

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 11—July, 1892.

I.

THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BOTH Jews and Christians receive the Old Testament as containing a revelation from God, while the latter regard it as standing in close and vital relationship to the New Testament. Everything connected with the Old Testament has, of recent years, been subjected to the closest scrutiny—the authorship of its several books, the time when they were written, their style, their historical value, their religious and ethical teachings. Apart from the veneration with which we regard the Old Testament writings on their own account, the intimate connection which they have with the Christian Scriptures necessarily gives us the deepest interest in the conclusions which may be reached by Old Testament criticism. For as the New Testament dispensation presupposes and grows out of the Mosaic, so the books of the New Testament touch those of the Old at every point: “*In vetere testamento novum latet, et in novo vetus patet.*”

We propose to take a summary view of the testimony of our Lord to the Old Testament, as it is recorded by the evangelists. The New Testament writers themselves largely quote and refer to the Old Testament, and the views which they express regarding the old economy and its writings are in harmony with the statements of their Master ; but, for various reasons, we here confine ourselves to what is related of the Lord Himself.

Let us refer, first, to what is contained or necessarily implied in the Lord's testimony to the Old Testament Scriptures, and, secondly, to the critical value of His testimony.

III.

THE SEMITIC TRADITION OF CREATION.

FROM the broken and scattered remains of ancient Assyrian and Babylonian literature there has been recovered, as is well known, a story of creation, notable for its striking resemblance to the Hebrew account. The narrative exists in mutilated condition, it is true; nevertheless, since it was written on a series of tablets, each of which contained the title of the complete work, the number to indicate its place in the series, and a catch-line with the opening words of the succeeding plate, the rearrangement of the fragments in their original order is possible and with that is established the succession of incidents in the story as once told.*

The account begins with a primitive chaos.

“At the time when on high the heaven announced not,
Below the earth named not a name,
[That is to say : When heaven and earth did not exist]
Then primeval ocean, their generator, [and]
Mummu-Tiāmat [the watery deep], the bearer of their totality,
United their waters as one.”

The origin of the gods was next narrated; but unfortunately the tablet is broken off obliquely at this point and the ends of several lines carried away. The remnants state that

“At the time when none of the gods had been brought into existence,
[When] a name had not been named, destiny not determined,
Then were made the gods
The gods Lahmu and Lahama were brought into existence
And grew up
Anšar and Kišar were made
Many days passed by
God Anu [was then made]

This portion of the story has been told in Greek by the Neoplatonist Damascius, who had opportunities for learning it, if not in the schools of Alexandria and Athens, at least during his sojourn at the Persian court. His version goes beyond the tablets in expressly

* Translations of the text, inclusive of Rassam's additions, are offered, though of course with many reservations, in English by Sayce, *Records of the Past*, New Series, Vol. i, 122 seq., and in German by Jensen, *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, S. 268 ff.

stating the material origin of the gods. With omission of his interpretation, his report is that

“The Babylonians assumed two principles of the universe Tauthe and Apason [*i. e.*, Tiāmat and Apsu]; making Apason the husband of Tauthe and naming her the mother of the gods. Of these two there was born an only-begotten son, Moymis. From these same another generation proceeded, Lache and Lachos. Then also from the same [original pair] a third generation, Kissare and Assoros; from whom sprang Anos, Illinos and Aos; and of Aos and Dauke, Belos was born, the fabricator of the world.”

The cuneiform narrative suffers a long interruption at this point, due to breakage and loss of the tablets. When the story is recovered, it appears that trouble has arisen:

Tiāmat has done evil to the gods and is now their enemy. Lahama has become her ally (iii, 31 obv.) and a troop of hideous creatures, eleven in number, stand ready to assist her (iv, 106, 115). Anšar has in vain sent god Anu [heaven] to punish the offenders; Ea [the waters of the earth] has turned back from the mission aghast; and finally Marduk [the rising sun] has been chosen as avenger and hailed as king.

The gods seat their chosen champion in the princely chamber and assign him dominion over the universe (iv, 14), declare his weapons irresistible (l. 16), proclaim his word all powerful, furnish him proof thereof (20-26), and bid him go forth and slay Tiāmat (31).

