

between the Babylonian products and the Bible's seems to me to forbid any such derivation. The debased form may conceivably arise from corruption of the higher, but not *vice versa*. Much rather may we hold with scholars like Delitzsch and Kittel, that the relation is one of cognateness, not of derivation. These traditions came down from a much older source, and are preserved by the Hebrews in their purer form. This appears to me to explain the phenomena as no theory of derivation can do, and it is in accordance with the Bible's own representation of the line of revelation from the beginning along which the sacred tradition can be transmitted.

Leaving Babylonia, I must now say a few words on the scientific and historical aspects of these narratives. Science is invoked to prove that the narratives of Creation in Genesis 1, the story of man's origin and fall in chapters 2 and 3, the account of Patriarchal longevity in chapters 5 and 11, the story of the Deluge, and other matters, must all be rejected because in patent contradiction to the facts of modern knowledge. I would ask you, however, to suspend judgment until we have looked at the relation in which these two things, science and the Bible, stand to each other. When science is said to contradict the Bible, I should like to ask first, What is meant by contradiction here? It may be granted at once to the objectors that the Bible was never given to anticipate or forestall the discoveries of modern twentieth century science. The Bible, as every sensible interpreter of Scripture has always held, takes the world as it is, not as it is seen through the eyes of twentieth-century specialists, but as it lies spread out before the eyes of original men, and uses the popular every-day