

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1929

Fundamental Inconsistencies in the Theories Postulating a Cuneiform Origin of the Biblical Creation Record

Henry J. Kleindienst

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_kleindienst@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kleindienst, Henry J., "Fundamental Inconsistencies in the Theories Postulating a Cuneiform Origin of the Biblical Creation Record" (1929). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 703.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/703>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

INTRODUCTION

Page 1

CONCORDIA SEMINARY

Department of Archeology.

PART I

- A. The Semitic
- B. Alleged Parallels

- - -

**Fundamental Inconsistencies in the Theories
Postulating a Cuneiform Origin of the
Biblical Creation Record.**

PART II

- A. Eusebius - Significance
- B. Alleged Parallels Between
- C. Differences
- D. Why the
- E. Relation

by

Henry J. Kleindienst

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Concordia Seminary in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity

June 1929

St. Louis, Missouri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION - - - - -	1
PART I - The Sumerian Cuneiform Creation Record - - - - -	-4
A. The Sumerians and Their Creation Legends - - - - -	4
B. Alleged Parallels and Differences - - - - -	10
C. Independence of Biblical Record - - - - -	17
PART II - The Semitic Cuneiform Creation Story - - - - -	20
A. Enuma Elish - Significance, History, and Contents - - -	-20
B. Alleged Parallels between Enuma Elish and Genesis - -	31
C. Differences between Enuma Elish and Genesis - - - - -	58
D. Why the Biblical Record is Independent - - - - -	65
E. Relation between Genesis and Enuma Elish - - - - -	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -	82

* * * * *

*

FUNDAMENTAL INCONSISTENCIES IN THE
THEORIES POSTULATING A CUNEIFORM
ORIGIN OF THE BIBLICAL CREATION RECORD

Introduction.

For more than three millennia the revealed account of the origin of the world as found in Genesis was accepted as history. From the time of Genesis till the 19th century no organized objection has ever been raised to the Bible story of creation. But with the remarkable development of the study of comparative religion, and with the rapid advance in the field of archaeology, there came a denial of the Biblical story of the creation of the world as a unique and inspired record, and various theories have been proposed to account for the origin and the contents of this story.

Thus Sir John Frazer accounts for the origin of the sacred truths of Genesis by the hypothesis known as the Naturalistic Theory. According to this claim the Creation story is merely an evidence of the natural and usual development from a savage state. If one gathers the creation legends of the various peoples, one will find that there is a striking uniformity in all of them, and that they are really a common inheritance that goes back to the early days of alleged savagery.

A modified form of this theory explains the Old

Testament beginnings as the "Common Semitic" inheritance. Proposed by Dillmann (and found in his "Commentary on Genesis") this theory claims that the Semites developed all of these traditions while still closely united, only to modify them when separated.

Another theory is Cheyne's Jerahmeelite claim. He gives the most abnormal emphasis to a tribe called "Jerahmeel", living in the Arabah of Judah, a people which was very troublesome to the Hebrews and intensely hated by them. Originally this name, it is claimed, was found in thousands of passages of the Old Testament, but later on it was removed by the Hebrews because they did not wish to perpetuate the name of their enemies. In this Jerahmeelite territory, he believes, the creation, as well as the other Biblical stories arose.

Again the "Freie Konstruktionstheorie" of Wellhausen, (based on the evolution of Israel's religion: nomad-agricultural-prophetic and legalistic religions) asserts that the Hebrew writer simply set down and wrote the Genesis stories, just as thousands of other stories are written, entirely uninfluenced by outside forces.

Some of these theories are no longer enthusiastically received, and none are as important as the claim that the cuneiform texts point to the originals of the creation stories. One of these cuneiform theories, is known as the Pan-Babylonian Theory, which is still cur-

rent with a number of critics. According to this theory the ultimate origin of the creation story, as well as of other Bible stories, is to be found in Babylonian mythology. Under the general head of this theory we find a sub-division based on astral theology. It was originated by Professor Stucken, elaborated by Professor Winckler of Berlin, popularized by Dr. Jeremias of Leipzig, and driven to radical extremes by Professor Jensen of Marburg. This theory asserts that all the Babylonian myths from which the Story of Creation, for example, is taken, have an astral basis in the starry heavens. What transpired in the heavens was believed to have its counterpart on earth. Thus astrology became the interpreter of history and all nations including Israel, are said to have been influenced by it. According to Dr. Jeremias, this astrology was based on the expression of a conflict between light and darkness, and between order and chaos, as seen in the Babylonian stories. According to Professor Jensen,⁽¹⁾ "the origin of what we know as Israelitish is really an adaptation by late Hebrew writers of the Babylonian sun-myths, which have been woven together into what is known as the Gilgamesh Epic." These motifs were then borrowed and developed by the Old Testament writers, and the evidence of all this is seen in the parallels existing in the Old Testament which are regarded as direct testimony. Professor Winckler lays special stress

1. Clay, Amurru Home of Northern Semites, p. 18.

on sacred numbers which the periodic changes in the positions of the heavenly bodies are said to have brought about. He uses these to show the bearing of the Babylonian astral mythology upon things Israelitish.

The purpose of this paper then shall be to consider the claims raised by those who believe that the Cuneiform tablets form the basis of these stories, to show the weaknesses of these theories, and to advance the positive reasons why the Genesis account is not dependent on any cuneiform original. We shall first treat of the Sumerian tablets for they are older in point of time, and then devote the major portion of the paper to the Babylonian tablets and restrict it to the so-called Enuma Elish.

I. The Sumerian Cuneiform Creation Record.

A. The Sumerians and Their Creation Legend.

A Sumerian story of the Creation and the Flood in six columns has been found at Nippur. This is of a fragmentary nature and is said to antedate the Hebrew record by at least a thousand years. The poem is written on a larger (Nipp.10,673) and two smaller fragments (Nipp.10,562) of a Sumerian tablet, the size of which was about 7.1x5.6 inches. A transliteration and translation with introduction and commentary have been furnished by Dr.A. Poebel.⁽¹⁾ The composition is of an epical nature and re-

1. Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum of Pennsylvania, Vol.IV m.1; Historical texts, Philadelphia 1914, p.17 ff.

presents, perhaps, the national Epic of the Sumerians. In those days, according to Langdon⁽¹⁾, "Sumerian culture was synonymous with world culture, and the great religious traditions became universal traditions adopted by the Semitic peoples who subsequently came upon the scene of history". Professor Woolley, one of the world's most famous archaeologists, in a book newly published, entitled "The Sumerians", shows quite clearly that at a time when Egyptian civilization began, Sumerian civilization had already flourished for 2000 years. In his book he claims that the Sumerians had attained to a high level of culture by 3500 B.C. Their religion was polytheistic and their gods innumerable. They were recognized and honored thru' out the whole land. The religion was anthropomorphic and the gods lived a normal life in the temples in the city's midst. It was a religion of fear and of sacrifice to the gods. According to Woolley, the Sumerians have mostly contributed to the development of the western civilization thru the Hebrew people. These stories, he thinks, the Semites adopted ready made from the inhabitants of Sumer.

The age of the tablet can only be conjectured since the tablet is not dated. Poebel conjectures that the language, character and contents of the poem point to the early period of the Cassites, ca 1750 B.C. The order of

1. Stephen Langdon - Sumerian Epic of Paradise, p.6.

the names of the gods: Anu, Enlil, Enki, Ningarsag, as here given, is an indication of an early age for these tablets, and since this order of the gods is already found by Lugalzaggisi who lived about 2800 B.C., there is a leadway of nearly 1000 years.

The tablet is devoted entirely, so far as the fragments permit us to infer, to the period from the Creation to and including the Flood. The lost portion of the tablet, according to Landesdorfer⁽¹⁾, appears to have described the creation of man, of which the tablet contains no record. The first column opens with the direct speech of one of the gods mentioning the building of a city. Then follows an account of a premeditated destruction of mankind. It seems that Enki gives mankind into the care of the mother-goddess, Ningarsag, who urges them to build a city and to found a civilization there. The only reference to creation is in this column where we are incidentally told that the above named gods created the "dark-headed" people, and the beasts of the field. The extant portion of the second column describes the Flood, the transition from the Creation to the Flood probably having been made on the missing portion. Landersdorfer thinks that the first lines presuppose the plan for the destruction of mankind, and that the portion of the fragment which gave the reason why Enki destroyed mankind was not pre-

1. Landersdorfer - Sumerische Parallelen zur Biblischen Urgeschichte. p.14.

served. The fourth column seems to indicate the communication of this plan of destroying humanity to king Ziudgiddu. Landersdorfer thinks that the lost portion of this column undoubtedly told of the building of the ship and of the entrance of the occupants, for the fifth column describes the flood itself and the sacrifice Ziudgiddu offers to the gods. The lost column begins with an oath of the gods, Anu and Enlil, and follows with the bestowal of life of the gods on Ziudgiddu.

This tablet, however, does not offer parallels to the Biblical record of Creation. Landersdorfer admits the following ⁽¹⁾, "Da der an erster Stelle genannte Text sehr verstuemelt ist und auch die erhaltenen Teile noch grosse Schwierigkeiten bieten, ist das Vergleichungsmaterial, das er bietet mehr als bescheiden. Auch ein noch so aufmerksamer Leser wird ueberhaupt kaum Beruehrungspunkte finden, die fuer eine literarische Zusammengehoeerigkeit ernstlich in Betracht kaemen." Since this tablet makes no mention of creation outside of the incidental reference in column one, where it is stated that the "dark-headed" people and the beasts of the field were created by the gods: and since it offers no parallels to the account in Genesis, we will dispense with this account and proceed to VAT 9307.

Another text which is the more important tablet,

1. Sumerische Parallelen, p 84.

since it is more comprehensive and pertinent to Creation, is the tablet designated as VAT 9307. This text comes from Assur where it was found at the German excavation. The Tablet is burnt and of a light yellowish hue, in size about 6.1 x 4.8 inches. It is in a good condition with the exception of the upper right hand corner and the edge of the front side which are somewhat damaged. The tablet is made up of three columns of writing on both sides of the tablet. The second column is the original Sumerian text while the third is an Akkadian translation. The first column contains a combination of various signs which are still unintelligible. Meissner⁽¹⁾ supposes that they are technical indications of musical accompaniment. Bezold⁽²⁾ thinks it is a kind of syllabary to explain the text. The text has been published by Ebeling⁽³⁾ and a duplicate by Bezold⁽⁴⁾. The latter, however, is very fragmentary and offers but a few lines of the front and reverse sides. A first translation was endeavoured by P. A. Schollmeyer⁽⁵⁾. The age of the tablet cannot be determined definitely. We have to deal, however, with an old Sumerian recension which was copied for the Assyrian libraries of Nineve and Assur with an Akkadian translation. Since the order of the gods in this text is that

-
1. OLZ (1915) Sp.333.
 2. PSBA 10 (1888) p.423.
 3. Ebelings, Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiosen Inhalts Vol.1, No.4, Leipzig (1915).
 4. PSBA 10 (1888) p.418.
 5. Theologie und Glaube 7 (1915) p.847 f.

of the previous text, the age of this tablet is very likely that of the former. Presumably the original also came from Nippur.

This text likewise presupposes the actual act of creation of heaven and earth, and mentions creation but incidentally and briefly in the first line, and then elucidates on it. It begins at a time when heaven and earth were united and had now separated, that the gods and goddesses began their work of creation. First they created the pillars of heaven and earth, then the Tigris and Euphrates, and finally the ditches and canals. Of their own accord the great gods, Anu, Enlil, Samas and Enki, consult with the Anunaki, the gods of fate and decide to slaughter the god Lamga from whose blood they desire to create mankind for the purpose of serving the gods. The text continues to state the specific purpose of man's creation, which is namely, to establish and to manage the affairs of the temple, to take care of the prescribed offerings and to care for the furthering of agriculture and of the canals. The reverse of the tablet is closely connected with the foregoing and resumes the story, telling how mankind is to further irrigation by carrying water in pails. Sheep, oxen, beasts of the field, fish and birds are all brought forth by the mouth of the god Endu and the goddess Aruru. The tablet closes by mentioning that Aruru is to be ruler, and that the

stars were formed by the gods.

B. Alleged Parallels.

Upon the recovery of these tablets it had been enthusiastically stated that there were many expressions parallel and identical between these cuneiform tablets and the Biblical record, and that there was an obvious relation existing between the two. But if there be such a relation existing between the Biblical and the Sumerian account, is the Biblical borrowed directly from the Sumerian, indirectly thru the Semitic, or do both Sumerian and Biblical go back to an Urtradition? Poebel and Langdon have shared the view that there is a literary dependence of the Old Testament on the Sumerian which Landersdorfer denies. He says in this connection ⁽¹⁾ :

"In der Freude ueber den gluecklichen Fund hat man sogar geglaubt, in mehreren Faellen woertliche Uebereinstimmungen des biblischen Textes mit der vermeintlichen sumerischen Vorlage feststellen zu koennen. Es ist klar, dass derartige vereinzelt Anklaenge, soweit sie ueberhaupt als zutreffend anzuerkennen sind, durchaus nicht berechtigen, den Schluss auf eine direkte Abhaengigkeit zu ziehen, wenn nicht andere Momente dazu kommen, sondern vielmehr bei der Gleichartigkeit des Gegenstandes als selbstverstaendlich zu betrachten sind. Es muessten schon ganz ausserordentliche Umstaende zusammentreffen

1. Landersdorfer - Sumerischen Parallelen p.82.

um derartige weitgehende Folgerungen zu rechtfertigen, Umstaende, deren Vorhanden sein in jedem einzelnen Falle besonders zu pruefen waeren." He continues to show ⁽²⁾ that some of these expressions which are regarded as being parallel and identical are not such, and that this agreement does not hold. Let us now examine both accounts and see the parallels which have been urged between the two records and also the differences existing.

