 21-23 describe the extinction of life, and again in three parts of increasing force.

(1) All flesh that moveth on the earth—bird, cattle, beast, all the swarms of earth, and all mankind—breathed its last, ver. 21;

(2) All on dry land, possessing the breath of the spirit of life, died, ver. 22;

(3) "And He (God) wiped away everything that ariseth (or standeth) which was upon the face of the ground, from man down to cattle, to creeping thing, and to the bird of heaven, and they were wiped away from the earth, so that only Noah was left, and those with him in the ark," ver. 23.

Note the force of the climax: first, a gentler word for death, used of the peaceful passing away of Abraham (xxv. 8) and others; then the contrast between the spirit of life and a sterner word for death; and, lastly, utter obliteration.

The prevalence of the waters extended far beyond the initial outburst of forty days:—"The waters were mighty upon the earth 150 days," ver. 24. Then came the turning point (viii. 1): God was mindful of (there is no suggestion of any forgetfulness as "remembered" might seem to imply) Noah and those with him, and sent a wind over the earth which "stilled" the waters; the fountains of the deep and the gates of heaven were closed, and the heavy rain completely ceased. The final phrase suggests that, though the continuous downpour ended at the fortieth day, there were occasional bursts of rain up to the end of the 150 days.

Under the pressure of wind above, and with the sources of supply cut off, "the waters returned (began to subside) from off the earth, going and returning (*i.e.*, subsiding progressively), and the waters lessened from (after) the end of the 150 days."

This lessening of the waters is also described in three stages, marked by precise dates :—

(1) On the 17th day of the 7th month (the day after the 150 days), when the waters were just beginning to subside, the ark came to rest on the mountains of (the region) Ararat, ver. 4. This was not " Mount Ararat," but the hilly district in the south of Armenia, just the direction in which the un-steered ark would be driven by the pressure of waters from the Persian Gulf.

(2) The waters went on lessening till the 10th month, and on the 1st day of that month the tops of the hills (that had been covered) appeared, ver. 5.

(3) The final stage is given in fuller detail :—

(*a*) after forty days a raven is sent out, but does not return, vers. 6, 7 ;

(*b*) a dove is sent out (probably a week later), but finding no resting-place, returns, vers. 8, 9 ;

(*c*) after another week, the dove is sent out again, and returns with an olive leaf (plucked, no doubt, from a tree on the mountain side), vers. 10, 11.

(*d*) Another week elapses, and the dove is sent out a third time, but (evidently finding a resting-place in the now uncovered trees) returns no more, ver. 12 ;

(*e*) these delays account for two months, and Noah must have waited yet another month, for it was on the 1st day of the 1st month, three months from the time that the hill-tops were seen, that he uncovered the ark, and found that the waters had disappeared from the face of the ground, ver. 13.

The three stages of the lessening of the waters are, then: (1) the grounding of the ark at the first beginning of the subsidence; (2) the emergence of the hill-tops, two and a half months later; (3) the re-appearance of the "face of the ground" three months later still.

The careful arrangement of the three subjects—the increase of the waters, the extinction of life, and the decrease of the waters—each in three stages, within the compass of 21 verses, wears all the appearance of a deliberately planned artistic effect, rather than the somewhat haphazard piecing together of inconsistent accounts.

Even after the waters had finally retreated from the surface of the ground, the soil must have been saturated to a great depth after so prolonged an immersion. Accordingly it was not till the 27th of the 2nd month (an interval of 47 days) that "the earth became firm," and the inmates of the ark could at last be released, vers. 14-19.

Noah's first care on leaving the ark is to build an altar, and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving (ver. 20), and, in response to this, the Lord determines that He will not again ban (make light of, despise; not the word for "curse" in iii. 17) the earth on account of sinful man (vers. 21, 22).

Chap. ix. narrates how God renewed to Noah and his sons the primal blessing bestowed on the first parents of the human race (ix. 1-3; cf. i. 28), and gives them commands as to the sanctity of life (4-7); communicates to them His solemn promise ("My Covenant") not to cut off again human and animal life by the waters of destruction (vers. 8-11), and

constitutes the rainbow the visible token of His pledge (vers. 12-17). Of course, this last does not require that no rainbow had ever been seen before, but only that now a deep and tender significance was attached to its beauty as the symbol of God's mercy.

It will not be necessary here to go into the details of this passage beyond noticing, first, that the appellation of Power—Elohim—is more than appropriate to, absolutely required by, the wide scope of the blessing and the covenant; second, that the whole narrative closes, as it began, with the record of a determination formed by the Lord, afterwards communicated to man by God, an indication of unity of thought hardly accounted for by the theory of two independent accounts.

CHAPTER XV.

WE may now proceed to consider the accusations brought against the Genesis narrative.

1. *That it is "composite."*

It is alleged that this is "particularly evident," because the narrative contains "many duplicates" and "many striking differences of representation and phraseology" (Driver, "Genesis," p. 85). To examine this in detail would take far too long,* and here it may be enough to refer to the foregoing examination of the narrative, in which it has been shown that the alleged "duplicates" are not really duplicates at all, and that the varying phrases (including the Divine appellations) are deliberately chosen to convey different ideas. To this it may be added that the methods employed to make good the critical statements are often open to serious objection. Thus it is said that there is a difference of representation as to the cause of the Deluge, one source mentioning rain only, while the other speaks also of "the subterranean waters bursting forth." That can only be made out by the arbitrary separation of "the rain" (vii. 12, viii. 3) from the immediately preceding opening of the "windows of heaven," thus divorcing effect from cause. Again, expressions supposed to be characteristic of one source are found in passages said to be derived from

* See the full treatment of these assertions in the writer's "Unity of the Pentateuch," Chap. V.

the other. These are accounted for by calling them insertions or interpolations due to the compiler (in two verses, vii. 16, 17, no fewer than three clauses are so treated). In reality these phrases are fair evidences that a common phraseology runs through the whole narrative, and the claim to treat them as insertions is nothing but an attempt to make the facts fit the theory. When it is further seen that there are verbal allusions connecting the parts together, as well as a general unity of plan and structure, which have been overlooked or ignored by the critics, the "composite" theory becomes doubtful in the extreme.

2. *That it is derived from a Babylonian legend.*

It has been before now pointed out that this is inconsistent with the assertion that the narrative is made up of fragments from two sources, for that would require that one account retained some features of the Babylonian story; and another, some four centuries later, retained other features; so that the full resemblance only comes to light when these two were afterwards combined. That does not seem a very probable proceeding.

Taking, then, the Genesis narrative as a whole how does it compare with the Babylonian?

According to the latter, four deities conspire to overwhelm a certain city; a fifth overhears their plans, and warns one of the inhabitants to save himself and "the seed of life of every sort" by building a great ship, which he is to launch on the ocean. He builds the vessel, and embarks in it with his family and a number of animals; a terrible storm arises, during which all mankind are turned to clay, and the fields to marshes; the ship grounds on a mountain, and, after an interval, birds are sent

out (no doubt to ascertain the state of things); the man leaves the ship with his companions, offers sacrifice, and receives a blessing.

Not only are these broad outlines singularly like those in the Scriptural account, but there are even some correspondences in minute details: the ship is covered with bitumen (practically the same word as in the Hebrew), and is divided into storeys and compartments; on entering the ship the door is closed, and when the storm ceases a window is opened; two of the birds sent out are the same (a dove and a raven); when sacrifice is offered "the gods smell the goodly savour."

Certainly stories which have so much in common cannot be independent of one another. What relation exists between them?

