

voice really human and truly divine, with the same loving accent as of old, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly," and again, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."



## Hasisatra and Noah.

### A "CRITICAL" ASSERTION CRITICISED.

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

"There has . . . been discovered [in the Cuneiform tablets] an account of the Deluge very similar to the one we have in Genesis. . . . What is the inference from all this? Surely this—that these legends were derived from a Babylonian or Accadian source."

"That the early Hebrews derived the story [of the Deluge] from Babylonia . . . may be considered a practical certainty."

THESE are two passages taken from two different books recently published which profess to state the "proved results" of Higher Critical investigations. Their authors are themselves Higher Critics, and they agree in asserting in the most clear and decisive manner, as will be seen, that the Biblical account of the Flood is borrowed directly from the Babylonian. The ground on which the assertion is professedly based is the alleged *great similarity* between the Hebrew narrative in Genesis and the Babylonian story known to us from the Deluge episode in the eleventh book of the "Epic of Gilgamêsh," and also in part from Bêrôssos. Our object in this article is to test this conclusion of the Higher Critics. We approach the subject from a purely critical and literary point of view, entirely setting aside all theological questions.

To enable our readers to estimate for themselves the degree of resemblance which exists between the Babylonian account and the Hebrew, it is necessary to quote the former, as related

by Šit-Napishtim or Ḥasisatra, the hero of the Deluge, to Gilgamêsh. It runs thus :<sup>1</sup>

“Šit-Napishtim<sup>2</sup> then said to him, to Gilgamêsh: ‘I shall disclose to thee, O Gilgamêsh, the account of the mystery, and I shall tell thee the oracle of the gods. The city Shurippak, the city which thou knowest, is built on the bank of the Euphrates. That city was ancient, and the gods within it did their hearts impel to produce a cyclone<sup>3</sup>—the great gods, as many as there were: Anu their father; the hero Bel their ruler; their throne-bearer<sup>4</sup> Adar;<sup>5</sup> their prince En-nu-gi. The lord of the bright eye, Êa, spake with them, and repeated their word to the forest,<sup>6</sup> (saying): “Forest, forest, town, town: forest hear, and town understand. O Shurippakite, son of Ubara-Tutu, destroy the house, build a ship, leave what thou hast, see to (thy) life: collect seed and preserve life alive. Bring up into the midst of the ship the seed of life of all sorts. As for the ship which thou shalt build, . . . let her proportions be measured, let her width and her breadth match (each other), . . . and the abyss, deck her.” I knew, and I said to Êa my lord: . . . “My lord, as thou sayest, so will I do. What shall I answer to the city, the youth and the elders?” Êa opened his mouth, he spake, he said to me his servant: “[Thus] shalt thou speak to them, It hath been said to me that Bel hateth me: I will not dwell, . . . and within Bel’s territory I will not set my face. I shall descend to the deep; with my lord will I dwell.””

In the broken lines which follow Ḥasisatra assures Êa that no one had ever before built a ship on dry land,<sup>7</sup> but he is again directed to do so. The fragmentary second column of the tablet evidently contained exact particulars as to the measurements of the vessel and the arrangement of its several parts. Ḥasisatra laid in an abundant supply of food and wine for the crew, and cut cable holes. The story then continues thus:

“‘Whatever I had I gathered it; whatever I had of silver I gathered it together; whatever I had of gold I gathered it together; whatever I had of the seed of life of all kinds I gathered it together. I caused all my family and my relations to embark in the ship. The cattle of the plain, the animals of the plain, the sons of the artisans, all of them did I cause to embark.’”

<sup>1</sup> My version is made from the Cuneiform text, printed in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Archæol.*, vol. iii., part ii., and vol. iv., part i. The “Epic of Gilgamêsh” was written by Šin-liqi-unnini, possibly a contemporary of Abraham (*vide* Sayce, “Religion of Egypt and Babylonia,” p. 423).

<sup>2</sup> The first ideograph in this name may be read variously. The name means “Sprout (or Sun) of Life.”

