

ARTICLE V.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE ANTEDILUVIAN NARRATIVES.—
LENORMANT, DELITZSCH, HAUPT, DILLMANN.

BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, D.D., OF CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

I. LENORMANT ON THE PRIMITIVE TRADITIONS.¹

THE translator, editor, and publisher of this work have rendered an important contribution to biblical studies by producing it in English dress.² While it handles the subject of which it treats in a learned and scientific way, yet it is quite within the comprehension of every intelligent reader who is interested in such subjects.

The author, who was born in 1835, at Paris, and who is professor of archaeology, and a librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, has secured a good reputation in archaeology and numismatics. More recently he has devoted himself to the primitive history of Semitic peoples. Among his works may be mentioned the *Manual of the Ancient History of the East*, in two volumes, London and Philadelphia, 1869-70. The first edition of the original was published 1868-69, in three volumes, and the sixth in 1876. His *Chaldaeian Magic*, London, 1877, first appeared in French in 1874, and was published as a revised edition in German, Jena, 1878.

In the preface to the work which we are considering he

¹ *The Beginnings of History according to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples, from the Creation of Man to the Deluge.* By François Lenormant, Professor of Archaeology at the National Library of France, . . . with an Introduction by Francis Brown, Associate Professor in Biblical Philology, Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1882.

² We consider them, however, worthy of stripes because they have failed to provide the book with an index. We always glow with indignation when we see such an omission which ought never to occur in the case of any book designed for scholars, in this age when there are so many books to be examined.

is at pains to claim that he is a Christian, notwithstanding his critical views. His position is that of the ordinary evangelical critics, who hold that in the Scriptures God has revealed the truths of salvation, rather than those of science and history. Hence the Bible does not seem to be any less a revelation of God to him, because he recognizes the Jehovist and the Elohist in the Pentateuch, or because he maintains that the records found in the first eleven chapters of Genesis are largely derived from Babylonian traditions. His views, given in his own language, are as follows: "Never yet in the course of a career which already reckons a quarter of a century given to study, have I come face to face with a genuine conflict between science and religion. As far as I am concerned, the two domains are absolutely distinct, and not exposed to collision." With reference to the authority of the Scriptures he says: "I believe firmly in the inspiration of the sacred books, and I subscribe with absolute submission to the doctrinal decisions of the church in this respect. But I know that these decisions extend inspiration only to that which concerns religion, touching faith and practice, or, in other words, solely to the supernatural teachings contained in the Scriptures. In other matters the human character of the writers of the Bible is fully evident. . . . Where the physical sciences were concerned they did not have exceptional light; they followed the common, and even the prejudiced, opinions of their age. . . . The Holy Spirit has not been concerned either with the revelation of scientific truths or with universal history."

With regard to the unity in the composition of the books of the Pentateuch he remarks: "It is my conviction as a scholar that a century of external and internal criticism of the text has led to positive results on this point, which I have not yet accepted without demur, though finally compelled to yield to evidence. . . . I hold as fully demonstrated the distinction between the two fundamental documents, Elohist and Jehovist, which served as sources to the final editor of the first four books of the Pentateuch. . . . And it is especially

the manner in which the final editor or compiler has abstained, beyond a certain degree, from harmonizing the two texts by removing their divergencies that seems to me a decisive proof of the holy and inspired character which he already recognized in their composition."

He finally raises the question, how the first chapters of Genesis should be regarded, and replies: "It is not an account dictated by God himself. . . . It is a tradition which all the great nations of Western Asia possessed in common, with some variations. . . . The family of Abraham carried this tradition with it in the migration which brought it from Ur of the Chaldees into Palestine. . . . The first chapters of Genesis constitute a 'Book of the Beginnings,' in accordance with the stories handed down in Israel from generation to generation ever since the time of the patriarchs, which, in all its essential affirmations, is parallel with the statements of the sacred books from the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris."

At this point he anticipates the objection, Where, then, is the inspiration of the writers? and answers: "In the absolutely new spirit which animates their narration. . . . The exuberant polytheism which encumbers these stories among the Chaldaeans has been carefully eliminated. . . . The essential features of the form of tradition have been preserved, and yet between the Bible and the sacred books of Chaldea there is all the difference of one of the most tremendous revolutions which have ever been effected in human beliefs. . . . I do not hesitate to find in it the effect of a supernatural intervention of divine Providence, and I bow before the God who inspired the Law and the Prophets."

After the author has given the biblical accounts contained in the first eleven chapters of Genesis in the twofold form, so far as they occur, he passes to the main subject of the book,—Comparative Study of the Biblical Account and of Parallel Traditions, which he discusses in eight chapters. The object of the book, as stated in his own language, (p. 337) is "to demonstrate" that "the first chapters of Genesis are

nothing more than a collection of ancient Hebrew traditions of the beginning of things held in common by the nations by whom they were surrounded, and in a very special way with the Chaldaeo-Babylonians. This compilation was made by inspired writers, who found means, while collating the old narratives, to make them the figurative garb of eternal truths, such as the creation of the world by a personal God; the descent of mankind from a single pair; their fall in consequence of the guilt of the first parents, which put them under the dominion of sin; the free-will character of the first sin, and of those which followed in its train. But while drawing a sublime dogmatic teaching from the sequence of this traditional history, the value and authority of which are not in the least impaired or lessened by this way of understanding the sacred book, and while impressing upon the story the stamp of the most rigorous monotheism, which it could not possibly have always preserved in the popular narratives, the legendary and allegorical tone have been retained."

In the first chapter he treats of the creation of man. He finds that the Egyptian account bears a striking resemblance to that of the Jehovist document of Genesis, wherein God forms man out of the dust of the ground. He says that "we still find among peoples who have not yet emerged from the savage state, the same notion prevailing of man fashioned out of the earth by the hand of the Creator." For example the first man according to the Peruvians is called "Animated earth," the Mandans relate that the Great Spirit moulded two figures out of clay, and animated them with the breath of his mouth, who were called the first man and his companion, and Taeroa the great god of Tahati formed man out of red earth.

On the other hand, the Babylonian narrative of creation follows the same order as the Elohist. Unfortunately, among the tablets discovered by the gifted George Smith none contains an account of the creation of man; but Ea, the god of pure life, is mentioned as "having formed with his hands the race of man."

In the mythology of the Scandinavians and Germans we find the belief that the gods drew the first human beings from the trunks of trees ; there are also traces of the same thing in the Vedas. The religion of Zoroaster, however, is the only one of the ancient learned religions of the world which refers the creation to the voluntary act of a personal god, distinct from primordial matter. Ahuramazdâ is represented as creating the universe and man in six successive periods, occupying three hundred and sixty-five days, and ending with the creation of man.

In conclusion Lenormant thinks that the Elohist account of the creation of man indicates that he was created as a double being,—which being male and female constituted Adam,—and calls attention to the fact that the verse says Adâm, and not hâ'âdâm. This interpretation was held by Eusebius, who thinks that Plato's account of the primitive Androgynus agrees entirely with that in the sacred books.