According to the Sumerian records Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Ningarsag are introduced as the creators, although we are not told how the work of creation is divided among them. According to the Genesis record, the one unique God creates the universe and men. The Sumerian account presupposes the act of creation and merely states that, at a time when heaven and earth were embossomed, the gods began their work of creation. How this was done we are not told. The Biblical record tells us in detail how the almighty God, by a direct and absolute fiat brought forth heaven and earth and everything contained in it. There is absolutely no resemblance in this respect.

The Sumerian sources mention only a few of the creative acts, namely the creation of the foundations of heaven and earth, of vegetation, of animals and of man, which have no connection whatever with the account in Genesis; while the Biblical record describes the entire

creation from the very beginning to the finish. The various tablets have different contents and some show local coloring by introducing the creation of rivers and canals. Thus in the Nippur tablets, mention is made of the creation of vegetation (?), and of the beasts, while tablet VAT 9307 mentions the creation of the irrigation systems such as the Tigris, the Euphrates and the various canals which were so important to the Babylonians. The formation of the stars are mentioned in the text from Assur, the purpose of which is foreign to that of the Old Testament. No mention is made of the other heavenly bodies in the Sumerian tablets.

In regard to the creation of man, the Sumerian records are very divergent. In this text VAT 9307, the various gods create man although later on the creative work was ascribed to Enki. We are told that the gods Anu, Enlil, Samas and Enki of their own accord consult the gods of fate, the Anunaki, and then decide to slaughter the god Samga from whose blood they desire to create mankind. The Nippurian school of Sumerian theology originally regarded man as having been created from clay by the great mother goddess described under the title Aruru. Later tradition tended to associate Enlil, the creator of the universe, with Aruru in the creation of man. Semitic tradition repeatedly associates Marduk with Aruru in this act, and even regards him as alone having created man.

"This evolution of the tradition concerning Marduk is, I venture to think" says Langdon ⁽¹⁾, "based upon an earlier one concerning Enki." To Marduk, the god of Babylon and the chief actor in the ancient Sumerian tradition, the Babylonians ascribed the creation of the world, its cities, its rivers and the beasts of the field. It was he who 'built' mankind, being assisted by Aruru. "Sumerian and Semitic sources", he continues ⁽²⁾, seem to agree in bringing the mother goddess in connection with the creation of man only. She has apparently, in all the known sources, no clear connection with the creation of the world, or its animate and inanimate nature. The Eridu school of Sumerian theology taught that Enki or Ea not only created the universe but mankind as well." Therefore it is quite natural to find the great Babylonian Creation Story, which we shall consider in the second part of our paper, teaching that Marduk, the son of Enki created man from the blood of one of the gods. A grammatical commentary on this epic, according to Langdon, says that Marduk created this "dark-headed" people. This view that Marduk created man is a Babylonian transformation of the Eridu view which taught that Enki or Ea created man from clay, which the Nippurian schools taught concerning Aruru (otherwise known as Mami, Nintud, or Ninharsag). "The Eridu point of view", says Lang-

1. Sumerian Epic of Paradise, p.22.
2. Same.

(1)
don , "is the one accepted in Hebrew tradition, borrowed no doubt from the Babylonians of the first dynasty, and imbedded in one of the oldest Hebrew sources: 'And God fashioned man of the dust from the ground'." There is, however, no semblance of a parallel and no basis on which such a supposition should rest in our Sumerian text. The text merely says that the great gods and the Anunaki proceed to Enlil and propose to kill the god Lamga, of whose blood they wish to make mankind. There is absolutely no parallel here but there are fundamental differences. The Sumerian account merely states that a number of gods plan to create man by killing a god. The Genesis account tells in detail how the one true God created man. The former account is polytheistic, the latter purely monotheistic. The former states that the creation is to be accomplished by the blood of one of the gods, the latter, that it is brought about by the almighty Word of God.

In Genesis 3,20 we are told that Adam called his wife Eve because she was "the mother of all living". Langdon finds in these words a survival of the ancient Eridu mother goddess who assisted the god Enkil in creating man. The name Eve has been connected with the Aramaic word for serpent hawwe which has been found in Phoenician with the title of a goddess. Since the Baby-

lonians identified Aruru, their mother goddess, who assisted Marduk in the creation of man with the Serpens or Hydra in their mythology, and who was clearly connected with serpent worship, Langdon associates Aruru with the Eve of Genesis. This identification, however, is entirely unwarranted and is based on a false derivation of the term חַוָּה . The word Chawah cannot be derived from the Arabic or Aramaic root meaning "serpent" as Langdon supposes, for this explanation is not concordant with the explanation given in this verse. Such an association would furthermore be derogatory to the spirit of the Old Testament. The best explanation of this term is to derive it from the verb חָיָה which means "to live". This derivation is in harmony with the significant explanation given in the verse where she is called "the mother of all living." The chief basis for his hypothesis of associating the Eve of Genesis with the Aruru of the Sumerians, rests on the words of Eve in Genesis 4,1: $\text{אֲנִי יָצַקְתִּי מִיָּדַי אֶת־הָאָדָם$, which she uttered after she had given birth to Cain. "This phraseology", he says ⁽¹⁾ , "was directly taken from the bilingual poem 'Aruru fashioned the seed of mankind with him' while in the Hebrew record, Eve says: 'I have created a man with Jehovah'. The word used for 'with' in each language is philologically the same, and the form of expression shows

1. Sumerian Epic of Paradise, p.36.

clearly enough the survival of the Babylonian myth." This statement of Langdon is based on a false translation of the term 𒌦 . The term cannot possibly mean "with" in this connection, for such a translation would be directly contrary to the plain statement of the first part of the verse. The only natural and direct grammatical interpretation is to take 𒌦 as the nota accusativi and to translate it: "I have received a man, Jehovah." Besides being the natural interpretation this meaning is supported by the Versions, and by the fact that it is made natural by the connection it has to Genesis 3,15. This identification of Langdon is certainly unwarranted and merely betrays another instance of his jumping at false conclusions, for which his entire book has been condemned by leading scholars.

Another miscellaneous omission in the Sumerian record is the statement of God's inbreathing into man, which even Langdon admits. "The problem of giving animal vitality to this creation of clay", he says ⁽¹⁾, "does not appear in the earlier Sumerian sources. The Biblical statement: 'And he blew into his nostrils the breath of life and the man became a living being', has as our material goes, no equivalent in any Sumerian or Babylonian source."

The purpose of man's creation is fundamentally different in both accounts. The Sumerian sources tell us that

1. Sumerian Epic of Paradise, p.29.

man was created for the purpose of serving the gods as well as to care for the temple and the things associated with it, as also to take care of the water-ways which were so important for irrigation. The Biblical record tells us, on the other hand, that the universe and man were ultimately created for God's glory, and on the other, that the universe and the other creatures were to serve man who was to have dominion over all the other creatures.

The only noted resemblance on the part of the Sumerian record to that of the Genesis record, is the fact that the gods deliberate in VAT 9307 before the creation of man. In Genesis 1,26 we read: [יְהוָה וְשָׂרֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם יוֹמְרִים אֶל־יְהוָה] which resembles the cuneiform record. But in spite of this resemblance one cannot establish a literary dependence of one on the other, for we have to deal here with what Landersdorfer calls "einen ganz vereinzeltten Zug", which readily permits itself to be explained psychologically.

Aside from the fact that the majority of critics no longer hold to the Biblical dependence on the Sumerian sources, we hold that the Biblical record cannot be derived from the Sumerian tablets, either directly or indirectly, for the two accounts are fundamentally different in principle and in detail. The one is grotesquely polytheistic, while the other is extremely monotheistic. There are no real parallels existing between the two records and Langdon fails to prove or to demonstrate any

literary dependence of the one on the other. But a still greater objection that we voice in opposition to this theory, is the fact that such a view runs counter to every doctrine of Scripture. A literary dependence of the Biblical record on that of the Sumerian, rules out the triune God and His work.

Landersdorfer shows the weakness of this claim for the Sumerian origin, when he declares that there are many more parallels, as he calls them, between the Old Testament and the Akkadian Versions, than between the Old Testament and the Sumerian, and shows that the Sumerian has no particular affinities to Genesis (so that it might be said that either one of these sources was closer to the original). Concerning the Sumerian records, he says: (1)

"Wir haben in ihnen jedenfalls nicht die Vorlagen zu sehen, nach welchen die biblische Darstellung als solche oder eine der beiden Quellen (?) bearbeitet waere, sondern wir haben eben ein Paar Versionen mehr, die wohl aelter sind als die biblische und die verschiedenen akkadischen, von welchen wir kleinere oder groessere Bruckstuecke besitzen, aber schliesslich nur Versionen sind und ebenso wie die anderen auf jene Urversion zurueckgehen, die wir als die Urtradition bezeichnen. Das Verhaeltnis der biblischen Ueberlieferung zu dieser Urtradition ist somit durch die neue Entdeckung in keiner

1. Landersdorfer, Sumerische Parallelen, p.102.

Weise geaendert, der Hauptgewinn der Kritik in allgemeinen besteht darin, dass wir die Babylonische Tradition eine Stufe hoeher hinauf verfolgen koennen." Although we do not endorse the documentary hypothesis of Genesis to which Landersdorfer subscribes, his quotation, nevertheless, shows that the Sumerian record cannot be accepted as the original, but rather that it is merely one of the many corrupt versions of the original, revealed and unique account which was transmitted by the Hebrews and later recorded in Genesis.

We have noted furthermore, that the Sumerian tablets do not even furnish real parallels to the Hebrew account, as some contend.

Another more important attempt made to find a Sumerian origin of the Creation Story, and which has received a wider endorsement among scholars and consequently become more significant than the theory of the Sumerian dependence, is the theory which claims a Babylonian-Jewish dependence for the Biblical creation account. According to this theory the Hebrew writer of Genesis borrowed, either directly or indirectly, from the Jewish literature of the Babylonians and that the revealed account of Genesis, which so uniquely describes the absolute beginning of all things, is dependent on the so-called Sumerian account. That this is a widely-current theory, shared by leading scholars of archaeology, we see from

II. The Semitic Cuneiform Creation Story.

A. "Enuma Elish" - Its Significance, History and Contents.

We have just discussed a theory which claims that the Genesis record of creation is dependent on the Sumerian account, (and which has received recent endorsement through late excavations particularly those conducted by Woolley in Sumer of Assyria), but have seen that the Sumerian tablets furnish no proof for the theory of a literary dependence of the Hebrew account on that of the Sumerian. We have noted furthermore, that the Sumerian tablets do not even furnish real parallels to the Hebrew account, as some contend.

Another more important attempt made to find a cuneiform origin of the Creation Story, and which has received a wider endorsement among scholars and consequently become more significant than the theory of the Sumerian dependence, is the theory which claims a Babylonian-Semitic dependence for the Biblical creation account. According to this theory the Hebrew writer of Genesis borrowed, either directly or indirectly, from the Semitic literature of the Babylonians and that the revealed account of Genesis, which so uniquely describes the absolute beginning of all things, is dependent on the so-called Enuma-Elish account. That this is a widely-current theory, shared by leading scholars of archaeology, we see from

the statement of Dr. Driver, a hearty advocate of this theory, when he says: ⁽¹⁾ "No archaeologist questions that the Biblical Cosmogony, however, altered in form and stripped of its original polytheism, is in the main outlines derived from Babylonia."

The event which gave rise to this theory was the discovery of several tablets found in the library of Ashur-Bani-pal, part of which was unearthed in 1853 by Sir Austin Henry Layard. While doing some excavating on one of the mounds of India with his faithful friend Hormuzd Rassam, he discovered the palace of Ashur-bani-pal, the last of the great Assyrian kings, who reigned from 668-626 B.C. Here he found hundreds of inscribed tablets piled high in heaps and masses, which at one time were the pride and treasures of Ashur-bani-pal's library.