Marduk thereupon arms himself; grasps a spear in his right hand, hangs bow and quiver on his side (37, 38), places lightning in front of him, fills his body with flames; he prepares a net to cast over the foe, takes in hand the four winds, arouses a hurricane, an evil wind, a storm, a tempest, the four winds, the seven winds, the cyclone. He sends forth the seven winds in advance to confuse Tiāmat, while he himself takes the storm, his great weapon, mounts his war chariot (50), and in the sight of the gods sets out to meet the monster (60). He finds her and challenges her to combat (86). She at once arms, and the combatants approach. Marduk spreads his net around her, releases a hurricane against her which enters her open mouth and prevents her lips from closing, fills her body with a strong wind, pierces her with his spear, grasps and slays her, casts her body down and stands upon it. Leaving the slain Tiāmat, he turns his attention to her hideous troop, at once routs them, pursues, captures and binds them and destroys their weapons.

Having established Anšar's superiority over the enemy, he returned to the body of Tiāmat, cleft it in twain and with one half overshadowed the heavens [made a covering for the heavens], then shoved in a bolt, and also set a watchman with orders not to allow the waters to stream forth. Having placed the heavens opposite the watery abyss, he measured the latter and founded an edifice like unto Išara, like the palace Išara, which he had built as heaven; and let Anu, Bêl and Ea, occupy their dwellings. Then he embellished the heavens, prepared places for the great gods, made the stars, set the zodiac, founded a place for Nibiru, fixed the poles and opened gates provided with locks on either side.

He caused the moon to shine forth and subjected the night to it, furnished it every month with a crown, in order at the beginning of the month to become bright at evening, on the seventh day to show half the crown, on the fourteenth day to stand opposite.

The remainder of this tablet is too broken to admit of connected translation.

One more small fragment of the series exists, but its place in the set is not known further than that, judged by its contents, it must follow those already mentioned. It narrates only the creation of plants (possibly) and animals. Any reference to man it may have contained is broken off. According to it,

“When the gods in their assembly created, they (?) made strong tree trunks (?) brought forth living [crea]tures cattle of the field, [beasts] of the field and creeping things”

Such is the story of creation as told by the tablets. But as is well known the teaching of the Babylonians was also committed to writing by Berosus, priest of Bêl. A portion of the priest's account was cited by Alexander Polyhistor and quoted from his writings by Eusebius and Georgius Syncellus. In these citations the Babylonian priest states that, according to the doctrine of his fellow-countrymen,

“There was a time when nothing existed but darkness and water, wherein resided most hideous beings which were produced of a twofold principle. For men were begotten with two wings, some moreover with four wings and two faces. . . . Bulls likewise were bred with the heads of men, dogs with four bodies, and horses with the heads of dogs. . . . In short, there were creatures which combined the shapes of all sorts of animals, and in addition to these were fishes, reptiles, serpents and other animals monstrous and transformed in that they had each other's faces. Representations of them are preserved in the temple of Bêl.

“A woman presided over all these by name Omorôka, which in the Chaldean language is *Θαλατθ*,* but in Greek is interpreted the sea (*Θαλασσα*), or, as it might be equally well rendered, the moon. When all things were in this condition, Bêl came, cut the woman asunder, of one-half of her formed the earth and of the other half the heavens, and destroyed the animals which were within her. All this, he says, was an allegorical description of nature; for the whole universe consisting of moisture and animals having been generated therein, the deity above mentioned removed his own head and the other gods mixed the out-flowing blood with earth and formed men; wherefore they are intelligent and partake of divine thought. Now this Bêl, by whom they signify Zeus, cleft [as has already been stated in more allegorical language] the darkness asunder, separated earth and heaven from each other, and reduced the universe to order. Now the [nondescript] animals, since they were not able to endure the power of the light, perished: Bêl thereupon seeing a waste but fertile region, commanded one of the gods to remove his (Bêl's) head and mix the earth with the thence flowing blood and form men and beasts capable of enduring the air. Bêl, moreover, made stars and sun and moon and the five planets.”

