

a touch of anti-sacerdotalism in what is said about the Anointing of the Sick (p. 219).

We must not omit to call the reader's attention to the remarkable list of works in chap. xi., which the author has studied in preparation for his own edition. We ought not, perhaps, to complain, because in chap. xii. (*Apparatus Criticus*) he repeats the stock assertion about the revision of the Peshitto in the fourth century. We would venture,

however, to invite his attention to what has been written on this subject in the third volume of *Studia Biblica*. We heartily thank Dr. Mayor for giving us this valuable edition of St. James. It is a work replete with matter of interest for the scholar, and of instruction for the student. It will be helpful to the teacher, whether in preparation for lecturing to the class, or for preaching to the parochial congregation.

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

BY THEO. G. PINCHES, BRITISH MUSEUM.

IN the articles which have appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES under the above title, I have brought forward the passages in the Babylonian versions of the Creation-story which seem to show parallels with the Biblical accounts in the first two chapters of Genesis. In many cases the parallels are striking, but in a few they have to be sought out, and, when examined, do not prove to be wholly satisfactory. Nevertheless, those which have been noted are most interesting and important, and show a close connexion between the two nations with whom they arose.

So far, however, I have only brought forward the passages which agree in sense with similar verses of the Bible story. A certain number of lines have been taken from their context, and compared with the corresponding passages in the Biblical account. Our examination of the Babylonian records has therefore been a one-sided one, and would naturally be incomplete without at least a few words on the other side of the question, namely, the *differences* between the Hebrew and Babylonian versions.

As is well known, there are in Genesis two accounts, one occupying the whole of the first chapter and the first three verses of the second (thirty-four verses in all), the other taking up the remainder of the second chapter (twenty-two verses), whilst chapter three is devoted to an account of the temptation and fall (twenty-four verses). The Biblical accounts are, therefore, short, and told in as few words as is possible consistent with the amount of detail which the

inspired writer has been able to put into them; in fact, five pages of the Hebrew Bible, in fair-sized type, hold the whole.

Shortness is not, however, a peculiarity of the longer Babylonian account, for it must have covered about seven closely-written tablets, making fourteen pages of much larger size and more compressed matter than the Hebrew account has, and the forty lines of the recently published Akkadian version almost equal, in themselves, one of the first three chapters of Genesis. In bulk, therefore, we find at the outset a great difference, the Babylonians carrying off the palm as far as amount of text goes.

The longer of the two Babylonian accounts (that wholly in the Assyrian or Babylonian language), regarded as having covered about seven tablets, began with a description of the time when heaven and earth were not,¹ when everything existing was brought forth by Mummu Tiamat² (Moumis-Tauthe), but was without order or completeness. This period was followed by that in which the creation of the gods took place.

In the break which follows (the text being very imperfect in parts) there was probably described the creation of further deities, as well as the introduction to, and account of the origin of, the fight between Merodach and Kirbiš-Tiamat,³ or Bel and the Dragon.⁴ Word of the hostility of Tiamat to

¹ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for Jan. 1892, pp. 165-167.

² A better transcription would probably be Tiawat, a form which would account for the Greek Tauthe.

³ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1892, p. 267 (col. 1, text and note 2). ⁴ *Ibid.* p. 269, note 3.

the gods seems to have been sent to the latter by Anšar, the personification of the host of heaven.¹ All the gods, so the messenger announces, have gone around Tiamat, and seem to call out to each other: "Ye have made her agreement—go to her side!"² Then "the strong one, the powerful one," not resting day and night, was called upon to assemble the warriors that they might make battle. Preparations for the fight were made—"an unrivalled weapon" (*kakki lâ mahri*). "The mighty snake is hostile—sharp also (are his) teeth. The unsparing ones I³ have incited; I have caused poison to fill their bodies like blood; I have clothed dreadful monsters⁴ with terrors." Various other fearful creatures are mentioned, among them "scorpion-men" and "fish-men," "wielding weapons, relentless, fearless in battle," and Kingu, her dreaded husband, she raised and made chief among them. In consequence of this, Anu, the god of the heavens, who was sent, was powerless before her; Nudimmud, the god of the sea,⁵ feared and turned back. At last, however, Merodach was prevailed upon to undertake the attack, and it is in the last portion of the tablet referring to the arrangements for the fight that the mention of some one enjoying himself in the gardens, eating the divine fruit called *ašnan*,⁶ occurs. This tablet or chapter ends with the statement that the fate of Merodach, the avenger of the gods, had been decided (*i.e.* that he was to go and do battle with the monster for the gods).