This collection, thus partially restored to the world by Layard and his young assistant, was then carried away to London. From its mass of material the historical inscriptions were first examined and published. Eminent scholars like Sir Henry Rawlinson, Professor A.H. Sayce ⁽²⁾ and others examined the material again and again, but not until the keen eyes of George Smith picked out and laboriously traced some broken fragments, did the Babylonian Creation Story become known. All the tablets and

-
1. Driver, Book of Genesis, p.30
 2. King: Seven Tablets of Creation, Preface p.XII; Rogers: Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Lecture III, p.102.

fragments which have hitherto been identified as inscribed with portions of the text of the poem, are preserved in the British Museum. (1)

In 1872 Mr. Smith, on the basis of what he had already observed, expressed his conviction that all the earlier narratives of Genesis would receive new light from the inscriptions so long buried in the Babylonian and Assyrian mounds. On November 2, 1875 he read a brilliant paper before the Society of Biblical Archaeology in which he described the fragmentary tablets, translated portions of them and pointed out what he called curious and interesting parallels with the Old Testament. The following year he published in his "Chaldean Account of Genesis" translations of all the inscriptions relating to the Creation which he had found. While his pioneer work has been duly acknowledged, it must nevertheless be said, that there are certain identifications which he made (which even the higher critics admit (2)) have not been justified by later research, such e.g., as finding in the Creation Story allusions to the fall of man; the instructions given by the deity to man after the creation, etc. According to King (3) it has now been shown by the duplicate tablets that the instructions Mr. Smith speaks of, are part of a long didactic composition con-

1. King: Seven Tablets of Creation, Introduction XXVI.
2. King: Seven Tablets of Creation, Preface p.XX.
3. King: Seven Tablets of Creation, App.II,p.201 ff.

taining moral precepts, and have nothing to do with the Creation Series. Since his time, however, many scholars, masters among Assyriologists, have contributed to its translation and elucidation.

Prof.H.A.Sayce of Oxford made the first broad discussion when he gave out a complete translation of all the fragments, which had then been found, in his "Hilbert Lectures" published in 1888⁽¹⁾. In 1890 Prof.Jensen of the University of Marburg, translated the fragments adding notes to it.⁽²⁾ In 1895 Prof.Zimmern published a translation of the legends as an appendix to Gunkel's "Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit."⁽³⁾ Prof Delitzsch of the University of Berlin next published a translation in 1896, which was followed by a second translation with commentary by Prof.Jensen in 1900.⁽⁴⁾ In 1902 Dr.L.W.King of the British Museum placed the capstone upon the whole work, when he added no less than twenty-eight fragments previously unknown to the twenty-one fragments, which up to this time had only been translated. The entire group of forty-nine separate tablets and fragments he now translated for the first time, in a masterly fashion. Upon this new edition all new pro-

1. "Records of the Past", now series vol.1 (1888) pp.122 f.
2. Die Kosmologie der Babylonier (Strassburg 1890) pp.263 ff.
3. Gunkel's Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. (Gottingen 1895) pp.401 ff.
4. Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen.

gress is based. Since then, however, this collection has been supplemented by other fragments of the Enuma Elish series which have recently been found, and are listed by Weidner.⁽¹⁾

The inscriptions are written in a rhythmical form and constitute an epic poem. It consists of some nine hundred and ninety-four lines and is divided into seven sections - each section being inscribed upon a separate tablet. The size of the separate fragments range from $7/8$ " x $7/8$ " to $4 \frac{7}{8}$ " x $3 \frac{3}{8}$ ". The tablets were numbered by the Assyrian scribes, and the separate sections of the poem written upon them do not vary very much in length. The shortest tablet contains one hundred and thirty-eight lines; the longest one, one hundred and forty-six. The poem is known to us from portions of several Assyrian and late-Babylonian copies of the work, and from extracts of it found upon the so-called "practice tablets" written by the students of Babylonian scribes.⁽²⁾ But besides these Assyrian copies which came from Ashurbanipal's library, older tablets have been found at the German excavations at Assur, dating from the ninth century, which are published in Ebeling's "Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Religioesen Inhalts." Younger fragments have also been found on Neo-Babylonian tablets which date

1. Die Assyriologie 1914-1922. p.99

2. King: Seven Tablets of Creation, Introduction XXVI.

from 625-538 B.C: Others again have been found on tablets of the Persian Period, dating from 538-530 B.C., and one probably even belongs to the Period of the Arsacidae, about 250 B.C. The date of the copying out of the tablets which are preserved to us in our day, however, gives us no idea of the composition of the story itself, for we have evidences of this story sculptured on monuments prior to this date.

But before we consider the actual composition of the story, let us first see the contents of the "Creation Story" as it is found on the seven tablets. The First Tablet tells us how there existed before the heavens and the earth were created, a primeval "chaos of water", in which lived a pair of gods known as Apsu and Tiamat. These primeval gods, Apsu, the male god, and Tiamat, the goddess, are the creators of the other gods. From these there spring forth a second pair of gods known as Lakmu and Lakhamu. While they are progressing a third generation of Babylonian deities, Anshar and Kishar, are created. Another pair of gods, Anu and Ea, now come forth. A conflict ensues between the older gods, Apsu and Tiamat on the one side, and the younger gods on the other side. Apsu and Tiamat are now angry at their own progeny. It is not perfectly clear just what the cause of their anger is, but from the new tablets, according to King ⁽¹⁾ : "We

1. King: Seven tablets of Creation, Intro. p.XXXVII.

now know that it was Apsu, and not Tiamat, who began the revolt against the gods; and that, according to the poem, his enmity was aroused, not by the creation of light as has been previously suggested, but by the disturbance of his rest in consequence of the new way of the gods, which tended to produce order in place of Chaos." Apsu and Mummu (his messenger) now go to Tiamat, complain and devise the destruction of the gods. Although Tiamat at first opposes their plan, she later is won over, and the three proceed to carry out their intentions. Everything they decide is then related in the presence of the other gods. The all-wise Ea now learns of their plan and cunningly applies "a pure incantation" which puts Apsu to sleep, whom he then binds and slays. Mummu, who then becomes violent is also killed. But Tiamat remains unconquered. Marduk is now born to Ea and Lahamu. He has four eyes and four ears and is clothed with the brilliancy of four gods. Tiamat, in the meanwhile, robbed of Apsu, has been incited to battle. She produces poisonous serpents, dragons, sea-monsters, scorpion men, dogs, and fish-men who do not fear battle. Among the gods who follow her, she chooses Kingu as leader of her troops. Thus in confusion, with wild threats, strange monsters and mighty forces of disorder the first tablet closes.

The Second Tablet begins with a description of the helplessness of the other gods, (until Marduk accepts

the challenge and enters the lists.) Tiamat is now ready and plans to avenge Apsu. She announces her intention to Ea who is disturbed and remains broken-hearted for several days. Great consternation is brought about among the younger gods, and the situation becomes desperate. Ea now goes to Anshar and tells him everything, who in turn becomes very angry and hits himself on his shins and bites his lip. He advises Ea to go to Tiamat and try to appease her wrath. Although he had triumphed over Apsu and Mummu, Ea is no match for Tiamat and turns back unable to do anything against her. Anu is then commissioned to battle against Tiamat, but he too, is unable to stand against her. Toward the end of the tablet, when the gods are all filled with fear, Ea calls Marduk into the assembly and commissions him to be the champion of the gods against Tiamat. He speaks words of love to him in order to enable him to undertake this perilous conflict. He finally encourages Marduk to undertake the task laid upon him who agrees to go out against Tiamat, under the condition that if he is successful, he is to be supreme and decide the destinies instead of the other gods.

The Third Tablet introduces Anshar as speaking to his servant, Gaga. He tells him of Tiamat's preparations for the coming contest; how she had sought to obtain Anu and Ea as her allies and how they both had declined. Then he relates of Marduk's readiness to go out against Tiamat

and calls for a banquet at which all the gods are invited. He now sends Gaga to the gods with this message. When the gods hear of this, they have confidence in the prowess of Marduk and in anticipation of his victory, eat and drink beer until their stomachs fairly burst. Following this picture of the feast, the tablet closes with the drunken gods giving the decisions of the destinies to Marduk.

The Fourth Tablet begins with the drunken gods heaping terrific honors upon Marduk. They next propose a curiously interesting test of Marduk's power which is successfully carried out. A garment is placed before Marduk; he speaks, and it vanishes; he speaks again, and it reappears! Then the narrative continues to describe with force and vividness the way the gods equip Marduk with weapons of offense and defense for the great and terrible conflict. They give him scepter, throne, majestic garment and an incomparable weapon. With a bow and arrow, lightnings, a club, a net containing the four winds and the seven violent winds he sets out. He mounts the wagon of the storm with four horses of terrible name and proceeds to the fray. At first he meets Kingu whom he puts to flight by his very appearance. Then he approaches Tiamat and so berates her that she loses her senses in anger. When they come together he seizes her in his huge net. When she opens her mouth wide he sends in a hurricane wind so that she cannot close it. Then he shoots an ar-

row into her and transfixes her with his spear, splitting her belly and her heart. After she has been killed, her army of monsters so often described, is wholly ruined with her. Kingu, he also kills, after taking from him the right of determining destiny. After this complete triumph he splits Tiamat's skull with his club and halves the carcass of the huge monster. Out of the one half which is flattened like a big fish he makes the heavens, which he fixes on high to form a firmament, the chief purpose of which is to retain the waters above it. A watchman stands guard at the door which bolts in the waters that were above the heavens. In the heaven Marduk now builds a mansion which he calls Esharra, and here Anu, Enlil and Ea have their assigned place.

The Fifth Tablet describes the appointment of the great heavenly bodies and tells how Marduk ordained the year and the months. It is very fragmentary, only about twenty-four lines being preserved to us. It seems to be the tablet, according to some ⁽¹⁾, in which "there was most probably the account of the creation of vegetables and of the animal world." From it we learn, however, that Marduk is supposed to have placed the stars, to have arranged the calendar, and to have decreed the days of the year. It was he who created the moon for the night

1. King, Seven Tablets of Creation, Introduction, p.L; p.LXXXIV

and who prescribed the time and the sizes of the phases.

In the Sixth Tablet, supplemented by various fragments, Marduk announces his intention to create man. The creation of man is ascribed to the desire of the gods to have worshippers. In announcing his plan, Marduk states that he will make him with the blood of one of the gods. The assembly of the gods now decree that through Kingu's destruction (who instigated the rebellion) man is to be created. After he is bound they cut his veins and make man from his blood. Then the Anunaki prepare a residence for Marduk which is called Esagila, and which requires two years for its completion. After this is completed the gods have a banquet in which Marduk is glorified with a bestowal of fifty names, which is to show the high position of prominence Marduk attained over against the other gods, for having overcome Tiamat.

The Seventh and last tablet is a continuation of the fifty names which celebrate the deeds and attributes of Marduk, the greater part of which consists of a hymn of praise by the other gods, in which he is honored by the bestowal of the fifty titles. Homage is paid to him both by man and god alike. He is hailed as "he who conquered Tiamat", "he who did create mankind", "creator of the earth", etc., and is represented as being powerful, beneficent, compassionate and just. And with this scene the Seventh Tablet, and the story as such, ends.

B: Alleged Parallels between E_numa Elish and Genesis.

At the very beginning George Smith felt that some relationship existed between this story and the account in Genesis, and according to Barton⁽¹⁾ : "Scholars of all shades of opinion agree that there is some connection between this Babylonian tradition and the first chapter of Genesis, though they differ as to whether the Biblical writer was acquainted with the Babylonian tradition as we have it in the epic, or whether he knew an earlier form of the story." The points of similarity which have been urged between the Babylonian Epic and the narrative in Genesis can be summed up in the following points as advanced by the various critics and as indicated below:

1. Gunkel⁽²⁾ and Barton⁽³⁾ say that the beginning of both accounts is the same, or at least, that they begin somewhat similarly. Genesis begins with the words: "In the beginning....."; the Babylonian Epic with the words: "Time was when above heaven was not named: Below to the earth no name was given." Rogers, who by no means shares our view, refutes this when he says that they are not the same. The Babylonian legend presupposes a whole catalog of things to have existed, such e.g., the creation or birth of Apsu and Tiamat, the primeval chaos, the existence of "heaven", of "Mummu (Kingu)", etc.,

-
1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.267.
 2. Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.
 3. Archaeology and the Bible, Part II, ch.1, p.267.

whereas the Genesis account starts at the very beginning. There is therefore no parallel in the beginning of beginnings."

3. The next point of resemblance is advanced by (1) L.W.King and reiterated by G.A.Barton (2) - that of a primeval chaos. According to King, a watery chaos preceded the creation of the universe in both accounts, which, in the Genesis account is personified by the Hebrew word "tehom" and translated "the deep", and in the Babylonian account with Tiamat, the Babylonian equivalent for "tehom", since, he claims, Tiamat is the monster of the deep who personifies chaos. Barton says that "tehom" and "Tiamat" are really the same word in the two closely related languages, just as day and "Tag" are the same word in an English and German form. In Babylonian the word Tiamat, which is found in various forms (ti-a-am-tu, ti-am-tu, ti-amat, tam-tu, tam-du, ta-ma-tu, ti-a(wa)-ma-tu and ti-a(wa)-wa(ma)-ti) according to (3) Clay means "sea, deep, abyss." "These many forms" he says "clearly show that the word is foreign. Yet the word "tiamat" for which there is no root in Babylonian, (but for which in Hebrew there are a number of roots with which it may be associated) scholars have declared is the origin of the Hebrew "tehom". When we inquire into Babylonian literature, we learn

-
1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Int.p.LXXXII.
 2. Archaeology and the Bible, Prt.II, ch.1,p.268.
 3. Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.87.

from the so-called Cuthean Legend, as also from the *Enu-
ma Elish*, that Tiamat was the mother goddess of a mountain-
ous peo ple. There is absolutely nothing in this legend
that connects her with the sea. In the *Enuma Elish* she is
described as equipping herself for the fight by making
weapons invincible, bearing monster serpents, vipers, dra-
gons, fish-men, et cetera. "In the entire list of eleven
aids" says Clay ⁽¹⁾, "only 'fish-men' are referred to, (if
that is the correct translation of the word), to show that
she had anything to do with water." Moreover, besides her
name, Tiamat, there is nothing in the entire poem to con-
nect her with the sea. Nor is there anything to show that,
although her name is the same as "tiamat= ocean", she is
personified as the "watery-chaos." It is important to
note here that in a bilingual Babylonian story of crea-
tion, the primeval water is not personified. In this con-
nection we quote Clay who says: ⁽²⁾ "With all the light,
therefore, that is now available from the cuneiform lite-
rature, we learn on the one hand, that with the excep-
tion of the *Enuma Elish*, but one legend mentions Tiamat,
who is not a goddess of the deep, but the mother god-
dess of a mountainous land which has humiliated Babylonia,
and on the other hand, the thought that all things emana-
ted from water is wholly wanting in the literature of the

-
1. Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.90.
 2. Same p.92.

