JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXII

1940

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, W.C.1

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on February 5th, 1940, the Paper appointed to be read on that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion elicited.

---

*GENESIS AND PAGAN COSMOGONIES.**

By Rev. Edward McCrady, D.D.

(*Former Head of Philosophy Dept., University of Miss., U.S.A.*)

IT was the well-nigh universal belief of scholars a century or more ago that the cosmogonies of pagan mythology, together with many associated legends of early events in human history, such as the existence of a primal Golden Age, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, etc., were but the half-forgotten and badly distorted recollections of a Divine Revelation vouchsafed to man at the very beginning of human history—the correct account of which had been providentially preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures. There were some distinguished opponents of this theory, it is true—especially among the Deists of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, who, curiously enough, substituted the conception of a primitive *Religion of Nature* for the orthodox Christian belief—but it nevertheless remains a fact that the great majority of scholars during this period were partial to the Church's view and, when not accepting the orthodox faith in its entireness, at least admitted that the pagan accounts in general were corruptions of the Genesis narrative. Indeed, it was not until after the publications of Spencer and Darwin had received widespread acceptance, that the sudden reversal of thought in the direction of materialism and atheism took place, and a view—the very antithesis of that formerly entertained—was introduced to explain the origin and

---

* With Professor McCrady's kind permission this paper has been abridged owing to lack of space. All the essential facts and arguments are preserved.—[Ed.]

evolution of Religion in general, and in particular to explain the relation existing between the monotheism of Genesis, and the polytheism of the Chaldeo-Assyrian Cosmogony. Under the leadership of Spencer, Lubbock, Tylor, and others, the principles of materialistic evolution were employed to explain the origin of Religion out of animism, dreams, hallucinations, magic, etc., and to prove that our present-day monotheism has come into existence only as the result of long ages of development.

Even men of a very different type—idealistic scholars like Max Müller and M. Reville—were so impressed with the evidence presented by Comparative Philology and Mythology to the effect that all the divinities of polytheism were personifications of the forces and phenomena of Nature, that they were driven to accept, in part or in whole, the general truth of these conclusions, until to-day we find this conception of the matter firmly established in educational circles, incorporated in every college textbook on the subject, and even accepted by the great majority of educated clergymen and laymen as a matter of course. Indeed, it is amazing to discover how few people, even of education, are aware that the old, materialistic conception of an uninterrupted evolution such as that entertained by Haeckel—a process utterly excluding the notion of all creative acts, emergences, and other miraculous events—is now thoroughly discredited by recent physical and biological science; and that in place of the tenet that all monotheism has evolved out of polytheism, the very reverse of that theory is now the accepted doctrine of the leading specialists in that field. We have only to consult such eminent authorities as Sayce, Flinders Petrie, Schmidt of Vienna, Langdon of Oxford, and numbers of other eminent students of the subject, to learn that (in the words of the last mentioned) "the history of the oldest religion of man is *a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism*" (*Field Museum Leaflet*, 28). Nor, in accepting this interpretation of the matter, is there any need to deny the general truth of Max Müller's assertion that the divinities of Paganism are, for the most part, personifications of the forces and phenomena of Nature, but only is it necessary for us to realise that inasmuch as there is abundant evidence to show that many of the stories told of these pagan deities *follow the order of events recorded in Genesis in which the corresponding physical phenomena are said to have been created*, and can only be understood in connection with certain specific statements of Genesis concerning them,

we begin to realise that *the "personifications" followed and were based upon the particular story contained in this narrative.* To illustrate what is meant. It is generally conceded that the Dragon, as a personification of the Evil Spirit, is more or less identified with the destructive and rebellious forces of Nature, especially as they bring chaos and suffering to mankind (the flood, storm, tempest, whirlwind, etc.), but it is only in connection with such stories as that of Bel and the Dragon that we begin to catch a glimpse of the *origin* of the myth, and only again as we compare this Chaldeo-Assyrian legend with the first chapter of Genesis that we begin to realise that this *Tiamat* (Dragon) of the former is but a personification of the *Tehom*—the watery abyss or chaos mentioned in Genesis; while Bel or Bel-Merodach (Marduk) is a personification of the sun which, appearing on the Fourth Day, "*breaks through this watery abyss that envelopes the earth—piercing, or rather tearing asunder this Dragon of the abyss, with his glittering sword*—and, eventually, after a long struggle, bringing order, law, and cosmos out of chaos, that we begin to see the explanation of the whole. Similarly, we see little significance in the Egyptian picture of Kneph sailing in a boat over the water, and breathing life into its tumultuous depths; or the Phœnician legend of Colpias and his Wife Bau, or Bahu, effecting a like organisation of the waste of primal matter; until we remember that *Kneph* signifies wind, air, living breath or spirit; and *Colpias* likewise means "wind," while *Bahu* is evidently the Phœnician form of the Hebrew "*Bohu*," the *waste of waters.*

With this discovery, however, it immediately dawns upon us that these legends must obviously refer to the statement of Genesis that "The Spirit (wind or breath) of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." A further careful study of the succession of male and female divinities of the Chaldeo-Assyrian Theogony—Lachmu and Lachamu; An-Sar and Ki-Sar—will also bring to light the fact that they are, respectively, personifications of the Light with his consort, Darkness; of the upper and lower "waters" (divided by the "expanse"), and occur exactly in the order of their appearance in Genesis narrative; while the divinities Anos (or Anu), Ilinos (Enlil) and Aos (Ea) which follow next, and which are universally identified with the heavens, the earth, and the sea, are obviously personifications of these physical phenomena which, as Genesis records, were separated

one from another as the next step in the creative process; while as the hero of the next succeeding generation appears Bel Merodach or Marduk, easily identified as the sun which, as Genesis again tells us, shone now for the first time upon the earth, and which, together with the moon and stars, completed the creative work of the Fourth Day, which last events are still further reflected in the Chaldean myth of the birth of Sin (Moon), Adar (Saturn), Merodach (Jupiter, *i.e.*, " the *Star* of Marduk "), Nergal (Mars), Nebo (Mercury) and others. The order of the appearance of these pagan divinities, we say, is exactly the order of the appearance of the corresponding physical phenomena given in Genesis—the *Theogony* (*Toledoth* or " Generation of the Gods ") of the Chaldeans is simultaneously a *cosmogony* and a cosmogony based on the cosmogony of Genesis.

So much for this general statement. Let us now examine the problem more exhaustively.

" When above the heavens were not yet named,
And below, the earth was without a name,
The limitless abyss (*apsu*) was their generator
And the chaotic sea (*Mummu-Tiamat*) she who produced the whole,
Their waters flowed together in one,
No flock of animals was as yet collected, no plant had sprung up.
When none of the gods had as yet been produced,
When they were not designated by a name, when no fate was as yet (fixed)
The great gods were then formed,
Lahmu and Lahamu were produced (first)
And they grew in (solitude).
Asshur and Kishar were produced (next).
(Then) rolled on a long course of days (and)
Anu, (Bel and Ea
Were born) of Asshur and (Kishar)."