<sup>3</sup> *ÂPÛPU* or *ÂBÛBU*. Cf. *Æg. APEP*.

<sup>4</sup> This word *may* have this meaning.

<sup>5</sup> Otherwise read “Nin-ip.”

<sup>6</sup> This and the next few words are of very doubtful signification.

<sup>7</sup> Some hold that this fragment belongs to a different version of the legend.

Then Êa said to him :

“The sun-god will appoint a fixed time, and the lightener<sup>1</sup> of the darkness in the evening shall cause the skies to rain down masses. Enter thou into the midst of the ship and bolt thy door.”

“That fixed time drew nigh. The lightener of the darkness in the evening caused the skies to rain down masses. Of the day I beheld the appearance, I felt awe upon seeing the day. I entered into the midst of the ship and bolted my door. For the steering of the ship, to Buzur Shadirabi,<sup>2</sup> the pilot, I gave over the palace<sup>3</sup> with its contents.

“At the shining forth of something of dawn, then from the horizon of the heaven there rose a dark cloud. Rimmon thundered in the midst of it, and Nebo and Merodach marched in front. The throne-bearers marched over mountain and land. Urra-gal drags forth the cables. Adar marches; he brings down ruin. The Anunnaki (gods of the earth) raised the torches; with their brightness they lit up the land.<sup>4</sup> Rimmon’s ragings reached the skies; they turned everything bright into darkness. . . . Brother saw not his brother; men were not known. In heaven the gods feared the cyclone and withdrew; they went up to Anu’s heaven. The gods crouched down like dogs; they camped on the walls. Ishtar wailed with a loud voice.<sup>5</sup> Ishtar the well-voiced proclaimed: ‘This people has returned to clay because I spake evil in the presence of the gods: for I spake evil in the presence of the gods. To the destruction of my men I spake strife, and, indeed, I bore a people, and it is not.’<sup>6</sup> Like the sons of fishes, it fills the sea.’ The gods weep with her for the Anunnaki. The gods humbled themselves, sitting weeping; their lips were covered in all the assemblies. Six days and nights the wind marches on; cyclone and tempest overpower the land. The seventh day, on its arrival the tempest breaks up, the cyclone, the strife, which had fought like an army.<sup>7</sup> The sea rested, it retired,<sup>8</sup> and the evil wind, the

<sup>1</sup> *I.e.*, the Sun-god (*cf.* Skt. *doshâ-vastri*, with the same meaning).

<sup>2</sup> “The secret of the god of the great mountain.” Bêrôssos, too, mentions the pilot.

<sup>3</sup> *I.e.*, the vessel.

<sup>4</sup> This must refer to the flashing of lightning.

<sup>5</sup> Another reading has, “like a mother.”

<sup>6</sup> Or, “where is it?”

<sup>7</sup> Others render, “like a whirlwind.”

<sup>8</sup> With this compare Pindar’s account of the falling of the water. The whole passage runs thus:

Φέροις δὲ Πρωτογενείας  
ἀσπει γλώσσαν, ἔν', αἰολοβρόντα Διὸς αἴσα,  
Πύρρα Δευκαλίων τε, Παρνασοῦ καταβάντε,  
δόμον ἔθεντο πρῶτον· ἀτερ δ' εὐνάς ὁμόδαμον  
κτηρᾶσθαι λίθινον γόνον·

λαοὶ δ' ὀνόμασθεν. . . .

. . . λέγοντι μὰν  
χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν  
ὑδατος σθένης· ἀλλὰ  
Ζητὸς τέχναις ἀνάπτωτιν ἐξαίφνας  
ἄντλον ελεῖν

(“Olymp.,” ix. 64-79, ed. Weise).

