

Now such a creed as a protest against a narrow orthodoxy is both beautiful and inevitable. We read Faber and reverence him. But is not the orthodoxy of the present day wide enough? Are we not now in imminent danger of approaching God indifferently and indiscriminately, as we might approach a benevolent old gentleman who is too indulgent to see that we are to blame and too soft-hearted to blame us if he saw? The prodigal goes out into the far country and spends his substance

in riotous living. Mr. Jacks seems to say that it scarcely matters. Does he think it matters at all when the end comes? But Jesus said, 'This my son was dead.' The prodigal had to return, saying 'Father, I have sinned,' before the Father could say, 'and is alive again.' In the scenes of Mr. Jacks's new book *Among the Idolmakers* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) there is human error enough. Is God really looking on all the while so complacently?

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.

9, 10. Here we have another extract from the book of generations, or series of tablets called *annâti talidât*. It would seem to have been the third tablet of the series, which followed 5³¹, to which v.³² has been appended by the Hebrew writer. Consequently the words, 'these are the generations,' will have been derived from the colophon of the tablet: *duppu III; Annâti talidât*, '3rd tablet of *Annâti talidât*,' and the extract would not necessarily contain a list of Noah's generations or descendants. And this, in fact, is the case. There are no generations of Noah, only the one generation of his three sons; cf. 25¹⁹. Hence the original would have been: 'And Noah lived (500?) years, and begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Noah walked with God after he had begotten his sons, 450 (?) years (and begat sons and daughters). And all the days of Noah were 950 years: and he died.' The last sentence has been transferred to 9²⁹. That Noah should be said to have 'walked with God,' like Enoch, is explained by the fact that, according to the Babylonian version, it was Utu-napistim, and not Enwe-dhuranki, who was translated to live 'among the gods'; see note on 5²⁴. Perhaps, therefore, the original had, instead of 'he died,' 'he was not, for God took him.' In any case, the repetition of the name Noah and the want of the copulative conjunction raises the presumption that the words, 'Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations,' were a marginal note which has made

its way into the text. *Zaddiq*, 'righteous,' is the Ass. *isaru*, but as a title of the hero of the Deluge it replaces *atra-khasit*, 'the very wise,' in the Deluge story. While, according to the Babylonian story, it was the wisdom of Utu-napistim which made Ea, the god of wisdom, reveal to him the coming catastrophe, Yahweh's revelation to Noah was due to the latter's righteousness. Once more there is an intentional correction of the Babylonian version on the part of the Hebrew writer. Yahweh demanded not only wisdom, but also righteousness; Babylonian polytheism divided the divine attributes among different gods. 'A righteous man' and 'he was upright in his generations' are alternative renderings of the Ass. *isaru ina amelûti*, 'upright among men.' The Septuagint corrects, 'in his generation'; but the correction is needless, since the patriarch or hero lived through several generations of ordinary men.

II. The Assyrian would be *irtsitu limnit* (or *šukkkhupāt*) *lapâni ilâni*; *irtsitu mikhtsi* (or *limutti*) *malat*. The earth had been pronounced good (1^{10.31}), but murder had brought upon it a curse, the Babylonian *arrat limuttim*, also called *qâlu lâ dhâbu*, 'voice of evil' (as in 4¹⁰⁻¹²). Hence, like the animals, it was to share in the punishment of the Deluge. Here, again, there is an implicit condemnation of Babylonian polytheism, which made the earth a goddess, whose name, *Irtsitu*, is compounded with those of Western Semites in the Khammu-rabi period. In the Epic of Gilgames the

Earth is put on a level with Namtaru, 'Destiny,' and regarded as 'taking' mankind from life. The Hebrew writer, on the other hand, degrades Earth, the goddess who inflicts death, to 'the earth' which shares in the corruption, and consequently in the punishment, of the men who inhabit it. Like Tiamât, it becomes the enemy of the deity (*limnit lapâni ilâni*), full of 'violence,' like the forces of Tiamât. The passage seems to be taken from a poem, since its Assyrian equivalent is in the form of a verse.

