

REPLY TO CRITICS OF THE FIRST LECTURE.

BY DR. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH.

PROCESSIONS OF THE GODS.

JENSEN would not countenance my proposition that processions of Gods are mentioned in Isaiah. We read (xliv. 20): "They have no knowledge that carry their graven image of wood, and pray unto a God that cannot help," and again (xlvi. 1): "Bel has sunk down, Nebo is bowed down, their idols are fallen to the lot of the beasts and to the cattle, the things (i. e., fabrications) that ye carried about are made a load, a burden to the weary beasts." There can be but few commentators here who do not think in connection with these passages of the Babylonian processions of the gods, in which Bel and Nebo were carried in ceremonious progress through the streets of Babel.

AARON'S BLESSING.¹

What I have said as to the significance of the phrase in the Aaronite blessing, "Yahveh lift up his countenance to thee," i. e., "turn his favor, his love, towards thee," holds good in spite of my critics. When spoken of men, "to lift the countenance to any one or to anything" means nothing more than "to look up at" (so it is used in 2 Ki. ix. 32). It is used in Job xxii. 26 (cf. xi. 15), as well as in 2 Sam. ii. 22, with reference to a man who, free from guilt and fault, can look up God and to his fellow-men. This meaning, of course, is not appropriate if the words are spoken of God. Then it must mean precisely the same thing as the Assyrian, "to raise the eyes to anyone," that is to say, to find pleasure in one, to direct one's love towards him; therefore not quite the same as to take heed of one (as in Siegfried-Stade's *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*, p. 441). If it were so, "the Lord lift up his countenance to thee" would be equivalent to "the Lord keep thee." When Jensen (*op. cit.*, col.

¹ Num. vi. 24 ff.

491) insists that the Assyrian expression is literally, not to lift up "the face," but to lift up "the eyes," he might with equal justice deny that Assyrian *bît Ammân* means the same thing as the Hebrew *bené Ammôn*. In fact, whereas the prevailing Hebrew usage is "if it be right in thine eyes," the Assyrian says in every case, "if it be right in thy countenance" (*ina pânika; cf. summa [ina] bân sarri mahir*); "eyes" and "countenance" interchange in such phrases as this.

In Hebrew we find "to lift up the eyes to one" used as equivalent to "to conceive an affection for one," only with reference to human, sensual love (Gen. xxxix. 7). The value of the Assyrian phrase, "to lift up the eyes to any one," in its bearing on the Aaronite blessing, rests in the fact that it is used with preference (though not exclusively, as Jensen thinks) of the gods who direct their love towards a favored person or some sacred spot. In reply to Jensen who claims (p. 490) that the choice of my example of the usefulness of Assyrian linguistic analogies is "a failure," I comfort myself with the thought that the recognition of our indebtedness as to a deepening of the meaning of the Aaronite blessing to cuneiform literature, was many years ago publicly endorsed by no lesser one than Franz Delitzsch.

J. Barth attacks on trivial grounds my statement that Canaan at the time of the Israelite Incursion, was a "domain completely pervaded by Babylonian culture." This fact, however, obtains ever wider recognition. Alfred Jeremias in the "*Zeitgeist*" of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, February 16, 1903, says: "Further, at the time of the immigration of the 'children of Israel,' Canaan was subject to the especial influence of Babylonian civilisation. About 1450 the Canaanites, like all the peoples of the Nearer East, wrote in the Babylonian cuneiform character, and in the Babylonian language. This fact, proved by the literature of the time, forces us to assume that the influence of Babylonian thought had been exerted for centuries previously. Of late Canaan itself seems to wish to bear witness. The excavation of an ancient Canaanite castle by Professor Sellin has brought to light an altar with Babylonian genii and trees of life, and Babylonian seals."

It may be briefly recalled here that the religion of the Canaanites with their god Tammuz, and their Asherahs, bears unmistakable marks of Babylonian influence, and that before the immigration of the children of Israel a place in the neighborhood of Jerusalem was called *Bit-Ninib* (house of Ninib), after the Babylonian god Ninib. There may have been actually in Jerusalem itself a *bît*

Ninib, a temple of the god Ninib. See *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, V., No. 183, 15, and cf. Zimmern, in the third edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, second half, p. 411. Cf. also Lecture II., p. 184.

THE SABBATH.

