

have been published at 'Rosel,' Wimbledon, S.W., for the use of officers and others (1d. each). Their titles are (1) *The Greatest of all Mistakes*; (2) *Undoubtedly He is Coming Again*; (3) *The Supreme Moment of a Lifetime*; (4) *The Inevitable Separation*; (5) *Is Real Peace Possible?*

You Can—that is the title of 'A Collection of Brief Talks on the most Important Topic in the World—Your Success' (Simpkin; 2s. net). The talker is Mr. George Matthew Adams. Success is the making of money. But it should be made honestly. There *are* other things in the world besides money, though they do not count for success; so money should be made quickly and cleverly, but honestly. One way to get on is to 'kick to grow.' Let us quote that chapter; it will stand for the whole book:

KICK.

Kick to Grow.

But Kick ahead and not behind. Kick to get Something and to get Somewhere. Kick to a good purpose. For to rightly Kick is to be Somebody.

Kick to Grow.

France Kicked itself into the French Revolution and cleared the Political map of Europe for centuries to come; Wendell Phillips Kicked against human Slavery and helped free a Race; Disraeli Kicked against a great horde of Kickers and it landed him Prime Minister of England. History favours Kickers.

Kick to Grow.

Kick with a Smile on your Face and Determination in your Heart. For the Kicking Business fares badly with Bitterness and Revenge taking tickets at the Gate. Kick the hardest against your own Faults and Defects. Also, Kick against everything useless—Time wasting, cheap Gossip, aimless People—Habits that sap away your Power.

Kick to Grow.

Kick for recognition when you have real Worth to show. Kick for Knowledge. Kick for Principle. Kick for a place on which to stand squarely and honestly. But in all your Kicking, remember that the Kicking is the Means and not the End. And after you have Kicked your Kick—pass on, and achieve your Task.

Kick to Grow.

The Garden of Eden and the Fall of Man according to the Sumerians.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAVCE, D.LITT., LL.D., D.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

A VERY important volume has just been added to the publications of the University of Pennsylvania. This is Dr. Langdon's account of his discovery of the early Sumerian legend of Paradise and the Fall of Man which he found among the cuneiform tablets from Nippur of the Abrahamic age now in the Museum of Philadelphia.¹ The book contains a copy of the text, together with its transliteration and translation, an interesting introduction in which the legend is compared with the South Babylonian legend of Adamu on the same subject, and full indices. A portion of the tablet was discovered and copied by Dr. Langdon in 1912, and

¹ *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man*. By Stephen Langdon, University Museum, Philadelphia, 1915.

a paper upon it was read by him before the Society of Biblical Archæology in the following year.

The legend is in Sumerian, and there is no Semitic translation to assist the decipherer. Only those who know what this means, and how abominably bad, moreover, is the cursive cuneiform script of the Khammurabi period, can fully appreciate the learning and scholarship which have surmounted the difficulties of translation and made the long story intelligible. Much, of course, still remains to be done; the intricacies of the Sumerian language are still imperfectly known, and there are many words and sentences the exact signification of which must at present remain doubtful. Indeed, I am afraid that the ordinary reader will regard the

whole legend as it appears in the translation as nothing but a nightmare of incoherencies and will wonder whether the old Sumerian scribes had any idea of what we mean by sense and reason.

This is in large measure due to Dr. Langdon not having divested himself of his original belief that the legend had to do with the Deluge. The fragment of the tablet he had copied, and which he showed to me at Oxford, referred to the land being covered by water as well as to a boat, and it was therefore natural that we should have thought we had a Sumerian version of the Deluge before us. Now that the whole tablet has been substantially recovered, it is evident that it contains nothing of the sort. Along with the Deluge must go the explanation of the name of the hero as the equivalent of the Semitic Noah. The explanation which was due to a suggestion of my own, has been practically withdrawn by Dr. Langdon, and in this he is unquestionably right. Tagtug, as the name is provisionally (but certainly wrongly) transcribed, is a gardener who appears only in the latter part of the story, and may possibly be mentioned in a list of deities published by the British Museum (in *Cuneiform Texts*, xxv. 27, iii. 4, where the pronunciation of the name is stated to be *Ziz*).

The legend begins with an account of the creation of the Sumerian Paradise in the land of Dilmun, which Dr. Langdon is certainly correct in placing to the south-east of Babylonia. Its situation was thus the same as that of the Biblical Garden of Eden which was similarly at the eastern end of the Babylonian plain, where it was washed by the ocean-river. But the ocean-river was salt; hence the soil of Dilmun had to be inundated or 'washed' by the four rivers which flowed into—or, as the Sumerians said, out of—the ocean-river, the modern Persian Gulf, before it could be transformed into a garden, and become a *gan*, or 'enclosure,' for mankind. Hence Ea or Ki-en and the mother-goddess undertook to irrigate it, and accordingly 'Nin-kharsag inundated the fields,' which 'received the waters of Ea.' This is in strict accordance with the Biblical statement which tells us (Gn 2⁵⁻⁶) how, before Paradise became fit for human habitation, it was watered by means of the *êdh*, or 'inundation.' *Edh* is the Babylonian *êdu*, the technical term borrowed from the Sumerian *êdê*, which signified 'the inundation' of Ea, and included both the tidal wash of the Persian

Gulf, and more especially the annual inundation of the ground by the rivers which flowed into the Gulf. It was to this annual inundation that the Babylonian delta owed its fertility, and the salt pool of Dilmun became a well of pure water. For nine months long the inundation was spread over the land, as is still the case in Southern Babylonia wherever the canals are kept in order, and everything was thus made ready for the creation of a garden, and the appearance of a gardener. It was this part of the tablet, divorced from its context, which led Dr. Langdon and myself to believe that there was a reference to the Flood, though we ought to have noticed that nothing was said about rain.

