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I. Introduction.
   1. A day of seeking the truth.

II. The Two Accounts of the Creation.
   1. Divine names, Elohim and Yahweh.
      a. Priestly (P) and Yahwistic (J) narratives.
      b. Elohim and Yahweh.
      c. Combination of Yahweh Elohim in second and third chapters.
      d. Yahweh in other J sections.
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   5. Second and third chapters.

III. Origin of the Narratives.
   1. Chapters one, two, and three; and science.
   2. Comparison of the Biblical accounts of creation and the traditions of other people.

IV. Conclusion.
In studying the first three chapters of Genesis we find several problems about which there is great dispute. Years ago these accounts were taken just as they appeared, because there was no time taken to inquire into them. However, that day of satisfaction has passed and today, in an age of reason, scholars are studying these accounts not with any preconceived opinions, but with open minds, with no intention of protecting some old tradition which has no firm foundation, but with the purpose of discovering the truth. It has been the intention of the scholars to take all the facts into consideration, not omitting some, because they may interfere with some former idea, but going as far as possible into these problems. This is the only satisfactory method of procedure. When we use the same method of studying these problems as we would any other, we will make progress in understanding them.

There are some persons, however, who would say that these problems can not be solved; that they are beyond comprehension. This point of view is false for there are many facts in these problems which can be discovered if their solution is undertaken. At the end of this process we would find that nothing worth while had been destroyed, but on the other hand, we had gained a great deal which would be very helpful. This reasoning which
can be applied to any problem, can also be used in studying Genesis; and especially the problems of the first three chapters.

The first great difficulty which confronts us is the account or accounts of the creation in the first two chapters of Genesis. There are some who say that there is but one account, while others say that there are two accounts. For a long time these records in the first two chapters were taken unquestionably as one narrative. However, today, this theory has been questioned and many are saying that there are two different stories of the creation in the first and second chapters of Genesis. That is, the author of these narratives, has taken the first chapter of Genesis from one source and the second chapter from another; or if his sources were not written the material was collected from tradition.

The investigation of the problems in Genesis followed the discovery by Jean Astruc a French physician, in 1753, of the use of two names, Elohim and Yahweh, for the Divine Being. He found that Elohim was constantly used in one set of narratives, and Yahweh in another. It seemed rather strange that Elohim should be used constantly in one or in several chapters, and in the next few chapters Yahweh should be used. Consequently from his efforts the scholars started with the hypothesis,
that those narratives which contain Elohim must have been
drawn by one author, and those which contained Yahweh
by another. These narratives were designated as the
Priestly (P) and Yahwistic (J). This investigation was
carried on not only in Genesis, but in the books following
Genesis, and this hypothesis was found to be true. The
situation was the same as today, when we hear a speaker
many times. Then if we should read several articles by
different men, one of these being by the speaker whom
we had often heard, we could probably tell which writing
was his by the words and expressions found in it. It is
possible that such might be the case with the writers of
these accounts which are in Genesis and the books follow-
ing. Since Elohim is used for God in many of the narratives,
and Yahweh in many other passages, it is probable that
there are two different writings.

In the second and third chapters we find Yahweh-Elohim
used together, but in the other J sections only Yahweh
is used. It is quite evident that the reason for the
combination is, because of the Redactor, who saw the
necessity of having Elohim used with Yahweh, that it
might be known that these two names referred to the same
God; although one name was used by one writer and the other
name was used by the other. The Redactor was, probably, one who believed in only one God and hence he would not want to convey the idea that his people were, or had been, worshippers of more than one God. Elohim is used in some of the passages ascribed to J, and Yahweh in some of the passages ascribed to P, yet this does not militate against the hypothesis that the words Elohim and Yahweh were characteristics of P and J respectively. It would be perfectly natural to find Elohim used in a J section, and Yahweh used in a P section. Just because a writer often uses a particular word it does not follow that he can not use another; and yet a word used frequently becomes a keyword that enables us to tell what writer it is. It is very probable that some of these words were placed where they are by the Redactor.

When the scholars compared the P narratives with the J narratives they found that the words for God were not the only words which differed in these narratives. There were other words and expressions which were peculiar to one writer and not to the other. In the first chapter where Elohim is used, there were certain words and expressions which appear quite often in the other writings of P throughout Genesis and the other books of the Pentateuch. Also in the second and third chapters of Genesis where Yahweh is used there are found various words and expressions
which are characteristic of those writings attributed to J.

We will consider briefly a few of the expressions and words which are characteristic of these different writings. Some of those attributed to P which occur in many chapters of Genesis are the following:

(1) ןָ֙יִן to create, is used by P instead of יָ֖זְמַ֫ןוּ to form, which is used by J. In almost all places where it is used in the Pentateuch, it is given to P. יָ֖זְמַ֫נְיָ֚ו to create is also found in other books; most frequently in Isaiah, in the fortieth and in subsequent chapters. In these passages יָ֖זְמַ֫נְיָ֚ו is the special expression for God's free fashioning or creating, without trouble or labor. The word is used exclusively of Divine activity. It expresses the idea of effortless production. The meaning of creating from nothing is not portrayed here, as is commonly conceived, but rather the idea, to make or fashion. Consequently in the creation we have the progressive ordering of the chaos into the Cosmos. This word is very suitable to P, because, as has been said, it is used exclusively of God, for P places God in a very exalted position. יָ֖זְמַ֫נְיָ֚ו contains the central idea of the first chapter of Genesis.

