

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

wrought and these thoughts recorded at the time and in the manner commonly supposed.

7. We have, lastly, added a few observations intended to meet the latest objections to the church's view of the apostolic and post-apostolic ages.

ARTICLE II.

THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS ATTESTED BY THEIR CONTENTS.¹

BY PROF. HORATIO B. HACKETT, NEWTON, MASS.

A DISTINGUISHED writer, Max Duncker, begins his excellent History of Antiquity with a general remark respecting

¹ The following Article consists mainly of a free translation of a portion of Professor Auberlen's "Die göttliche Offenbarung: Ein apologetischer Versuch." Erster Band, pp. 123-163. The volume which contains this extract was published in 1861, and is regarded as the ablest production of that eminent scholar. The second volume has just come to hand, entitled "Zur Lehre vom Menschen als religiösem Wesen," but proves, alas! to be a fragment only, in consequence of the death of the author, and appeared as a posthumous work, in July of the last year. A friendly hand has prefixed to the unfinished treatise a brief sketch of the writer's life and character. It is a beautiful picture, and portrays to us a man who was thoroughly in earnest, whose religious convictions were heartfelt, who had received the word of God into his soul as a source of life and power, was a faithful worker for the cause of his Lord and Master, and when the last hour came could say, with a full consciousness of its solemnity: 'God be thanked, of death I have no fear; the Lord Jesus is my light and my song'; and in the joy of that faith passed quietly away.

It is proper to state that some parts of the essay, as presented here, are an abstract of the original, rather than a version. It was the more necessary to be thus free in some passages, because the author's style is unusually terse and idiomatic, and has so many expressions borrowed from the philosophical phraseology of the Germans. A few additional notes and references have been inserted and two or three paragraphs abridged, but nothing, of course, has been added or omitted which affects in any way the argument or ideas of the writer. After having been occupied so much, in the course of recent criticism, with the historical and philological grounds on which the claims of the Pentateuch are vindicated, it may be profitable, and serve to augment the force of other considerations, if we turn our thoughts to the internal argument has so ably unfolded in the pages here laid before the reader.

the lands of Africa as divided by the equator; and then, on the second page, proceeds to speak of the lands and people of Egypt. He passes over, without a single word, the fundamental preliminary questions which pertain to ancient history, and brings us, by a single step as it were, into the presence of the various nations of which he writes. It is certainly, in many respects, a wise and commendable reserve which excludes the obscure domain of first causes and effects from the sphere of history. But it is a characteristic sign of our times that we consider it so wise to confine ourselves here to the middle of things, and not to inquire after their beginnings and ends, while in other studies the investigators who have most repute for wisdom are those who search most deeply for ultimate reasons and principles. In truth, it is hardly correct to speak here of a history of antiquity, in any proper sense of the term; at least it is antiquity more as an aggregation of separate parts, than as the representation of a world's common origin and growth. A more correct designation would be a history of the ancient nations. It is the style of history of which Herodotus is father, not that of which Moses is father. Herodotus has written for us a history of antiquity according to this idea, since he leads us, in his narratives, from one nation to another. It corresponds with the point of view of the Greeks, those coryphaei of heathendom, to addict themselves, with love as well as labor, to single objects and detached investigations, and to set forth the results of such study with artistic skill. The historic art, the plastic representation of single forms, reaches here its crowning point. But something different from this is the philosophy of history, a thoughtful, scrutinizing survey of the whole order of life, as it unfolds itself in space and time, therefore not of single nations only, but of the race, and not of the middle only, but also of the beginning and end, of the idea of the world, and its realization in history. It is only such inquiry, extended to the entire range of history, that satisfies the wants of an inquisitive spirit; for such scrutiny, all those works of his-

toric art are, in the end, only preparatory labors. This highest form of history is at present one of our philosophical wants, as Schiller's well-known Academic Inaugural, for example, has shown. Such a view, indeed, does not accord with the tendency of man's fallen nature. The example of Herodotus proves this, and the example of the Greek philosophers, as well as of the Greek historians, proves this. They were not able to raise themselves to the idea of mankind — the idea of humanity. It is only where the true idea of God is, that there can be a true idea of mankind and, consequently, a true idea of history. Hence, also, in this deeper sense the Israelites are the people among whom the genuine feeling of history shows itself, and Moses is the father of history. In this point of view an immense importance belongs to the first eleven chapters of Genesis.

It is a distinguishing peculiarity of the Israelitish people, that their historical recollections have this universal background and circle of view; that their traditions are not only those of a single people, but of a primitive history of the race. In the case of the heathen nations it is not so. As, in general the world, before the Christian age, was rent into separate nationalities, so every nation, at the utmost, goes back merely into its own past existence.

The most cultivated heathen, as the Athenians, regard themselves as autochthones, sprung from their own soil. In this fact the national limitation and the operation of natural and physical laws are abundantly manifest. The people have no idea of any other antecedent of their existence than their own land: the nation is born of the earth where they dwell. About the other nations, upon which they look as barbarians, they trouble themselves but little or not at all, as we find to be true of the Chinese; and if at any time a wider commerce with the world awakens a more general sense of the relationship of nations, they concern themselves with them, as remarked already, only as separate communities. The consciousness of the original connection of the nations, the idea of the human race exists among them only

in a faint degree. If they seem to have any old, primeval recollections, any views concerning heaven and earth, gods and men, which reach beyond their own national history, such imaginations are nothing more than theogonic and cosmogonic myths; myths into which they have transfused some notions of their own origin, and out of which, in turn, they have drawn some of the notions themselves.

Israel also, though in a different way, holds an attitude of strict separation from the other nations. The opposition between people of God and nations of the world is a similar one to that between Greeks and barbarians. Not only so, but the result of the political connections into which this people were drawn in the course of time, was to increase rather than diminish the consciousness of this difference between them and other nations. Israel had no Herodotus, who has written a history of the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Persians, though the Jews were brought so much into contact with all these nations. General history in this sense, or that of the world, is more strictly a worldly science, and not one of a religious people, like the Israelites. The peculiarity of Israel lies, not in their culture, but in their sense of the primitive relations of men to each other. They have not only a clearer and more complete knowledge of their own origin since the time of Abraham than any other people, but a knowledge which goes back, beyond their own origin, to that of mankind, and recognizes the unity as distinctly as the separation: the lineage is Abraham, Noah, Adam. It has been justly pointed out as a noteworthy fact, that Genesis represents the ark as landing, not on Lebanon or Sinai, but on Ararat, a locality entirely foreign to Israel; while the heathen, for the most part, in their traditions of the flood, place that event on their own mountains, and convert the patriarchs of the deluge into the original men of their respective lands, and the progenitors of their nation. In the book of Genesis, therefore, the national barrier is broken through from the very outset; the people of Israel, with all their *particularism*, are

the most human, the most universal, people in the world. This fact stands connected, manifestly, with their religion. Since the people to whom the light of revelation was given, lift themselves above nature and the world to God, their range of view rises above the natural limits of their position, and surveys the broad field of humanity. Jehovah is Elohim, the national God of the Israelites is the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth. From the beginning it is declared as explicitly as possible that God has established the particularism in their case upon the most universal foundation, and for a most universal object; so that the distinction between Israel and the heathen world is one of principle, and not accidental, and transcends infinitely that between Greeks and barbarians. Israel, therefore, has from the beginning what may be termed a consciousness of the universality of history; it sees relations in its past and its future, which concern man in general, and which are fraught with blessings for all the races of the earth. That which Hellas reached, after a long time, and only in a very weakened and limited degree as the fruit of culture, the people of Israel possessed from the first, in all its universality and fulness, by means of their religion. Here, again, we have disclosed to us another and deeper insight into the original connection between religion and history. The chosen race, with their true knowledge of God, and in virtue of it, have preserved the primitive recollections of mankind, and with these recollections have preserved the true knowledge of God. The two go hand in hand with each other; and hence the truth respecting the knowledge of God which we find in Genesis is a guarantee for the truth of its traditions, as the truth of the history is a guarantee for the truth of the religion.

Had we not the information contained in the first eleven chapters of Genesis; had we only the myth of the heathen or the speculations of philosophers and the observations of naturalists, to instruct us concerning the beginning of the world and of mankind, we should be in the deepest darkness

on these subjects. These chapters and the prophecies of scripture supplement and illustrate each other: there we have the true explanation respecting the first things, here respecting the last; there respecting the principles, here respecting the ends of history; there respecting the original cause, here respecting the object of the world. Without this twofold knowledge, past and prospective, a universal history, a history of philosophy, is impossible.¹ But prophecy is not only thus correlative, but has its roots also in these chapters, since upon them all later revelation in general is founded. Fortunately, the primitive recollections of our race contained in them have pervaded our entire modes of thought to a much greater extent than we ourselves are aware, and even control the views of those who think they must reject the historical character of those documents. These chapters uphold and perpetuate the consciousness of mankind concerning their own nature, formed after the image of God, concerning their original nobility and their eternal destination.

