

heroic fidelity to truth. In all the life of Rome there was nothing grander than the moral courage shown by those humble men and women in turning their backs upon the Jewish or Greek or Roman orthodoxy in which they had been reared, and clinging with absolute faith to the simple axioms that form the basis of the religion of Christ—love to God and love to man.

BW 3/2  
Feb 1894

## THE ORIGIN OF MAN AND HIS FIRST STATE OF INNOCENCE. GENESIS II.

By WILLIAM R. HARPER,  
The University of Chicago.

*The significant expressions in the story.—Its structure and style.—Some of the more important teachings of the story.—The purpose in the mind of the writer of the second story.—The points of difference between the first and second stories of creation; in respect to language, in respect to style, in respect to material, in respect to theology.—The harmonizing of the two stories.—Efforts which have been made.—Reasons why these efforts have been insufficient.—The harmonizing of the letter impossible and undesirable.—A real harmonizing, that of the spirit, possible.—The essential features of other creation stories, the character of these stories as contrasted with that of the biblical stories.—An estimate of the Hebrew stories as based on literature, as historical records, as scientific records, as the medium for the conveyance of religious truths.*

The second of the two stories of the creation of the world and man, introduced by the author of Genesis, is found in Gen. 2:4b-25.<sup>1</sup> The same order as before may be followed in the examination of this story. Adopting this order, some of the more significant expressions may first be considered. Among these are the following:

1. The second half of the fourth verse is to be connected with the fifth verse, and thus it will read: "In the day that Jehovah God made earth and heaven, no plant of the field was yet in the earth," etc.
2. It will be seen that the personal name of God, "Jehovah," a covenant name, which, according to Exodus 6:2, was revealed for the first time to Moses, is used by anticipation in this narrative. The combination of it with the word "God," found here and in the following chapter, shows the purpose of the writer or editor to convey the idea that the Creator of the world and the God of Israel were one and the same.

<sup>1</sup> For the literature the reader is referred to the preceding article of this series in THE BIBLICAL WORLD for January, 1894.

3. According to vs. 5, two reasons are assigned for the lack up to this time of any vegetation: (1) the absence of rain, and (2) the fact that there was no man yet to till the ground.

4. In vss. 5, 6 and 7 we see that these two difficulties are removed. A mist rises from the earth and waters the ground; man is formed out of the dust of the ground. The representation in vs. 7 is extremely real, consisting of a figure formed of clay, into the nostrils of which breath is introduced.

5. The details of the garden of Eden in vss. 8-14, including rivers, may be taken up later in connection with a fuller treatment of the garden.

6. In reference to "the tree of life," "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," it may be noted (substantially with Dodds) that according to the representation of this narrative, man as originally created would have died if he had not eaten of the tree, but he had a possibility of not dying. The tree provided for this possibility to become an actuality. Everything depended upon his being with God. The tree was symbolical of immortality. Disobedience drove him from God, out of the Garden of Eden and away from the tree.\* The prohibition of this tree was to cultivate moral growth, for a man grows morally *only when he is in the presence of a forbidden thing* and restrains himself. There being a prohibition, he knows that there is a distinction between good and evil. He may choose either. This tree made him conscious of good and evil. The prohibition was a constant education of the law. The tree was named not for its fruit, but for the prohibition. From the phrase "to dress it and to keep it" (vs. 15), we would infer that man had work to do before the fall.

7. When man has lived for some time alone, the fact is recognized that this is not as it should be, and it is proposed (vs. 18) to make an help "meet for him," that is, a help answering to him, one which would in all respects satisfy him.

8. The phrase "to see what he would call them" (vs. 19), means really "to see what estimate he, Adam, would place upon them." The name assigned, as always in the Old Testament,

\* Handbook for Bible classes, Genesis, *in loc.*

indicates the character. When cattle, fowl, and beasts have been introduced to him and their names assigned, that is, when the estimate has been formed of them, it is discovered (vs. 20) that none of them furnishes the help which it was proposed to create for him.

9. The description in vss. 21 and 22 is very distinct. The man is put to sleep, and one of his ribs, or perhaps better, sides, is taken, out of which the woman is made, or more literally, built. The words of vs. 24 would seem to be those of a writer of the narrative rather than of Adam himself, and perhaps might better be rendered in the present tense. Looking about him and seeing that men entered into the marriage state, he finds in the origin of woman the explanation of this now established fact.