The vocabulary (II. R. 32, No. 1) mentions, among divers kinds of days, a *ûm nuh libbi* (l. 16, a, b), a day for the quieting of the heart (viz., of the gods), with its synonym *sa-pat-tum*, which word, in view of the frequent use of the sign *pat* for *bât* (e. g., *supat*, var. *bat*, "dwelling"; Tig. vi. 94), might be interpreted to mean *sabattum*, and on the authority of the syllabary (82, 9-18, 4159, col. 1, 24) where *UD* (Sumer. *û*) is rendered by *sa-bat-tum*, it must be so.

The statement in the syllabary not only confirms the view that the word *sabattum* means a *day*, but it may also explain the *sabattum* to be *the day par excellence*, perhaps because it is the day of the gods.

Jensen in *Z. A.* iv., 1889, pp. 274 et seq. says that *sabattu* means "appeasement (of the gods), expiation, penitential prayer," and the verb *sabātu* "to conciliate" or "to be conciliated" (Jensen in *Christliche Welt*, col. 492). But, neither from 83, 1-8, 1330, col. 1, 25, where *ZUR* is rendered *sa-bat-tim* (following immediately upon *nuhhu*), nor from IV. 8, where *TE* is rendered by *sa-bat-tim* [why not, as elsewhere, in the nominative?], may Jensen's proposition be inferred with any degree of certainty. The verb *sabātu* is hitherto only attested as a synonym of *gamâru* (V. R. 28, 14, e, f). Therefore, the only meaning that may be justifiably assumed for *sabattu* at present is "cessation (of work), keeping holiday." It seems to me that the compiler of the syllabary 83, 1-8, 1330, derived his statement *ZUR* and *TE* = *sabbatim* from the equations *UD. ZUR* and *UD. TE* = *ûm nuhhi* or *pussuhi* = *ûm sabattim*.

Accordingly, the Babylonian *sabattu* is *the day of the quieting* of the heart of the gods and *the rest day* for human work (the latter is naturally the condition of the former).

If in the well-known calendar of festivals (IV. R. 32/33) the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth days of a month are expressly characterised as days whereon every kind of labor should rest, should we not see in these days no other than the *sabattu-day*?

The mooted words in the calendar of festivals run, according to our present knowledge, thus: "The shepherd of the great na-

tions shall not eat roasted or smoked (?) meat (variant: anything touched by fire), not change his garment, not put on white raiment, not offer sacrifice." [It is doubtful whether these prohibitions are of universal application, binding also the flocks of the shepherd. Then the particular prohibitions follow]; "the King shall not mount his chariot, as ruler not pronounce judgment; the Magus shall not give oracles in a secret place [i. e., removed from profane approach], the physician shall not lay his hand on the sick, [the day being] unaudivicious for any affair whatever" (? *ana kal sibûti*; *sibûtu* here, it seems used like *שִׁבְטִי*, in Dan. vi. 18; "affair, cause").

Accordingly we must acquiesce in the fact that the Hebrew Sabbath, ultimately is rooted in a Babylonian institution. More than this was not claimed.

We need not quarrel with König who emphasises that the Israelite Sabbath received its specific consecration on account of its "humanitarian tendency towards servants, and animals."

The setting apart of the seventh day as the day in which we are to refrain from labors of any kind finds its explanation, as I showed years ago, in the fact that the number seven was in this as in other instances to the Babylonians an 'evil' number, and this is the reason why the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth days in the above-mentioned calendar are called *UD. HUL. GAL.*, i. e., evil days.

Alfred Jeremias (l. c., p. 25) aptly recalls the Talmudic story, according to which Moses arranged with Pharaoh a day of rest for his people, and when asked which he thought the most appropriate for the purpose, answered: "The seventh, dedicated to the Planet Saturn, labors done on this day will anyhow not prosper, in any case."

THE FALL.

Any one who reads without bias my comments on the cylinder seal (Fig. 47) representing a Babylonian conception of the Fall, will grant that in comparing it to the Biblical story of the Fall, that I merely proposed to emphasise the circumstance that the serpent as the corrupter of the woman was a significant feature in either version. The dress of the two Babylonian figures, naturally prevented me also from regarding the tree as the tree "of knowledge of good and evil."

It seems to me that possibly there may loom back of the Biblical story in Gen. chapters ii.-iii. another older form which knew of

one tree only in the middle of the garden, the Tree of Life. The words in ii. 9, "and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," seem to be superadded, and the narrator, quite engrossed with the newly introduced tree of knowledge, and forgetful of the tree of life inadvertently makes God allow man to eat of the tree of life which is in contradiction with iii. 22.