(2) יָ֖זְמַ֫נְיָ֚ו to make, is another expression which is used by P,
and also by J, but it must have a different shade of meaning from אֶלֶף. They are both used together in Genesis 2:3. Just what the difference is, it is hard to say. In Gen. 1:21 אֵין אִלֵּה is used when speaking of the water animals, and Gen. 1:25 אֵין אִלֵּה is used when speaking of the land animals; and so it is hard to see any difference from these two passages. However, taking all the passages into consideration, it would seem that אֵין אִלֵּה is more closely connected with the idea of God than אֵין אִלֵּה; especially since J does not use it, for as, we have said, J has a different idea of God.

(3) P always uses אֵין אִלֵּה instead of אֵין אִלֵּה which is used by J.

(4) אֵין אִלֵּה to swarm.

(5) אֵין אִלֵּה swarming things.

(6) אֵין אִלֵּה to be fruitful and multiply.

(7) אֵין אִלֵּה to creep.

(8) creeping things.

(9) פָּה waste, abyss similar to the Babylonian Tiamat.

(10) אֵין אִלֵּה emptiness, also a Babylonian word.

(11) אֵין אִלֵּה divide, quite frequent in P.

(12) אֵין אִלֵּה kind, species, frequent in P.

(13) אֵין אִלֵּה in our image, found in the O. T. only in
(14) \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) likeness, used in P and Ezekiel and in the exilic Isaiah.

(15) \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) food, used only by P and Ezekiel.

(16) \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) beast of the earth, used by P instead of \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) Beast of the field.

(17) \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) collection.

(18) \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) male and female, also used by \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\).

Words and expressions peculiar to \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) are the following:

1. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) to form, used instead of \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) which is used by P.
2. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) to make.
3. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) beast of the field.
4. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) bush of the field.
5. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) herb of the field.
6. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) this time, now, occurs repeatedly in \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) passages in the singular denoting this time or this once, in the dual meaning, twice, and in the plural with different numerals as three times and etc.
7. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) because, occurring many times.
8. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) not to, appearing several times.
9. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) what is this?
10. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) sorrow, toil.
11. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) drive out.
12. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) hearken unto the voice.
13. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) greatly multiply.
14. \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\) ground, peculiar to \(\mathcal{J} \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{n}}\).
In Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 2:4 there are expressions which have caused a great deal of discussion. In Gen. 1:1 we have, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth".
In Gen. 2:4 we have, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created". Some scholars have said that the inference from the expression in Gen. 1:1 is that God created the world from nothing. However, this does not seem to be the idea of the writer, for \( \sqrt{7} \) does not have that meaning of creating from nothing. Other scholars say that is a summary of what follows, and this explanation may be true. It seems that the phrase, Gen. 2:4, is in the wrong place, and that it should be at the beginning of chapter one. The expression, "The generation of" occurs ten times in Genesis, and the authorities every time ascribe it to P. As the phrase is used it is a superscription instead of a subscription. The second chapter is not exactly concerned with "the generations of the heaven and the earth". It is a record concerning the formation of man, woman, and beast. The only reference to the heavens and the earth is in Gen. 2:4. The question is raised, why should this expression be where it is, when that which follows does not refer to it? This expression, Gen. 2:4, has \( \sqrt{7} \) which is also characteristic of P and not of J; however, this phrase is assigned to P in every other place where it occurs. This phrase occurs when P makes a break in the
series of events, which he is relating, and starts upon a new series. Therefore, since it is characteristic of P and not of J, and since it does not fit into the series of events which follow, it must certainly belong to P.

It is true that this could be made the conclusion of the account in the first chapter of Genesis. After the writer narrates the creation story as he does, he could have summed it all up by saying, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth". This statement would have made a good summary. Such may be the case, but it is rather strange that the author would use it in this manner in Gen. 2:4 while in no other place does he so use it. It seems to explain this situation in this manner: the phrase was at the beginning of chapter one, which would then read, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, (either) in the beginning of God's creating, (or) when God created the heavens and the earth". Later when these accounts were put together by the Redactors, the final Redactor for some hidden reason, took Gen. 2:4, which probably stood as Gen. 1:1 and placed it where it now stands.

