

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

hended distinctly enough to settle every great question that can arise. When then the appeal is made to these, we determine, without any discrepancy, the right of the state to teach its religion, and the wrong of the state in persecution. Religion may be taught as a means to the highest civilization ; but when persecution is employed in its support, it ceases to be a means, but becomes an end, to maintain which civilization itself is overborne.

ARTICLE IV.

THE MOSAIC NARRATIVE OF THE CREATION CONSIDERED GRAMMATICALLY AND IN ITS RELATIONS TO SCIENCE.

By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.

By the discoveries of geology the Mosaic narrative of the creation has been invested with new and extraordinary interest. These revelations, as might have been anticipated from the history of all past discoveries in science that touch upon the sphere of revelation, have been treated in two opposite and extreme methods, both of them alike uncandid and unphilosophical. One class of men take the position of entirely neglecting the facts of geology ; generally on the ground that the science is yet in its infancy, that its cultivators are at variance among themselves, and that everything which pertains to it is uncertain. But if these men would make themselves acquainted with the subject, at least in its outlines, they would learn that it is the certainty of the great facts of geology which furnishes a basis for all the controversies among its teachers and expounders ; the problem being, not whether they are sustained by valid evidence, but how they are to be accounted for. They would further learn, that while they have been disregarding these facts, others

have been making themselves masters of them, and spreading, everywhere, the knowledge of them ; and that they are the very facts which have the nearest relation to the Mosaic narrative.

Another class of men, receiving the facts of geology, have hastily turned them against the sacred narrative ; not considering that a record, sustained by such a mighty mass of evidence, justly demands of them that they should, first of all, make a candid and earnest attempt to harmonize with its statements the discoveries of the science ; not understanding that the principle of setting aside evidence of one kind, that stands firm upon its own foundation, by evidence of another kind and resting upon another foundation, is radically unsound, since it is far more probable that some mistake has been made in interpreting the relation of the two classes of evidence to each other, than that God has arrayed irrefragable proof against irrefragable proof, in a contradictory way ; and forgetting, moreover, that many discoveries of science that have been claimed, at the outset, as being on the side of skepticism, have afterwards been found to be on the side of faith.

The true inquirer after truth will avoid both of these extremes. He will not shut his eyes to the revelations of science, because the work of harmonizing them with the inspired record costs him some labor, and some sacrifice, it may be, of old pre-judgments ; nor will he make his faith in the Bible to rest upon the narrow foundation of his success in this work. If he cannot solve existing difficulties, he will wait, in a believing and patient spirit, for more light.

This we believe to be the position of multitudes, at the present time, in respect to the Mosaic account of the creation. They have no idea of throwing away their faith in Moses as an inspired historian, any more than they have of substituting gas-light for sun-light in agriculture. But they have given sufficient attention to the science of geology to understand fully that, however many questions pertaining to it may be yet uncertain and matters of controversy, its grand facts are, like the granite beds which underlie its strata, im-

movably settled by extended and patient investigation and induction. In their controversies with unbelievers, they have been in the habit of insisting much and earnestly upon the duty of candor in the treatment of evidence ; and it would be, in their judgment, a very miserable example of candor to reject or set aside the true significance of facts which they have no power to gainsay.

It is with feelings such as these that we address ourselves to the work of interpreting the Mosaic narrative of the creation. We wish it to be understood at the outset, that we do not stake our faith in its plenary inspiration upon any theory we may adopt for bringing into harmony with it the discoveries of science. We receive it with all our heart as being, in the fullest sense, a revelation from God, and we shall continue so to receive it, though our method of reconciliation be found, upon further investigation, to be untenable. Should our views elicit any criticism, as is apt to be the case with discussions on this subject, we trust we shall have grace to bear it patiently, since the thoughts of an author, when committed to the public, become the property of the public, and, as such, may be freely discussed and controverted ; all that he has a right to claim being a fair and candid statement of his positions and arguments.

Our plan includes a *grammatical exposition* of the narrative, and an inquiry concerning its *relations to science*. The grammatical exposition comes first in order, and constitutes the foundation of the scientific inquiry ; for unless we know the true meaning of the record, interpreted according to the laws of language, we cannot intelligently affirm anything respecting its relations to science. In the performance of this first part of our work, it is necessary carefully to guard against the introduction of modern ideas ; for we propose to ascertain, not what are our views of creation, but what the sacred writer has said concerning it. Violently to warp a Hebrew verb or phrase into an agreement with some one of our scientific formulas, will not be interpreting the Divine record, but "walking in craftiness," and "handling the word of God deceitfully." We must, as far as we are able, put

ourselves back into the age of the writer, and look at his narrative not from our present position, but from that which he occupied.

But when we have done this, no man may lawfully forbid our comparing the record, thus grammatically interpreted, with the discoveries of modern science, and gaining from modern science new and deeper views respecting the truths which underlie its statements. To make this plain, let us take a declaration of the Old Testament familiar to all: "The world also is established, that it cannot be moved."¹ One class of expositors, rightly understanding the terms of this proposition in their natural and ordinary signification, but incorrectly receiving it as a statement, in scientific form, of an astronomical truth, feel bound to condemn, as heretical, the Copernican system, which places the sun in the centre, and assigns to the earth two motions. Our readers all understand that this is no ideal case, but a simple statement of the decision of a congregation of cardinals, in the seventeenth century. If, now, there should be another class of interpreters, receiving the modern doctrines of astronomy as indubitably true, but still holding on to the error that the words of the Psalmist under consideration must be taken in a scientific sense, they would, as the certain result, either reject the proposition as false, or set themselves, perhaps unconsciously, to the work of *forcing* its terms into an agreement with the discoveries of science, by false exegesis like the following: "*Is established* (Heb. *הֵבְטִיחַ*); that is, not made *immovable*, but made *constant* or *steady* in its course — in its two motions, on its axis and around the sun; compare *יָבִיחַ יְבוֹנִן*; not a spirit that *never moves*, but one that is *steady* in its motions." Again, on the words, "that it cannot be moved," we might have such a note as this: "*cannot be moved*; that is, cannot be *disturbed* in its two revolutions." The error of such exegesis consists in its bringing into the sacred text scientific forms of truth. Here we beg leave to introduce a just remark of Prof. Lewis, in respect to the three forms of language, the simply *phenomenal*, the *scientific*, and the *poetical*.

¹ Psalm 93: 1.

“Now in reference to these three kinds of language, we may say that the Bible can employ, and does employ, most copiously, the *first* and the *third*; but it cannot make use of the *second*. The reason is, that the adoption of scientific language, as above defined, would be an endorsement of its absolute correctness, whilst the responsibility of no such endorsement could be ever implied in the use of the others.”¹

The moment we disentangle ourselves from the error of considering the passage in question as pledged to a scientific form of truth, all difficulty vanishes. *In its relations to man*, “the world is established, that it cannot be moved.” To his apprehension, and to his uses, it is as firm and immovable now as it was in the Psalmist’s day. The scientific discovery that the earth is continually moving in her orbit around the sun, at the rate of sixty-eight thousand miles an hour, while she revolves on her own axis once every day, does not make her one whit the less immovable to us, who dwell upon her surface. We have now brought science into harmony with the inspired record, without sacrificing either to the other. We have neither denied the authority of the Scriptures, nor perverted their plain meaning, that astronomical discoveries might stand; nor have we rejected these as repugnant to revelation.

What has long since been achieved in the domain of astronomy, needs to be accomplished in that of geology. We say not that the adjustment can be wholly effected in the same specific way, that of regarding the Mosaic narrative as simply phenomenal. We think that, in respect to the element of time, it will be necessary to bring in some other principle or principles. Perhaps we are not yet far enough advanced in our investigations to determine where the full harmony is to be found; but we may confidently say that it is to be sought mainly in the direction of those broad and general principles of interpretation that pervade the sacred volume, and not in that of mere philological research. Philology is indispensable to the work; for it gives us, as already remarked, the true contents of the record with which

¹ Six Days of Creation, Chap. V. p. 42.

the discoveries of science are to be harmonized; but it does not, in all cases at least, itself furnish the principles of adjustment.¹

In pursuance of the general plan which we have indicated, we propose to connect with the grammatical interpretation of the different sections of the Mosaic narrative, more or less discussion respecting their relations to science, reserving for special consideration, in a subsequent Article, the difficulties which grow out of the modern science of geology.

EXPOSITION.

Gen. 1: 1. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

In the beginning. In interpreting these words, metaphysical subtilty is out of place. The beginning here spoken of, is plainly that of *the heavens and the earth*; though we need not supply these words, or anything else.² The writer means

¹ Of this the work of Prof. Lewis, to which reference has already been made, furnishes many striking illustrations. What he says in regard to the meaning of the word ארץ, and of Gen. 1: 2, first clause; particularly the question discussed in the eighteenth chapter: "What is meant by God's making the plant before it was in the earth?" — all these, and many other discussions in the book, rest on previous grammatical interpretations; while at the same time the main body of the work is occupied not with philology, but with the discussion of philosophical principles of interpretation. The present article is not intended to be a review of Prof. Lewis's treatise, but as we shall have frequent occasion to refer to it in the course of our remarks, we would here say, once for all, that, while we fully sympathize with him in his reverence for the Divine record as paramount to all human authority, and are, moreover, indebted to him for many valuable suggestions, we feel constrained to dissent from his views in some very important respects, on grounds which the reader will find stated in their proper place.

² Prof. Turner notices a refinement of some Jewish Rabbis, approved by Jarchi, who would render: "In the beginning of God's creating the heavens and the earth, then the earth was empty and void," etc., on the ground that ארץ is always in the construct state. On this Aben Ezra well remarks: "They have forgotten the passage, Deut. 33: 21, וְלֹא אֶרֶץ אֲרָצוֹתָיִם." There is no ground for ascribing to ארץ any such peculiarity. In the great majority of cases it is used either literally or figuratively of *first-fruits*, where, almost as a matter of course, a specifying genitive is added, as "the first fruits of thy corn," etc. Yet in this signification it can stand absolutely, as well as any other noun; e. g. "The oblation of the first fruits," Lev. 2: 12; "He provided the first part for himself," Deut. 33: 21; "For the first fruits, and for the tithes" (with the article), Neh. 12:

to assert, as we shall see under the word *created*, that God brought them into being by his creative power; and, as this was their beginning, so the act must necessarily have been *in the beginning*. *The heavens and the earth*. These words are to be understood, in their usual popular signification, of the whole material creation which comes under the observation of our senses. They commit the sacred record to no doctrine respecting the time when angelic beings were created.