The account of the fall follows in chapter second. The author begins with the statement that one of the most universal traditions is that the progenitors of the human race were in a state of Edenic happiness. We find it among the Egyptians, and among all the peoples of the Aryan or Japhetic race. Among the Aryan nations this belief is connected with the four successive ages of the world, lasting twelve thousand years, which are marked by a gradual degeneracy expressed by the names of the metals, gold, silver, brass, and iron. We are living in the iron age—the worst of all.

It is a noticeable fact that “the religious philosophies which took root outside of that revelation whose depository was among the chosen people made no account whatever of the fall.” It is a truth against which human pride revolts, and which it has forgotten in the traditions of the infancy of the race. In rejecting this doctrine of original sin, the majority of the peoples of pagan antiquity were led to take that of emanation, and of a continual degeneracy of the human race in proportion as they were removed from their

starting-point. We find, however, in a legend common to Oriental Aryans prior to their separation into two branches, that Yima, who unites in himself the characteristics ascribed in Genesis to Adam and Noah, after a season of blameless living, commits the sin which is to burden his descendants, which causes his expulsion from the paradisaic land, and gives him over to the power of the wicked spirit *Angrōmainyua*. But there is no distinct proof that the first sin as related in the Scriptures formed a part of the Babylonian and Chaldaean accounts of the origin of the world and of man; yet Lenormant finds traces of a tradition of the fall among the Phoenicians and Chaldaeans, although of a far less spiritual character, on account of the grossly materialistic spirit of pantheism characterizing the religions of these countries.

With respect to the tempter he says: "Among all the highly civilized peoples whose traditions we have scrutinized [the great serpent] is symbolical of [the] dark and evil power in its broadest conception." While he holds firmly to the "dogma of the fall of the human race, in consequence of the perverted use which its authors make of their free-will," yet he thinks we may safely hold that the "form of the serpent attributed to the tempter may in its origin have been an essentially naturalistic symbol," and adds: "Nothing compels us to accept in its literal sense the story of the third chapter of Genesis."

The third chapter discusses the cherubim and the revolving sword; and the author says: "We are compelled to settle down upon Chaldaea as the place whence the narration started," where we find it "in an inscription dating back to the remotest past of this country."

The fourth chapter treats of the fratricide and foundation of the first city. The fact is here pointed out, as was first indicated by Sir Henry Rawlinson, that the Chaldaean tablets discovered by George Smith were arranged according to the signs of the zodiac, e.g. the eleventh month is called "'month of the curse of rain'; its myth being the deluge, and its zodiacal sign *Aquarius*." So the third month is called "the

month of brick-making," — sometimes "month of the twins," — and the sign in the zodiac was Gemini. In this connection Lenormant speaks of the frequent recurrence of the tradition of a fratricide in connection with the formation of a city, from Cain who built the first city Chanok after slaying Abel to Romulus who laid the foundations of Rome in the blood of his brother Remus. In closing he finds a philological evidence in favor of the story respecting Cain coming from Chaldea. He quotes from Gen. iv. 7: "When thou hast not done well, sin places itself in ambush at thy door, and its appetite is turned toward thee." He says, "The participle *robêtz*, here employed as a substantive, constitutes the only known Hebrew example of the verb *rabatz*. . . . In Assyrian *rabatz* has the two current acceptations — the one as frequent as the other — of 'lying down, resting,' or of 'lying in ambush, spying.' The seven Rabici are numbered among the most redoubtable of the malevolent and infernal spirits." So too in iv. 13, where Cain says, "My crime is too great for me to carry the burden of it," he finds the same idea and image as that existing in the religious poetry of Chaldea, which affords interesting parallels to the penitential Psalms.

We next proceed, in chapter fifth, to a discussion of the "Shethites and the Qainites." The author does not hesitate to say that he regards the genealogy given by the Jehovist in chapter four of the Cainites, and that of the Shethites in chapter five given by the Elohist, as artificial; and that "they were prepared in order to establish an exact and constant parallelism between the two lines of descent from the criminal and accursed son and from the just and blessed son, by marking the contrast between malediction and election in the signification of the names of either line, which resemble each other so closely in sound."

In treating of this subject Lenormant calls attention to the way in which the Elohist reduces the heroes of popular traditions to human proportions, and remarks that their very great age, which is quite inconsistent with the physiological

conditions of the terrestrial life of man, only indicates a difference from the regular records of the best attested genealogies. The Jehovist, however, does not assign any age to the Cainites, who preserve a decidedly legendary physiognomy. The name Lemek introduces us to a cycle of heroic legends, one might almost say myths; only great reserve should be used in employing this term in biblical narratives, since the spirit of this book is at the widest remove from the mythos, as seen among polytheistic nations. In Lemek we have a direct condemnation of polygamy and personal vengeance, since their origin is carried back to the race of the accursed on the eve of the flood, when "all flesh had corrupted its way on the earth."

While the three sons of Lemek find worthy parallels in the mythic genealogies of Phoenicia there existed neither among the Phoenicians nor the Chaldaeans two of primitive heroes, "the one criminal, the other the one cursed, the other blessed. The origin of the Bible narrative lies precisely in this distinction between these two antagonistic lines of the representatives of antediluvian humanity and it is in this sense alone that it can be granted that the two tables of the Cainites and Shethites were formed by a systematic duplicating of a single primitive list which may have been common to the Terachites and to other people of the same race in accordance with the characteristics attributed severally to the children of Cain and Sheth."

Lenormant admits the principle stated by Knobel, although he does not accept its application, that in the sons of Lemek we have types of the great human families as in the sons of Noah; and he quotes with approval from Baron d'Eckstein, who affirms that the shepherd patriarchs should always be taken collectively, as standing for their actual family.

With respect to the ten antediluvian patriarchs, of whom our author treats in chapter six, he finds that the Iranians had nine heroes of a mythical character who succeed Gayômaretan, the typical man; that the Hindus in their co-

mogonic legends have nine Bramâdikas, who with Brahma make ten; that the Chinese reckon ten emperors sharing in the divine nature before the historic age; and that the Germans and Scandinavians, not to allude to others, believed in the ten ancestors of Wodan or Odin. He accounts for the constant repetition of the number ten in so many different nations, because at this epoch ten was the highest number that had been reached, and was equivalent to "many."

Chapter seven discusses what is meant by the intermarriages of the children of God and the daughters of men. The author thinks that here the mythic coloring is more decidedly pronounced than in any other part of the Pentateuch. He rejects the view of those who maintain that marriages between men of noble birth and women of inferior rank are indicated, and also the view more commonly accepted that a union between the Sethites and the voluptuous daughters of Cain is intended. He thinks that the only legitimate interpretation of the chapter is that the sons of God who were angels (*benê hâelohîm*) cohabited with the daughters of men, descendants of Adam, and that from this unnatural union a race of giants sprung. He finds in this only a soberer and less repulsive form of myths which were current among the Persians and the Rabbins of the intermixture of demons with women; and says that the legend among the pagan nations which comes nearest to it is "this complete cycle of myths founded upon the idea that the heroes participating in the divine nature, and superior to other men, are sons of the gods, issues of amorous unions between the race of immortals and that of men." Lenormant considers that here and in the passage about Nimrod "the narrator no longer speaks directly in the name of inspiration which guides him, but simply appears as the recorder of a current tradition," and that his language might be paraphrased: "These are the men who are known as the heroes of old, about whom so many tales are told."

