The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Chapter vi.

1. We here have another extract from what may be termed the Book of Origins, of which Gn 1 forms the introduction. In 4^{26} the beginning of Yahweh-worship is described, in 6^{1} of the tribe and nation, in 9^{20} of agriculture, and in 10^{10} of sovereignty. The Assyrian equivalent of the Hebrew phrase would be *enuma*, so that the Book of Origins would answer to the Babylonian work entitled 'Enuma.' The Babylonian legend of the King of Kutha similarly describes the origin of the tribe and nation, which belonged, however, not, like the antediluvian race of Genesis, to the present creation, but to the imperfect creation by Tiamât and the powers of anarchy which had preceded the creation by the gods of light and order. Hence this creation was not 'on the face of the ground,' but 'in the ground' (*ina qaqqar*), and it was 'within the mountain' that the warriors 'increased and became heroes and multiplied in number' (*ina kirib sadî irtibu-ma itedlu-ma irtasû minati*).

Here, as before, the *adâmâh* would be the soil of Babylonia where man was created. The original would have been: *Enuma amelûti ana eli qaqqara irtibu-ma binâtu ti'aldu ana-sunu* (or *binâti aldu sunu*, as in *W.A.I.* iv. 1, v, 7). It is assumed that (as in $4^{1.2}$) the first-born were sons; daughters came later.

2. 'And the sons of the gods saw the daughters of mankind that they were good, and they took them wives of whomever they chose,' in Assyrian: *marê ilâni binât adami* (*amelûti*) *imuru kî dhâbat sinâti, û ekhuzu assâti ana sasunu istu kali sa irâmu.* (*Ana sasunu* belongs to the language of the Tel el-Amarna tablets; it would hardly be used in classical Assyrian.) In the religious hymns of Babylonia the worshipper is often called 'the son of his god,' an expression which originated in the belief that the gods were in the likeness of men, and so, conversely, men were in the likeness of the gods. The sovereigns of Semitic Babylonia were themselves gods, and the kings of the West Semitic dynasty of Khammu-rabi, more especially, assume the divine title, like the kings of the dynasty of Ur before them. So in the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian king is called 'god,' the plural 'gods' being used instead of the singular, like *Elohim* in the O.T., though only a single individual is meant. In assuming the title of 'god,' the Babylonian kings followed the precedent of the old heroes of Babylonian legend, all of whom were divine, though in some instances neither the father nor the mother seems to have been a deity. This, at least, appears to have been the case with Utu-napistim; in the case of Gilgames, the mother was a goddess. The actual 'sons' of the gods were the inferior deities, of whom there were several hundreds, who constituted the families of the divine hierarchy, and whose names are enumerated in the mythological tablets. These clustered more especially round the great sanctuaries, where they were served by women, with whom they were supposed to cohabit. Thus the Epic of Gilgames (vi. 184–185) enumerates the three classes of religious prostitutes (*kizirêti, samkhati*, and *kharimâti*) who served the great sanctuary at Erech; and, according to Herodotus (i. 181, 182), Bel Merodach, at Babylon, took to wife 'a woman whom he chose out of all the natives of the country.' This latter expression, which Herodotus states he quoted from 'the Chaldæans,' is identical with the phrase used in Genesis (*τὴν ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἕληται ἐκ πασέων, ὡς λέγουσι οἱ Χαλδαῖοι*; נָשִׁים מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ). The technical Babylonian term was *râmu*, of which the Greek and the Hebrew (*αἱρεῖν* and בחר) are alike translations. The belief in the cohabitation of the sons of the gods with the hierodules of the temples (which does not appear to have been applicable to the father-gods Anu, Ellil, and Ea) survived the decay of Babylonian civilization in folklore. In the Book of Tobit, Asmodeus similarly cohabited with Sara, the daughter of Raguel; and the Mendaite Book of Adam describes the Henge as demons 'who throw themselves upon the daughters of men.'