cyclone, ended. I beheld the sea uttering (its) voice, and all mankind had returned to clay. The forest had become like unto the desert.<sup>1</sup> I opened the window, and the light fell upon my face. I fell down; I sat weeping; over my face went my tears. I beheld the regions, the shore, the sea; unto twelve did the district rise. At the land of Nişir<sup>2</sup> the ship stood still. The mountain of the land of Nişir caught the ship and permitted it not to be lifted up. One day, two days, the mountain of Nişir, *do., do.* Three days, four days, the mountain of Nişir, *do., do.* Five days, six days, the mountain of Nişir, *do., do.* The seventh day, on its arrival then I caused a dove (?)<sup>3</sup> to go forth: it left; the dove went; it returned; a standing-place there was not, and it turned back. Then I caused a swallow to go forth: it left; the swallow went; it returned; and a standing-place there was not, and it turned back. Then I caused a raven<sup>4</sup> to go forth: it left; the raven went and saw the drying up of the waters, and it eats, it wades, it croaks, it turned not back. Then I caused to go forth to the four winds; I offered sacrifices. I made a libation on the top of the summit of the mountain. Seven and seven libation-vessels did I set up; below them I poured out cane, cedar, and rosewood (?). The gods inhaled the odour, the gods inhaled the good odour, the gods gathered like flies over the sacrificer. Ishtar, on her arrival from afar, raised the great signets which Anu had made as her adornment, (saying): 'By the lapis-lazuli stones of my neck, let me not forget these gods<sup>5</sup>; I shall remember these days for ever: I shall not forget. Let the gods come to the libation. Bel will not come to the libation because he did not consider, and made a cyclone, and he has numbered my men unto destruction.'

"Then, on his arrival from afar, Bel saw the ship. Bel became angry; he was filled with wrath against the gods, the Igi (spirits of heaven). (He said): 'What life has escaped? No man shall live in the destruction.' Adar opened his mouth and spake, he said to the hero Bel: 'Who but Êa has done the thing? And Êa, too, knoweth every matter.' Êa opened his mouth; he spake, he said to the hero Bel: 'Thou art the leader of the gods, O hero! Why, why didst thou not consider and didst make a cyclone? On the sinner lay his sin; on the evildoer lay his evil deed. Release him,<sup>5</sup> let him not be destroyed; yield, let him not be destroyed. Instead of thy making a cyclone, let a lion come and diminish men. Instead of thy making a cyclone, let a leopard come and diminish men. Instead of thy making a cyclone, let there occur a famine, and let the land be desolated. Instead of thy making a cyclone, let Urra (god of pestilence) come, and let him destroy men. I did not divulge the oracle of the great gods. I caused a dream to fly to Hasisatra, and he heard the oracle of the gods.

" 'And now do ye take counsel.'

"Then Bel came up into the midst of the ship. He took my hand and

<sup>1</sup> Rendering doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> Bêrôssos says in Armenia, but wrongly, as will be pointed out later.

<sup>3</sup> Sum. TU-KHU, Ass. *summatu*.

<sup>4</sup> Bêrôssos merely mentions that "some birds" were sent forth. He does not specify number or kind.

<sup>5</sup> *I.e.*, Hasisatra.

raised me up; he raised up, he caused my wife to bow down beside me; he turned our faces and stood between us; he showed favour unto us, (saying): 'Formerly Šit-Napishtim was a man: and now let Šit-Napishtim and his wife be like the gods, even us; and let Šit-Napishtim be a dweller in the distance at the mouth of the streams.' Then they took me and made me to dwell in the distance at the mouth of the streams."

The general resemblance between the two accounts is obvious. Yet the *differences* are very considerable indeed, and *these also* should be taken into consideration if we wish to form a correct and unprejudiced opinion upon the question whether one narrative is derived from the other. This we now proceed to do.

The greatest difference of all undoubtedly is that in the Hebrew account we have pure monotheism, whereas in the Babylonian legend the polytheism is completely undisguised. The gods meet in council, and resolve upon producing a destructive cyclone; but one of them, Êa, gives timely warning to Ḥasisatra. The cyclone was so terrific that it frightened even the gods themselves, and they joined the goddess Ishtar in weeping. One of their number, Bel, is furious on discovering that some human beings have escaped destruction, but he is ultimately pacified. All the gods "gather like flies over the sacrificer."