This high purpose the first eleven chapters of Genesis fulfil in the most simple form. They do not display, it is true, the historic art of the Greeks; but what they relate groups itself around the genealogy which appears so dry to us in occidental lands. Yet this peculiarity itself impresses the stamp of internal truth and of the remotest antiquity on the record. Genealogical registers, transmitted orally or by writing, are the simplest, most original expression of the historical feeling, which attaches itself, in this instance, to the first form of human relationship, to wit, the family, and this at first takes up history only on the side of its natural basis, founded in the law of derivation or descent. Hence genealogical registers are, without doubt, the oldest medium through which history was handed down among men. We find them existing among the nations of the east, as they begin to elevate themselves from that mere consciousness

¹ Perhaps the History of Redemption by President Edwards, in its idea and plan, recognizes this conception of history as perfectly as any similar work from human hands.

of the natural relations to the wider consciousness of history, as, for example, among the Arabs. At the same time they serve as a means of adjusting the chronology, especially when, as in the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis, the year when the patriarchs had sons, and the duration of their lives are preserved with them. Thus tables of genealogy furnish the casting or framework of history, in their names and numbers; but these data are to the oriental living things; they are to him as a gallery of family pictures, with which an ever-fresh remembrance and oral tradition may connect many particulars which are not recorded.¹ The case of the Table of Nations, so called, in the tenth chapter of Genesis, shows how readily the genealogical register advances to historiography: the genealogy becomes ethnography, and the ethnography becomes history.² Scattered through this Table are notices concerning the incipient organization of states and kingdoms, with which history in the narrower sense begins. •

Hebrew antiquity also employs the genealogical form for the purpose of making it the vehicle of transmitting that higher view of human destiny which is derived from the light of revelation. It is the form specifically adapted to the design of a book which has to do with the earliest origin of the holy people as a distinct family, and then, still further back, as descended from the first human pair. Hence the principle of classification which pervades Genesis is that of the ten Tolethoth,³ i.e. procreations, generations, and in that expression we have the ultimate idea of history.

The genealogical registers which are found in the first

¹ Of the transmission of such accessory facts we have an instance in Gen. v. 21-24: "And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah. And Enoch walked with God, after he begat Methuselah, three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years. And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him."

² See Acts xvii. 26: "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation."

³ תולדות

eleven chapters of Genesis, especially in the fifth and the eleventh, are without doubt extremely ancient, perhaps the oldest examples first of an oral, and then of a written tradition that there are on earth. They derive their importance from two elements, which belong to them: one is the Elohist or general element, which relates to the past, and the other the Jehovistic or Messianic, which points forward to the future. The former has respect to the human race as God's creatures or offspring; the latter, to the goal or destination for which he designed them. Men were created by God in his image, and therefore the families of men are all regarded as of value in his sight, and deserve to have a place in the sacred tradition and record. But in consequence of the fall, the race have gone astray from the divine original, and become subject to death. Yet they were not doomed on that account to perish, but though smitten with death, might still exist and perpetuate themselves; yea, the perpetuation itself should be a means of deliverance from the corruption into which they had fallen. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head,"¹ that the divine goal may yet be reached. Upon this great design in the perpetuation of the race as essential to the plan of redemption rests the peculiar biblical importance of the genealogical registers.

But men now sustain various relations to this object, of the continuation of human life after the apostasy. The divergence shows itself at once in the sons of Adam. Some of them, like the mother of the race,² hold fast to the divine goal; they are the proper children of this mother, the woman's seed, the true mankind. Others wander farther and farther from the goal, and exclude themselves, as the serpent's seed, from the true mankind. The latter class also, though they have gone astray from the presence of Jehovah,³ are still enclosed within the power of Elohim;⁴

¹ Gen. iii. 15.

² Gen. iv. 1, as compared with v. 29.

³ Gen. iv. 16: "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden."

⁴ Gen. iv. 27: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

but the former only have the future hopes of mankind entrusted to them; since they adhere to Jehovah, and Jehovah adheres to them.¹ In other words, those who not only enjoy God's gifts of creation, but cultivate personal communion with him, and the life which springs from it, are his people, and he is their God.²

Both directions, the religious and the irreligious, rest upon original acts of the ancestors, a Cain and Ham, Abel and Seth, Shem and Japhet.³ These original acts, then, transmit their effects to the descendants, and give to the entire line of such posterity its characteristics; since after mankind have once fallen under the power of the flesh the religious moral principle, within certain limits, propagates itself from one to another naturally, i. e. through the operation of the family spirit. From the hereditary law or family spirit the primitive fathers, who are at the same time primitive children, may have been less exempt than we are, for whom the attribute of a freer personality has been won through Christ. While from this point of view a new light is thrown upon the significance of the genealogical tables, we learn also from this source an explanation of another fact: we see why the woman's seed only, the "generations" of Adam, on which the future welfare of mankind depends so much, are regarded as worthy of a continuous genealogy; while of the race of Cain, a few names only are mentioned, and the succession is broken off as soon as the wickedness of the race has reached a characteristic height in Lamech and his family.⁴

¶ The Table of Nations, already mentioned, and the Semitic genealogy,⁵ exhibits a similar relation in the period

¹ Gen. iv. 26: "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the Lord"; and Gen. iv. 26: "And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant."

² Ex. vi. 7: "And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God."

³ See Gen. iv. 3 seq., and iv. 22 seq.

⁴ Gen. iv. 17-21.

⁵ Gen. iv. 17-21.

after the flood. The Table is carried forward at all points only as far as certain individuals are concerned; and then, as Baumgarten very aptly remarks¹, the Old Testament dismisses the heathen from sacred history. Thenceforward they go their own way, but yet are written in God's book, as not forgotten by his grace, and as destined to share at length in his salvation. The Semitic genealogy, on the contrary, after having traced the line of Seth with so much care hitherto, still follows, in like manner, the holy Messianic race, from the beginning of the restored human family in Noah to the beginning of the people of God in Abraham, where the seed of Abraham and David connects itself, yet further with the seed of the woman.² But there is a difference in the two cases which is not unimportant. Before the flood only two lines, as it were, of light and darkness stand opposed to each other; but after the flood there comes forward an intermediate class between Ham, the slave of flesh and sense, and the Jehovistic Shem, through whom the spiritual life of mankind is borne along the ages; and that link is Japhet, the object of a special blessing, the father of a widely-diffused progeny, and representing the highest natural or purely intellectual culture known to the world's history. From Japhet are descended the Greeks, Romans, Germans, and others, who in the tents of Shem became partakers of the blessing.

Thus the Table of Nations, in its connection with Gen. iv. 20 seq., which sets forth Noah's relation to his descendants, illumines the entire history of the world in its moral aspects, as does Gen. iii. 15, where the key-note is first heard: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." But as the fifth chapter, which contains the generation of the patriarchs, attaches itself to the fourth chapter, which treats of both classes, so

¹ Baumgarten, *Theologischer Commentar zum Pentateuch*, I. s. 134.

² The genealogy of Christ as given in *Matth. i. 1 seq.* and *Luke ii. 23* is instructive here.

here also, in xi. 10 seq., the Messianic genealogy becomes distinct from the general or human genealogy, or, more correctly, the reverse: the former, or human history, appears at this point as manifestly subordinate to the latter, or Messianic, history. The Messianic genealogy forms properly the grand procession which runs through the old covenant, and so through the old world in general. The consciousness of the Israelite, being lifted above itself in its knowledge and aspirations to the divine height, embraces within its survey the wide circle of humanity, and does so precisely in the degree that this circle stands connected with the Messianic line of our race. It is in this same degree, also, that the families of the earth are deemed worthy to see their genealogy written in the sacred primitive records.

With this view of the genealogies, all is simple and natural; and all, at the same time, profound and suggestive. It is the union precisely of these two qualities, depth of meaning and simplicity of form, which constitutes the signature of divine truth. On these characteristics depends the spiritual power of the Bible over the human soul; a power, as all experience has shown, which no historic or poetic or any other art possesses in an equal degree; though there are always some of spoiled tastes who think heaven's manna should not be as coriander seed.¹

Let us take now a closer view of our history. We learn, from this early age, of three great catastrophes connected with the fall and subsequent judgment, and associated with the three principal names of the genealogical registers; namely, Adam, Noah, and Abraham, which mark respectively the beginning, middle, and end of the series. The name of Adam connects itself with the fall and expulsion from Paradise.² The name of Noah connects itself with the flood,³ and the name of Abraham with the confusion of tongues, the dispersion, and rise of heathenism,⁴ resulting from the building of the Babylonian tower. These are the three great

¹ See Num. xi. 7.

² Gen. vi. - ix.

³ Gen. ii. - iii.

