

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXXII.—AUGUST, 1896.—No. 2.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—NATURAL FACTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE.

BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., MONTREAL, CANADA,
LATE PRINCIPAL AND VICE-CHANCELLOR OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY.

(Third Article—Concluded.)

It remains to say a few words as to the structure of the narrative and its more distinctly practical aspects.

Attempts have been made to connect the different lists of animals and also the times assigned to the advance and recession of the flood with the alleged fusion of two documents by a later editor. It appears, however, that there is no good philological ground for this, and when it is carried out under the supposition of an Elohist and Jahvistic writer, the same result follows which experience has shown to arise from the bisection of homogeneous writings, viz., that neither half is quite complete, and that discrepancies appear which do not occur in the complete document.* We have also found in a previous paper that, even before the flood, a religious distinction had grown up between Elohists and Jahvists or between mere Elohists and Jahveh-Elohists, equivalent to our distinction between Deists and Christians. If, as we have seen, the Cainites ceased to serve God in the aspect of Jahveh, and became pure Elohists and served God, as Bishop Heber puts it, tho in another connection:

“Since first Jehovah scorned such sacrifice,
With frankincense and flowers and oil and corn,
Our bloodless sacrifice.”

Then as our narrator must have belonged to the Jahvist school, we might expect him to use both names, either together, as in Genesis ii., or distinctly, as referring to different aspects of Deity. The latter is the mode employed in allied passages, as where Noah and Enoch are said to have “walked with Elohim,”† while they invoked and offered sacrifice to Jahveh.‡ Accordingly in the deluge narrative, while Elo-

* See Green's "Unity of Genesis," p. 88.

† E. V. "God."

‡ E. V. "Lord."