

unparalleled. His discussions of each topic in the *System*—the Trinity, Creation, Revelation, Sin, Christology, Atonement—are exhaustive treatises. Each doctrine is viewed under three aspects—Biblical, which is treated briefly, Ecclesiastical, and then Dogmatic, where the author reasons out his own position in masterly style. If Dorner is not easy to read, the translators must bear part of the blame.

It may be alleged that the influence of the negative school of criticism is a heavy set-off to the gain of our intercourse with Germany. I am too

little acquainted with the works of this school in detail to be able to pronounce an opinion on them; but it may be safely said that the last word will not belong to those who take extreme positions. No one questions the great ability and learning of scholars like Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Lipsius, Schürer, etc. On the other hand, orthodox scholars are not slow to recognise the rights of criticism, or to accept established conclusions. Witness Delitzsch, Riehm, Von Orelli, Strack, Kostermann, Weiss, perhaps even Dillmann.

The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of Assyria and Babylonia.

BY THEO. G. PINCHES, BRITISH MUSEUM.

GENESIS ii. 4, 5.

These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth . . . And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up.¹

The negative clauses of the non-Semitic account of the creation may be regarded as corresponding roughly with the above. They are as follows:—

1. The glorious house, the house of the gods, in a glorious place had not been made;
2. A plant had not been brought forth, a tree had not been created;
3. A brick had not been laid, a beam had not been shaped;
4. A house had not been built, a city had not been constructed;
5. A city had not been made, a foundation² had not been made glorious;
6. Niffer had not been built, È-kura had not been constructed;
7. Erech had not been built, È-ana had not been constructed;
8. The Abyss had not been made, Èridu had not been constructed;
9. (As for) the glorious house, the house of the gods, its seat had not been made—
10. The whole of the lands were sea.

¹ So the R.V.

² Or, "habitation" (*nammaṣṣet*). See vol. iii. p. 410.

The "positive clauses" corresponding with the above, which describe the creation of the things mentioned, is mutilated. The text runs, however, as follows:—

31. Lord Merodach on the sea-shore raised a bank.
32. . . . at first he made not;
33. . . . he caused to be.
34. [He caused the plant to be brought forth], he made the tree;
35. . . . he made in its place.
36. [He laid the brick], he made the beams;
37. [He constructed the house], he built the city;
38. [He built the city], he made the foundation glorious;
39. [He built the city Niffer], he built È-kura the temple;
40. [He built the city Erech, he built È-a]na the temple.

The text is here broken away, but it probably went on to describe the creation of the other great cities of Babylonia, with special reference, probably, to Borsippa and its renowned temple-tower called È-zida, to which the incantation on the reverse of the tablet refers.

In the first of the two extracts given above, the "glorious house of the gods," in lines 1 and 9, may be regarded as corresponding with the heavens, where most of the gods of the Babylonians were

regarded as having their abode; though it is not impossible that the "glorious house of the gods" may have indicated the earth as well as the heavens—the former as the floor, the latter as its domed vault or roof, beset at night with stars, evidences of the "glorious place" beyond,—“the land of the silver sky.” Next in order, as in Genesis, plants and trees are mentioned. The remainder, which speaks of the building or the creation of the dwellings of men, with special reference to the cities Niffer and Erech, their temples Ē-kura and Ē-ana, and the Abyss (*abzu* or *apsū*, see vol. iii. p. 166), differs from the biblical account.

The portion which refers to the creation or building of Niffer, Erech, and their temples, is apparently intended to bring into prominence the antiquity of the foundation of these renowned cities and fanes of ancient Babylonia, and to emphasise their divine origin.

GENESIS ii. 8.

A garden eastward, in Eden.