⁴ Gen. xi. 1-9.

catastrophes which form the presupposition of the present state of our world, since they represent a successive decline from the strength and purity of man's original life, with which also the gradual abbreviation of human life goes hand in hand. From the first catastrophe it arises that our world in general is a fallen world; upon the second depends the present condition of the earth in so many respects; and upon the third, the condition of history, which the diversity of races has so modified. History in the stricter sense, it must be allowed, is essentially a history of nations, and therefore presupposes the existence of the nations. From the eleventh chapter of Genesis, says Johannes von Müller, must begin all universal history.¹ In this sense, what we have here before us is to be termed ante-history, or better, primordial history. If all beginnings are wonderful, we must expect beforehand that these would be such. They are naturally beginnings on a mightier, more colossal scale than the later beginnings, because they lie at the foundation of the present system of things, and consequently have another and earlier foundation of their own. If any one stumbles here at the outset, let him call to mind the testimony of another book, the earth's internal structure, which also presents to us an original world, of more colossal relations than our present one. On the other hand, those who believe the testimony of scripture may not forget that we have not here what has taken place in history, but before history, i.e. something not less actual, but which occurred in a different way, under other conditions of life; as, for example, men nine hundred years old are yet men, but different men from those ninety years old. The further an event lies from the present period of our world, the less may we venture to measure it

¹ The celebrated geographer, Ritter, remarked that there are no ancient writings which the modern researches in history and geography so fully confirm as this eleventh chapter of Genesis and the works of Herodotus. Dr. Gesenius, though in the main so sceptical respecting the histories of the Pentateuch, acknowledged the extraordinary interest of this chapter, and in his lectures on Genesis was accustomed to dwell upon it longer than upon any other five chapters of the book.

by our present standard. This principle holds true especially of the events which relate to Paradise, and may be applied to other cases where it would serve to remove various difficulties. In like manner, we know little or nothing respecting the particular mode of our activity in the future ages of our existence.

If these three catastrophes are the original facts on which the present state of the life of mankind on earth depends, the effects must naturally be still apparent, and, as in other cases, we may reason back here from the effect to the cause. We proceed to some illustrations of this remark.

It has been suggested already, that the Old Testament expression *Gojim*¹ denotes, at the same time, nations and heathen, therefore embraces nationality and religion, and that this is significant and apposite; there are precisely as many heathen religions as there are nations, since every people has its own gods. The second element by which the nations differ from each other is language. Hence the confusion of languages and the dispersion of the nations connect themselves with the tower of Babel as one act.² Nationality, religion, language, are the three original elements in the historical life of nations; and it is a striking fact that, while the modern ethnographic, linguistic, historical researches are now causing these elements, in their proper relation to each other, to be more deeply recognized for the first time, the book of Genesis presents them to us already in their organic unity, on the ground of the early traditions. This circumstance may predispose us to look with favor on a record for which so impartial a witness appears.³

¹ גוֹיִם

² Gen. xi. 9: "Therefore is the name of it called Babel, because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."

³ "The science of Comparative Philology," says Bunsen, "must present the supposition of such a separation of the nations in Asia as a postulate, especially on the ground of the relation of the Egyptian language to the Semitic languages, if the Bible had not preserved to us this great, truly historical event."—*Bibelwerk*, Band I. s. 3a.

Schelling, it is well known, in his *Philosophy of Mythology*, has treated these questions more seriously than has been usual with writers of his class, and has directed interpreters here into new paths. He takes more positive ground in regard to the history in Genesis, and especially that part of it which relates to the Babylonian tower. In his introduction to the *Philosophy of Mythology*, he goes into a critique of previous theories concerning the origin of mythology, and he comes to the inquiry: How did nations originate? And, in answering this question, he lays down the following principles: nations were neither always, nor did they begin to be of themselves. All merely physical explanations of the separation of nations are insufficient. "The human race cannot have left the condition in which there were no nations, but only different families, without a crisis in man's spiritual nature which was radical, which must have taken place in the basis itself of human consciousness. It can excite wonder only, that what is so obvious has not been at once acknowledged. For we cannot conceive of different nations without the idea of different languages; and language surely is something that belongs to the soul itself. If the diversity of nations, then, is not something that has not been from the first, but has had an origin, this must be true also of the diversity of languages.

"At this point we find ourselves in harmony with the oldest document of the human race, the Mosaic writings, against which so many have a repugnance, because they know not how to begin with them, how to understand or to use them.¹ The book of Genesis places the origin of nations in connection with the origin of languages, but in such a way as to make the confusion of language the cause, the origin of nations the effect. This narrative has been derived from actual recollection, which has preserved itself, to some extent, also among other nations. It is impossible to

¹ It will be borne in mind that Schelling is led to these speculations as a philosopher merely, and not at all as an apologist for the credibility of the sacred writings.

conceive of a confusion of language without some internal event, without some disturbance of the mental organization itself. This disturbance must affect the soul in its deepest consciousness, its vital elements; and if a confusion of the language hitherto common to all is to take place, the disruption must occur precisely in that which before held mankind together; the spiritual power must be enfeebled which previously restrained every tendency that might be striving to urge men asunder. This power could be only a God who filled entirely the soul's consciousness, who was common to all the human race, a God who drew them, as it were, into his own unity. Polytheism, severing this tie makes a continued unity of the human race impossible. The operation of this innermost event is indeed not stated expressly in the Mosaic tradition; but when it names merely the next cause, i.e. the confusion of languages, it has at least intimated the remote and last cause, i.e. the origin of polytheism.

"Of these intimations one only may be mentioned now, viz. that Babel is represented in scripture as the scene of the confusion, the place of the future great city Babylon. An entirely independent testimony leads also to the result that the transition to polytheism, properly so called, took place at Babylon. The idea of heathenism, i.e. strictly, in other words, of the formation of nations, as such, is so inseparably connected with the name of Babel, that even to the last book of the New Testament it stands as the symbol of all that is heathenish, or that is to be viewed as heathenish. Babel is really, as the old narrative says, only a contraction of Balbel,¹ a word which is manifestly onomatopoeic. Singularly enough, the imitation of tone which has disappeared in the pronunciation of Babel, is still preserved in the Greek *βάρβαρος*, which signifies properly one who speaks unintelligibly,² and, by means of the familiar

¹ בַּבֶּל בְּרָל

² Thus Ovid (*Trist.* V. 10, 37) says: "Barbarus hic ego sum quia non intelligor ulli."

commutation of *r* and *l*, is formed from the oriental *balbel*. By a similar imitation of sound has arisen the Latin *balbus*, the German *babeln*, *babbeln* (Schwabian), *plappern*, French *babiller*, *babil*, and English *babble*. The connection of religious susceptibilities with susceptibilities or affections of the faculty of speech, is not more mysterious than how, with a particular form of religion, certain peculiarities of the physical constitution also were connected. What else could the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian church be, than the effect of a religious affection or impulse? We are too little accustomed to recognize the principles by which the involuntary excitements of religious sensibility are determined as principles of general importance, and which consequently, under given circumstances, may become the causes of other and even physical effects.

“At all events, the origin of nations, the confusion of tongues, and polytheism are correlated ideas and accompanying phenomena, according to the Old Testament way of thinking. The origin of mythology will fall exactly at the point of transition, where a nation does not yet exist as a distinct nation, but is on the point of separating itself and becoming such. The same must be true of the language of every people; that, too, determines itself first and only when the nation assumes to itself a distinct position. From that period when the languages are not yet separated, but becoming separated, may be dated the names among the Grecian deities which are manifestly not Grecian, but belong to pre-historic times.¹ From that period also may be derived certain points of agreement in the material of languages, which otherwise are formed after altogether different principles. The language of no people arises without some connection with the original unity of languages, and that it seeks to maintain even after its departure from the common stock; for to such a unity, the power of which

¹ In his lecture, *Ueber die Gottheiten von Samothrace*, Schelling, in common with many others, assigns a Semitic etymology to many of the gods of the Greek mythology.

is never wholly lost, all the phenomena of philology point, as does likewise the conduct of nations, as far as this, notwithstanding the distance of time may still be traced through the mists of antiquity. It is not so much any external incentive as the thorn of inward restlessness, the feeling that they are no longer the entire humanity, but only a part of it; that they belong no longer to the absolute one, but have fallen under the power of a separate god or gods; it is this feeling which drove the wanderers from land to land, from coast to coast, until each nation saw itself alone with itself, and separated from all that is foreign, and had found the place destined for them and suited to them.¹ This fear of the entire disappearance of man's native unity, and, with that, of all truly human consciousness, suggested to them not only the first institutions of a religious kind, but even their first political organizations, the object of which was no other than to enable them to retain and secure against further destruction what they had rescued from the apostasy."

So far the words of Schelling. We quote them not because we would adopt them all as our own, but as showing that revelation and the philosophy of which some think so highly are not always in conflict with each other.