12. This verse is a commentary on the preceding one. When God sees the earth (*irtsitam inadhdhal* in Assyrian), it has become corrupt, because the living beings upon it—who were formed of its dust, and returned at death to its bosom—were corrupt and hostile to God. In the Epic of Gilgames, 'the law of the Earth' (*urtim irtsitim*) is declared to be that mortal man is formed from the dust, and shall 'sink back' into it (*ina epiri ittapalsikh*). In v.³ man had already been pronounced to be 'flesh,' and in v.⁷ the lower animals had been stated to be involved in the judgment that was coming upon man. Just as v.⁷ refers us to 1²⁸, so this verse refers us to 2⁷.

13. The earth had become corrupt and ruined, so God will now ruin it. The play on the Hebrew word reproduces the Assyrian *irtsitam ulammenu*, 'I will destroy the earth,' where there is the same play on *limnit* and *ulammenu*, though perhaps the original text had *askhup*, 'I will destroy,' since *sikhiptu*, 'the destruction,' is given as a synonym of *bubbulu*, 'the deluge' (see note on 6¹⁷). In the Babylonian story of the Deluge, however, the word actually used is *khullug* (*ana khullug nisi-ya*, 'to destroy my men'). The Hebrew text has 'I will destroy them, (namely) the earth,' where the Septuagint has endeavoured to make sense by inserting 'and' after 'them.' 'The earth,' however, must be a marginal gloss, derived from the Babylonian original; the Hebrew writer was explaining that the reference to 'the earth' meant the living creatures upon it. Hence we may conclude that, in the original tablet, v.¹¹ (or 12^a) was followed by v.¹³, which ran: 'And God said unto Noah: The fated period of all flesh is come before me, and behold, I will destroy the earth.' The explanation of what was meant by the earth obliged the Hebrew scribe to substitute 'them' for 'the earth' at the end of the verse.

The Septuagint is right in reading *καρπὸς*, 'period,'

for 'end.' The Babylonian original had *adannu*, as in the story of the Deluge (l. 87), *adanna Samas iskunamma*, 'the fated period did the Sun-god fix,' and (l. 90) *adannu sù iktalda*, 'that fated period arrived,' and would have been *adannu sa kullat nisi ana mukhkhhi-ya issakin*.

14. In the Babylonian story of the Deluge the command of Ea to Utu-napistim is: 'Fashion a house, build a ship,' and in the account of its construction it is said to have been divided into nine rooms, and to have been pitched within and without. The Heb. *kopher*, 'pitch,' is borrowed from the Babylonian *kupru*. The stoneless plain of Babylonia was the first home of building with brick, and the bitumen springs at Hit and on the eastern side of the Tigris supplied the builders with mortar.

Bayit, 'within,' answers to the *bitu*, 'house,' of Ea's command. Later on in the Babylonian story, the Chaldean ship is called an *ékallu*, or 'palace.' The wood of which it was built is not stated in the Babylonian account. What is meant by 'gopherwood' is unknown; the Septuagint translates, 'square logs.' In an Assyrian lexical tablet (K 169) mention is made of the tree *kuptarru*, which is said to be also called *kaptaru*, reminding us of Caphtor, the Hebrew name of Krete. Both *gubru* and *kapru* mean a 'plate' or 'table.'

The 'ark' (*tébâh*), which replaces the Babylonian 'ship,' is Palestinian, Palestine being a country without navigable rivers (cf. note on 1¹¹). Similarly, the members of Osiris were said to have come to Byblos (Geba) in a chest. The word *tébâh* seems to have been borrowed from the Egyptian *deb*, *teb*, or *tebt*, 'a chest.'

15. Ea's instructions to Utu-napistim were—

The ship which thou buildest, even thou,
let its size be so planned
that its breadth and its length be proportionate,

where *mitkhur* ('proportionate') probably means that the length and breadth should be the same, like those of the modern *kufa*, which is used on the Tigris and Euphrates; but it may signify only that their proportions were similar.