This difference may seem slight unless we realize the fact that the chasm between the conception of "God" the Creator and that of "the gods" is so vast that *no nation of antiquity was ever able to attain to the former conception except the Hebrews.*

Ḥasisatra builds a "ship" (*êlappu*) so large and commodious that he speaks of it as a "palace" (*êkalu*). He takes with him a pilot, his own family and relations (their names are not given), and a large number of people, of a different rank apparently. He not only lays in a supply of food and wine, but he also loads the vessel with treasures of gold and silver. He remonstrates against the command to build the ship on dry land, fearing to be scoffed at, and is told to make an excuse and declare that he is fleeing from one god's province to that of another.

Noah, on the other hand, builds an "ark" (*tēbāh*, תֵּבָה). The word used is not Assyrian, Babylonian, or Accadian, but *Egyptian* (*tēb-t*). It is in the latter language applied to coffers, chests, and even coffins,<sup>1</sup> but it has not been found in Babylonian. The use of the word would lead us to suppose that the Hebrew narrative assumed its present form in the land of the Nile. Noah took with him none but his own family; his three sons are named. No mention whatever is made of *treasures*.

The scene of the Flood in the one case is Babylonia, the city of Shurippak on the Euphrates being especially mentioned. Hasisatra is a native of that city, and resident there. The "ship" is ultimately stranded on Mount Nišir, which is mentioned in one of Asshur-našir-pal's inscriptions as lying between the Tigris and the Lower Zab. In the Hebrew account, on the other hand, the ark rests "on one of the mountains of *Ararat*"<sup>2</sup> —*i.e.*, Armenia. The mention of the "olive leaf" confirms the inference that the catastrophe occurred in that country, for the olive in ancient times abounded in Armenia,<sup>3</sup> as it still does along the south of the Caspian,<sup>4</sup> whereas it was unknown in Babylonia in early days, and is therefore not mentioned in the Babylonian narrative.

The birds sent out differ somewhat in the two accounts. The Hebrew speaks of the raven and the dove; the Babylonian of the raven, the swallow, and a third bird, which *may* be a dove and *may* be a quail. The name of this bird is *summatu*<sup>5</sup> in Semitic Babylonian (TU-KHU in Accadian), and this has not

<sup>1</sup> Probably also to a kind of boat used on the Nile.

<sup>2</sup> In all other narratives of the Flood—as, for instance, in the Babylonian—a mountain in or near the country in which the narrators live is named. But the Hebrew account, naming no special mountain, mentions that the one on which the ark rested was in a distant country—Armenia. This is a reason for concluding, not only that the account in Genesis is not borrowed from Babylon, but also that it did not arise in *Palestinian* tradition.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, Lib. XI.

<sup>4</sup> To this I can testify from personal observation.

<sup>5</sup> *Vide* Muss-Arnolt's "Assyrian Dict.," *s.v.* Hommel compares the Egyptian *semen*, "goose"; and in Arabic we have *sumanatum* and *sumāna*, "quail," *summatu* standing for *summatu*. In Arabic *samām* also occurs as the name of a species of swallow.

the slightest resemblance to the word *yônâh* used in Hebrew. In fact, the only reason for supposing that *summatu* means a dove seems to be that it occurs here, and therefore "ought" to have that meaning in order to make the resemblance between the two accounts appear greater than it otherwise would.

In the Babylonian story the duration of the Flood is limited to a fortnight; in the Hebrew it lasts in all a year and ten days.<sup>1</sup>

The Hebrew text speaks of "a flood of waters" (*mabbul mayim*), the Babylonian of a "cyclone" or storm (*âpûpu*). This latter word is also used in the Creation tablets, in the narrative of the fight between Merodach and Tiâmat, where it is spoken of as his chief weapon against her, and the way in which it is employed proves that it means "storm" rather than "flood." This translation is supported, too, by the vivid description of the raging of the elements and the flashes of lightning. Of course the storm produced a flood, but yet in this matter there is a marked difference between the two accounts. It is noteworthy that in Arabia and Persia to the present day people speak of the *tûfân* (طوفان, typhoon), or "storm," of Noah, not of Noah's "flood," as we do.