It is commonly taken for granted that one must have been "derived" from the other, but that is not the only possible explanation. Along with the marked resemblances there are some notable differences. Apart from what is called the "polytheistic colouring of the Babylonian narrative" (it is surely something more than "colouring": the preservation of a favoured few by the interference of one deity defeating the purpose of another is of the very essence of the story), there are differences in detail. The vessel, which in the Hebrew account is a mere "chest," in the Babylonian is a regular ship, with bow, mast, helm, and steersman (whose name is given); the dimensions are considerably larger; there are seven storeys instead of three; the number of human beings is greatly increased, "servants" (or, according to Ball, "his clan") and "craftsmen" being specified; "possessions," including silver and gold, are taken on board; the flood is attributed to rain and storm alone, and only lasts

six days; the vessel does not float over the land, but is launched on the sea; Ut-Napishtim is made immortal, whereas Noah returns to ordinary life.

There are also some puerilities in the Babylonian story, such as Ea imparting his warning to inanimate objects instead of to the man ("Reed-fence, listen; house-wall, give heed"; a line which is not quoted by Dr. Driver); and the gods, affrighted by the storm, "cowering like dogs," and afterwards gathering "like flies" over the sacrifice. Besides all this, there is a broad distinction which is of great importance. The Hebrew account is marked throughout by a definite and just purpose; mankind is destroyed on account of wickedness, Noah is preserved for his righteousness: the Babylonian is purposeless, confused, and not always consistent; the original intention to destroy one city becomes the destruction of mankind without any apparent reason, and Ut-Napishtim is preserved, not for any merit, but by the caprice of Ea.

Now when two accounts, having a good many features in common, differ widely in important particulars, there is reasonable probability that both are variants of a common original, and then the question is, which of the two has been the more faithful to that original.

It has been argued that "the Hebrew narrative must be *derived from* the Babylonian," because the latter is much older than the Book of Genesis, and because the Bible narrative "pre-supposes" a country like Babylonia. That is hardly a safe argument. A later document may quite possibly have preserved a truer account than one of earlier date. Also the earliest version of the Babylonian story (and that a mere fragment*) is dated in the

* The full account in its present form is only dated about 660 B.C.

reign of "the fourth successor of Hammurabi," and Hammurabi was a contemporary of Abraham. A *Mosaic* account of the Flood would almost certainly be founded on a tradition (possibly even a written narrative) derived from Abraham, a native of Babylonia. In that case there is fair reason to think that the Hebrew narrative represents more faithfully the original account.

That conclusion is strengthened when the nature of the differences is considered. Where the two accounts differ, the Babylonian variant is always in the direction of elaboration. The chest-like Ark has become a ship, its size is exaggerated, its human inhabitants are multiplied: the terrific nature of the catastrophe is heightened; even its short duration makes its effects the more portentous; the costly nature of the sacrifice is enhanced; the hero is made immortal. All these are just such differences as are likely to be made by popular fancy.

In short, the Hebrew narrative is sober and restrained, powerful by reason of its simplicity: the Babylonian is fantastic and highly coloured. The difference between the two may aptly be compared to the difference between the plain dignity of the Gospel narratives and the puerile marvels of the Apocryphal tales.

3. *That it is "unhistorical"—i.e.*, that no such catastrophe ever happened.

Dr. Driver ("Genesis," pp. 99, 100) gives five principal reasons for pronouncing a Universal Deluge impossible.

(1) There must "have been *five miles depth* of water over the entire globe: whence could this incredible amount of water have come, and whither, when the Flood abated, could "it have disappeared"?

The narrative requires no such "incredible amount of water": it does not speak of the depth "over the entire globe," but only over what had been dry land. The breaking up of the fountains of the great deep points to a tremendous inrush of oceanic waters, lasting for a definite period. The various oceans cover far more of the earth's surface than the dry land, and great depths are found, in some places even exceeding five miles. It is therefore not impossible that a great convulsion (a sudden alteration of the earth's axis has been suggested) might cause the great mass of ocean waters to sweep over and submerge the land portions, eventually retiring to their present limits.

(2) A "stupendous miracle" would have been needed to bring all the animals together, and to tame them so far "as to have refrained from attacking each other," and

(3) "The number of living species of terrestrial animals is so great "that the ark could not have held them all."

These are no arguments to prove that a Universal Deluge is impossible, but only that the Genesis account of the preservation of the animals is incredible.

At that remote period the number of species may have been considerably less than it is now, and the size of the ark would certainly allow of a very large number. In times of stress, flood or fire, wild animals have been known to herd together peaceably, their usual instincts overcome by terror, and as the ark was divided into chambers (Heb., "nests"), the predatory animals could be separated from others.

(4) The present distribution of land animals and (5) of human races could not have been effected in the time that has since elapsed.

Here again is no proof that a Universal Deluge can never have occurred, but only that it cannot have occurred *at the time usually assigned.* That would mean that the subsequent chronology is not to be trusted, and does not touch the Genesis account, which only requires that the Flood took place in the 600th year of Noah's life, 1656 years after the formation of Adam.

Even if, however, a Universal Deluge is impossible, does the narrative require us to believe that Noah's flood was universal "?

Certainly, at first sight that seems to be the meaning, and it has generally been so understood. Moreover, there are Flood stories in so many widely separated parts of the world as seem to point to a world-wide catastrophe.

But the Hebrew Eretz (like the German Erde and our Earth) sometimes means the whole world (Gen. i. 1), or sometimes the soil ("Let the earth bring forth grass," Gen. i. 2), and in addition, sometimes has the meaning of a particular region or country ("There was a famine in the land," Gen. xii. 10). It is possible, therefore, that in chapters vi.-ix. "the earth" means "the land," not the whole world.

Now Eden is placed near the Euphrates and Tigris (ii. 14, 15); Cain's "Land of Wandering" was to the east of this (iv. 16); the "Ararat" region, where the ark came to rest, borders on the same district (viii. 4); and the dispersal of nations was from "the land of Shinar" (xi. 2). All these indications point to Babylonia, and suggest that up to the Flood mankind had not spread beyond the valley of the Euphrates. That region is described as a "great alluvial plain" stretching some 700 miles to the Persian Gulf, and "hemmed in *on all sides,* except towards the Persian Gulf, by elevated

ground " (Driver, " Genesis," p. 101). If then a great convulsion (perhaps partly volcanic and seismic activity beneath the sea) caused the waters of the Indian Ocean to rush violently in on the land, it is not impossible that the whole of this restricted region was flooded, even to the depth needed for floating the ark to the spot in the south of Armenia where Christian and Mahommedan traditions agree in fixing the ark's resting-place. Such an inundation, lasting altogether over ten months, would involve the perishing of all the then existing human race, except those in the ark. Then the repeopling of the world from this one centre by the descendants of those survivors would account for reminiscences of the Flood being found in so many parts.

The phrase " all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered " (vii. 19) seems to preclude this more limited interpretation : but if, on the very day that the waters *began* to subside (c. viii. 4), the ark grounded on the lower range which skirts the Euphrates valley, it would seem to follow that the much loftier ranges to the north were not covered, and therefore that the phrase " under the *whole* heaven " is not to be pressed too literally.

A similar use of the word col (all) is found in Exod. ix. 6, where it is stated that "*all* the cattle of Egypt died," and yet after that (vers. 20, 21) there were still cattle, belonging to the servants of Pharaoh, which needed to be sheltered from the hail.

Since, then, the possibility of a Universal Deluge has not been disproved, and since the narrative need not *necessarily* mean a Deluge " over the entire globe," either way it is not safe to assert that the Bible account (supported as it is by

the traditions of so many different races) is "unhistorical."

CONCLUSION. Read fairly and without prejudice, according to what is actually said, and not according to what it may be supposed to say, the Genesis narrative is no patchwork of contradictory fragments, but a straightforward and consistent account, of which the various parts fit together perfectly and explain each other. It is no improbable legend of something that never took place: there is every reason to believe it a real history of an actual event, of which reminiscences have survived in many parts of the world (including the Babylonian story, a version distorted and coloured by polytheistic fancies). It tells in plain and simple language, all the more impressive because unadorned, of a terrible but righteous judgment whereby (as the only hope for the future of the human race) a hopelessly corrupt generation was swept away. Even in this, where it was possible forbearance was shown, and the whole concludes with a rainbow glory of Mercy and Hope.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

Two consecutive pages of Dr. Driver's "Genesis" furnish two notable instances of the flimsy arguments sometimes used to support the critical theory.