But in adopting the popular legend which represented the heroes, or demigods, as the sons of gods and the daughters

of men it was only possible for the inspired writer with his spiritual views of the one God, who is never mentioned in connection with a female deity, to modify the popular tradition, so that angels are represented as mingling with women. The Bible represents the result of this unnatural union as giants, in accordance with a common representation among the various peoples. According to the apocryphal book of Ezra the stature of men has been growing less since the deluge. This is an amplification of the idea in the Talmudic legends, which represent that Adam was endowed with prodigious size and strength. "To-day we have scientific proof that such belief has no real foundations, but is simply a product of the imagination. . . . As far back as we can trace the vestiges of mankind, up to the races who lived in the quarternary period, side by side with the great mammals of extinct species, it may be proved that the medium height of our species has not been modified in the course of centuries, and that it has never exceeded its existent limits."

Lest, however, this should prove a stumbling-block to some one, he quotes the following words from Reusch:¹ "God gave a supernatural light to the writers of the Bible, but this supernatural light, like revelation in general, had for its sole object the manifestation of religious truths, and not the communication of profane knowledge; and we may, without violating the claims of these sacred writers upon our veneration, without weakening the dogma of inspiration, frankly acknowledge that in profane learning, consequently likewise as regards the physical sciences, they are not one whit superior to their contemporaries, and even share the errors common to the epoch and their nation."

The author further shows that it was a tradition, common to the Aryan no less than to the Cushite and Semitic peoples, not only that there were giants, but also that they were violent, were rebels against heaven, and that they were punished. We notice, however, the very different way in which the Jehovist has treated this tradition. The Gentiles

¹ *Bibel und Natur* (Bonn, 1876), p. 23.

are essentially devil-worshippers from fear of the power of the vanquished spirits. But Jehovah is a jealous God. He admits of no rivals in his worship. Hence the Jehovist has produced a complete disenchantment in regard to the giants. They are mere men, impious beings, justly punished; and so the original reader is put on his guard against a corrupt mixture of admiration and condemnation.

Chapter eight, the last and longest in the book, treats of the deluge. This is the most universal of all the traditions, and is found among all the great races except the black race. The author considers this an important fact, which should be kept in sight as perhaps involving important consequences.

In entering upon the discussion of these traditions he seeks to sweep away all local inundations which may have become associated with the tradition of the great primitive cataclysm. Such is the great Chinese inundation, which is referred to the reign of Yao, and was purely of a local character. Turning to primitive accounts of the deluge, he first gives the version of the story according to Berosus, which was once thought by some to have been derived from the biblical account until the discovery of the Assyrian inscriptions.

Alongside of the story of the deluge by Berosus is the Chaldaeo-Babylonian account, which is the eleventh canto of the great epic of Uruk. The hero of this poem is Izdhubar, king of the city of Uruk, to whom Ishtar the Chaldaean Venus proposes that he should marry her. He rejects her proposition, and casts in her face the various amours of which she has been guilty. In a rage she causes the death of his friend and counsellor, the man-bull Ea-bani; at the same time she strikes him down with sickness. He has recourse to Hasisadra, who had been translated by the gods to the abodes of the blessed. He asks Hasisadra, who corresponds both to Enoch and Noah, to tell him how he secured this boon of immortality. He does so in the story which, as we have seen, forms the eleventh canto of the great epic. There are three incomplete copies of this poem. They "were made by order of the king of Assyria, Asshur-bani-abal, from a

very old copy in possession of the Sacerdotal Library of the city of Uruk, founded by the monarchs of the first Chaldaean empire." While the date cannot be precisely settled, yet it certainly goes back to "the epoch of that ancient empire, at least seventeen centuries before our era," long before the time of Moses. Nor is this all. It is evident that this copy, written in hieratic characters which had already become unfamiliar, was from a still older copy. The account of the deluge according to this document is in outline as follows:

The gods met in council, under the chief deity Anu, determined on a deluge. Their decision was communicated to Hasisadra in a dream by Ea, who told him to prepare a vessel quickly, as he would destroy all life. Its length was to be six hundred cubits, its breadth and height sixty cubits. Hasisadra says that young and old will laugh at him; but the god tells him to threaten them with punishment if they injure him. He employs ten thousand eight hundred men as porters, who carry into the vessel chests of provisions. He gathers into it all his possessions of silver and gold, all his servants, the cattle of the field, the wild beasts of the country, and the sons of the people. He then closes the door, and commits the care of the vessel to Buzur-shadi-rabi, the pilot.

Then a terrible storm comes on. Even the gods are afraid, and Ishtar bemoans the destruction of men. For six days the storm is in its full strength. On the seventh there begins to be an abatement. Hasisadra looks out and sees the corpses floating about on the water. He is greatly overcome, and sits down weeping. The vessel is carried on to a mountain of the land of Nizir, where it stops. On the next day he lets loose a dove. It finds no place where it can rest, and comes back. Next he sends forth a swallow, with the same result; then a raven, who rests and feeds on the carrion on the waters, and does not come back. He then causes all the occupants of the ark to go forth, and he himself offers sacrifice. The gods, who gather like flies about the sacrifice, smell a good odor. When Bel, one of the gods,

sees the vessel, he is greatly enraged, and declares that none shall come out alive. Ea remonstrates with him, and begs him to send any other curse rather than a deluge. Bel then enters the vessel, and, taking Hasisadra and his wife by the hand, raises them up to live with the gods.

Leaving the other traditions of a deluge found among the Greeks, the Mexicans, the Aleutians, the Polynesians, etc., it is fitting that we should bring this extended notice to a close; and we will merely make the following remarks in conclusion:

1. The comparison of the narratives in the first eleven chapters of Genesis with similar traditions among other peoples shows the infinite superiority of the former.

2. If they were derived from current traditions, nothing short of divine inspiration could have cleared them from their gross polytheism and fantastic character.

3. Whatever may be proved as to their origin, or value as history, they must still be regarded as the medium of a divine revelation which is to be received with all reverence.

4. The evidence is not yet, as we think, sufficient to prove that the materials in these chapters were derived from the current traditions. The traditions seem more like a perversion of the original events as given in the Scriptures, and derived from a common source. For example, while there are some striking points of similarity between the Chaldaean and the biblical account of the deluge, yet the points of disparity are far greater.