Babylonians. How will the advocates of this theory explain the omission of the very idea in the literature of the Babylonians that they say the Hebrews borrowed, and with which their own literature was so thoroughly penetrated?" Concerning this word "tiamat" Knieschke says (1):
"Wir haben hier wohl ein auf diesselbe Wurzel zurueckgehendes Wort, aber in diesem Worte sind ganz andersartige Begriffsvorstellungen ausgedrueckt." We see from all this that no real parallel can possibly be found here, since in the first place, both accounts have entirely different conceptions associated with these words. The connotation that the Babylonian Tiamat has, is that of a huge monster, terrible in appearance, whereas the Hebrew word "tehom" pictures only the "deep sea." In the second place, we have shown above from Clay that the word "Tiamat" is a west Semitic conception. In answer to the question as to whether the words: Apsu, Tiamat, Mummu and ⁽²⁾Khur are Babylonian or Amorite, he says in conclusion:
"For these four words used as names and titles, as we have seen, on the one hand, there are no roots in Babylonian, nor are there derivatives from the roots, i.e., it is not possible to explain them etymologically on the basis of known roots in that language. On the other hand, in Hebrew we have not only the corresponding words in use,

1. Bibel und Babel, El Und Bel.
2. Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.97.

but in every instance verbal forms from the roots to which they belong, as well as other derivations."

(1)
3. King points out that the creation of the light before the sun in the Biblical account is also characteristic of the Babylonian Epic. "In the Hebrew narrative", he says "the first act of creation is that of light (Gen.1,3-5) and it has been suggested that a parallel possibly existed in the Babylonian account, in that the creation of light may have been the cause of the revolt of Tiamat. From the new fragments of the poem we now know that the rebellion of the forces of disorder which was incited by Apsu and not Tiamat, was due, not to the creation of light, but to his hatred of the way of the gods which produced order in place of chaos. Moreover, day and night are vaguely conceived of in the poem as already in existence at the time of Apsu's revolt, so that the belief in the existence of light before the creation of the heavenly bodies is a common feature of the Hebrew and the Babylonian account." Rogers (2) shares the same opinion when he says that "day and night seem to have existed when Apsu revolted" and deduces from this that consequently both are here in agreement. The Babylonian account, however, says nothing of the creation of light and both King and Rogers strain themselves to the utmost when they attempt to prove it. King mentions that

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro. p.LXXXII
2. Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p.138.

day and night are vaguely conceived of (?) in the poem, but says nothing about the sequence of day and night found in Genesis.

4. The creation of a firmament, according to King (1) is a parallel record in both accounts. The second act of creation, according to the Genesis record is that of a firmament which "divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament." In the Babylonian poem, the body of Tiamat is divided by Marduk, and from one-half of her he established a covering for heaven, i.e., a firmament which kept her upper waters in place. The conception of both accounts is again entirely different. In the one account the firmament is brought about from pre-existing material, from the carcass of the huge monster; whereas in the Biblical account it is simply brought about through the creative word of the almighty God:]ִּי־אֱלֹהִים יִבְרָא הַשָּׁמַיִם . They may agree in the conception that there is a super-celestial ocean, but the Babylonian record says nothing whatever about the division of the waters.

5. Another alleged parallel which King finds is in the creation of the earth and of vegetation. These comprise the third and fourth acts of the Biblical creation and are narrated in Genesis 1,9-13. "Although" says King (2) "no portion of the Babylonian poem has yet been

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p.LXXXIII.
2. Same, p.LXXXIV.

recovered, which contains the corresponding account, it is probable that these acts of creation were related on the Fifth Tablet of the series." His assertion is, however, entirely unfounded, for the Babylonian text contains absolutely nothing of the creation of the earth and of vegetation. How can King draw a parallel if the Babylonian text does not even mention the creation of the earth and of vegetation? Rogers, in his book already quoted, says that the corresponding story has been lost, but that it seems quite probable that these were described, in the same order on the Fifth Tablet. According to Berossus, Bel formed the earth out of one half of Omorka's (Tiamat) body. "And as in every instance" says Rogers, (1) "where we can test his narrative, it has proved to be correct, we have just ground for believing that it is correct in this also. Moreover, at the very beginning of the Seventh Tablet, Marduk is hailed as 'bestower of fruitfulness, founder of agriculture, creator of grain and plants, he who caused the green herbs to spring up.'" From the fact that Berossus makes mention of the creation of the earth and of vegetation, he concludes that it must therefore have been inscribed on one of the tablets which are lost to us and which, of course, is no proof at all. Since, in the second place, Marduk is called "founder of agriculture, creator of grain and plants etc." Rogers

1. Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p.138.

would prove that these acts of creation were described on some portion of the Fifth Tablet. A mere title on the Seventh Tablet is no proof that Marduk created the earth and all the vegetation in the same manner which the Biblical account records. Not only is absolutely no mention made of such creations in the cuneiform, but if there were, the manner would have to be entirely different. In the Biblical account we have this majestic record: הָאֵרָאָה וְהַיַּבֵּשֶׁת and $\text{וְהַיָּם וְהַכֶּלֶם}$. In Genesis 1,11 $\text{וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם}$ and in verse twelve we have the result of this command: $\text{וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הַיָּם וְהַיַּבֵּשֶׁת}$. The cuneiform knows nothing of this in its present form - and never did in any form - to judge from all other analogies.

6. Parallels are likewise found in the creation of the heavenly bodies. "To the fifth act of creation, that of the heavenly bodies," says King ⁽¹⁾, "we find an exceedingly close parallel in the opening lines of the Fifth Tablet of this series. In the Hebrew account, lights were created in the firmament of heaven to divide the day from the night, and to be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years. In the Babylonian poem also the stars were created and the year was ordained at the same time; the twelve months were to be regulated by the stars and the Moon-god was appointed to determine the days! As according to the Hebrew account two great lights were crea-

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p.LXXXV.

ted in the firmament of heaven, the greater light to rule the day and the lesser to rule the night, so according to the Babylonian poem the night was entrusted to the Moon-god, and the Moon-god's relation to the Sun-god are described in detail." But this statement of King is a great exaggeration of the text, for the Babylonian record nowhere states that the sun, moon, and stars were created to divide the day from the night, etc. It merely says that Marduk ordained the stations of the great gods, that he established three stars and that he caused the moon-god to shine and to determine the days. But there is no parallel here. As a matter of fact there is a great difference existing, for in the Babylonian text there is no mention made of the creation of the sun which is to rule the day, and to divide the day from the night as we find in Genesis. The high-handed procedure of King ought furthermore be noted. The creation of the moon and the stars was indeed the fifth act of creation as mentioned in Genesis, which, however, occurred on the fourth day. Since the Babylonian account makes reference to these objects on the Fifth Tablet, he jumps from his former procedure of comparing tablets and days to this one, of comparing tablets with acts so as to find a parallel. In summing up our objections we may say that his procedure is altogether unscientific and different in both cases.

7. As a seventh parallel King lists the crea-

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p. LXXVI.

tion of animals, although he admits the Babylonian record contains no such account. For he says: ⁽¹⁾ "To the sixth and seventh acts of creation, i.e., the creation of creatures of the sea, of winged fowl, and of beasts and cattle and creeping things (Gen.1,20-25), the Babylonian poem offers no parallel, for the portions of the text which refer to the creation of animals is still wanting. But since Berossus states that animals were created at the same time (?) as man, it is probable that their creation was recorded in a missing portion either of the Fifth or of the Sixth Tablet. If the account was on the lines suggested by Berossus, and animals shared in the blood of Bel, it is clear that their creation was narrated, as a subsidiary and less important episode, after that of man." Since there is no word mentioned in the Babylonian account how can King find a parallel to the Biblical account? The fact that Berossus mentions the creation of animals does not prove that the account existed on one of the seven tablets. Such a procedure of finding parallels to accounts that are not mentioned at all, surely condemns itself.

8. The crowning act of creation in the Hebrew account, namely that of the creation of man, recorded as the eighth and last act of creation (Gen.1,26-31) according to King, finds its parallel in the Babylonian poem upon the new fragment of the Sixth Tablet B.M. 92,
1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., P.LXXXVI.

629. "The Babylonian account", says King, ⁽¹⁾ "closely follows the version of the story handed down to us from Berossus and it may here be added that the employment by Marduk, the Creator, of his own blood in the creation of man, may perhaps be compared to the Hebrew account of the creation of man in the image and after the likeness of Elohim. Moreover, the use of the plural in the phrase 'Let us make man' in Gen. 1, 26, may be compared with the Babylonian narrative which relates that Marduk imparted his purpose of forming man to his father, Ea, whom he probably afterward instructed to carry out the actual work of man's creation." But there is no resemblance here between the two accounts. In the first place, the Biblical phrase: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" has no reference to an external bodily likeness to the creator (which meaning King puts into the Babylonian text), but rather refers to a spiritual condition of man in which he was created, namely that state of original righteousness and holiness. In the second place, the plural in Genesis 1, 26 is not a communicative plural as King and Franz Delitzsch seem to think - according to which God took someone else into counsel as Marduk did when he approached Ea - but rather a plural which is indicative of the plurality of persons in the one united God, the Holy Trinity and for this reason there is no

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p. LXXXVII.

parallel in this respect. In the third place there is absolutely nothing said in the poem that Ea carried out the actual work of man's creation. According to Barton, the Sixth Tablet from lines one to thirty-three, contain the account of the creation of man which is accomplished by sacrificing the life of Kingu, the god, who, by leading a rebellion had created strife among the gods. "This", he says ⁽¹⁾, "seems to have been the Babylonian way of expressing the thought that man is akin to deity." In the one account the blood of one of the inferior gods, Kingu, was used in making man, while in the other account the blood of Marduk himself is mentioned. But here again the whole conception of both accounts is so unmistakeably different that no parallel can possibly exist. There is first of all a difference in the material used in making man. According to the Babylonian account man is made from the blood of one of the gods while in the Biblical record, man is formed from the dust of the ground. Then there is the difference in the manner and process of creation. In the one account, we are merely told that it was because Kingu had been the instigator of the rebellion, that a curse was laid upon him and he was killed, in order that mankind might be created from his blood; while in the other account, we are told that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils

1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.267.

the breath of life." In the one account man was the result of a curse and punishment while in the other the object of God's love and deliberation. In the one instance man ^{receives} only a body while in the other he receives both body and soul. In view of these differences any semblance of a parallel vanishes.

9. Another alleged parallel is found in the instructions which God gives man. Smith in his "Chaldean Genesis" ⁽¹⁾ has a wide-spread account of what the Babylonian god told man to do. King, in his book, repeatedly ⁽²⁾ quoted above, says that "a parallel to the charge which, according to the Hebrew account, Elohim gave to man and woman after their creation, has hitherto been believed to exist on the tablet K 3,364 is not a part of the Creation Series but is merely a tablet of moral precepts, so that its suggested resemblances to the Hebrew narrative must be given up. It is not improbable, however, that a missing portion of the Sixth Tablet did contain a short series of instructions by Marduk to man, since man was created with the special object of supplying the gods with worshippers and building shrines in their honor." Since the record does not exist, this alleged parallel simply does not exist.

10. The dominion of man over creation is consi-

1. See p.80, also King, Appendix II, p.201 f.
2. Seven Tablets of Creation, p.LXXXVIII.
3. Same, Introduction, p.LXXXIX.

dered parallel in the two records, according to King, ⁽³⁾ although inconsistently he admits the Babylonian record has no exact parallel. Although he lists this point as a parallel, he admits: "It is unlikely that the Babylonian poem contained an exact parallel to the exalted charge of Elohim in which He placed the rest of creation under man's dominion." We need not take seriously any claim for parallels which critics admit is no parallel.

⁽¹⁾ 11. An eleventh parallel listed by King is found in the words of the creator. In the Biblical account, we are told God said, e.g. רִאָאֵן . The suggestion has been made that the prominence given to these words in the Hebrew account may have found its parallel in the magical word of Marduk. But in this case also, King admits that the parallel between the two accounts under this heading is not very close. "It is true" says King, "that the word of Marduk had magical power and could destroy and create alike; but Marduk did not employ his word in any of his acts of creation which are at present known to us. He first conceived a cunning device, and then proceeded to carry it out by hand. The only occasion on which he did employ his word to destroy and to create is in the Fourth Tablet, when at the invitation of the gods, he tested his power by making a garment disappear and then reappear at the word of his mouth." But

3. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p.LXXXIX.
1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p.XC.

since, as King even admits, these words have nothing whatever to do with creation, we find no parallel here.