Such are the opening lines of the great Chaldean Epic of Creation as given by Lenormant (*Beginnings of History*, Appendix, p. 491) and based upon the original translation furnished the world by George Smith in his now famous *Chaldean Account of Genesis* (p. 62 *et seq.*). Since the publication of Smith's work, however, many other fragments of this early Chaldean cosmogony have been discovered, and many other scholars have been at

pains to piece together, and retranslate the text, with the result that we have now a fairly complete reproduction of the entire Seven Tablets which constituted the original narrative.*

As it is not in line with the purpose of this brief study, however, to do more than point out the significance of certain allusions and statements of the Chaldean account which have their counterparts in other ancient cosmogonies, no attempt will here be made to discuss the entire text; but attention will be directed solely to those features of the narrative which bear directly upon the matter under consideration.

Returning, therefore, to the examination of these opening lines of the First Tablet, we find that later commentators have modified the reading in a few more or less important particulars. Thus, following what he claims to be "the latest and best commentaries," Dr. Theophilus G. Pinches renders them as follows:—

"When on high the heavens were unnamed,
Beneath the earth bore not a name;
The primæval ocean was their producer;
Mummu Tiamtu was she who begot the whole of them,
Their waters in one united themselves, and
The plains were not outlined, marshes were not to be seen.
When none of the gods had come forth,
They bore no name, the fates (had not been determined).
There were produced the gods (all of them ?):
Lahmu and Lahamu went forth (as the first ?):
The ages were great, (the times were long ?).
Ansar and Kisar were produced and over (them) . . .
Long grew the days; there came forth (?) . . .
Ansar, the god Anu. . . ."

(*The Old Testament*, p. 16.)

Now, ignoring the minor rhetorical differences, it is apparent that the actual meaning of certain words and passages of the original are differently interpreted here. For example, the Assyrian word "apsu," first rendered "abyss" ("the limitless abyss"—Smith-Lenormant) is here rendered "ocean" (the primæval ocean"); while the meaning of the expression "Mummu-Tiamat" or "Mummu-Tiamtu," in the first transla-

* Those interested in examining the complete work will find a most readable translation presented in Dr. George A. Barton's *Archæology and the Bible* (p. 251, *et seq.*).

tion given as "the chaotic sea," is here ignored altogether. We shall have occasion to comment on this difficulty later on, when we come to discuss the significant Hebrew expressions *Ihohu va bohu** and *Tehom*,† in Gen. i, 2. For the present, we merely call attention to the problem here presented. Again, a very marked discrepancy is apparent in regard to the correct interpretation of the Assyrian "*gipara la giççura çuça la seh.*" Here the literal translation of the earlier authorities, as given by Lenormant (*Id.*, p. 490), is "a flock not was folded a plant not had put forth," whereas Pinches has it "the plains were not outlines, marshes were not to be seen"—an interpretation which now seems to be very generally adopted—to wit: "No field had been formed, no marsh land seen" (Barton, *Archæology and the Bible*, p. 251). Other differences present themselves also in the concluding lines of each translation, but these are due more to the fragmentary and uncertain character of the cuneiform inscriptions themselves than to any disagreement among scholars as to the real meaning of words. Before considering this last matter, attention must be called to the very valuable exposition of the religious views of the Babylonians given by the Syrian Neo-Platonist, Damascius (*circa* A.D. 560), which has served to throw much light on certain phases of the text. "The Babylonians, like the rest of the Barbarians," says he, "pass over in silence the one principle of the Universe, and they constitute two, Tauthe and Apason, making Apason the husband of Tauthe, and denominating her the mother of the gods. And from these proceeds an only-begotten son, Moumis, which I conceive, is no other than the intelligible world proceeding from the two principles. From them, also another, progeny is derived, Daché and Dachos; and again a third, Kissare and Assoros, from which last three others proceed, Anos, and Illinos, and Aos. And of Aos and Dauke is born a son called Belos, who, they say, is the fabricator of the world, the Creator." (*De Prim. Princip.*, 125, p. 384, ed. Kopp.)

Commenting upon this passage, Pinches says "the likeness of the names given in this extract from Damascius will be noticed, and will probably also be recognised as a valuable verification of the certainty now attained by Assyriologists in the reading of the proper names. In Tiamtu, or, rather, Tiawtu, will be

---

* תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ † תְּהוֹם

easily recognised the Tauthe of Damascius, whose son, as appears from a later fragment, was called Mummu (Moumis)." Apason he gives as the husband of Tauthe, but of this we know nothing from the Babylonian tablet, which, however, speaks of this Apason (*apsu*, "the abyss"), which corresponds with the "primæval ocean" of the Babylonian tablet.

In Daché and Dachos it is easy to see that there has been a confusion between Greek Λ and Δ, which so closely resemble each other. Daché and Dachos should, therefore, be corrected into Laché and Lachos, the Lahmu and Lahamu (better Lahwu and Lahawu) of the Babylonian text. They were the male and female personifications of the heavens. Ansar and Kisar are the Greek author's Assoros and Kisare, the "Host of Heaven" and the "Host of Earth," respectively. The three proceeding from them, Anos, Illinos, and Aos, are the well-known Anu, the god of the heavens; Enilia, the Akkadian name of the god Bel, afterwards identified with Merodach; and Aa or Ea, the god of the waters, who seems to have been identified by some with Yau or Jah. Aa or Ea was the husband of Damkina, or Dawkina, the Dauke of Damascius, from whom, as he says, Belus, *i.e.*, Bel-Merodach, was born, and if he did not "fabricate the world," at least he ordered it anew, after his great fight with the Dragon of Chaos, as we shall see when we come to a third tablet of the series. (*The Old Testament*, pp. 17, 18.)

Without attempting to go into any criticism of the above, we may summarise the main conclusion at which scholars have now arrived in the following tabular statement:—

TABLE I.

1. Tauthé (-Tiamat) × Apason (-Apsu)
2. Mummu (Moumis)
3. Laché (-Lachamu) × Lachos (Lachmu)
4. Kissare (-Ki-shar) × Assoros (-An-shar)
5. Anos (-Anu); Illinos (-Enlil); Aos (-Ea)
   (Aos × Damkina)
6. Bel-Merodach.

We may now note certain further meanings attached to the above, which, in one way or another, have the endorsement of scholars.