No argument is needed to prove that Berosus and Damascius and the scribe who wrote the tablets have the same story in mind. The fact is patent that these tales are the outcroppings of one and the same tradition; a tradition furthermore which extends through many ages and whose traces may be followed back into remote

* In uncials *ΘΑΛΑΤΘ*, which Robertson Smith happily conjectures to be a misreading of *ΘΑΜΤΕ*, *tâmtu* (ZA., 1891, S. 339).

antiquity. The Neoplatonist philosopher wrote his concise version about the year 560 after Christ. The priest Berosus penned his account nine hundred years earlier, in the days of Alexander the Great; but even then tablets containing the cuneiform account were old. They had been lying buried for three centuries beneath the ruins of Nineveh, having been prepared for Ashurbanipal about 650 before Christ (colophon of 5th tablet). But the story in some form was current earlier still. The conflict of Marduk and the dragon was depicted on the sculptured mural slabs of the palace which Ashurnatsirpal built at Calah 880 years before Christ. Yet more ancient was the restoration of Marduk's temple at Babylon which Agukakrimé undertook. This king reigned later than 1050 B.C. (Delitzsch, 1883) or more probably before the beginning of the fifteenth century B. C. (Tiele, 1885; Bezold, 1886; Sayce, 1888; *Guide to British Museum*, 1890). The royal restorer relates that he decorated the temple doors with certain objects which he names and which prove to be the hideous beings allied with Tiâmat. Besides these more important monuments of which the date is known, there are numerous undated cylinder seals covering fairly well the entire period of Assyro-Babylonian civilization, engraven with various scenes from the story and revealing thereby the wide publicity and popularity of the tale. Jensen surmises an earlier date than the earliest which has been mentioned. He argues that the progress of the returning sun of spring among the constellations, placed and named as they are, and its position at the autumnal equinox repeat the story of the conflict of Marduk with Tiâmat and her allies; and hence that the starry host received these names when they occupied such a position with reference to the sun that with his appearance at the vernal equinox the story began. This event, he finds, was not later than 3000 B. C., and concludes that the creation legends are, in part at least, as old as that (p. 309-320).

A tradition which was current among the inhabitants of the Tigris and lower Euphrates valleys for several thousand years would be known and might perhaps be entertained by peoples who had been brought under the influence of Babylonian culture. Our main interest in the Babylonian tale centres in its possible affiliation with other cosmogonies, especially with the Hebrew account of creation. Greater or less differences develop themselves in a tradition in the ordinary course of transmission, a fact which is abundantly exemplified by the variations of the Babylonian legend in Babylonia itself. It is not surprising, therefore, that even on the assumption of common origin, in the Assyro-Babylonian and Hebrew traditions of creation after their subjection to diverse conditions, differences obtrude themselves. There is literary unlikeness.

The Babylonian story knows nothing of a division into days (see *Presbyterian Review*, x, p. 670 *seq.*); whereas the Hebrew account is distributed within a framework of six days. The Babylonian tale, moreover, not only encumbers the plain narrative of creation with an account of the choice and exaltation of a demiurge and of his preparation for the mission, but it is, to say the least, highly figurative and to the last degree anthropomorphic; the Hebrew story on the other hand is the sober recital in simple yet stately prose of the impressive tradition concerning the development of the ordered universe from chaos.

In addition to the marked literary contrasts, there are profound differences in conception. The Babylonian stories taken together describe the primeval waters as spontaneously generative; the Hebrew account represents the material of the universe as lying waste and lifeless and as not assuming order or becoming productive of life until the going forth of the divine command. These divergent views are allied with different theistic conceptions of the two peoples. On this subject the fragments of Berosus' narrative throw no light. He is describing the origin of the ordered universe and assumes the existence of the gods, however he may have treated of them in his complete history, mentioning them only casually in connection with their respective activities in the work of creation. But the cuneiform story goes back to a time when the gods did not exist. It depicts the primeval chaos of waters and proceeds to state, without determining the manner of origination, that the gods came into being in successive periods of long duration and in the order assigned by Damascius. The tradition as reported by the latter ascribes a material origin to the gods; the primeval waters producing among others an early pair of deities from which the other gods were descended by successive generations—a conception which is perhaps allied to the Phœnician doctrine that out of the material of the universe were evolved sun, moon, stars and constellations which eventually arrived at consciousness and were called the watchers of heaven. In the Hebrew records, however, a different theistic doctrine prevails. God is the creator of the heavens and the earth, the bringer into existence of that which did not previously exist. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever he had formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting He is God. He was from the beginning or ever the earth was, when there were no depths, no *t'hômôth*, no *t'âmâti* (Prov. viii. 22-24).