The Babylonian text makes no mention of the distinction between clean and unclean animals, which is again and again insisted on in the Hebrew.

In the Hebrew account it is clearly and repeatedly stated that sin was the cause of the Deluge; in the Babylonian this is implied, but not plainly affirmed.

The incidents of the rainbow and the Divine promise do not occur in the Babylonian text, the former being represented, if at all, only by Ishtar's lapis-lazuli necklace and her signets, and the latter by Êa's advice to Bel to punish men by sending wild beasts and pestilence instead of a cyclone.

Hasisatra is finally removed by Bel to "dwell in the distance at the mouth of the streams," where he and his wife are made like the gods. Noah, on the other hand, remains with his family and resumes his life on earth.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. vii. 11, viii. 14.

These are some of the most important differences between the Babylonian and the Hebrew accounts of the Deluge. On the supposition that the latter was derived from the former, how is the occurrence of these differences to be accounted for?

It may, of course, be asserted that doubtless the Hebrew writer or compiler did not borrow directly from the "Epic of Gilgamêsh," but from some simpler form of the legend. At first sight this theory appears plausible, because it to some extent obviates the difficulty presented by the self-evident fact that the Hebrew narrative is simpler and less ornate than the "Epic," and therefore seems to give the tale in an *earlier* and less fully elaborated form. The version that represents the hero of the Deluge as building a "ship," answering the scoffs of those who laughed at him for doing so on dry land, and not only employing a "pilot," but actually carrying off treasures of gold and silver in the vessel, does certainly seem later than the unvarnished tale of the "Ark" given in Genesis. Doubtless, also, some simpler and more ancient tradition did at one time exist in Babylon, and upon it the "Epic" was based. But we have *no proof whatever* that this supposed earlier account differed from that given in the "Epic" in the particulars in which the Hebrew account contradicts the latter. Bêrôssos' narrative agrees more closely with the "Epic" than with the Hebrew text. If critics base their argument on the *hypothesis* that the Hebrew writer had at his disposal an earlier and simpler Babylonian form of the tradition than that found in the "Epic," then this is at once a *petitio principii*, and a confession that, whatever the source of the Hebrew account may have been, it was *not* the "Epic," nor was it Bêrôssos. But these are the only *known* authorities upon which our information about the Babylonian tradition rests. There is clearly a link missing in the Higher Critical chain of reasoning. The search for the "missing link" always excites keen interest in investigators, but to assert that, because the link cannot be found, therefore the chain is complete, is logic of a kind not indeed unprecedented in our own day, but



none the less certainly unworthy of reasonable and unprejudiced scholars.

But let us for a moment suppose that the Hebrew narrative *is* borrowed from Babylon. When then did this take place? The "Epic of Gilgamêsh" was known in Palestine (as we learn from the Tell-el-Amarna tablets) at least as early as the time of Moses, having been composed hundreds of years earlier still. If the Hebrew account in Genesis was compiled some hundreds of years *later* than Moses' time (as the Critics assert), how did the compiler (or compilers) gain access to the supposed *antique* form of the Babylonian tradition? Are we to imagine that the Hebrews learnt the story from the "Epic," and then, handing it down orally for many centuries, insensibly simplified it until it became practically identical with the *supposed* original Babylonian form, of which we have no knowledge? Stories handed down orally generation after generation usually become more marvellous and complicated as time goes on. But perhaps *this* particular one is the exception that proves the rule!

One great difficulty in accepting the Higher Critical assertion which we are considering in this article is that, according to it, whereas almost all other nations, savage or civilized, ancient or modern, have preserved each their own tradition of the Flood, the Hebrews alone among the peoples of antiquity were so completely devoid of any such tradition that they were glad, at a comparatively late period<sup>1</sup> of their history, to borrow it from their heathen enemies and oppressors, the Babylonians. This theory is one which appears contrary both to reason and to our experience of other nations. It *may* be capable of being proved correct, but I confess that I have never yet read any such proof, though doubtless we have all met with reiterated *assertions* instead. But it has never yet been decided how many assertions are equivalent to a single proof.