1. Tauthe (Tiamat)—Hebrew *Thohu* (תֹּהוּ), waste (*i.e.*, of matter), hence *unformed* matter—cloud-like or nebulous material—the so-called celestial "waters" (fluids); shapeless nebulæ.
   Apason (Apsu)—Hebrew *Bohu* (בֹּהוּ), void, emptiness, chaos proper (*i.e.*, empty space), the "deep."
2. Mummu (Moumis) or Mummu Tiantu—*organised* matter, *formed* matter, hence the beginning of the Cosmos. N.B., Damascius, in explaining the meaning of Moumis (Greek Μωυμις calls it νοητὸς κόσμος "which is generally translated by 'intelligible world'" (Hugo Radau, *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*, p. 11). But an "intelligible world" is a rationalised or organised world—a *cosmos* as distinguished from a *chaos*.
3. Laché (Lachamu) and Lachos (Lachmu)—conflict, opposition, a tearing asunder (see note below). Hypothetically, a rending of the existing material through the opposition of polar forces—Lachos *versus* Laché.
4. Kissare (Ki-Shar)—"lower hosts" or "waters." Assoros (An-Shar)—"upper hosts" or "waters."
5. Anos (Anu) heaven; Illinos (Enlil) Earth (?); Aos (Aa or Ea) Sea.
   Aos and Dauke (Damkina), his wife, are said to bring forth Bel (Belus) or Bel-Merodach (Marduk)—the Sun.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to comment more particularly upon the words *Lachmu* and *Lachamu* in the third generation cited above. The meaning of these words is very obscure. However, a probable connection with such Hebrew words as לֶחֶם, לְחוּם and מִלְחָמָה has been pointed out (Houtsma—*Zeitschrift fur altestamentliche Wissenschaft*, p. 329 ff. Cited by Hugo Radau, *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*, p. 17, note). These words, together with לֶחֶם (war), are derived from the verb לָחַם, to eat or consume, but also (acc. to Gesenius) *to fight, to war.* "Soldiers in war or battles are hyperbolically said *to devour* their enemies." Hence we find also

such meanings as *to contend, to fight together, to fight against.* The connection between eating, devouring, biting, *tearing asunder,* fighting, therefore, is obvious, and seems amply to justify the interpretation that Lachmu and Lachamu refer to some kind of "*tearing asunder,*" *division* or *separation* of the embryonic cosmic material; an event which is clearly implied in the statement of Gen. i, 4; where God, in creating light, is said to have "*divided* the light from the darkness, and again, in creating the firmament ("expanse"), is said to have "*divided*" the waters from the waters (*Id.* vs. 6–8—literally *torn them asunder*).

But whatever interpretation we prefer, it remains true that, in any case, the circumstantial evidence points to "the breaking forth of light out of darkness" as the true meaning of this passage.

We say "the circumstantial evidence," for, as aforesaid, it is not the mere identification of the pagan divinities with certain phenomena and forces of Nature that is the point to be stressed, but the further fact that the "phenomena and forces" are the same as those mentioned in Genesis as the "creations" of God, and are brought to the attention of the reader in the same general order of succession as they appear in Genesis. It is these very *parallelisms* which constitute the main force of the argument. There are differences, of course, but they are not of sufficient magnitude to eclipse the manifest resemblances which have forced themselves upon the attention of all students of the subject.

In this connection, too, we call further attention to the curious fact that the sexual distinctions among the divinities correspond to the polar differentiations of the cosmic material in the Divine acts of creation, and that it is the female to whom is ascribed the greater honour in the Chaldean system—her name always preceding that of her consort—while even parthenogenetic powers are apparently ascribed to her in certain instances. That with the Chaldeans the female principle is supreme in Nature will readily be seen from the prominence of the Dragon Goddess *Tiamat,* who is the central figure of the whole drama until finally overthrown, in the course of ages, by one of her own progeny.

Before entering upon any discussion of the remarkable correspondences presented here between the Hebrew and Chaldean cosmogonies, let us state at the very outset, for the benefit of

a certain class of critics, that we are quite aware that there are also many *great differences*. No one denies this fact. Indeed, if it were not the case, there would be no object in writing this paper. If there were *no* differences, why call attention to the obvious identities? Of course, there are differences—very conspicuous differences—but it is this very fact that makes a certain series of identities all the more remarkable. No one denies the fact, for example, that an Intelligent Creator of the world is not mentioned in the Chaldean account—that the Hebrew narrative is monotheistic, the Chaldean polytheistic; that the one is purely spiritual while the other is grossly materialistic; that one bears all the evidence of being a Divine Revelation, while the other has all the ear-marks of a human, sensual production. But true as this is, there are also a number of remarkable points of agreement between the two, which upon closer examination clearly indicate that the Chaldean is a gross perversion of the statements of the Hebrew—a revolting parody *which has been built upon the latter*—and that it is exceedingly important that we recognise this fact, as it further indicates the priority of Genesis and monotheism, and confirms the traditional view that the Chaldean Epic together with all the gross materialistic conceptions of polytheism generally are, the result of ages of *spiritual degeneration*—indisputable evidence of the "*Fall*" of Man. Just as there is no better evidence of a "forgery" than the number of "agreements" which it manifests with the original, so there can be no better evidence of the borrowed but degenerate character of this Chaldean Epic than the number of "correspondences" which it manifests with this inspired document of pure Hebrew monotheism. But the importance of this statement will appear as we proceed with the enumeration of these details. For the present, we must call attention to one singular fact which must be considered before entering further into the matter.

The Six Days of Creation.

It has been asserted by critics that there is at least one "difference" between the two accounts that cannot be lightly disregarded. It has been said that, *unlike* the narrative in Genesis, the Chaldean account makes no allusion to the six days of creation or to the seventh day of rest. This is true.

But while we are considering this, why not also call attention to the further significant coincidence that, *like* the Genesis account, the Chaldean is divided into *seven* sections, and that at least five out of these seven sections refer to matters specifically mentioned in the corresponding " days " of Genesis ? Nay, more—we may go further and say that five out of the first six tablets of the Chaldean Epic refer to phenomena duly recorded in Genesis as " *creations* " of God occurring on the corresponding " *days* " of His creative work. Is that an accident ? Not only is this a most remarkable circumstance but, as we propose to show, it finds no satisfactory explanation, save upon the hypothesis that the Chaldeans followed the general arrangement of events recorded in Genesis, both as regards the successive *periods* of time (days) into which these events were divided, as well as regards the actual order of the events themselves *within* each of these " periods." Indeed, as we propose further to show, it should be evident to all " who have eyes to see," that the successive *physical phenomena* created by Elohim during the six days of His creative works, ARE the gods and goddesses of the Chaldean Religion. They have simply deified the numberless *works* of God—exalting the " *creature* " in place of the " *Creator.*"

But to return to the number " seven," evidently regarded as sacred in both narratives. Merely to assert that the Chaldeans, like the Hebrews, regarded this number as sacred, explains nothing. The real question is, *Why* did they hold it sacred ? The Hebrew account gives us a *reason* for their attitude on the subject ; the Chaldean does not ; and it is this very " reason " which, when coupled with other remarkable " correspondences " elsewhere, give us the key to the solution of the whole problem. In short, the very retention of this sevenfold division in the Chaldean Epic, though unexplained anywhere in the text, throws light on its origin, and, taken in connection with other remarkable " *correspondences,*" proves that the work was a subsequent degenerate version, or rather *distortion*, of the original spiritual document preserved for us in Genesis—a conclusion which is now thoroughly in line with the latest opinion of scholars concerning the priority of monotheism to polytheism, as well as with all the evidence that the trend of religious life and worship is ever *downwards*—from the spiritual to the material—from the purest idealism to the grossest idolatry.