As to the tree, but that alone, I agree with the late C. P. Tiele who sees in the mooted Babylonian picture, "a god with his male or female worshippers partaking of the fruit of the tree of life," "a symbol of the hope of immortality," and also with Hommel, who says (p. 23): "It is most important that the original tree was obviously conceived to be a conifer, a pine or cedar with its life and procreation promoting fruits. There is, accordingly, an unmistakable allusion to the holy cedar of Eridu, the typical tree of Paradise in the Chaldæan and Babylonian legends."

Jensen (col. 488) argues as follows: "If the picture has any reference to the story of the Fall, it is likely to represent a scene in which a god forbids the first-created woman to partake of the fruit of the tree of life."

That one of the figures is distinguished by horns, the usual symbol of strength and victory (see Amos vi. 13) in Babylonia as well as in Israel, is in my opinion a very ingenious touch on the part of the artist, in order to give an unmistakable indication as to the sexes of the two clothed human figures. Those who see in the serpent behind the woman a "meandering line" or "an ornamental division," may do so if they please, but they will find few that will concur.

I do not stand alone with my opinion. Hommel, for instance, says (p. 23): "The woman and the writhing serpent behind her express themselves clearly enough"; and Jensen (col. 488): "a serpent stands or crawls behind the woman."

As to the nature of this serpent, nothing definite can be said so long as we depend upon this pictorial representation alone. We might regard it as one of the forms of Tiāmat, who, like Leviathan in Job iii. 8, and the old serpent in the Apocalypse, would be assumed to be still in existence. But this is very uncertain.

Haupt's *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, p. 119, contain a bilingual text (D. T. 67) which may deserve a passing notice in this connection: It mentions a fallen hand-maid, the "mother of sin," who being severely punished, bursts into bitter tears—"intercourse I learned, kissing I learned"—and we find her later on lying in the dust stricken by the fatal glance of the deity.

LIFE AFTER DEATH.

In the code of Hammurabi (xxvii. 34 et seq.), the sinner is cursed in the words: "May God utterly exterminate him from among the living upon earth, and debar his departed soul from the fresh water in Hades."

The last passage confirms the great antiquity of the Babylonian conception concerning the life of the pious after death.

The Book of Job which shows a close acquaintance with Babylonian views, describes the contrast in the underworld between a hot, waterless desert destined for the wicked, and a garden with fresh clear water for the pious. The passage is rendered in a philologically unobjectionable translation in my book *Das Buch Job*, Leipzig, 1902: "Cursed be their portion on earth. Not does he turn to vineyards. Desolation and also heat will despoil them. Their prayer for snow-water will not be granted. Mercy forgets him, vermin devours him; no longer is he remembered."

Thus in its right interpretation this passage forms a welcome bridge to the New Testament conception of a hot, waterless, and torture-inflicting Hell, and the garden which to the Oriental mind cannot be conceived of as lacking water, abundant, running, living water.

The concluding verse of the prophetic book of Isaiah (ch. lxvi. 24): "and they shall go forth and look with joy upon the dead bodies of those that have revolted from me: how their worm dieth not, neither is their fire quenched: and they are an abomination to all flesh," means that those whose bodies are buried in the earth will forever be gnawed by worms, and those whose bodies are burnt with fire shall forever suffer the death of fire. In two respects the passage is important: first, it shows that cremation is thought of as standing entirely on the same level with burial, and that, accordingly, not the slightest objection can be made to cremation on account of the Bible; secondly, it follows that the words, "where their worm dieth not," in Mark's account of the description of hell-fire as given by Jesus¹ should not have been admitted; they are out of place.

TIÂMAT.

Jensen (*l. c.*, p. 489) observes with reference to Tiâmat: "Berossus calls this being 'a woman,' she is the mother of the gods,' has a husband and a lover, and nowhere throughout Assyrian or

¹ Mk. ix. 44, 46, 48.

Babylonian literature is there found even the slightest hint that this creature is regarded otherwise than as a woman."

Nothing can be farther off the mark than this assertion, which contradicts not merely me, but also a fact recognised by all Assyriologists. Or is it not true that a human woman gives birth to human beings, while a lioness brings forth young lions? Therefore, a creature which gives birth to *sirmahhê*, i. e., gigantic serpents (*ittalad*, see Creation-epic, III., 24 and *passim*), must itself be a great, powerful serpent, a δράκων μέγας or some serpent-like monster. As a matter of fact, Tiâmat is represented in Babylonian art as a great serpent. (See, e. g., Cheyne's English translation of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah in Haupt's edition of the Bible, p. 206.)