It remains to consider the force of the word *created* (Heb. בָּרָא). Prof. Lewis has taken the position that this word never denotes *making something out of nothing*, but always *the fashioning of something which already exists*. On this point, his assertions are very explicit and abundant. "We do not at all deny," he says, "the fact of such creation out of nothing, but it is a metaphysical tenet, to which we are driven by the demands of the reason."¹ He fully admits that the material universe must have had its beginning in a primordial act of creation, but thinks that the beginning spoken of in the present verse was not the beginning of matter, but the beginning of the fashioning of matter.

"The language seems not to denote a separate primordial act, but to cover the whole process that follows. It suggests to us the fashioning of something which, as far as the material is concerned, is already in existence as the subject of the operation, or series of operations, afterwards described. The beginning, then, is the beginning of this fashioning."

He elsewhere suggests that the chaos described in the second verse (which he takes the liberty of transposing, and putting *before* instead of *after* the beginning) "may have been a rudimentary chaos, which had never yet assumed order—such as we may suppose to have been the condition of many an elemental world; or it may have been a chaos

44. In the sense of *beginning* it also naturally takes a specifying genitive; as, "In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim," etc., but here too it can stand absolutely. An example of crystalline clearness is Isa. 46. 10: מְבַרְרֵי מֵרֵאשִׁית אֶת־חַיְתָּוּתָם, "declaring from the beginning the end." There is no necessity, then, for departing from the simple and obvious construction of our version, and assuming here the construct state before the finite verb.

¹ Six Days of Creation, Chap. VI. p. 50.

² Ibid. pp. 45, 46.

to which some world or system had been reduced from some previously better state." ¹

In accordance with this idea of the Mosaic creation, he tells us that "the Hebrew word בָּרָא , rendered *create*, has nothing abstract or metaphysical about it. It is as clearly phenomenal as any word in the language. Its primary meaning is to *cut*, hence to *shave*, shape, form, fashion." He compares it with the German word *schaffen*, by which Luther translates the Hebrew word, without seeming to understand how completely this works against the theory he is maintaining. And he adds: "It is this idea of making, which consists in cutting, separation, and arrangement, by division of what previously exists in a confused and disorderly state, rather than a combining or a constructing of new and scattered elements."² Again: "It is the fashioning, constructing, forming, or making of something which already exists to be formed, fashioned, etc., and is brought into order through steps or degrees following each other in a regular methodical series."³ To crown all, he puts the Hebrew word בָּרָא (*create*) lower than יָצַר (*form*). After quoting Jer. 1: 5, "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee," he adds: "The word יָצַר , here employed, has more of the idea of fabrication, or direct workmanship, than either עָשָׂה (*make*) or בָּרָא ;" in evidence of which he quotes Ps. 94: 9. Gen. 2: 19. Amos 4: 13. Jer. 10: 16.⁴

The same views he reaffirms in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. In answer to Prof. Dana's question: "We would ask Prof. Lewis what Hebrew word he would substitute for the one used, that would convey the precise idea of creation out of nothing?" he answers: "There is no such Hebrew word or root; there is none such in the old Shemitic languages; and the reason is, there is no such idea (working at least) in the old Shemitic mind. The root *bara* is sometimes taken to denote the making of 'a new thing in the earth,' but it is ever as a new *thing*, not new *matter*."⁵

¹ Six Days of Creation, Chap. VII. pp. 57, 58. ² Ibid. Chap. VI. p. 48.

³ Ibid. p. 50.

⁴ Ibid. Chap. X. pp. 113, 114.

⁵ Vol. XIII. April, 1856, p. 475.

Such are his positions in regard to this most important word. Whether, now, we examine the true idea of God, as revealed in the Hebrew Scriptures, or the usage of the word אֱלֹהִים, we are, alike, conducted to very different results. We begin with the Hebrew idea of God, so far as it has a bearing on the present question.

The idea of creation, that is, the *origination of being*, is purely spiritual. We apprehend it, as Prof. Lewis justly maintains, not by scientific investigation and discovery, but by *faith*. It follows from this, that for receiving it our science gives us no advantage over Moses and the men of his day. The tendency of moral degradation is to stupefy alike the understanding and the conscience, and to obliterate all spiritual ideas. But such a result does not follow from the mere absence of scientific culture, although this latter was not wanting to Moses, a man "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." A sound, practical, believing spirit, such as was eminently characteristic of the Hebrew mind, is of more importance here than high attainments in science and philosophy. Prof. Lewis speaks of "the modern metaphysical sense of create, that is, of *making something out of nothing*," as "a metaphysical tenet, to which we are driven by the demands of reason."¹ That this "metaphysical sense of create" is not modern, can be easily shown. But we hold that the old Hebrew did not come at the idea of creation from nothing in any abstract metaphysical way, as a necessary postulate of reason, but by a shorter and simpler road — *faith in the true revelation which God himself had made of his own being and attributes*. Here it will be our privilege to draw arguments from that chapter of Prof. Lewis's book, in which he exposes, in a just and forcible way, the absurdity of ascribing the Mosaic cosmogony to the Egyptians and Phœnicians. In this chapter he shows how the pure and simple monotheism of the Hebrews stands forth, in the Mosaic record, in sharp contrast with all forms of *polytheism* and *pantheism*; and he might have added *dualism*, which is a mongrel com-

¹ Six Days of Creation, Chap. VI. p. 50.

pound of polytheism and pantheism. That there is *one absolute, self-existent, personal God*, this is the doctrine which constitutes the very soul and spirit of the Hebrew writers. Let us now consider what ideas are *immediately connected* with this doctrine; not what may be *derived* from it by abstract reasoning, but what lie, as it were, on its surface, so that he who holds the doctrine, must hold these ideas also.

God is a *personal* being. This view of his nature everywhere fills the sacred page; and it is utterly opposed to all pantheistic schemes of *emanation*, which are only the division and distribution of the original substance of Deity, to the absolute exclusion of creation. The Hebrew always thought of Jehovah as one indivisible, personal being. He never conceived of either matter or mind as *drawn out* of God's substance. He could only think of everything out of God as *called into being* by God's power, without any attempt to explain the mystery. On this point we need not dwell, since Prof. Lewis holds it as firmly as ourselves. To the Hebrew, the production of man's soul was not an emanation from God's substance. It was a downright creation out of nothing. It was the calling into being of a spirit, mysteriously united with "the dust of the earth," but not made out of it, as was the body it inhabited, nor out of anything else whatever in the universe. Here he had the idea of creation, in the strict sense of the word, and could have no difficulty in extending it to matter.

Again, God is *self-existent and absolute*. He exists in and of himself, and must therefore be eternal and independent in the highest conceivable sense of these words. And as a self-existent, eternal, and independent being, he is *absolute*; that is, his nature and attributes are *without any bounds*. His is not infinity in one direction, but in every direction; infinity in duration, in presence, in power, in wisdom, in knowledge, in holiness. He limits and controls all things, but is himself limited and controlled by nothing.¹ With this

¹ The existence of sin constitutes no exception. It only implies that God governs moral beings in accordance with the free nature which he has given them.

idea of God, the Hebrew Scriptures are filled to overflowing. When Sarah had smiled at the annunciation that she should bear a son in her old age, Jehovah rebuked her with the question: "Is anything too hard for the Lord?"¹ Her sin lay in limiting God's power. He will have her believe everything which he promises, without reasoning concerning his ability to do it, because he is God. The same view the Hebrew Scriptures give of all of God's attributes. They are, each and all together, without measure or end.

And this absolute, self-existent, personal God is *one*, and there is nothing else like him. There are finite persons, made in his image, and there is a finite, material world; but there is nothing like him in self-existence and absoluteness. The pure and absolute monotheism of the Hebrews is as much opposed to the idea of the eternal existence of *matter* out of God, as of *mind* out of God. Were anything, out of God, self-existent, it would be independent of God in its being and attributes. But the Hebrew conception, which fills the pages of the Old Testament, is, that every existence whatever, out of God, is absolutely at his disposal as the workmanship of his hands, so that he can do with it what he will. There is not, in the writings of Moses, any declaration that God is the Creator of angels. Yet how absurd to suppose that, if one of the patriarchs had been asked: "Are angels eternal?" he would have replied: "That is something of which I never thought; but now that I reflect, I do not think they are eternal." From his very conception of God, it followed, at once, that they are God's workmanship. In the same way, he must have thought of the material world. Not only did he not conceive of any substance out of God, whether matter or mind, as self-existent, and therefore coördinate with God in being (which would have been the *negative* state of non-reflection hinted at by Prof. Lewis),² but he *positively* conceived of it as called into being by God's fiat, and dependent, in its inmost essence, upon his absolute power. If the Hebrew did not speculate and spin subtle theories concerning the origin of matter and the formation of the world, as did

¹ Gen. 18: 14.

VOL. XIII. No. 52.

² Bib. Sacra for April, 1856, p. 475.

64

the heathen philosophers, it was because he had, in God's revelation, a perfect resting-place for his faith; and he needed not, like Noah's dove, to be continually flying to and fro, from one theory to another.

Thus, through faith in the true revelation which God has made of himself to men, and not by any abstract metaphysical reasoning, he came to hold, in a very clear and positive way, the doctrine that God is the *absolute* author of "the heavens and the earth."

In the Mosaic narrative, says Prof. Lewis, contrasting it with the heathen cosmogonies, "God is the supernatural cause, as well as the supernatural governor of nature."¹ Very correct. And is he not, we ask, represented as the supernatural cause, *without any reserve or limitation*? Was it possible for the Hebrew, with his conception of God's absoluteness, to stop short of the *matter* which underlies nature? All the heathen cosmogonists did this; and thus they made the *absolute Creator* of revelation only the first and greatest of *architects*; constructing the world out of preëxisting materials, just as we take clay, and water, and lime, and sand, and wood, and out of them fashion a house, making the best we can of materials furnished to hand, over whose nature we have no direct control. But this heathen idea was not simply *un-Hebraic*, it was *anti-Hebraic*. To the Hebrew, God was the *absolutely* supernatural cause of every jot and tittle that there is in nature; and this includes matter, the very substratum of nature.

We will bring this part of our discussion to a close by the examination of a passage which we find in the ninetieth Psalm, entitled, "A Prayer of Moses the man of God." In the second verse of this noble psalm, we read: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed² the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." These words assert the eternity of God, in the full and absolute sense, in contrast with the limited duration of the world.

¹ Six Days of Creation, Chap. XXII p. 287.

² Heb. בָּרָא . originally, *to bring forth*, Isa. 51: 2; then, by a natural transfer, *to bring into being*, Job 26: 13. Compare for the figure Job 38: 28, 29.