But let us now proceed to a more detailed comparison of the two records.*

Naturally the first thing which one observes on comparing these two narratives is the absence of all reference to a Supreme, Intelligent Deity in the Chaldean account. It is a distinctly materialistic and polytheistic narrative; and the fact that even the God whom the Hebrew writer acknowledges is called *Elohim* — a *plural form* though curiously enough used with a verb in the *singular*—was for a long time pointed out by critics as further confirming their theory that polytheism antedated monotheism, and that even Moses himself, in attempting to introduce the latter, could not afford to drop a term which has been so long familiar to his people, though he attempted to belittle its true significance by invariably using a singular verb in connection with it—an explanation so utterly improbable that it could never have gained the support of any sensible body of men had it not served the purpose of justifying a preconceived theory. Now, however, that we know that this basic assumption of scepticism is unfounded—that the latest authorities assert that, "wherever we can trace back polytheism to its earliest stages we find that it results from combinations of monotheism" —that "the history of the oldest religion of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism," etc.—we are compelled to acknowledge the validity of the position assumed by the old school theologians. Nor should there ever have been any question in regard to the matter as all the earliest testimony of the various religions themselves indicate that polytheism resulted from many diverse manifestations of the one all-supreme God, and the fact that He was worshipped under many different names by different peoples and in different localities until finally men lost sight of the unity underlying all this vast multiplicity. Yet even the Rig-Veda (Book I, p. 164) assures us that (in that early day) the gods were regarded as simply diverse manifestations of a single Divine Being—"They call *him* Indra, Mithra, Varuna, Agni—that which is One, the wise name by different terms." Now the word Elohim is only an example of this statement occurring among the Hebrews and the Chaldeans. We now know that a Supreme Deity—the God *par excellence*—was recognised even among the Chaldeans under the name of

* The reader is requested to compare what has preceded, as well as what is to follow, with Tables II and III, at end of paper.

El, *Il*, or *Ilu*. He was acknowledged as "the Supreme God, the first and sole principle from whom all other deities were derived" (Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, p. 452). That is to say all subsequent divinities—the entire *theogony of polytheism* were born of him as *personifications* of his numberless attributes; the various *Elohim*, in other words, were only the diverse aspects (personified) of the One *El*, *Il*, *or Ilu*,* and it is this *unity* underlying all the diversity of *names* assigned to him that Moses *emphasises* in the very opening words of the first chapter of Genesis when he affirms that: "In the beginning *Elohim*—(the *One God* of *many names*)—*He* created (*bara*) the heavens and the earth." In such language, therefore, Moses merely stresses a fact that was universally recognised by the Chaldeans themselves, in the beginning of their history, but was all but forgotten in the polytheism of later years. A similar history attaches to the names *Baal* and *Baalim* of Phœnician fame. The names *Baal*, *Ba-el*, or *Bel* were various renderings of the same title, and, in the opinion of the writer, were all corruptions of the original *Ba-ra El* (the "bara *Elohim* of Gen. i, 1), *i.e.*, the God who *created*—the *Creator-God*. But just as the various manifestations (theophanies) of *El* were later spoken of collectively as the *Elohim*, so the various manifestations of *Baal* became the *Baalim*. There were many of these Baalim. As referred to the localities in which they were worshipped, they were *Baal-Tsur*, Baal of Tyre; *Baal-Sidon*, Baal of Sidon; *Baal-Tars*, Baal of Tarsus; *Baal-Hermon*, Baal of Mt. Hermon; *Baal-Pisgah*, Baal of Mt. Pisgah, etc. With reference to the particular phenomena of Nature in which he manifested himself, he was called *Baal-Thammuz* (the god who controlled the decay and regeneration of vegetation); *Baal-Chon*, Baal the Preserver; *Baal-Moloch* the Destroyer; and *Baal-Zebub*, another personification of the death and resurrection of vegetation in the spring. As Lenormant remarks, "This Phœnician deity, like those of all ancient pantheisms, *was at the same time one and several*. He was subdivided into a number of hypostases called *Baalim*, secondary divinities, emanating from and (of) the substance of the deity, and who were merely personifications of his attributes." (*Ancient Hist. East*, i, 219.) In short, the historical process from pure monotheism to gross polytheism and idolatry seems to have been somewhat as follows. The pure, spiritual conception

* The *Al* or *Allah* of the Arabians to-day.

of the Creator entertained at the beginning was difficult for the average worshipper to visualise; but as this God was the Creator of Nature, His ineffable presence was assumed to be *everywhere* in Nature; indeed (as the next step), Nature itself *was* God (pantheism); and this being the case, every *physical object*, every *phenomenon* of Nature was a definite theophany of embodiment of God, and so could be regarded as a definite *representative* of God and worshipped accordingly, with the result that the *Creature* was soon substituted for the *Creator*, polytheism taking the place of monotheism. Before this unity underlying the plurality of names had been entirely forgotten, however, there was nothing unusual in the employment of a verb in the singular number in connection with both the terms of Baalim and Elohim, and this usage so characteristic of the first chapter of Genesis only bespeaks its great antiquity.

In the case of the Chaldean narrative, however, the decadence of all true spiritual conceptions has gone so far that the very existence of *El*, *Il* or *Ilu* appears to be forgotten, and only His material creations remembered. These, now, are personified and deified—yea, the works of His own hands are exalted above Him—the creature worshipped in place of the Creator. Not only so, but hardly a single material phenomenon or event of His Divine work mentioned in Genesis appears to have been overlooked in the Chaldean theogony, while the actual chronological order of their creation, though occasionally forgotten, is followed in the main with amazing fidelity. The very opening words, "*In the Beginning*," naturally suggest the idea of "*Time*" as existent before the appearance of the watery abyss of matter—the Goddess *Tiamat*. And accordingly we find that the Chaldean account opening with the statement "*Time was* (that is existed) when above heaven was not named; Below to the earth no name was given." But do not imagine that this "Time" that existed before the world was, was a mere abstraction. To them he was a concrete reality; a true divinity—the equivalent of the Chronos of the Greeks, who is said to have devoured his own children; and the *Ulom* of the Phœnicians who "never grows old," and embraces all things in himself. Moreover, he is actually associated in some of the myths with Ilu, Asshur, and Asura (all of whom appear to have been identical)—This "Time" was said to be "*the Father of the gods*," a statement which has never been forgotten, but which still lingers on in the familiar expression "*Father Time*." Again, while the etymology of the