Undoubtedly it is true that the Redactor has done this, but his reason for doing it is not known. His purpose may have been to show that there is in chapter two another account of the creation, since this expression is used in other places where there is a break. In this instance
the Redactor makes use of the phrase to show that there is a break in the narrative. Indeed, this is quite possible. For if there was a certain expression or word needed by the Redactor in placing these narratives together, it would be natural for him to use the word or expression which best fits the context, even if the expression or word belonged to another writer, for his purpose is to give a connected account, bringing in as much of the narratives of the different writers as he can. That the author would use such an expression in this connection is quite natural when it meets his needs so well as in the present instance, for there may not have been such a good expression in use by J, which he could have employed. This same explanation will give the reason why in some cases, a writer uses words and expressions common to another writer, namely, that these words or expressions convey the true meaning.

This word study led to the discovery that these narratives could not be written by one author, as there were contradictions in them. Not only in the first two chapters of Genesis were there found contradictions, but also in the following chapters. If Chapter two is a supplement to chapter one, as some contend, it seems that the writer would have harmonized the accounts or at least would have given an explanation of the present content. It would have been natural for him, if he were the same writer, to refer to
the account in the first chapter when he related the same things in chapter two, or in some way to have made an organic connection between them. Instead of a unity in the account there are contradictions. The order of the things created is different. The representation of the two are different. In the first chapter the earth is considered as at first emerging from the waters, but in chapter two it is represented as being dry. This would indicate that the account in the first chapter probably came from a wet country, while that in chapter two originated in a desert or dry country.

The teaching in chapter one is that man can eat of every tree, but in chapter two he is warned not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There is in chapter two a separate account of the creation of woman, whereas, in chapter one the narrative states that man and woman were created at the same time. The writer of chapter two probably did not have as high a conception of woman as the writer of chapter one; for men in all ages have differed as to the true place of woman. Not only between these two narratives are there contradictions, but there are also differences in some other similar narratives recorded in Genesis.
Besides these contradictions scholars have discovered many differences in the treatment of these accounts. Although the narratives in the first two chapters related the same event, that is the creation; yet it was found that there were differences in the order of the things created. In the first chapter there was one order, and in the second chapter the order was reversed. Although the subject is the same, it is treated differently in the two passages. In the first chapter of Genesis we have a very orderly and systematic account of the beginnings of the heavens and earth and all things connected with them. On the first day there was light; on the second day, the firmament; on the third day, the earth, seas, and heathage; on the fourth day, the sun, moon, and stars; on the fifth day, sea animals and fowls of the heaven; on the sixth day, the land animals and man. In this account the writer makes no explanation as he proceeds with the narrative, but gives only the bare facts. Dillman says, "we have in P the naked facts, the dry bones without flesh and blood". In the account given in the second chapter there is an altogether different record. Instead of just a skeleton outline, there is an explanatory account. In chapter one as observed, the writer begins with light and closes with man, the plant life and animal life having been created before man. In chapter two this is not the case, for man
is created before the plants and animals. In the second narrative much more is said about man than in the first. In the first account man is included with the rest of creation. The thought, here, is not alone the preeminence of man, but rather the power and glory of God in bringing about such a wonderful creation. There is nothing said concerning the creation of the heavens and the earth except the one statement which occurs in 2:4\(^b\), "In the day that Jehovah God made earth and heaven". The reason why there is no more lengthy narrative of the creation of the heavens and the earth can be accounted for in the following ways: (1) It may have been that there was such a similarity between the account of the creation of the heavens and the earth in chapter one and chapter two that the Redactor thought it unnecessary to mention it again in chapter two, but to have it implied only in this statement in 2:4\(^b\). However, (2) it may have been that the tradition or writing from which the author of chapter two received this account did not give any more concerning the creation of the heavens and the earth; it being the purpose of this story to give more about the creation of man and those things which were more intimately connected with him. (3) Again the writer of chapter two may have given his idea of the creation of the heavenly bodies, but it may have been inferior to that
given in chapter one, and so much more like those accounts of heathen people, that the Redactor thought it not worthy of a place in this connection. This might be naturally expected of J, for in the second chapter J presents anthropomorphic conceptions of God. God forms man out of the dust of the ground, He breathes into man’s nostrils the breath of life, and He takes a rib from the man and makes a woman. This conception is quite different from that in chapter one, where God is thought of not as coming down among men and working with them; but rather as being off at a distance ruling the whole universe. From His throne He only has to speak the word and the task is accomplished. P's representation of the Deity is, therefore, far more transcendent, than that of J, and it places God in a more exalted position. The representation of Deity by J is more in harmony with the beliefs of other nations about God. However, there is this difference, where J has only one God, the other nations have many. These ideas of God fit in well with the words which these writers use, as we have said, P uses Elohim when speaking of God and this harmonizes with the exalted idea which P has of God; while J's anthropomorphic idea of God is expressed very well by Yahweh which word conveys the impression of the nearness of God. The narrative in the second chapter is more like the accounts of primitive people, whereas, the account of chapter one seems
to be far above them. This is to be expected as the writings of P are thought to be of a later date than those of J. It is a fact that as the Hebrews developed, the religious ideas became more purified. In the first accounts of the Israelites, e.g., in chapters two and three of Genesis, although it seems that the same traditions which are found among other people are set forth, yet they are on a higher plane than the stories of other nations. The reason for this is that the Israelites have used their stories not for the sake of the traditions alone, but rather for the purpose of bringing out great moral truths. It is justifiable to say great truths, for they really were at that time, although such conceptions may be far below our standard of morals. In this respect we might say they have received more of a revelation than other people of their time. They contributed to humanity at that time greater moral truths than the other people. Other nations could have received the same revelations if they had so desired, and had worked to the best of their ability to attain them. There is no revelation without a longing and working for it.