Though there is a mention of "gardens" in the Semitic story of the creation, there is a certain amount of doubt whether the Paradise of our first parents is meant or not. The words containing the reference occur in a portion of the account of the fight between Bel and the Dragon (Merodach and Kirkis-tiamtu),¹ and are as follows:—

- 8. [Let him be endowed with speech], let him enjoy himself in the gardens,
- 9. [Let him eat the *ašnan*], let him cut the cluster.²
-
- 133. He has been endowed with speech,³ [he has enjoyed himself] in the gardens,
- 134. He has eaten the *ašnan*, he has cut off [the cluster].

The possibility that the "gardens" mentioned in the above extract correspond to the "garden . . . in Eden" of Genesis, is increased by the mention of some one eating the fruit called *ašnan*, and enjoying himself in them (*ina kirēti līšbū*, "let him be satisfied in the gardens"). Nevertheless,

¹ See vol. iii. p. 267.

² In the original: *libtiku kuruna*, the former word from *batāku* (Heb. *pnq*); the latter the accusative of *kurunu*, a word generally translated "wine," but which could apparently also be used for "bunch of grapes" (see below).

³ This I take to be the meaning of the words *līšanu iškunu*, literally, "he has made tongue."

it would probably be best to suspend judgment thereon until the series giving the Babylonian account of the creation is more complete.

The usual word for "garden," "orchard," or "plantation" in Assyrian is *kirū* (plural, *kirēti*; as above). There is another word, *gannati*, = Heb. *ŋ*, but this seems rather to designate a *kitchen*-garden. A better comparison, however, would probably be the Akkadian *gana*, which is rendered by the Assyrian *ganū* (not *ginū*, as the printed text has), and *ēklu*, "field." If this comparison be correct, *ŋ*, "garden," like *ŋy*, "Eden," would appear to be of Akkadian origin. The incomplete state of the Semitic-Babylonian account does not allow us to see whether Eden was mentioned in it or not; but Professor Fried. Delitzsch has pointed out that the word is far from rare in Assyro-Babylonian literature, and he compares, very justly, the Akkadian *edina*, borrowed by the Babylonians under the form of *edinu*, the meaning of which is "plain" or "desert." *Edina* or *edinu* is not found by itself as a geographical name, but as it occurs as part of such a name, it may be regarded as one. The text containing this is rather important, and reads as follows:—

Sipar, . . D.S. ⁴	"Sippara.
Sipar-edina, D.S.	Sippara of Eden.
Sipar-uldua, D.S.	Sippara-uldua.
Sipar-Utu, . D.S.	Sippara of the sun-god."

The above occurs on a fragment of a bilingual list acquired by the Rev. Dr. Hayes Ward in the East in 1884-85.

GENESIS ii. 9.

The tree of life . . . and the tree of knowledge.

Whether the *ašnan*—"the glorious *ašnan*" (*ašnan ēlliṭi*), as it is called in one place—be the tree of life or not is very uncertain; we can only say that it was a divine seed-bearing tree, written, in Akkadian *še-tir*—*še* meaning "seed," and *tir* "vegetation"; the last, with the prefix *ē*, being the usual Akkadian group for "forest." The Akkadian pronunciation, however, seems not to have been *še-tir*, but *ezinu*, which may be in some way connected with *ašnan*.

The lines in which the reference to this plant or tree occurs I have quoted above, and the "cluster" (for such, apparently, is the meaning of the word *kuruna* in this place) would seem to be the fruit

⁴ I.e. "Determinative suffix," showing that what precedes is the name of a place.

growing on it. *Kuruna* (the accusative of *kurunu*) is one of the words translating the group *kaš-tin* or *geš-tin*, “drink of life,” i.e. “wine”; or, with the prefix denoting a tree (see line 40 above), “tree of the drink of life,” i.e. “vine.” Other meanings of the group *geštin* or *kaštin* (also pronounced *kurun* in Akkadian) are *šikaru*, “strong drink,” Heb. שִׁבְעָה; *sību* (probably the same); *karanu*, “wine” (the same root as *kurunu*); and *damu*, “blood.”

If, therefore, the divine *ašnan* be the “tree of life,” it is probably a kind of glorified vine that is meant.