Before passing from this topic, we subjoin a few remarks upon it from the ethical point of view. The idea of humanity is one of the most beautiful and one of the truest ideas of our time, because in its genuine form it is a Christian idea, although some have often and greatly wrested it from its Christian foundation, and have misused and perverted it. But in its proper scope the idea of humanity is co-extensive with the unity of the human race. All men are brothers. It is the violation of this consciousness, the violation of man's dignity, which so shocks us in the slavery of the negro race, and which urged, for example, an Alex-

¹ Dent. xxxii. 8: "When the Most High divided the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel."

ander von Humboldt to exert himself against it to his life's end. The same principle of our nature, transferred from social to international relations, gives to noble minds such a passion for the idea of universal peace, for the fraternization of nations, and causes war, the mutual slaughter of nations, to appear, not in its consequences only, but in its very nature, as something horrible, and that ought not to be. And though peace congresses and schemes of that nature may be only chimeras now, yet a new age of the world will come, when men shall change their swords into ploughshares.

The contrast between this ideal of the unity of our race and the present reality is a painful one to contemplate. Humanity has been split into a variety of nations, each one of which forms an exclusive whole by itself; they understand each other neither externally nor internally, neither in language nor religion. Nay, for the most part, each nation despises all others in comparison with itself as barbarian, and treats them as enemies, and considers itself alone as the "middle kingdom." The egoism which we regard in individuals as the root of sin, is found among nations, in general, more sharply defined than in single instances. This fact agrees as little with the notion of a true humanity in the one case as in the other; it is something abnormal, but at the same time humiliating; it is guilt, but at the same time punishment. The great majority of the nations stand upon a step of existence so low that it hardly deserves to be called human. And who has not felt it to be like a curse resting upon the most cultivated nations, to find when he has been with "strangers," and was conscious of an inward harmony with them, that he could only imperfectly at best communicate his thoughts and feelings? Humanity at present fails to give scope and activity to the common life; instead of being a living organism, putting the parts into joyous sympathy with each other, it consists of disrupted members.

If we are really in earnest about these thoughts, as we

should be where the question concerns what ought to be and what is, we must infer that there was some original transgression of our race by which its organism became rent and divided. We are led, then, to interrogate history, to ask the old tradition if it knows of any such event in the infancy of mankind. Here Genesis presents to us the tower of Babel as the solution of the riddle. It shows us, in the case of Noah and his descendants, that the Creator's design at the beginning was, that men should unfold an organic unity of life though separated locally from each other; but the entire race conspired together to thwart this purpose. Instead of seeking an inner unity in God, they sought an outer one in a visible, colossal work of their own hands, and, in consequence of this, God, by confounding their language, caused the dispersion and disruption of mankind to take the place of the diffusion without division, which should have been their destiny. In tearing themselves away from God, in the heaven-daring act of the building of the tower, they lost God, but at the same time lost also themselves. Only in God, who, as the ground of life, is also the bond of life to all creatures, could they be one and duly manifold, according to their true nature. In tearing asunder the bond of unity with God, they tore asunder likewise the bond of unity which links the members with one another; for which reason, on the other hand, the reconciliation of men with God is their reconciliation with one another.¹ There was now strictly no mankind any longer, but only nations, which God left to go their own way.² But every falling away from God is, at the same time, a falling

¹ So we learn in Eph. ii. 14-16: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby."

² Acts xiv. 15, 16: "That ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein; who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways."

under the dominion of the world and its princes. So it is here. The nations, left to themselves, came under the controlling influence of the powers of nature, of climate, soil, and other physical elements, to which they could no longer offer a sufficiently strong countervailing energy from within. Out of this fact are to be explained the great diversities of races; the circumstance that only a small part of mankind, relatively, attain to historical importance, namely, the nations that dwell in the temperate zones, while the hot and cold regions hinder so much the development of the inhabitants that they are degraded to a half-brutish existence; and, finally, all the separations and exclusive limitations, egoisms, and hostilities of nations, of which we have spoken above.

We close this part of the subject, by mentioning the local tradition respecting the Babylonian tower, which M. Oppert, one of the most learned of the European savans, has recently brought to light.¹ It is one of the cuneiform inscriptions, as deciphered by him, found on a cylinder which Rawlinson discovered among the ruins of Babylon. The writing purports to be from Nebuchadnezzar, and, among other things, says: "The temple of the seven lights of the earth [the planets], the original edifice of Borsippa, was built by an ancient king; since then are reckoned forty-two generations; but the summit he did not finish. The men had abandoned it [the structure] after the flood, because they found their words confused. The earthquake and thunder had shattered the bricks, had torn down the casings of burnt tiles, and the materials of the walls were thrown together and formed hills. The great god, Merrdach, had put it into my heart to build it again; I have not changed the place, and have not disturbed the foundations. In the month of salvation, on the auspicious day, I have pierced the unburnt brick of the walls and the burnt brick of the casings with arches; I have inscribed the glory of my name on the frieze of the arches."

¹ He went to Mesopotamia in the service of the French government, and published the results of that journey in the *Journal Asiatique*.

If this interpretation of Oppert be confirmed,¹ then we have two points here in particular which are very important. Among the ruins of Borsippa, the castle of the ancient Babylon, which lay on the southwest of the city, between the outer and the inner circle of walls, is found still a hill of ruins, which the popular tradition calls Birs Nimrud (Nimrod's Tower), and also Tower of Languages, and concerning which it affirms that it is a relic of the ancient tower of Babel. Modern scholars have naturally rejected this as a myth, and have seen there only remains of the temple of Belus, built by Nebuchadnezzar and described by Herodotus. This inscription now, if reliable, would show that both views are correct, inasmuch as Nebuchadnezzar built his temple purposely on the site of the ancient tower. The architectural document — for so we may term that inscription — gives the local tradition respecting that famous structure of ancient times, as still well known on the ground itself. This tradition of the country relates the substance of the matter in accordance with Genesis ;² it is a vast edifice, which, in consequence of a great catastrophe, remains unfinished ; and from it dates the confusion of tongues. But not less remarkable is the chronological indication. King Nebuchadnezzar reigned B.C. 604–561, and the building of the tower, according to the biblical chronology,² is to be placed in the twenty-third century before Christ ; the intervening period is about sixteen hundred years, which agrees very well with the forty-two generations of the cylinder, if we allow thirty-five or forty years to each. This result is not unimportant, in view of modern objections, which charge the chronology of Genesis with errors of centuries.

We proceed to speak, next, of the flood. As an event in

¹ Our understanding of the cuneiform character is still imperfect, and we must wait for additional light before we can be sure of every item. Ewald has raised serious doubts as to some of the conclusions. It is certain, at all events, that no one has so deciphered these monuments as to find any contradiction between them and the Bible.

² See Gen. x. 25 ; xi. 16.

nature, this catastrophe, of course, shows its effect not in the condition of mankind, but that of the earth only. Such effect it does show abundantly, as geology proves to us. This science indeed, as it appears, testifies in an undoubted manner to a series of earlier great catastrophes of this nature, on our globe; but this fact naturally does not exclude, but includes, a confirmation of the flood as the last of such revolutions. As there have been so many creative epochs, some have more frequently used geology as a weapon against the truth of Genesis. On the contrary, it is to be observed that these changes, as to the principle which they involve, furnish a strong proof of the biblical view of the world, as opposed to the modern one; inasmuch as they disprove, most decisively, every supposition of the eternity of the world's present state, and of a constant sameness of the conditions under which life exists. It should be added, that as far as regards the particular theories and the particular periods of geology, this science is still too young and too unsettled to allow us to draw so hastily from them any certain conclusions either for the confirmation or the refutation of the Bible. The case is similar to that of Egyptology and its centuries. We should leave these sciences, and also theology, to unfold themselves, free and unopposed, by the side of each other; in the end, the harmony between them will make itself evident, as certainly as the God of revelation is no other than the God of nature and history.

In addition to the geological evidence, there may and must be another evidence for the flood, if, as we read in the book of Genesis, the father of the renewed human race was a witness of that event. This supplementary evidence is that of the traditions found among all nations. A stupendous catastrophe like this must have left traces of its remembrance everywhere. So it is in fact. Alexander von Humboldt says: "The old traditions of the flood which we find scattered over the earth, like the ruins of a great shipwreck, are highly interesting in the philosophical study of

our own species. Like certain families of the vegetable kingdom, which, notwithstanding the diversity of elements and the influence of light, retain the impression of a common type, the traditions of nations respecting the origin of the world display everywhere the same physiognomy, and present features of resemblance that fill us with astonishment. How many different tongues, belonging to branches that appear totally distinct, transmit to us the same fact! The traditions concerning races that have been destroyed, and the renewal of nations, scarcely vary in reality, though every nation gives them a local coloring. In the great continents, as on the smallest islands of the Pacific ocean, it is always on the loftiest and nearest mountains that the remains of the human race have been saved; and this event appears the more recent, in proportion as the nations are uncultivated, and as the knowledge they possess of their own existence is not remote. After having studied with attention the Mexican monuments anterior to the discovery of the New World; after having penetrated into the forests of the Orinoco, and seen how insignificant and disconnected are the European settlements, and in what condition the independent tribes have remained, we are compelled to say that it is impossible to ascribe this coincidence to the influence of missionaries and of Christianity on the national traditions. Nor is it at all more probable that the discovery of sea-shells on the summit of mountains gave birth, among the nations of the Orinoco, to the tradition of some great inundation, which extinguished for a time the germs of organic life on the earth."¹