But this difference in conceptions, diametrically opposed though these views be, is explicable without denial of kinship between the accounts so soon as the divergent thought of the two peoples is

recalled. And two considerations leave no reasonable doubt of a relationship between the two traditions: first, the ancient common habitat in Babylonia of the two peoples who transmitted these accounts; and second, the community of conception, Hebrews and Babylonians uniting in describing the primitive condition of the universe as an abyss of waters shrouded in darkness and subsequently parted in twain in order to the formation of heaven and earth. The kinship between the traditions need not be close, but kinship there is.

The question then is, How are these two traditions related to the original source? An answer is offered by the mediation theory which regards the Babylonian legend as intermediate in time and as forming the connecting link between the primitive story and its assumed Hebrew modification. According to this theory, the early tradition, ever changing, passed through the elaborate Babylonian tale and thence into the purified Hebrew form. The prevalent opinion is expressed by Jensen, who declares that "the end of the fourth and the fragments of the fifth and seventh (?) tablets, together with the beginning of the first, quite unquestionably form the prototype of the biblical legends" (*Kosmologie*, S. 304). Notice that, in addition to the opening lines in the first tablet which depict the primitive condition of the universe as watery chaos, the part of the Babylonian tale which is declared to form the prototype of the biblical story is that portion which is taken up with the description of the work of Marduk as fabricator of the universe (S. 304-306). The monotheistic revisers, finding nothing objectionable in the conception, allowed the description of the universe to remain, which represented it as once existing in a state of chaotic waters enshrouded in darkness. The story of the origin of the gods believers in one god necessarily omitted and took up the tale again with the work of the demiurge, Marduk the *light bringer*, whom they simply identified with the one eternal God; following the order of the Babylonian narrative, they next related the separation of the waters and formation of heaven; then the gathering of the lower waters into one place and the appearance of the dry land; then, departing for a moment from the Babylonian order, the clothing of earth's surface with vegetation; then, once more like the Babylonian narrative, the creation of the heavenly bodies and the calling forth of animate terrestrial beings. The Babylonian tale was thus, it is claimed, stripped of all features repugnant to the spirit of monotheism, reduced to a fundamental though modified physical conception and transfused and glorified with the doctrine of the eternal God, creator and sovereign of the universe.

This mediation theory, however, rests, we believe, on a demon-

strable error. Contrary to the common assumption, the Hebrew narrative is not chiefly, if it is at all, reflected in the Marduk section of the cuneiform story, but in the first tablet and in Damascius. It shines conspicuously in the lineage which is assigned to the gods by these authorities, for the genealogical succession of the gods is the creational order of the natural objects which they were supposed to animate. Damascius, it will be remembered, reports the Babylonian belief that at first there were two principles of the universe, viz., the two primeval waters, from which, as from parents, sprang not only Moymis and the gods Lahmu and Lahama, but also two others, related as children of the same generation, Kišar and Anšar, which, being interpreted, mean the comprehensive heavens above and the comprehensive earth beneath; and of these in turn came a group of three, Anu, heaven, and Illinos, earth's surface, and Ea, the terrestrial waters; and the son of the latter, so called because rising daily from that god's abode, the ocean, was Bêl [Marduk], the sun, whom the Babylonians say is the demiurge. Evidently, if for these divinities there be substituted the natural objects which the divine names signify, an orderly statement is rendered, like that in the book of Genesis, of the physical development of the universe. A similar doctrine permeates the native literature. According to the monuments, Gur, *i. e.*, Apsu, the primeval ocean, was "the mother, the bearer of heaven and earth" (II R. 54, 18e ASKT. 76, 15, 16), "the mother of Anu and the gods" (*Ancient History from the Monuments*, "Babylonia," p. 66 note; *R. P.*, Vol. ix, p. 146, 64 note). Of these Anu, Bêl, *i. e.*, Illil or Ἰλλίως and Ea constituted a triad, the supreme one in the Assyrian pantheon. And of Ea and his consort Damkina, *i. e.*, Dauke (II R. 55, 53d), "the king and queen of the watery deep" (II R. 55, 24c, d), was born Marduk (II R. 55, 64d).