I see by no means in the scene reproduced in my First Lecture (Fig. 46, p. 46) an exact portrayal of Marduk's fight with the Dragon, as described to us in the creation-epic; on the contrary, I speak expressly and cautiously of a battle between "the power of light and the power of darkness" in general.

The representation of this battle, especially of the monster Tiâmat, naturally left a wide scope to the imagination of the artist. A dragon could be represented in various ways, such as we see in Figure 44, page 44. The beast which lies at the feet of the god Marduk has since been palpably proved by the German excavations to be, as explained by me, the dragon Tiâmat. The relief of the *sirrussû* found on the Gate of Ishtar at Babylon unmistakably agrees with the figure familiar to us from our illustration.

Oettli, following Gunkel (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 29-114), practically agrees with my conclusion when he says: "There are enough references in the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament to make it obvious that the old [Babylonian] creation-myth survived in the popular conceptions of Israel, and that in a highly-colored form." And again: "There are indeed enough cases where the original mythical meaning of the monsters *Tehôm*, *Leviathân*, *Tannîn*, *Rahab*, is unmistakable."¹ Isaiah proceeds (li. 10): "Art thou not it that dried up the sea, the water of the great Tehôm, that made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?" Here the prophet actually couples "those mythical reminiscences" with the deliverance from Egypt, as another triumph of Yahveh over the waters of Tehom. And when we consider how in other passages (e. g., Ps. cvi. 9-11, lxxviii. 13) Yah-

¹ Oettli cites Job ix. 13 and Isaiah li. 9, where, moreover, "pierced" might be better than "dishonored."

veh's achievement of the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea is described and celebrated, we cannot apply to any but primæval times the words in Ps. lxxiv. 13 *sq.*: "Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters, thou didst dash to pieces the heads of the sea-monsters" (*Leviathân*). *Leviathân*, according to Job iii. 8 also, is a personification of the dark chaotic primæval waters, the sworn enemy of light.

Even König reluctantly grants (p. 27) that the Book of Job¹ "alludes, in all probability, to the conquest of the primæval ocean;" Jensen accordingly seems to stand quite alone when he says (*l. c.*, p. 490):

"Wherever the Old Testament mentions a struggle of Yahveh against serpents and crocodile-like creatures, there is no occasion to assume with Delitzsch and with a goodly number of other Assyriologists [add: also with Gunkel and most Old Testament theologians] a reference to the Babylonian myth of the struggle with Tiamat."

Oettli is right when he declares (p. 17):

"To submit the researches of Natural Science to the Biblical version of the creation is a wholly erroneous proceeding, which is the more unintelligible as the details of the second account of Genesis and many other passages in the Old Testament are quite incompatible with the first. Let us, therefore, unreservedly give to Science that which belongs to Science."

Oettli proceeds:

"But let us also give to God that which is God's; the world is a creation of God's omnipotence, which supports it as its law of life,—this the first page of Genesis tells us."

In this I can no longer concur. Our faith claims, and many passages in the Old Testament assert, that God is the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth, but this truth is certainly not stated on the first page of Genesis, where we read: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,—and the earth was waste and desolate," etc.; for this passage leaves unanswered the question, "Whence did chaos originate?" Besides, even among the Babylonians the creation of the heavens and of the earth is ascribed to the gods, and the life of all animate creatures is regarded as resting in their hands.

* * *

I will call attention to a passage in II. R. 51, 44*a*, where a canal is named after "the Serpent-god who bursts (or destroys) the house of life," apparently referring to some as yet unknown Babylonian myth. This, however, would upset Jensen's view, that

¹ "God turns not his anger, the helpers of *rahâb* brake in pieces under him" (ix. 13), and "in his power he smote the sea and in his wisdom he dashed *rahâb* to pieces" (xxvi. 12).

we may perhaps see in the two figures, two gods dwelling by the tree of life, and in the serpent, its guardian.

Zimmern¹ regards the serpent-god as ultimately identical with the chaos-monster.

ANGELS.

Cornill (*l. c.*, p. 1682), also, comes to the conclusion that "the conception of angels is genuinely Babylonian." When I spoke of guardian angels who attend on men (Ps. xci. 11 et seq., Matt. xviii. 10), I had in mind such passages as Aplâ's well-known letter of consolation to the queen-mother (K. 523). The Babylonian officer writes: "Mother of the king, my lady, be comforted (?)! Bel's and Nebo's angel of mercy attends on the king of the lands, my lord." Further the writing addressed to Esarhaddon (K. 948): "May the great gods send a guardian of salvation and life to stand by the king, my lord;" and also the words of Nabopolassar, the founder of the Chaldæan kingdom: "To lordship over land and people Marduk called me. He sent a Cherub of mercy (a tutelary god) to attend on me, and everything I undertook he sped" (see *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 10, p. 14 et seq.).