After selecting the hierodules, the sons of the

gods would have 'gone'—φοιτᾶν is the word used by Herodotus—to the temple and reclined with the women upon the nuptial couch, which stood in the inner shrine of the Babylonian sanctuary. It is clear, therefore, that v.^{4b} should follow v.^{2}, vv.$^{3.4a}$ being interpolations. The passage ought to run: 'They took them wives of whomsoever they chose; and then after this (it happened) that the sons of the gods went to the daughters of mankind, and they begat for themselves the heroes which were of old, men with names.' The Assyrian would be: *u arki annu marê ilâni ana binât amelûti itbû-ma yulidu ana sasunu qarradi, sa ultu yumê ullûti suma iskunú-sunusi*; or perhaps better: *arki sa marê ilâni ana binât amelûti itbuni-ma*, 'after the sons of the gods had gone to the daughters of mankind, they begat,' etc.

The *qarradi*, or 'heroes' (of which the Heb. *gibborîm* is a translation), were the subjects of the Epic poems of Babylonia. They were all semi-divine, though some of them were not actually the sons of the gods. Among them were Etana and Gir, the first who had kingdoms, and who therefore correspond with the Biblical Nimrod, the *gibbôr-ṣaîd*, or 'hero-huntsman,' and who in the Epic of Gilgames (vii. 38) are described as 'wearers of crowns who of old (*sa ultu yumê pani*) ruled the earth.' Gilgames himself is described in the Epic as 'two-thirds divine and one-third human,' 'his body being the flesh of the gods.'

The West Semitic (or rather Israelitish) equivalent of the Bab. *qarradi* were the Nephîlîm. In Assyrian this would be *napîli*, but *napîli* signifies 'the destroyers' (literally 'tearers-out'); while *nephîlîm* is shown by Nu 13$^{32.33}$, where the spies apply the old folk-lore word to the Anakim, to have meant 'giants.' Hence the Assyrian and Hebrew words probably have no connexion with one another. That the Babylonian heroes, however, were regarded as of gigantic size, like their Greek representatives, we may gather from a fragment of Berossus relating to the war of the three brothers, Kronos (Bel), Titan (? Etana), and Prometheus. The discovery of the huge fossil bones of extinct mammalia led to a general belief in the ancient world that the earliest men were giants, and the Arabic legend of the gigantic sons of 'Ad may go back to a remote antiquity. At all events, the Israelites shared the belief, and the existence of men taller than themselves at Hebron and in the Philistine cities made them at once conclude that they were the descendants of the primitive race of giants. As a matter of fact, Mr. MacAlister's excavations at Gezer have shown that the neolithic population of Palestine was of shorter stature than the Semitic population of the bronze age which followed it, the height of neolithic man ranging from 5 ft. to 5 ft. 7 in., while that of his successor averaged from 5 ft. 7 in. to 6 ft.

It was thus natural that a Hebrew writer should add a note upon the *qarradi*, or *gibborîm*, identifying them with the *nephîlîm* of his countrymen. Hence the marginal note, 'The *nephîlîm* were in the land in those days,' which has made its way into the text, like the similar marginal note in 12^{6}. But, like the note in 10^{14}, it has been misplaced, being inserted before, instead of after, the passage to which it belongs. It would therefore seem to be of Hebrew origin, and not to be due to the translator of a cuneiform document. On the other hand, it goes back literally into Assyrian: *ina yume-suma* (*napîli*) *ina mati ibsu*, and so could be derived from a Hebrew scribe who wrote in cuneiform.

At any rate, the misplacement of the note appears to be the cause of the misplacement of the verse which precedes it, which not only interrupts the context, but has nothing to do with the origin of the heroes. V.^{3} reads, 'And Yahweh said: My breath shall not dwell in man (Adam) for ever, since he indeed is flesh, and his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.' The reading of the Septuagint, יִדּוֹר instead of יָדוֹן, must be adopted here, since it is impossible to find an etymology for יָדוֹן, *yâdôn*, which would yield any sense. As the passage takes us back to chaps. 2 and 3, it is probable that the Septuagint is also right in reading 'Lord God' (Yahweh-Elohim) for 'Yahweh.' Ewald[1] first pointed out that 120 years are two Babylonian sosses of 60 years, the normal age of man being divided into the two halves of youth and age, and that consequently the passage must be of Babylonian origin. That the Babylonians actually regarded 120 years as man's normal age, we learn from Pliny (*H.N.* vii. 50) and Censorinus (*De Die Nat.* xvii. 4); and when Berossus is stated to have reckoned it at between 116 and 117 years, this merely means that 120 lunar years represent 116$\frac{2}{3}$ solar years. In Egypt, on the contrary, where the Babylonian sexagesimal system was not

