

seek for Thy forgiveness. Pardon our shortcomings. Give us greater zeal for Thy glory. Make us more ready and more diligent by our prayers, by our alms, and by our examples, to

spread abroad the knowledge of Thy truth, and to enlarge the boundaries of Thy Kingdom. May the love of Christ constrain us, and may we do all to Thy glory.—BISHOP WALSHAM HOW.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

Chapter vii.

IN **vii. 4** the words, 'for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation,' are an insertion, referring back to 6⁹. In the Epic Utu-napistim is made to say (like Cain in Gn 4¹⁴) that Ellil (Bel) has 'hated' or 'rejected' him, and that consequently he flies from the earth over which Ellil presides and takes refuge in the sea, the domain of Ea. Hence there may have been a reason for the Hebrew writer thus insisting on the 'righteousness' of Noah before Yahweh.

According to the Babylonian Epic Utu-napistim took into the vessel 'the cattle of the field, the wild beast of the field,' and 'the seed of life of every kind,' as well as gold and silver; the Hebrew narrative omits the gold and silver, which were better suited to the ideas of a rich and commercial community like that of Babylonia than to the Israelites of the Mosaic age, and expands 'the cattle' and 'wild beasts' into 'two and two' of every 'kind' in 6¹⁷⁻²², and into 'seven and seven' of clean beasts and 'two and two' of the unclean in the variant passage (7¹⁻⁵). 'Seven' was the sacred Babylonian number, and when Utu-napistim offered sacrifice after the Deluge he placed the libation-vases upon the altar 'seven and seven' (*siba u siba*). In 7⁹ the word 'clean' has dropped out of the Hebrew text after 'fowl of the heavens.'

The 'food' taken into the ark (6²¹) is not mentioned either in the duplicate account or in the Babylonian story, where in place of it Utu-napistim is said to have taken 'all (his) possessions of silver and gold.' But the verb *תָּבַע*, 'gather,' corresponds with the cuneiform *etsen*, 'gathered,' and it would therefore seem that 'food' has been intentionally substituted for the Babylonian 'silver' and 'gold,' which, however important they might have been in

the eyes of a commercial community, were useless in the ark.

4. According to the Babylonian story the Sun-god fixed the date of the beginning of the Deluge, which lasted for seven days. Here the seven days have been transferred to the period during which Noah waited for the coming of the Flood, which lasted forty days. Forty, however, which thus takes the place of the sacred Babylonian number, was the Hebrew equivalent for an 'indefinite number,' '40 years,' for example, signifying a period of unknown length (*e.g.* 2 S 15⁷), and the same idiom occurs on the Moabite Stone. The reason of the transference is the tacit rejection of the polytheism of the Babylonian story which is evident elsewhere. The introduction of the Sun-god into it was excluded by the Hebrew writer, and therewith the Babylonian date for the commencement of the Flood. The alteration, however, has led to an inconsistency similar to that occasioned in Gn 1^{8, 14}, by the change of the appointment of the heavenly bodies as calendrical signs into their creation. Utu-napistim closed the door of his vessel immediately after entering it on the evening before the rain began, and accordingly, in Gn 7¹⁶, the door of the ark is closed immediately after all its occupants have entered. But since in vv. 4-10 Noah had still to wait seven days after his entrance into the ark, the door would thus have been closed six days too soon. 7^{6-10, 11-17} are again duplicate passages which presuppose a free translation of the same original. But whereas vv. 11-17 can be put without difficulty into Assyrian, vv. 6-10 betrays no Assyrianisms. It is the linguistic difference between 2^{4-3²⁴} and 1^{1-2³}. In v. 11 we have the ordinary mode of Babylonian dating, except that the year is placed first instead of after the day of the month,

and 'life' is substituted for 'reign.' Noah, however, was not a Babylonian king as was Utu-napistim. 'On that day' is the Assyrian *ina yumi-su*. *Têhôm* is used as in 1², without the article, and consequently as the proper name Tiamât. The adjective *rabbâh*, 'great,' which is attached to it is similarly without the article, and reproduces the common Assyrian phrase *tamti* (= Bab. *tiamati*) *rabiti*, 'the great sea.' In the Epic of the Creation, the Creator, after cutting Tiamât in half, is said to have made the heaven of one half, 'drawing a bolt and setting a watch, enjoining upon them that her waters should not issue forth.' It was this injunction which was now removed according to Genesis, though the Babylonian story avoids all mention of Tiamât. According to it the law of the Creator remained unbroken so far as the anarchic forces of nature were concerned; the Deluge came from the lower heaven and was directed by Hadad and Nebo and the other gods of light. For the Hebrew writer, however, Tiamât was no primeval deity who had been conquered by Bel-Merodach; she was the sea merely whose waters were fed by fountains (Ass. *naqbi*) and not self-produced, and which was wholly under the control of the supreme God. A tidal wave is therefore made to accompany the deluge of rain.

The 'windows of heaven,' like 'the doors' in Ps 78²⁸, followed from the conception of the sky as a temple or palace. In Babylonia it was known as Ê-Sarra, 'the house of hosts,' and accordingly in the Epic of the Creation Bel-Merodach is said to have 'made the palace of Ê-Sarra the heavens, and set Anu, Ellil, and Ea in their (several) quarters.'

In v.⁸ the fact that the clean beasts went into the ark by sevens is omitted; cf. the omission of 'clean' in v.³. Hence the clean beasts as well as the unclean are made to go in by twos. The original text is to be found in v.¹⁴, where the Hebrew corresponds with the *bâl tseri umam tseri*, 'the cattle of the field, the wild beast of the field,' of the Babylonian story. The introduction of the Mosaic distinction between the clean and the unclean has produced confusion in the alternative version of the narrative.