word *Yahveh* (apparently identical with *Iao*, *Jah*, etc.) is a matter of dispute, the God referred to was undoubtedly the same as *El* or *Elohim*—the Creator of the world, the two names being conjoined, in later passages, as *Jahveh-Elohim* and, according to the interpretation of Damascius, this word *Yahveh* means not simply "*the existent One*" but "*He who lives eternally*"—that is *The Eternal Life*. But this again only serves to identify *El* or *Yahveh* as the Author of *Time* and *Matter*, and this is exactly what the Phœnician myth implies. While there is much confusion in the various accounts as to the exact order in which they should be named, yet it appears that *Zes*, *Chthonia*, and *Chronos—i.e.*, Ether (Light or Fire); Matter (later Earth) and *Time* are everywhere mentioned as the originators of all things—an allusion to the statement of Genesis that the *Eternal Elohim* "begins" (*i.e.*, in *Time*) His work, and first creates *Matter* (formless or chaotic) and then, out of Chaos, produces *Light*. Thus, in the opinion of Lenormant, the whole Phœnician system reduces to the following: "In the beginning were *Yahveh* (*He who lives eternally*); *Bahu* (feminine *Chaos*), and *Ulom* (*Time*)—and *Yahveh*, who was *breath* (*ruach*), made himself into *Desire* (*hipec*) to operate the creative work in the womb of *Bahu*. And *Bahu* became *Earth* (*erets*) when *Yahveh* had accorded her honour to her, and the Sea (*Yam*) was separated from the dry land. And *Ulom* begat the three celestial elements, fire (*esh*), breath (*ruach*) and water (*mem*)." (*Beginnings of History*, p. 557.) As already stated, there is some confusion in the various myths as to the exact *order* of the appearance of these first divinities. In the above, *Time* (*Ulom*) is mentioned as the *third*; and it may be observed, parenthetically, that the poet Vergil (apparently following Pherecydes) gives the order as "fire, earth and time"; while the Sidonians are very emphatic in their statement that "*Before all else was Time.*" However this may be, it is very easy to see that when these various myths are taken together, they are all concerned with the same created phenomena and events recorded in the opening verses of this first chapter of Genesis. *Elohim* (the Eternal Life) begins His creative work in *Time*, and successively produces *Chaos* or *formless matter* (*Bahu* of the Phœnicians being the *Bohu* of the Hebrews—"*Tiohu va Bohu*"—the Dragon Goddess, *Tiamat*, etc.); then brings *Light* out of Darkness (Ether, Fire, Esh, Lachmu and Lachamu); Evening and Morning; Day and Night; though His *Spirit* (*rauch*, Wind, *Colpias*,

Kneph, Air, Breath) hovering over the *watery abyss* (Tehom, Tiamat, etc.) and eventually produces the organised world of Sky (Heaven), Land (Earth) and Ocean, etc.

Indeed, the echoes of this primal revelation, transformed and corrupted as we have just explained, are to be found in nearly all the mythologies, cosmogonies, and theogonies of paganism. For besides the Chaldean, Assyrian, Phœnician and other narratives just cited, we find them in Greek and Latin literature.

To attempt to carry the story beyond the evidence presented in the above-mentioned extracts from the Chaldean, Assyrian and Phœnician religion, however, is obviously impossible in this brief essay.

In our discussion of the *Light-gods* we have, thus far, failed to mention that deity who, in many of the theogonies, is represented as the real *source* of the light embodied in sun, moon, and stars—viz., *Heaven* or the *Sky-father* himself. It will be noticed in the account given us in Genesis that Heaven, in the sense of the *clear, open sky*, was not created until the Second Day, and was the result of the " expanse " (raquia') or " *opening* " which God caused to exist in the midst of the clouds. Indeed, it was this very " opening " or " expanse " *per se* that God designated Heaven—to wit: " And God called the firmament (*expanse*) Heaven." (v, 8.)

" *Heaven* and *Earth*—that is the beginning of all mythologies and cosmogonies," says Dr. Otto Rhyn. " Heaven and Earth are for the Israelite the first *works* of the Eternal; for the Chinese they are ' *Father and Mother* of all things '; for the Hellenes and Teutons the first divine beings (Uranos and Gaea, Wodan and Ertha. . . . Heaven and Earth were regarded as sexed beings, Heaven as fructifying, noble, lofty, male, controlling the lightning and thunder; Earth as prolific, conceptive, passive, female. *Heaven and Earth formed a union, and Sun, Moon, and Stars were reputed their children.*" (*Mysteria*, p. 7, *italics ours.*) This birth of the Sun as the result of the union of the Sky-father and the Earth-mother is presented every morning at sunrise, when out of the apparent union of Sky and Earth on the horizon, the Sun emerges out of the very womb of Earth.

All that we are here interested in pointing out is the important fact that even this famous Sun-myth of which critics have made to much in attempting to undermine the story of the Christ—so say nothing of destroying our entire belief in Genesis and a

primitive "Revelation"—finds its very roots in Genesis, and is nothing more or less than a gross materialisation and corruption of the statements of that sacred document, in which "*Heaven* and *Earth* (which) are for the Israelite the first *works* of the Eternal" (see Dr. Rhyn's testimony above), as well as the *Sun* which God also created and caused to emerge out of the very substance of the former, have been exalted to the rank of *gods*, and the story of these *natural phenomena*, together with the phenomenal inter-relations, movements, etc., and connections with other similar phenomena, are woven into a long and intricate story—the drama of the *Sun-god*. It is the ingenuity of Man himself that has changed the original truth into this baseless fabrication—Man himself "*who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator.*" (Romans i, 25.)

But even as it is, "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God," and knowing their pride, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness."

We have now presented the main evidence in support of our thesis that the *gods* of paganism are simply personifications of the "*works*" (*creations*) of God enumerated in the first chapter of Genesis, and even the very order of their "descent," as given in the pagan theogonies and cosmogonies follows, with but few exceptions, identically the *order* of God's creative acts as recounted in the sacred narrative. It is true that this remarkable parallelism can only be demonstrated in connection with the events recorded as having taken place during the first Four Days of God's creative work,* for after the creation of the sun, moon, and stars, which afford the basis for the apothesis of these heavenly bodies in the Chaldean narrative, there is a sudden break in the continuity—the Fifth Tablet making no reference to the creation or appearance of "animals." Nevertheless, this is the only exception, for the Sixth Tablet of the Chaldean Epic, like the Sixth Day of the Hebrew narrative, is particularly concerned with the creation of Man, while the Seventh Tablet—though making no allusion to a day of "Rest," nevertheless recounts the final consummation of all things in the happiness of the gods, who now dwell with Man, their servant in a wonderful "*garden*"—the "*Eden*" of Genesis ii, 8.† The omission of any reference to the appearance of animals is,

* See Table II. † See Table III.

however, a serious divergence from the Genesis account, which would be a matter of more than usual significance were it not that we now know that other Babylonian accounts of the cosmogony make distinct reference thereto.