Concerning chapters two and three it has been observed that they are more like the accounts of other people, because the writer has the anthropomorphic idea of God. He pictures God coming down and working in the earth, fixing
a place where He can put the man, and then later creating and appearing to him.

The writer pictures the serpent as coming to Adam and Eve and talking to them. This is nothing more than the idea of many gods, just as much as is found in the history of other people. Because the narrator has pictured the Deity appearing in the form of a serpent, the idea of godhood is not taken away, other people thought of their gods appearing in the form of animals. The serpent was looked upon by primitive people as altogether different from other animals. The Arabs said it had a spirit, and others looked upon it as supernatural. The serpent was thought to have wisdom. Jesus in Matthew 10:16 said, "Be ye wise as serpents". Perhaps, the writer of Genesis three makes use of the serpent as a representative of the power of temptation. It might be said that many people today are influenced by these traditions of past ages, because they think of the serpent as another god. Although they do not call him a god, yet they call him Satan or the Evil One, and think of the serpent in the same manner that they think of a god. However, when this is done there is read into the account that which is not there, for the writer had no thought of an Evil One, since the serpent was the symbol of shrewdness. It is true that today we can read into this story the meaning of sinfulness, when we look at it in the
light of our day; but when we say that an Evil One is represented in this appearance we might be classed with those nations who have many gods. When J makes use of the serpent to convey his idea it seems that he is using a tradition which was prevalent. Although he does use a tradition, he has put into it a great meaning, or rather, we today find therein a moral truth, and far greater than any truth found in the same traditions of other people; yet we must not think that there is no uplifting teaching in the traditions of other nations of their time, for this would be false. Such an idea as is found here in J is not found in the writings of P.

There is another great difference between the account of J and that of P in reference to the dominion and earthly abode of man. P pictures him as lord over the whole world. J pictures man as placed in the garden of Eden, giving the same narrow characterization of God and man. Whether J imagined the idea of a garden or received it from some other source, we do not know. It is true that in the history of other people this very same idea of having a place or places where their gods dwelt is prevalent. In this narrative God places His people in a garden where He can commune with them and personally look after their needs. Just where this garden was located is not known. It has been the general opinion that it was somewhere along the
Tigris and Euphrates rivers in Babylonia or Mesopotamia. It is impossible to locate a place which will harmonize with the description in Genesis 2:10-14. There is no known place where there are four rivers which will answer to the description given in Genesis. It is quite certain that it was located in or near Babylonia. The Tigris and Euphrates are there and other rivers flow into them; and it may be that the writer did not give a true description of these rivers, that is, as they really were, but he described them in the way they appeared to him. Again, as the ancestors of the Israelites came from this part of the country it would be natural to expect that they would place the garden of Eden in their known country. Since the conditions in Babylonia resemble the description in Genesis, it would be plausible to say that the garden of Eden was located somewhere along the rivers, Tigris and Euphrates. As far as the name Eden is concerned it is the Hebrew word Edhen which means pleasure. This is a very appropriate name for this place, for the picture we have is that of a place of pleasure where the first people had all they could desire; there they could live in luxury, peace, and idleness. Just such a picture as this is found among other people, e.g., the Persians, Indians, Greeks, and Romans. In P we have no such description as that given by J. In P, man is given charge over all things, and is
thought of as taking care of the things God has placed in the world.

It is conceded that chapters two and three are by the same writer, J, because they bear traces of the same style and language, and furthermore the contents of two and three form a connected account. In chapter two the writer describes how man was formed, where he was placed, and his condition. In chapter three he tells of the sinning of this man as we interpret it, which brought about his fall and caused him to be cast from his position of pleasure and idleness. J pictures man as being formed from the dust of the ground and having the breath of life breathed into his nostrils by God. In this manner he becomes a living soul. Through what process man passed before he attained his present condition the writer had no knowledge. Some say that man came to the position he now occupies by passing through the different stages of animal life. There is not sufficient evidence to disprove this hypothesis, while, on the other hand, this theory might harmonize with the account, for all the author tells us is, that God formed man from the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.
The writer does not picture man perfect as we often think. There is a great difference in saying that "God breathed into the nostrils of man the breath of life" and "that God made man perfect". Moreover, the account of man's fall does not convey this idea, for man did not need to be perfect to fall. Indeed, we today fall many times yet we are not perfect. Neither can we get this idea of perfection from the statement in the first chapter, where the writer says, "man was made in the image of God". In this statement the writer does not picture man as perfect. Many have thought that this referred to the physical body of man and have, therefore, thought of God as having a body. The best explanation that has yet been given of this clause, "in the image of God", is the idea of self-conscious reasoning, the power given to man by God by which he has power to consider all that is in this great world and to search out and accomplish wonderful things— in this man is far above the animals. God has also given him a will so that he may work toward this goal of perfection if he so desires. This is a much more reasonable position to take than to say that man was perfect at the very beginning. If man was created perfect, he has been descending, but when we think that he has been evolving, we can be optimistic, as there is a constant ascent toward the life of God which is manifested.
in the life of Jesus. How much more optimistic we become when we think of the fall of man in this manner. Instead of man falling from perfection— for would man stoop so low as to partake of some food when he was absolutely perfect?— it is much more encouraging to think of this fall as referring to the time when man's moral consciousness awakened and he was able to see the difference between right and wrong; and from that time on the struggle for righteousness has had such a great place in the history of mankind, even if it has not always been successful.