V.¹⁰ introduces another element of confusion into the text. In the duplicate passage (v.¹³) Noah and the animals enter the ark on 'the self-same day' on which the Flood commences. This is in accordance with the Babylonian story which makes the rain begin *ina lilâti*, 'at night,' after the sun

had set. When Utu-napistim looked out the following morning the storm had begun. It is also in accordance with the Babylonian method of reckoning time, from midnight to midnight, not with the Hebrew method which reckoned it from evening to evening, since in this case the entrance into the ark would have taken place the day before the Deluge commenced. But, as we have seen, the seven days during which the Deluge continued, according to the Babylonian account, have been changed to the indefinite 'forty days and forty nights,' while the seven days have been transferred to the interval between the entrance into the ark and the beginning of the rain. Since the transference is dependent on the 'forty days' of the duplicate passage, the cheap explanation is excluded that the two passages belong to different narratives and different writers. But in the second passage the seven days have been dropped altogether and the order of events in the Babylonian story strictly followed, the result being a hopeless inconsistency between vv.¹⁰ and ¹³.

The Babylonian *abubu* and *bubbulu* meant 'a flood of waters.' But in transferring the foreign technical term to his own manuscript the Hebrew writer felt constrained to explain it, just as the Canaanite writers in the Tel el-Amarna tablets from time to time explain the Babylonian words they employ. Hence the expression 'waters of the Deluge.' In 6¹⁷ and 7⁶ the Tel el-Amarna usage is exactly followed, indicating that a cuneiform tablet lay before the scribe, *ham-mabbâl*, 'the deluge,' being glossed by *mayim*, 'waters,' which in 7⁶ has slipped into the wrong place in the text (for an explanation of its position see note on Gn 10¹⁴). While, therefore, in 6¹⁷ and 7⁶ we have evidence of a cuneiform original, 7¹⁰ must be regarded as purely Hebraic.

12. In the Babylonian story we have '*Muir-kukki* (the director of the scales?) in the night rained an evil rain.' The polytheism of the expression disappears in the Hebrew version, where we have instead of it: 'the rain was upon the earth (forty days and forty) nights.' The introduction of the length of time the rain lasted interrupts the context and may be derived from v.⁴. In v.¹⁷ 'nights' is not mentioned. Perhaps it may be worth noting that the cuneiform *ina lilâti*, 'in the night,' might be read '60 nights,' *lilâti* being plural as well as singular while the horizontal wedge represents '60' as well as the preposition 'in.' In

the sexagesimal system of the Babylonians 60 occupied much the same place as 40 in the system of the Hebrews.

15. The animals came to Noah as they had come to Adam (2¹⁹). In the Babylonian story the animals do not enter the vessel of their own free will in accordance with the commands of God, but are taken into it by Utu-napistim. The 'breath of life' corresponds with the 'seed of life' in the Babylonian version.

16. The words, 'And Yahweh shut him in,' seem intended to be a direct contradiction of the statement in the Babylonian story, *aptekhi babi*, 'I closed the door.' Utu-napistim, with the help of Ea, was concealing himself from the notice of Ellil, who sent the Deluge; Noah, on the contrary, had entered the ark in accordance with the command of the one God to whom the Deluge, like everything else, was due.

17. Since the ark of Noah was not a ship like that of Utu-napistim, it had to be lifted up by the waters above the earth before it could float. Utu-napistim's vessel was already in the water when he entered it. After lifting up the ark the waters became 'violent,'—*kima qabli*, 'like the storm of battle,' as the Babylonian story has it,—so that the vessel was driven over them like a ship. They had indeed been already so violent (v.¹⁸) that the highest mountains were covered by them. The Assyrian text would have been something like *mê gabsâti dannis irbu ina eli irsitam*.

19. 'All the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered.' This is in silent contradiction of the statement in the Babylonian story that the *nagû* or 'coastland' beyond the circumambient ocean and opposite the mountain of Nizir was not covered. But the geographical conception of the seven 'coastlands' which rose by the side of the circumambient ocean and bounded the world was

connected with Babylonian mythology, and it is probable that the mountain of Nizir itself was identified with the Babylonian Olympus, 'the mountain of the world' on which the gods had their seat, and which is described in Is 14¹³ as 'the mount of the assembly (of the gods) in the sides of the north.'

20. In Ass. *ana xv. ammâti gubus mê itelâ*, with which we may compare the words of the Babylonian story of the Deluge, *ana xii. tân itelâ nagû*, 'at 12 measures (of distance?) rose a coastland.' Both the cubit measure and its name were Babylonian, and 15 is a quarter of the Babylonian soss, the unit of the numerical system.

21. *Hâ-romêsh 'al-hâ-ârez* (Ass. *nammassû sa tsêri*) is an insertion which breaks the grammatical construction as well as the sense, and is, moreover, a variant of *hash-shereç 'al hâ-arez*, 'that creepeth upon the earth,' in the latter part of the verse, where it comes in its right place. It is not found in the parallel passage 8¹⁷ (on which see note). Here, therefore, we must have another instance of alternative translations one of which has crept into the text in the wrong place.

23. Ass. *mimmû sa ina eli qaqqari imût*, 'all that was upon the ground died'; of this the Hebrew is a literal translation. Hence its grammatical peculiarities.

24. In Palestine the rainy season of winter extended from the beginning of November in the middle of the 'second month,' called Bul or 'rain' in Phœnician, to the end of March in the middle of the 'seventh month,' Abib (7¹¹ 8⁴). Consequently we have 150 days of rain instead of the 7 of the Babylonian Epic. This is another illustration of Palestinian influence, and indicates that a cuneiform version of the narrative used by the translator had been written in Palestine. The months, it will be observed, were months of 30 days like those of the old Babylonian year.