The account as transmitted by the first tablet does not expressly publish the descent of the gods from the primeval waters, as does Damascius, though traces of a traditional genealogy are contained in the later tablets of the series in allusions to the gods as the fathers or ancestors of Marduk. It does, however, purport to give the chronological order in which the gods came into existence. It pictures a primitive chaos of waters and then proceeds to relate the origin of the deities; teaches, like Damascius, that Lahmu and Lahama, whoever they may have been and who later became involved with Tîāmat, came into existence and grew up; that Anšar and Kišar, in other words that heaven and earth in the widest meaning of these terms, namely all above and all below, were formed; that after a long period Anu, the spirit of the heavens proper, and Bêl, the surface of the earth, and Ea, the terrestrial waters, were made.* Here

* Last two names restored from context and Damascius.

again the substitution for the gods of the natural objects which their names signify and which they were believed to animate yields a correct chronological account of the physical development of the universe. In the light of this evidence, the story which the tablets, especially in their opening sentences, tell and which they reveal later between the lines, is not in its germ a sun myth, although it has unfolded into or been engrafted on a sun myth (cp. Sayce, *Hilbert Lectures*, 1887, p. 393), but it is the deformed outgrowth of an earlier physical doctrine of the origin of the universe.

It may be read later between the lines of the Marduk section we say, for it is legible in Marduk's inferior rank and in the actual place assigned to him in the pantheon. The Babylonian religion was a nature worship, according to which natural objects were regarded as animated. Yet Marduk, the rising sun, who in earliest times was represented as destroyer of Tiâmat, framer of heaven and earth and seas, and constructor of the abodes of the gods, was not originally worshiped as father of the gods, the first in order of time, the head of the pantheon, but as a subordinate deity; and when at a late period he was admitted into the number of the great gods, it was as occupant of an humble position. To this fact the story of creation as told by the tablets, and in a part which is traceable to the earliest times, bears witness. The king of the gods is Anšar; he sends Anu to subdue Tiâmat, and on Anu's failure employs Ea; and not until the god of terrestrial waters proves unable does Anšar turn to Marduk as a last resort. It is only after this commission has been announced that Marduk is led into the princely chamber by the gods who are called his ancestors, and there endued with might and invested with dominion over the universe (iv, 14). This peculiarity is not accidental, but significant. The explanation is found in the underlying cosmological theory: Marduk's birth immediately followed that of the triad of deities Anu (heaven), Bêl (earth) and Ea (house of terrestrial water). The universe had in part developed before Marduk came into being; his rank coincides with his place in unfolding cosmos, and the order in which the gods, one after the other, are sent forth to battle, the reliance which is placed in Marduk's predecessors before he is appealed to for help, likewise correspond broadly to the chronological succession of the gods as determined by the creative order of the natural objects which they represent. Thus even the Marduk section of the creation story, notwithstanding its representation of that god as a maker of heaven and earth, seems in reality to presuppose a somewhat advanced stage in the formation of the universe before his offices are called into requisition. In other words the sun-myth section was not at first intended to describe creation, but only to depict the subsequent potent benign influence of the sun.