The next (the fourth) tablet begins with a description of the honours conferred upon Merodach. Princely habitations were made for him, and he was set as ruler in the presence of his fathers (as the tablet has it). Miraculous powers were given to him; and when Merodach tested them successfully, the gods rejoiced and gave blessing, and proclaimed him king. Merodach then armed himself for the fight with spear, bow, and arrows. He made lightning before him, filled his body with darting flames,⁷ and set his net⁸

¹ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for Jan. 1892, p. 166.

² *Ali-ša attunu tabnâ—ida-ša álka!*

³ It seems to be Tiamat who is speaking.

⁴ Called *ušum-gallu*, "unique" and "great."

⁵ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1892, p. 268.

⁶ *Ibid.* for Dec. 1892, p. 124.

⁷ So Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 281.

⁸ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1892, p. 267, note 1.

ready to catch the dragon of the sea. He placed the four winds, so that she should not escape, and roused every other kind of wind and storm to attack her. Kingu, her husband, was soon disposed of, and then she herself was challenged to battle. She cried aloud in her rage, uttered incantations and charms, and begged weapons of the gods of battle. The combatants then drew near to begin the fight, and with the help of the net, a friendly hurricane, and his spear, Merodach soon put an end to her. All her troop, together with Kingu, her husband, was captured, though their lives were spared. The body of the slain dragon was then divided, one portion being a covering for the heavens, whilst the other remained below as the "waters under the firmament."⁹ Merodach then set about the ordering of the world in which chaos had thus been destroyed, and with the opening lines describing this the fourth tablet ends.

The fifth tablet, as it has come down to us, is only a fragment, and refers to the forming and placing of the heavenly bodies. It is translated in full in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1892, pp. 269, 270. Then came, apparently, the account of the creation of animals, as translated in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1892, p. 409; but whether this is a portion of the fifth or of the sixth tablet we do not know, and the contents of the wanting parts, which are considerable, cannot even be conjectured. The imperfection of the ancient record here is greatly to be regretted.

A fragment of a tablet, which is probably the seventh and last of the series, is most interesting. Where the text becomes legible, it speaks of the god Zi—probably Merodach as the god of life—who, in a series of numbered paragraphs, is mentioned, in laudatory wise, as "he who doeth glorious things, the god of the good wind,¹⁰ lord of hearing and obeying; he who causeth glory and riches to exist, who establisheth abundance, who turneth small things to great—(even) in his strong severity we scent his sweet odour. Let him speak, let him glorify, let him¹¹ pay him homage!"

It is probably the paragraph following the above,

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 267. Berossus also mentions the division of the woman (*i.e.* the dragon of the sea), from one half of whom Belus made the earth, and from the other half the heavens.

¹⁰ Or "sweet breath" or "odour."

¹¹ Apparently some one mentioned in the lost lines at the beginning.

however, that is the most interesting, speaking, as it does, of the creation of mankind as one of the things which this deity, the king of the gods, had done, and giving the reason for it—a reason strangely agreeing with that given by Cædmon (in “the fall of the angels”), and Milton (in *Paradise Lost*)—

“(He called him) fourthly Aga-azaga (*i.e.* ‘the glorious crown’):

May he make the crowns glorious—
The lord of the glorious incantation raising the dead
to life,
Who granted favour to the gods in bondage,¹
Fixed the yoke, laid it on the gods who were his
enemies,
And, to spare them,² created mankind—
The merciful one, with whom is the giving of life.
May his word be lasting, may it not be forgotten
In the mouth of the black-headed ones whom his
hands have made.”

From this it would seem that mankind, called in the last line of this stanza “the black-headed ones” (*salmat kakkadu*), were created to fill the place of the rebellious gods, whom Merodach spared in consideration of this taking place.

The text then goes on to say that he was called, fifthly, *Tu-azaga*, “the glorious incantation,” because he was to put his glorious incantation into their (men’s?) mouth; *Ša-zu* (“heart-knowing”), because he knows the heart of the gods. The text which follows this is mutilated, and the meaning not altogether clear. After a gap the reverse continues the story, still singing the praises of Merodach on account of his successful fight with the personification of chaos: “As he tirelessly thwarted Kirbiš-tiâmat, let his name be Nibiru³ (or Nêbiru), the seizer of Kirbiš-tiâmat,” and apparently as the tireless one the text continues: “May he restrain the paths of the stars of heaven—like sheep may he pasture the gods, all of them. . . . As he has made the world, and appointed the firm (ground), father Bêl called his name the lord of the lands (*Bel matâti*).” Êa or Aê, the god of the deep,⁴

¹ *I.e.* the helpers of Tiamat and Kingu her consort.

² Jensen: Um milde gegen sie zu sein. This, however, is not the idea in Cædmon and Milton, and does not, moreover, make good sense. The original has *ana padi-šunu ibnû awelûtu*, where *padi* is the same root as occurs in the expression *lû-padû*, “unsparing.” Perhaps we may here translate “to replace them.”

³ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March, 1892, p. 270.

⁴ *Ibid.* for Jan. 1892, p. 166; March 1892, pp. 267, 268; Dec. 1892, p. 125.

rejoiced on account of the honour done to his son, and said: “Let him be like me, and let Êa (Aê) be his name. Let him effect the performance of all my commands; let him, even him, bring to pass all my ordinances.” He then bestowed upon him the names of the fifty great gods, uttered good wishes for the glory, honour, and power of his reign, pronounced the changelessness of his word, and the fierceness of his anger beyond any other god. The text, after one or two mutilated lines, then breaks off.

It will be seen from the above *précis* that, though there are many and extensive gaps, we have still a considerable portion of the text—enough, in fact, to show what its nature was.

The non-Semitic account, written in Sumerian with a Semitic translation, is the very antithesis to that given above, being exceedingly terse and rather unpolished. It mentions the time when the glorious house of the gods (apparently the sky) did not exist, when a plant had not been brought forth, and a tree had not been created; when a brick had not been laid, a beam not shaped, and a glorious foundation, or dwelling for men, had not been made. The great cities which were of old the glory of Babylonia had also not been founded. The abyss of waters under the earth, and Eridu, the Babylonian Paradise, were, at this time, equally non-existent, and “the whole of the lands were sea.”⁵ When within the sea there was a stream, the Babylonian Paradise (Eridu),⁶ and its temple, called Ê-sagila, came into existence, the latter having been founded by the god Lugal-du-azaga. Babylon is mentioned next as having been built, and the earthly Ê-sagila, the well-known temple-tower within it, was at the same time completed. The first living things mentioned as having been made are not man, however, but beings of a higher station, namely, the Anunnaki, or spirits of the great deep. Lugal-du-azaga then “supremely proclaimed the glorious city, the seat of the joy of their hearts.” Merodach is now said to have bound together a foundation before the waters, made dust, and poured it out with the flood, and then the gods were to be set in a seat of joy of heart.

So far everything has had to do with the earth and its cities, the abyss and its divine abode, and the gods and their dwelling-place. A change,

⁵ See p. 123 for the literal rendering of these passages.

⁶ See p. 125.

however, is here introduced by the single short line, "He made mankind,"¹ and the next line informs us that he was helped in this by the goddess Aruru.² Then he made the beasts of the field, and the living creatures of the desert, the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, which he set in their places, and "proclaimed their name well."³ He (it is apparently still Merodach who is referred to) next created grass, the plants of the marshes and the forests, the verdure of the plain; land, marsh, and thicket-grown tracts.⁴ This was followed by the creation of oxen and other large cattle, with sheep, and the meadows and forests where they fed and dwelt.⁵ "Lord Merodach," after this, raised a bank (lit. "filled a filling," *tamlâ imallî*) on the sea-shore, and the things mentioned at the beginning of the text as non-existent were created—plants and trees, bricks and beams, a "glorious foundation," the city Niffer and its temple Ê-kura, Erech and its temple Ê-ana.⁶ The account of the Creation is here brought to an end by a fracture of the tablet.

The parallels between these two accounts and those given in the first two chapters of Genesis having already been quoted, all that is now needed is to point out the differences, which are considerable. In both the Babylonian accounts there is, at the beginning, a statement to the effect that certain things, belonging to and forming part of the terrestrial creation, did not exist; but there is nothing in either of them corresponding exactly with the opening words of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void," etc. From the fact that those things did not exist, it may be taken for granted that the earth *would* be without form, and void; but the Babylonian compilers of the cuneiform accounts seem never to have got so far as to be able to make a clear statement to that effect. Then, again, there is no record of the creation of light, and its division from darkness. We are not in a position to speak positively as to the order of the events of Creation in the longer Semitic-Babylonian account, but it is very probable that the order did *not* agree exactly with the accounts as found in Genesis; and as to

the shorter non-Semitic version of the origin of things, it is easy to see that, though there are many parallels, the order in which the creation of terrestrial objects occurs not only differs, but the things mentioned are given in a rather erratic way (mankind; animals of the field and plain; Tigris and Euphrates; grass and plants; verdure of the plain; lands, marsh, thickets; oxen, etc.; meadows and forests;⁷ and then, further earthly things, among which trees are mentioned), differing considerably from the orderly narrative of Genesis.

In neither account, moreover, is there any mention of the spirit of God brooding over the face of the waters. For the Babylonian, Mummu Tiamat was the producer (*muallidat*) of all things existing during the period when chaos reigned. There is also no mention, in either account, of the "days" of creation; and the naming of things, as they were created, is also absent. The non-Semitic Creation-story also omits to mention the creation of fishes and sea-monsters, birds, and creeping things.