On page 106 a footnote (5) quotes Prof. Sayce as noting three points in which "the [Bible] story has assumed a *Palestinian* colouring."

(1) "The ship has become an 'ark,' as was natural in a country in which there are no great rivers or a Persian Gulf."

If the account was written by Moses, there would have been little opportunity for its acquiring anything Palestinian at all, and in his hands the colouring would rather have been Egyptian.

If, on the other hand, the "composite" theory be true, the earliest portions of the narrative were put into shape by the Jehovist about 850 B.C., and by that time the dwellers in Palestine were quite familiar with shipping (witness the "ships of Tarshish with the ships of Hiram" in Solomon's time (1 Kings x. 22).

It is far more probable than an archaic "chest" would be transformed into a "ship" in passing through Babylonian hands.

(2) "The period of the rainfall has been transferred" to the second month (= November), when rain usually falls in Palestine, whereas in Babylonia it is delayed till about January.

Here it is assumed that the altogether exceptional rainfall of the Flood must have coincided with the ordinary rainy season; and also the fact is overlooked that the "second month" of Gen. vii. 11 was that of Noah's 600th year, which, of course, might have been at any season.

(3) "The dove brings back in its mouth a leaf of the olive, a tree much more characteristic of Palestine than of Babylonia."

But the ark was resting on "the mountains of Ararat," not in Babylonia. Are there no olive trees in Armenia?

On page 107 Dr. Driver himself argues that the Babylonian story, transmitted orally for many generations, "assumed, of course, a Hebrew complexion, and was accommodated to the spirit of Hebrew monotheism."

It would be interesting to learn what features impart a particularly "Hebrew complexion" to the narrative, but has the learned doctor forgotten that, according to the critics, before the prophetic age of Amos and Isaiah, the spirit of Hebrew religion was not monotheism, but "henotheism," the worship of only one God, "without affirming that this God was necessarily the *only* God (monotheism)"*? How then came the Jehovist passages, belonging to an earlier age, to be "accommodated" to a spirit of monotheism which had not yet developed?

* Driver, "Exodus," page 413.

CREATION.

RECENTLY a dignitary of the Church of England declared from the pulpit that the Scriptural accounts of the Creation and tne Fall can no longer be accepted. On what grounds did he make this startling statement? In a subsequent communication to a newspaper he says that if he had insisted "on the scientific value of Genesis, the men of Science present would have smiled at my ignorance or deplored my prejudice." That, of course, in itself would be no reason for not boldly stating his own convictions, even if they differed from those of his hearers. It is only doing justice to the preacher's earnestly expressed desire for truth to recognize that he must himself be honestly convinced that in these matters Science furnishes a different account, inconsistent with that in Scripture: that here Science must be right, and, therefore, Scripture must be wrong.

In a newspaper correspondence that took up the subject, one writer declared that eighty per cent. of the clergy held the same views (an estimate I take leave to think considerably exaggerated), and one or two of the clergy wrote to say they had been preaching the same for years past. A little later, I was in a church at the seaside, when the preacher, adverting to this subject, stated that he did not think any thoughtful Christian could accept the Genesis narratives as historically true, but added that though not historically true, they

are spiritually true. What the latter remark exactly means is not easy to understand. Of course, a fictitious story may be so framed as to convey a spiritual truth—many an allegory proves that—but that is not quite the same thing as being "spiritually true." Historical falsehood and spiritual truth hardly seem compatible. Even if the preacher meant to say that though not historically true, these narratives convey spiritual truths, how would this apply to Genesis i.? Beyond the statement conveyed in the first verse that Creation is God's work, what spiritual truth is conveyed by the rest of the chapter?

However, we have a considerable number of those who believe in the Bible, and even clergy who have made solemn affirmation that they "unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," emphatically maintaining that, as to two matters of great importance, the Scriptural account is erroneous. They do so on the ground that our enlarged knowledge of the facts of Nature compel us to accept a very different account. In effect they say: Science says this, Scripture says that; Science, the study of facts, must be right; we therefore pin our faith to its teaching, and accordingly can no longer accept the account in Scripture.

It will be my endeavour to-night, without touching on the question of Inspiration, or whether every part of the Old Testament must be held to be God's Word, simply to test the initial assertion "Science says this, and Scripture says that": in other words, to see whether the Scientific and the Biblical accounts of Creation are really as irreconcilable as they are alleged to be. Only in so doing we must be careful to consider what

Science and Scripture actually say, and not what they may have been supposed to say. For instance, Canon Barnes asserted that "we have to abandon belief in the special creation of Adam in Paradise." About "special creation" something will have to be said another time, but as to Adam being created "in Paradise," of course Genesis says nothing of the sort. It does say that *after* the formation of man "the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed." Further on the Canon says: "God did not at some moment in the past make an Adam splendidly perfect." The Bible says nothing at all about "splendidly perfect." The Talmud indeed represents Adam as a giant in stature and proficient in all the sciences, but you will look in vain for any such idea in the pages of Scripture, though you may find something like it in Milton.

We will begin, then, by trying to ascertain what Science has to teach us about Creation, first considering what is meant by "Science."

Many seem to suppose that Science means the statement of unquestionable facts and immutable laws of Nature, and therefore always indisputably right; but that is hardly accurate. It would be nearer the mark to say that Science is the classification of facts so far as they are known to us *at the present time,* and the formulation of the inferences that may reasonably be deduced from them. But Science has by no means ascertained all the facts that exist. For instance, in Geology, we have, it may be, some considerable knowledge of about one thousandth part, structure and materials, of the whole substance of this world. Of all the rest, we are in absolute ignorance,

except that it appears to be decidedly of greater average weight than the part we do know. In Astronomy, we know a good deal about the motions of the members of the solar system, their size and weight, and something about the elements that enter into their composition; but, after all, how little that is compared to what remains unknown, and how much less do we know about the more distant worlds! We know that light, heat, and electricity are so correlated that it is reasonably believed that they are varying manifestations of something called "force," but what that something is no one can tell. All the substances of which we are cognizant are believed to be combinations of force and matter, but what matter is no one knows, and some go so far as to deny that it has any real existence.

Since, then, its range is so comparatively limited, Science is eminently progressive. Every new fact discovered, every improved means of observation must make some difference. The Science of to-day is not quite the same as the Science of fifty years ago, and the Science of fifty years hence will probably differ quite as much, or more, from the Science of to-day. Such discoveries as those of radium and the X-rays can hardly fail to modify some of our conclusions, and now, if Einstein is right, we have to revise matters so fundamental as our conceptions of Time and Space. As a matter of historical fact, various Scientific conclusions have had, even in recent times, to be seriously modified or abandoned in the light of fuller knowledge. Anthropologists at one time were practically agreed that the various races of men now existing differ so greatly that they could not have been all derived from one single pair as the Bible asserts: as time has gone

on, they have been more and more coming to the conclusion that identities of structure show that they all have been so derived. Nebulæ were once considered all to be, as the name indicates, of the nature of clouds, masses of gaseous vapour. Greater telescopic power resolved some of them into the light of separate stars, and then the idea came to be entertained that, with sufficiently powerful telescopes, all the others might be resolved in the same way. Now the spectroscope has taught us that some even of the most remarkable are truly nebulous. Darwin considered that man was descended directly from the apes, and for a considerable time there was eager search for that "missing link" which has never yet been found. Now that theory has been abandoned in favour of one that both men and apes are descended from some common ancestor, but in divergent lines of descent. So Canon Barnes asserts that "biologically he [man] is cousin, a hundred thousand or a million times removed, to the gorilla"; a sufficiently wide departure from the original Darwinian theory.

Since then the range of Science is as yet comparatively limited, and since Scientific theories have actually varied in the past, it is rash to assume that the current conclusions of Scientific men form the final verdict of positive knowledge from which there can be no appeal. Present day "Science" is not necessarily infallible.

