Adrahasis and Parnapištim.

By Morris Jastrow jr.

I

In *The Independent* (New-York) of February 10th and 17th 1898 I published two articles on *The New Version of the Babylonian Account of the Deluge*, the discovery of which we owe to the indefatigable Father SCHEIL.¹⁾ My study of this new version led me to certain conclusions regarding its relationship to the tale incorporated in the Gilgamesh epic that, I venture to hope, will be of interest to Assyriologists in general; and inasmuch as *The Independent* is a journal of a popular character and not likely to reach specialists, it may be of some use to indicate in the *Zeitschrift* the main points of the article together with some additional observations.

That SCHEIL's tablet contains an account of a deluge and that this account is sufficiently similar to the narrative in the Gilgamesh epic to be called a 'version', may be regarded as certain. But the chief value of the new version lies in the possibility that it affords us of separating the component parts of the story as given in the Gilgamesh

1) The first communication on the subject was made by SCHEIL at the 11th oriental congress held in Paris 1897. See also SCHEIL's articles in (1) *The Independent* Jan 13th 1898, (2) *Revue des Religions* 1897, and (3) *Recueil des Travaux* Vol XX, pp. 55—59: *Notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie assyriennes* No. XXX.

epic. It is quite evident that the tale now forming the 11th tablet of the great epic had no original connection with Gilgamesh. The hero of the Deluge is Parnapištim or Adraḥasis — a personage totally different from the warrior Gilgamesh; nor has Gilgamesh anything to do with Parnapištim. One can remove the deluge episode from the Gilgamesh epic without disturbing the narrative of Gilgamesh's career. Gilgamesh, stricken with disease through the instrumentality of Ištar and fearing lest death may overtake him as it overtook Eabani, seeks to learn from Parnapištim the secret of immortal life. Not only does he fail of this purpose, but Parnapištim has in reality no secret to communicate. He merely tells a story of a great Deluge from which he and his family escaped through the intervention of Ea — the god of humanity. True, at the close of the tablet, Parnapištim tells Gilgamesh of a magic plant that has the power of restoring old age to youth, but this section of the tablet is quite independent of the Deluge story. The 'magic plant' is a bit of folklore too common to be particularly associated with Parnapištim; and there is no apparent reason why he should know of this plant, since his preservation is not due to this plant, but to a direct intervention of the gods. One can imagine Gilgamesh, who wanders about in search of healing for disease, hearing through some source of the existence of this magic plant so that that part of the tablet, in which he gives an account of the dangerous districts through which he passed before he finds the plant, may belong to the narrative of his career, but Parnapištim is a personage that can be dispensed with, so far as Gilgamesh is concerned.

The Gilgamesh epic is a composite production in which a variety of originally independent tales have been incorporated and artificially brought into connection with Gilgamesh. Thus the Eabani episode is another tale that once had an existence independent of Gilgamesh. Theo-

logical motives have also influenced the composition. The Deluge story is introduced as an illustration of the impossibility for mortals to attain immortality. The exception proves the rule. In the twelfth tablet of the Epic the doctrine is preached that mortals may not even learn the secret of death and of the life hereafter. For a further exposition of this view, I may be permitted to refer to the chapter on "The Gilgamesh Epic" in my *Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians* (p. 467 ff.), and to a forthcoming article in the *American Journal of Theology* on "Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature".

The series to which the new version of the Babylonian Deluge story belongs is certainly not the Gilgamesh epic, — a circumstance that may be set down as an additional proof that the story is quite independent of Gilgamesh. As an independent story it may have found a place, or been incorporated, in various literary productions; but if we examine the tale more closely as embodied in the Gilgamesh epic, distinct traces will be found pointing to the composite character also of this tale. In the first place our suspicions are aroused by the existence of two names for the hero, — Parnapistim and Adraḥasis. ZIMMERN already suggested in his *Babylonische Busspsalmen*¹⁾ that these two personages were originally distinct. The two names, it will be observed, have nothing in common, the one signifying "source — of life" (or 'offspring of life'), the other "very pious". Secondly the tale begins with the mention of a single city, Šurippak — the home of Parnapistim — and it is clear that it was the destruction of this city alone that was planned by the gods. Without any apparent reason the catastrophe assumes larger dimensions and all mankind is involved. Again in the course of the narrative, the god Enlil — the Bel of Nippur — appears particularly enraged, whereas the other gods play no

1) P. 26 note 1.

active part whatsoever. They are as thoroughly alarmed at the Deluge, as are the children of men.