We care not how long a "*growth or genesis*" may be indicated by the words וַיִּבְרָא and וַיַּחַדְלֵם (though we think this is but straining a figure), the main point is, that Moses puts God's eternity before this growth absolutely; before the *whole work* of bringing them into being, and not merely the closing work, by which they were reduced to their present orderly state. However many ages may have elapsed after the primordial creation of matter, and through however many changes it may have passed before the six Mosaic days, Prof. Lewis justly holds that the entire process constitutes one grand whole;¹ and it must be this whole, and not the last part of it, that is set over against the absolute eternity of God.

It cannot be justly said, in answer to this, that neither Moses nor the men of his age ever once raised the question whether matter is or is not eternal, as Prof. Lewis seems to intimate in the words already quoted from the Bib. Sacra. This, besides being in itself altogether improbable and unsustained by a particle of proof, is contrary, as we have shown, to the *positive*, and not merely *negative* view of the Old Testament, which everywhere represents *all* finite being as the product of God's creative power, and, as such, subject, in its inmost essence, to his absolute control.

From the Old Testament, this idea of an absolute Creator, who is before nature and the author of nature, came down to the writers of the New Testament, who exhibit it in its purity. We will only consider the passage in Heb. 11: 3—"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." To change the original text, from $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\ \phi\alpha\iota\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon$, not from things that appear, to $\epsilon\kappa\ \mu\eta\ \phi\alpha\iota\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon$, from things that do not appear, things that are in their nature invisible, on the authority of the Syriac and Vulgate versions, without the warrant of a single Greek manuscript,

¹ "To God all his works must appear a totality, with none of those *discrete* degrees of cause and effect by which we are forced to measure, and even to conceive of, duration. In other words, the remotest natural effect (or *out-working*) is in the supernatural cause that originates the whole inseparable chain." *Six Days of Creation*, Chap. XIV. p. 167.

is uncritical. It is far more probable that the translators were influenced by their previously conceived views of its meaning, than that they took it from a text of which no trace is to be found. To suppose a *transposition*, not of the text, but of the sense, that is, that the former arrangement of the words (*μη̄ ἐκ φαινομένων*) is used for the latter (*ἐκ μη̄ φαινομένων*), is, to say the least, altogether arbitrary and unnecessary. Though it has the sanction of some high names, the names on the other side are more numerous, and no less high.¹ We adhere to the English version as correct, and we understand the writer as affirming that things seen² are the product of God's creative word, in opposition to the idea that they sprung³ from previous things that appeared, according to the heathen doctrine of an endless cycle of changes in nature, produced by powers lying wholly within herself. But we are willing to argue here *ex concessis*. According to Prof. Lewis's version: "So that what is seen, came into being from things that do not appear," it by no means follows that these things which do not appear, are "invisible, immaterial, vital powers, principles, laws, *σπερματικοὶ λόγοι*, spermatik words or ideas, call them what we will, which are themselves the first and immediate creations of the Divine word, going forth before any new agency of nature, whether the universal or any particular nature."⁴ Whether this Platonic idea of created immaterial and invisible principles, out of which come visible things, is in itself true or false, we shall not inquire here. It is enough to say that it does not suit the context here, and is, moreover, not a thing which we *understand by faith*, using the word faith, as does the apostle in this chapter, *in a religious sense*. Such a derivation of the seen from unseen created principles, is nowhere revealed in God's word as an object of faith. It may involve the exercise of a faith, but it is a faith resting upon the basis of speculative philosophy, not Scripture. Much more natural

¹ See De Wetto in loco.

² According to another reading, τὸ βλεπόμενον, *that which is seen*.

³ The original word is *γεγονέναι*, which denotes *coming into existence*, in the widest sense.

⁴ Six Days of Creation, Chap. XVIII. p. 224.

is Ebrard's interpretation. Agreeing with Prof. Lewis as to the rendering of the last clause, "so that what is seen is made of things unseen," but rejecting the Platonic idea as "heterogeneous, although an approximation to the truth," he says: "We are yet led, by the expression *word of God*, to think of the invisible creative powers which form, as it were, the import of his *word*."¹ According to this view, then, it is the invisible *creative* powers that lie in God's being, not the invisible *created* principles of Plato which God has put into nature, that constitute the *things unseen*. Thus we come, again, to the true idea of creation, by the power of God, out of no previously existing materials.

We come, now, to the philological argument. Here we begin by laying down three principles,—two of a general nature, and the third having special reference to the Hebrew language and its cognates.

1. All purely spiritual ideas are originally expressed by analogies drawn from the world of sense. Probably not an example can be found in any language of a word coined outright, to express such ideas as those now contained in the words *holiness, sin, regeneration, cause*, or this very idea of *creation*, now under consideration. It is not till the analogy is lost sight of, that they become, to our apprehension, simple spiritual terms. Here Prof. Lewis and ourselves are agreed. His "ineffable fact," standing behind all phenomena as their ground; his *νοούμενον*, "not a phenomenon, not a thing that appears, not a thing seen, not capable of being known by any of the senses, not imagined, or conceivable, but understood," is precisely the spiritual idea of which we are speaking, and which we are able to express only through an analogy drawn from the world of sense. Thus the Greek *ἀμαρτάνω*, to miss, as an arrow the mark, came naturally to signify to *sin*, which is a purely spiritual idea. This alone is sufficient to show the inconclusiveness of all that he says about the primary physical idea of *קָרַט*, to cut, hence to *shape*. What if it did, originally, mean to cut, how does this prove that it was not *trans-*

¹ Commentary on the Hebrews, in loco.

² Six Days of Creation, Chap. VI pp. 47, 48.

ferred to the idea of *creating*? According to his etymology, the German *schaffen* had, originally, a similar physical meaning. Yet it is, and has long been, used to *express* the "ineffable fact" of creation from nothing. Why should not the Hebrew word be so used?

2. What words, originally expressing *physical* ideas, are transferred in a given language to represent those which are *spiritual*, is a question of fact, to be determined by observation, and not by *a priori* reasoning. The transfer will always be natural, but different languages may employ different analogies, and the same language may have more analogies than one for the same general idea. The idea of *law*, as applied to moral beings, is purely spiritual. The Hebrew word הוֹרָה, from הוֹרָה, *to show, teach*, indicates law, as that which shows men their duty.¹ The Greek νόμος, from νέμω, *to deal out, assign*, indicates the same, as that which is assigned to each as duty. The Greek δεσμός, from τίθημι, *to put, lay down*, and the German Gesetz, from setzen, *to set, put*, denote law as something *laid down*, that is, established by authority.² Greek usage, again, has introduced distinctions between δεσμός and νόμος, that are to be learned from observation alone, and not from etymology.

The same variety of analogy prevails in respect to the modes of expressing the idea of *creation*. That the German *schaffen* is, in its origin, connected with *schaben, to shave*, we doubt not. But its more immediate connection seems to be with *schöpfen* (Heb. צָפַע, *to draw*, as water from a well; Greek, σκάπτω, *to scoop, to dig*; Eng. *to scoop*). The order of significations in *schöpfen*, is, *to scoop up*; *to draw*, as water; and then, by analogy, as we see in the derivatives *Schöpfer* and *Schöpfung*), *to draw out of nothing into being*, that is, *to create*. It is worthy of special notice, that the idea next underlying that of creation, in the strict sense of the word, is not that of simply *forming*, or of *separating*, but rather that

¹ But the more generic meaning of the root הוֹרָה is *to throw, or cast*; whence the different usages of the verb, *to lay foundations, to shoot, to show, to teach*.

² We omit the Latin *lex* (whence the English *law*, and the French *loi*), because its original meaning is a matter of dispute. But we prefer that of *laying down*. See Smith's Latin Dictionary.

of *bringing out*. We cannot express even "our modern metaphysical sense of *create*," without employing the word *out*, or its equivalent. It is "making something *out of* nothing;" nothing (in a *negative*, not in a *positive* sense) being, from the necessity of the case, considered as that *out of* which it is taken.

On the Latin *creo* we need not dwell. Its relation to *cresco*, and our *grow*, is obvious. The order of meanings is: *to cause to grow*; to cause to *spring forth*, as plants; then, *to make spring forth* into being. In this sense, whether used of *human* relations, which man can create, or of *Divine* operations, it wholly loses the idea of *growth* by the *gradual unfolding* of a germinant principle: e. g. "Duo consules creati sunt:" "Et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam."

With regard to אָרָא, though there is reason to think that it is nearly related to the English *bear*, and the Latin *fero*, *pario*, *paro*, and the numerous cognate words in our western languages, yet, with our present light, we are willing to accept the idea of *cutting*, as its radical signification. Then the order of ideas will be: *to cut*; *to carve or hew out*; then, by analogy, *to bring forth into being*.¹ And is not this as natural as either of the two previously named analogies?

3. In investigating the meaning which usage has given to verbs in the Hebrew language and its cognates, we must carefully distinguish between the different forms called *conjugations*, although this word very inadequately expresses their true nature.² In many cases their meanings are but distantly related, if at all.³ And where the etymological relation is clear, the ideas which usage has attached to them are often very different. One conjugation often retains the original physical idea, wholly or in part, while another has wholly lost it. Take, for example, the root אָרָא, which the lexicographers tell us means, originally, *to break*; hence, *to bend*,

¹ If we admit the opinion of some eminent philologists that κτίζω is related to κτάομαι, then its primitive meaning is not *to found*, but *to get, to bring into one's possession*, as wild land. See Rost's Greek Lexicon. However this may be, we are inclined to think that the idea of *creation* comes from that of *founding*.

² The Hebrew term בְּנֵי־יָד, *buildings*, that is, *formations*, is more appropriate.

³ As the Hiphil of this very word, which means *to fatten*.

as the knee. In Kal, with the exception of the passive participle, it signifies *to kneel*; in Hiphil, *to cause to kneel*, as camels. But in Piel, the meaning is, *to bless*, as God men, and as men God or their fellows. The original connection between the two ideas of *kneeling* and *blessing* it is not hard to show; but the former is wholly lost in Piel, as also in Niphil and Hithpael. Another familiar example is that of *קָיָה*, which in Kal and Piel means *to expect, wait for*, but in Niphil, *to be gathered together*. We need not pursue this subject further. Enough has been said to show that in reasoning from the meaning of one conjugation to that of another, etymology alone is no adequate guide. We must inquire what ideas usage has attached to each. Etymology is a good servant, but a bad master. He who mounts this Pegasus, must keep it under bit and bridle, else it will run away with him, and land him in a limbo of absurdities.

We are now prepared to examine, by the light of the above principles, the meaning which usage has attached to the verb *קָרָא*, in its different forms, omitting, as wholly irrelevant, the Hiphil conjugation, which signifies *to fatten*.

It is used in Piel *five* times, always of *human* operations.

It is used in Kal and its passive Niphil, *forty-eight* times, always of *Divine* operations.