12. The next parallel, King finds in the order of creation. He however, retracts his claim when he admits that the two accounts are not the same when he says: ⁽¹⁾

"The order of the separate acts of creation is also not quite the same in the two accounts, for while in the Babylonian poem the heavenly bodies are created immediately after the formation of the firmament, in the Hebrew account their creation is postponed until after the earth and the vegetation have been made." This admission is

quite in order, for the two records are fundamentally different in this respect. But King makes the claim that the Hebrew order has perhaps been disarranged. He says:

"It is possible that the creation of the earth and plants has been displaced by the writer to whom the present form of the Hebrew account is due, and that the order of creation was precisely the same in the original form of the two narratives. Barton, however, (to state a critic's

⁽²⁾ opposing view) says: "The differences between the accounts are, however, most marked." The opposed parallel

of King he lists as a fundamental difference between the two accounts in the words: ⁽³⁾

"The classification of the acts of creation is clear and consistent and thoroughly

-
1. Seven Tablets of Creation, Intro., p.XC.
 2. Archaeology and the Bible, p.269.
 3. Same, p.270.

independent of that in the Babylonian account." The differences in the order of creation can be seen from the following table which lists the events as they occur in the Biblical account, on the one hand, and on the Seven Tablets on the other:

Biblical Story

- Day 1. Heaven, earth and light created
2. Firmament created
3. Waters gathered, earth brings forth vegetation
4. Sun, moon and stars created
5. Birds and fishes created
6. Beasts of the field, reptiles and man created
7. The day of rest

The Seven Tablets

- Tablet 1. Ea-Apsu conflict; Marduk-Tiamat fight
2. Continuation of fight
3. " "
4. " " ; firmament established
5. Appointment of stations of gods, placement of stars, luminaries; divisions
6. Creation of man and titles of Marduk
7. Continuation of titles of Marduk

The table above shows us that the acts of creation for the six days in the Hebrew account are very different from those contained on the Seven Tablets. It ought to be stated here that the Babylonian story makes no reference

to the creation of light, of the sun, of vegetation, birds and fishes; nor does it refer to beasts and reptiles outside of those made to help Tiamat in her conflict.

13. The last point of resemblance, between the two accounts, advanced by King and shared by Gunkel, is found in the Seven Days and the Seven Tablets of Creation. The two records are here parallel, they claim, because there are seven tablets to the Babylonian record and seven days of creation. Driver and Skinner likewise accept this theory. But King himself admits that the reasons for the employment of the seven are not the same in both accounts and that the resemblance therefore is somewhat superficial. He says ⁽¹⁾ : "It would be tempting to trace the framework of the Seven Days of Creation upon which the narrative is stretched, to the influence of the Seven Tablets of Creation, of which we know now that the great creation series was composed. The reason for the employment of the Seven Days in the Hebrew account are, however, not the same which led to the arrangement of the Babylonian poem upon Seven Tablets. In the one, the writer's intention is to give the original an authority for the observance of the Sabbath; in the other there appears to have been no special reason for this arrangement of the poem beyond the mystical nature of the number 'seven'. Moreover, the acts of creation are all

1. Seven Tablets of Creation, p.XCI.

recorded on the first six days in the Hebrew narrative; while in the Babylonian poem the creation only begins at the end of the Fourth Tablet. This resemblance, therefore, is somewhat superficial, but it is possible that the employment of the number 'seven' in the two accounts was not fortuitous." Professor A.T. Clay refutes this claim (1) when he shows that originally there were not seven tablets, but that the original story was much shorter. It originally dealt with Enlil, not Marduk, and we have now the original to show that the account was later elaborated. In answer to Barton's statement: (2) "Each account is arranged in a series of seven, the Babylonian in seven tablets, (3) the Hebrew in seven days", Clay declares; "There can be little doubt that prior to the time when the Marduk school-men used the Epic to glorify their deity, when the vain repetitions were doubtless introduced, and the stately titles of the other gods were added to those of Marduk, the epic had been written on fewer tablets; yet we are asked to believe that the division of the Hebrew story of creation into six days and the Sabbath, originated in the number of tablets it required to hold this Epic, because we find in each instance the number 'seven' and the fact that the creation of man in both instances is connected with the number 'six'." Barton himself, mo-

-
1. Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.74.
 2. Archaeology and the Bible, p.268.
 3. The Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.74.

difies his statement of a parallel in this connection when

(1) he says: "Some of these resemblances are of no great significance. The fact that the two accounts are arranged by sevens may be due simply to the fact that that number was sacred among both peoples." King, too, yields this

(2) point when he says: "It is possible that the division of the poem into seven sections, inscribed upon separate tablets, took place at a later period; but, be this as it may, we may conclude with considerable degree of confidence that the bulk of the poem, as we know it from late Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian copies, was composed at a period not later than 2000 B.C." If we but examine the tabulation above, we will have to conclude that the number seven is but a mere accident and cannot be called a parallel to the Seven Days in the Genesis record.

14. Barton finds a parallel in the cause of the beginning of the creation process. In Genesis 1,3 we are told the "The Spirit of God moved (R.V. was brooding) upon the face of the waters." This he says is parallel to the conception of the Babylonists who spoke of the waters as being of two genders, which were embossomed. The thought occurs in the words: "The roaring Sea who bore them; Their waters together were mingled." But this meaning, which is questionable, is entirely foreign to the

-
1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.269.
 2. Seven Tablets of Creation, p.LXXX.

Old Testament text and is based simply on a misunderstanding of the implications of the Hebrew terms: אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא in Genesis 1,2, which certainly is not used as of the propagation of the world. Nor is the hovering of the Spirit of God the act which produces the beginning of creation. This idea is so distinctly opposed to the Old Testament that any such alleged parallel vanishes.

15. A fifteenth parallel is found by Gunkel in his "Schoepfung und Chaos", where he claims that even as the Biblical account closes with the Sabbath, so also the Babylonian record closes with the banquet scene on which occasion fifty titles are bestowed on Marduk. He claims that both the Sabbath and the banquet represent a cessation from work and consequently there exists here a parallel. And as Jahweh blessed the seventh day so Marduk was blessed and sanctified by the others. But such a forced parallel cannot be taken seriously, for in the first place, both are different in themselves; and secondly, the purpose, institutions and result of each is different. The Genesis record does not speak of a Sabbath as Gunkel contends, but merely says that God blessed and sanctified the seventh day. On this day, the creative activity proper ceased. It, however, belongs to the creative cycle in a negative sense for God finished his creation on that day. In resting God did something negatively, while in bestowing a blessing he did something positive-

ly. But the claim of Gunkel, Skinner and others who say that the Sabbath observance is based on this verse is unfounded. The passage in question attaches a special significance to that seventh day insofar as the Sabbath legislation is based on the sanctification of this day. The Sabbath is part of the ceremonial law and was officially instituted at the time of Moses who recorded it in Exodus 20. This can be clearly seen from the fact that no command was issued to Adam or to his posterity to celebrate this day in the future. God and the seventh day are here concerned and not man. How then can this be an institution of the Sabbath? But aside from the fact that the Sabbath is not mentioned in Genesis, there can be no parallel between the two records in this respect, for a banquet is not the same as a day of rest. The Sixth Tablet (and not the Seventh) merely tells of a banquet on which occasion Marduk received fifty titles. Nothing is said of a cessation of work, or of any special significance attached to the banquet. Where then can a parallel possibly exist?

16. Barton points out another alleged parallel in the similar endings of the two accounts. At the end of the Creation account in Genesis (ch.1,31), we read that God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." A parallel to this Barton finds in the Praise of Marduk by all the gods, because he had de-

stroyed evil and created good. In both cases the claim is made, that there is an antithesis between the world formed by God and the good done by Marduk, and between evil. But the Biblical account says that there was no evil, while the Babylonian poem is saturated with evil and does not even think of any moral issue whatsoever. The thought of pure abstract morality, of right and wrong, are entirely foreign.

17. A second class or group of theories advanced by critics to show the dependency of the Biblical record on that of the Babylonian Epic, is that of finding alleged traces in the Old Testament, especially in the poetical books, of the battle between Tiamat and Marduk. Gunkel was one of the first to advance this theory which was then reiterated by Barton and many others. This opinion claims there are passages in the poetical books of the Old Testament which give us additional light upon Israel's conception of the creation, especially those which refer to a struggle between Jahweh and a being who is regarded as personifying the primeval ocean. Several different names of this monster are supposed to be found as for example Tehom, Rahab, Leviathan, Dragon and Serpent. In some of these poetical passages, it is asserted, this thought can be traced: Jahweh had a great conflict with a being of this kind after whose defeat the heavens and the earth were created. In this conflict it is claimed, this hos-

tile creature had helpers who were also overcome. "It is generally held by Babylonists" says Clay, ⁽¹⁾ "that such a crude conception as the strife between Jahweh and the monster (which idea was borrowed from Babylonia) was not tolerated in the creation story, as it jarred upon the purer theological conceptions and in consequence was suppressed." For this reason, they allege, these various names were substituted and are found chiefly in the poetical books. Barton ⁽²⁾ lists a number of these passages, in which it is claimed the most important parallels are found. The first passage he cites is Job 9,13.14 where "the helpers of Rahab" (עֲזָרֵי רַהַב) are mentioned. Rahab, according to this critical view, is an epithet of Tiamat, and consequently "the helper of Rahab" refer to "the helpers of Tiamat" mentioned in the Fourth Tablet (lines 105-118). This, however, cannot be the case as we shall presently see, but even if this were so, this argument is not decisive of authorship, for as Keil ⁽³⁾ says: "Die Poesie des Buches Job verschmaecht auch sonst mythologische Elemente nicht; man erinnert sich bei עֲזָרֵי רַהַב an das indische Mythologumen von Indias' Siege ueber den finstern Daemon Writras, welcher das Ergiessen des Regens verkuendern will, und ueber dessen Helfershelfer, oder (so Hitz) an Vishnu, welcher den Drachen (rahu) entzweihieb und die Dae-

1. Clay, Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.69.

2. Archaeology and the Bible, p.271.

3. Heil-Dehltzsch - Commentar ueber das Alte Testament IV 2, p.124.

monen besiegte..." But the etymology of רַחַב is "raging, fierceness, insolence or pride" and "the helpers of raging etc." could be those who rise up against Jehovah in any rebellion. Thus Egypt especially figures in this capacity. Keil says in another connection ⁽¹⁾ :

" רַחַב ist Aegypten als Wasserungeheuer vorgestellt und zwar in der Bedeutung $\kappa\hat{\eta}\rho\sigma\varsigma$ Seeungestuem monstrum marinum, bezeugt von LXX zu Job 26,12 u. 9,13. Hier aber bedeutet dieser Name wie sonst gewoehnlich das Ungestüms der Uebermut, die Grosstuerei." Then the situation in both passages is entirely different. In Job 9,13 there is no reference to creation, and if we turn away from the meaning "Egypt" which the word also has ⁽²⁾ (since as Keil says Job makes no reference to Israel's history) we may agree that רַחַב - as the LXX indicates here and in Job 26,13 by $\kappa\hat{\eta}\rho\sigma\varsigma$ - denotes a legendary monster personifying proud rebellion (as Egypt) against God. But this does not make a reference to the Babylonian cosmogony even probable. What etymological or historical connection is there between Tiamat and Rahab? Assyrian literature knows nothing of a רַחַב .

In the next passage which Barton cites, Job 26,12, we find a similar situation. In this passage the words: "He smiteth through Rahab" occur, which have been brought into comparison with the Fourth Tablet lines 93 ff. But

1. Keil Delitzsch - Commentary to Isaiah, p.331.
2. See Isaiah 30,7 and Psalm 87,4.

this situation is parallel to the foregoing passage and likewise has nothing to do with creation, but rather emphasizes God's rule over nature. Here, too, Rahab is a personification of the opposition to God in the form of a mythological creature.

Another passage which Barton cites is Job 3,8 where leviathan is mentioned. "It would appear from Psalm 74,13", says Barton ⁽¹⁾ "that as the Hebrews called Tiamat Rahab, so they called Kingu leviathan." Therefore he finds in this passage (Job 3,8) another reference to the Babylonian creation epic and claims that there were magicians who professed to be able to arouse such a monster. But how could this be possible since Kingu was killed? This passage likewise, does not speak of the creation, but as the context shows, of Job's denunciation of the day of his birth. "Those that curse the day" mentioned in this verse, are a reference to the professional cursers who, in popular superstition were believed to have command over a mythological creature which ate up the sun and the moon. Keil says in this connection ⁽²⁾ : "Die Tagewuenscher (׀ִי־רַךְ־אֵל) sind Zauberer, welche Tage durch ihre Bannsprueche zu 'dies infausti' zu machen verstehen..... Eine besondere Geschicklichkeit bestand dem Volksaberglauben nach, von dem die Bilderrede V.8 entlehnt ist, darin, den Drachen, welcher der Feind

1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.273.

2. Keil Delitzsch, Commentar ueber das Alte Testament, p.69.

der Sonne und des Mondes ist, wider beide anzuheizen, so dass, indem er sie verschlingt, Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse entstehen. Dieser Drache heisst arabisch-persisch tinnin, indisch rahu, hier ךָיִן , was LXX τὸ μέγα κῆτος uebers.; den Chinesen sowohl als die Eingebornen von Algier machen noch heutiges Tages bei einer Sonnen- und Mondfinsternis wildes Getoese mit Trommeln und kupfernen Becken, bis der Drache seine Beute fahren laesst. Job wuenscht, dass dieses Ungeheuer die Sonne seines Geburtstages verschlingen moege."