The mother-goddess now comes forward to beget vegetation, which (or something like it) must be the signification of the word *ya-lum*, a compound of *ya*, 'juice,' at the end of the second column. It appropriately covered 'the river-bank.' The passage which follows is with our present imperfect knowledge of Sumerian extremely difficult to interpret. The goddess's 'angel,' we are told, summoned certain 'divine anointed ones, and 'she did not repudiate'—so I should translate the Sumerian word, 'the saintly sons of men.' But we are not told where either of the two came from, unless 'the sons of men' are included in the *ya-lum* begotten by the goddess, and the following lines in which mention is made of 'my king' who 'sets his foot' upon a river-boat, yield at present but little sense. If I am right in my interpretation of the second column of the Reverse, 'my king' would be the god Ea. The line which Dr. Langdon translates with a query, 'Doubly he caulked the ship; torches he lighted,' I should render: 'he lighted the censer, he purified with fire,' and in the following line we should read: 'Ea inundated the fields.'

After the creation of vegetation, Tagtug, 'the gardener,' appears upon the scene. The ideograph of divinity attached to his name would seem to indicate that he was one of 'the divine anointed ones.' Ea now sits as king in the temple of Dilmun, and receives from Tagtug the fruits of the garden (cf. Gn 2¹²). Meanwhile the mother-goddess causes various plants to grow, assigning 'destinies' to each class of them, six classes being good for food, a seventh class only being poisonous (see Gn 2¹⁶⁻¹⁷). Here it seems to me that Dr. Langdon has overlooked what the sense demands

should be the subjects of the verbs. In Rev 2² it must be: 'My king (*i.e.* Ea who had already seated himself as king in the temple) said of the woody plants,' and in line 34 the subject is, not 'my king' as supplied by Dr. Langdon, but the erring mortal, whoever he was, who ate the poisonous plant and thereby brought death into the world.¹ That he should have done so was really the fault of Ea, as in the legend of Adamu: Ea had bidden the man eat of it, not knowing, apparently, that the goddess had put a ban upon the plant in her heart. 'The vision of life when he dies he shall not see,' she exclaims, while the spirits of the underworld sit down to weep, and the goddess goes to the god Ellil in anger to ask how Ea could thus have led man astray. As a result man ceases to be immortal and divine, and becomes a twofold being, man and wife, each the common offspring of the mother-goddess. Ellil now intervenes, and seven deities are appointed to provide man with the necessities of existence, for, it would seem, the lotos-eating life of Paradise is no longer to be his. The first of them presides over agriculture, the second over Magan or Northern Arabia, with its population of nomad herdsmen, the following five look after the health and needs of the individual, while the seventh is to be lord of Dilmun.

In his introduction Dr. Langdon has poured out of his abundant stores of learning a wealth of material from both Sumerian and classical sources which illustrates the legend he has discovered.

¹ It should be noticed that in the Biblical account of Paradise the name of the man is not given. He is always 'the man,' except in Gn 3²¹, which seems to be a marginal gloss.

As he points out, this latter is the legend of Nippur or Northern Babylonia in contradistinction to the story of Adamu, which was the Southern Babylonian attempt to explain how death entered the world. Dr. Langdon still reads the latter name as 'Adapa,' but the Hittite legend of Adamu and Sargon, written in the literary Assyrian of Boghaz-Keui, which I am publishing in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, has now verified my transcription of it. The introduction is full of valuable facts and suggestions, though naturally on several points there will be differences of opinion among scholars. What my own view is of the antediluvian genealogies of Genesis and their relation to the list of Berossos will be seen from what I have written on the subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES some years ago (June 1911, pp. 429-430). Dr. Langdon has apparently not noticed that both in Genesis and in Berossos the first two names are later additions to the original lists which began with Enos and its synonym Amelon, and that Cain or Cainan with its Babylonian synonym Ammenon, 'the artizan,' was necessarily the representative of the civilized population of Babylonia. This population was agricultural as well as industrial in opposition to the nomad Sutu, whose representative was known under the varying forms of Abel and Jaba. Nor can I see any reason for doubting Professor Hommel's explanation of the name Amempsinos as Amel-Sin, 'the man of the moon-god,' since Amempsinos is the correspondent of Methuselah and Methusael in the Biblical lists, and these are certainly the Babylonian Mutu-sa-arkhi, 'the man of the moon-god' and Mutu-sa-ili, 'the man of the god.'

Contributions and Comments.

Psalm cxvi. 1.

'I WILL lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.'

This verse has long been a *crux interpretum*. The difficulty is that the second clause is not relative but interrogative. Delitzsch in his commentary (Eng. tr., 1889) says: 'To render "from whence my help cometh" (Luther) is inadmissible. ךָּ is an interrogative particle, as it is also in Jos

2⁴ ["but I wist not whence they were"], where the question is an indirect one'; and he renders: 'I lift up mine eyes unto the mountains: Whence will my help come?' The LXX have the same rendering, and so also the R.V. But this is surely a direct question, not indirect.

Professor Briggs, in the 'International Critical Commentary,' accordingly pronounces the phrase to be a direct question: 'Whence cometh my help?' Dr. Cheyne (*The Book of Psalms*, 1904) quotes