P does not give us anything similar to the account of the fall by J, and from P's style and manner of writing we would not expect to find anything like the account of the fall. Later in P's account it is mentioned that man was wicked, yet there seems to be much of the history omitted between these two narratives, that is, the first chapter is more of a general outline of the whole world, whereas, in the sixth chapter, he has brought us to the condition of mankind. However, he does not use a tradition which was prevalent as J seems to do, but only narrates a fact. We also find another difference between J and P. P does not make use of legends in order to show how man was formed and how he sinned, but J seems to do so. We find that the accounts of other people are very similar to this
account in chapter two. In the Babylonian history we find a narrative similar to the account of the creation of man in the second chapter of Genesis. It speaks of man as created by the gods and then all the other things were created. In this record the Tigris and Euphrates rivers are also mentioned. As the account in Genesis two pictures the location in the region of the Tigris and Euphrates instead of some place in Canaan, it seems as if there might be some connection between these narratives. It is true that there has been found no exact parallel account of Paradise as given in Genesis two, in the Babylonian history. However, since there are so many similarities between the other accounts in Genesis and the Babylonian accounts, it would be safe to say that this too could have originated in Babylonia, or have had some connection with Babylonian tradition. J pictures man as placed in a garden where God is represented as dwelling near him. This is altogether different from P's representation.

Another story which seems to be founded on some legend of the time, is that of the prohibition of man from eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This is, undoubtedly, founded upon some legend which contains the tree idea, a legend which also may contain the idea of the tree of life. The author of chapter two has used this legend of the tree of knowledge of good and evil
to convey the idea that when primitive man partook of the fruit of the tree, he became conscious of good and evil for the first time. It seems that there is in this eating of the fruit more of the idea of becoming wise. When they became wise, these things which were prophesied to come upon them naturally followed. The idea of sinning is more often emphasized. However, this idea does not appear to be emphasized as much as the idea of obtaining wisdom. At the time this story was written they possessed enough wisdom to know that man was in sin, hence the writer probably makes use of some legend connected with the idea of wisdom either prevalent among them or among other people. It is perfectly natural for him to use the story of the tree. This idea is similar to that entertained by the Greeks, in which God is thought to be jealous, because man has become wiser, so as to know good and evil. We might say that man's progress has been similar to the growth of a child, for as the child at first is not conscious of the different conditions about it, but later is able to comprehend them, so was it with the human race. There was a time when man was not conscious of the great world in which he lived, but later in his process of "becoming", he developed a consciousness of himself and the world about him. The writer in picturing the conditions of man, used a legend which was prevalent in order to make it more forceful. This is natural for figurative language
always has a place in conveying truths to mankind. In this instance man is thought of as sinning, because it is thought that he disobeyed God's commands; but, on the other hand, let us ask what would have been the outcome if the human race had not searched after wisdom? Although it meant labor and toil yet where would the race have been today if man had not at some time tried to become as God seeking the great mysteries of this universe. Today, it is true, that a man must go through toil and hardship to gain a knowledge of the truth. Even if man was pictured in the state of sin, why should the present generation look upon this incident as such a great sin? For example, many of the commandments in the Hebrew religion were looked upon as from God, and if any body refused to do as was taught, he was classed as a sinner. In this age we do not keep the religious customs of the Jews, neither are we considered sinners, for we do not think as the Jews did, that these commandments came from God. Persons who are called sinful because they do certain things, in reality are not sinful, but merely out of harmony with some one's standards. To such a person it may seem to be sin, but is not a sin in the sight of God, which is the same as saying that, in the true sense, it is not sin. If, indeed, we can make mistakes in the matter of saying what sin is today, why should we be
so confident that man as pictured in the third chapter committed a great sin? It was natural for primitive man to account for the presence of sin in the world, hence he pictured it in this way—that man brought it upon himself—which is true for man did and he can free himself from sin just so far as he wills to do so. God is spoken of as casting man out of the garden before he partook of the tree of life, for if he should partake of this he would live forever. There seems to be a great similarity between this account and the Grecian legend which speaks of the jealousy of the gods. There is a great difference between the God idea in chapter one and chapter three. In chapter one God has unlimited power attributed to Him, while in chapter three He is considered a God who is limited. If this latter conception was carried out logically, it would lead to polytheism.