Still, it will be urged, there is a considerable amount of Scientific teaching founded on such well-ascertained facts that it is exceedingly improbable that it will ever be seriously modified. Taking then this more moderate estimate of its authority, what has Science to teach us about the beginnings

of this world? It is important to note that of Creation, strictly speaking, Science knows nothing and can know nothing. From the existence of the Universe, from the impossibility of supposing it self-originated, and from the extreme improbability (almost if not quite amounting to impossibility) that it can always have existed, we can reasonably and rightly infer that it must have had a Maker. From the vast extent of the work, and from the mighty forces involved in it, we can infer that Maker's Power. From the marvellous adaptation of means to ends, and from the wondrous skill everywhere exhibited we can infer His Wisdom. But what that "making" was—whether for instance (as Pantheism demands), the universe is part of the Maker Himself, and the "making" a self manifestation, or whether it was a calling into existence out of nothing (which is the stricter sense of "creation"), Science cannot decide: there is no Scientific evidence available. All that Science can do is to tell us something of the stages by which this world reached its present condition.

Geology, then, begins with the igneous—granitic and basaltic—rocks. There is good reason for believing that at one time these were in a molten condition, requiring an exceedingly high temperature (over 4,000 degs. Fahrenheit), so that water could only exist in the form of vapour, in which also would be suspended many of the minerals in a gaseous state. At that time, therefore, the whole globe would be surrounded by a mass of dense cloud, impervious to light. As the incandescent mass beneath cooled, the granite and basalt substances would solidify and crystalise, and, when the temperature was low enough, a great

part of the over-hanging vapour would be precipitated in the form of water strongly impregnated with minerals. These in their turn would fall and be deposited on the granite foundation, and in time solidify into rocks, forming the earliest sedimentary stratum, on which other strata again would be deposited. Of these strata, the earliest shows only doubtful traces of even the humblest forms of life, vegetable or animal. The next layer shows "ripple-marks," which must have been made at the meeting point of land and water, and also traces of volcanic action. After this comes an amazing outburst of vegetation—"chiefly tree-ferns, large mosses, and pines"—preserved to us in the coal measures. Next comes a period in which there are scanty traces of reptiles, which in the subsequent Jurassic rocks become very abundant and of monstrous size, while also birds, some of gigantic size, are here found. Then comes the age of huge extinct mammal animals; and last of all the evidences of modern mammals, and man. Since then there has been no new type.

Geology then goes back no further than the time when the igneous rocks were already in existence. For anything earlier we have to turn to Astronomy. Sir W. Herschell observed that of the nebulæ which could not be resolved into separate stars, some were shapeless masses of faint light, others circular and generally brightest in the centre, and others, again, something between the two. These, he thought, might represent stages in the formation of worlds. From this has sprung the theory known as "Nebular," according to which the whole solar system was originally a diffused mass of atoms, probably gaseous and rotating. This mass broke up into separate smaller masses which

ultimately became the sun and its attendant planets, including, of course, the earth, which became incandescent either by friction or contraction.

The theory is ingenious and plausible enough, but after all it is only an explanation of the way in which the earth *may* have been formed. It is not proved that the earth actually was formed in this manner, or that it could not have been formed in any other way. It has not been proved that what Herschell observed was really the formation of worlds, nor that all worlds are formed in the same way. Also, one or two of the steps are assumed rather than demonstrated, as for instance, the rotation of the nebula, and the generation of heat sufficient to melt the most intractable of rocks out of a space temperature very far below zero.

Besides these teachings of Geology and Astronomy, the only other contribution bearing on the subject which Science has to offer is the "great scientific doctrine of Evolution," which Canon Barnes admits to be "a theory," but emphatically adds "the theory is true." This, however, will be better discussed when we come to consider the other Scriptural account which we are told to abandon—that of the Fall.

We turn now to the Scriptural account contained in Genesis i.

The first verse simply asserts that God created the heavens and the earth, an assertion which Science certainly cannot contradict, and can only to some extent corroborate by inference. Strictly speaking it is outside the province of Science.

The second verse commences, in the original, with a peculiarity which is important. Ordinarily in Hebrew the verb stands first, and the nominative

follows (e.g., in ver. 1 the order is "In-beginning created God"): here the substantive "the earth" stands first and the verb follows. This unusual construction occurs elsewhere occasionally, and I have noted a number of instances in Genesis. In every case I have found that it indicates a marked change of subject, as, for instance, in Genesis xxvii., where the first four verses narrate what Isaac said to Esau, and in ver. 5 the change of order marks the transition, "And *Rebekah* heard." Also in several instances a distinct lapse of time is implied, as in chapter xxv., where verse 2 mentions the birth of Jokshan, and verse 3, with the altered construction, states, "And Jokshan begat," clearly implying an interval of years. So in chapter i., the first verse deals with the Divine action, but verse 2 changes abruptly to the earth and its condition, possibly at some later period.

That condition was "desolation and emptiness" (Hebrew *tohu vabhohu;* R.V.: "waste and void"), and some have thought that this refers to the formless condition of the earth as a nebula. But Isaiah xlv. 18 explicitly states: "He created it not tohu," and that probably means that "desolation" was not the original condition of the earth at its first creation, but a condition which supervened at some unspecified later period. At any rate, whether this refers to the original state, or to some later condition, it becomes clear that the remainder of the chapter is not an account of the *creation* of the earth, but, like the Geologic record, is an account of the processes by which the earth was brought into its present habitable condition.

We start then with a statement that at some undefined period the earth was desolate and empty,

to which is added the further statement "and darkness upon the face of the deep." That seems to agree fairly well with the starting point of Geology, namely the time when, owing to the molten state of the igneous rocks, the earth must have been desolate and empty, and entirely shrouded in a dense mass of vapour. The further Biblical statement that "the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters" is, of course, one that Science cannot touch, either to affirm or to deny.

According to Genesis, the first step towards changing this condition was the introduction of light—"And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." There is no assertion that light was then created, or that no light had existed previously. Bearing in mind that the whole context deals with the condition of the earth, and that this statement follows hard upon "darkness upon the face of the deep," it is only reasonable to understand it as meaning that light was now to be admitted where before had been darkness. Now Science indicates that the cooling of the molten rocks below a certain point would result in condensation of the vapour above, water forming, and in its fall carrying with it the minerals formerly held in suspension. That would certainly mean the breaking up of the dense veil of cloud which encircled the earth, and the consequent admission of light "upon the face of the deep."

Upon this follows the formation of a "firmament" to divide the waters above from the waters below. It is often asserted that by "fermament" is meant a solid vault, and we now know that such a thing does not exist. But the "fundamental signification" of the root from which the Hebrew word *Raki'a* must be derived is "to stretch, to

expand, to spread out" (*Fuerst's Lexicon*), and the word may therefore be rightly rendered "expanse," without any necessary implication of solidity. Such an "expanse," which actually does divide great volumes of watery vapour from the waters on the earth is found in the atmosphere, the "expanse" of air which envelopes the earth. As no word for "air" or "atmosphere" is found in Biblical Hebrew, no better word than *Raki'a* can be found to indicate that "expanse." The discharge of a large proportion of the mineral-laden waters from the original mass of dense vapour, to which Science points, is just what would be needed to fit the purified air for the function it now performs of separating the waters drawn up by evaporation from those which remain in the reservoirs on the earth.

Both these operations, the admission of light and the purification of the air, would leave no direct evidence in the rocks, yet the statements in Genesis accord well with the inferences which may legitimately be drawn from the facts disclosed by Geology.

The third stage in Genesis is divided into two parts:—(*a*) Separation of land and water; (*b*) Outburst of Vegetation.