[1] *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, i. 367 (2nd ed.).

in use, the normal age of man was reckoned at 110 years.

The original of the Hebrew translation would have been: *Sâru-ya ina amelûti lâ ittusib ana darâti, assu-sa sutu-ma bisru, û yumê-su* cxx *sanâti ibassu*, where *darâti* (from דור), the Babylonian equivalent of עֹלָם, may have led to the choice of יָדוֹר on the part of the translator. בְּ־שׁ, 'since,' is an Assyrianism, intended to render *assu-sa*.

Man became a 'living soul' through the 'breath' of Yahweh-Elohim (2^{7}); since this breath was divine, and consequently immortal, man was immortal so long as it remained in him. But he was also 'flesh,' which decayed and perished; hence the decree was issued that God's breath should not remain in him 'for ever,' and that his age should be reduced to the normal two sosses of years. More than one of the Babylonian Epics was intended to provide an answer to the question why man, who was made in the image of the gods, was nevertheless not immortal. The story of Adamu, the first man, illustrates one of these attempts; the story of Gilgames and his vain search for immortality illustrates another.[1] The heroes, indeed, who were semi-divine, lived long lives, which were counted, not by sosses, but by *sari* and *ners*; but they, too, died at last. And the ordinary man could claim at most his two sosses of years. In Gn 6^{3} we have a fragment of an Epic which explained why this should be so.

It would seem natural that the fragment should belong to the history of the first man, and either follow 3^{22} or be derived from a parallel story. But neither in Babylonian legend nor in the O.T. does it harmonize with the ages assigned, not only to the antediluvian patriarchs, but to the post-diluvian patriarchs as well. Moses is the first who dies at the normal age of 120 years, while the first two post-diluvian kings of Babylonia are made to reign 2400 and 2700 years. The O.T. patriarchs and the Babylonian kings, however, alike belong to the class of heroes; they are not ordinary men. Hence the fragment ought to have followed the account of the heroes; its present position appears to be due to its having been attached as a note to the statement that 'men began to multiply,' and it may then have followed the marginal gloss about the Nephîlîm in creeping into the wrong place.

[1] See my *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, pp. 425, 447.

In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the vivifying 'breath' of Yahweh is replaced by that of the Egyptian king who, being the *ilâni* or 'Elohim' of the writers, took for them the place of the Hebrew God. Thus Abimilki of Tyre, who calls the Pharaoh 'my gods' and 'the breath of my life' (*sari napisti-ya*), says in one passage (Knudtzon, 149. 21–26): *mannu baladh amel-sêpi enuma lâ ittazi sâru istu bi sarri beli-su û balidh summa istapar ana ardi-su û balidh* [*ana*] *dariti*, 'What is the life of a vassal when the breath goes not forth from the mouth of the king his lord? Yet he lives if (the king) sends (it) to his servant, yea, he lives for ever.'

5. In Assyrian: *ragga yumisamma ikpudu*, 'they devised evil every day,' where *ragga* has perhaps caused the introduction of *raq*, 'only,' into the Hebrew text. The Babylonian Deluge also was a punishment for sin; Ellil (Bel) was angry with the whole human race, and condemned it to death accordingly. He assented to the escape of Utu-napistim only when Ea laid down the rule that 'the (individual) sinner should bear his own sin, the transgressor his own transgression,' and that it was therefore unjust to confound the innocent with the guilty.