*The structure of the second story of creation* is in marked contrast with that of the first. 1. The beginning in this representation is a picture of the earth in its barrenness, and the occasion of this barrenness, no rain, no man (2:4b-5).

2. A mist ascends and man is formed. The whole situation is now changed (2:6-7).

3. Provision is made for the nourishment and education of the man by the preparation of the garden of Eden (2:8-14).

4. Man is placed in the garden. His moral education now begins (2:15-17). How long does the education continue? The picture cannot indicate.

5. "His being alone" is not good, as God himself after a while sees. A help suitable for him must be found (2:18).

6. The first effort is a tentative one. Beasts and fowl are formed and brought to him. He expresses his opinion of each by the name which he gives it, but he gives to none the name expressive of his satisfaction (2:19-20).

7. A new creature out of man himself is then formed and at once proves acceptable (2:22-23).

8. All this is seen to be an explanation of the custom of marriage, which in the writer's time has become universal (2:24-25).

9. The whole chapter is a series of pictures, not of words, of which the central figure is the first man.

In close connection with the structure of the passage we may, as before, note *the characteristics of style*:

1. Man is presented first and everything else is introduced in its relation to him. The style is therefore logical, not, as in the first story, chronological.
2. We find no systematic order, no constantly recurring phrase, no stereotyped formulæ. The writer passes gradually and imperceptibly from the description of one event to another. There is no classification of any kind. Everything is grouped around man. The style is therefore free and flowing, rather than rigid and statistical.
3. The opening words depict a scene for the imagination. Instead of a carefully tabulated enumeration of the different orders of created beings, the simpler first, the more complex afterwards, we have a picture of which the central figure is the first man; the background formed by a few hasty but masterly touches. Not in the beginning, but before there was any plant of the field or any herb or any rain or any man, was the time when Jehovah made earth and heaven. The scene was a barren waste because Jehovah had not caused it to rain. There was no vegetation because there was as yet no man to till the ground. But a mist arises and moistens the ground. Clay is taken and moulded into the form of man. Breath is blown into his nostrils. A garden is planted. Trees made to grow in it; rivers made to flow in it, while the man tills it. This is poetry in the strictest sense. The style is picturesque in the extreme.
4. The anthropomorphic representations are many and very gross. The divine Being is represented as walking at that particular time of the day which was most cool. He breathes the divine breath into the clay figure. He cuts from the man a side or rib which is constructed into a woman. He plants the trees in the garden, and himself introduces to man, one by one, the animals which have been created.
5. It is no longer the race of man as a whole, the species of a given kind, nor the earth and heaven which is created, but a certain particular first man, a first woman, a certain particular

garden and certain rivers. In contrast with the first story the style is individual rather than generic.

Some of the more obvious *teachings of this story* are the following:

1. The Creator of the universe and the God of Israel are one and the same.
2. Man's bodily form contains no element which is not the common property of animal life, but there was breathed into his nostrils a breath of higher and spiritual life, and by a special act man became closer kin to God.
3. Man, as originally created, had in him the possibility of not dying. Obedience was the test by which it should be determined whether this possibility should prove an actuality.
4. Residence in the garden which contained the tree of life would secure immortality. Banishment from that garden, and from the nearness to God which it involved, meant death.
5. Man, even in Eden, was to work. The work consisted in dressing the trees and keeping the garden.
6. Possession of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, as well as of the others, would have signified "that man's moral development is an external gift which he can receive without inward trial."
7. Prohibition of this tree shows that "it is in the presence of that which is forbidden, and by self-command and obedience to law" that man is to obtain his moral education.
8. The nature of the help suitable for the man was determined not absolutely by a word or act of God, but gradually and by an exhaustive process, namely, by allowing it to be seen that no creature yet created was fit to occupy such a position.
9. Man without woman was not a whole. Woman's creation was a second and distinct act, consequently "complete humanity is found in neither."
10. Woman formed from man is and always must be dependent on him.
11. Woman taken from man's side is "neither servant, nor idol, but partner."

12. The marriage relation, as it appears the world over, has grown out of the original constitution of man and woman.

13. The first man and woman lived together in a state of childlike innocence, "having no sense of evil and therefore no sense of shame."