We begin with Piel. Here the idea of *hewing*, with various modifications, suits every passage: Josh. 17:15, "Get thee up to the wood, and hew out for thyself there (*וַיִּבְרָאָהוּ לָהּ מָקוֹם*); that is, hew out for thyself a place there. So also in the 18th verse: "And thou shalt hew it out" (*וַיִּבְרָאָהוּ*). After an interval of about eight hundred and fifty years, the word appears again in Ezekiel, 23: 47, "And the company shall stone them with stones and hew (*וַיִּבְרָאָהוּ*) them with their swords." The two remaining cases occur in 21: 19 (Heb. 21: 24); and here the idea of *cutting*, or *graving out* is appropriate: "And, thou son of man, set thee two ways;" that is, represent them to the people, whether actually on a tablet, or in prophetic vision, "that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: from one land shall they both come forth: and

cut a hand;" that is, either make a finger-post, or, according to others, grave a place; "at the head of the way to the city cut it;" that is, at the head of the road to Jerusalem, where it leaves that leading to Rabbath Ammon. We notice that here, as in some other cases, the Piel conjugation retains the *original physical* sense, which in the other conjugations is wholly lost.¹ Compare Roediger's Gesen. Heb. Gram. § 51. 2.

We come now to Kal and its passive Niphal. Here we find no trace of the original physical idea. In every case the word is used of *bringing into being by Divine power*. This definition consists of two parts: first, *bringing into being*. We do not say that it always means bringing *substance* into being from nothing. That which is created may be a miraculous *event*, as in Num. 16: 30, "If the Lord create a creation;" but in all cases something is produced that did not exist before.

But this does not constitute creation. So far as the outward form is concerned, man can produce many new things. When the potter moulds clay into a vessel, he produces a new form of matter. But he exerts no immediate and independent power upon matter. He works through its laws, not above and beyond them; and when his vessel is completed, there is nothing whatever new, except only another arrangement of old materials, through old powers and properties. Not so when our Saviour changed water into wine, and called Lazarus from the grave; or when God made plants and animals; or when he now regenerates men. Here is the *bringing into* material nature and the created spiritual world, of a power *without* both, *above* both, and the *author* of both. This is what we mean by *Divine* power; that is, power which is in its *quality* creative; for it is the quality of the power exercised, and not its mere product in time, to which we must have regard. When God destroyed

¹ In rendering the above passages the ancient versions vary greatly. In Joshua, the Targum of Jonathan has *prepare*; the Syriac, *choose*; the Arabic, in v. 15, *clear*, in v. 18, *choose*; the Seventy, *clear*; the Vulgate, *cut down*. In Ezek. 23: 47, the Syriac has *smite*; all the rest, *pierce*. In Ezek. 21: 19 (Heb. 21: 24) the renderings are still more various.

Korah and his company, he is said to have *created a creation*; that is, created a new thing. That any new *substance* was produced in nature, we have no reason to believe. But there was the exertion upon nature of a power wholly without and above nature;¹ the very power that produced nature; and this made it an act of creation, in the proper sense of the word.

Our proofs that this is the proper meaning of *בָּרָא* and its passive *נִבְרָא*, are few and simple.

First, it cannot be by accident that these forms of the verb, so abundantly used, are *never once applied to human operations*. The only explanation is, that they express the exercise of an incommunicable Divine prerogative. This cannot lie in any separating, rearranging, and fashioning of old materials. Such a fashioning may often be the *result* of creative power, but it is not itself creation. This word always carries the idea of a divine energy above nature. It is worthy of special notice that while such words as *עָשָׂה*, to *make*, and *יָצַר*, to *form*, are often used instead of *בָּרָא*, this latter is never once used in their stead. The reason of this is obvious. Divine power covers the whole field of human operations. Sin only excepted, there is no sphere of action peculiar to man, and needing its terms of merely human application. But human power does not cover the whole field of Divine operations. God has his own incommunicable sphere of activity, and, to the expression of this, the Hebrew forms under consideration are consecrated. In this respect, the Hebrew *בָּרָא* is higher and more sacred not only than the words *עָשָׂה* and *יָצַר*, but also than our modern word *create*, which we apply to human operations also.

Secondly, the idea above given is appropriate to all the cases where *בָּרָא* and its passive *נִבְרָא* are used, which is not true of any other definition, as will now be shown. To avoid misapprehension, however, we wish here to remark that the Hebrew's conception of creation, as of all God's works, is preëminently *phenomenal*. We agree with Prof. Lewis that he takes the effects, which offer themselves to his senses, and

¹ For Moses certainly did not represent this as an earthquake produced by natural causes.

ascribes them directly to God as their author, without raising any scientific questions respecting them. And this is philosophically correct. For let us take Prof. Lewis's formula :

$$P, p^1, p^2, p^3, p^4, p^5 \dots p^r \dots X;$$

in which P represents the phenomenon that offers itself directly to the senses ; p^1, p^2 , etc., the series of second causes lying back of it, to X , the immediate creative act of God ; and, to take a particular case, let P be the going back of the Red Sea by a strong east wind. It mattered not, to the Hebrew, whether God created this wind directly, or whether his miraculous act lay back of the wind, one, two, three, or more stages. Of such a hidden series of second causes (if it actually existed) he could know nothing. In simply referring the wind to God's power, his faith was truth, and not delusion. With this explanation, we affirm that the idea of the word under consideration is always that of *bringing into being by Divine power*.

We give the following synoptical view of the passages in which אָרָץ or אֶרֶץ occurs. It is used,

I. *Of the original creation* : 1. of the world generally, or parts of it : Gen. 1:1. 1: 21. 2: 3. 2: 4. Ps. 89: 13 (Eng. version, 89: 12). 148: 5. Isa. 40: 26. 40: 28. 42: 5. 45: 18 (*bis*). Amos 4: 13. Here we would also place Isa. 45: 7 (*bis*) ; making fourteen times in all. 2. Of rational man : Gen. 1: 27 (*ter*). 5: 1. 5: 2 (*bis*). 6: 7. Deut. 4: 32. Isa. 45: 12. Eccl. 12: 1. Mal. 2: 10. Here also we may conveniently place Ps. 89: 48 (Eng. version, 89: 47) ; twelve times.

II. *Of a subsequent creation* : 1. Of the successive generations of men : Ps. 102: 19 (Eng. version, 102: 18) ; and of animal beings, Ps. 104: 30. 2. Of nations under the figure of individuals : Ezek. 21: 35 (Eng. version, 21: 30). 28: 13. 28: 15 ; three times, in Ezekiel only. 3. Of particular men, as the instruments of God's purposes : Isa. 54: 16 (*bis*). 4. Of miraculous events : Ex. 34: 10. Num. 16: 30. Jer. 31: 22. 5. Of events foretold in prophecy : Isa. 48: 7.

III. *Of creation in a moral sense* : 1. Of a clean heart and

holy affections and actions: Ps. 51: 12 (Eng. version, 51: 10). Isa. 45: 8. 57: 19. 2. Of Israel as God's covenant people, or of a member of Israel: Isa. 43: 1. 43: 7. 43: 15. 3. Of a new and glorious order of things for Israel and in Israel: Isa. 4: 5. 41: 20. 65: 17. 65: 18 (*bis*).

An examination of the above passages (half of which relate to the original creation) will show that in every instance the idea is that of bringing into being by Divine power. Whether that which is created is new matter, or something else that is new, must be determined by the context. We add a few remarks on particular passages.

Very noticeable is Gen. 2: 3: "Which God created to make" (אֲדָרָא בְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְעָשׂוֹר). It represents the *making* as a product of *creating*, and clearly distinguishes between the two ideas.

The passage Isa. 45: 7: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil," represents God as the absolute author and controller of nature and of providence. It belongs, therefore, partly at least, to the head of "original creation."

Of the passages under II. 1, we simply remark that the Hebrew always conceives of *life*, whether animal or rational, as the product of God's creative power, without occupying himself with any theory respecting the traduction of souls by natural generation. Such is preëminently the representation in Ps. 104: 30: "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit; they are created." Here we have the same life-giving Spirit that originally created the various races of living beings.

Gesenius's definition of בָּרָא here, and in the passages of Ezekiel, "*to be born*," is wholly unwarranted. In Scripture, a *birth* always implies the *creation* of a living soul.¹

Peculiar to Isaiah is the application of the word to Israel as God's people in a special sense, and constituted such by the exercise of his Divine power and sovereignty; and to the renovation of heaven and earth for Israel. Though this usage

¹ "According to the doctrine of Scripture, all life, not only that which is intellectual and spiritual, but that which is physical also, is from God, the fountain of life."—Hengstenberg on Ps. 104: 30.

is in a sense figurative, it still retains the essential idea of something produced by the exercise of that incommunicable power by which God called the world into being. In not a single one of all the above cases is *בָּרָא* "the fashioning, constructing, forming, or making of something which already exists to be formed, fashioned, etc.," according to Prof. Lewis's definition of the word.

We bring this discussion to a close by repeating the words of the Psalmist, Ps. 148: 5, "He *commanded* and they were created." Bringing into being by an act of the Divine will — this is *creation*.

The relation of the first verse to the subsequent narrative, will be given in connection with the interpretation of the second verse.

V. 2. And the earth was empty and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God was hovering upon the face of the waters.

Empty and void (*תוהו ובוהו*). The word *תוהו* is of pretty frequent occurrence. It always denotes *nothingness* or *vanity*, generally in a moral sense, but sometimes, as here, in a physical. In the latter case, the idea is always that of emptiness: "He stretcheth the north upon emptiness (*בְּלִי-תוהו*); he hangeth the earth upon nothing."¹ "And he causeth them to wander in emptiness (*בְּתוהו*), where there is no way."² The idea of *formlessness*, though implied, is not directly expressed. The other word occurs in but two other passages, where, as here, it is joined with *תוהו*. One of these (Jer. 4: 23) being copied from the present, gives us no new light respecting its meaning. From the other passage (Isa. 34: 11—"He shall stretch out upon it the line of emptiness and the plummet of nothingness"), we infer that it is of similar signification, and is added for the sake of intensity, the two words in the original making a complete rhyme.

The deep (*תְּהוֹמוֹת*) must be the abyss of waters that covered the whole earth. The word is of very frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Scriptures, and never has any other signification.

¹ Job 26: 7.

² Job 12: 24. Ps. 107: 40.

To make *the deep* and *the waters* a limitless mass of gaseous elements, is to force upon them a meaning which they will not bear. The waters of this verse are manifestly the waters which are *divided*, in vs. 6 and 7, and *gathered into one place*, in v. 9. The geological hypotheses relating to this and the six following verses, will be noticed in a subsequent Article.