The problem involved in these features of the story finds a ready solution, if we separate the story into two parts, originally independent of one another — a local tale embodying the recollection of the sudden destruction of a particular city, and a nature myth embodying in poetic form the annual phenomenon witnessed in the Euphrates Valley prior to the perfection of its canal systems, when in consequence of the winter storms and rains the whole valley used to be submerged. It is the same myth substantially that we meet with again in both the Babylonian and the Biblical cosmology. The *primaeval* chaos, when "the waters covered everything", was suggested by the appearance of the Euphrates Valley in the spring. Neither in the first chapter of Genesis, nor in the Babylonian creation "epic" are we told that the land was created. The dry land 'appears' after the waters are gathered together and confined within definite limits. The older Bel (like the later Ramman) is a god of storms; hence it is he who brings about the general destruction referred to in the Deluge narrative. But Bel's particular domain is the earth, whereas Ea controls the deep. We can thus understand the opposition between Bel and Ea, which crops out in the course of the narrative. This opposition likewise belongs properly to the nature myth. The god who appears in the local tale is also Ea, but it is the god in his role as the saviour and protector of mankind, such as we find him constantly in the incantation literature. A tale of the destruction of a single city is an exceedingly common one among ancient nations; and the escape of certain favoured individuals is frequently a feature of such tales. We have such a tale in the narrative of the destruction of Sodom, and it is sufficient to recall here similar tales of the destruction of cities current among the ancient Arabs.

The question now arises: can we still distinguish, to which tale Parnapištim belongs and to which Adraḥasis belongs? SCHEIL's tablet taken in connection with Berosus' account of the Babylonian Deluge as preserved by Eusebius¹⁾ enables us to answer this question. SCHEIL found his tablet at Abu Habba — the ancient Sippara. It is precisely this city, which is introduced in the narrative of Berosus; and the only name given to the hero in Berosus' version is Xisuthros, the identity of which name with Adraḥasis admits of no doubt. It is in Sippara that Xisuthros by command of the gods buries the tablets containing the wisdom of mankind, and it is to Sippara that Xisuthros returns after the Deluge has passed away. We may reasonably conclude that there was a version of the Deluge closely associated with Sippara, and it is a further reasonable inference that SCHEIL's tablet found at Sippara gives us this version. The name that clearly appears in SCHEIL's fragment is Xisuthros or as it is here written *Ad-ra-am-ḫa-si-is*. True, SCHEIL also proposes to see the trace of the other name in his tablet, but the restitution that he proposes is exceedingly doubtful. At the end of one of the lines in the seventh column there appears the sign *pi*. SCHEIL thinks that he can detect traces of a sign *ir* after *pi*, but so expert a reader of tablets as Mr. T. G. PINCHES, who examined the tablet in Paris, was unwilling to accept SCHEIL's opinion; and Professor HOMMEL likewise expressed grave doubts. Given *pi-ir*, SCHEIL proposes the further restitution of *napištim*. The proceeding is all the more precarious inasmuch as SCHEIL is unable to make any sense of the line in question. The word preceding *pi* is *tarkulle* — an obscure term, that SCHEIL renders "oar", but which appears to me to designate "mischievous forces"²⁾ of some kind. The term occurs also in the other

1) CORV's *Ancient Fragments* pp. 60 seq.

2) See my *Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians* p. 500.

version of the Deluge, and taking into consideration the connection in which the term occurs there, a study of SCHEIL's tablet has led me to the conclusion that the passage in question contains a description of the terrors of the storm and which Ea (who is speaking) hopes will never come again. According to SCHEIL it would contain a reference to the building of the ship by command of Ea, but the context is strongly against such a supposition. Another objection against SCHEIL's reading Pirnapištim, is the absence of the determinative for proper names before *pi*. This determinative it is true might be omitted, but a distinct trace of it is to be seen in the line furnishing the name Adraḥasis, while in the Gilgamesh epic, this determinative is never wanting, neither before Parnapištim nor before Adraḥasis. Rejecting SCHEIL's proposition, there is no reason for setting aside DELITZSCH's reading Parnapištim proposed by him in *Wo lag das Paradies* p. 149 and adopted by HAUPT (in the forthcoming third edition of SCHRADER's K.A.T.), though the possibility of a reading Pirnapištim (so already ZIMMERN, *Babylonische Busspsalmen* p. 26 note 1) may of course be admitted.