5. Friends of God's word as found in the Old Testament need have no fears for the safety of the ark.

II. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH ON THE SITUATION OF PARADISE.¹

The author of this treatise is the son of the famous professor of Old Testament Theology, Franz Delitzsch of Leipzig. There were three other sons. Of the two who were elder,

¹ Wo Lag Das Paradies? Eine Biblisch-Assyriologische Studie. Mit zahlreichen Assyriologischen Beiträgen zur Biblischen Länder und Völkerkunde, und einer Karte Babylonien, von Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor der Assyriologie an der Universität, Leipzig, 1881.

one who was a surgeon in the German army died at the close of the Franco-Prussian war. The other, James, a young man of much promise, became a professor extraordinary of theology in the University of Leipzig in 1875, but died in his thirtieth year in 1876 at Rapallo near Genoa. The only surviving brother, Hermann, is a merchant who is known to German scholars by his translation of Smith's Chaldaean Genesis.¹ Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch has already won a high reputation as an Assyrian scholar by his various learned publications.²

The work which we have under review is an outgrowth of a lecture, and is dedicated to Karl Richard Lepsius and Sir Henry Rawlinson. It is a peculiar book in its make-up, and affords a striking contrast to the work just noticed. It consists of ninety-four pages of text, seventy-two of which are one hundred and fifty-one of appendixes, and fifteen of indexes.

After an exegetical and philological introduction, in which he treats of the narrative, he presents in the First Part former views: I. Paradise in Utopia; II. in Armenia; III. in South Babylonia. In the Second Part he gives his own view. After the remarks which seem to be of great value, and which really run out in excursions such as (rem. 47) The Old Testament Cherubim, pp. 150-155; and (rem. 50) The popular Name of God with Yodh as an essential part, i.e. Jehovah³ (pp. 158-166), he gives in the appendixes the following dissertations: I. The Geography of Babylon, including rivers and their tributaries, districts and cities, neighboring countries and tribes; II. The Ethnographical Table of the Bible; III. The Geography of Canaan; IV. The Geography of Egypt; V. The Geography of Elam. The index is threefold, and atones, if anything can, for the pecu-

¹ George Smith's Chaldäische Genesis, Leipzig, 1876.

² Studien über Indogermanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft, Leipzig, 1873; Assyrische Studien, Leipzig, 1874; Assyrische Lesestücke, 1878, etc.; as well as his remarks appended to the translation of George Smith's Chaldaean Genesis.

³ For a translation of this Excursus, see The Hebrew Student for January and February 1883, Chicago.

liar construction of the book ; including (1) Cuneiform words and names ; (2) Hebrew words and names ; (3) names of authors. At the very close of the book is a beautiful map of Babylonia at the time of the Assyrian and Babylonian world-empire, with special reference to the biblical country of Gan Eden or of Paradise.

In the beginning of his work the author lays a good foundation for his investigation, and completely justifies it. He says : " The entire narrative makes the impression, as every unprejudiced reader must admit, that the writer, so far as he is concerned, is perfectly clear with respect to the position of Paradise, and that he is determined to be fully and completely understood by his readers. His description contains points of contact and indications enough, which certainly reveal this object of the narrator."

With respect to the term Eden (Benê Eden 2 Kings xix. 12), found elsewhere than in this narrative (Ez. xxvii. 23 ; Amos i. 5), he says it is clear that the Eden, the land of Paradise, has nothing to do with this Eden. And he adds, " We have no right to assume that the author in his account respecting the planting of the divine garden in the first beginning of the creation of the world used geographical conceptions of a relatively younger period and of limited extent." He then calls attention to the fact that the almost universal opinion of the present day in regard to Eden, the land of Paradise, is that it is an emblematic name invented by the Hebrews signifying land of delight. He finds, however, manifold objections to this view.

With respect to the geographical position of Eden, he does not find in the expression " God planted a garden in Eden eastward " anything more than the stand-point of the Hebrew narrator in Palestine, but there are other indications which are in his mind of great importance in determining this question. Such are the allusions to the cool of the day (iii. 8) ; and the use of fig-leaves by our first parents in covering their nakedness. The first indicates the cool breath of evening after the heat of the day in the Orient ; and the second

points to a tropical country, since the author must have certainly known that the fig-tree is only to be found in a tropical zone like that of Syria and Palestine. A further indication of a southern position is in the watering of the garden. "The narrative breathes throughout the equably warm, delightful climate of the Orient."

The point, however, of main importance in determining the position of the garden is in the streams that water it. While the first two streams are unknown, the last two are clearly indicated. They are the well-known twin rivers of Mesopotamia, the Chiddekel, or the Tigris, which the author, as though he would not leave any room for doubt, expressly indicates as the recognized river of Assyria which flows in the forefront of Assyria, as is really the case. The fourth river is pointed out as the Phrat, or the river Euphrates.

These last two indications regarding the four rivers of Paradise are so clear, definite, and at the same time so surprising, that from century to century scholars have not been weary of investigating, and racking their brains, that they might find an answer to the question which Friedrich Delitzsch proposes for solution: Where was Paradise? It would require too much time to give his discussion of the three main views already indicated with respect to the position of Paradise. We pass, therefore, at once to his own view.

1. He affirms that the biblical narrative of Paradise expressly indicates the territory of the Euphrates and the Tigris as the place where Paradise was situated, and he concludes that only and exclusively the Babylonian plain is pointed out.

2. The first two streams mentioned, Pishon and Gihon, are canals. The Pishon is the canal Pállakopas, and the Gihon is the Shatt en-Nil. This identification of the first two streams with canals is justified by lexical usage; for from that day to this *nahar* is used not only in designation of rivers, but also of canals. Of course the objection would occur here, how the author could mistake a canal made by man for a river. But Friedrich Delitzsch affirms that these canals were so old that their origin was forgotten, and so the

author of the account concerning Paradise could name them as rivers without being guilty of an anachronism that was too glaring. Furthermore, a part of the Babylonian canals were not artificial, but natural; and this might be the case with the Pishon and Gihon, and so all obstacles would be removed.

3. It is not difficult to show that the names Chawila and Cush are not opposed to the theory that the garden was situated in Babylon. He does not deny, indeed, that in every other case Cush signifies Ethiopia; but he calls attention to the fact that in the ethnographical table there is not among the seven names in Gen. x. 7, who are reckoned as sons of Cush, a single one which can be proved with certainty to be the name of an Ethiopic people or land in Africa. Cush rather stands as the ancestor of a series of stems and peoples from the northwest point of the Persian Gulf to the boundaries of Arabia southward. It is clear that Cush in this case cannot be narrowed down to the African Cush. While these peoples might be regarded by the Hebrews as related with the Ethiopians, they could never be considered as of especially Ethiopian origin. Most important of all, however, Nimrod is named (Gen. x. 8 ff.) as another son of Cush. The beginning of his rule was in Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calne in the land of Shinar. Hence a ruler of Babylonia was a son of Cush.

But there is a further confirmation of the residence of the Cushites in Babylonia. They are identified by Friedrich Delitzsch as the most ancient civilized people of Babylonia, the Sumerio-Accadian. Indeed, this Elamitic population affords traces of the Cushitic and Ethiopic type in the physiognomies found on an Assyrian monument of the seventh century which represents Elamitic warriors. At the same time we must notice the name *Κισσῖοι*, which Herodotus and others give to the Elamites in connection with the biblical Cush and the hieroglyphic *Kash* (the Nubians), and the *Casdim* or Chaldaeans. The author sees in this a close connection between the non-Semitic people, who obtained extensive dominion on the Persian Gulf and the Cushites or Ethiopians in the upper land of the Nile.