In the account of the building of the ship we read:

According to the plan, 120 cubits high were its sides,
120 cubits was the width of its roof.
I planked its side and closed it in;
I completed it in 6 storeys (?);
I divided its . . . into 7 parts;

its interior did I divide into 9 rooms;
 a mast (?) in the middle of it I planted;
 I looked to the rudder and added what was wanting;
 6 sari of pitch I poured over the hull;
 3 sari of bitumen [I poured] over the interior.

The Hebrew ark needed, of course, no mast or rudder. The proportions of a chest; moreover, were necessarily not the same as those of a ship. Hence, in passing from Babylonia to Palestine, the account of the size of the vessel underwent alteration. Its length and breadth were no longer proportionate, the length being half a *ner* of cubits, and the breadth fifty cubits, a measurement which is no longer Babylonian, but Egypto-Palestinian. When the measurement of the breadth was changed in order to make the Hebrew ark conformable to the shape of a chest or Egyptian box, the number of cubits in which it was expressed ceased to be Babylonian, and became Egyptian. The height remained the Babylonian measure of half a *sofs* of cubits, a fourth part of the height of the Babylonian ship. Perhaps, therefore, the reduction in the length of the vessel was the same; in this case, the ship of Utu-napistim would have been 1200 cubits long, but it was more probably 300. The Heb. word *ammâh*, 'cubit,' like the measure it denoted, was borrowed from Babylonia.

16. The *paseq* attached to *zohar*, A.V. 'window,' shows that the meaning of the word was doubtful to the Massoretes. The Septuagint translators were equally puzzled by it, and their rendering, *ἐπισυνάγων*, 'narrowing,' seems to indicate that they corrected it into *zâ'ir*. Professor Jensen has pointed out that it is the *tsuhru* and *tsukhru* of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which in Winckler (157. 11) is given as the Canaanite equivalent of the Ass. *tsiru*, 'back.' Hence the word will signify the back-like roof of the ark, which, like that of most Egyptian chests, resembled the roof of an English house. The Babylonian vessel also had a 'roof.'

What is meant by the phrase 'thou shalt finish it (the ark) above at a cubit' is not clear. Perhaps it is a translation of the common Assyrian expression: 'so many cubits' *ina i. ammati*, 'according to a cubit-measure'; literally, 'in a cubit.' If so, the phrase would signify that no fractions of the cubit were to be used, but that the dimensions of the ark when completed should represent accurately aggregates of cubits only. In any case the ark, it would seem, was to be built from the bottom upwards.

The Babylonian vessel also had a door which Utu-napistim closed when he entered it. On the other hand, the six storeys of the Babylonian account are halved in the case of the Hebrew ark in accordance with its otherwise reduced dimensions. These reduced dimensions, it may be noticed, correspond with the reduced number of years assigned in Genesis to the antediluvian patriarchs when compared with the antediluvian kings of Babylonia.

17. Once more the Hebrew writer emphasizes the fact that the Deluge was brought upon the earth by the same God as He who revealed its approach to Noah. Once more, therefore, there is a silent condemnation of Babylonian polytheism. The Heb. text has 'the flood of waters,' indicating that it was a well-known event. Zimmern is doubtless right in holding that *mabbûl*, 'flood,' is borrowed from the Ass. *bubbulu*, which is given as a synonym of *abubu*, 'the deluge,' as well as of *sikhiptu*, 'destruction,' the equivalent of the Heb. שׁוּחַת. Both the word and the event would have been well known in pre-mosaic Canaan where Babylonian literature was studied and the Babylonian language and script learnt in the schools. For 'waters,' see note on 7⁶.

'All flesh wherein is the breath of life,' answers to *zir napsâti kalama*, 'the seed of life of every kind,' in the Babylonian version, the variation in the words being due to the reference to 1⁷ 6^{8, 12}. But the sense is the same; hence 'the breath of life' is not restricted to man as in 1⁷ 6⁸, but includes the animal creation as in 6^{7, 1}. 'Everything which is in the land,' not 'earth,' since the destruction did not extend to the vegetable creation. The olive was still in leaf when the waters abated.