And the Spirit of God was hovering, or, was brooding. The word rendered *hovering*, occurs in Deut. 32: 11, where our translators have used the word *fluttering*, after the Latin *volitans*. Whether we assign to it the idea of *brooding*¹ or of *hovering*, it indicates the active operation of God's Spirit upon the unformed mass. He was at work preparing it for its future orderly arrangement. This certainly excludes the idea of a momentary or brief state of the earth. Whatever theory of the six days we adopt, we must admit that the so-called chaotic period was one of indefinite extent.

It remains to consider the relation of this verse to the preceding. Prof. Lewis renders: *For the earth was without form, etc.*, and explains the force of *for*, which he has substituted for *and*, thus: "*In the beginning God created, that is, fashioned, formed, reduced to order. And why? Because the earth, which was to be created, was then without form and void. It was a fit subject for such a process.*"² This is wholly arbitrary and ungrammatical. The conjunction \imath never has, in itself, the signification of *for*, any more than of *but*, *therefore*, etc. If, in rendering, we substitute one of these words for it, it is because we wish to indicate the connection more definitely than the Hebrew has done. But this connection we never learn from the \imath alone, which still means *and*. It must be manifest, from the nature of the clause and its relation to the preceding, *even when the*

¹ As Milton, in a beautiful figure suggested by this passage.

"Thou from the first
Wast present, and with might wings outspread,
Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,
And mad'st it pregnant."

Basil, long before, in his second homily on the Six Days, had developed the same idea.

² Six Days of Creation, Chap. VII. p. 56.

word "and" is retained. This is the decisive test. We sub-join some examples:— "Let them curse, *and* do thou bless;"¹ that is, as every one sees: "Let them curse, *but* do thou bless." "How excellent is thy loving-kindness, O God! *and* the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings;"² where our translators have put *therefore* for *and*. "Behold! thou art a dead man, because of the woman whom thou hast taken, *and* she is a man's wife;"³ that is, "and, at the same time, she is a man's wife;" where our idiom naturally substitutes *for*. It is only before such *causal* clauses that we can put *for* instead of *and*.⁴ When the Hebrew wishes to indicate causality in a direct way, it uses וְ. Arbitrarily to substitute *for* instead of *and*, is to reduce the Hebrew language to the very chaos described in the present verse. In the words: "And the earth was empty and void," we have an indication of *sequence*, but none whatever of *causality*. We must insist, therefore, upon restoring the word *and* to its lawful place.

We understand, then, the first verse as affirming the creation of heaven and earth, in respect to their elements or matter; and the second, as describing the condition of these elements, in relation to the earth, before the six days' work that followed. If one object to this view that the formation of the heavens was the work of the second day, we answer: This is bringing into the Hebrew Scriptures a subtilty to which they are strangers. It was the heavens and the earth in an unformed state, which God created in the beginning. We close our discussion of this verse with the following pertinent remarks of Tuch. After a statement of the true idea of אֶרֶץ, as that of creation out of nothing (Schöpfung aus Nichts), he adds:

"But more decisive is the connection in which אֶרֶץ stands. For, when it is said: 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth; the earth was waste and empty; darkness covered the waters,' etc.; what can this mean, except: God

¹ Ps. 109: 28.

² Ps. 36: 8 (English version, 36: 7).

³ Gen. 20: 3.

⁴ See Ges. Heb. Lex. Art. * (4), where, however, some of his examples are irrelevant.

created, in the beginning of the creation, as the first act of the same, the matter (Stoff) of heaven and earth, yet unseparated and unarranged; to separate, arrange and fashion which, was the well-ordered work of the six days of creation. To hold this conclusion as erroneous (as do Buttmann and others), is so much the more impossible, because the second verse decidedly continues the narration; so that ver. 1 cannot be a superscription which prefixes to the narrative a summary view of the whole. God accordingly remains Creator of this matter; and, although the Hebrew theory of creation, like other cosmogonies, certainly places a chaos at the head, it yet presents an essential difference in this respect, that it does not make the chaotic matter coördinate with the Deity as eternal, but strictly subordinates it to the one only eternal and self-existent God.”¹

V. 3. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light.

“He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” — this is the idea that fills this narrative. Everything is referred to the creative will of God. Darkness covered the deep: God commanded, and light shone upon the deep. Whether it was now, for the first time, created in its essence, by his will; or whether, by his will, it now began to shine upon the face of the earth, the sacred record does not determine. See our remarks, p. 763.

V. 4. And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided between the light and the darkness.

God saw . . . that it was good. These words, so often repeated in the course of the narrative, express, after the manner of human conception, God's complacency in every part of his work. What was the division which God made between the light and the darkness, we learn from the next verse. It was that of day and night.

¹ Tuch, Kommentar über die Genesis, in loco.

V. 5. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night : and there was evening, and there was morning, one day.

God called the light Day, the darkness Night; the firmament, Heavens; the dry land, Earth; the collection of waters, Seas; and our first parents, Adam, that is, Man. He brought to Adam the lower animals, "to see what he would call them." Adam gave names to them all, and his wife he called Woman, and Eve. The bare perusal of this catalogue of names is sufficient to show that they are all to be taken in their literal and ordinary sense. They are the current names of well known objects. The Day and Night here spoken of can be no other than the alternate periods of light and darkness to which we now give these names.

In what sense did God give these names? It is commonly answered: In his Divine purpose.¹ When he made the objects, he appointed them to bear these names, when man should be created and endowed with the gift of speech. But when we consider how conspicuous a place the giving of names holds in this brief narrative, and especially the fact that God himself assigns some of them, and lays upon Adam the work of assigning others, it seems as if something more were intended. We find Adam, from the beginning, in the possession of language, and holding converse with his Maker. This implies that God did not wait for him to develop speech by the unaided exercise of his faculties, but communicated it to him directly, in its elements at least, as a necessary gift. Why may we not, then, suppose that these are among the names which God, in some way, taught Adam? That they are mentioned before his formation, creates no real difficulty. This is a natural anticipation. Besides, the objection lies, with equal force, against every other hypothesis. All the names assigned seem to be significant of qualities, as רָעַף, *high*, exactly like the English *heaven*, and the German *Luft*.

And there was evening, and there was morning, one day. The exactly literal rendering of the original is: *And evening was,*

¹ Compare Eph. 1: 4.

and morning was, one day. All the nouns are without the article, and should be so translated. There is no necessity for taking אֶחָד (*one*) in the sense of רִאשׁוֹן (*first*). It has its proper cardinal signification, thus: "There was evening, and there was morning, one day;" "There was evening, and there was morning, a second day;" and so on to the sixth day, where the article is used emphatically. The meaning of these words cannot be simply: "Evening and morning were one day;" that is, *made* one day. If the verb הָיָה had no other office than that of the logical copula, its repetition would be altogether without precedent or explanation. It is manifest that the writer means to affirm, separately, the existence of evening and of morning. Nor is it congruous to translate: "There was evening, and there was morning, *on* one day." The best explanation is that which takes the words "one day" as standing in a sort of apposition to the preceding; so that the whole is an abbreviated expression for: "There was evening, and there was morning; and these were one day." So the Seventy: καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα, καὶ ἐγένετο πρωΐ, ἡμέρα μία. In this formula, six times repeated, the evening, as introducing the night, and the morning as introducing the day, represent the night and the day themselves; and this is applied, for the sake of uniformity, to the first night—the darkness described in ver. 2.—although this, being preceded by no day, had, properly speaking, no evening.

The question of main interest in this formula respects the meaning of the word *day*. That the Hebrew יוֹם is often used for a period of indefinite extent, is undeniable. But so also are the corresponding words in other languages.¹ We must admit, however, that, in Hebrew usage, this indefinite application of the word is more common. The argument from this source goes so far as to allow the word to be taken in an extended sense when the context plainly requires it; as in oh. 2: 4, but not arbitrarily. For the literal understanding

¹ Compare the Greek δούλιον ἡμῶν; the Latin, *dies doceret*; and the English, *A useful man in his day*.

of the word, it has been urged that, in the first clause of the verse, it must be taken literally. But this argument is not decisive; since, upon any interpretation, the meaning of יָמֵי in the two clauses is undeniably different. In the first, it excludes the evening; in the second, it includes it. In such a case, mere juxtaposition is of no account.¹ The true difficulty is the emphatic ascription to each day of an evening and a morning. This, in our view, forbids us to understand these days *immediately* in the sense of indefinite periods of time. We cannot think that this difficulty is fully met by assigning to the words *evening* and *morning* a purely metaphorical sense, as is done by Prof. Lewis and others. That the difficulties in the way of compressing the whole work of creation into six literal days, of twenty-four hours each, are insuperable, we most firmly believe. We think, however, that the solution is to be found, not in forcing upon the word יָמֵי the meaning of *indefinite time*, limited as it is by the ascription to it of an evening and a morning, but rather in *the analogy of prophecy*, which employs the common designations of time, such as *day*, *week*, *month*, to *symbolize* higher periods. This subject we reserve for fuller consideration in a subsequent Article.

Vs. 6—8. And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters: And let it divide between waters and waters. And God made the firmament, and divided between the waters which were below the firmament, and the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven: And there was evening, and there was morning, a second day.

The Heb. קַיִן originally signified something *beat out*, as a metallic plate. Hence it came to be used for the blue expanse of heaven, which is spread out over our heads. What was the exact conception of the Hebrews respecting its nature, or whether they had any such conception, we cannot say. The words of Elihu to Job: "Canst thou, with him, spread out the skies strong, like a molten mirror?"² are not to be taken as a philosophical account of their substance. They

¹ Compare Zech. 14: 6—8.

² Job 37: 18.

simply convey the idea of their *stability* (compare the Greek *στερέωμα*, and the Latin *firmamentum*) and their *splendor*. In this azure vault God has placed the heavenly bodies, vs. 14, 17; the fowls fly above the earth, on its face; that is, along under it, as if skimming its surface, ver. 20; and it constitutes a permanent division between the waters above and below itself (Heb. וַיְיָדֵי טַבְרָיִל, *and let it be dividing*, where the participle denotes continued action). The waters under the firmament, are those on the earth's surface. The waters above the firmament are not, directly, the clouds; but rather that invisible storehouse of waters whence the clouds are, from age to age, supplied. The idea of water rising from the earth in the shape of mist,¹ and perhaps of clouds also,² was familiar to the Hebrews; but this belonged to the waters *under* the firmament. Though we need not take the word *windows*, in the account of the deluge,³ in a literal sense, it is still certain that the forty days' rain is represented as coming from the waters *above* the firmament, described in the present passage. And it is in the same waters that God "layeth the beams of his chambers;" that is, his heavenly palace.⁴

Such seems to be the representation of the sacred writer. And now what is there in this at which modern science can justly take offence? Is it that he describes the firmament as an outspread vault, in which are placed the sun, moon, and stars? This is spoken according to appearance, just as we continue to speak of the sun as rising and setting, although we have learned that his motion exists only to our senses. Is it that he places an inexhaustible reservoir of water above our heads? That God has such a reservoir there, is certain; for he has been pouring down rain from it for six thousand years, and yet it is not spent. Whether all the waters of this reservoir were laid up at the beginning, or

¹ Gen. 2: 6.