In conclusion, then, we remind our readers once more that the object of this essay is not simply to defend the theory that the vast majority of the pagan gods are personifications of the phenomena and forces of Nature—a proposition which is no longer seriously questioned—but to point out the further fact, of which few are apparently aware, viz., that the *history* of the earliest of these divinities—as given us in nearly all the old theogonies and cosmogonies of the ancients—that is the traditional story of their *origin, order of generation or appearance in time, together with their inter-relations one with another,* follows with amazing exactness the story given us in Genesis of the order of appearance of God's successive *physical creations,* thus testifying to the fact that the theogonies of paganism have been built upon the Genesis narrative, or else upon some yet earlier record of that primitive revelation from which Genesis itself has been derived. In short, it is not merely the fact that the gods of paganism are personifications of physical phenomena that is the important thing to be noted, but the further fact that they are the personifications of *those particular* physical phenomena enumerated in Genesis i as *the first* of God's creative works—the very order of the theogony or "*generation*" of gods presented in the pagan narrative, following, with remarkable fidelity the order of God's "creations" given in the sacred text. This cannot be explained on any theory of chance or accident. Moreover, it is only on this interpretation of the matter that we can discover any reasonable explanation of all these marvellously concordant, though none the less mysterious, legends. Here, in other words, we have a principle which will account for the genealogies of the pagan divinities, and simultaneously give us the key to the solution of the whole controversy between theism and atheism in this particular field of investigation.

TABLE II.

Showing earliest gods of Chaldean theogony to be simply *personifications* of the "*works*" (*i.e.*, physical creations) of Elohim recorded in the first Four "Days" of Creation—Gen. i.

(For further "correspondences" see Table III.)

GENESIS.

"In the beginning (*Time*) Elohim created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was, . . ."

1.	*Thohu* Waste of matter Watery fluid, or shapeless Nebula.	*va* and	*Bohu* a Void or Chaos (*i.e.*, empty Space) and darkness of the abyss.
2.		*The Spirit of God* (*Breath* or *Wind* of God—the "*Organiser*" of Nature, hovered above the waters, and said, "Let there be *Light*.")	
3.	*Darkness* (Evening, Night.)	(divided from) ,, ,,	*Light* (Morning, Day.)
4.	Waters *below*	separated by an "expanse" from . . .	Waters *above*
		Final differentiation of	
5.	*Heavens*	*Lands*	*Seas.*
6.	Sun, Moon, Stars, appear fully formed . . . . created for signs and for seasons.		

BABYLONIAN THEOGONY ACCORDING TO DAMASCIUS.

(Cited by Lenormant, *Begin. History*, p. 489.)

"*Time* was (*i.e.*, existed) when above heaven was not named," etc. (Tablet 1.)

1.	*Tauthe* (*Tiamat*) *Dragon Goddess*—Personification of Watery waste	×	*Apason* (*Apsu*) Husband of Tiamat—Personification of Chaos.
2.		*Mummu* (*Moumis*) *Organising Principle* personified; called by Phœnicians "the *Wind Colpias* (*i.e.*, the *Breath* or *Spirit* of God) Egyptian, *Kneph.*	
3.	*Lache* (*Lachamu*) *Darkness*, spouse of *Light.*	×	*Lachos* (*Lachmu*) *Light*, Husband of Darkness.
4.	*Kissare* (*Ki-shar*) (Waters *below*—Wife) "Terrestrial Ocean"—Radau.	×	*Assoros* (*An-shar*) (Waters *above*—Husband) "Heavenly Ocean"—Radau.
5.	*Anos* (*Anu*) (Heavens.)	*Ilinos* (*Enlil*) (Earth or Land.)	*Aos* (*Ea*) (Sea.) | Aos × Damkina |
6.			*Bel* or *Marduk* (*Sun*) and also

Sin (Moon); *Adar* (Saturn); *Merodach* (Jupiter) or the "*Star of Marduk*"; *Nergal* (Mars); *Ishtar* (Venus) and *Nebo* (Mercury). The Sun was also called *Shamash.*

TABLE III.

Showing other "correspondences" between the Genesis and Chaldean cosmognonies.

GENESIS.

Day 1.

The earth a watery waste of matter, and an abyss—*Tehom.*
The Spirit (Breath or Wind) of God creates *Light* out of *Darkness,* differentiating *Morning* and *Evening, Day* and *Night.*

Day 2.

By means of an *expanse* in the midst of the waters. God divides "the waters above" from "the waters below."

Day 3.

God differentiates the *Heavens, Lands* and *Seas.*
God creates vegetation.

Day 4.

God causes Sun, Moon, and Stars to appear—the Sun to rule over the day, and to organise Nature.

Day 5.

God creates the animal life of sea and air.

Day 6.

God creates the higher land animals. God culminates His work with the creation of MAN—into whom He breathes His Divine Life.

Day 7.

After finishing His work of creation God "*rests.*"

CHALDEAN COSMOGONY.

Tablet 1.

Origin of all things the Primeval Abyss and the Roaring Sea—*Tiamat.* The Wind of God (Phœnician) organises the world, begetting the deities *Lachamu* (darkness) and *Lachmu* (Light).

Tablet 2.

The deities *An-shar* (the waters above) and *Ki-shar* (the waters below) are begotten.

Tablet 3.

The divinities *Anu* (Heaven), *Enlil* (Land) and *Ea* (Sea) are begotten.

.....

Marduk (the Sun) is born.

Tablet 4.

"Marduk (the Sun) is King"—goes forth to war with *Tiamat* (the Dragon of chaos) and slays her.

Tablet 5.

.....

Marduk (the Sun-god) continues his organisation of Nature—assigning the stations and duties of the stars and constellations.

Tablet 6.

.....

The gods culminate their work with the creation of MAN, who is made of the blood (life) of a god (Kingu). Man created "to serve the gods—to satisfy them or "*give them rest.*"* The gods dwell happily with Man in a beautiful "*garden*" (Garden of Eden).

Tablet 7.

Further allusions to the agricultural life in the "garden." (Compare Gen. iii, 15.)

---

* Barton, *Arch. of Bible*, p. 270.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON wrote: I have read this paper with great interest, and much regret that it has not been possible to hear a discussion upon it. However, there is one small question I should like to ask. I note on page 58 that Dr. McCrady equates Kronos with Chronos (time). Perhaps he would kindly explain this point.

Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote: I am unable to agree with Dr. McCrady in the importance which he attaches to the resemblances between the Babylonian traditions regarding the origin of created things and the narrative which makes such a sublime beginning for Genesis. A certain similarity seems to exist, although it is much exaggerated, and inferences are drawn from the supposed parallels which are greater than the evidence can bear. Dr. McCrady admits the presence of differences, but he seems to dismiss that fact in a way which would hardly convey to the uninstructed reader an adequate impression of their extent. Let me illustrate my meaning by a simple analogy. Men and monkeys resemble each other in astonishing fashion. A monkey is much more like a man than a bear. But while the likeness is indisputable, the distinction between the two is so tremendous that these points of similarity are

hopelessly overshadowed. In the same way, the narrative in Genesis may offer some points of similarity to that in the Babylonian epic which deals more or less with the beginning of things, but the differences are immeasurable. Only one point need be mentioned. The pure and profound monotheism of Genesis contrasts with the hideous polytheism of the pagan poem.

In these circumstances, I would deprecate any attempt to base an argument for primæval theology as being akin to that of the Old Testament on such points of resemblance. One reason is that these very resemblances are employed by modern critical scholarship to explain the origin of the story, told with such matchless grace and truth in the opening chapter of Genesis, on purely naturalistic grounds. The facts of that chapter are said to have been borrowed from Babylonian religion with which the Hebrews came into close contact during the Exile in the sixth century B.C. They have been transfigured by the lofty piety of Israel; but that does not alter the fact of their origin. In view of such a contention, which is widely accepted in these days, one should hesitate to emphasise these points of likeness lest it plays into the hands of those who take a very different view of the Bible from that associated with the Victoria Institute.

Again, the Bible itself gives no warrant for these inferences. It is true that there are passages in which the Apostle Paul clearly teaches that the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, as imparted to the progenitors of the human race, has been corrupted and abused by reason of sin and unbelief, but there is no hint that this early monotheism extended to a detailed revelation regarding the creation of all things, such as we find in Genesis. Indeed, the Bible seems to lay stress on its own uniqueness. When it refers to heathendom, it is only to condemn it. It might have been expected that some hint would be given regarding a widespread tradition and testimony to these basic things, if that had existed. The same argument applies to the Deluge, of which there are myths in many languages; but these stand in a different category entirely from the records in Genesis. It is a familar fact in human experience that things which most closely resemble each other are farthest apart. Jacob and Esau were twin brothers, and yet they were as the poles apart. The same applies to Judaism, whose Bible is the Old

Testament, and Christianity. I should rather be disposed to regard the Babylonian legends as mere coincidences so far as their resemblance to the narratives in Genesis is concerned.

Lt.-Col. L. M. DAVIES wrote: I welcome Dr. McCrady's paper. The facts adduced in evidence of the priority of Genesis to pagan cosmic stories are of great importance to all who believe in the literal inspiration of Scripture.

I would like to add, in further evidence of the seniority of Genesis, some remarks about its account of the Deluge of Noah—the greatest cosmic event after the Creation and Curse. Thus, although the tendency has recently arisen, in deference to Chaldean flood legends from which the Genesis account is assumed to have been derived, to treat the Deluge as a mere local calamity confined to the Euphrates valley region, this seems obviously out of accord with the statements in Genesis itself, and I had to protest against it when answering remarks made at the close of my paper dealing with physical evidence of the flood (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, LXII, 1930, pp. 62–95). I there alluded, in a final footnote, to the fact that the Genesis account contains details which are missing from the Chaldean flood stories, but link it to others all over the world, and thereby prove its seniority.

The most striking of these is indicated by Col. Garnier in his book *The Worship of the Dead*. He shows that a festival of the dead is widespread among the nations of the world, and is "held by all on or about the very day on which, according to the Mosaic account, the Deluge took place, viz., *the seventeenth day of the second month*" (Gen. vii, 11). He remarks that "The Jewish civil year commenced at the autumnal equinox, or about September 20th, and the seventeenth day of the second month would therefore correspond with the fifth day of our month of November; but as the feast was originally, as in Egypt, preceded by three days' mourning, it appears to have been put back three days in countries where one day's festival only was observed, and to have been more generally kept on November 2nd" (p. 4).

According to R. G. Haliburton (*The Year of the Pleiades*), "The festival of the dead . . . is now, or was formerly, observed at or near the beginning of November by the Peruvians, the Hindus, the

Pacific Islanders, the people of the Tonga Islands, the Australians, the ancient Persians, the ancient Egyptians and the northern nations of Europe . . . Wherever the Roman Catholic Church exists, solemn Mass for All Souls is said on the 2nd November, and . . . the Church of England, which rejects All Souls. . . . clings devoutly to All Saints". Garnier tells us that "In Rome the festival of the dead, or 'Feralia', called 'Dii Manes' or 'the day of the spirits of the dead', commenced on February 17th, the second month of their year".

Space forbids quoting more details; but, as Garnier says, "the observance of this festival at, or about, the seventeenth day of the second month of the recognised year, by almost every race and nation of the earth" affords a striking commentary on the Genesis account of a world-wide cataclysm "in which a few survivors saw all their friends and relations swept away by a mighty flood of waters" *on that day.* The absence of any mention of this day in the Chaldean legends forbids our deriving the Genesis account from those legends; while the observance of the festival by people like the Peruvians and Australians, whose very existence was unknown to Moses and the Chaldeans, shows that Moses' source of information was—to say the least—unique.

This widespread festival of the dead, on the very day indicated in Genesis as having witnessed the annihilation of the old world, affords the most striking piece of evidence in this connection; but others might also be quoted. For why should the dove, and the olive branch, have been so commonly regarded as symbols of peace and reconciliation in the ancient world? Certainly the Chaldean legends offer no explanation; but Genesis does—for did not the dove, returning with the olive leaf to the ark, certify the end of God's wrath and the termination of the flood?

How often, too, do other legends (not the Chaldean) talk of eight persons—the number mentioned in Genesis—being saved from the flood! According to Garnier (pp. 184–185), "Menu Satyavrata" (the Indian Noah) "is represented as being saved with seven saints from the Deluge . . . The Druids have a similar tradition; they say that the Patriarch was saved with seven companions on a floating island with a strong door". (Note this seemingly irrelevant reference to a "door", which is more naturally emphasised in

Gen. vi, 16; vii, 16.) The Chinese flood story not only talks of eight survivors, but says they were Fo-hi (the Chinese Noah) and his wife, their three sons and three daughters, which closely resembles the Bible account (*cf.* Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, iii, p. 16). Even Fijians talk of eight survivors from the flood being landed on the island of Mbenga (*cf.* Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, pp. 252–253). According to Catlin, American Indian flood stories habitually talk of " one, three or eight " persons being saved; the recurrence of the number eight being thus remarkable (*Letters*, etc., i).