Of these traditions, which point so significantly to the past, it is proper to mention here a few examples. Humboldt himself relates the following, which he found among the South American Indians on the Orinoco: "The natives of this region entertain the belief that at the time of the great waters, when their fathers were forced to have re-

¹ Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of America. See Bohn's Scientific Library, Vol. II. p. 183.

course to boats, to escape the general inundation, the waves of the sea beat against the rocks of Encaramanda. This belief is not confined to one nation singly, the Tamanacs; it makes part of a system of tradition, of which we find scattered notions among the Maypures of the great cataracts, among the Indians of the Rio Erevato, which runs into the Caura, and among almost all the inhabitants of the Upper Orinoco. When the Tamanacs are asked how the human race survived this great deluge, the 'age of water' of the Mexicans, they say: 'A man and a woman saved themselves on a high mountain, called Tamanacu, situated on the banks of the Anveru; and casting behind them, over their heads, the fruits of the Mauritia palm-tree, they saw that the seeds contained in those fruits produced men and women, who repopled the earth.' Between the banks of the Cassiquiare and the Orinoco, hieroglyphic figures are often seen at great heights, on rocky cliffs which could be accessible only by constructing very lofty scaffolds. When the natives are asked how these figures could have been sculptured, they answer with a smile, as if relating a fact of which a white man only could be ignorant, that at the period of the great waters, their fathers went to that height in boats."

We follow the sun still further west, and find like traces of a primitive fact on the islands of the Pacific. As the English missionary, Mr. Ellis, was preaching in Owhyhee, one of the Sandwich islands, on the subject of Noah and the flood, his hearers remarked that they had received from their forefathers an account of a general inundation which overflowed the land except a small point of the mountain Kea. Two men, they said, escaped the universal destruction which overtook all others; but of a ship and of Noah they had never heard. The inhabitants of Tahiti, one of the South Sea islands, say, in explanation of their origin, that "the supreme God, a long time ago, being angry, dragged the earth through the sea, when their island was broken off and preserved."

The American explorer, Wilkes, found that even the Fy-

jis had been reached by this great terror of mankind.¹ They say that, "after the islands had been possessed by the first man and woman, a great rain took place by which they were finally submerged; but before the highest places were covered by the waters, two large double canoes made their appearance. In one of these was Rokora, the god of carpenters, in the other, Rokola, his head workman, who picked up some of the people and kept them on board until the waters had subsided, after which they were again landed on the island. It is reported that in former times canoes were always kept in readiness against another inundation. The persons thus saved, eight in number, were landed at Mbenga, where the highest of their gods is said to have made his first appearance. By virtue of this tradition the chiefs of Mbenga take rank before all others, and have always acted a conspicuous part among the Fijis."

The American aborigines in the extreme north are familiar with the same tradition, modified, as is natural, by their location and habits. The Dog-rib Indians heard from their fathers, as they say, that "the first man was named Chapewee. He lived with his family on a strait between two seas.² Having there constructed a weir to catch fish, such a quantity were taken that the strait was choked up, and the water rose and overflowed the earth. Chapewee embarked with his family in a canoe, taking with him all manner of birds and beasts. The water covered the earth for many days, but at length Chapewee said: We cannot live always thus, we must find land again; and he accordingly sent a beaver to search for it. The beaver was drowned, and his carcase was seen floating on the water; on which Chapewee despatched a musk-rat on the same errand. The second messenger was long absent, and when he did return, was near dying with fatigue, but he had a

¹ Exploring Expedition.

² Manifestly Beering's Straits, which the tribe crossed at some remote period. That the aborigines conceive of America as an island, is a remarkable testimony to their migration thither from Asia, beyond the water.

little earth in his paws. The sight of the earth rejoiced Chapewee, but his first care was about the safety of his faithful servant, the rat, which he rubbed gently with his hands and cherished in his bosom until it revived. He next took up the earth, and moulding it with his fingers, placed it on the waters, where it increased by degrees until it formed an island in the ocean."¹

In the Mexican city of Cholulu is found a wonderful pyramidal temple or Teocalli (house of God), which was consecrated to the first man, Quetzalcoatl. With this temple is associated a tradition which connects the flood and the building of the tower in a very remarkable manner. Alexander von Humboldt relates it thus: "Before the great inundation, in the year 4008 after the creation of the world, the land of Anahuac (Mexico) was inhabited by giants. All those who did not perish in the great inundation were, with the exception of seven who had taken refuge in caves, changed into fish. When the waters had subsided, one of these men, named Xelhuar, the architect, went to Cholollun (Cholulu), where he erected an artificial hill, of a pyramidal form, in memory of the mountain Tlalok, which had served him and his six brothers as a place of shelter. The bricks for this purpose he caused to be made in the province of Tlamanalco, and in order to bring them to Cholulu, he placed a row of men, in line, who passed them to each other from hand to hand. The gods saw this building with displeasure, and, enraged at the audacity of Xelhuar, hurled fires against the pyramid. Many laborers perished; the work was not continued, and they afterward consecrated the structure to the god of the air, Quetzalcoatl (the first man of the golden age)."² This history, adds Humboldt himself, reminds us of the ancient traditions of the East, which the Hebrews relate in their sacred books. The Choluluanians still preserve a stone which, as they say, fell out of the clouds like a ball of fire, on the pyramid. This aerolite has the form of a turtle.

¹ Franklin's Second Expedition to the Shores of the Polar Sea, pp. 291, 292.

² Ansichten der Cordilleren (Vues des Cordillères), I. s. 42 f.

In order to show the age of this story, about Xelhutz, father Rios (who had previously, viz. about 1566, communicated the tradition according to hieroglyphic pictures) remarks that it was contained in a song which the Cholulians were accustomed to sing at their festivals, while they danced about the Teocalli, and that this song began with the words "Tulanian hululaez," which occur in no one of the Mexican languages. Everywhere on the globe, upon the summits of the Cordilleras as on the islands of Samothrace in the Aegean sea, fragments of the original languages have preserved themselves in the religious usages of men." So far Humboldt.

It is especially noticeable, as Humboldt points out, that the pyramid of Cholulu has the same formation as the tower of Belus at Babylon, according to the description of Herodotus. This agrees fully with what has been ascertained from the inscription of Nebuchadnezzar respecting the tower of Belus. That temple, as appears from the remains of the edifice, and as affirmed in the still living tradition, was a restoration of the ancient tower of Babel, and would be constructed naturally according to the original model. Lücken extends the comparison still further. He finds a significant similarity between the Babylonian tower and the pyramidal structures which are found not only in Mexico, Babylon, and Egypt, but appear in all parts of the earth as the oldest buildings and monuments of the nations, such as the Indian pagodas, the Buddhist stupas, the Chinese thas, the morais in the South Sea islands.

In the same sense, Schelling says: "The nations sought to hold themselves together externally, by means of these monuments, evidently of a pre-historic age, which are found in all parts of the Roman world, and, by their size and mode of construction, afford evidence of an almost superhuman strength; and by which we are involuntarily reminded of that fatal tower which the oldest narrative mentions when it speaks of the dispersion of the nations. The builders say to each other: 'Come now, let us build us a city, and a

tower whose top may reach unto heaven ; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth.' ”

“ Such traditions of a flood,” says Lücken, “ are, if possible, more common in the new world than in the old. The form in which the natives relate them, agrees in such a striking manner with the traits of the Bible history, that we cannot blame the astonished Spaniards if, on their first discovery of that continent, they believed, on account of these and similar traditions, that the apostle Thomas must have preached Christianity there. Truly we must regard it as a work of Providence that this new world, which, perhaps for centuries, unknown to the rest of mankind and separated from them, followed their own course of training, when suddenly discovered in the midst of the light of historical times, shows at once an agreement with the traditions of the old world, which must convince even the most incredulous that all mankind must originally have drank from the same common source of intellectual life.”¹

The Asiatic nations give their testimony to the same effect : “ The history of a general inundation of the earth,” says Bopp,² “ as it is related to us in the Mahâbhâreta and several other Indian writings, affords an unmistakable and most remarkable agreement with the Mosaic tradition of the flood.” In the preface to his translation of parts of that work out of the Sanscrit, he states the substance of the story as follows : “ The Lord of creatures, Brahmâ, the highest existence, appeared to a pious king named Manus, and announced to him the impending deluge, which was to destroy everything. He commanded him to build a ship, and in the time of danger to enter it, and to take with him seeds of all kinds, as they would be named to him, separated from one another. Manus obeyed the command of the

¹ H. Lücken, die Traditionen des Menschengeschlechts oder die Offenbarungen Gottes unter den Heiden.

² Die Sündflut u. s. w. aus der Ursprache übersetzt von Franz Bopp. Berlin : 1829.

deity, and brought all seeds into the ship, which he himself then entered. But the ship, guided by the deity, swam many years upon the sea, until it finally settled upon the highest summit of the mountain Himawân (Himalaya), where it was bound fast at the command of the deity. This summit is therefore still named, at this day, Nau-Bandhanam (i. e. ship-binding); and from Manus descends the preserved race of mankind."

