

probably in progress within the ken of the patriarchal narrator in Genesis, at least during the one hundred and twenty years of grace allowed before the catastrophe.\* The geological evidence for all this has been already referred to, but we must endeavor to realize the fact that the geographical and climatic conditions of the present day and of the early post-diluvian time are very different. In regard to the Euphratean region, to which the narrative in Genesis chiefly relates, the survivors of the deluge must have found the site of the Edenic garden either submerged or converted into a swampy flat, even now only partially reclaimed by silting up and by artificial embankment. Neglect of this fact has led to geographical mistakes as to the site of Eden. For tho the writer of the description of the "Garden" lived in post-diluvian times, he was aware of these differences.†

In discussing the human conditions of the antediluvian age, we must beware of the too common error of importing into them ideas belonging to later times, and must note with care the few graphic touches of the author of Genesis. The keynote to the whole antediluvian history is found in the terrible tragedy of the death of Abel, and in the consequent division of mankind into two distinct tribes separate from each other, and following quite different lines of development. In heathen myths this is the story of Adar and Tammuz and of Typhon and Osiris, but in Genesis it is a sad tale of murder and estrangement in the primitive family, leading, however, to far-reaching historical consequences, more especially in relation to the early separation and later intermixture of the two tribes of men, with the natural physical and moral results of such mixture.

Who then were the "Sons of God" and the "Daughters of Men," (or of the Adam), whose intermarriages are connected with the moral decadence of the antediluvians? Of the conjectures which have been hazarded on this subject, two only appear to deserve notice. The first is that "infranatural" view, as it may be called, which regards the Sons of God as angelic beings fallen from their high estate and uniting themselves to human maidens. This idea, however it may be paralleled with ancient superstitions, is at once unnatural and out of harmony with any subsequent doctrine of the Bible respecting angels, whether holy or fallen, and especially with Christ's statement that angels neither marry nor are given in marriage.‡ It seems at present generally abandoned, except by those who hold the early chapters of Genesis as mythical or allegorical, and can thus regard this incident as analogous to the amours of the Olympian gods and similar heathen stories. The second is the interpretation, favored by more conserva-

\* Gen. vi. 3. They may also be referred to in the words attributed to the Sethite Lamech in Gen. v. 29. The period of one hundred and twenty years undoubtedly refers to a delay of execution to that extent.

† See for a discussion of this, "Modern Science in Bible Lands," by the author.

‡ Mark xii. 25; Matt. xxii. 30. See also Gree.'s "Unity of the Book of Genesis," p. 51 et seq.