The discussion so far has not only shown that there must undoubtedly be two different accounts of the creation in Genesis, but it has also shown that there is a great similarity between several of the items in chapters two and three and the traditions and legends of other people. Not only is this true of chapters two and three, but it is also true of chapter one. Although chapter one seems to be of a much later date than chapters two and three, since it is a more dignified account, yet we shall find in the follo
discussion that there is a great similarity between it and other accounts. This similarity does not end with these first three chapters, for there are narratives among other people similar to other accounts in Genesis, as in the case of the account of the Flood. The question that would naturally arise to any person's mind who was in search of the truth would be that of the origin or sources of those accounts which appear in Genesis. There is another question which must be considered before an answer can be given to the former, and that is concerning the relationship which exists between these records in Genesis and those accounts of other nations. To save time and work we could say that these accounts were given directly by God to the person who wrote them, but by this procedure no progress would be made. Some people insist upon this as the way these accounts in Genesis were revealed, yet they will not grant such kindness of God to other people. Why should God favor the people of Israel any more than He did other people? Moreover, why should one discover such a similarity in these accounts if Israel received her account directly from God and other people did not? Why insist upon such a process of revelation? There is no place where we are so commanded by God nor can we find where the writer says he received this information in this manner. Furthermore,
when these things occurred, the content of man's mind was not of such a nature that it desired any such revelation, and there can be no revelation without a desire for such.

If we should take the position that this was given directly by God, then we would be compelled to say that God Himself did not know all things - that He was not acquainted with all the laws of the universe, because these accounts are not in harmony with the laws of the universe as the scientists and others have discovered. However, this could not be possible since God is the Creator of all things. He could not give these great laws of the universe and at the same time not understand them.

In the first place the record states that light was created before the sun, yet today we know that the sun gives this light. The writer has pictured the sun, moon, and stars as being created after light, but man has discovered that this would be impossible. Some have said that the sun, moon, and stars were created before the fourth day, and that God did not cause them to shine till the fourth day, but the writer would not have permitted such a misunderstanding to occur, according to the opinions of those who insist upon this being revelation. God would have given this to man so that there could have been no misunderstanding. Those who hold the direct revelation theory would make it appear that this writer knew all things, but this seems to be a
great mistake. It is the same old mistake which is found so often, of taking away the humanity of a person and leaving nothing to him but the divine. When we do this the personality disappears. The idea that God works in mankind should not be discarded. It is not natural to conceive that He worked through men ages ago any more than He does through men today. Men of all ages who desired the help of God, have received it, for He does and will work through, and in, them just so far as they allow Him to do so.

Returning to the opinion of those who say that the sun, moon, and stars were created, but were not caused to shine till the fourth day, we shall say that there is nothing in the account to verify this. If this had been the case, the writer would have made himself clearer on this point by using different words or expressions so as to show us that these great lights had already been created. This he does not do. If this does not relate the writer's true thought, how can any of the remainder of the account be accepted? In other words we read into the account our own meaning rather than the writer's meaning. This is the procedure when it is said that the sun, moon, and stars were created before the fourth day, but were not, until then, caused to shine. In every other instance it is believed by those who hold this opinion that the sun, moon, and stars were created before the fourth day; that all the
other things created were not in existence until the day in which they were said to be created. It seems that it is much better to take the author's meaning than our own. Such an order of creation as presented in Genesis may be expected from a writer at that time. First he pictures God as creating the great expanse, then placing in order the earth which was below the expanse, then placing the sun, moon, and stars in this great expanse. Before the expanse was created there was no place to put the heavenly bodies, but as soon as He had the expanse He had a place for them. This is in harmony with prevalent ideas of primitive man. We also find that this writer makes the earth the greatest of the heavenly creation, even making the sun subservient to it. Because, in these modern days, the sun is regarded as the greatest body in our planetary system, it can not be inferred that the writer of Genesis should have had such a conception of this universe, for if so, we would have had a man far ahead of the conceptions of his own age. When he pictures the earth as the main planet we are not surprised, for before the days of Copernicus the earth was looked upon as the center of the solar system, not only by the Israelites but by all the civilized people of that time. On the fifth and sixth days, the fowls,
fish, and animals are created. On the third day the grass, herbage, trees, dry land, and seas appeared. According to the first account in Genesis the animals were created after the vegetation, but geology affirms they were created simultaneously. In the first account in Genesis the fishes and birds were created on the same day, before the animals of the land, but according to the testimony of geologists the birds appeared long after the fish and some species of the land animals. The Genesis story relates that water and plant life were created before the sun which would be contrary to modern scientific conceptions of creation. Consequently it is impossible to make this first account in Genesis agree with science. Some persons read their own meaning into the account in order to make it harmonize with the theory of scientists. The creation of the sun, moon, and stars is an illustration of this. There is another illustration in a Babylonian account called the seven periods of time. Those who would harmonize Genesis with science say the seven days are representative of seven periods of time, but when this statement is made, there is something read into the account which is not there. It is a known fact that the world is millions of years old, and, therefore, some persons in order to make this account seem more in harmony with the age of the world,
ay that the seven days are seven periods of time. Why try to make this Genesis account scientific when its order of creation is not scientific? The true meaning of the writer's conception of the order of creation will be obtained if we acknowledge that he had no idea of the age of this world, and all that he attempted to do was to give an account of the creation basing it upon the frame work of their week. On each day of the week a certain part of God's creative work was done.