14. "Adam is represented not only as naked and subsequently clothed with leaves, but as unable to resist the most trivial temptation, and as entertaining very gross and anthropomorphic conceptions of the Deity. In all these characteristics, Adam was a typical savage" (?).

15. "An Aristotle was but rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise" (?).

It is proper here to consider *the purpose of the story*. The writer is endeavoring to present in vivid form some great religious truth. A story of creation, resembling, as will be seen later, in many respects those of other nations around about, is selected, and the material is arranged in such a form as to accomplish the writer's purpose. What was this purpose? If we recall the story of the garden, beautifully ordered to supply man's needs; the tree of life, suggesting the test to which man is to be subjected; the tree of knowledge, the means provided for man's education; the command, "of the tree of knowledge thou shalt not eat"; the details of the creation of the woman; the satisfaction exhibited by the man and the state of innocence in which they lived, it is soon apparent that the single purpose of the account is to furnish a preparation for the story of the Fall in the following chapter; and when we take up the story of Paradise and the later material furnished by this same writer, we soon discover how everywhere and at all times his mind rests upon that greatest problem of all life, *the existence in the world of evil*.

It does not require a close comparison of this chapter with the preceding to *discover many points of difference*.<sup>1</sup> These differences appear—

1. *In respect to the language* of the two accounts: for the second writer uses the word "Jehovah" or "Jehovah God"

<sup>1</sup> For the fuller treatment of this subject, of which this is an abridgement, the reader is referred to *Hebraica*, Vol. V.

instead of "God," the synonym "form" instead of "create," the phrase "beasts of the field" instead of "beasts of the earth," the phrase "man and his wife" instead of "male and female." We find also in this narrative the phrase "breath of life" where the writer of the former narrative later uses "spirit of life"; the phrase "the man" where the other writer later uses "Adam." Much more might be said in reference to differences of language, but this must suffice.

2. *In respect to style*. This difference has been sufficiently indicated in what has already been said. The second account, in contrast with the first, is without system; is logical rather than chronological; free and loose, rather than systematic and precise; picturesque and poetical, rather than rigid; individual, rather than generic; and anthropomorphic in the extreme.

3. *In respect to material*. It is here that the greatest differences appear. In the first account the order of thought is from the lower to the higher—the vegetable world, the moving world of meteoric creatures, the population of sea and air, the population of land, man. The second story starts with the highest, for when the first man was created no shrub or plant existed. After man there came vegetation, which man was to maintain, and then came animals.

In the first story vegetation appears only when a superabundance of water has been removed (1: 10, 11). In the second story there can be no vegetation until the dry ground receives moisture (2: 5, 6). In the first story man and woman are created together; in the second, the order of creation is man, vegetation, animals, woman.

In the first story mankind is installed over his dominion as a populous race, with no warning that it is necessary first to go back again to the time when there was no vegetation, and when Jehovah must by manipulation form him and cause him to pass through a tragedy, at the end of which he is found at a place similar to that in which the first story left him.

In the second story there is no reference to the details of the first, as for example, the Sabbath. The animals are moulded

from the ground without a hint of the creation which has already been described.

According to the first story the universe is conceived of as a diving bell in water (the abyss). Its roof is the expanse of the heavens; dry land is the floor. In the second story the earth is an indefinite expanse of dry plain upon which the water is poured out.

4. *In respect to theology.* Here again the differences are marked. The first story is monotheistic—every polytheistic expression being avoided, and God being represented as absolutely supreme. The Deity is not represented as "forming," "breathing," "walking"; he says "Let be" and the fulfillment comes. The attributes most clearly presented are those of power and beneficence. He speaks, and the world is created for the blessing of man. When finished, everything is pronounced good.

In the second story the monotheism is not so rigid. The means employed in creation are always indicated, "clay," "rib," etc. The Deity is represented as laboriously gathering materials, preparing and shaping them by manipulation. Man is on free and confidential terms with God. No special attributes present themselves. The writer of the first story, understanding that the word "Jehovah" was revealed only at the time of the Exodus, does not use it. The writer of the second story treats the name as having existed from the very beginning. The anthropomorphic character has already been pointed out.