(*a*) It is simply stated, "God said, Let the waters be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so," without any explanation of how this was accomplished. Geology illustrates both the fact and the means employed. The earliest sedimentary strata, the Laurentian and Huronian, were wholly deposited under water: the next layer, Cambrian, shows the "ripple marks," which must mean that before solidifying it had been exposed to the action of

wavelets breaking upon a shore. What had been the floor of the sea must in part have been elevated above the level of the water, forming dry land, and traces of volcanic action show how this was effected. The separation of land and water, so briefly mentioned in Genesis, was brought about by the process of upheaval shown by Geology.

There is also a detail in the Scriptural account suggestive of an unexpected accuracy of knowledge. The waters, it says, were gathered "unto one place." We now know that while land is separated into distinct continents and islands, the oceans connect one with another, but that fact could hardly have been known to the writer of Genesis i.

(*b*) Till this division was secured, terrestrial vegetation was out of the question. It is therefore significant that just here the Genesis account places the appearance of various kinds of vegetable growths, yet it does not assert that God now created or even made them. The language used is, "God said, Let the earth put forth . . . and the earth put forth . . . ," as though the germs already existed in the earth, and only needed exposure to light and air in order to spring up. Also, the wording is strictly limited to land plants and trees, marine growths being unnoticed. It is therefore not accurate to represent this as "the *creation* of vegetation." What has Geology to tell us? It is in the Silurian and Devonian strata immediately following the Cambrian that are found the "earliest land plants," which attain their full development in the amazing luxuriance of the Carboniferous period which comes next.

The fourth stage—the two Luminaries—is often quoted as one in which the Biblical account must be

wrong. The objection put forward is that the passage in question represents the sun, moon, and stars as being formed after the earth, which is "inconsistent with the entire conception of the solar system . . . as revealed by Science" (Driver, *Genesis*, p. 24). But here we have to note carefully the actual wording. The Revised Version renders ver. 16 by "And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night." Punctuated in this way, it certainly seems to assert that God then made, *i.e.*, formed, the sun and moon. But the semi-colon after lights only represents the Hebrew accent Athnach, and the Hebrew accents often serve only to emphasise a remarkable word, without any interruption to the sense. In the very next verse (17) the same accent is attached to the word "heaven," where the English has not even a comma. It would hardly do to read, "and God set (lit. gave) them in the firmament of heaven; to give light upon earth." Clearly the sense runs straight on (cf. ver. 1). It is therefore quite legitimate to connect "made" in ver. 16 with the following "to rule"; and, also, the word "lights" should properly be light-bearers, luminaries. The meaning would thus be, not that God then *formed* the sun and moon, but that He then constituted them luminaries for the ruling of day and night. Is this in any way contrary to the teachings of Science? Geology does not help us here, for it is not to be expected that the giving of luminaries in the heaven would leave any imprint on the rocks, yet it is noteworthy that the Permian rocks, which succeed the Carboniferous, are unusually bare of fossil remains. In Astronomy, however, there are reasons for believing that the light-giving chromosphere and corona are not yet wholly concentrated

in the sun, and were once far more widely spread, even beyond the orbit of the earth. When that was the case, instead of the present alternation of day and night, there would be a constant diffused light all round the globe, probably accompanied by a high temperature and a moisture-laden atmosphere. Those are just the conditions required to produce the kind of vegetation and the luxuriant abundance indicated in the coal measures, and in this way the Geologic record fits in with the inference drawn from Astronomy. But then this evidently requires that these light-bearing envelopes of the sun must have gradually retreated by contraction to their present position. When once they had withdrawn within the orbit of the earth, their light would only fall on half the surface of the globe at a time, and the alternations of day and night would ensue. Then, but not till then, would the sun become the ruler of the day; and then, but not till then, would the moon, reflecting his rays, become the ruler of the night. There are therefore scientific reasons for believing that at a definite period the sun and moon did become luminaries, rulers of the day and night; and that probably at the very epoch where Genesis places it, just after the abundant vegetation of the Carboniferous age.

The fifth stage—that of life in the waters and in the air—is particularly remarkable, and again the exact wording is important. The command (ver. 20) rendered literally is: "Let the waters swarm with swarms, the soul of life, and let the flying one fly upon the earth, on the face of the expanse of the heaven" (see R.V. marg.). Two points are to be noticed; (1) the emphasis on great abundance, still further emphasised by the benediction (ver. 22),

" Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas "; and (2) the association of denizens of the waters with denizens of the air. Further, in ver. 21 the word rendered " whales " in A.V. and " sea-monsters " in R.V. simply means " lengthy ones," and elsewhere is usually applied to reptiles. The phrase " the lengthy ones, the great ones," does not refer to any particular species, nor is it limited to sea creatures. Thus a time is indicated, not of the earliest appearance of animal life, but of an extraordinary prevalence of life in the waters, and of flying creatures and gigantic reptiles. It would be difficult to assign any reason for this particular combination in any writing or tradition of ancient times, yet it is fully justified by the Geologic record. Sir. J. W. Dawson characterises the Jurassic period as the " age of monster reptiles and of birds," and the fossil remains include huge saurians like the ichthyosaurus and deinosaurus, flying creatures like the pterodactyl, and the traces of gigantic birds.

The sixth and last period of development, like the third, is divided into two parts : (*a*) the making of animals, and (*b*) the making of man. In (*a*) the command, ver. 24, is " Let the earth bring forth," the same word used in ver. 12 of the earth producing vegetation, which points to development rather than creation. In ver. 25 it is said " and God made," but " make " is always used of making out of material which already exists, not of independent creation. In (*b*) man is placed last of all in a special category, and is given dominion over the rest of Creation. Geology shows us the Tertiary periods as the age of " extinct mammals," chiefly of great size; the post-Tertiary as that of existing mammals; and man appears last, only "in

the later Pleistocene period." Science certainly does not dispute the supremacy of man.

After the formation of man, Genesis asserts that God "rested . . . from all His work which He had made"; *i.e.*, this was the conclusion of His work of making: Geology knows of no fresh type.

There remains now only the oft-repeated objection that Genesis speaks of days where Science requires long ages. In passing it may be observed that when Canon Barnes speaks of "hundreds of millions of years," his Science is surely a little out of date. If I mistake not, the later geologists have very considerably reduced the older estimates, and now measure rather by thousands of years.

Of course, we who believe in God's Almighty Power do not doubt for a moment that had He so willed He could have accomplished His work in a single instant, but Genesis as well as Science proclaims that He did not so will, dividing the work into several periods. The only question is, Does the use of the word day in Genesis *require* us to believe that this means a period of 24 hours? Now it is quite certain that elsewhere in Scripture "day" is often used of lengthened periods, and even in modern English if we speak of "the marvellous achievements of Science in the present day," we do not limit them to the current 24 hours. Nor does the use of the terms "Evening" and "Morning" necessitate that a natural day is meant, for evening and morning do not constitute a complete day and night, and, moreover, these terms are used three times over before the sun and moon were made rulers of the day and night. It is therefore not impossible that the "days" of Genesis may refer to lengthened periods.

Also the Hebrew words *'Erebh* and *Boker* do not signify Night and Day, but the *early* evening (say between sunset and actual darkness) and *early* morning (say, between dawn and sunrise). These do not make up a " day " of 24 hours.

A reasonable interpretation, then, of both Scripture and Science does not show the irreconcilable contradiction so often asserted, but on the contrary does show some very remarkable points of agreement. No other cosmogony, not even the Babylonian, can even begin to be brought into comparison with the teachings of Science: on the face of them they are palpably absurd. When due allowance is made for an account addressed to people altogether ignorant of modern Science in a language devoid of Scientific terms, the Genesis narrative does bear a great deal of comparison. If the agreement were limited to the undeniable fact that Scripture represents the preparation of this world for habitation as proceeding by regular, orderly stages, and that in the ascending scale from the inorganic up to man, it would be sufficiently striking. But it is far more than that. In no less than ten distinct points—(1) Desolation and Darkness; (2) Influx of Light; (3) Expanse of air; (4) Division of land and water; (5) Prevalence of vegetation; (6) Constitution of Luminaries; (7) Prevalence of aquatic animals, monster reptiles, and birds; (8) Prevalence of mammals; (9) Late appearance of man; (10) Absence of further development—the Scriptural account does correspond even minutely with the precise order of the ascertained facts and legitimate inferences of Science.