In "the Old Serpent which is the Devil and Satan" is preserved the ancient Babylonian conception of Tiâmat, the primæval enemy of the gods, while Satan, who appears several times in the later and latest books of the Old Testament, and is always the enemy of man, not of God,² owes his origin to Babylonian demonology in which we become acquainted with an *ilu limnu* or 'evil god' and a *gallû* or 'devil.'

BABYLONIAN SUPERSTITIONS IN SWEDEN.

How much Assyria intrudes into our own time can be seen from G. Hellmann's most interesting communion on the Chaldæan origin of modern superstitions about the understorms (in the *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, June, 1896, pp. 236-238), where it is proved that an ancient Babylonian belief survives even at the present day in the popular Swedish book, *Sibyllæ Prophetia*, in which a chapter entitled "Tordöns märketecken" treats of the prognostics of the weather and fertility as indicated by the thunder in the several months.

CANAANITES.

The term used by me in its usual linguistic sense (see, e. g., Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 27th ed., p. 2), has been replaced

¹ *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed., second half, p. 504 et seq.

² See Job, ch. i. et seq., 1 Chron. xxi. 1, Zech. iii. 1 et seq.

in later editions by "North Semites," simply because the name was frequently misunderstood. That the kings of the first Babylonian dynasty, *Sumu-abi* and his successors, do not belong to that Semitic stock of Babylonian Semites who had become fused with the Sumerians, but rather to later immigrants, is proved by the ancient Babylonian scholars, for they deemed the names of the two kings *Hammurabi* (also *Ammurabi*) and *Ammisadûga* (or *Ammizadûga*) to be foreign and stand in need of explanation, rendering the former by *Kimta-rapastum*, "wide-spread family" (cf. 𒊕𒍪𒍪𒍪, Rehoboam), and the latter by *Kimtum-kêttum*, "upright family" (VR. 44, 21, 22, a, b). The replacement of the *y* (in 𒊕𒍪, people, family) by *h* in the name *Hammurabi* shows that these Semites, unlike the older stock that had been settled for centuries in Babylonia, still pronounced the *y* as an *y*. Further, their pronunciation of *sh* as an *s*,¹ no less than the preformative of the third person of the perfect tense with *ia* (not *i*²), proves that these Semitic tribes were quite distinct, which fact, first stated by Hommel and Winckler, is and remains true, in spite of Jensen's opposition (*l. c.*, p. 491). Linguistic and historical considerations make it more than probable that these immigrant Semites belonged to the Northern Semites and are most closely affiliated with the linguistically so-called "Canaanites" (i. e., the Phœnicians, Moabites, Hebrews, etc.). The knowledge of this we owe to the acumen of Hugo Winckler (see his *Geschichte Israels*), who thereby made a particularly important addition to his many other merits. The *na* of *ilûna* (in *Samsu ilûna*), which is alleged to mean "our God," is not sufficient to prove tribal relationship with Arabia, since, in view of the names *Ammi-zadûga*, *Ammi-ditana*, it is at least equally probable that *ilûna* represents an adjective.³ However, *zadûg*, "righteous," may indicate a "Canaanite" dialect, both lexically⁴ and phonetically;⁵ and the same may be said, too, of such personal names as *Ya-sû-ub-ilu* belonging to the same age.⁶ Will Jensen be able ever to produce an unobjectionable explanation from the Babylonian language of such names as *Yasûb-ilu*?

¹ *Samsu* in *Sa-am-su-ilûna* (cf. also *Samu-abi*) as contrasted with the older Babylonian *Shamshu*.

² In the personal names of that age *Yamlik-ilu*, *Yarbi-ilu*, *Yak-bani-ilu*, etc.

³ Note the personal name *I-lu-na* in Meissner's *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht*, No. 4; cf. 𒊕𒍪𒍪?

⁴ *Zadûg* must be the Hebrew 𐤆𐤃𐤂; for the verbal stem, compare *saduk*, "he is righteous," in the Amarna tablets.

⁵ The vowel *â* is obscured to *ô*, *û*; e. g., in *anûki*, signifying the pronoun "I" in the Amarna tablets, etc.

⁶ Cf. Phœn. *Ba-'a-al-ia-sû-bu*, VR, 2, 84.