With this elucidation in mind, the cuneiform story as a whole should be reviewed. The tale begins with the statement that at first the primeval waters lay mingled together and eventually became the begetter and bearer of heaven and earth. Deities came into existence: first, Lahmu and Lahama; then after a considerable period, all above and all below; after lapse of other years, heaven, earth's surface and terrestrial waters; finally Marduk, the rising sun. But Tiâmat, the watery abyss, resisted the unfolding order and infringed the divine command (iv, 82) probably by her continual endeavor to confound earth and heaven and sea. The nightly darkness obscuring the regions of the universe and enveloping all nature in the primeval shroud, the dense mists reuniting at times the waters of heaven and earth, continued rains when the windows of heaven were opened and the fountains of the great deep broken up, which threatened to deluge the earth and again convert the celestial and terrestrial waters into the one vast original ocean, suggested a possible return to chaos; yea, told these Babylonians, who believed in the existence of animate beings back of every natural object, of a determined struggle on the part of Tiâmat to reduce all things to primitive disorder; while the black clouds and vapors of fantastic shape, the angry mutterings of thunder and the fierce tornado, evoked in their superstitious minds the conception of a brood of horrid creatures, offspring and abettors of Tiâmat, allied with their cruel progenitress in bitter warfare against the established order of the universe. These foes, which the Babylonians discerned in darkness and fog and storm, the deity of the comprehensive heavens, Ansar, in vain sent Anu to overcome. Ea, lord of earthly waters, availed still less. Finally Marduk, the rising sun, was sent. A fearful storm was the result (Tablet iv, 45 *seq.*); but the god of the rising sun dispelled the darkness, scattered the hideously shaped clouds, lifted the vapors in masses on high, subdued the tempest, reopened the space between heaven and earth, revealed the blue firmament, cleared a pathway for the starry host, brought to light the earth and dried its surface, awoke animal and vegetable life.

The story in its developed form is an exaltation of the sun. The events which preceded the sun's appearance are recognized, but being apart from the plan are not dwelt upon. Moreover, in course of time, with the growth of the mythological conception and the consequent partial concealment of the germ of the tale, there ultimately developed a story which ascribed to the hero Marduk results which even in Babylonian thought were in no wise due to the sun's agency (cp. Jensen, S. 309).

Compare with this Babylonian story the account which the Israelites transmitted. A striking feature of the Hebrew narrative is its

symmetry. While by necessity a natural sequence of events is observed, the principle of grouping prevails. Creative acts, so distinct as to be introduced by the recurring formula, "God said Let there be," and dismissed by the statement, "God saw that it was good;" creative acts, so diverse as is making from creating or as is the gift of life from the mere separation of the material elements, are in several instances grouped in one and the same period, as in the first, third, fifth and sixth days. Again, the motionless objects are grouped as the works of the first three days, and the moving objects, or those which appear to move, as the works of the last three days. Still again, the respective periods of the two great divisions offset each other: the creation of light on the first day corresponds to the making of the heavenly luminaries on the first day of the second period; the division of waters by a firmament on the second day, to the calling forth of animate beings in the waters and in front of the firmament on the same day of the second period; the appearance of dry land and of vegetation on the third day, to the land animals and the appointment of herbs for their food on the third day of the second division. This distribution of the various works of creation is not arbitrary, but logically determined; it is based on the relations of these objects the one to the other, and it exhibits the true character and progress and purpose of creation.

Of course the conclusion would be unwarranted that this symmetry is necessarily artificial; but the theory that it is the result of intentional arrangement is plausible and has been adopted and advocated by leading interpreters. If entertained, its bearing upon another question must not be overlooked. If it be true that the material has been arranged, it follows that while the natural sequence of events has in a measure been retained in the narrative, chronology has been subordinated; it has been either intentionally ignored or at least only so far regarded as that the works of creation, which may have had their beginning in a prior period, have been recounted in the order of their day or period of prominence, not in the order of their coming into existence.

What then is meant by the much discussed days of the Hebrew tradition; for so far as yet appears they are peculiar to the Hebrew transmission?* Under the teaching of God they are the accurate and admirable classification of the works of creation in six divisions; six distinct groups of deeds followed by cessation from creative activity, for the end and ideal of creation had been attained. And in view of the sacredness which was conventionally attached to the number seven, even by the authorized teachers of Israel, seven sections were peculiarly appropriate in a narrative of God's works.

* The Etruscan story is of course not forgotten.