The same is true of the Sabbath. The writer portrays God as creating the world in six days and resting on the seventh. He did not have the Babylonian idea of the creation lasting eight periods. It is often thought that the Israelites observed the seventh day because they believed God rested from His creative work on that day. This seems to be another tradition which has come down to the present time. It is probably more correct to say that it is recorded that God created the world in six days and rested on the seventh because of the Jewish Sabbath, than to say that the Jewish Sabbath was instituted because God rested on that day and hallowed it. In this way the seventh day is a type of the later Israelitish Sabbath. This scheme of seven days of creation is due to the fact that the things which were created are not in their right order, and that on the third day and the
sixth day there are two different classes of things created instead of one. This seems to have been the reason for six days of work and one day of rest. If the Jew's week had had eight days in it there would undoubtedly have been an account of eight working days. Since it was the custom of the Jewish people to observe the seventh day as a sacred day and since seven seems to be a sacred number in the Old Testament, does it not seem reasonable that the account states that God rested on the seventh day and hallowed it? One may say where did the Israelites receive the idea of a Sabbath, as the day of rest? They may have received this institution from another people such as the Babylonians, for the Babylonians had a day on which their gods might get rid of their anger. If the Israelites did not receive the idea of a day of rest from the Babylonians, probably they received it from the same source from which the Babylonians received their idea of a day of rest.

Let us return to the consideration of the relationship of this account to science. Why is it necessary to try to have this first account harmonize with our present day scientific knowledge? The main purpose of the narrative in Genesis does not seem to be an attempt to outline a scientific account of creation, yet it may have been a good scientific account for the day in which it was written.
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If now the facts which we have recorded in the first chapter of Genesis were not given by God as it has been thought, how did the writers ever get any such ideas at all? If this were the only account we had of the creation, this question would be much harder to answer, but as there are many accounts of the creation among different people, similar to the one in Genesis, it makes the problem much easier. When we find accounts of the creation of the world among other people, and where there is very much similarity between these accounts and the one we have in the first chapter of Genesis and also in the second chapter, it would not be right for us to overlook the fact in considering these accounts of the creation in Genesis. In order to understand the similarities of these accounts better we shall look into them and see what they give us.

Among the Indian theories we find these ideas of darkness at first; then, the creation of light; next, the forming of heavens and earth, and between the heavens and earth the atmosphere; and finally, the creation of individual beings.

Among the Greeks first, the chaos; next, the earth; and then, the bottomless abyss. Out of this chaos came darkness, then night, and these together produced light, and this in turn daylight. And at the same time the earth brought forth the starry heaven and the seats of the gods, the mountains and the salt depths of the sea, and then the ocean.
Among the Egyptians there were first the chaotic primeval waters, then the firmament and light.

The Etruscans' account has first the heavens and earth, then the vault of heaven, next the sea and other waters, the sun, the moon, and stars, living creatures of the air, the water, and land, and lastly mankind. Each of these periods consisted of one thousand years making a total of six thousand. This account of the Etruscans agrees remarkably with the first chapter of Genesis. It is thought by some to be founded on the Biblical account.

The Phoenicians have at first boundless time, gloomy darkness, a longing, and then fruitful matter which is full of impulse of life. We also find among them the idea of a world egg which when it is split forms heaven and earth, and from this we then have the sun, moon, and stars, the luminous air, the warm sea and land, then the wind, clouds, rain, thunder, lightning, and finally beings, male and female.

According to one of the Babylonian accounts we have Marduk or Bel as the Babylonian god. First, there is darkness and water, from these there arose a host of monstrous creatures over which a woman by name Markaya ruled. This name, Markaya, is similar to the Chaldean name \( \theta \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \) which is similar to the Greek \( \theta \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \) (sea). Later Bel or Marduk came and cut the woman in two, and from the
its formed heaven and earth. He also destroyed the us creatures. Not using the figure, the Babylonian through the darkness, separated heaven and earth established the orderly system of the world, while the rs which could not endure the light perished. When the Babylonian god, saw the land desert but capable of ing fruit, he had his hand cut off by one of the gods; arth blended with the blood that flowed out and menimals that could endure the air were formed therefrom. Also perfected the sun, moon, stars, and five planets. hen there is another Babylonian account which is found he seven tablets. Here in this account there is a battle een the gods, the battle of Marduk, the Babylonian god, his host against Tiamat and her host. Tiamat is here ight of as the deep abyss. In this battle Tiamat is thrown, and Marduk makes her into earth and heaven; there is the sun, moon, stars, and constellations, formation of the animal world, and finally, the glori- ation of Marduk the highest of the gods.