How can such an amount of correspondence be accounted for? It cannot be mere chance: it

cannot be supposed that Moses or Ezra had so far anticipated the scientific discoveries of the last century or two. There is but one alternative—that the account which so correctly describes the Work really comes from the Worker Himself. In the days when it was written down, He and He alone knew the true order of His procedure, which, in these days, we are only beginning to learn. The whole character of the volume to which this chapter is the indispensable preface warrants us in believing that it is all instinct with a knowledge far transcending that of man. In that case, to abandon the Scriptural account of the beginnings of the world will only be to substitute the fallible inferences of an, as yet, imperfect Science for the truth of Him who is Truth.

THE FALL.

THE second Scriptural narrative, which we are told can no longer be accepted, is that of the Fall of Man.

There are a good many believers in the Bible as truly the Word of God who find it difficult to accept the account in Gen. iii. literally, because they cannot bring themselves to believe in a serpent able to talk, and a fruit which could convey the knowledge of good and evil. They do not doubt that man is fallen, or that this narrative tells of the first disastrous fall, only they think it must be understood as an allegory, or at least as expressed in highly figurative language; as, for instance, that "the serpent" is merely a figure of speech for the Devil (just as our Lord called Himself "the Vine" and "the Door," and no one thinks of taking those words literally). Now the sturdiest maintainer of the literal interpretation of Scripture can hardly hold that the tempter of Adam and Eve was a *mere* serpent. There is a sublety about the temptation, a fore-knowledge of the effect of eating the forbidden fruit, a deliberate malice towards humanity which cannot be attributed to an ordinary reptile. Moreover, we have New Testament authority for understanding that the "old serpent" is "the Devil and Satan" (Rev. xx. 2), and surely the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head (Genesis iii. 15) can only be interpreted as a prophecy of the

Christ's victory over the Enemy of mankind. Both literalist and allegorist are, then, agreed that the temptation must really have emanated from Satan. The difference between them is that the former believes that Satan made use of a literal serpent as his instrument, while the other holds, either that Satan himself assumed the outward appearance of a serpent, or that "the serpent" is a figurative expression for the tempter, or else that the whole narrative is of the nature of a parable, conveying a spiritual meaning by means of an earthly story. Those who hold these differing views are none the less agreed that there was a real Temptation and a real Fall, which Fall was the original source of the sinfulness of mankind.

The view we have to consider to-night differs essentially from any of these. When Canon Barnes asserted "We can no longer accept the story of the Fall" he was not objecting to the outward form of the Genesis narrative; he was combating the teaching that there ever has been a Fall. He cannot even look upon the account as an allegory; he must look upon it as a mere myth, utterly misrepresenting the truth, and of about the same value as the legend of Pandora. He lays it down uncompromisingly that a belief in the Fall is contrary to "the great scientific doctrine of Evolution."

We have, then, to consider what this doctrine of Evolution is. Here is Canon Barnes' own statement of it: "Man . . . . is the final product of a vast process by which all life has evolved from primitive organisms. Biologically he is cousin, a hundred thousand or a million times removed, to the gorilla, and his ancestry goes back through amphibians to fishes"; and, again, "It appears

that from some fundamental stuff, possibly the ether of the physicists, the electrons arose. From them matter has been formed. From matter comes life. From life mind emerged. From mind in man spiritual consciousness is developing. A vast process and progress is thus disclosed."

The statement is somewhat dogmatically expressed, and not always in strictly scientific terms, *e.g.*, the rather indefinite phrase "some fundamental stuff." It would be interesting too to know whether Scientific men in general would endorse every assertion in it. For instance, "from matter comes life"; has the axiom, once regarded as Scientific, "Omne vivum ex vivo," really been entirely exploded? The statement is also so worded that the process spoken of might seem to be simply mechanical and inevitable, but we gladly recognise that this is not at all Canon Barnes' view. He goes on to argue that "it clearly forms one great, one stupendously great design," and that therefore there must have been a Designer. That is what is technically called the Teleological argument, which it has been rather the fashion to discredit. However, the Canon adds, "Thus we conclude that there must be a God, and, moreover, that He is spiritual perfection." That, of course, is the firm belief of those who accept the Genesis narratives, only they base their belief on God's revelation of Himself to man rather than on the more precarious foundation of human reasoning. Indeed the Canon's argument only serves to show that a strictly logical chain of reasoning on the facts disclosed by Science ends in corroborating precisely what Scripture taught ages ago about the existence of God, His nature, and that the universe is His work. That in this work there is

"one great, one stupendously great design," is surely also precisely the teaching of Scripture, implicitly perhaps up to the formation of man, but explicitly onward through the whole course of human history. For the Scriptural design does not end at "man's moral and spiritual consciousness," but carries it forward through the ages up to the New Creation, when the Son of God became man in order that man might indeed become like unto God, a partaker of the Divine nature, and even beyond that to "the restitution of all things," the redemption of the whole creation.

Since, then, the theory of Evolution, if it be true, is not incompatible with Scripture in these important respects, what is the precise point of contradiction?

"Man," says Canon Barnes, "was not specially created by God, as the Jews believed, and as is stated in the Book of Genesis. Man is, on the contrary, the final product of a vast process by which all life has evolved from primitive organisms." The point of difference, then, lies in the idea that man was "specially created by God," whereas Evolution teaches that he is "the final product of a vast process." It is strange to find that the Canon himself, a few paragraphs further on, sets forth a view which surely differs from this. "When," he says, "life emerged from non-living matter, or, again, when self-conscious mind grew in living things, God made something new. So, also, in creating the soul of man He made something new, definite, real, something different from any previous evolutionary product." Assuming, then, for argument's sake, that man is the final product of a process of Evolution, he is not, on the Canon's own showing, a mere pro-

duct of that process. There is in him "something new . . . something different from any previous evolutionary product," viz., a soul, which Canon Barnes himself asserts was *created* by God. What is this but a special creating, and that at a definite period? If it be true, as Canon Barnes affirms, that "about a million years ago primitive, very primitive, man evolved from the primates," still if that primitive man possessed a soul then newly created by God would it not be in a very real sense true that God then created man? Even if it be contended that "primitive, very primitive, man" was at first a mere animal without a soul, which only developed later, yet when God did make that "something new" and impart it to the hitherto soul-less man, that would still be a real creating of man, for until then he was not man in the full sense, being devoid of that which differentiates him from "any previous evolutionary product." Either, then, Evolution does admit of what may fairly be called a special creation of man, or else Canon Barnes' own teaching is inconsistent with Evolution.

The fact is that when Canon Barnes denies that man was "specially created," he seems to think that "created" always means "called into existence without any kind of relation to what has gone before." That is not the case. Moses said, "If the LORD create a creation" (Num. xvi. 30, R.V. marg.) in making the earth open her mouth, but he certainly did not suppose that this would have no relation to the existing earth or the rebels. St. Paul says (2 Cor. v. 17), "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature" (marg., "there is a new creation"), but that evidently does not mean that the previously existing man would be annihi-

lated and an entirely new being substituted. In both cases it is obvious that "creation" means introducing something new, and that is exactly what Canon Barnes affirms that God did "when life emerged from non-living matter . . . when self-conscious mind grew in living things," and again "in creating the soul of man." Now it is remarkable that in Genesis i. after the first verse the word "create" only occurs twice: (1) at the great development of animal life, when "God created the great sea monsters and every living soul"; and (2) when God created man; and these two correspond fairly with two of the occasions when the Canon admits that God made "something new."