If then the tablet found by SCHEIL contains the version which was transmitted by Berosus, there is every reason to believe that it contained only one name for the hero of the story. At all events, since in Berosus' account the name of Parnapištim does not occur, we are certainly justified in concluding that in the source, whence Berosus drew his information, no such name appeared. A version, therefore, existed, in which the hero of the Deluge was Xisuthros or Adraḥasis. Moreover, in Berosus' account no mention of Šurippak is made, or of any other city that was destroyed. The destruction is universal. What Berosus therefore furnishes, is the larger nature myth — not the local tale. In the Gilgamesh epic, both stories have been incorporated, and the combination of the local tale with the nature myth has been brought about

in such a way as to make it appear that Parnapištim and Adraḥasis are one and the same person and that, while the gods decided only upon the overthrow of a single city, Bel causes of his own accord the storm to assume the larger dimensions of a Deluge, involving the destruction of all mankind. Parnapištim being expressly designated as the "man of Šurippak", it follows that he is the hero of the local tale, whereas Adraḥasis belongs to the nature myth.

II

Through this proposed separation, the relationship of the Babylonian Deluge to the Biblical narrative is also set in a clearer light. It is interesting to note that, as ascertained by modern Biblical criticism, the Genesis tale is also a composite production due to the dovetailing of two versions that once had an existence independent of one another — the so-called Jahwistic and Elohist documents. The analogy thus presented by the literary processes in Babylonia to those in vogue among the Hebrews is not without importance. In the Biblical narrative, however, we have only a single tale — the nature myth suggested by the annual floods in the Euphrates Valley; and we likewise have only a single name for the hero — Noah. There is no trace in either the Jahwistic or Elohist version of a local tale. The Biblical story, accordingly, even in its composite form is to be compared with the Sippara version as represented by Berossus and by Schen's tablet, and Noah is the Hebrew counter part to Adraḥasis and not to Parnapištim. While there is no connection etymologically between these two names — Noah and Adraḥasis — in the description given of Noah, there is still to be seen a trace of some ultimate connection between him and Adraḥasis. In the ninth verse of Genesis VI Noah is spoken of as *אִישׁ צַדִּיק תָּמִים בְּדֹרֹתָיו*. The ordinary translation, "Noah was a man just and perfect in his generation",

is not justified by the Hebrew text which has no conjunction between *ṣaddiḳ* and *tamîm*. The two words must be taken together as a compound term. The expression occurs only once again in the Old Testament, viz. Job 12, 4, where Job refers to himself as a *ṣaddiḳ-tamîm*. The word *ṣaddiḳ* is the Hebrew equivalent to our English 'saint', and *tamîm* indicates the high quality of Noah's and Job's piety. Both are appropriately termed "perfectly just", "veritable saints". Still the expression is somewhat unusual, and it is not surprising that so ancient a version as the Septuagint should have found it necessary to insert a conjunction between the two substantives. If, however, it can be shown that *ṣaddiḳ-tamîm* is an old term that has survived from an early form of the narrative, the unusual character of the combination can be accounted for. Now, it can hardly be accidental that Adraḥasis forms a perfect parallel to *ṣaddiḳ-tamîm*. The second element *ḥasis* means not only 'wise', but as HAUPT already suggested 'pious'. The association of ideas is the same that we find among the Hebrews, where the wise man is also the pious, the god-fearing man.¹⁾ It is therefore the equivalent to *ṣaddiḳ*. As for *adra*, it gives precisely the same force to *ḥasis* that *tamîm* does to *ṣaddiḳ*. Both terms accordingly mean the same thing — 'very — pious', and the one may well be the translation of the other. The combination of such a term as *adra* with some substantive, being not infrequent in Babylonian, while the Hebrew expression is unusual, the presumption is in favor of taking the latter as dependent upon the former — the Hebrew as a translation from the Babylonian. Can we on this supposition account for the inversion *ṣaddiḳ-tamîm* instead of *tamîm-ṣaddiḳ*, which on the assumption of a translation from Adraḥasis is the form that we would have a right to expect? This question also, I venture to answer in the affirmative.