With Tablet Four lines 93 ff, Psalm 74,13 has been compared. In this passage "sea monsters" (ךָיִן) and "leviathan" (ךָיִן) are mentioned:

"Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength
Thou breakest the heads of the dragons in the waters
Thou breakest the heads of leviathan in pieces;
Thou gavest him to be food to the people inhabiting the wilderness."

The word ךָיִן comes from the root ךָיִן which means properly "to extend". Hence ךָיִן is a vast creature (κῆτος) so called from the length to which it extends. Keil says it is "das langgestreckte Wassertier, Saurier welches bei Jesaias und Ezekiel das stehende Emblem des Pharao und seines Reiches Aegypten ist cp.K.51,9; Ps.74, 13; Ezek.29,3, et alii." The root of the word leviathan (ךָיִן) is a word which means "a long stretched

out animal." Hence it is used for a serpent of a longer kind as in Job 3,8. Thus we see that these names cannot refer to Tiamat for the etymology of these words would give us an entirely different conception of Tiamat. In the second place this passage cannot refer to the creation for these creatures were given as food to man. If the dragon of the sea and leviathan are to be identified with Kingu, and if mankind was made from Kingu, how is it possible that mankind could have eaten Kingu? Hengstenberg⁽¹⁾ says in this connection: "In verses 13 and 14, the only matter-of-fact subject is the restraining of the sea by God, in reference to the dividing of the Red Sea: the dragon and leviathan are merely poetical figures. These appear as monarchs of the sea, and their subjection as a sign of it..... According to the common interpretation, the dragons and leviathan are intended figuratively to represent the Egyptians and Pharaoh (compare Ezek.29,3.4 where the crocodile occurs as the emblem of the Egyptian) and the inhabitant of the wilderness are the beasts of the desert, who got for their food the carcasses of the Egyptians.

The last of the passages to be considered is Isaiah 27,1 where we read: "In that day Jehovah with his hard and great and strong sword will punish leviathan, the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent;

1. Hengstenberg on the Psalms Vol.II, p.424 f.

and he will slay the monster that is in the sea. Since the words "in that day.... Jehovah will punish" clearly refer to the future, there can be no reference here to the Babylonian Creation Epic. In the second place there can be no parallel here for Tiamat, as shown before, is originally not a water deity, but a goddess of a mountain country. We can explain the use of these various names as personifications of the hostile powers and forces which rise up against God, symbolized under the picture of these terrible animals. They are used in the Bible in the same way as they are used in sermonic material and in other literature of today.

C. Differences Between Enuma Elish and Genesis.

We have just shown that the claim of the critics are not borne out by facts and that the many parallels they allege to be parallels between the two records, are in reality no parallels. We now turn to the differences. There are many and fundamental differences as the preceding has already emphasized. We shall, however, group these in two classes - those differences in general and those in detail - and list them as follows:

1. The first great and fundamental difference between the two accounts is the central theme of the story. The Genesis record is really an account of creation and describes the origin of the world, the animals and

man. The Enuma Elish, on the other hand, cannot properly be called a creation story for as such it is merely incidental. In the Bible account creation is real, intentional and central, while in the cuneiform record it is only incidental and is occasioned thru patriotic motives. The chief and all-important event in the Babylonian story is the Marduk-Tiamat fight which glorifies Marduk, the national god of Babylon. Professor G.A. Moore in his book "Religions of the World" in this connection points this fact out when he says: "In any case (i.e. creation)^{this} is not the main subject and purpose of the poem, and it is only misleading to call it the Epic of Creation." Professor A. Noordtzijs likewise points out this fact in his "Ein Babylonisch Schepfungsepos?" concerning which Weidner says in his brief review: ⁽¹⁾ "Enuma elis sei coelozentrisch, nicht geozentrisch. Der Name Schoepfungsepos sei daher falsch. Im Vordergrund stehe der Kampf der Ordnungsgoetter gegen die chaotischen Maechte. Die Grundanschauung von Enuma Elis sei pantheistisch."

2. Another important difference is found in the pre-existence of many things which characterizes the Enuma Elish account. The Genesis record goes back to the absolute beginning of beginnings, whereas the Babylonian story starts out with a definite pre-existence, at a time when Apsu, Mummu and Tiamat lived in a primeval state

1. Weidner, E.F., Die Assyriologie 1914-1922, p.99.

known as chaos. The Biblical record presupposes the existence of God who creates the world and mankind, while in the Babylonian record Marduk, the creator, and the other gods must first be made or produced.

3. A third difference is seen in the order of creation. In the Biblical account the order of creation is clear and progressive, while in the *Enuma Elish* this order is characterized by its absence. The Genesis record tells how God first created the inanimate creatures then the animate, first the simple then the more complex, first the lower then the higher, until the crowning act of creation, man, was accomplished. The difference in the order of the separate acts of creation has been shown in connection with the alleged parallels discussed above. Professor Barton admits: ⁽¹⁾ "The classification of the acts of creation in Genesis is clear and consistent, and thoroughly independent of that in the Babylonian account."

4. The method of creation is likewise very different in both accounts. In the one God creates simply by his divine fiat "creatio e nihilo", emphasized by the term אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם (Gen.1,1) which excludes any pre-existing material from which God could have made the universe, whereas in the other, Marduk makes the world from the carcass of Tiamat whom he had conquered only after a fierce combat. In the Bible record the mode of God's creation

1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.270.

is' n', אִלְהִים אֶתְּרַם אֶתְּרַם and the result is יְהוָה .

The words show the ease with which creation was accomplished and stands in contrast to the laborious process of Marduk. Driver admits: ⁽¹⁾ that in the Genesis record "the supremacy of the one Creator is absolute and his word alone suffices to bring about each stage of the work of creation." According to the Enuma Elish man was created from the blood of Kingu who was first killed before mankind could be made, while the Biblical record describes him as having been formed from the dust of the ground by God, who at the same time gave him the breath of life. In the one case man has but a material form, while in the other, he consists of two parts: an inanimate body and a living principle. Other differences in the method of creation are found under the parallels listed above.

5. Another obvious and important difference is seen in the omissions and additions existing. The Genesis record tells us in detail how the heaven and the earth was created; how the earth was made fruitful: how the sun, moon and stars were created, the fish and the fowl, and the beast of the field, and the cattle. It tells us very minutely how man, that supreme creature, was created by the personal workmanship of God. The first four tablets of the Enuma Elish series, on the other hand, merely describe the Marduk-Tiamat fight, while the remaining three

1. Hogarth, Authority and Archaeology, p.14.

tablets tell of the establishment of the firmament, the luminaries, and of man's creation from pre-existing matter. Concerning the creation of light, of the sun and of vegetation, nothing is mentioned of in the Enuma Elish, nor is mention made of the creation of the fowl of the air, of fishes, and of animals.

6. Another chief difference is seen in the religious background of both accounts. In Genesis we read of the one supreme Creator who alone creates by the mere use of his word. In the Enuma Elish a number of gods war against each other, and not until Marduk attains supremacy over Tiamat is he hailed as their chief, and then only does he begin to "create" from pre-existing material. In the Biblical account, on the other hand, God is specifically viewed as the absolute, exalted, all-powerful God who is supreme Ruler over everything, and whose destiny does not depend on any conflict, but who is established from eternity. Driver says that the theological differences between the two accounts are profound, and that the Babylonian record is characterized by an exuberant and grotesque polytheism, while the Biblical record has a severe and dignified monotheism. Gunkel ⁽¹⁾ says that the religious differences between the two accounts are so great that at first glance there seems to be nothing parallel. His words read: "Die Verschiedenheit der babylonis-

1. Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.

chen Schoepfungsgeschichte und der von Gen.1 ist sehr gross; sie koennte kaum groesser gedacht werden. Dort alles wild und grotesk, himmelstuermende, barbarische Poesie; hier die feierliche, erhabene Ruhe einer weitlaeufigen und manchmal etwas nuechternen Prosa. Dort die Goetter im Laufe der Dinge entstanden, hier Gott von Anfang an derselbe. Dort der Gott der im heissen Kampf das Ungeheuer erschlaegt und aus dessen Leibe die Welt bildet; hier der Gott der spricht und es geschieht." Barton (2) who has advocated the alleged similarites noted above admits that the differences between the two accounts are most marked. In speaking of the religious conception of both accounts he states that the Babylonian record is mythological and polytheistic, whereas the Biblical record reflects the most exalted monotheism. He characterizes the former correctly when he states that the conception of the deity is by no means exalted. The gods love, hate, scheme, plot, fight and destroy. "Marduk their champion conquers only after a fierce struggle which taxes his powers to the utmost." On the other hand when speaking of the Biblical account, he says correctly: "God is so thoroughly the master of all the elements of the universe, that they obey his slightest Word. He controls all without effort. He speaks and it is done...."

-
1. Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.
 2. Archaeology and the Bible, p.270.

Granting, as most scholars do, that there is a connection between the two narratives, there is no better measure of the inspiration of the Biblical account than to put it side by side with the Babylonian. As we read the chapter in Genesis today, it still reveals to us the majesty and power of the one God, and creates in the modern man, as it did in the ancient Hebrew, a worshippful attitude towards the creator." Rogers likewise, who by no means shares our position in other respects, says ⁽¹⁾ when comparing both accounts: "As great as are the resemblances which bind the two narratives together, the differences are far greater and more important. The soberness, the dignity, the simplicity of the Hebrew account lift it far above its ancient exampnar. From it the crude nature myths have all been stripped away: no drunken gods hold revels in its solemn lines. But above even this stands monotheism. Alone and lonesome is this God whom the Hebrews knew..... To that lofty faith the Babylonians never came. This great glory belongs to Israel. No other people brought forth prophets to preach, or priests to teach this truth. Whence came this superiority? I can find no origin for it but in a personal revelation of God in human history. It was He who made Himself known to the Hebrew people, thru their prophets, and thru their living experience of him in history."

1. Religion of Babylonian and Assyria, p.140 .

The above quotations of the critics themselves who hold to the Babylonian origin of the Biblical record, conclusively show what remarkable differences exist between the two accounts. Their claim, however, that the Enuma Elish story went thru a long process of editing and assimilation by the Hebrew scribes and thus gradually became divested of all those objectional features of insipid polytheism is quite unwarranted. It is simply an attempt to budge over the insuperable differences existing between Enuma Elish and Genesis.

7. Besides these major differences there are a few miscellaneous ones which might be mentioned here. There is a difference in the patriotic motive of the Babylonian account. The aim of the Enuma Elish account was to glorify Marduk, the god of Babylon, at the expense of Ashur, the national god of Assyria, while the aim of the Biblical Account was to show mankind by divine revelation, who is behind all things and in all things, - the living God, our Maker, and our Father. Another difference is seen in the purpose of man's creation. According to the Enuma Elish account, man was created to serve the gods while the Scriptural record tells us that man was created for God's glory.

D. Why the Biblical Record is Independent.

We have above considered the Enuma Elish story as such, and have examined the parallels suggested by the

critics who postulate a Babylonian origin for the Biblical creation record, and have emphasized the fundamental differences between the two accounts. In this chapter we shall demonstrate in a positive way why the Biblical record is independent and cannot possibly have been derived from the *Enuma Elish*.

1. In order to base a claim for a literary dependence of one record on that of the other, the two records must be similar, at least, to some extent. The critics have tried to show a similarity between these records by advancing a number of alleged parallels. But upon a closer examination of these alleged parallels, we have seen that they are in reality no parallels. On the other hand, if one record is based on the other, as the critics assert is the case here, we would not expect to find a great number of differences existing between these accounts. This, however, is not the case here, for as we have seen, there are many fundamental and unbridgeable differences in principle and in detail. Can it be possible that a record, which is so fundamentally different, and which has no similarities to the Cuneiform record, be based on that record? Indeed such a claim is absurd.

2. It may be stated as a fundamental principle, that in comparing myths, legends and other folklore, there exists no evolution but rather a devolution. If the Biblical account be a development of the Babylonian record,

an evolution would naturally then have taken place which would be contrary to fact and unprecedented. There is absolutely no basis for assuming that a monotheistic record should come from a polytheistic one, or that such a moral and exalted record should be derived from such a grotesque and base record as the Enuma Elish. Urquhart in his "Biblical Guide" says ⁽¹⁾ at this point: "The theory which traces the Genesis of the Bible to these traditions proceeds upon the notion that the traditions, like the waters, were purified as they ran. The riotous imaginations are supposed to have grown sober with advancing years, till, from this turbid mass of idolatrous fancies, we got the pure and simple story told in the first and second chapters of Genesis:" "But," he continues, "we have conclusive proof that this primitive record never sobered down." This he demonstrates from the account of Berossus (who wrote in the third or fourth century B.C.) in which the conflict between Bel and Tiamat is vividly described. Since Berossus wrote 1200 years later than Moses, and uses the very same material that Moses is supposed to have used, how is it that those grotesque and hideous features of the Enuma Elish are even more so in the account of Berossus? If it was impossible for Berossus to transform this polytheistic myth into a monotheistic myth in the 3rd century B.C., why was it possible for Moses to do so in the

1. New Biblical Guide Vol.1, p.164 ff.

15th century B.C.? Is it plausible to assume that a person having his mind saturated with such grotesque and polytheistic literature, could sit down and write the first chapter of Genesis, verse by verse, without divine revelation? Indeed the answer is obvious for "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" The Enuma Elish story is itself a testimony that revelation is a fact, for only thru revelation could these mysteries of the creation have been known to men.