² 1 Kings 18: 44, where, however, the original words: מֵהַיָּם אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם, *ascending from the sea*, do not necessarily mean anything more than *coming up from the sea* upon the land.

³ Gen. 7: 11. 8: 2.

⁴ Ps. 104: 3.

whether he is continually supplying them anew, and how this supply is effected — these are questions for science, with which the inspired penman does not concern himself; nor is it necessary to suppose that he had any exact ideas on the subject. But why, it may be asked, did he not speak of this storehouse of waters as diffused *through* the firmament, instead of placing it *above* it? We answer: This would have been to convert the *firmament* of sense into the *atmosphere* of science, and phenomenon into natural philosophy; which, doubtless, God could have done, but did not see fit to do. The essential facts represented by placing these waters *above* the firmament, are: that they are invisible to our senses; that the firmament sustains them in their place above the earth, so that they are kept separate from the waters on its surface; and that from them an inexhaustible supply of rain is furnished. These facts remain valid for all ages and for all stages of science. Science resolves the star-spangled *vault* of heaven into an *atmosphere*. Thus it ceases to be at any definite distance above the earth. It is no more forty miles above it, than it is forty rods. Hence, as Prof. Turner remarks, these waters may still be said, in popular language, “to be *above* the firmament, although at no very great elevation from the earth, because above that part of it in which birds usually fly.”¹ This is one of the many instances where science furnishes its own adjustment to unscientific phenomenal language.

Vs. 9, 10. And God said, Let the waters be gathered together from under the heavens unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas; and God saw that it was good.

From under the heavens (Heb. מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם); that is, from being spread abroad under the whole heavens. There is no necessity for taking מִתַּחַת in the sense of לְמַעַל. *Unto one place*. The meaning is not that there shall be one sea, in opposition to many (for the gathering together of the wa-

¹ Turner on Genesis, Note (7), p. 133, where he answers Pfciffer's objections to this view.

ters is called *Seas*); but that the sea shall occupy one place, and the dry land another; in other words, that each shall have its own separate place. This part of the narrative needs no further grammatical elucidation. It has a most important bearing on the question of the *time* occupied by these Mosaic days, which will be considered hereafter.

Vs. 11—13. And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit-tree bearing fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, whose seed is in itself, after its kind: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening, and there was morning, a third day.

Here begins a new order of things, the product of God's creative power, in the highest sense of the words. Hitherto, all has been dead matter. Now, by the fiat of the Almighty, the earth, which has been separated from the waters, is clothed with vegetable life. The sacred writer divides the vegetable kingdom into three classes: *קָדָה*, *tender grass*, for the use of cattle, where the seed does not come into account; *עֵשֶׂב בְּזֵרֵי זֶרַע*, *herb yielding seed*, such as the different grains and pulse, where the seed is the most important part; and *עֵץ פְּרִי נֹשֵׂא פֶרִי*, *fruit-tree bearing fruit*. The fruit he again distinguishes from the seeds of herbs by the addition *אֲשֶׁר זֶרְעוֹ בּוֹ*, *whose seed is in itself*; for here it is neither the green herbage, nor the seed, but the fruit enveloping the seed, that comes into account. This is to be regarded as a popular division, in reference to the wants of men and animals, and not an exhaustive scientific division. The words *עַל-הָאָרֶץ*, *upon the earth*, refer to the *fruit-tree*, with its enumerated properties; and they indicate its permanency, as standing upon the earth from year to year.

The word *אֲחֵרָיו*, *after its kind*, is connected, in the 11th verse, with the fruit-tree alone; but, in the 12th verse, with the herb also; and is manifestly to be understood as indicating the universal law of the vegetable world, as it does af-

¹ Not *עֵשֶׂב בְּזֵרֵי זֶרַע* in construction, *βοτάνην χότρον*, Sept.; that is, *green herbage of plants*, contrary to the Masoretic accents. This impedes, instead of facilitating, the sense.

terwards that of the animal. The primitive Divine plan for all organic life, written as with a sun-beam upon the face of the Mosaic narrative, is that of *species* produced at their beginning by God's creative power, and each propagating itself *after its kind*. In this respect, the harmony between revelation and science is absolute. Every tree, every plant, every fern, every sea-weed ; every beast, bird, fish, insect, is found to be *after its kind*. Many species are capable of *variation*, within certain limits ; but no such thing exists in nature as the *transmutation* of one species into another, or the permanent confusion of species by hybrid mixtures.¹

The theory of original *panzoic germs*, possessed of unlimited "elasticity and adaptability," and capable of taking upon themselves new forms and characters, according to the outward conditions to which they are subjected ; so that from them have come, by an endless series of metamorphoses, all the protean forms of living things that now occupy the earth, or have occupied it in past ages, man himself included, — this "development theory," we may safely turn over to the hands of such men as Hugh Miller and Charles Lyell, contenting ourselves with the unequivocal testimony of both Scripture and science, that sea-weeds were originally made sea-weeds, and trees, trees, *after their kind*.²

There is another point, on which we wish to add a few words. When Moses represents the earth as *bringing forth*, at God's command, grass, herbs and trees *after their kind*, it is manifest that his design is not to describe the particular

¹ For a good summary of the results of science on this point, we would refer the reader to the last edition of Lyell's Elements of Geology, Chapters XXXIII. to XXXVI. inclusive. The testimony of Lyell is the more valuable, because it is altogether independent of theological questions, and rests upon purely scientific grounds.

² Prof Lewis rejects as atheism "a development theory which has no divine origination;" and adds that one "which acknowledges only one divine origination, and this from the logical necessity of getting a starting-point for physical speculation, is as near to atheism as it can be." But he thinks that "a development theory in the sense of species from species, as well as individual from individual," by repeated "Divine interpositions," "may be as pious as any other." (Six Days of Creation. Chap. XVII. p. 215.) That it may be so *per se* we do not doubt. But it is a hypothesis which has neither Scripture nor science in its favor.

manner in which the first plants of each species were formed, but rather to state *the laws of the vegetable world*, established by God when he called it into being, and remaining valid through its whole duration. It is the plan of vegetable life, with its different "typical forms," which we of the present day see operating before our eyes — the earth bringing forth plants, which have their roots fixed in its soil and a nature adapted to its nature, so that they draw their nourishment from it — it is this plan which he sets forth as the product of creative power. When, leaving this idea, we fall upon the question *how* the first individual plants were brought into being — whether, for example, they were created outright in full maturity; or whether their embryo germs were created in the earth; or whether, according to the opinion of Prof. Lewis, the creation consisted of "seminal principles," lying back of all outward organization — we travel out of the record, and are no longer upon the field of revelation, but upon that of human speculation. One opinion may be more probable than another; but it is still only an opinion, and not an interpretation of the Mosaic narrative. Created life is the mystery of mysteries. We naturally conceive of it as an invisible formative power, manifesting itself in and through visible material organizations. And since these organizations have their different specific forms and properties, which are incapable of being permanently confounded with each other, we justly assume original differences in their "seminal principles;" in other words, that all living things are, not in outward form alone, but also in inward essence, each *after its kind*. To suppose that life consists in any juxtaposition and arrangement of the original atoms of matter, is sheer materialism. But who shall say, on the other hand, that it existed, in its beginning, a single moment, without connection with matter, or without putting forth its formative powers upon matter? Who shall presume to tell how the great Creator constituted its connection with matter? Was it by creating it in matter, in a local sense, and leaving it to draw to itself and arrange its atoms, one by one? Or did he create the life and its organized material body

(whether in an embryo or a perfect state) together? When we attempt to answer these questions, "we cannot order our speech by reason of darkness." We follow up the stream of life a little way, to the thick darkness where God is; and there we can only put off our shoes from our feet, and worship him that liveth forever and ever, out of whose unseen bosom have sprung all these wondrous forms of living beauty.

The only passage which seems to describe the manner in which the first plants were formed is Gen. 2: 5, rendered, in our version: "And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew." But it is generally agreed, among Hebrew scholars, that the right translation is: "And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field yet grew," as the Syriac has it. Compare, for this use of the participle *טָרָם*, Ex. 10: 7, "Dost thou not yet know (*הֲטָרָם תֵּדָע*) that Egypt is destroyed?" Also Josh. 2: 8, "And they had not yet lain down (*וְהָטָרָם יִשְׁכְּבוּן*), and the woman went up to them upon the roof." Similar cases are 1 Sam. 3: 3. Isa. 65: 24.¹

We have one more remark to offer, which applies alike to the animal and vegetable kingdoms. No man acquainted with the facts of geology, will venture to deny that not only many species of plants and animals, but many genera, and even entire orders, flourished during their appointed day, long before the creation of man, and then became extinct,

¹ The proper meaning of *טָרָם* is, *not yet*, Lat. *nondum*; and of *בְּטָרָם*, *while not yet*, that is, *before*, as, *בְּטָרָם אָמַרְהוּ*, *while I shall not yet die*, i. e. *before I die*, Gen. 27: 4. By a sort of breviloquence *טָרָם* is used three times for *בְּטָרָם*; twice before the second of two verbs immediately connected with each other in the true order of time, thus: "And the people took their dough before it was leavened (*וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת הַלֶּחֶם בְּטָרָם*)" Ex. 12: 34. Had the second action been named first, it would have stood thus, with the insertion of a *ו*: "And their dough had not yet been leavened (*וְהָטָרָם יִקְחוּ אֶת הַלֶּחֶם*), and the people took it;" precisely as in the example already given, Josh. 2: 8. So also Josh. 3: 1. The only case of *טָרָם* in the sense of *before*, where the second verb in the order of time stands first, is Ps. 119: 67: "Before I was afflicted (*בְּטָרָם אָעִיַּב*) I went astray," which seems to be a simple inversion of the two clauses. In the passage in question, Gen. 2: 5, we follow De Wette and Tuch in rendering vs. 4 and 5, thus: "These [that follow] are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created. In the day when Jehovah God made earth and heaven, then no plant of the field was yet in the earth," etc.

while new species, genera, and orders took their place. Now this is entirely consistent with the Mosaic narrative, which asserts only the establishment of the vegetable kingdom, with its laws, on the third day, leaving us at full liberty to believe, if we shall find evidence for so doing, that old forms of vegetable life gave place, from time to time, to new forms, better adapted, we may suppose, to the altered physical state of the globe. This, however, does not imply any transmutation of old species into new, by the operation of nature herself. Until man, the crowning work of God, was made, creation was not finished, and he might *continue to unfold* his plan of vegetable life, according to its original and immutable laws, while he added that of animal life, in its several departments, on the fifth and sixth days. The same remark holds good of the *fifth* day's work as related to that of the *sixth*.