1) *Proverbs* 14, 16. ,

The divergence between the form given to the hero of the Deluge of Berosus and the name that appears twice in the Gilgamesh epic and now in SCHEIL's tablet, has not escaped the notice of scholars. Among the various solutions proposed to account for the transformation of Adrahasis to Xisuthros, the most satisfactory is the one, first advocated (I believe) by JULES OPPERT, which referred Xisuthros to an inverted Babylonian form *Ḫasisadra*. On this supposition the addition of a single *s* is all that would be required to make *Xisus* a perfect equivalent to *Ḫasis*, while the second element *'thros* comes as close to *adra* as can be expected, the final *os* being the Greek ending attached to the name.¹⁾ While such inversions are not infrequent in Babylonian,²⁾ (however they may be accounted for) still as long as the inverted form *Ḫasis-adra* is not met with, an element of doubt is attached to OPPERT's conjecture. The curious writing of the name in SCHEIL's tablet, *ad-ra-am-ḫa-si-is* is, I believe, an indication of the actual occurrence of the inverted form. The *m*, as is well known, may be attached to nouns used independently, or to the second of two nouns in close relationship to one another. The addition of the *m* to *adra* and not to *ḫasis* is suspicious. If however the words be inverted, we obtain the compound *Ḫa-si-is-ad-ra-am*, in which case the *m* would be perfectly in place. The subscript to SCHEIL's tablet (dated in the reign of Ammi-zaduka) states that it is a copy from an older tablet. In view of this the conjecture may be ventured that in the original the name appeared in the form *Ḫasiadram*, and that for some reason or other the copyist inverted the name, but in doing so omitted to drop the syllable *am*. A name like "very pious" is clearly not a genuine proper name, but a more or less fanciful

1) Can, however, this *s* be the letter that is missing in the first part of the name?

2) The two best known examples are *Bil-gi* and *Gibil*, *zu-ap* and *apsû*.

or allegorical designation — an *epitheton ornans* — appropriately attributed to one who merited the distinction of being the favorite of a deity. As a mere appellative, it would make comparatively little difference, whether the hero was designated as Ḥasisadra or Adraḥasis 'pious exceedingly', or 'exceedingly pious'.¹⁾ There is every reason to believe that both forms were used, but that in later times Adraḥasis became the more common one. Berosus' account being derived from a version current in Sippara points to the form Ḥasisadra as the one occurring in this version, and it may well be therefore that the original, to which SCHÉIL's copy reverts, was identical with the source of Berosus' narrative. The name Noah may represent the Hebrew contribution to the old tale, though the sense of 'pacification', attached to it, reminds one of the use of the Babylonian term *nuḫ* in such a phrase as *nuḫ-libbi*. Coming back for a moment to the composite tale in the Gilgamesh epic, we may now ascribe to the nature myth all that part of it, which deals with the general destruction — the storm of seven days, the escape of the hero and his family, the anger of Bel, and the final reconciliation. In these episodes, Parnapištim has assumed the role originally taken by Ḥasisadram or Adraḥasis. Of the local tale nothing remains but the bare outlines, the decision of the gods to destroy Šurippak and the escape of Parnapištim and his family. This tale reminds one, as already suggested, of such a story as the overthrow of Sodom. Parnapištim is a kind of Babylonian counterpart to Lot. The introduction of the wife of the hero may also be peculiar to the local tale. Noah's wife plays no part in the Biblical narrative of the Deluge, whereas Lot's wife is an important factor in the Sodom story; and similarly Parnapištim's wife comes in for express mention in the very important

1) The case is different with *Parnapištim*, where the inversion would distort the meaning of the name.

last act of the drama — the 'translation' of the couple to the gods. The building of the boat may be an element common to both the local tale and the nature myth. On the assumption that Šurippak was destroyed by some severe storm, a further motive would be found for combining the local tale with the nature myth; and if Parnapis-tim and Adraḥasis are both saved by taking refuge on a ship, the intervention of Ea in both instances would be accounted for, with this difference however, that in the nature myth Ea appears as the master of the deep — the principal rival of Bel, whereas in the local tale, Ea is introduced as the general protector of mankind without any reference to Bel's domain and functions.