Such being the differences, a question naturally arises as to the harmonizing of the two accounts. The best effort which has been made to do this is that of Professor William Henry Green,<sup>1</sup> who maintains that the second account is not a duplicate account. "The expression, 'These are the generations' belongs not to what precedes, but to what follows. It is impossible to suppose that the second story is to be regarded as an account of creation when it makes no reference whatever to sea, sun, moon, or stars. It is simply an account of the planting of a garden in Eden. The chapter has its present form because it is intended to prepare the way for the account of the fall. To understand

<sup>1</sup> *Hebraica*, Vol. V., page 146 ff.

this account, one must know the origin of man and the location of the garden of Eden. The first chapter is, therefore, an account of creation in general; the second has to do with a single garden."

The differences referred to above, according to Professor Green, are not differences. In each case there is a satisfactory explanation; and it is only a forced exegesis which brings the two accounts into such sharp contrast. A single example may be taken. "To suppose that beasts and birds were made in execution of the divine purpose (to provide a help meet for Adam) is not only a grotesque conception, but implies the incongruity that the Lord's first attempt was a failure. The beasts were brought to Adam to see what he would call them. There is no thought of making the beasts. It is rather that of bringing the beasts already made to let them make an impression on Adam, and awaken in his mind a sense of need of companionship and of their unfitness for the position."

But all such efforts are insufficient because they

(1) Are inspired chiefly by a dread that the acknowledgment of differences will wholly invalidate the stories. Accepting the position that the acceptance of differences destroys the value of the material, no difference is permitted to be discovered.

(2) Are founded upon a wrong conception of the character of the material. This postulates that these records are divine in the sense that they are exclusively divine, and delivered through a machine. This machine was man. His interest, then, is simply the interest which a machine has in the article which is manufactured by means of it. The records stand related to the man in whose times they first took form as the fabric stands related to the machine. This material, assumed to come from one source, and through one machine, must be in strict agreement. Nay, more, if anywhere a roughness occurs in one which the other does not possess, that roughness must be removed.

(3) Employ principles of interpretation which, if applied generally, would make it possible to twist Scripture into any meaning whatever.

What now, shall we say concerning the harmonizing of the

letter of these two stories. We recognize many important differences; an entirely different purpose, different age, different circumstances, different writers; themes of different growth. We find in the world's traditions some agreeing with our first story, some with the second. And in view of all this we conclude that the harmonizing of the letter is impossible. We may go further and say that such a harmonizing becomes necessarily forced, and even if possible, would be undesirable. The result would be something entirely mechanical, and would compel us to lose the distinctive idea which each story presents. Let us be thankful that we have two accounts of Creation instead of one.

But the matter does not rest here; a deeper study shows that the spirit of the two stories is, after all, fundamentally the same. If a rough figure may be used, let us call them two branches of a tree; one straight, strong, unbending, unyielding, with its leaves and smaller branches growing at regular intervals, rigid in its form. The other more supple, bending more easily under the influence of the breeze, with smaller branches, and leaves scattered—here a cluster, now a long space entirely bare. Nor are these the only branches on the tree; many others grow, which take on a yet more individualistic form of development. However different these two, or, indeed, all these branches may be, the outer bark, in spite of many variations, is the same bark. The fibre is the same, the sap is the same, the trunk is one, and it comes from the same roots. Outward differences do not disprove identity of origin or identity of life.

What do these stories teach us of man? In the first everything looks forward to man; in the second everything begins with man. In both the purpose of creation is man; in both the crown of creation is man. In the first, man is to rule the world; in the second, the world is brought to man for his acceptance.

What do they tell us of God? It was God in the first story who created man; in the second story it is God. In both, before man, or earth, or heaven, God was. Neither makes any reference to a period before God, or to any material out of which the world was made.

There is little time to study in detail *the elements of outside*

*creation stories* which bear resemblance to this story. The story of Prometheus, who formed man by moulding him out of clay, is late. An older Greek story is that which attributes to fire stolen from heaven the source of life and soul. The Assyrian account, which represents Ea as forming man with his two hands to be subject to the gods, is in substance the same. In Scandinavia the gods are supposed to have drawn the first human being forth from the trunks of trees. In Egypt the story of the use of clay is found, likewise in Peru among the Indian tribes. The account of Berossus presents an order worthy of notice. According to it the earth first becomes fertile; man is moulded, soul is breathed into him, and then the animals are formed from the earth. This, as will be seen, is the same order.

Without taking further time for the presentation of details, it is easily seen that, as in the cases cited in comparison with the first story, the outside stories are polytheistic rather than monotheistic; extravagant and ridiculous rather than pure and simple; lacking totally in that which is beautiful and elevating, and utterly devoid of definite religious teaching.