3. The Biblical record cannot be derived from the Babylonian record because there is no suitable time in which the Hebrews could have been influenced by the Enuma Elish account. We may assume with the critics ⁽¹⁾ that the most important elements in the creation legends may date from the first half of the third millenium B.C., since there are historical inscriptions and similar references of the period of 2000 B.C. which bear a close resemblance to the Enuma Elish series. But the claim that the Babylonian record is the original, because it is older is unwarranted. The Biblical record may have existed in tradition or writing before its incorporation in the Bible.

The question thus resolves itself into an inquiry as to the periods in which the Hebrews may have come into direct or indirect contact with Babylonia. If these

1. See King, S.T. of C., p.LXXIV ff. for a complete discussion on this point.

legends are older than the Biblical record in point of time, and if, as the critics assert, the Hebrews borrowed from Babylonian mythology, what is the date that they suggest, for Babylonian influence on Hebrew literature? Here there is a diversity of opinion.

Of the critics who take a definite attitude in this matter, some suggest that the Hebrews may have acquired a knowledge of Babylonian traditions during the age of the Patriarchs, at a time when the Hebrews lived side by side with the Babylonians in Ur of the Chaldees (ca.1400 BC). According to this view Abraham heard these legends in Ur of the Chaldees and that they were then disseminated among the Hebrew people. But this theory is against Abraham's character, and it is contradictory to the entire spirit ~~of the entire spirit~~ of the Old Testament. Abraham is pictured to us as an example of sturdy faith. In Hebrews chapter 11 he is mentioned as a great hero of faith who trusted unreservedly in Jehovah. Such an assumption, therefore, that Abraham or his posterity should appropriate such polytheistic myths, and later on embody them in their religion is certainly impossible.

Others claim that these myths were introduced at the time of settlement in Canaan (ca.1200 BC). A far greater number of critics hold to this view and say that it was after their arrival in Palestine that the Hebrew patriarchs came into contact with Babylonian culture. The Tel-el-Amarna tablets have furnished the background for this view which

(1)

is expressed by Driver when he says: "Since the Tel-el-Amarna tablets have shown how strong Babylonian influence must have been in Canaan even before the migration of the Israelites, this has been thought by many to have been the channel by which Babylonian ideas penetrated into Israel. They were first according to this view naturalized among the Canaanites, and afterwards - as the Israelites came gradually to have intercourse with the Canaanites- they were transmitted to the Israelites as well". According to Clay the most important argument used by scholars to show the influence of Babylonia upon Canaan has been the fact that among the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, two Babylonian epics were found which were used as text-books, being marked for purposes of study. This, however, he shows, is no more proof of Babylonian culture in the West than the finding of French text-books in the Pacific." It would be just as easy for them to prove", he continues, (2) "that when French was studied in England and Germany for a similar purpose, the people of these lands appropriated the Marseillaise, or the legend of Jeanne d' Arc as their own, as it would be to prove that Canaan or Israel appropriated in this age the myths and legends of Babylonia for their own literature. Since a cuneiform tablet has been found by Bliss during his excavations at Lachish, critics have contended that in early times Babylonian influence must have been predominant in Canaan. But the Babylonian language was the international and com-

1) 1) Authority in Archaeology by Hogarth, p.16
2) The Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.45

mercial language at that time, and this finding of a cuneiform tablet in Canaan would be no more proof for the influence of things Babylonian upon Canaan, than the discovery of French documents at the present time in Africa, would show French influence upon the savages of Africa.

On the other hand, if Babylonian religious influence was so extensive upon Canaan, how is it that there are not Babylonian gods found in early Canaan? Could we not expect to find the name Marduk, the god that absorbed the attributes and prerogatives of the other gods, in the early literature of Canaan? But with one exception in the Amarna letters, according to Clay ⁽¹⁾ there is no mention of this made. Such is also the case with the names of the other Babylonian deities. If Babylonian influence was so predominant in Canaan at this time, we might reasonably expect to find traces of such influence. The facts at hand show that this is not the case. The relatively insignificant Babylonian influence on Canaan can be seen in the archaeological remains that have been found in numerous sites excavated at Palestine. The amount of things Babylonian is so small that Prof. Sayce says: ⁽²⁾ "The more strictly archeological evidence of Babylonian influence upon Canaan is extraordinarily scanty", and that there are "few material evidences of intercourse with Babylonia." "Until it can be shown that the people of the Western lands actually adopted or assimilated Babylonian myths or religious ideas"

1) Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites, p.37.

2) Clay, The Origin of Biblical Tradition, p.49

(1)
says Clay, "...no far-reaching conclusions, based upon the theory that when Israel entered Canaan all these ideas were a part of the mental possession of the people, can be maintained." There is absolutely no shred of evidence to suppose that the Hebrews derived their religious beliefs from Babylonia through Canaan, and that they took over the religious traditions of the land, for as Driver says: (2) "that Moses, who, if the testimony of the Pentateuch be of any value, set his face sternly and consistently against all intercourse with the Canaanites and all compromises with polytheism should have gone to Canaan for his cosmogeny, is, in the last degree, improbable."

The third period is that of the late Judaeen monarchy. (734-586 BC), at the time of Ahaz and Manasseh, when there are traces in the Old Testament of intercourse taking place between Juda and Assyria. But critics usually admit that the Hebrews even according to their own theory, had a creation-story before this time. When the Jewish exiles came to Babylon in the year 586 B.C. they were directly exposed to the religious beliefs of the Babylonians. "They had the life and civilization of their captors immediately before their eyes", says King, (3) "and it would have been only natural for the more learned among the Hebrew scribes and priests, to interest themselves in the ancient literature of their new home. And any previous familiarity with the myths of Babylon would undoubtedly have been increased by actual residence in the country." Although the Hebrews came

1) Brigin of Biblical Tradition, p.49

2) Hogarth, Authority and Archeology, p.16

3) Legends of Babylonia and Assyria, p.131f.

into contact with the religion of these people, there is no shred of evidence to prove that they ever assimilated their religious beliefs. It would be almost absurd to suppose that after God had permitted these countries to exercise judgment on Israel, and to lead them into captivity, because they had forsaken their true God and had associated themselves with the heathen gods, that they should now continue this practice by taking up these heathenish traditions. The subsequent history of Israel shows that the Jews in captivity returned to Jehovah, and as a result, rehabilitation ensued. Had this not been the case, the Lord would not have stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, the king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom that the captives be permitted to return. (1)

But aside from this fact the Babylonian traditions could not have been used in the Genesis record, since the Pentateuch, as it stands, is historical and from the time of Moses who is its real author. The radical claim of the higher critics that the Pentateuch is merely a mythical and confused account of the origin of the people and institutions of Israel, which was composed by a dozen unknown redactors out of five or more other books (J,E,D,H,P), which were written from 900-400 B.C., is subjective and self-contradictory. The Mosaic authorship has been amply established and defended by internal and external considerations, as Prof. Wilson has shown (2) and need not be taken up here.

1) See 2.Chron.36,22 and Is.44,28.

2) Cfr. Scientific Investigation of the OT, Chapter I for a complete discussion on this point.

4. The chief and supreme objection, however, that we voice in refuting the alledged theory of the dependency of the Genesis Creation-story on that of the Babylonian record is the fact that it runs counter to every relevant statement made in Scripture. The Babylonian story does not picture the Creator of man and the universe as an exalted and transcendental personal God who is omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent, as the exalted record of Genesis does. It does not picture God as Love, Righteousness, and Holiness. It does not set the true importance and value of the creation of man, and the aim and end for which man was created. In fact, belief in the Babylonian creation-story as the source of the Biblical story means a denial of the truth that Scripture is the inspired Word of God and of every doctrine which it contains.

E. The Relation Between the Genesis Record and the Enuma Elish.

From the preceding, we have seen that the two records are entirely different and that there is no real relation existing between them. Two fundamentally different records characterized by some many differences and by an absence of real parallels cannot possible share any real relation. Such an endeavor would be futile. But if we take the most liberal view and find some general similarities existing, such for example as the cosmos and mankind being brought about through the creation of a supreme being, the idea of a firmament being divided, the placement of luminaries in the heavens etc; or if we might anticipate that

later on some fragments might be found which would contain a closer resemblance to the creation of the world and its inhabitants, what would the relation^{be} between these records? As far as there would be any connection, it would have to be traced back to this, that the cuneiform legends are mythological reflections and the generations of the truths as revealed in the Old Testament. The Babylonians received this revealed information, either through contact with the believing Hebrews or from other people, and grossly perverted it. Thus we have today a multitude of conflicting accounts of the creation which are demoralized, degenerate, vague, and mythological re-echoings of the exalted, pure, distinct, yes, unique account as revealed in Scripture. In a reply to Delitzsch's "Babel und Bibel" , W. Knieschke shows ⁽¹⁾ that the Babylonians are not the only people who have such a creation-legend. He says at this point: "Man lese sich die indischen Theorien ueber die Entstehung der Welt durch (z.B. Manus Gesetzbuch); man vergleiche die der Aegypter, Griechen u.s.w.. ja man frage bei den Missionaren der Jetztzeit an und lasse sich erzaehlen von den Vorstellungen der Heidenvoelker - ueberall dieselbe oder aehnliche Mythologie. Die Babylonier haben hierin nichts vor den uebrigen Heidenvoelkern voraus. Ganz gewiss werden auch sie aus einer Urquelle geschoeppt haben. So allein erklare ich mir die Anklaenge an den biblischen Bericht: es ist ein altes Erbstaeck, unter Staub u. Geruempel verpackt, ein dunkles Bewusstsein von der einen

1) Bibel und Babel, El und Bel, p.14.

Wahrheit bei ihnen wie bei andern - rein geblieben ist die Urquelle in der Schrift."

It is interesting to note in this connection that Prof, Clay of Yale, in four elaborate works, ⁽¹⁾ sets forth an opposite view which is demoralizing to those who hold to the Babylonian priority of the Biblical record. According to this theory, Clay maintains, that the Amorites of Syria possessed a civilization older than that of Babylonia or Egypt, that Amurru was the cradle from which the Semites migrated and that from them, and not from the Babylonians, the Hebrews derived the Biblical traditions. He says at this point ⁽²⁾ that "the religious literature, including the creation and deluge stories, which Amurru and Babylonia had in common had its origin in Amurru, whence it was carried with the migrating Semites into Babylonia." His four-fold argument with which he substantiates this original and striking theory is 1) the originality of the Amorite civilization, which he claims, influenced both Egypt and Babylonia, but was not influenced by them. 2) The contention that the geographical and climatic conditions of Babylonia do not, as others have supposed, account for the origin of the accounts of the Creation, Eden and the Flood. 3) The argument from the names of deities and of persons. 4) The linguistic and stylistic considerations. While our view is not concordant with Clay's theory in all respects, his theory, nevertheless, substantially demonstrates, that these creation-legends are importations into Babylonia.

1) Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites, 1909; The Empire of the Amorites, 1919; A Hebrew Deluge-story in Cuneiform, 1922; The Origin of Biblical Tradition, 1923 -2) Same, p.60.

Archeology and history afford us some remarkable instances in which we see traits of the true, revealed religion among the peoples with whom God's chosen people came into contact. Even from the earliest times it was very possible for these people to have become acquainted with these stories of the Creation, Flood, Fall of Man etc., which had been orally handed down from generations to generations. Since we know that the patriarchs transmitted these stories to their children by word of mouth, is it not plausible to assume that the people with whom they associated also heard of these stories? Archeology furnishes us with some additional light on this subject and corroborates our claim. Barton (1) tells us that a Sargon I, who lived about 2800 B.C., conquered all Babylonia and founded a dynasty which was Semitic. These Semites who migrated into Palestine, established commercial intercourse with the Amorites. We also read (2) of a ruler of Lagash in Babylonia named Gudea who lived about 2400 B.C. He belonged to a dynasty which arose in the city of Ur and which reigned over Sumir (known in Gen.10,10 as Shinar). Since we are told in Gen.10 (the table of nations) that the descendants of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, lived closely together, and in Gen.11 that "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech", it is natural to assume that the early Babylonians could have heard of the creation story. We can point to the time of Abraham, where there was contact between Babylonia and Israel. Hammurabi, who lived about 1950 B.C. was a contemporary of Abraham, and

1) Archeology and the Bible, p.122

2) Same p.62 and p.462.

archaeology and history afford us some remarkable instances in which we see traits of the race, revealed in relation among the peoples with whom God's chosen people came into contact. Even from the earliest times it was very possible for these people to have become acquainted with these stories of the Creation, Flood, Fall of Man etc., which had been orally handed down from generation to generation. Since we know that the patriarchs transmitted these stories to their children by word of mouth, is it not plausible to assume that the people with whom they associated also heard of these stories? Archaeology furnishes us with some additional light on this subject and corroborates our claim. Sargon

(1) Sargon I, who lived about 2300 B.C., conquered all Babylonia and founded a dynasty which was destined to last for 200 years.