Vs. 14—16. And God said: Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens, to divide between the day and the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years. And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made the two great lights; the greater light for the dominion of the day, and the less light for the dominion of the night; and the stars. And God placed them in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide between the light and the darkness: and God saw that it was good. And there was evening, and there was morning, a fourth day.

Let there be lights. The word in the original is *מאורות*, *luminaries*, different from the word *אור*, *light*, in its substance, which is used in vs. 3—5. We may, however, retain the Saxon word *lights*, in the sense of *luminaries*, as this is good usage, and occasions no ambiguity.

In the firmament of the heavens. As the writer is giving an account of the formation of the earth, it is generally agreed that he takes the position of a spectator on its surface, and describes things according to their appearances from that point of view. On the fourth day, God places the heavenly bodies in the firmament. Whether they were then created materially, or whether, by a change in the constitution of the atmosphere, or by some other unknown operation

they were caused to appear for the first time on that day, is a scientific question back of the immediate phenomena, while it is to these latter that Moses restricts himself, always ascribing them to God's creative power.¹ The heavenly bodies are made, to him, when they are made to the earth; that is, when they first appear as recognizable objects. The diffused light of the first day may have proceeded from the sun, and this luminary may have been continually exerting an influence upon the earth; but neither the light nor the influence could have been connected with the sun's being, without a revelation from God in scientific form; that is, going back of the phenomena to explain the *manner* of their existence. If one insists that the sun and moon were created materially on the fourth day, he must maintain the same of "the stars also;" for, in the original, the clause "and the stars" (וְהַכּוֹכָבִים), is in the accusative case, depending immediately upon the verb "and he made (וַיַּעַשׂ)." He must hold that the whole material universe, with the exception of our planet, was made out of nothing on the fourth day; a supposition so contrary to the general analogy of God's operations, that it ought not to be admitted without a very decisive reason; while here, we have only the empty shadow of a reason, coming from a false idea of the Mosaic narrative as scientific, or rather as a mixture of the scientific with the phenomenal. We do not suppose that Moses knew how the heavenly bodies were made to appear in the firmament on the fourth day, whether by the immediate creation of their substance, or in some other way. It was enough for him that God, by his Divine power, did somehow set them there, to fulfil the offices assigned to them.²

¹ See our remarks above, pp. 762, 763.

² This view of the fourth day's work is now so common that it is unnecessary to quote authorities. In maintaining that the whole plan and course of the record decides for the actual creation (wirkliche Schöpfung) of the heavenly bodies on the fourth day, and that it is not simply a statement of their *destination and relations to the earth*, Gabler (Introduction to Eichhorn's Urgeschichte, Vol. II. p. 209) is as right, as he is wrong in maintaining that the record itself is a poetic myth. Only we must look upon this actual creation from a *phenomenal*, and not from a *scientific* position.

For signs and for seasons, and for days and years. These words have exercised the ingenuity of commentators not a little. According to some, whom Bush follows,¹ we are to understand by *signs* (חֹמִים), *remarkable appearances* in the heavenly bodies, as “eclipses of the sun and moon, comets, meteors, falling stars, etc.,” portending extraordinary events. Compare our Saviour’s words: “And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars.”² But the context here decides for ordinary and regularly recurring signs. Others, as Tuch,³ translate thus: “For signs *both* for seasons *and* for days and years;” taking ׀—׀ as equivalent to the Latin *et—et, both—and*. This is an uncertain usage of ׀. Others again, as Gesenius,⁴ with whom Prof. Turner agrees,⁵ understand a *hendiadys*: “signs and seasons,” for “signs of seasons.” This is, for substance, the idea; yet we need not assume a direct hendiadys, which is always a doubtful figure. *Signs* may be taken as a general term, to which are subjoined, for a fuller unfolding of its meaning, specific terms comprehended under it. So Jer. 36: 27, “After that the king had burned the *roll* and the *words* which Baruch wrote at the mouth of Jeremiah.” *Seasons* (סִיָּוָן) are those fixed times which are marked by the course of the heavenly bodies, as months, and weeks, and seasons of the year appropriate to particular operations, whether of man or of nature.

The two great lights. It is well remarked by Tuch,⁶ that the writer, in accordance with his general plan, intentionally avoids naming the sun and moon. Had he filled out the narrative, he would have added: “And God called the greater light Sun, and the less light he called Moon.”

To rule over the day—the night. To regulate their extent and divisions, as well as their uniform alternation. The words have no astrological meaning, but rather a poetic cast.

Vs. 20—23. And God said: Let the waters swarm with creeping things, living souls; and let fowls fly above the earth, on the face of the firmament of the heavens. And God created the great dragons and every living soul

¹ Notes on Genesis in loco.

² Luke 21: 25.

³ Kommentar über die Genesis in loco.

⁴ Lexicon under the word חֹמִים.

⁵ On Genesis, Part II. Note (8), p. 134.

⁶ Kommentar, ubi supra.

that moveth, with which the waters swarmed after their kind ; and every winged fowl after its kind : and God saw that it was good. And there was evening, and there was morning, a fifth day.

The earth being now supplied with the direct light and heat of the sun, is fitted to be the abode of animal life.¹ Accordingly, at God's command, the waters now teem with aquatic animals, and the air is filled with the feathered tribes.

Let the waters swarm with creeping things (וַיִּשְׂרָצוּ הַמַּיִם שֶׁרָץ); more literally, "Let the waters creep with creeping things." שֶׁרָץ, like הִיָּה, is to be taken collectively, and is the indirect object of וַיִּשְׂרָץ. This verb is always intransitive, and takes, like other verbs of *abounding*, the accusative of that with which anything abounds.²

It will be in place here to consider the different usages of the nouns שֶׁרָץ and רֶמָשׁ, with their cognate verbs. According to Jarchi, "every living thing which is not high above the ground, is called שֶׁרָץ" (כל דבר חי שאינו גבוה מן הארץ ארוי שרץ) : and he specifies flies, ants, beetles, worms; the weasel, mouse, snail, and other like creatures, and *all fishes*.³ This definition agrees with scriptural usage. The word includes the small land animals that move with a low creeping motion, such as weasels, chameleons, and lizards (Lev. 11: 29, 30) ; also "all flying creeping things" (כל שֶׁרָץ עֵיף), as bats, grasshoppers, and the like (Lev. 11: 20—23) ; and finally, as in the present passage, all aquatic reptiles and fishes, at least the smaller fishes (Lev. 11: 9, 10), where the words, "of all that move in the waters," are, in the original, (הַכֹּל שֶׁרָץ הַמַּיִם). שֶׁרָץ is used with שָׁרַץ, as its cognate verb, in the phrase : "The creeping thing that creepeth upon the ground" (הַשֶּׁרָץ

¹ On this point see Prof. Dana's remarks in the Bib. Sacra for January of the present year, p. 118.

² It might be taken as a cognate accusative, but the same construction is found with other nouns; as, "The river shall swarm with frogs," Ex. 7: 28 (English version, 8: 3). Compare for this use of the accusative such phrases as the following : "The mountains shall drop with sweet wine" (וַיִּרְטָטוּ הַהָרִים יְצִיטָה), and the hills shall flow with milk (וַיִּתְלַחֲמוּ הַרְיָבִים חֵלֶב), and all the channels of Judah shall flow with water (וַיִּתְלַחֲמוּ כָּנָתֵיהֶם מַיִם); Joel 4: 18 (English version, 3: 18) : "And mine eye shall run down with tears" (וַיִּתְרַדַּם עֵינַי הַמָּעֵה); Jer. 13: 17.

³ Commentary on Genesis in loco.

(השרץ על הארץ); then, as here, of *abounding*, like the reptile races. In this sense it is used absolutely of animals, Gen. 8: 17, and of man, Gen. 9: 7.

According to Jarchi רָמָשׁ denotes low animals that seem as if they crawled, because their gait (חילוק) is not noticed. The full Hebrew division of the irrational land animals is into *wild beasts* (חַיָּה), *cattle* (בְּהֵמָה), *creeping things* (רָמָשׁ), and *fowls* (עוֹף אוֹר אוֹר);¹ but frequently *beasts* and *cattle* are included in one term.² When רָמָשׁ stands alone, it denotes *moving things generally*.³ שָׂרָץ, as already shown, is used of land reptiles, as well as of aquatic reptiles and fishes generally. But רָמָשׁ, as denoting a *particular class* of animals, is used only of those that move on the ground. See below.

רָמָשׁ has the same usage as its cognate רָמָשׁ, with which, as also with שָׂרָץ, it is frequently joined. It is used once of beasts of prey creeping forth at night from their lairs.⁴

Living souls (נַפְשׁוֹת חַיָּה collectively), that is, living creatures. According to the accents, these words stand in apposition to שָׂרָץ. Some prefer to render *creeping swarms of living beings*.

And let fowls fly (וְעוֹף יָעוֹף). This simple and literal rendering spares us the vain inquiry why the waters, and not the land, should have produced the fowls. According to ver. 22, the fowls "multiply in the earth;" and according to 2: 19, they are formed "out of the ground." The proper signification of עוֹף is *fowl*; yet from Lev. 11: 20—23, it appears, as Prof. Bush has remarked, that the word עוֹף was applied by the Hebrews to all *flying animals*, as bats, grasshoppers, etc., and flying insects generally.

The great dragons. We render the Hebrew תַּיִמָּוֹת *dragons*, in accordance with the usage of our translators elsewhere. It is sometimes used of *serpents*, Ex. 7: 9, 10, 12; at other

¹ Gen. 1: 24 compared with v. 20. 7: 14, 23. Ps. 148: 10.

² Gen. 6: 7, 20. 1 Kings 5: 13. Ezek. 38: 20.

³ Gen. 9: 3; and so of all *moving things* in the water, "small and great animals." Ps. 104: 25. Hab. 1: 14. Compare also Ps. 69: 35 (English version, 69: 34): "The seas, and all that moves in them" (וְכָל-רֶמֶשׂ בָּם).

⁴ Ps. 104: 20.

times, of the *crocodile*, Ez. 29: 3; but here it seems to denote large *sea-monsters* generally. The article points out the "great dragons" as well-known objects.

God blessed them, saying. Here, as throughout the narrative, God's *words* are *deeds*.