Passing over a very interesting discussion of this subject, we reach his conclusion that there was a Babylonian province whose name could be, and was, transferred to Ethiopia or Cush. If he does not find the name Chawila so good a support for his theory as Cush, he does not see anything contrary to it; for in his opinion it is a part of the *Ard el-halât*, the Syrian wilderness, especially in the part which lies east by northeast, and adjoins the Euphrates in its course by Babylonia.

4. Our author then reviews the entire picture, which he finds very clear: "Out of Eden went a stream to water the garden—it is the Euphrates, which on the narrow tract northward from Babylon blends, through numberless channels leading to the Tigris, with this into one stream, waters this district lying next to Babylon almost superabundantly, transforms it at times into one great stretch of water, and raises it to unexampled fruitfulness and loveliness. . . . The first stream that is an arm of the Euphrates is the [Pishon], which branches off below Babylon, and flows on the right Arabian bank of the Euphrates in a long course direct to the Persian Gulf. The second arm of the Euphrates is the Guchânu [Gihon], which flows from Babylon out of the left Babylonian bank of the Euphrates in a long line through all central Babylonia, in order to return again to the main bed of the Euphrates. The third is the well-known stream of Assyria, the Tigris, which from thence again takes its former position of independence from the Euphrates. The fourth is finally the Euphrates, which noticeably enough not only retains the last position in the narrative, but also without addition. The reason of this certainly was not because it was known to every Hebrew,—for the Tigris was as well known,—but because it is the chief stream watering the garden, or peculiarly the stream of Paradise."

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of this particular discussion, concerning which Dillmann says that in less than a year it is pretty generally acknowledged as a tremendous failure,¹ yet it is hardly to be considered a mummified theory,

¹ Ueber die Herkunft der urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer, p. 6.

but may yet exhibit signs of life. At any rate, the book contains a great deal that is attractive and valuable to the Semitic student.

The most interesting part of the discussion for us in this connection is with regard to the origin and age of the Old Testament narrative about Paradise. In the discussion of the subject Dr. Delitzsch claims that although the science of Assyriology is so young, yet it is one of the most important auxiliary helps to Old Testament investigation, with reference to geography, chronology, history, and worship. Especially have the so-called primitive narratives of Genesis received an entirely new light through the cuneiform monuments, and are destined to receive more. It has been shown that Babylon, the home of Israel, was, according to biblical representations, the theatre of the oldest antediluvian and postdiluvian history of the race. It was once thought that Berossus had derived his accounts concerning the creation of the world and the flood from the Bible. But it is now seen that such a derivation of the Babylonian narratives is forever impossible. It is all the while more clear that as Babylon is the scene of the narratives so also it is the home of them. Indeed the agreement between the biblical narratives, both in their Elohistic and Jehovistic form, with the Babylonian is so great, and extends so remarkably to certain forms of expression,¹ as to force us to the conclusion that the biblical narratives not only in contents, but even in form, were derived from Babylon. It is certain that the Babylonians in their literature possessed narratives concerning the creation of the world, the antediluvian patriarchs, and the deluge which were entirely analogous to those in the Bible.

The question arises whether there was a Babylonian narrative respecting Paradise. A cuneiform inscription giving such an account has not yet been found. But then we are far from being in possession of all the Babylonian documents.

¹ Compare *ubassimû ilâni*, the gods had made good, with "and God saw that it was good." This correspondence as Dillmann remarks, supposing that the phrase has been properly translated, does not prove a common origin, but simply common emotions in view of the glorious work of creation.

There are still thousands which have not yet been brought forth from Asshurbanipal's library at Nineveh. New additions are being made every year to the account of the creation; and we can say that a narrative respecting the fall will and must be found. For the Babylonians like the Hebrews had a clear consciousness of sin, guilt, and punishment. We see this from a comparison of their penitential psalms.¹

Delitzsch tries to show the probability of such a tradition regarding the fall, from the Babylonian tradition known to the priests as the serpent, or Tiamat, which is chaos personified, and was the original enemy of the gods. And he conjectures that this serpent Tiamat, according to the Babylonian tradition had a part in the fall of man, "for we read in a fragment that the men who were first created were repeatedly exhorted to obedience to God's commandment, and further (perhaps after the fall) they are warned to have pure hearts toward God, and to pray to him daily, and are assured that the fear of God, sacrifice, and prayer secure grace, life, and the forgiveness of sins. In the same connection, however, on the same tablet Merodach makes war on Tiamat, wounds and kills the great serpent which is trodden in the dust." Furthermore, Delitzsch refers to the two figures on a Babylonian cylinder of great age, sitting on either side of a tree, with a serpent standing behind one of them.²

We now come to the most important point in the whole treatise, which will be discussed under Dillmann's article. Delitzsch affirms that no allusion is made to these early narratives in Genesis, whether in their Elohistic or Jehovistic form, except after the time of Ezekiel, that is after the Exile. We find the first mention of the flood in Deutero-Isaiah [Isa. liv. 9], and with the exception of Ezekiel (xxviii. 13; xxxi. 8, 9, 16; xxxvi. 35) and Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. li. 3) there is no previous reference to the garden except in Joel.³ Hence

¹ Compare Lenormant, *Die Magie und Wahrsagekunst der Chaldäer*, pp. 66-67; and my *Date of our Gospels*, pp. 29-30.

² See however p. 532 of this Article.

³ Joel is now regarded by many critics as a post-exilic book. Compare Merz, *Die Prophetie des Joel*, Halle, 1879.

Delitzsch concludes, that as neither these Jehovistic nor Elohistie naratives are mentioned in pre-exilic literature, that not only the Elohistie account was derived from the Babylonians after the exile, as many critics would readily admit, but also the Jehovistic. It seems to be pretty clear that this argument proves too much; but as Professor Dillmann alludes to this point in his treatise we leave any further discussion of the subject to him, and will only add that in this case the *argumentum e silentio* seems to lead to a great absurdity, and yet as Christians we need not be afraid of any incontrovertible facts.

III. HAUPT ON THE DELUGE.¹

This lecture, which covers only thirty pages is worthy of special notice, not only as the production of a young man of great promise, who has already made himself a name in the department of Assyriology,² and is destined, if he lives, to make still more important contributions to that department of study, but also for the account which it gives of the deluge, and for the theory which the author draws from it, in connection with Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, with respect to the Babylonian origin of the first chapters of Genesis subsequent to the Exile. As the lecture is based on a translation of the eleventh tablet, which was until recently incomplete, because the beginning was wanting, but which has been supplemented through the reception of a fragment which has not been published hitherto, at the risk of a repetition of the same story of which Lenormant treats, we will give it with some abbreviation from Haupt's translation, that we may be able to judge more fully as to the propriety of supposing with him that our account in Genesis was derived from it.

¹ Der Keilinschriftliche Sintfluthbericht, eine Episode des Babylonischen Nimrodepos, gehalten an der Universität Göttingen am 18 December 1880 von Dr. Paul Haupt, . . . Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1881.