6, 7. In the Babylonian story it was not the creator, Ea or Bel-Merodach, who launched the Deluge, but Ellil of Nippur. The Hebrew writer, in opposition to Babylonian polytheism, is careful to point out that the creator and the author of the Deluge were one and the same. We have here the same underlying thought and purpose as in the first chapter, to which these verses take us back, and which they presuppose.

'It grieved him at his heart'; so in the Babylonian Penitential Psalms: 'My lord was wroth in his heart.' The phrase, 'the heart (of such and such a deity) was vexed' (*libbu eziz* or *igug*) is common in Assyrian, and is especially used of Bel-Merodach.

7. אֶמְחֶה is the Ass. *mâkhû*, 'to destroy,' which is connected with *mêkhu*, 'the storm of the deluge,' and is therefore specially applicable to the destruction caused by the Flood. In the Babylonian story of the Deluge it is Istar who describes mankind as her offspring: this is implicitly contradicted by the Hebrew writer.

Yahweh was angry with men, not with the animals, and it was men whom He repented of having

made. But the animals also were involved in the destruction brought about by the Deluge; hence the insertion of the words, 'from man to beast,' etc., with reference to Gn $1^{26.28}$. They more probably come from the Hebrew translator, or a later scribe, than from the cuneiform original.

8. The construction is like that of Gn 1^{2}, 'now Noah had found favour' before the destruction of mankind by the Deluge was determined upon. In the Babylonian story Utu-napistim found favour in the sight of Ea, not of Ellil, who was the author of the Deluge: the Hebrew writer once more emphasizes the fact that the author of the Deluge and the preserver of Noah were one and the same.

Literature.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

BEING within sight of the end of the 'Cambridge Modern History,' and being well advanced with the 'Cambridge History of English Literature,' the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have begun the issue of *The Cambridge Medieval History*. The work has been planned by Professor Bury; the editors are Professor Gwatkin and Mr. Whitney. The first volume deals with the Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms (Cambridge: At the University Press; 20s. net).

It will be noticed that the volumes are to be a little more expensive than the volumes of the 'Cambridge Modern History,' and much more expensive than those of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature.' That may be due to the expectation of a smaller circulation; but, after a thorough and careful study of this volume, we have come to the conclusion that it is worth the money on its merits. Some slight improvements, we are told, have been made on the plan of the work as the result of experience, but our belief is that that is as nothing compared with the advance that has been made in the art of editing. For we have little doubt that it is due to the editors, and not to the individual contributors, that this volume can be read as if it were written by one man, and the mental jolting that we used to experience in passing from one chapter to another is almost entirely absent. And yet each author retains his individuality. He is allowed to select his own facts, and to make his own impression.

This smoothness is the more surprising that the range of subject is so great. That range is from Mr. C. H. Turner's chapter on 'The Organisation of the Church' to the chapter on 'The Asiatic Background' by Dr. Peisker of Graz. These chapters not only express the range of the work, they also express its characteristics. They show us that it is not a popular book for easy reading at the fireside, or a student's manual to be got up in the face of an examination. It may be read easily, but easy reading will only skim the surface of it; it may be studied by the student, but if he crams it for an examination he will do injustice both to himself and to it. It is to be read chiefly by those who have passed all their examinations, but are students still; it is to be read by them for the ascertaining of facts, and they will be able to rely upon the facts which are presented to them here; for the men, chosen to write the chapters are specialists, each in his own particular domain, and the editors are men of eagle eye who let nothing slip. But more than that, it will be read by them for that higher education which no school or university can give, but only the after experience of life and the study of such a book as this.

There is another difference between the Medieval History and the Modern. The Medieval History is much more easily quoted. Take this from Mr. Turner's article: 'In the early days of Christianity the first beginnings of a new community were of a very simple kind: indeed, the local organisation had at first no need to be anything but rudimentary, just because the community was never thought of as complete in itself apart from its apostolic founder or other representatives of the missionary ministry. "Presbyters" and "deacons" no doubt existed in these communities from the first: "presbyters" were ordained for each church as it was founded on St. Paul's first missionary journey; "bishops and deacons" constitute, to