It was doubted, at one time, whether the Chinese had any knowledge of a flood. It is now well known that the Chinese form no exception in this respect. Dr. Gutzlaff, for example, states that he saw, in one of the Buddhist temples, "in beautiful stucco, the scene where Kwan-zin, the goddess of mercy, looks down from heaven upon the lonely Noah in his ark, amidst the raging waves of the deluge, with the dolphins swimming around, as his last means of safety, and the dove, with an olive-branch in its beak, flying towards the vessel."¹

It is sufficient to allude merely to the opinions of the ancient Hellenic and Semitic races. The existence of such traditions among the Greeks and Romans, and the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, Persians, were so notorious that the Christian apologist Lactantius,² early in the fourth century, could say: ² "Factum esse diluvium ad perdendam tollendamque ex orbe terrae malitiam constat inter omnes. Idem enim et philosophi et poetae scriptoresque rerum antiquarum loquuntur, in eoque maxime cum prophetarum sermone consentiunt."³

At this point, again, we might pause and ask, as a reason-

¹ As quoted in the Bible Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 672.

² De Falsa Religione (II. 10).

³ It is to be remarked that the diffusion of such a belief in all parts of the earth proves nothing as to the universality of the Mosaic deluge; for if the races were scattered from a common centre, the impression would be the same whether the flood was universal or confined to the region inhabited at the time by man.

Among the sources of fuller information are Smith's Sacred Annals; Calcott on the Deluge; Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge; Bryant's Analysis of Ancient Mythology; Stillingfleet's Origines Sacrae (Book III. 4); and the summaries in Dr. Smith's Bible Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 671.

able act, that men should reflect on these traditions actually found among the remotest nations. It seems, to us at least, that a common reminiscence of something that has really taken place presents itself as the only rational explanation of this striking agreement, especially as exemplified in so many details. He, indeed, who has his mind preoccupied with certain views of modern mythicism,¹ and measures everything according to his "critical principles respecting mythology and the origin of religions," will seek to escape here also, or find it most agreeable not to regard these things, at least not in a proper manner. But he to whom facts are something that demands attention and consideration (and of such thinkers there are some still, as ever), will perhaps prove the truth of Plato's words: "Wonder is the beginning of knowledge." He will perceive that these primeval traditions of the human race illustrate as much the historical credibility of the Mosaic writings, even in their minute recitals, as they do their essential purity and elevation, in contrast with the heathen myths. In this latter respect it will be seen especially how Israel only, together with the fact, maintains, at the same time, the innermost divine idea of the fact; while the heathen preserve the external forms remarkably enough, but clothe them with fantastic and national costumes. There is a difference here similar to that between the canonical and apocryphal gospels.

Thus it is ever with the truth; and perhaps science will yet, in a still higher degree than the genial man himself thought, bring to recognition what Herder says in reference to the "oldest document of the human race," as he terms it: "Its sound is gone out into all the world, and even into all lands its words! Whence is it that the remotest nations of the earth knew it? How could they build upon it entire systems of religion and mythology, yea, the simplest foundation of all their arts, institutions, and sciences? But if from that source precisely things may be made plain as the

¹ By "mythicism" is meant the science (as some would term it) of finding, understanding, and explaining myths.

sun-light, which otherwise lie there as chaos, a riddle, night itself, where nothing is heard but denial or the jargon of mere hypotheses; if, in general, from this source precisely an entire antiquity may be reduced to order, a thread of light be drawn through the most confused beginnings of nations, which manifestly, as in Corregio's night, spreads itself from the cradle of the human race,—then ye inventors of mythologies, and desecrators of the revelation of God, what say ye then?"¹

We now go further back, to the first of the three catastrophes, that is, the apostasy or fall. This is, in one respect, but too much like the third, viz. that it has left behind it the deepest traces in the moral condition and life of mankind. What the building of the tower is for the life of nations, the fall is for the human race in general, as well as for the experience of each individual. The evil which exists in us as a matter of fact, if this fact be correctly analyzed, demands for its explanation such an original act and transgression as we find related to us in the book of Genesis. As we look within ourselves here, we find that our moral consciousness involves an apparent contradiction. On the one side, we feel ourselves to be accountable for sin; on the other, we know that the susceptibilities of our nature, which form in us the proper incentives to sin, are involuntary; and this same conscience which holds us accountable for sin, says to us that we have nothing to answer for which is not an act of our own freedom.

In the solution of this contradiction, we must first of all duly consider the difference adverted to in what has just been said—the difference between the sinful act and the sinful state, by which latter term we mean, here, our natural constitution as the source of the sinful propensity. It is clear that we have an accountability for our sins resting upon us, so far as they are deeds, free acts by which we assist the sinful propensities, instead of checking them,

¹ Aelteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts Sämmtliche Werke, Religion, and Theologie (Carlsruhe, 1827), V. s. 187 f.; V. s. 12; VI. s. 4 f.

to break forth and obtain the mastery. Hence the question can only be, whether, and how far, we are accountable for the sinful state itself? This state is our natural constitution; it is innate; we brought it with us into the world, before a free decision was possible for us; and hence theology terms the sinful state the hereditary sin, in distinction from actual sin. For something inherited now, we cannot be accountable, at all events in the same sense that we are for something done by ourselves.

Yet the circumstance that we feel ourselves accountable for the actual sin, leads us to form a remarkable conclusion as to the hereditary sin. There results from this fact at least as much as this, that the hereditary sin does not serve to excuse a sinful act. But this would be the case if we had to recognize in the act a pure natural necessity; for we cannot speak of guilt where there is no freedom. If we felt ourselves absolutely and altogether innocent in reference to hereditary sin, we could hardly charge ourselves with any guilt in reference to actual sins, since we know that these always spring from the hereditary sin—from our carnal nature. Perhaps it itself, would be only the degree of our sinfulness, not the sinfulness that would then appear to us as matter of self-inculpation. On the whole, we could then say, with reason: "It is, after all, my nature; so I cannot otherwise; and as to what I do under a natural necessity, I need not reproach myself for that, or fear that I shall be punished." Spinoza would then be right, when he declares that repentance is unphilosophical; and Carl Vogt, when he combats the rightfulness of punishment. Unless we could recognize also hereditary sin as something that should not be; and yet could be, it would cease to be, and with it all sin of every kind would cease to be, wicked. In some way, therefore, hereditary sin must have a criminal origin, from which I cannot pronounce myself free, although it lies out of me personally. I am involved in an act of guilt which I myself have not committed. But this is only a new contradiction, which demands its solution. Just here, however, this hereditary law, this

idea of something inborn, transmitted, comes to our help. Man is not an isolated, an independent being. The roots of his existence lie in his relation to the species; generation is the mysterious origin of individuals. Each single one stands in organic connection with family, people, mankind. A degraded father leaves shame to his children; a bankrupt leaves debts which rest on the entire family. Thus we cannot take ourselves out of the corruption of our race. Though it is not an individual guilt, it is a collective guilt, in which we all have to bear our part together. In this sense, too, every one among us must say: "homo sum, nihil humani a me alienum puto." This organic partnership in guilt expresses itself in various ways, inasmuch as every one feels himself concerned in the sins of his family, his native city, his people, though personally he may have no immediate participation in them. Upon this principle depends the profound meaning of a day of general humiliation and repentance. So, therefore, the fact of hereditary sin does not suffice for an exculpation, but deepens and sharpens the consciousness of our sins, so that we know we are born of a perverted race; the aggregative life to which we belong is an unclean one. David well understood this when, in a penitential (not self-justifying) psalm, he says: "Behold, in iniquity was I begotten, and in sin my mother conceived me." But because the entire race of mankind now, as experience shows, are found in this pollution, we are compelled to go back to the first man. If the race, as such, exists in a perverted state, one inherited, and yet accountable in the sense described, then the first man, the progenitor of the race, must have sinned freely. Man must have been originally pure and good; the apostasy must have been his act, his personal guilt. He could and should have actually avoided sin; his sphere of freedom must have been greater than ours, and he must have had a full choice between good and evil. Only where the sinful state is no physical one merely, but ethically conditioned, product of a free act, so that the act with its accountability still trembles through the entire

range of man's existence, then only does the hereditary sin not serve as an excuse for the actual sin ; then only is the contradiction between the "terrible necessity for sinning" and freedom and accountability solved. My sin says to me that Adam has sinned in a different way from my own sin, that is, as one entirely free.

Hereditary sin, i.e. the sinful state in general, as an attribute of mankind, furnishes also a proof of the derivation of the human race from a common parentage. If there were several progenitors, there must have been several acts of apostasy like each other, and the diffusion of sin would be something accidental ; whereas the aggregate condition of mankind and nature shows itself to be affected by the same malign power. "Through one man," says Paul, briefly and directly,¹ "sin has come into the world."