(2) Sargon II, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(3) Sargon III, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(4) Sargon IV, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(5) Sargon V, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(6) Sargon VI, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(7) Sargon VII, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(8) Sargon VIII, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

(9) Sargon IX, who lived about 720 B.C., was a powerful monarch who extended his empire into Asia Minor, established commercial intercourse with the Greeks, and also read the Hebrew Bible.

3) The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Truth of Genesis 11:1-9

We can point to the fact of the discovery of the Tower of Babel, which was contact between Babylonia and Israel. Sargon I lived about 2300 B.C. was a contemporary of Abraham, and

(1) Archaeology and the Bible, p. 122.
 (2) Same p. 82 and p. 122.

it is quite reasonable to assume that these Biblical stories were known at Babylonia at this time.

As examples of such heathen knowledge concerning divine revelations we may cite the following incidents. In the Book of Numbers, Chapter 24, v.19 we are told that Balak, king of Moab, who lived about 1400 B.C., met Balaam who prophesied concerning the Star of Jacob. Both Balak and Balaam, had originally come from Aram on the Euphrates (1) and through this encounter the Moabites could have learnt of Israel's religion. A like opportunity was afforded Babylonia through the contact which was established with the Israelites, when Daniel became associated with Nebuchadnezzar about 600 B.C. Egypt already in the days of Joseph and later on in Solomon's time became associated with Israel through Joseph and the Queen of Sheba, and thus through such channels, these great Biblical truths (of the origin of the world and of man) could have been known to them.

The Babylonians may also have acquired some of their beliefs from the natural knowledge that is inherent in man. We see traits of such knowledge at the time of Christ's (2) birth when the wise-men came from Babylonia or Persia to visit the Christ-child (Mt.2,20) they must have learnt and expected, as did the entire Orient, a great king who was to come from Juda, either from traditional knowledge or in some other way. Sir William Ramsay says in this connection: (3) "It is clearly implied in the tale that the

1) Numbers 22,5

2) We believe they came from there because the astrologers in Babylon and the priests in Persia were called "wise men".

3) The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of NT

wise-men had other knowledge from other sources, making them expect the coming of some special king of the Jews, whose birth was an event of universal interest to the world. There^{was} implied also a certain store of traditional knowledge and a certain expectation of the cosmic event. It was not the birth of any common king of the Jews that roused their adoration and prompted their journey. It was some special king, whose advent was looked for by them, and by all that studied history. The belief was widespread in the world at this time or earlier that the Epiphany or coming of the god in human form on earth, was imminent, in order to save the human race from the destruction which the sins of mankind had brought ^{neigh} at this time. The world was perishing in its crimes, and only the coming of God himself could save it. This belief can be observed in varied forms during the years that preceded. It prompted the Fourth Eclogue^{of Vergil}, and it is seen in the Second Ode of Homer" The Roman historian Tacitus⁽¹⁾ and Suetonius⁽²⁾ refer to the prophecy in Numbers 24 and tell of the great conviction among the Jews before the great rebellion, that a King of the Jews would come from Judaea to rule the world.⁽³⁾ Prof. Oswald Gerhardt of Berlin says concerning this tra-

- 1) Annals, V.13: "Pluribus persuasio iuerat, antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens profectique Judaea verum potirentur".
- 2) "Vesp. C.4: percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio: esse in fati ut eo tempore Judaea profecti verum potirentur." To these words the renowned French philologist, Gasonbanus, (d.1614) says: "Videtur et Tacitus et Suetonius, qui verbis iidem hoc oraculum referrunt, ipsa verbis expressiste (quibus id conceptum)".
- 3) Der Stern des Messias, p.44

ditional knowledge as follows: "Bei den Griechen bietet die Prometheussage eine gewisse Parallele zu den Erloeserhoffnungen anderer Voelker. Dem an den Felsen geschmiedeten Titanen Titanen verkundete Hermes, dass er durch das stellvertretende Leiden eines Gottes erloest werden wuerde; auch konnte Prometheus ein Orakel, das des Zeus Herrschaft durch einen Sohn Gottes gestuerzt und dann ein neues Zeitalter herbeigebracht werden wuerde. Von einem leidenden Gerechten sang Theokrit, vor allem aber entwarf Plato hiervon eine packende Schilderung, in welcher christliche Theologen viele Zuege des leidenden Gottesknechtes (Jesaias 53) wiederfanden." Plato who lived in the 5th century B.C. gives a description of a righteous man which clearly indicates that at some time or other he must have directly or indirectly made acquaintance with Isaiah's description of the "Servant of Jehovah" (Is.53).

-
- 1) Platonis Operum, Tom.VI, De Republica, Lib.II, p.214f. Par.361: τοῦτον δὲ τοιοῦτον θέντες τὸν δίκαιον παρ' αὐτὸν ἰστώμεν τῷ λόγῳ, ἄνθρωπον ἀπλοῦν καὶ γένηαίον, κατ' ἄισχύλον οὐ δοκεῖν, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἄραθον ἐθέλοντα. ἀφαιρετὸν δὲ τὸ δοκεῖν. εἰ γὰρ δόξει δίκαιος εἶναι, ἔσονται αὐτῷ τιμαὶ καὶ δωρεαὶ δοκῶντι τοιοῦτῳ εἶναι ἄδελον οὖν, εἴτε τοῦ δικαίου, εἴτε τῶν δωρεῶν τε καὶ τιμῶν ἕνεκα τοιοῦτος εἶη. γυμνωτέος δὲ πάντων πλὴν δικαιοσύνης καὶ ποιητέος ἐναντίως διακείμενος τῷ προτέρω· μηδὲν γὰρ ἀδικῶν δόξαν ἔχει τῶν μεγίστην ἀδικίας, εἴη ἢ σεβασανίσμος εἰς δικαιοσύνην τῷ μὴ τεγγεσθαι ὑπὸ κακοδοξίας καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῆς γιγνομένων, ἀλλ' ἔστω ἀμετάστατος μέχρι θανάτου, δοκῶν μὲν εἶναι ἀδίκος διὰ βίου, ὡν δὲ δίκαιος, εἴη ἀμφοτέρω εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον ἐληλυθότες, ὁ μὲν δικαιοσύνης, ὁ δὲ ἀδικίας, κρῖνόνται, ὁπότερος αὐτοῖν εὐδαιμονέστερος. Βαβαί, ἦ δ' ἐγὼ, ὦ φίλη Γλαύκων, ὡς ἐφώμενος ἑκάτερον ὡσπερ ἀνδριάντα εἰς τὴν κρίσιν ἐκκαθάρεις τοῖν ἀνδρῶν. ὧς μάλιστα, ἔφη, δύναμαι. ὄντοιν δὲ πούτοιν οὐδεὶν ἔτι, ὡς ἔραμαι, χαλεπὸν ἐπεξελθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ, οἷος ἑκάτερον βίος ἐπιμέναι. λεκτέον οὖν καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀρροικότερος λέγεται, μὴ εἰ μὴ αἶον λήρει, ὡς Σώκρατης, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπαινοῦντας πρὸ δικαιοσύνης ἀδικίαν. ἐροῦσι δὲ τάδε, ὅτι οὕτω διακείμενος ὁ δίκαιος μαστιγύσσεται, στρεβλώσεται, δέδησεται, ἐκκαυθήσεται τρωθάλμῳ, τελευτῶν πάντα κακὰ παθὼν ἀμοχινδουλεύθησεται καὶ γνώσεται, ὅτι οὐκ εἶναι δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ δοκεῖν δεῖ ἐθέλειν.

Concerning this description Dr. Luthardt of Leipzig says:
(2)

"Selbst die Vorstellung eines Selbstvertretenden Leidens fehlt, wie wir sehen, in diesen Bildern der zukuenftigen Erloesung nicht. Hiemit beruehrt sich der Gedanke vom leidenden Gerechten, als dem Traeger der hoechsten vollendeten Gerechtigkeit, welcher bei Plato einen so merkwuerdigen Ausdruck gefunden hat, dass wir unwillkuerlich an die grosse alttestamentliche Weissagung Jesaias 53 erinnert werden und die Kirchenvaeter darin prophetische Worte sahen." The infidel Rousseau ⁽¹⁾ refers this passage of Plato to the description given in Is.53. One thing is certain, and that is, that Plato must have heard something, either directly or indirectly, of the Servant of Jehovah, for such a description is above man's natural knowledge.

These many examples serve to illustrate the manner in which the pure religious stories could have been disseminated among the outside nations by the believing Jews. And just because these revealed truths of God were thus corrupted, we may justly infer, that God foresaw how His Word would be perverted and had Moses write it as a lasting memorial.

1) Emele l.IV.t.2,p.109. "Quand Platon peint le juste imaginaire couvert de tout l'opprobre du crime et digne de tous les prix de la vertu, il peint trait pour trait Jesu-Christ: la ressemblance est si frappante, que tous les peres l'ont sentie, et qu'il n'est pas possible de s'y tromper."

2) Apologetische Vortraege ueber die Grundwahrheiten des Christentums, p.179.

(1)
Chemnitz has a fine exposition on this point showing how God's Word was more and more corrupted through the ages, for which reason God had Moses put the words in writing. But before it was put down in writing the Word of God was adulterated by many within and without, from the earliest times down to the present day, and we have demonstrably seen in the example of the Babylonian "creation-story", where the divine, exalted, pure and unique, monotheistic creation-story was corrupted to such a demonalized, degenerate, and mythological account as the Enuma Elish sets forth. Out of the many conflicting accounts extant, the Babylonian record stands supreme and will remain as such in all eternity for Verbum Dei Manet In Aeternum.

* FINIS *

*

-
- 1) Examen Concilii Tridentini, Ed. by Ed. Preuss, Berlin, 1861, p. 8-9.

"Deus igitur ab initio mundi, et ante et post lapsum ex arcana sua sede, quae est lux inaccessibilis, prodiens se et voluntatem suam generi humano, dato certo verbo, et additis manifestis miraculis patefecit: utque doctrina illa divinitus patefacta, viva voce propagari, et posteritati quasi per manus tradi posset, Deus Adamum constituit, aetatis illius quasi Episcopum: quem divino testimonio, et autoritate ornatum fuisse, non est dubium, cui etiam tan longaevitam Deus concessit, ut is suo testimonio puritatem doctrinae coelestis a corruptelis vidicaret, et suos ab assaendis peregrinis opinionibus retraheret..."

He continues to show how Adam's posterity continued to corrupt this revealed knowledge so that God had Moses record it, as he says..."Ibi vero sicut antea etiam, cum traditio non conservasset depositum illud, Deus peculiaribus revelationibus, additis multis stupendis miraculis puritatem doctrinae suae per Mosen ad veteres fontes Patriarcharum revocavit: id quod scriptio libri Genesis manifeste ostendit."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites by Albert T. Clay; published by the Sunday-School Times Co. Philadelphia, 1909.
- Sumerian Epic of Paradise, The Flood, and The Fall of Man by Stephen Langdon; published by The University Museum, Philadelphia, 1915
- Die Sumerischen Parallele zur Biblischen Urgeschichte, by P. Simon Landesdorfer; Muenster, 1917. Verlag der Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung.
- Orientalischer Literatur-Zeitung; edited by Peiser, 1915 (O.L.Z.)
- Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology (PSBA)
- The Book of Genesis by S.R. Driver; 11th edition, published by Methuen & Co. Ltd. London.
- Seven Tablets of Creation by L.W. King, London; published by the Oxford University Press.
- Legends of Babylon and of Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition by L.W. King, London; published by Oxford University Press, 1918.
- Schoepfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit by Herman Gunkel, Goettingen, 1895.
- Archeology and the Bible by George A. Barton, published by the American Sunday-School Union, Philadelphia.
- The Origin of Biblical Tradition by Albert C. Clay; published by Yale University Press, New Haven, 1923.
- Bibel und Babel, El und Bel by W. Knieschke,
- Commentar ueber das Alte Testament by Carl F. Keil and Fr. Delitzsch; published by Doerffling & Franke, 1889.
- Die Assyriologie, 1914-1922 by Ernst F. Weidner, Leipzig; published by J.C. Hinrich.
- Authority and Archeology, edited by David G. Hogarth, 2. ed. Published by John Murray, London 1899.
- The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria by Robert William Rogers; published by Eaton & Mains, New York.
- Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament by R.W. Rogers, Oxford, 1912.

New Biblical Guide by Rev. John Urguhart; published by W.P. Blessing, Chicago.

Commentary on the Psalms by E.W. Hengstenberg, Vol. II, 4th Ed; published by T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1870.

A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament by Robert Dick Wilson; published by the Sunday-School Times Co. Philadelphia, 1926.

The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament by Sir W. Ramsay, 4th Ed.; published by Howder & Stoughton, London 1920.

Platonis Operum Tom. VI, De Republica;

Examen Concilii Tridentini edited by Preuss; published by J.C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1915.

Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon by Samuel P. Tregelles; published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, London.

Apologetische Vortraege ueber Grundwahrheiten des Christentums, von Dr. C. Luthardt, 8th Ed.; published by Doerffling & Franke, Leipzig, 1873.

- - - - -

- - - -

- -

-