And these sections are called days. It is to be admitted that these expressions can, on purely linguistic grounds, be interpreted as ordinary days, which taken together form a week of seven times twenty-four hours. It is also to be admitted that, on literary grounds, these terms can be interpreted as days, marked by the alternation of light and darkness, but not consecutive. The several days are the respective points of time when God issued His decrees. No stringent reason compels belief that this same writer would teach that there were ten generations and no more from Adam to Noah and from Shem to Abraham; and certainly Matthew neither believed nor would teach that the generations from Abraham to David, and from David to the captivity, and from the captivity to Christ, were in every case consecutive and in each group were fourteen and no more. Perhaps the Hebrew writer is pursuing the same plan when he describes the six groups of creative deeds as the works of six several days, and adds thereto the seventh day of divine rest; thus making, when taken together, a complete week and a heavenly example to man of labor and repose. Still again it is to be admitted with Driver, Delitzsch and a host of other distinguished scholars, that "the writer may have consciously used the term [day] figuratively," for the words "day" and "week" were unquestionably employed by the Hebrews with latitude. It has, indeed, been argued that the periphrastic division of the day into two halves bounded by evening and morning is conclusive proof that an ordinary day of twenty-four hours is meant (Dillmann); but if day is used figuratively, evening and morning must likewise be, and accordingly the answer has been well returned that evening may mean "the time when the creator brought his work [temporarily] to a close, and morning the time when the creative activity began anew" (Delitzsch). Each period of creative activity was followed by one of inactivity, corresponding to night when man works not; and when creation was complete, when the ideal which God had set before Him had been attained, when all had been pronounced very good, God entered upon His long and as yet unended Sabbath of cessation from creative work, or, as the writer himself significantly phrases it, from "work which God made in a creative manner."

Three interpretations of the term "day" are accordingly in themselves admissible, and we are constrained to say with Augustine: "What kind of days these were it is extremely difficult or perhaps impossible for us to conceive and how much more to say!" (*de civ. Dei*, xi, 6). A breadth of statement is employed by the author which is usual with biblical writers when setting forth the subordinate elements of their doctrine and which renders the teaching of Scripture broader than the varying conceptions which man in different ages entertains.

The writer's own conception, not of day but of the time occupied in bringing the world into its present condition, may be ascertained, if not with certainty, at least with probability. The plausibility of the theory that he subordinates time to arrangement has already been mentioned. Add to that the fitting omission of the definite article from the enumeration of the periods; day one, day second, day third, day fourth, day fifth and, to judge from the versions, day sixth, leaving the expressions in themselves indefinite, which is not customary when as here ordinals are used and the days of an ordinary week period are numbered (Num. xxix. 17, 20, 23, etc.; Neh. viii. (2), 13, 18; cp. Num. vii. 12, etc., *et pass.*). The method of enumeration employed is suitable for exhibiting a relation between the groups which the writer would not narrowly define, and accordingly he speaks of a second day, a third day, etc. Add further the Semitic tradition, which has been preserved in the Babylonian version that the successive stages in the development of the ordered universe occupied long periods of untold duration, and the presumption becomes strong that the Hebrew writer likewise conceived of the creation period, not as seven times twenty-four hours, but as vastly, indefinitely long.

So much for the style and for the framework of the Hebrew tradition, now as to its contents. The cosmology underlying the Hebrew account, apart from its theology, is that at first there was a chaos: called the earth, because the heavens had not yet been detached from the mass, and because it contained all the elements out of which the universe was formed; called also the great deep or *êhôm*, because existing in watery or fluid state. This mass of material was shrouded in darkness. Then light was created. All accounts, Babylonian and Hebrew, presuppose the existence of light before the sun. The idea was familiar to the ancients, being found among the Aryans east and west as well as among the Semites. The doctrine is true; the causes were of old at work which make the light of myriad suns and render our own orb of day luminous. Then the blue vault called the firmament parted the primeval waters, dividing the fluid heavens from the fluid earth. The latter watery body is next described as undergoing change; it was separated into seas and dry land, and the land clothed with verdure. As yet, however, notwithstanding the allusion to vegetation, no mention has been made of the creation of the sun. In this the Hebrew departs from the order of the Marduk section, which tells of the formation of the sun and stars immediately after that of earth and before any allusion has been made to vegetation. The explanation may be found either in the author's intention to teach that vegetation preceded the sun's formation, or at least the sun's appearance through the mists,