Thus a true analysis of our moral consciousness serves as an essential confirmation of the biblical narrative of the fall ; and we see also here, again, that Genesis alone takes up the actual fact, and explains it in an adequate manner. If we have only once learned to put correctly the questions of our experience, the Bible constantly furnishes to us the correct answer. That which it positively transmits to us will ever prove itself more and more to be the rational account, the alone *ratio sufficiens* for that which experience places before us in the most diverse relations. Robespierre once said : "If there be no God, we must then invent him" ; and that remark we may apply also to God's word and its explanations. If there be no such history of the origin of sin, one should then invent it — if he could ; for indeed we learn first to interpret experience aright when the divine light falls upon it. The heavens must illumine what is earthly if one is to see it. The holy scripture is the genuine word of the Spirit ; it speaks the genuine language of the Spirit. It is in this sense the scripture *κατ' ἔξοχόν*, the only actual writing of the Spirit in the world, to which all other writings approximate only in endless gradations. The

¹ Rom. v. 12.

more, now, we elevate ourselves in the Spirit to a truly spiritual contemplation of things, the more the scripture will reveal itself as nearest and most kindred to us, as clearest and most transparent. There it then becomes to us *Θεία πάντα και ἀνθρώπινα πάντα*.

But the narrative of Genesis respecting the fall sustains itself still further under this regressive scrutiny. If the sin of mankind rests upon a free act of Adam, then that sin cannot yet have its ultimate ground in that act. Every existence, and especially the personal, is linked by an inner bond to its origin. So, then, the first man also must have been bound to God through a natural attraction of the deepest piety. As Melancthon so beautifully says, in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession: "They had a fine, good, joyous heart towards God and godly things; they lived in and out of God, as the child lives in and out of the mother." If, now, the thought of the disruption from God, of the first soul-murder, had arisen in their hearts, they then would have determined themselves against God in their own innermost individuality; the evil would be nothing foreign to the human being; the man himself would be evil, he would have satanized himself. In that case, too, the evil could no longer be removed from human nature; mankind would no longer be capable of redemption. Exactly on that account, therefore, because that man is no devil, there must be a devil. The evil in human form, since it does not constitute the substance of a creature's personality, and leaves room still for redemption, admits of explanation only as the result of temptation.

The two ideas, therefore, which have given most offence to the natural reason, because they belong to the sphere of mystery, the ideas of hereditary sin and a devil, prove themselves to be rather the true vindicators of humanity. How much declamation has there been about the unworthy, degrading view concerning our race contained in the doctrine of hereditary sin! But who consults better for the dignity of man, he who takes the present condition of

flesh and death as the normal and only possible one, or the other, who teaches that we were born and created to something better, and that our present state is only a period of the fall which has supervened? No one has ever discoursed more sublimely respecting man's true dignity than Genesis, with its doctrine of the formation after God's image, and the fall of the first-created. And no one has judged human sin with greater lenity, and, also in the doctrine of conversion, with more energy maintained still the better I, the good substance in man, than the book of Genesis, with its narrative of the temptation of our first parents.

While, now, the origin of evil in man admits of no other explanation than that in Genesis, viz. by an act of freedom on the one hand, which lays the foundation of guilt, and by a temptation on the other, which affords a possibility of redemption, it is also true that the Mosaic narrative, in its account of this origin, describes at the same time the nature of sin in a way never surpassed, and confirmed by all experience as true. The first act is, that the tempter seeks to loosen the bonds of child-like confidence which attach man to God; that he sows unbelief and then disobedience in the human heart. He must, first of all, tear away the sure ground beneath the feet of man, on which alone he stands morally, by exciting suspicion against his Maker's eternal love, as if he were capable of jealousy and envy.¹ Upon the relation of man to God depends the difference between good and evil; the one is coincident with the other. Scripture knows no morality without a religious foundation, no moral law to which man is bound, apart from God, merely in his own individual nature and attributes. But man himself is bound to the living, holy God in his inmost being; God's will and

¹ Gen. iii. 1-4: "And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

command, as it was revealed at the beginning, to the first-created of the race, is the rule and condition of the highest good, the law of morality; ¹ as, on the other hand, turning aside from the order of life fixed by God and in him, is sin, the *ἀνομία*.² If a person should think to define the difference between good and evil, without any reference to God, he is in danger of losing all conception of the difference itself; for without God, the highest the immutable standard of good is wanting; and we comprehend sin in its true nature and full extent only when we recognize it as treason against the majesty of the living God. The first act of sin, therefore, is a breaking away from God, godlessness, unbelief, which shows itself first as mistrust which allows itself to suspect the person of God, to obscure the sense of his fatherly love, and after that a disobedience which does not regard his command as holy. In our relation to God, as well as in other connections, the religious element in the stricter sense, the inner position of person to person, the disposition of the heart gives to our conduct its moral character, and precedes it. Upon this principle, again, rests the reciprocal relation of justification and sanctification, faith and works.

But this first assault does not succeed at once,³ and the tempter follows it up by another. He instils into man the poison of pride, self-elevation, by holding out to him that he may rise above his dependent condition as a creature, and even become as God, knowing good and evil. We have here, now, a masterly stroke of Satanic art. In denying, so falsely, that God would inflict the threatened death, he knew how to interweave a lie and the truth together. It is

¹ Gen. ii. 16, 17: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

² 1 John iii. 4.

³ Gen. iii. 2, 3: "And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." How finely is man's better character disclosed here, in contrast with Satan's.

really the will of God and the destination of man that he should ascend to the higher step of a consciously free life. It is the will of God and our destination, as a result of having been made in the divine image, that man should become like God. There is a sense in which all our nature, in virtue of that spirit of God breathed into us, longs for the perfect life for which we were designed.¹ But as a creature, man, in order to reach this goal, has to pass through a course of development, under God's discipline. It is only in the state of subjection to God which corresponds to man's nature; only through a free acknowledgment of his position as a creature in an act of obedience, which God therefore before all else demands, and must demand, that progress to a higher stage of life is possible; only as a reward for fidelity towards God can the creature who is free receive the crown of eternal life.

While God, now, has at first shown to men the way only, and not as yet the goal, because they are required to trust him, to exhibit fidelity; the tempter, on the contrary, shows to them immediately the alluring prize, and promises to spare them the way, in order to bring them to it by a false path, which makes the actual attainment of the goal impossible. Satan promises likeness to God in a moment, without the toil. Man has only to cast away God, to transgress his command; then his eyes are opened, he finds himself at once in a new, higher sphere of existence; he awakes, as out of a sleep, to self-consciousness, to a free knowledge of good and evil, and therein he is like God. It is this thorn of self-exaltation which the serpent has planted in the human heart, exciting man to wrest as under the connection between knowledge and obedience, to seek to be at once what he is to become by degrees, to put his own will and

¹ Thus Rom. viii. 29: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren"; 1 John iii. 2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is"; and Matth. v. 48: "Be ye, therefore, perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

caprice in the place of obligation and doing the will of God. Man has indeed, as a personal creature, a principle of independence and of self-activity in himself. This power he exercises in a normal way when he devotes himself freely to God. The tempter says the reverse: "Thou needest not trouble thyself about God; only be independent, take the fruit, and be wise, live according to thy own will, and so thou art God." He puts forward the personality, the egoism, but thrusts aside the dependent nature; he perverts man's being formed in God's likeness, into his making himself a god. Selfishness, which deposes the Supreme, which makes man himself supreme, the centre of all things, is the second element in the nature of sin.

To this is added, as the third element, after the serpent has thus loosened the ground, what takes place in Eve herself, viz. desire, love of the world, gratification of the senses.¹ The prohibitory command has its importance in this, that by means of an external object to which man is attracted by no want whatever, the renunciation of which therefore was easy, it may become known whether man will decide for God or the world, for the higher or the lower, for the spirit or the flesh, for good or evil. The question was put altogether abstractly: the tree had no importance of any sort by itself, but came into account merely as a means of bringing our freedom into activity. This its name imports: tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But this tree in particular, the one forbidden, beyond all others unforbidden, now acquires a charm and interest in the eyes of the woman. God has now lost his reality for her; the world also allures with magic power, though what it offers is, in itself, most insignificant; the tree seems to the senses so sweet. The appetites obtain the control, and sin is committed. The flesh has conquered, and life's course is changed. Since the

¹ "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat."

higher powers, out of God, their proper ground and support, have yielded, the lower ones become the masters.

Men have now, it is true, as to their knowledge, strode forward.¹ But they would have done that also, in the event of a normal decision; for not sin, as Schiller, Hegel, and others think, but the trial of liberty, the power of choice, is the condition of progress from a state of childhood to one of higher spiritual development. But in the case of a normal or right decision there would be connected with the progress in knowledge a corresponding progress in the entire existence of man, physical as well as ethical. The actual change, however, was very different from that which the tempter held out to him to excite and delude his hopes. He became actually a prey to the death with which he was threatened. The spirit was henceforth subordinate, the flesh ascendant. The knowledge which he gained was the sense of this degradation, of the loss of his innocence, of subjection to matter; so that, instead of being like God, he is drawn toward the level of the grovelling serpent, the instrument of his ruin. It is impossible not to be struck with the singular simplicity, not to say irony, of the words of the sacred writer, in allusion to those of the serpent: "Then were the eyes of both of them opened, and they knew—that they were naked."²

¹ Gen. iii. 7: "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked"; and vs. 22: "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."