Besides the *ašnan*, however, there was another tree of divine origin, which is described in the following lines from an Akkadian text:—

“Eridu is the shady vine, growing in a glorious place,¹
Its form bright marble-stone, set in the Abyss;
The path of Aê perfects fertility in Eridu;
Its seat is the place of the eye of the land,
Its shore is the bed of Nammu.
In its glorious house the forest-shade extends, and no man
enters its midst.²
[It is the abode of] the peerless mother of heaven;³
[In its midst is] the god . . . , the god Tammuz
: : : : : each side.”

The statement given by the above, that Eridu was a vine, is confirmed by the ideograph (*Nun ki*) with which the name is written. It shows the figure of a tree or trailing plant, with three branches on each side, at right angles with the stem, and a longer cross-piece at the bottom to represent the ground.⁴ The identification of the ideograph, which is undoubtedly correct, was first proposed by Professor Hommel. This vine seems to have been regarded as being in the likeness of bright marble or crystal, and it grew in the Abyss. By the Abyss is meant the underworld, beneath the waters, where dwelt the Aê or Aos or Oannes, god of the sea, of rivers and streams, and of deep wisdom. From the god Aê, as Berosus states, the Babylonians regarded all knowledge as having come, and he describes him, much as he is shown on the sculptures, as being of human and of fish-like form, dwelling on land during the day, and

¹ The Assyrian translation has: “Eridu, the dark vine, grew; it was made in a glorious place.”

² The Assyrian translation has: “At its glorious house, which is like a forest, its shadow is set, no one enters its midst.”

³ Or, “of Anu.”

⁴ The ideograph, turned the right way up, and with the wedges restored again to lines, has the following form: 

returning to the deep at night. The seat or site of Eridu is described as “the place of the eye of the land,” i.e. the centre, as it were, of the earth, and its shore was “the bed of Nammu” (*mālu ša Nammu*), or the river-god. It was the path of Aê, god of rivers and of wisdom (to whom even Merodach went for advice), which flowed along its banks, and filled Eridu with fruitfulness, the fruitfulness of the fulness of knowledge; and it is the unattainableness of the fulness of knowledge, apparently, which is indicated in the line which says that no man entered the midst of the forest-shade of this divine city. Eridu, “the shady vine,” was the dwelling of Aê, his consort Damkina, their sons and daughters, and many attendants and servants, four of whom seem to have been partly in the form of oxen (compare Berosus: “bulls also were bred there with the heads of men”), similar to the winged bulls which adorned the palaces of Assyria and Babylonia. Besides these, Eridu had also other inhabitants — its “glorious chiefs,” Enkum and Nenkum, and an incantor who raised “the wise sayings of Eridu.” As the abode of the god of wisdom, it was the place where all the incantations used by the Babylonians and Assyrians were regarded as having their origin, and Merodach, who was a “merciful god” (*ilu riminū*), and who is called also “son of Eridu,” is frequently represented as going to ask the advice of Aê, dwelling in the Abyss, on behalf of his suffering worshippers in Babylonia and Assyria.

Eridu is a corruption of the Akkadian *guruduga*, “the good city,” and it had an earthly counterpart, now represented by the site known as Abu-shahrein, on the left bank of the Euphrates (Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 228). Fertility was, therefore, brought also to the earthly Eridu by “the pathway of Aê.” Though situated at some distance from Sipar or Sippara, it is not impossible that it was regarded as lying in the same tract as the Sipar-edina, or Sippara of Eden, mentioned above.⁵

Though we have found the earthly paradise and the tree of knowledge, and, perhaps, also the tree of life, there are difficulties in the way of the identification of the biblical Eden with the Babylonian Edinu. Whether the likenesses outweigh the dissimilarities sufficiently to enable us to say that they are the same notwithstanding, the reader must judge.

⁵ Cf. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887, p. 238, where also the learned author compares the vine of Eridu with the famous Yggdrasil of Norse mythology.