In stating now our estimate, we may connect the two stories and use in part language already used.

1. These stories, as, in themselves, pieces of literature, for sublimity, force, strength, and beauty, have no superior.
2. These stories, as intended in each case to prepare the way for something of great importance lying beyond—the *one* for an institution which has been world-wide in its acceptance and most beneficent in its influences—sanctioned by divine example and based upon divine command—the Sabbath; the *other* for a narrative which embodies the world's greatest tragedy—man's first sin—a story, the thought of which lies back of all human thought, all human life—the form of which is adapted alike to the child or the old man, the savage or the sage, these stories of creation, as intended each to prepare the way for something beyond, contain no fault or blemish; but are in the most perfect sense the fulfillment of the Author's purpose.

3. These stories are not history, for the times are prehistoric times. They are the Hebrew version (purged and purified) of

the best thoughts of humanity in that earliest period when man stood alone with nature and with God. It is sacrilege to call them history. To apply to them the tests of history—always cold, and stern, and severe, is profanation. They are *stories*, grand, inspiring, uplifting stories. Either of them has influenced human life more than all the historical records ever penned.

4. These are not scientific records, for science is modern. Hugh Miller has said, "the Scriptures have never yet revealed a single scientific truth." If one will collect from the Scriptures all reference in prose and poetry to heaven, earth, sun, moon, stars and seas, he will soon discover that the Bible knows no science. The writer speaks of things as they appear to his untrained, unscientific eye. Let us be very careful not to credit to the Holy Spirit, who kindled the fire of inspiration, the ignorance and superstition of those in whose hearts the fire was kindled.

5. As to their value as the medium for the conveyance of religious truth, let history speak. The statement made above is not an exaggeration. These stories have directly and indirectly influenced human life more than all the historic records ever penned.

Recall what they teach us of God, of man, of revelation.

Recall how other nations have struggled, but in vain, after these same truths.

Recall *how*, in each case, the truth is taught.

Recall the parallel statements in other literatures.

Remember the age in the world's history when all this was delivered to men.

Now let us be honest with ourselves.

Is there not something here, something that is very tangible, which we do not find elsewhere. This element, unique in the strictest sense, is an element which must be accounted for. Any hypothesis which omits to explain it must be refused acceptance. The statement of the hypothesis which, under all the circumstances seems satisfactory, we may reserve until the examination of other material has been completed.

## THE CHALDEAN ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE.

A Revised Translation by  
W. MUSS-ARNOLT,  
The University of Chicago.

*Introduction.—The Nimrod Epic.—Gilgamesh and Çetnapishtim.—Çetnapishtim's account of the deluge, the work of Bel, Adar, and the Anunnaki.—The building and outfitting of the ship.—The great storm-flood.—The end of the cyclone.—The ship settles on Mount Niçir.—Sending out of dove, swallow, and raven.—Peace and thank offering of Çetnapishtim.—Ea's rebuke of Bel.—Çetnapishtim and his wife removed among the gods.*

The Chaldean (or rather Babylonian) account of the deluge, contained in the eleventh tablet of the great so-called Nimrod-Epic, was first brought to light and translated by the late George Smith, of the British Museum, in his "Chaldean Account of the Deluge" (London, 1872).

This document has been, from the very beginning, a centre of attraction for cuneiform scholars, owing to its importance for the investigation of the biblical account of the deluge. Much zeal and earnest labor has been bestowed upon the restoration of the original text and its interpretation.

The cuneiform text was published in the fourth volume of the *Inscriptions of Western Asia*, edited by Sir Henry C. Rawlinson, plates 50 and 51, of which a new and much improved edition, by Theophilus G. Pinches, appeared in 1891, giving on plates 43 and 44 the deluge tablets, with numerous variant readings. Frd. Delitzsch published the whole text of tablet XI. in the third edition of his *Lesestücke* (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 99-109, and in 1891 Professor Paul Haupt, of the Johns Hopkins University, edited, for the first time, a complete critical text, in the first fascicle of part II. of his edition of the Nimrod-Epic, giving all the variant readings and additional remarks beneath the text (pp. 133-150).

Translations of the whole account of the deluge (*i. e.*, lines 1-185 of the XI. tablet), or of parts thereof, have been made