Perhaps, however, Canon Barnes was referring, not to Gen. i. 27, but to ii. 7: "The LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." That this was in his mind is suggested by the sentences "The special creation of Adam in Paradise" and "God did not at some moment in the past make an Adam splendidly perfect." As I have already had occasion to remark, "in Paradise" and "splendidly perfect" atrribute to Scripture what is not there asserted. If in "splendidly perfect" the Canon is alluding to "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him" (Gen. i. 27), it must be observed that he himself admits at least something of Divine likeness. After declaring that God made something new "in creating the soul of man" he says of this soul, "It partakes of the nature of God, and so has entered the realm of things eternal with God." Whether this exhausts the full meaning of "in our image, after our likeness," is another question on which we need not enter now.

It is, of course, possible to interpret Gen. ii. 7 in a crudely childish way, as though it meant that God took a sufficient quantity of dust, moulded it into human form, and then gave it life, just as the Apocryphal Gospels assert that the Christ in His boyhood fashioned birds out of clay and made them live, so that they could drink water and fly away. It is much to be doubted, however, that such an unworthy interpretation has ever been seriously prevalent. It is quite clear that the forming out of the dust of the earth concerns the bodily nature of man, and we now know better than in past ages that our bodies largely consist of elements that can rightly be called earthy. How long the process of formation took is not even remotely suggested; so far as the Scripture statement is concerned, it might have been instantaneous, or it might have occupied millenniums in preparation and execution. Even Dr. Driver in discussing this passage contends that Evolution "if, and in so far as this theory is true . . . simply implies an alteration in the manner in which God is conceived as having acted; what was supposed to have been accomplished by Him, as the result of a single act, some 6,000 years ago, was really accomplished by Him as the result of a long process, extending through unnumbered years" ("Genesis," p. 55). Here we have the express testimony of one who certainly had no prejudice in favour of the Genesis narrative (evidently he considers it "a purified form of legendary narrative," p. 53, note) that the Evolution theory does not contradict what Scripture actually says, but only what it has been supposed to say. Since then Evolution does not forbid us to accept what Dr. Driver calls "the essential point . . . that God (mediately or immediately) formed man of the dust of the ground" (p. 55),

and Canon Barnes admits that "in creating the soul of man" God "made something new . . . something different from any previous evolutionary product," it seems reasonable to conclude that, so far, Science does not require us to abandon belief in the Scriptural statement that at some definite period God created man, forming him out of the dust of the ground. It may require us to revise our understanding of what Scripture does say, but that only means that the carefully chosen wording of Scripture often has a far deeper significance than appears on the surface. All the more wonderful is it that what was written in ages of such very imperfect knowledge should have escaped the many traps and pitfalls into which unaided human thought has so often blundered.

We now come to the more serious allegation that Science "can no longer accept the story of the Fall." Here it is not a question of incredible details, but the assertion is that the main teaching of the narrative—that the parents of the human race fell by disobedience, and that by this fall sin and sorrow entered into the world—is false: that man is not fallen, but, on the contrary, rising.

In his Church Congress paper Canon Barnes stated: "We view man as something in the making, not as a once innocent being now marred. To us he is struggling, not to regain a lost perfection, but to realise the Divinely appointed end of the whole terrestrial process." In his communication to the *Evening Standard* he affirms that "our younger people . . . see how man has struggled upwards"; and again, "We know that man is not struggling to regain a lost perfection, but to be loyal to the design which God had in mind when first He created the world."

It would be difficult, it seems to me, to substantiate the last assertion. The whole history of the human race, and the present condition of the enormous majority of mankind, can hardly be said to show anything of a struggle to be loyal to God's design. But putting that aside, it is abundantly clear that Canon Barnes' position is: Man is not fallen; he is and always has been struggling upwards; therefore the story of the Fall cannot be accepted; it is not true.

Now it is surely useless to try and prove that man is fallen (as did the preacher to whom I listened some time ago) by appealing to the evil all around us, to the horrors of history, even recent history, and to our own consciousness of the antagonism in our own selves between good and evil, so vividly described in Rom. vii. 15-24. The advocates of the opposite view can at once retort: "The evidences you rely on to show that man is fallen really prove our own position; the existing evil and the horrors of history only show that man has not yet freed himself from the instincts of the animals from which he has been evolved; the antagonism in our own selves is precisely the struggling upwards for which we contend." Not on this ground can the question "Fallen or not Fallen" be decided.

Before we enter on this it may be as well to note that Canon Barnes does not always do justice to the views he opposes. "Nowadays," he says, "those who believe in the Fall look backwards somewhat puzzled. We who believe in Evolution look forward in confident hope." Those who believe in the Fall only look backward in so far as they look for the origin of sin and sorrow in the world; the evolutionists must look backward in

precisely the same way when they attribute the evil that is in man to inherited animal instincts. Those who believe in Evolution as the working out of God's design (but not other Evolutionists, of whom there are surely some) may look forward in confident hope: the hope of those who believe in the Fall is not one whit less confident, nay, it is rather more, for they believe that, in spite of the Fall, God is working to raise the fallen—not man struggling to raise himself—to a state far more glorious than was ever the state of Adam in Eden. It is not clear what is meant by believers in the Fall being "somewhat puzzled." If it refers to the difficulty of accounting for the origin of evil, are the Evolutionists in any better case? They may account to their own satisfaction for human sin and wickedness by ascribing these to a fatal inheritance from animal ancestors, but that only pushes the difficulty a step further back. If Evolution be the working out of God's great design how came He to allow the intrusion of this alien element even into the animal world? Why did He not eliminate it along with other animal characteristics in evolving man?

Again, the Canon says: "The story of Adam belongs to the time when man placed the Golden Age in the past. We now place it in the future, a future when time and space shall be transcended and when Christ shall be all in all."

I am not aware that the scientific doctrine of Evolution points to a future "when time and space shall be transcended," and certainly it can know nothing about Christ being all in all. But does the Canon really suppose that believers in the Fall do not, quite as confidently as himself, place the true Golden Age in the future? Whether or not

in that future time and space will be transcended I know not, nor does it seem to me of any moment. What the believer in Scripture does look forward to with most ardent longing is a future when there shall be "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," and when (as St. Paul puts it) "the Son shall also Himself be subjected to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that *God* may be all in all."

However, our main concern is to see whether the narrative in Genesis, commonly called the story of the Fall, is so inconsistent with the scientific doctrine of Evolution that we must necessarily reject the former as untrue, not merely as regards accessories which might be interpreted as figurative, but in its main central idea. To ascertain this we shall need to note carefully what the Genesis account actually says. To begin with, it should be noted that Genesis does not say that Adam was "innocent," any more than it says he was "splendidly perfect," nor does it say that Adam "fell," or that after his disobedience he was "fallen," or that in consequence all his descendants are also "fallen." It simply narrates straightforwardly as facts certain happenings in the lives of the parents of mankind, without attaching any labels or drawing conclusions. It asserts that God placed the man whom He had formed—call him Adam if you will (though the Hebrew in these chapters is not "Adam" as a name but ha-adam, the man), or, if you prefer it, call him "primitive, very primitive man"—in a garden which He had planted in Eden (it is only the Greek translation which calls it "a paradise of delight"), where He had caused to grow "every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food." The man is placed in the

garden "to dress it and to keep it," that is, to cultivate and watch over it, and he may eat freely of the fruits with one exception: he is not to eat of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and is warned that the penalty of disobedience will be death. He is then provided with a suitable companion and consort, and "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." That is the only hint at "innocence," yet it is but the imperfect and unconscious innocence of animals and infants. How long this condition lasted is not told; it may have been years, or it may have been a single hour. Then at the instigation of a crafty being, "the serpent," who persuaded the woman that the result of eating would be God-like knowledge and not death, the pair disobeyed the injunction laid upon them and did eat. We are not told that this conferred upon them "the knowledge of good and evil" (though perhaps it may be inferred from the statement, "the eyes of them both were opened"); but we are told that the immediate result of their disobedience was shame and fear. The immediate penalty was not physical death, for they continued to live, and the sequel shows for a considerable time, but a sentence of punishment, increase of pain and sorrow and expulsion from the garden, is pronounced upon them.

