

To take the story as ~~an~~ an account of the order of creation is to miss its purpose altogether, as even a cursory examination of the context should make abundantly clear. It is only reasonable to consider that the author is referring back to the fact that God had already created the animals.

~~It should surely be a most naive and primitive mind that could invent a story in rather than to interpret his words as meaning that~~

~~they were only then created.~~ God had other purposes in mind, as had already been suggested in chapter 1. Here ~~is~~ only the relative man's need of

① not informing the animals

③ proper compensation that is under consideration.

What sort of primitive mind could invent a story in which ~~creation of animals~~ came into being simply as the result of a series

of unsatisfactory attempts to satisfy man's need. After [to A on p/16]

B. Thus one animal after another was created. If it proved unsatisfactory, it was not destroyed, but allowed to continue - perhaps even a second one was reated, so as to produce posterity.

All these animals having thus proven unsatisfactory, but having begun to fill the earth with their descendants, God ~~thought~~ of a new idea.