or else in his method of grouping, already described. It may be that the author, without intending to teach the priority of vegetation to the sun's light and heat, having narrated the gathering together of the terrestrial waters and the appearance of dry land, wished to preserve the determined symmetry of his account and to complete the present picture by telling of the verdure which forthwith covered the earth and which, in reality, forms one stage with the ground in the earth's development. It may be added in passing that perhaps no man to this day knows whether vegetation delayed until the sun had thrown off the planets which are within the earth's orbit and had assumed its present dimensions, or whether herbage appeared long before. Proceeding to the movable bodies, the Hebrew narrator first describes those which pass in solemn procession across the sky—the sun, moon and stars. Then he depicts as a succeeding day the time when fish swarmed in the waters and fowl flew in the heaven, when the lower animals reached great development and dominated the earth. He pictures next the day of the land animals, made of the earth, higher in order of being than fish or fowl, attaining to prominence and dominion after the reign of aquatic and aerial animals, and culminating in man created in the same manner as were they, ruling at the same time with them on earth, but made in the divine image and commissioned to subdue the earth to himself and reign supreme among its creatures.

The outcroppings of the Semitic tradition of the creation of the world, as they come to light on the Tigris and the lower Euphrates and in Palestine, reveal a diverging trend in southern Mesopotamia. The original tradition, discoverable even beneath the distortions to which it was subjected by polytheism, represented a primitive condition of the universe consisting of chaotic waters enveloped in darkness; a separation of these so-called waters into two divisions, the great above and the great beneath; the clear distinction, later, of these into heaven above and land and ocean beneath. Under the influence of animistic nature worship, however, this fundamental physical doctrine was perverted. The divisions of the universe were severally assigned a spirit and deified; consequently the original teaching of the orderly development of the material universe became in allegory the genealogy of the gods. At the point where the appearance of the sun was noted, the tradition diverged still more. The worshippers of the one true God, preserving both the physical doctrine and the sublime truth behind it, told of the appearance, at God's command, of sun, moon and stars, of animate beings in sea and air, of beasts on earth and of man in the divine image. The Assyro-Babylonian adorers of nature on the other hand, worshiping the sun, hail him as offspring of ocean's lord and

lady, because going forth daily from the sea, laud him as the restorer and preserver of order and the awakener of life; yea, they exalt him at length to the rank of a creator and in their fervor ascribe to him the completion of the universe. The physical doctrine which is the substratum of the tradition has been preserved in the Hebrew transmission. The deification of nature and the glorification of the sun are polytheistic amplifications. The Hebrew account is the intentional perpetuation of the basal doctrine of the origin of the universe.

And now allow the eye to sweep in rapid survey over the literature of antiquity. Cosmological theories entertained by the peoples who were akin or neighbor or by commerce and conquest bound to the Babylonians, Assyrians and Hebrews come to light. In Etruria and Greece, in Persia, India, Egypt and Phœnicia cosmogonies are found which bear resemblances to the Semitic tradition; concurring with it not in the accidents of literary form and mythological fancies, but in the essential of physical doctrine. For the most part they, too, like the Babylonian tale, find a place for the sun and exaggerate his agency; and yet not one is a sun myth. The exact relationship of these cosmogonies to the Semitic tradition cannot as yet be finally determined; but all confirmation which, with increasing knowledge of ancient thought, shall accrue that these teachings have a common origin with the Babylonian and Hebrew transmissions is additional proof that the genealogy of the gods is a distortion and the sun myth an amplification of the primitive tradition.

These national traditions show more. They show that the original doctrine was never wholly lost sight of by mankind at large. It was an influential presence in human thought. But especially among the ancient Babylonians was the primitive tradition apprehended despite its perversion; for the same agencies which distorted worked also to preserve it. The early doctrine of the more or less vital relation between the gods and the natural objects whose names they bore and which they inhabited, a doctrine which had converted the account of the physical development of the universe into the genealogical descent of the gods, must act in the opposite direction; the genealogy of the gods must be ever readily reconvertible into the generations of the heavens and the earth. Whenever, then, this primitive, ever discernible and imperishable teaching of the origin of the universe was held by monotheists, it was formulated essentially as is the doctrine in the opening chapter of the book of Genesis.