What has Evolution to say to all this? Can it affirm that the primeval man and woman were not at first in pleasant surroundings? or that they were not given any command? or that they did not disobey? Surely not. Evolution may teach us that man was evolved from the lower animals; it cannot tell us what happened to man after he was evolved.

The essence of the narrative surely is that man

did not at first possess the knowledge of good and evil, but afterwards acquired it by wrong-doing. Is that contrary to the doctrine of Evolution? "The scheme," says Canon Barnes, "leads up to man's moral and spiritual consciousness." Well, even so, it does not follow that the moral and spiritual consciousness was in full play the moment man was formed or evolved, any more than it is in a newly-born infant. The picture of the man and woman naked and unashamed, unconscious as yet of the distinction between right and wrong, is not out of keeping with the ideas that have been formed of "primitive, very primitive, man." If, then, primitive man was not at first morally conscious how was that consciousness aroused? Scripture says it was by his disobedience to a direct command of God. Can Evolution say anything to this, either to affirm or deny? It is necessarily something quite outside the province of Science.

Thus it cannot be the narrative of Genesis *in itself* which is alleged to be inconsistent with the doctrine of Evolution, but the belief which has issued from it. That belief is that Adam and Eve's disobedience was more than the first act of wrong: that it rendered our first parents, and therefore all their progeny, sinful; and therefore all mankind is "fallen." Now it is certainly true that for a clear statement of this belief we are chiefly indebted to the teaching of St. Paul. "St. Paul believed in the Fall," Canon Barnes admits. That is unquestionable, but, more than that, St. Paul believed in the truth of the Genesis narrative, for in 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14 he founds a practical argument on one of its details. "He drew a parallel," continues the Canon, "between Adam and Christ which many are loth to abandon." That also is true, but not

the whole truth. It is not only the parallel between the first and second Adams in 1 Cor. xv. which shows the Apostle's belief in the Fall; it is far more clearly stated in the closely reasoned argument of Rom. v. 12-21, beginning with "as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that the whole of St. Paul's teaching on sin and salvation is conditioned by this belief.

To justify his own belief in, and his teaching of that which is contrary to the belief of St. Paul, Canon Barnes adds: "But is his spiritual insight to be denied because he sometimes made a mistake? Surely not." In this concession of spiritual insight to the Apostle, in spite of occasional mistakes, there is an undertone of something like patronising superiority which is not very pleasing. But notice that it is quietly assumed that St. Paul's belief in the Fall is "a mistake": indeed, a little further on it is plainly called "this error." Also, the possibility that St. Paul's teaching was in any way guided by the Holy Spirit of Truth is utterly ignored. And if this be "a mistake," what a terrible mistake to have made! If St. Paul's two great arguments on justification by faith and on the resurrection of the dead are flawed by "this error," what confidence can we have in any of his teaching? Where shall we find his "spiritual insight"? Canon Barnes is sure that "when the General [Booth] affirms with St. Paul that 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,' his emphasis is on the last part of the sentence." No doubt, and so would also St. Paul's be, simply because it is far the more important statement of the two. That is

a very different matter from asserting that the latter statement is true, and the other false. The Canon relies very confidently on the authority of men of Science of to-day : personally, on a matter like this, I should very much prefer (and I do not think I stand alone) the authority of St. Paul guided by the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, the authority of St. Paul does not stand alone. Though the narrative in Genesis does not say, " This was a Fall, and in it all mankind was involved," yet it is not possible, I think, to read the rest of the book, and indeed the whole of the Old Testiment and of the New Testament to boot, without realising that everywhere all men are represented as sinners and sinful, and that this universal sinfulness is one long chain, of which the first link was the fatal error in Eden. So far from representing the course of human history as a struggle upwards, the Scriptures consistently regard it as steadily tending downwards, only checked, and even from time to time turned back in an upward direction, by the merciful intervention of God Himself. The disobedience of Adam is followed by the crime of Cain, and that by an ever-increasing propensity to stray (see Genesis vi. 3, R.V. marg.), till in Noah's days the whole earth has become corrupt. After the cleansing Flood the presumption of the Babel builders deepens gradually into the vile abominations of Sodom and the entire Canaanite peoples. Even after the wondrous deliverance from Egyptian bondage and the manifestation at Sinai, the history of the Chosen People itself is but a long catalogue of rebellions and apostacies involving terrible moral degradation. The Bible does not speak of a " Fall " or " fallen man," but it does everywhere speak of Sin, Sinners, and Sinfulness.

It is here that the modern teaching seems to me fraught with danger: it would practically eviscerate the meaning of Sin. If man is not fallen, but ever struggling upwards, then his wrong-doings, even his most atrocious crimes, can be looked upon as only frailties, failures to realise his ideals, foolish disregard of his true interests, which is the conception of Buddhism. The New Testament, indeed, calls sin a "missing of the mark" (ἁμαρτία) but also characterises it as "lawlessness" (ἀνομία) and "unrighteousness" (ἀδικία), and the Hebrew words are even stronger. There can be no question that the Scriptural idea of sin is that of something far more deadly than failure to attain the ideal. This watering down of the nature of sin touches even the work of our Blessed Lord Himself. It is noticeable that Canon Barnes can speak eloquently of Christ as "the pattern perfect man, the ideal of evolutionary finality"—(does he think of Christ Himself as "evolved"?)—but says not a word of Him as Saviour. We prefer to believe the "faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ JESUS came ino the world *to save sinners.*"

In this paper it has been my aim to show that the Genesis narrative of the Fall, rightly understood, is not incompatible with the scientific doctrine of Evolution: that does not mean that I accept the doctrine. I do not: not from any faintest fear that true Science is in the least contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture, but because I believe—and I think I may speak for many others (including Dr. Driver, whose cautious "if and in so far as this theory is true" shows a good deal of doubt)—that the theory is far from proven. There are serious gaps in the evidence. For instance, the Darwinian theory of the descent of man from the apes had a

certain plausibility from the resemblance of form, and it was thought that a single "missing link" would complete the proof: now we are told that man is not descended from apes, but amphibians and fishes, and in that case it seems to me that there must be a good many "missing links" yet to be discovered. There are also steps in the theory which are assumed rather than proved, and this applies particularly to a leading argument of Canon Barnes. Because there is a steady upward tendency discernible in the development of the physical world, he jumps to the conclusion that there must be a corresponding upward tendency in man throughout history. But, because there is this upward tendency in the works of God, it by no means follows that there will be a corresponding tendency in the progress of man *apart from God*. Man has indeed made marvellous progress in arts and sciences, especially in the last century or two, but it would be safe to challenge Canon Barnes, or any of his sympathisers, to point to any similar upward tendency in "moral loyalties and spiritual perception," any struggle "to be loyal to the design which God had in mind when He first created the world," *except* where God's teachings in Holy Writ have, wholly or in part, penetrated.

Canon Barnes considers that "the older Christians among us who cling to the Fall, exaggerate absurdly its importance in Christian doctrine": he argues that "the Fall is not vital to Christian theology: it is not even of value to it": he goes even further, and declares it an actual "stumbling-block." I venture to submit that to deny the Fall is to abandon, not the early chapters in Genesis alone, but the main teaching of the entire Bible; to pronounce the whole Christian

Church in error for nearly 2,000 years; and seriously to belittle the work of our Saviour. Canon Barnes asserts that there never has been a fall, and that man has always been struggling upwards. Secular history shows us degeneracy and moral deterioration, not only in the Decline and Fall of Rome, but in all the great world empires. Scripture shows us the same downward tendency of man when left to his own devices, but at the same time the upward trend of God's workings in man and for man, the steady progress of His great design for uplifting the fallen, and the whole Creation, to unimagined heights of Grace and Glory.

Marshall Brothers, Ltd.,
Printers,
Crane Court, Fleet St., London, E.C.4

Works

by the

Rev. A. H. FINN,

lately

Senior Chaplain, Rangoon Diocese,

and formerly

Lecturer in Hebrew, Leeds Clergy School.