18. Here, as in Gn 1, there is an implicit contradiction of the polytheistic Babylonian story. The 'covenant' which was made after the descent from the ark and Noah's sacrifice to Yahweh (9⁹⁻¹⁷) corresponds with the covenant made under the same circumstances between Ellil (Bel) and Utu-napistim. It was Ellil who had sent the Deluge and with whom the covenant with Utu-napistim was finally made. But it was not Ellil who had warned Utu-napistim of the approaching

¹ The expression 'breath of life' seems to have been specially Canaanite, like the use of the plural *ilâni* for the singular *ilu*, 'god,' since the Tel el-Amarna writers address the Pharaoh as *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.'

catastrophe and told him to build the ark, but Ea, whose intercession alone saved the Chaldæan hero from destruction and made the covenant possible. The Hebrew writer, however, here emphasizes the fact not only that the author of the Deluge and the preserver of Noah were the same, but also that in bidding him build the ark this one God declared at the same time that He would make a covenant with him. The polytheism of the Babylonian story is thus tacitly denied.

17-22. This passage is a variant of 7¹⁻⁶. In the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation long passages are similarly repeated at different moments of the story, and the same characteristic recurs in other Babylonian legends. We may, therefore, have here a reproduction of Babylonian literary usage. But, on the other hand, we may have variant free renderings of the same cuneiform original, just as elsewhere we have alternative renderings, side by side, of the same Babylonian word (e.g. Gn 4²²). In favour of this are the words with which both passages conclude (6²² 7⁵), as well as the fact that a little further on (7⁷⁻¹⁰. 13-17) we find another duplicate pas-

sage which can best be explained as due to variant translations. Against this explanation is the dislocation of 6¹⁷ when compared with 7⁴. In any case the entrance of Noah into the ark is regarded in the two passages from different points of view: while 7¹⁻⁵ refers us to the Mosaic Law with its division of animals into the clean and unclean, 6¹⁷⁻²² takes us back to Gn 1.

The variations in the order of the words—'thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy' family, 'come thou and all thy house into the ark,' etc.—are instructive, and throw light upon the method of translation from Babylonian or Israelitish cuneiform texts. So, too, are the paraphrastic explanations of words or expressions; 'all thy house,' for example, being resolved into 'thy sons, and thy wives, and the wives of thy sons.' The Babylonian Epic has simply 'my family, and my wives.' But it adds to these the 'craftsmen' who had constructed the ark; to the Hebrew writer Cain, the Smith, belonged to the accursed race whom it was the object of the Deluge to destroy. Hence the family of Noah alone was admitted into the Hebrew ark; nor did it need a steersman like the Babylonian vessel.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Two Important Works by Professor König.¹

I. A NEW Hebrew Lexicon by so competent a Hebraist as Dr. König will be very welcome to O.T. scholars and students. It will supersede the admirable work of Siegfried-Stade, which is now somewhat out of date, and which had the very serious defect of almost entirely omitting the etymological element which is so important. It will appeal to many who cannot afford to procure the great *Oxford Heb. Lexicon*, and even those who possess the latter will thankfully give Professor König's work a place alongside it. To a very large class of students a welcome feature of

the new Lexicon will be the fact that the Heb. words are dealt with alphabetically and not etymologically, as in the Oxford Lexicon. This will save much time to those who consult its pages. Moreover, any forms that are difficult to recognize are analyzed in their alphabetical place, and the Massoretical notes are explained. The thoroughness and up-to-date character of the work are illustrated by the fact that the Aramaic part of the Lexicon contains not only the words found in the O.T. but all the most important terms that occur in the recently discovered texts of Assuan and Elephantine. Special attention is bestowed on the development in meaning of Heb. words, and copious references are made to the usage in the cognate languages. The Assyriological and other literary data are fully given, and the author is not content, as too many are, simply to cite an authority, but is careful to indicate what that authority contains. Alike for its practical use and for its scientific value, which is of the highest, Professor König's Lexicon merits the warmest commendation.

¹ (1) *Heb. und aram. Wörterbuch zum A.T.; mit Einschaltung u. Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der massor. Randbemerkungen, u. einem deutsch-heb. Wortregister.* Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Price M.11.

(2) *Gesch. der Alttest. Religion kritisch dargestellt.* Gütersloh: Druck u. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. Price M.7, bound M.8.