² Die Sumerischen Familien Gesetze, Leipzig, 1879; Assyriologische Bibliothek I. Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte, Leipzig, 1881. He has also made contributions to the last edition of Schrader's Keilschriften und das Alte Testament, Gießen, 1883, not to speak of other works in the press.

The Assyrian Account of the Deluge.

It was known long ago from the fragments of the Babylonian history of the Chaldean priest Berosus (280-270 B.C.) that the ancient Babylonians were acquainted with a myth respecting the deluge which is connected even in its particulars in the most remarkable way with both [the Elohist and Jehovistic] accounts contained in chapters vi.-ix. of Genesis, which were united by one editor.

Xisuthros, the tenth of the Babylonian kings, was told by Chamos that there would be a flood. At the conclusion of the narrative we are informed that when he left the ark he was taken on account of his piety to heaven. The resemblances between this and the biblical account were so striking that people for a long time doubted whether this story concerning the flood existed in Babylonia before the Exile or not, until in the autumn of 1872 George Smith was so fortunate as to discover, in the Assyrian department of the British Museum, on an Assyrian clay tablet from the royal library of king Sardanapalus, the cuneiform account of the flood through which the independence and genuineness of the account of the flood by Berosus was gloriously confirmed.

The inscription which he found was: "On Mount Nizir the ship stood still. Then I took out a dove and let it fly. The dove flew hither and thither, but since it found no resting-place for its feet it returned to the ship." He recognized at once that he had discovered a fragment of the cuneiform account of the deluge. With unwearied persistence he devoted himself to looking through the thousands of Assyrian clay fragments which are kept in the British Museum in search of further fragments. . . . He did not, indeed, find any fragment which completed the half of the first tablet that he had discovered, but he found fragments of two other copies of the cuneiform narrative, which supplemented the text in the desired manner, and discovered that the narrative concerning the deluge was only an episode in a great heroic poem, which celebrated the deeds of an old king of Erech, in twelve cantos, the whole being about three thousand lines long.

“The name of the hero is Izdubar. . . . It is clear that Izdubar is identical with Nimrod, whose deeds in the lands of the Euphrates and the Tigris still live in the mouths of the people. . . . The account in the fragment, of which the beginning is broken off, commences with a description of the sufferings which the city Erech, the capital of Southern Babylon at that time, had to suffer under the tyranny of an Elamitic conqueror. Erech had previously been ruled by Tammûz the Babylonian Adonis, and after his death his wife Istar, or Astarte, the Babylonian Venus, received the government.” She was not in a position, however, to oppose her enemies. Nimrod now enters on the scene. He came from the Babylonian city, Marad. His ancestor was Shamash-napishtim, the Xisuthros of Berosus. In Erech he has a remarkable dream. “The stars of heaven fall upon the earth and hit his back. A dreadful being stands before him, armed with claws like a lion.”

Nimrod is deeply agitated by this vision. He consults all the wise men and seers and promises them rich rewards, but no one is able to interpret the dream. . . . He hears of a seer who is highly celebrated on account of his knowledge of all things visible and invisible. . . . The name of this wonderful being, who in the representations on the old Babylonian cylindrical seals is always represented with horns upon his head and feet and with the tail of a steer, is called Eabânî. . . . First the sun-god Samas tries in vain to get him to go to Erech to explain the dream to Nimrod. . . . Finally two women induce him to come; and he brings a lion in order to try the strength of the much praised hero. Nimrod slays the lion, and a close friendship is formed between them. Nimrod and Eabânî then determined to slay the Elamitic tyrant Humbaba.

“After Nimrod had slain the tyrant Humbaba, and had set the crown of Erech on his head, he stood at the summit of power, so that the goddess Istar sought his love.” Nimrod refused her hand. She was very angry, and went to Anu her father. She prays that he will create a divine steer,

and send it against Erech. Anu does as he is desired; but the monster is killed by Nimrod and Eabânî. As a punishment Anatu, Istar's mother, removes Eabânî by a sudden death, and smites Nimrod with sickness. Tortured by pains and terrible dreams, Nimrod determines to visit his ancestor Xisuthros, who leads an immortal life at the mouth of the streams, to ask him how he may be healed. He reaches the domain of the scorpion-men, one of whom shows him the place where Xisuthros dwells. "He passes through an extended, unfruitful desert until he reaches the wonderful grove whose trees bear precious stones as fruits. . . . Finally he comes to a river, where he finds a ferryman, Urubêl [servant of Bel]. They both get into the ship, and Urubêl steers him to the waters of death. After a long voyage they come to a distant land at the mouth of the streams where Hâsisadra [Xisuthros] dwells, who tells Nimrod his escape from the great flood. This account of the flood fills the first two columns of the eleventh table of the poem. Hâsisadra announces to Nimrod, the oracle of the gods how he can be freed from the curse which rests upon him. Urubêl takes the hero with him, bathes him in the sea, whereupon the curse is washed away. Nimrod re-embarks on the vessel with the ferryman, and returns healed to Erech. Anew he raises his lamentation for his departed friend Eabânî, until finally the God Ea hears him, and commands his son Mero-dach to restore the shade of the seer from the lower world, and to cause him to rise to the land of the blessed, where fallen heroes rest, lying on beds of ease and drinking eternally clear water." The epic closes with this.

Sir Henry Rawlinson represented that the twelve songs of the poem evidently symbolize the heavenly course of the sun, and that every table corresponds relatively to a month of the year, and so to a sign of the Zodiac. This view is carried out still further by Lenormant (in the book just noticed), and by Sayce: "e.g. Eabânî, the white steer-man, corresponds in the second canto to the month Ijjar (i.e. April-May), and corresponds in the Zodiac to the sign of the steer, since the

name of the second month in the old Sumeri-Accadic language is called the month of the righteous steer. Further, Nimrod concludes with Eabânî an inseparable covenant in the third canto, which corresponds to the month Sivan (May-June),” the sign of the twins; Nimrod is sick in the seventh canto, the month Tishri (September-October), when the sun begins to be weaker; on the following eighth table, in the month of Marcheschvan, which corresponds to the sign of the scorpion, he meets with the scorpion-men; finally, the flood is narrated in the eleventh canto, which corresponds to the eleventh month Shabatu, consecrated to Rimmon, the god of storm and rain, which corresponds to the sign of the waterman in the Zodiac: in the Sumero-Accadian it is called the month of the curse of the rain.

“The eleventh tablet, which now exists in three copies, is in the best state of preservation of the whole series. The beginning was very badly mutilated. . . . Fortunately a piece has lately been received in the collection of the British Museum, in which the beginning of the text is preserved nearly uninjured.” Mr. Theophilus G. Pinches, the successor of Smith in the British Museum, furnished this missing part, which Dr. Haupt gives in translation for the first time:

“I will relate to you, Nimrod,” begins Hâsisadra, “the history of my rescue; I will also announce to you the oracle of the gods. Thou knowest the city Surippak, which lies on the Euphrates. This city was even very old when the gods determined to prepare a flood—the great gods together, their father Anu, their counsellor the valiant Bêl, their throne-bearer Adar, their leader Ennugi. The lord of unsearchable wisdom, the god Ea, was with them, and related to me their decision.