² The following sentences belong here, and are intelligible enough to the German scholar; but it would be a useless travestie to attempt to put them into English: "Das jene drei Momente des Sündenbegriffs nicht zufällig sind, zeigt sich prinzipiell darin, dass sie den drei Grundelementen des menschlichen Seins und Bewusstseins, Geist, Seele, Leib, Gottesbewusstsein, Selbstbewusstsein, Weltbewusstsein entsprechen. Das Gottesbewusstsein ist zur Gottentfremdung, das Selbstbewusstsein, zur Selbstsucht, das Weltbewusstsein zur Weltlust geworden. Das erste, höchste Element des Menschenwesens, das pneumatische, ist verneint, getrübt, kraftlos; die beiden andern, untern sind auf falsche, krankhafte Weise bejährt und gesteigert: der Mensch ist psychisch und sarkisch geworden. Der Mensch will nicht mehr Gott, er will die Creatur nach ihren beiden Seiten, der geistigen und natürlichen, der subjectiven und objectiven, er will sein eigenes Ich und die Welt."

In the foregoing analysis the factors are unbelief, selfishness, lust of the senses. The selfishness is, as it were, the soul of sin, and the senses the body of sin; the former, the inner root of evil, while the latter is the external medium through which the "I" or egoism, now separated from God, would seek its end of life in the world. The progress of sin, as exemplified in a man's actual experience, accords with this view of its origin. Thus Genesis combines and harmonizes the conflicting theories of human speculation respecting the nature of sin: the theory of selfishness, represented in recent times by Julius Müller, and that of sense represented by Schleiermacher and Rothe. But Genesis carries back both ethical theories to a religious foundation; and here we all still have much to learn in our modern ways of thinking. In correspondence with this, the scheme of redemption opposes belief to unbelief, love to selfishness, the hope of a new world to the pleasures of this world.

I think we may say that Genesis, with its narrative of the fall, will bear examination. There are vouchers for its truth not less important than those which accredit the accounts of the flood and the building of the Babylonian tower. As the actual condition of Israel, their history, and their experience serve to confirm the Pentateuch, so the actual condition of the world and life of nations, the human consciousness of sin and of relationship to God, as well as the traditions of all nations, serve to confirm "this oldest record of the human race."

Shall I speak now still further of that which the first three chapters of Genesis announce to us concerning the creation of the world, of mankind? A "rational" theology, cosmology, psychology lie here in *nuce*. Some things we have already intimated. At the outset the first verse moves like a saving ark over the waters of heathenism, and presents to us correct ideas of the deepest import respecting God and the world, and their mutual relation to each other, such as we seek in vain elsewhere in the whole ancient world. In inditing the word, Gen. i. 27: "God created

man in his image; in the image of God he created him," as Ewald finely remarks in reference to the repetition in the parallelism, the hand of the narrator seems to have trembled with joy—a word which describes the position and dignity of man, with which nothing certainly in the ancient or modern world can be compared. That other word respecting man's creation: "And the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul,"¹ will ever preserve its place in the foundation of all sound anthropology; for the extremes which for centuries have been contending with each other in this science, materialism and spiritualism, sensualism and idealism, are here in principle combined together in a deeper, more suggestive manner than appears to every one at first sight.

Where such stars glitter, there we discern the heavens, although obscure places also still lie between them. Written monuments, like the first chapter of Genesis, to the third verse of the second chapter (Elohistic, so called), and from the third verse of the second chapter to the end of the third chapter (Jehovistic, so called), have a right to present to us also difficulties; and difficulties there are, whether we consider the two portions by themselves or in their relations to each other. The obscurities lie, in part necessarily, as has been suggested before, in the entirely pre-historic character of the records,—as to the general relation which the two sections bear to each other, modern researches have cast no small light upon it, so that what is now intelligible even here, and seen to be grand and magnificent, far exceeds that which is still unpenetrated,—of which, in truth, exegesis and theology have not more to encounter than all other sciences involve. The first, the Elohistic portion, shows us what nature is, and what man's relation to it is; what history is, and man's position in it is. Man in his connection with nature, and his elevation above it, in his moral attitude as contrasted with it, is described there in a style

¹ Gen. ii. 7.

so lofty, pure, grand, that modern pantheism and materialism might much better learn from it than mock at it. How simply and pertinently, for example, is the distinction drawn between man and beast, so nearly obliterated by some modern theorizers, by the two traits that men were created with such solemnity in God's image, and as a single pair, while the beasts always come forth out of their elements at the Creator's word, and at once in a countless swarm. Man appears as the key-stone, and lord of nature, but his entire importance centres in his relation to God, in whom he was destined to enjoy the sabbatical rest. Then follows the second part, in which Elohim appears as Jehovah, and connects himself with man as accountable and holy at first, then fallen, and the object of measures for his rescue. He assigns to him, in accordance with his earthly nature, a special place of revelation, the garden of Eden (Gen. xi. 2-14). There, at first, Adam is with God alone. He receives from him the command which should bring his freedom into action, and make him a factor in the world's development (Gen. ii. 15-17). This is the beginning of history. Man's relation to God is the original one, which precedes every relation of man to man, even the most intimate which attaches itself most closely to it, that of man and woman (Gen. ii. 18-25). Here the connection which meets us so often presents itself to us again, that of religion and history, which corresponds in the universal sphere to that of religion and morality in that of the individual; and human history unfolds itself out of and through this relation of man to God. Sin, judgment, and grace (the promise)¹ could have no place without this antecedent. That all history — all life of men as persons and as a race — has its root in religion, is a fundamental idea, on the apprehension and application of which we have yet long to learn and labor.

Thus we meet here, in detail and in general, points of light which are not only clear and distinct of themselves,

¹ The contents of chapter iii.

but shine far away into the whole range of man's history and experience. Hence he who makes the truth an earnest thing, though he may find perplexities which are not to be cleared up in a moment, will not, at least rashly, condemn and cast away the whole; but remember that beautiful remark of Socrates concerning the writings of Heraclitus, the obscure, which has often cheered me in reference to these chapters: "What I have understood," says the wise man, "is genuine and solid; but I think what I have not understood is so too: only this needs a Delian diver."

Our investigation has become unintentionally dogmatic; and there is truly no better apology for the first chapters of Genesis than that which lies in this simple fact. If a person will speak of them, he must touch the fundamental questions concerning sin, the nature of God and men; and so also the reverse: whoever will discuss these questions is led back to those chapters. So true is it that they assert everywhere their character as the pillars which support the foundations and principles of all inquiry. Nay, these primitive testimonies must strike more and more fully through all our modes of thought, if our ideas of God and creation, man and sin, are not to become derogatory to the character of both God and man. Our believing theology, too, has yet to lift itself up to the full height of that chapter, the want of a due recognition of which casts broad shadows still over systems which contain even now much light. But especially can we learn from them not to confine our theological ideas to too narrow a circle, and not to limit them to the usual field of dogmatics, but to give to them that philosophical universality which theosophy has sought for and foreshadowed. For in the first eleven chapters of Genesis lies the foundation of all that relates to man's entire life: marriage and family, labor and raiment, city and state, the relation of mankind to nature and the world of spirits, to nations, languages, religions, and the like. For ethics, too, rich and fruitful hints are to be found here. These chapters, so fundamental, so wide in their scope, would teach

even Christians as well as Israelites : "homo sum, nihil humani a me aliènum puto."

"A thing of wonder," exclaims Herder, "to which the men of reason still venture to give no name, is the story of the fall of the first man. Is it allegory, history, fable? And yet there it stands, after the account of the creation, a second pillar of Hercules, beyond which is nothing further! All subsequent history of the human race begins there. And then what a piece-work follows, made up of the murderous hate and mark of Cain, the little song of Lamech, a row of names of the hundred-years-old, cedar-like men, giants, the flood, and an ark! Ah, the philosophical wits must have so much trouble about the swaddling bands of our race and must be ashamed of them; must wish the waters of the flood had swept them away, or at least left them to appear only in the juggler's commentary. And yet ye are, dear, oldest, and eternal traditions of my race, kernel and germ of its most hidden history! Without you, mankind would be what so much else is, a book without title, without first leaves and explanation; with you, our family acquires foundation, stem, and root, back to God and father Abraham. And they are all taken in so simple, child-like a tone, from the mouth of the first tradition among the trees of the eastern land, and are set forth by Moses, so true and one by one, as if he found them there, the echo of eternal times." And Herder writes to Hamann: "Believe me, my dear friend, the time will come when the revelation and religion of God, instead of criticism and politics, as now, will be the simple history and wisdom of our race."