III

How a tale of a local catastrophe can be combined with so large an episode as a general destruction of mankind is illustrated by the story of Sodom. PIETSCHMANN,¹⁾ following EWALD, has pointed out the force of such an expression, "and there was no man on earth" (Gen. 19, 34), occurring in the narrative, and which points to a universal destruction. Instead, however, of drawing the conclusion, as PIETSCHMANN does, that a version existed, according to which the destruction of Sodom involved the disappearance of all mankind, it is more plausible to assume in view of the example furnished by the growth of the Babylonian Deluge narrative that the tale of the local catastrophe was combined at one time with a general destruction of the present form of the Genesis narrative. Lastly, I should like in this connection to call attention to a parallel between Noah and Adraḥasis, which so far as I can see has been overlooked.

In Berosus' account, the hero, when asked whither he was to sail on the ship, replies: "To the gods".²⁾ In other

1) *Geschichte der Phönizier* p. 115.

2) CORY's *Ancient Fragments* p. 61.

words, Adraḥasis is 'translated'. Precisely the same is told of Noah, for this is evidently the force of the phrase, which closes the 9th verse of chapter VI.¹) It is the same phrase which is used of Enoch (Genesis 5, 24), and there is no reason for assigning a different meaning to the phrase in the case of Noah than the one which it admittedly has in the case of Enoch. I therefore propose to render the 9th verse of Genesis VI as follows:

"Noah was a perfect saint in his days —
he was translated to the gods."

The latter phrase is a survival of the 'mythological' period of the Hebrews. The use of the plural (Elohim) is significant, but intelligible on the assumption of a great antiquity for the phrase in question.

In the Gilgamesh epic, Parnapištim and his wife are placed among the gods by the express command of the conciliated Bel:

"Hitherto Parnapištim was human,
But now Parnapištim and his wife shall be gods
like us".

Parnapištim again assumes the role of Adraḥasis, but the express introduction of Parnapištim's wife cannot be accidental. In the local tale, of which Parnapištim was the hero, the wife must have played a part, as Lot's wife does in the narrative of Sodom's overthrow. Exactly what that part was, we have no means of ascertaining, but certainly the translation of the two seems a forced episode. The hero alone is the favorite of the gods. The translation is appropriate in the case of Adraḥasis as an "exceedingly pious" man, who was so superior to the rest of mankind that he was singled out for a marvelous escape from a catastrophe, which involved the destruction of entire mankind, but is hardly appropriate in the case of Parnapištim

¹) אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְחַלְּקָה־נָם

and his wife, who are saved by the intervention of Ea from the fate that overtook the inhabitants of Šuppirak only. As a matter of fact, Parnapištim and his wife do not dwell with the gods, but 'at the confluence of streams'.

To sum up, then, through SCHÉIL's tablet we are enabled to carry the analysis of the deluge in the Gilgamesh epic several steps further. Separating the two elements, the local tale and the nature myth, Parnapištim appears as the hero of the local tale, Ḫasisadra or Adraḫasis as the hero of the nature myth. Through the combination of the two tales, Parnapištim and Adraḫasis have been thrown together, and the former assumes the role that of right belongs to the latter. While it is no longer possible to reconstruct the local tale, the general course of the nature myth is clear. The two tales may have had some features in common (such as the building of the boat), but the 'translation' episode belongs properly to Adraḫasis, who has his counterpart in the Biblical Noah. Parnapištim and his wife remind us rather of Lot and his wife.

If the explanation above offered for *Ṣaddik-tamim* be accepted, the direct dependence of the Biblical narrative upon the Babylonian tradition is of course selfevident; but the points of disagreement between the Biblical story in its present form and the two Babylonian versions (so far as they are known to us) are still sufficient to warrant the conclusion, that the Hebrews must have received their tale at a very early stage of their career, at a period when they were still in a position to transform mythological tales and ancient traditions by introducing features which bear the stamp peculiar to the Hebrew mind, and which are due to conditions that prevailed among the Hebrews. The Gilgamesh epic we may fairly assume was completed by 1500 B.C. Had the Hebrews borrowed the Deluge story direct from the Babylonians subsequent to this period, they would have embodied at least some of

the elements of the tale peculiar to the Gilgamesh epic. The fact that the Biblical tale has an independent place in the Hebrew traditions, as comprised in the early chapters of Genesis, added to the fact, that the Genesis tale bears a greater resemblance to the account of Berosus — clearly an older version than the one in the Gilgamesh epic — strengthens the view, which is gaining adherents, that the Hebrews carried the story in some form with them, when they first crossed the Jordan.