“‘Man of Surippak, son of Ubaratntu,’ he said, ‘forsake thy house and build a ship; they intend to destroy the seed of life; therefore keep thou in life, and bring up the seed of life of every kind into the ship that you are to build. x ells shall be its length, and y ells its breadth and height. Cover it over with a deck.’¹

¹ The numbers in question have been completely obliterated.

“When I heard this, I said to Ea, my lord, ‘O my lord, if I execute the building of the ship which thou hast commanded, the people and the elders will [mock] me.’

“But Ea bade me execute his command, and said to me his servant: ‘Do not close the door of the ship behind thee, until the time comes, when I will let thee know. Then enter and bring to the ship thy store of grain, all thy goods and chattels, thy family, thy men-servants and maid-servants, and thy nearest friends. The cattle of the field, the beast of the field I will send to thee, that they may be hidden behind the door of the ship.’

“Then I built the ship, and laid in a supply of provisions. I divided its interior into *x* compartments. I saw to the seams and filled them out. I poured three sars of bitumen on the exterior and three sars of bitumen on the interior. I gathered together all that I possessed, and brought it on board the ship — all my gold, all my silver, and the seed of life of every kind, all my male and female servants, the cattle of the field, the beast of the field, and my nearest friends — I brought them all on board. As now the sun-god brought on the fixed time, a voice spoke: ‘At evening the heavens will rain destruction; get into the ship, and close the door after thee. The fixed time is come,’ spoke the voice, ‘at evening the heavens will rain destruction.’ With fear I awaited the going down of the sun on this day, the day that I would begin my journey. I was afraid; yet I entered into the ship, and shut the door after me in order to close the ship. I entrusted the mighty structure with its cargo to Buzurkurgal the helmsman.

“Then arose Mû-shêri-ina-namâri from the foundation of heaven, dark clouds in whose midst the storm-god Rimmon caused his thunder to crack, while Nebo and Sêrru engage in combat. The bearers of the throne go over mountain and valley. The mighty god of pestilence unchains the whirlwinds; the god Adar causes the channels to overflow incessantly; the gods of the great (subterranean waters) bring up mighty floods; they cause the earth to tremble through

their power; the surging waves of the storm-god rise to **heaven**; all light is turned into darkness.

“ Brother does not regard brother; men do not any longer **trouble** themselves about each other. In heaven itself the **gods** are afraid on account of the deluge; they flee up to the (highest) heaven of the god Anu. As a dog in his kennel, the gods cower on the lattice of heaven.

“ The goddess Istar screams like one in travail; the mighty goddess calls with a loud voice: ‘So then everything is **turned** into mud as I prophesied to the gods. I prophesied **this** mischief to the gods, and proclaimed the war of annihilation against my men. ~~But~~ I did not bear my men that they should fill the sea like fish.’

“ Then the gods wept with her for the spirits of the great (subterranean) waters; weeping they kept sitting (*hockten*) in one place, and pressed their lips together. Six days and seven nights wind, storm, and flood kept the upper hand. **On** the seventh day the deluge abated, which had fought like a mighty army. The sea returned to its bed, and the storm and the floods ceased.

“ But I rode through the sea, loudly lamenting that the dwelling-places of men were turned into mud, the corpses drove about like logs. I had opened a hatchway, and as the light of day fell upon my face I was convulsed, and sat down weeping; my tears flowed over my face. I rode over the lands, now a dreadful sea. Land rose twelve measures above the surface of the water. The ship steered toward the land of Nizir. The ship reached the mountain of the land of Nizir, and did not go further. I waited six days. But when the seventh came I took out a dove, and let her fly; but as it did not find any resting-place it came back to the ship. Thereupon I took out a swallow, and let it fly. The swallow flew hither and thither; but as there was no resting-place, it returned to the ship. Then I took out a raven, and let it fly. The raven flew away, and as it saw the abatement of the waters it came toward [the ship], while it carefully waded through the water; but it did not return.

"Then I let everything go to the four winds. I brought an offering, and erected an altar on the top of the mountain. I placed seven adagur vessels in pairs; under them I spread calamus, cedar-wood, and lightning-plant. The gods sucked in the sweet odor. Like flies the gods assembled around the one offering sacrifice.

"Upon this the noble goddess (Istar) came and raised on high the great bows (?) which Anu the god of heaven had created. 'I shall always remember this day,' she said, 'I shall not forget it. All the gods may come to the altar, only Bêl shall not come, because he inconsiderately caused the deluge, and made my men victims of destruction.'

"As then the god Bêl came and beheld the ship, he started; his heart was filled with anger toward the gods and the spirits of heaven. 'No soul shall escape,' he cried, 'no man shall remain alive from the destruction.'

"Then the god Adar opened his mouth, and spoke, and addressed the mighty Bêl: 'None other than the god Ea has brought this about. Ea knew (about our determination), and has told him all.'

"Then the god Ea opened his mouth, and said, and spoke to the mighty Bêl: 'Thou art the powerful prince of the gods; but wherefore hast thou acted so rashly, and brought on the flood? Let the sinner repent of his sins, the evil-doer of his evil deeds; but be gracious to him; let him not be destroyed; have pity upon him that he may remain in life. Instead of thy bringing on a deluge again, let lions and hyenas come and decimate men, let famine arise and destroy men. I have not communicated to Adrahâsis the determination of the great gods; I only sent him a dream, so he learned the determination of the gods.'

"Then Bêl came to himself, went into the ship, took my hand and raised me up; he also raised up my wife and laid her hand in mine. Then he turned himself to us, placed himself between us, and spoke the following blessing: 'Hitherto Shamash-napishtim was a mortal man, but now, united with his wife, he is raised to the gods. He shall dwell in a

distant land on the mouth of the streams.' Then he led me away to a distant land, and placed me at the mouth of a stream."

This is the conclusion of the episode concerning the flood.

Dr. Haupt then discusses the relation of this account to the two biblical narratives of the flood (the Jehovistic and the Elohist). He says that the differences between the Babylonian and the biblical accounts need not surprise us, since for the most part they are occasioned by the differences between both lands and peoples. On the one side we have the strong monotheistic coloring of the biblical account, on the other the Babylonian polytheism. In the cuneiform narrative we have the description of a ship which is confided to a helmsman. In Genesis we read of an ark. Besides, in the Nimrod-epos we have the raven and the swallow in connection with the dove. Dr. Haupt thinks that these are unimportant differences, and that if we remember that in both accounts the flood is regarded as a divine judgment; that in both the building of the vessel is exactly described and a delay of seven days is allowed; that the closing of the door is expressly emphasized; that the thank-offering is graciously received after the flood; and that at the conclusion of both the divine promise is given that henceforth no deluge shall come, there can be no doubt that one representation has flowed from the other. He claims on account of the great age of the Babylonian narrative, which was written down at least 2000 B.C., that a derivation of it from the Hebrews is excluded. The only possibility which he sees is twofold, either that the Hebrews took the tradition with them on their emigration from Ur of the Chaldees, or learned it first during their exile in Babylon. He rejects the former supposition, however, because the pre-exilic writers know nothing about Noah—he being first mentioned, as is known, in Ezekiel, and in the fifty-fourth chapter of [Deutero] Isaiah. Nothing, therefore, remains but to assume with [Friedrich] Delitzsch that both biblical accounts of the deluge, Jehovistic and Elohist, were first composed in the Exile, after the Babylonian tradition became known.