On the other hand, many things are introduced in the longer version which are not to be found in that in Genesis, the principal being the long account, extending over many tablets, of the fight between Merodach and Kirbiš-Tiamat (see pp. 347, 348), and the long recitation of the titles and merits of that god on account of his having overcome this monster of the sea. Finally, there is the substitution of the whole heathen pantheon of the Akkado-Babylonians for the monotheism of the narratives in Genesis.

From the above it will easily be seen, that no charge of plagiarism can be brought against the Hebrew writer on account of any parallels which may exist between his narrative or narratives and those of the Babylonians. They are parallels, and nothing more; for the two sets of narratives are so different, that no one, comparing them, would venture to say that either was copied from the other. That the legends current among the Babylonians were known, at least to a certain extent, to the scribes of the Hebrews, is very probable, and it is just as probable that the legends current with the Hebrews were known to the scribes of Babylonia. How much each has been influenced by the other, the reader can, from the above, judge for himself. That the Hebrew writer *may* have been influenced by the Babylonian

¹ See also the translation on p. 349.

² See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1892, p. 410.

³ *Ibid.* p. 409.

⁴ *Ibid.* for March 1892, pp. 268, 269.

⁵ *Ibid.* for June 1892, p. 409.

⁶ See p. 123.

⁷ See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for March 1892, pp. 268, 269.

legends, is not only possible, but probable; but if he was so influenced when he wrote, he has managed to suppress the fact in a remarkable way, for such parallels and similarities as these are, are only what might be expected among writers so closely akin in race and language, belonging to nationalities whose forefathers had, in early times, inhabited the same country, and between whom there was much intercourse in later days. Two

descriptions of the same event, especially if that event be the Creation, are, moreover, bound to contain a certain number of parallels.¹

¹ Professor Ryle, in an excellent article on "The Assyrian Cosmogony and the Days of Creation," in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, also speaks (p. 198) of the conspicuous points of difference offered by the Babylonian longer account of the Creation—differences which now prove to be even greater than was then supposed.

Joseph Mazzini.

BY ELEANOR F. JOURDAIN.

"My work," wrote Mazzini in an early essay on "Faith and the Future," "is not a labour of authorship, but a sincere and earnest mission of apostolate." We could hardly wish for a more accurate description, not only of the essay in question, but of Mazzini's life as a whole. It is as an apostolate that the work of this Italian patriot should be judged. He nowhere claims to have originated the ideas which he so persistently put forward, and to which he dedicated his life; but he does claim to be the bearer of a sacred mission, to be an interpreter to the world of the true aim of life, and to restore to it certain pure and lofty ideals too long obscured from sight. In Mazzini's utterances we must not seek for daring flights of original thought; we must not expect that he will give us ideas clothed in perfect and artistic form; he was elevated above his fellows not by this, but by a faith distinct and inspiring in the great truths of ethics and poetry, of politics and religion, and by a stern loyalty to what he apprehended of those truths.

His portrait has been drawn for us in his autobiography and scattered papers. As a youth he was impressionable and sensitive both to what he saw of sordid misery and suffering in the world, and also to the more subtle sadness connected with the torpor and poverty of national life in his country. By nature gifted and imaginative, but always, as he has told us, complete master of himself, he decided to give up his hopes of a literary career, seeing that in Italy, divided, dismembered, and oppressed, no truly national literature could arise until political freedom had been attained. The union of the free nations in

Europe would lead, he hoped, in the future, to a union of the highest literary aspirations of all men. And to this ideal he was content to sacrifice his own personal wishes. In the interests of his country he considered it right to join the secret insurrectionist society of the Carbonari, but his instinct revolted against the means they employed, and he was quick to see, moreover, that a society pledged to the destruction of tyrannical governments, but destitute of a constructive aim, could do but little, and in the very moment of success would find itself without a mission. He therefore withdrew himself from its ranks, not, however, before he had suffered imprisonment, and during his imprisonment conceived the idea of a new organisation, named by him "Young Italy." This new society had a distinct aim, and the greatest possible publicity was given to its methods. It is noticeable that from the first Mazzini's association appealed to the *youth* of Italy. For he felt that people in general refuse the credit to enthusiasm which they grant unreservedly to caution, because of a prevalent idea that intellect is enlisted on the side of caution, feeling only on that of enthusiasm. Let enthusiasm be cultivated together with intellect, he urged; they will then have an overwhelming force. So, in the world of art, which he constantly parallels with the world of politics, he held that philosophy, appealing principally to the intellect, poetry, appealing above all to the emotions, should not be kept apart.

He had not over-estimated the result of his appeal to the intellect and the enthusiasm of the Italian youth. The organisation of "Young