When not only the Greeks, the Egyptians, and the Hindûs, but even the Scandinavians, the Mexicans, and the Polynesians

<sup>1</sup> "J" is asserted to have been composed in Southern Palestine about 650 B.C., and "P" in Babylonia about 500 B.C.

preserved each their own version of the momentous event, is it credible that the Hebrews should have failed to do so, and have, therefore, been compelled to resort to the Gentiles for instruction on the subject? If the Jews *had* a tradition of the Deluge, it must either be the Biblical one, or it must be some other which has perished and left not a trace behind in all Hebrew literature. If it was the *same* as that now given in Genesis, what room is there for the theory that the "source" of the latter is found in the Gilgamêsh "Epic"? If it was *other* than the Biblical narrative, how can we account for its being dropped and the Babylonian one adopted instead? though we have already seen that this was *not* done, since the account in Genesis differs in so many particulars from the only known forms of the latter.

The Higher Critical conclusions on this subject cannot, therefore, be safely stated in the manner in which they are quoted at the head of this article. Perhaps the proper way to formulate them would be this: "It is clear that the account in Genesis is borrowed from the earliest Babylonian form of the Deluge story, which form differed considerably from that given in Bêrôssos and in the 'Epic of Gilgamêsh,' and has perished so completely that we find it nowhere but in Genesis, where it has replaced the original Hebrew tradition, with which it coincided in all particulars." In this form the theory would, at least, put us in mind of the way in which Mr. Gladstone jestingly stated the conclusions drawn from a careful examination of the evidence for and against Wolf's theory which denied the Homeric origin of one of the great epics of ancient Hellas: "The 'Iliad' was not written by Homer, but by another man who lived at the same time and bore the same name."

It has been known ever since Bêrôssos' time that the resemblance between the Babylonian account of the Flood and that given in Genesis is comparatively great—greater, for instance, than in the case of the Greek legends of Deucalion's<sup>1</sup> flood and that of Ogyges.<sup>2</sup> If we accept the Biblical account as

<sup>1</sup> Pindar, "Olymp.," ix. 64-79; Apollodorus, "Bibliotheca," I., vii. 2, 3; Lucian, "Tim.," 3, and "De Dea Syra," cap. xii. *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> N. Dionysius, iii., p. 96.

true, this is very easily accounted for, since it was to Babylonia that men first returned after the Deluge. But the Higher Critical theory is founded upon certain self-evident coincidences between the narrative in Genesis and that given in the "Epic of Gilgamêsh." Now, coincidences are strange and very interesting things, but they may easily lead us astray. It is remarkable that some details found in the Biblical account and *not* in the Babylonian occur again in the Greek and other legends. For example, the Greek tale tells us that Deucalion was saved in an *ark* (λάρναξ and κιβώτιον, Lucian), not in a *ship*. One of the Sanskrit accounts<sup>1</sup> mentions *eight* persons (Manu and the seven R̥ishis) as saved, thus agreeing with the Biblical account as far as the number is concerned, though every form of the Sanskrit legend speaks of a *ship*, in accordance with the Babylonian. The Fijian<sup>2</sup> tradition also states that *eight* persons were saved. The Mechoachan deluge myth tells us that Tezpi sent out several birds to see whether the water was subsiding or not, and one of these, the humming-bird, returned with a branch covered with leaves.<sup>3</sup> The "Edda" informs us that the Flood was of *blood*,<sup>4</sup> not of water, and flowed from the veins of the slain giant Ymir. All the Frost-giants were drowned except Bergelmir and his wife, who escaped "on his bench" (*i.e.*, in a boat). Strange as this myth sounds, not only does it agree with the Greek tale as to the number of people saved (Deucalion and Pyrrha), but also in regard to the gruesome liquid of which the Flood was composed it exactly coincides with the ancient Egyptian legend of the Destruction of Mankind found in the tomb of Seti I.<sup>5</sup> But such coincidences as these, which might be indefinitely multiplied, do not prove that the Scandinavians

<sup>1</sup> That in the "Mahābhārata" (*Matsyopākhyānam* episode). The earliest form is that in the "Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa" (eighth Adhyāya, first Brāhmaṇa, §§ 1-11); and perhaps the latest in the "Bhagavata-Purāna," viii. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Calvert's "Fiji and Fijians," cap. vii.