IV. DILLMANN ON THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE HISTORICAL TRADITIONS OF THE HEBREWS.¹

The author scarcely needs introduction to American scholars. A pupil and an admirer of Ewald, he was called as a successor of Olshausen to Kiel in 1854, where he became a professor of Oriental languages in 1860. In 1864 he was called as a professor of Old Testament exegesis to take Knobel's place at Giessen, and in 1869 he was made Hengstenberg's successor at Berlin. He is considered the first European authority in the Ethiopic language, and has devoted much attention to Old Testament criticism. His position may be considered conservative in comparison with that of such extreme critics as Wellhausen and Stade. While his lectures are not especially popular, his literary work is thoroughly done.²

The paper from which the following notes are taken is published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, and follows in natural order as it was especially prepared with reference to those who, like Haupt and Friedrich Delitzsch, maintain that the primitive traditions in the opening chapters of Genesis were derived from Babylon after the Exile. We give a few excerpts from the article:

“Already people go so far as to maintain that the entire material of the primitive traditions of Genesis was first received and adopted from Babylon into the Scriptures by the Jews who were banished by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon. But, in fact, such opinions only confirm the old experience, that enthusiasm often exaggerates the application of a newly discovered mode of scientific knowledge to a monstrous extent.”

I. He then proceeds to raise the following preliminary objections to the theory respecting the post-exilic origin of these traditions:

1. “While those who maintain the post-exilic origin of that

¹ Ueber die Herkunft der urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer. Von A. Dillmann. 1882.

² See his Commentaries on Job, 1869; Exodus and Leviticus, 1880; and Genesis, 1882.

part of the Priests' Codex which is found in Gen. i.-ii. 3, and partially in Gen. vi.-ix., would joyfully accept this view, yet it goes altogether too far, for it would also lead to the inference that this part of the Jehovistic document (ii. 4-iv., and partially vi.-viii.), which is now regarded by the critics as the oldest part of the Pentateuch, was also post-exilic. Such an argument, which makes the oldest and the youngest document post-exilic, is not to be tolerated for a moment.

2. "The feeling of the Jews in Babylon towards their oppressors was of such a kind that it seems to be simply impossible that they should have adopted out of the mythological writings or traditions of the Babylonians entire passages with which they had been hitherto unacquainted, and even have placed them at the beginning of their code. The national and religious antagonism was then too strong for the formation of a mythological syncretism." There is no example of any such adoption of the Babylonian belief or superstition of that time, and they even adopted indifferent things like the Babylonian names of months only gradually.

3. "The Babylonian myths, with which we here have to do, even in the oldest form in which they have come down to us, and especially in the sixth century and later, were so thoroughly enmeshed and permeated by a multiform mythology, and coarse sensual views,¹ that even an eminent religious man of genius, such as the Jews in those centuries no longer had, would have been unable, so to speak, to reproduce them in their purer primitive form, and to restore them in the monotheistic simplicity, beauty, and truth in which they lie before us in the Bible."

II. He affirms that the agreement between the Hebrew and the Chaldee primitive traditions is neither so great nor so pervasive as to justify the immediate derivation of the former from the latter.

1. The relationship between the Babylonian and the biblical doctrine of creation reduces itself to one particular. Both set out from chaos, that is, primitive material. From

¹ Compare pp. 527, 528 of this Article.

this everything else originated among the Babylonians, even the gods. But then this idea was not confined to them, for it is common to the representations of the most ancient men, who regard a chaotic primitive material as the *præ* of all that exists.

2. "The second part of the primitive Hebrew tradition of Paradise is, if we regard the fundamental idea, entirely unique. It is true that the representation of a happier, blessed, golden primitive period of the human race, under the immediate rule of the gods, is to be found among the ancient peoples, from India and Persia to Egypt, and to the classic peoples; although just [this representation] has not yet been proved [as existing] among other Semites, and especially among the Babylonians. But no one has ever found, nor can ever find, that the first man, who was originally intended for a life of communion with God in his garden, lost his happiness through an act of disobedience, and fell under the dominion of the whole host of evil: because no other people and no other religion have such high thoughts of the destiny of man and of the idea of sin as the Hebrew. As yet there is no trace of such a narrative of Paradise among the Babylonians." Dillmann claims, as is now admitted by competent authorities, that nothing can be proved as to the existence of a tradition regarding the fall among the Babylonians from a picture on a cylinder of two persons sitting on either side of a tree, one of whom stretches his hand out toward the tree, while a serpent stands upright behind the other. There is no evidence that one of them is a woman; and, moreover, the other has two horns on his head. Dillmann thinks rather that they represent divine beings, or at least priests of divinities.

3. "The two cherubim which, according to Gen. iii. 24, guard the entrance to Paradise, were certainly not brought from Babylon. That which the Bible calls cherubim has not yet been found." This Professor Dillmann seems to establish in opposition to Lenormant and Friedrich Delitzsch. Not to dwell on this, or to speak especially of the arguments

which he adduces to show that the ten antediluvian ancestors from Adam to Noah, so far as present investigations go, have nothing to do with the ten Babylonian kings, we pass to the Babylonian tradition respecting the flood.

4. Dillmann admits that there is much here that is similar between the biblical and the Babylonian account; but he mentions the following things which to his mind seem to preclude the derivation of the first from the second: (1) The Babylonian account is steeped in a coarse polytheism;¹ (2) Those who are rescued are many more than in the biblical account;² (3) The knowledge of ship-building is presupposed, and the helmsman is especially mentioned; (4) The Babylonians had various versions of the flood; and the biblical account does not look like a copy of them; but both accounts seem to be independent and individual representations of the matter; (5) The whole color of the cuneiform account is Babylonian, although Babylonia was not the original seat of the narrative respecting the flood; (6) Other Semitic peoples had their traditions respecting the flood. It is certain that they did not derive them from Babylon. Their literatures have perished; but who can say, if monuments were to be found, whether they would not afford as striking parallels to the biblical account as are found in the cuneiform inscriptions? Hence Dillmann argues that it obviously does not follow, because a literature only remains from two old Semitic peoples, and we have from these but two narratives concerning the flood, that one must have been derived from the other, instead of both giving a common tradition which was native to other Semitic peoples.

There can be no question that Dillmann is right when he says: "It is incredible that first in the Exile the Jews should have received from the Babylonians and have written out the narratives with reference to the primitive traditions"; for this derivation of the Jehovistic as well as the Elohist narrative from Babylon during the Exile is one of the most startling vagaries of modern research, and is a complete *reductio ad absurdum*.

¹ See p. 527.

² Compare p. 526.