Geology shows that the work of the fifth day had two great subdivisions: the *marine* era, including molluscs, corals, and fishes; and the *amphibian* era, that of reptiles and birds.¹ Nor is this in the least inconsistent with the Mosaic record, which gives us the *whole* of the Divine work on each successive day; but names its *subdivisions* in the case of only two days,—the third and the sixth; where there was a special reason for so doing, growing out of the *distinct nature* of the operations recorded.

Vs. 24, 25. And God said: Let the earth bring forth living souls after their kind; cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind: and it was so. And God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and all the creeping things of the ground after their kind: and God saw that it was good.

Let the earth bring forth. The earth is said to bring forth living souls, in the same sense in which we now say that it produces animals. They have their origin upon it, and are nourished from its products. It is not the particular mode in which the first animals were formed, which the inspired historian has in mind, but the great laws of animal production valid for all time. At the command of Jehovah, the earth then began to produce the land animals after their kind, and it has continued to produce them ever since. All speculation as to the manner in which God formed the first animals of each species, are *extra-scriptural*. We can affirm nothing concerning them, except that they came into being by an act of God's creative power. Prof. Lewis justly criticises Milton's image:—

" Now half appeared

The tawny lion pawing to get free
His hinder parts."

¹ See Bib. Sacra, as above, pp. 118, 119.

The same criticism lies against every attempt to give the *how* of their formation.

Living souls. In the original *נִפְשׁ הַחַיָּה*, *living soul*, the singular standing to represent the whole class. The same is true of the terms which follow. We may conveniently render them into the plural. *נִפְשׁ הַחַיָּה* includes the whole creation of the sixth day, man excepted. It is then distributed, after the Hebrew manner, into *בְּהֵמָה*, *cattle*, that is, *tame beasts*; *רֶמֶשׂ*, *creeping things*, that is, small land-animals that move with a low creeping motion (not *שָׂרָץ*, which is applied to the aquatic reptiles and fish of the fifth day); and *חַיְהוֹת אֶרֶץ*, *beasts of the earth*, that is, wild beasts. For the form *חַיָּה*, which stands instead of *חַיִּים*, and is repeatedly copied by later Hebrew writers, see Roediger's Heb. Gram. § 88. 3.

The sixth day introduced the era of *mammals*, the highest type of animal organization. Geology shows that the work of this day, also, before man's creation, had its subdivisions and progress towards the existing order of things; a fact which we have shown to be in entire harmony with the Mosaic record.¹

Vs. 26—28. And God said : Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the moving things that move upon the earth. And God created the man in his image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said to them : Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it ; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heavens, and over all the living creatures that move upon the earth.

Let us make man. The form of this narrative is, throughout, adapted to impress us with the idea of man's immeasurable dignity and elevation above the irrational animals. Hitherto God has simply said : "Let the waters swarm with creeping things ;" „ Let the earth bring forth living souls." Now he says : *Let us make man.* The words seem to imply mutual counsel, and their true interpretation has been a matter of much controversy.

¹ See Bib. Sacra, as above, p. 126.

Some have explained the plural here as conformed to the usage of human dignitaries. But such a usage in Moses's day is altogether uncertain.¹ Besides, it does not apply to the words: "Behold, the man is become *as one of us*," 3: 22. Though one should assume, as many do, that Moses has brought together, in the first three chapters of Genesis, two distinct documents, written by two distinct authors, still he could not reasonably suppose that the "*us*" of 3: 22, has for its foundation any other idea than the first person plural of the present passage.

Others suppose that God here addresses the angelic hosts who surround his throne; not that they can have any proper share in the work of creation, either as counsellors or as actors; but that thus Jehovah communicates to them his plan in regard to the creation of man, that it may receive the joyous approbation of their understanding and will. One might perhaps adduce, as parallel, the narrative 1 Kings 22: 19—22. But that is wholly poetic, and besides, it relates to a work in which created beings could be employed.

More satisfactory is the opinion of Hengstenberg and others, that both the plural אֱלֹהִים, and the plural forms here and elsewhere, indicate the fulness of God's powers, "the extent, riches, and glory of his nature." "The one God," he adds, "comprehends multiplicity in himself."² Yet this is a very inadequate explanation of the remarkable phrase קָאָהִרִי קָאָהִי, *as one of us*. Equally inadequate is Tuch's explanation, after Hitzig, that the plural here denotes reflection and self-solicitation, as if God addressed himself.³ They, certainly, have the best of the argument who suppose that we have here an intimation of that great doctrine on which the whole plan of redemption hinges, the trinity of persons in the Godhead. They who reject this doctrine will, of course, deny all reference to it in the present passage. But to those who receive it as the central truth of Christianity, it

¹ See a review of the passages on which this opinion is based in Turner on Genesis, Note (9), pp. 140, 141.

² Genuineness of the Pentateuch, Edinburgh translation, Vol. I. pp. 310, 311.

³ Über die Genesis in loco.

cannot appear surprising that some obscure hints of it should have appeared in the very earliest communications of God to man. This is altogether in accordance with the analogy of Divine revelation. We mean not that the doctrine of the Trinity can be *proved* from such hints as those contained in the Mosaic narrative, but that its subsequent revelation *explains* these hints.

In our image, after our likeness. The image of God lies in man's spiritual nature, which Moses here brings prominently to view. Elsewhere he teaches that man's body was formed, like the bodies of beasts and birds, of "the dust of the ground." This body of flesh and blood cannot bear God's image, except in a sense altogether secondary, as *symbolizing*, by its upright, majestic, and beautiful form, the character of the soul that inhabits it. The soul itself must be the real seat of God's image. This image is all which constitutes man a rational and moral being, the accountable subject of God's law, and capable of knowing God and holding fellowship with him. We cannot, in the present connection, restrict it to the actual possession of holiness. It is rather a moral nature capable of holiness. When man had fallen, he still retained the *natural* image of God, with the possibility of recovering, through grace, his *moral* image; and for this reason his life was guarded by the highest earthly sanction: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man."¹

And let them have dominion. It is by no arbitrary act that the dominion of this lower world is conferred upon man. Because he is made in the image of God, and therefore capable of exercising dominion over the irrational animals, they are committed to his hand, and he is put in possession of "all the earth," as his lawful patrimony.

And over all the moving things that move upon the earth (וּבְכָל־תְּרֵמֶת הָאָרֶץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ), ver. 26; and ver. 28: "*And over all the living creatures that move upon the earth* (וּבְכָל־חַיֵּי הָאָרֶץ עַל־הָאָרֶץ). The position of רֵמֶשׂ in ver. 26, after the clause *and over all the earth*, shows that it does not describe a *class* of

¹ Gen. 9: 6.

land animals, as in vs. 24, 25; but is rather a general term for all moving things (see above notes on vs. 24, 25). For this reason, in ver. 28, חַיִּים is substituted for it, in the sense of living creatures generally. Compare Gen. 8: 17. Lev. 11: 46, etc.

And God created the man. "The man" stands here as the representative of human nature.

Male and female. In the case of the irrational animals, the creation of male and female is tacitly implied; but in the case of rational man, it is expressly named, because of the high moral relations which it involves. For the same reason the formation of woman from man is subsequently described, the moral significancy of which the inspired penman himself gives.

And God blessed them. The blessing of God bestowed upon *moral* beings, under a system of pure law, implies their perfect rectitude. The happy pair had both the natural and the moral image of God.

Vs. 29, 30. And God said: Behold I have given to you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of all the earth; and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: to you it shall be for food. And to all the beasts of the earth, and to all the fowl of the heavens, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, in which is a living soul [I have given], all green herbage for food: and it was so.

God gives to man *seed-bearing plants*, and *fruit-trees*, for his sustenance; and to the irrational tribes *all green herbage*; in the original: כֹּל-יִרְקֵה עֵשֶׂב, *all the greenness of herbs*, grasses being especially intended. The true explanation of this latter clause is, that God simply specifies that part of the vegetable kingdom which is unsuitable for human food, as given to the animals. To say nothing of the carnivorous races, it certainly does not mean to teach that all the irrational animals and birds are to feed on grasses and green herbage alone. In this passage, no grant is made to man of animal food, and all attempts to torture the text till it should utter such a grant, have proved unsuccessful.

V. 31. And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning, the sixth day.

It was very good. He no longer says "good," but "very good," because God's creation is a whole; and it is not till all the parts are finished, that each particular part can attain to its highest excellence.

The sixth day (יְוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי). The article is now added for the first time, to indicate this as *the* day on which the work of creation was completed. For the syntax, see Roediger, § 109. 2. a.; Nordheimer, § 724. IL Note.

Ch. II. vs. 1—3. And the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their host. And God finished, on the seventh day, his work which he made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he rested from all his work which God created to make.

All their host. Tuch remarks that this is the only passage in which the word אֲשֶׁר includes earthly objects along with the heavenly host. It denotes the orderly marshalling and arrangement of all created things in heaven and earth. The same idea belongs to the Greek κόσμος, and the Latin mundus.

And God finished, on the seventh day, his work which he made. The reading "sixth day," of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, and the Syriac, is justly thought to be an emendation for the purpose of avoiding a supposed inconsistency. The language is simply loose: "God finished, on the seventh day, his work which he made," for, God brought his work to an end when the seventh day came, so as not to continue it on that day.

He rested on the seventh day; namely, in a special sense, from the work of creating the world, having already completed it. That he rested from all exercise of creative power, is neither asserted nor implied.

And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it. The only natural interpretation of these words is, that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day at the time when he rested from the work of creation. When God had made the aquatic animals he blessed them: he blessed the land animals also, and man, at the time of their creation. He instituted

marriage, moreover, at the very time when he symbolized the marriage relation by giving to Adam bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. Why now should one maintain, in the face of all these analogies, that these words mean: God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath some twenty-five hundred years afterwards, at the giving of the law upon Sinai, unless he has a preconceived theory to maintain? We do not mean that all the particular precepts of the Mosaic law respecting the Sabbath belonged to it from the beginning; but that it was, from the beginning, a day consecrated to God, and, therefore, according to its true idea, a day of rest from worldly toil, and joyous contemplation of God's character and works. The arguments by which the existence of the Sabbath from the beginning, may be maintained, our limits will not permit us to review here. We have simply presented that drawn from the passage under consideration. The bearing of these words on the question concerning the six Mosaic days of creation, we reserve for consideration in a subsequent Article, as also the very significant omission of the formula: "And there was evening, and there was morning," by which the *close* of each of the preceding six days has been indicated.

ARTICLE V.

BASHAN, ITURÆA, KENATH.

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

§ 1. BASHAN.

IN the Bible, this word is always written בַּשָּׁן, but has sometimes the article. The general form, in the LXX., is Βασάν, though Βασανίτης is also used, Ez. 27: 6. In Josephus, we find the Greek form *Baravala*. The latter was