<sup>3</sup> Humbolt.

<sup>4</sup> "Prose Edda," "Gylfaginning," cap. vii., and "Vafthr.," 35.

<sup>5</sup> In studying this Egyptian document, which is in a somewhat injured condition, I find no mention that anyone escaped from the wrath of the goddess Hathor.

learnt from the Egyptians, and that the Mexicans borrowed from the Hebrews. Nor are we justified by similar coincidences, in defiance of points of contrast, in accepting the assertions of the Higher Critics, and asserting on their authority that the narrative of the Noachian Deluge had its source in Babylonia. It would be more plausible to imagine that the Sanskrit versions of the tale were derived from Chaldæa. The two earliest Sanskrit forms of the story agree with the Babylonian in mentioning a *ship* (*naus*) provided with *cables*, in the command given by a deity to Manu to *build* it and enter it, in the *warning* of the coming flood (given *seven days beforehand* in a later account), in the mention of the great *winds* that raged over the waters, in the statement that sacrificial *libations* (and not burnt-offerings—*‘ôlôth*—as in the Bible) were offered on coming out of the ship, and in the gaining of *Divine favour* thereby. The “great fish” of the Indian tale might be held to represent the Babylonian fish-god Êa (Ôannês). Such a theory would, of course, be wrecked on other grounds, just as was Sir W. Jones’ idea that the Biblical narrative of the Flood was borrowed from the Sanskrit. Doubtless the Babylonian theory, which has succeeded the latter, will share the same fate.

It does not lie within the scope of this article to attempt to account for such coincidences as we have mentioned, but their occurrence should make us chary of dogmatizing on such uncertain evidence. Yet there is one coincidence which is so striking that we are almost forced to come to some conclusion about it. As is well known, there is absolutely no event in the past history of the world regarding the occurrence of which we have such a mass of unanimous and unmistakable tradition preserved by almost all nations as we have about the Deluge. No two versions of the tale agree in their details, but the force of the evidence is thereby strengthened. The result is to lead us to conclude, in the words of Sir Henry Howorth—a witness by no means prejudiced in favour of Genesis—that the evidence (palæontological as well as traditional) points to the occurrence of “a widespread calamity, involving a flood on a great scale.

I do not see how the historian, the archæologist, and the palæontologist can avoid making this conclusion in future a prime factor in their discussions, and I venture to think that before long it will be accepted as unanswerable."<sup>1</sup>

This being so, we are led to regard the narrative (or narratives) in Genesis as, to take the very lowest view, the genuine ancient Hebrew tradition about the Flood, and quite as independent of the Babylonian as the latter is of the Indian or the Mechoachan. In any case, whether this view be correct or not, we venture to conclude that the derivation of the Noachian Deluge narrative from the Babylonian has certainly not yet been *proved*, and should not therefore be *assumed* or *asserted*, as it now so frequently is.



### Hilary of Poitiers.

By MISS M. E. AMES.

THE esteem generally entertained for the Patristic writings has not more obviously erred in ascribing undue honour to some than in evincing a lack of appreciation of others of the earlier Fathers; and as one whose claims to our gratitude and reverence have thus met with a wholly disproportionate response, we unhesitatingly instance the subject of this present sketch, Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers. While the fame of his friend and pupil Martin of Tours has transcended the limits of human reverence, we are assured by Isaac August Dorner that the merits of Hilary, his father in the faith, have never been appreciated—a circumstance that is all the more remarkable from the fact that, while the sources from which the history of the founder of monachism has been drawn are universally admitted to be more or less unreliable, the Bishop of Poitiers has interwoven so much of his own personal experience into his various writings that Dom Constant has furnished us

<sup>1</sup> "The Mammoth and the Flood," p. 463.