So as has been said before we find a great similarity ween these accounts and the account of Genesis one.

all, there is the idea of a chaos at the beginning; these counts do not go back to the time when there was not any ing of which the people could not conceive but it was tural for them to conceive of such a time as is pictured these narratives. They would naturally think of a time
at the beginning when all was chaos and darkness. In all accounts there is order coming out of this condition; there is a separation of this abyss into an upper and a lower world; then light is brought forth, the formation of the heavenly bodies, of all animals and mankind. Since then these accounts and the account of the first chapter of Genesis are so much alike, what prevents us from saying that they must have originated from a common source? Especially so, when the writer of the account in Genesis does not tell us where he received his information or how he received it. The writers of Genesis or of the several following books do not mention the authorities from whom they received their information, and hence it is different from Kings and Chronicles, for these mention their authorities. So then if the authors of Genesis do not state the sources of their information why would it not be permissible to think of there being some connection between these accounts? And furthermore this is natural, for there were communications between the Israelites and other people such as the Babylonians. But as to which had the most influence upon the other it is hard to say. For example, did the Israelites receive this tradition from the Babylonians, when Abraham and his people were yet in that country, or did the Israelites receive it from the Canaanites, who in turn had received it from the Babylonians, or did the Babylonians receive it from the Israelites?
Or did the Israelites receive this tradition from some unknown people, or did all other people receive this tradition from Israel? These are questions we can not answer though we recognize their importance. Although we are certain of a connection between these accounts in a certain sense, yet in what way they are all connected we can not say.

There is another common characteristic of all these people; and that is, they all have a god or gods, all of them except Israel having several gods, and it may be that at a very early age she had the idea of several gods. But in looking into the accounts of these people and seeing the many similarities and also the similarities of opinions of these people whom we are quite certain never knew of each other's customs, habits or thoughts, we are compelled to come to the conclusion that the one whom we look to as God today placed in the very soul of all mankind the same needs, longings, and desires, and since we find them thinking along similar lines we might also say that He placed in them the same goal for them to attain in their thinking. And when we affirm this we are not saying that God placed in the minds of every person certain inclinations just as if we should say that in Genesis the first chapter we have an account which was delivered by God to this very person. Far from this, but
rather that God has placed in mankind certain instincts such as the recognition of a higher power or powers over all; the knowledge that this power or powers made this world and all things therein possible; and that life is continuous. Hence because these instincts are within all mankind we find the similarity in their longings and desires, some of which are found in these narratives. Along with all these God has given man a will, in order that he might choose for himself what he will do or not do. And because man has been favored in such a remarkable way above all other animals it has caused man to see his own great importance, and to say that he is created in the image of God as the writer of the account in the first chapter of Genesis tells us. So man has used his will and is using it today in willing to discover the great truths which God has placed in this world. Just so far as man wills to know the mysteries of this universe so much nearer he comes toward the truth, although the real truth may yet be at a great distance. While man is searching after this truth he will be guided to a great extent by his past experience and history. This is found true in all history. That is why it is so hard to make progress. This same truth is found applicable in considering these creation accounts. The writer who gave us the creation account in the first chapter of Genesis and also these other writers
must have been influenced by the history before them. Or how else could we have these accounts? We can not think of the first people at the very earliest time writing these accounts which we have. For why would they be desirous of writing a history of their time or what would influence them to write? They could not see into the future far enough to feel the necessity of writing. It is true that this is getting back to the times of which we might as well say we know nothing, but we have had and do have certain traditions of the first people. So we can use this same reasoning in finding out how these accounts came to be. There came a time when the people began to think about their previous history and not having any history which told them about their early life, they formed certain opinions about the creation of man, and as these opinions seemed to meet the demands quite well they probably thought of them as the explanation of this whole universe. Although they were not written down then they were probably circulated as tradition. At last they were written by later generations, they themselves bringing in their own opinions which they had received either from their own people or from outside nations. This was probably done several times until finally we have the accounts as they stand.
Although it is impossible to distinguish the exact relationship between the accounts in Genesis and the accounts of other people, yet because of the great similarity of the different narratives, we are confident that there is a very close connection between them. Since there is this connection between them, it is very likely that ages ago the very first ideas of creation were thought out by man, and as these people continued to move about here and there on this earth, these ideas continued to change, being influenced by the peoples' own experience in different countries and by the surrounding conditions. From these continual processes the present accounts originated. This position does no harm to anything except some old traditions. On the other hand, it has been discovered that God did not favor one class of people any more than another, but gave to all races opportunities of bringing about the best that was in them; and just so far as they used these opportunities in discovering the wonders of this universe so far did they advance in the scale of progress. There were revelations made to mankind in ages past to just such a degree as humanity was able to receive them, and today, men will receive revelations from God just so far as they are willing to use the powers God has given them in seeking and working to know Him and the great truths which He has placed here for their discovery.
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