The Chaldean flood legends, describing a ship with steersman (or pilot) and numerous passengers (family, relations, servants, etc.), have obviously lost all primitive simplicity; and their details are actually incongruous, for navigation would be at a discount during a general chaotic flood and downpour, which a great chest or ark would be more likely to survive than any ship.

So I would suggest that its flood story, as well as its creation narrative, shows the priority of Genesis to all other versions of these early events. In simple, straightforward language Genesis gives an account which is consistent to itself, and affords both common factors and explanations of otherwise arbitrary and disconnected ideas found among the most widely scattered races of mankind. No such features appear in the Chaldean legends, which could therefore in no case be ancestral to Genesis.

To quote a final illustration. According to Lenormant (*Les Origines*, v, pp. 16–17), the Peruvians believed that the sea encircled the land, which it could not overflow because the ends of the rainbow press upon its surface. This looks remarkably like an echo of Gen. ix, 12–16; and in any case it is Genesis, not the Chaldean legends, which supplies an explanation.

Author's Reply.

Space prohibits anything but the briefest reply to the courteous and much appreciated criticisms of my paper.

First, then, in answer to the question of Mr. Titterington. He says—" I note on page 58 that Dr. McCrady equates Kronos with Chronos (time). Perhaps he would kindly explain this point ".

Of course, Mr. Titterington will agree with me that this is *an inference* only, as neither on p. 57, nor again on p. 58, nor elsewhere

in my paper have I formally identified the two, but—as a matter of fact—have purposely refrained from using the word Kronos in connection with what I have to say about Chronos. The reason for this precaution is that the name Kronos has long been associated with two very distinct deities—(*a*) The Latin Cronus or Saturn; and (*b*) An Oriental divinity presiding over vegetation, harvests, etc. So far as Chronos (Time) and the Kronos of vegetation are concerned, there is (so far as I am aware) no connection whatever; and, consequently, no possibility of "equating" them. On the other hand, the distinction existing between Chronos (Time), and the Kronos or Cronus (Saturn) of Roman mythology is not so clear as it was once supposed to be. According to Liddell and Scott (Greek-English Lexicon, Art. Κρόνος) this name (Kronos or Cronus) was "*later* . . . interpreted as = χρόνος"; and whatever the explanation, it is unquestionably true that some of the stories told of Saturn (*e.g.*, as devouring his children) have been told likewise of Time or Chronos. But this supposed derivation of the Time Myth from the Saturn Myth has itself been called in question by scholars. Thus, Mr. T. W. Doane, in his *Bible Myths*, writes as follows:—"Every one is familiar with the story of Kronos, who devoured his own children. Now, Kronos is a mere creation from the older and misunderstood epithet *Kronides* or *Kronion, the ancient of days.** When these *days* or *Time* had come to be regarded as a person, the myth would certainly follow that he devoured his own children, *as Time is the devourer of the Dawns. Saturn, who devours his own children, is the same power whom the Greeks called Kronos (Time)*† *which may truly be said to destroy whatever it has brought into existence.*" (*Id.*, p. 559. Italics ours.)

Now, in my paper (*Genesis and Pagan Cosmogonies*) I do not attempt to dogmatise on this vexed question one way or another, and have purposely refrained from all reference to the myths of Kronos. All I have sought to show is that the same *Chronos* or *Time* who is certainly said to have devoured his own children, is evidently connected with the *Ulom* of the Phœnicians who "never

---

* This very expression—*The Ancient of Days*—is preserved for us in the Hebrew Scriptures, but is there used of the *Creator* Himself and not of the *Creature*.

† Misprint for *Chronos*.

grows old " and embraces all things in himself; also with the *Time* of the Chaldean and other pagan Cosmogonies who is said to have *existed* before all the other gods were brought forth—and indeed to have been the *Father of Gods* (" *Father Time* "); and who—like all other pagan gods—owes his divinity to the *personification* and *deification* of the various creative acts and works of God—recorded in Genesis i—in this case that *primary act of creation* whereby the world " *in the beginning* "—*i.e., under the condition of Time*—took definite shape and form.

In conclusion, then, I would say that my statements regarding *Chronos*, *Ulom*, etc., are, in my opinion, unaffected by any theory regarding the relation of the former (*Chronos*) to *Kronos*.

I regret that the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr finds that he is " unable to agree " with me respecting my general interpretation of the problem, and much prefers the old orthodox view of the Higher Critics, in which the facts of Genesis i " are said to have been borrowed from Babylonian religion with which the Hebrews came into close contact during the Exile in the sixth century B.C. ", and that " in view of such a contention which is widely accepted in these days ", he thinks that " one should hesitate to emphasise these points ", etc. But while I deeply regret that Principal Curr is thus unable to agree with me, and appreciate his solemn warning against presuming to question the infallibility of the Higher Critics, I am nevertheless forced to confess that after more than forty years of diligent study I am convinced that these " confident assertions " referred to, have *never been proved.* They still remain " *assertions* " only; while not only these, but many other conclusions of the same school have been definitely overthrown in recent years, partly by the revelations of archæological research, partly by advances made in anthropological science, partly by greater familiarity with the facts of Comparative Religion and Mythology; but more especially in our whole conception of the Theory of Evolution which has radically changed since the days of Spencer, Darwin, and Haeckel, upon whose fundamental assumptions as to the nature of primitive man (*e.g.*, his purely animal mind; his long, but steady *ascent* (*without degeneration*) from this brutal state; the lateness of civilisation; especially of the art of writing; and this particularly in case of the Hebrews, etc.) many of the tenets of Higher Criticism have been erected.

In short, there is nothing sacrosanct about the conclusions of this school, many of which have already been overthrown, and others as yet *unproved—pure speculations.* Moreover, while we gladly recognise the " scholarship " exhibited by many of these writers, it would be ridiculous to assume that they alone represent the opinions of scholars generally on the subject. Principal Curr seems to have forgotten that from the earliest days of the controversy there have been numbers of scholars who have protested against the conclusions of this school. George Smith, Rawlinson, Lenormant, Sayce, Flinders Petrie, Schmidt, Langdon, Kyle, Wiener, represent only the merest fragment of a list that could be indefinitely extended—and one, too, that is growing daily.

But enough of this. Beyond these " generalities " there is nothing to answer in Principal Curr's criticism. Beyond the expression of his general disapprobation of my views, he has attempted no rebuttal of any one of my arguments. He has challenged the evidence for no specific statement; nor has he attempted to refute any particular point that I have made. Under these circumstances, therefore, there is nothing that calls for any specific reply on my part, as there is nothing to refute. On the other hand, I cheerfully accord him the right to his own opinions.

Finally, as regards the remarks of Col. L. M. Davies, I have only to express my very grateful appreciation of the same. It is obvious that his views are in substantial agreement with my own.