

CRITICISMS AND DISCUSSIONS.

THE MYTHOLOGICAL HEBREW TERMS EXPLAINED BY THE SANSKRIT.

An Essay in Comparative Philology and Mythology.

[Mr. O. Neufchotz de Jassy's article presents a very original and novel theory, the derivation of Israelitish notions and names from Sanskrit sources. If it be true, it would open a new vista to comparative religion and folklore, but if it be a mere ingenious conceit, it remains none the less interesting and will even prove instructive because it teaches us how many purely haphazard coincidences can be discovered if we only seek zealously for them, being permitted to adjust them ever so little to make them suit the occasion. What remarkable combinations can be found in the Cabbala, and other mystic books!

We do not deem it likely that Hebrew scholars will readily take to M. de Jassy's theory, but they will be astonished to note how easily, for instance, the plural form *Elohim* which has given so much trouble to Biblical exegetes can be changed into a veritable singular without changing a letter in the text, simply by a modification of the vowels, superadded to the text by later generations. And what a remarkable coincidence, if such it be, is the fact that the name Noah (in Hebrew *Nowah*) might very well according to its sound be a derivative from the same Aryan root from which sprang the words *nauta*, sailor, *navis*, ship, *navigare*, to sail, etc.!

The three consonants N V K correspond exactly to the root of *navigare*, N V G, and it would not be impossible that the Persians, who are an Aryan people, called the Babylonian Parnapishtim, the hero of the Babylonian Deluge legend, in their own language "the seafaring one," and that the Jews adopted that name. At any rate we may concede that the word Noah is not Hebrew and its derivation from the Hebrew *noakh*,* "rest," is not tenable.

We can not say that we have become convinced by M. de Jassy, but we trust that our readers will be as interested as we have been, in noting these many surprising coincidences.—ED.]

I propose to show in this essay that almost every mythological Hebrew term in Genesis finds a similar term in the mythology of the Hindus, and that the similarity of the terms has as corollary an

absolute concordance of the myths. I will show further that most of the Hebrew terms even of less importance are derived from Sanskrit roots and that there is without doubt a narrow relationship between the Sanskrit and the Hebrew languages.

The results of this essay may be a copious harvest of surprises. Many terms whose explanation has been more or less doubtful will find a definite solution, other terms will show that they conflict obviously with the primitive significations scholars have given to them. The whole mythological web and woof may change in its intrinsic form, and people will be surprised to suddenly find the reconstruction of the mythology of the Hebrews, accidentally lost or intentionally destroyed.

It may be that scholars will hesitate to follow us in the new orientation given to the methods of explaining words and myths *per analogiam*—especially those scholars whose theological convictions harmonize with their scientific conceptions; but by deeper examination of scientific facts and the result that necessarily follows, they cannot but consider very curious these numerous coincidences.

Let us take one or two examples:

The word *Shadai* or *Shaddai* is translated by all scholars “the almighty,” and *El shadai*,¹ “the almighty God.” Our method *per analogiam* will show that this translation is absolutely false. More than that, it will show that the similarity of the Sanskrit and the Hebrew words reveals a mythological fact that was unknown until the present time.

Let us see for instance whence *Shadai* is derived. It comes from the verb *shadod*,² “to destroy.”

Shadai, then, means “destroyer” and *El shadai*, “the God of destruction.”

Let us now investigate the root of the verb *shadod*, which is *shad*. What does *shad* mean in Sanskrit? To subdue, to vanquish, to destroy. Hence the root is the same. Let us now see what *shadia* means in Sanskrit. It means “the destroyer” and is an epithet of Shiva. *El shadai* is therefore *Shiva-Shadia*. Is this a coincidence? Let us go further, let us follow it to its last consequences. Let us see how the worshipers of *Shiva* adored Shiva, and how the worshipers of *El-Shadai* adored El-Shadai. This comparison will be the more interesting because it has never before been undertaken.

The worshipers of the Hindu *Shadai*, of Shiva, put on their left arm a little receptacle or a ring containing the united *linga* and *yoni*. We do not need to observe that Shiva represents both lust and destruction, or destruction and *reconstruction*.

The Jews have the same custom even in our time. They put on the left arm a little black box (*Shadai* or *Shiva* represents the dark color, the night). On two sides of this receptacle the letter *sheen*,³ representing the word *Shadai*, is embossed. It is presumable that this little box, called *baith*, "the house," contained originally the same priapic emblems replaced later by the Talmudists with a few texts taken from the Bible. The Talmudic rabbis changed even the name of these boxes⁴ called formerly *Totuphath* (the etymology is unknown) to *Tephilim* (Greek, philacteries), "prayer-boxes."

It is needless to add that the Jews were worshipers of the phallic cult, that the covenant between El-Shadai and Abraham is a phallic one etc. We will only observe that the phallic worship comes from the Hindus and that Shiva especially was narrowly and brutally connected with this worship.

So inveterate was this cult of *Shadai-Shiva* with the Jews that neither the efforts of the Jehovahists nor time itself could destroy it. Even to-day on the doors of every orthodox Jew may be seen a little cylindrical box of glass or metal bearing the name *Shadai*, and the women in childbed are surrounded by little papers bearing the name of *Shadai*. Certainly the signification is lost, like the signification of the fish that Catholics eat on Friday, like so many religious or superstitious significations.

It there also a strange coincidence in the similarity of the worship?

Let us now take an example of less importance, the word *Miz-raïm*,⁵ Egypt. Let us remove the plural ending or rather the dual form *aïm*. We obtain the word *Mizr*. Let us now see what *misr* means in Sanskrit.⁶ *Misr*, from *misra*, signifies "combined, united, jointed places." *Misr* in Sanskrit means Egypt (the upper and the lower, hence the dual form in Hebrew). It would be idle to continue here.

³ ש

⁴ There are two, one for the forehead and one for the arm. The worshipers of Vishnu also put a kind of trident called the *Nachman* on their foreheads.

⁵ מצרים

⁶ See M. Monier Williams, *A Sanskrit Dictionary*.

Before I go further I would observe that this essay contains nothing but a few outlines of an important work in preparation that requires time, patience and depth of research.

Elohim.

The first mythological surprise arising from a study of comparative philology and mythology meets us in the well-known triade: *Bereshith bara Elohim*⁷: "In the beginning *the Gods* created."

These three words in the beginning of Genesis, have always been the stumbling-block of Jewish and Christian scholars. Why is Elohim in the plural, and why is the verb in the singular?—The most fantastic comments were given to this grammatical anomaly. Petrus Lombardus went so far as to try to prove the trinity in this—*pluralis majestatis*, and Rudolph Stier invented for this purpose a new grammatical term the *pluralis trinitatis*.—The most subtle comments were given and the most ingenious. However, scholars were mistaken; the ground for their mistake lies in the fact that they reasoned with casuistry rather than scientifically.

From the standpoint of comparative mythology, we do not see in any other theogony a similar conventional plural form, though the highest gods of the Hindus, Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks and Romans represent a plurality of the most various epithets. Savitri is Praja-Pati, is Indra, Rudra, Agni, Soma, Vishnu etc. The Babylonian Marduk possesses fifty names of the great gods that had been conferred upon him; he is Bel and Ea and Anu and Nebo, Enlil and Nergal etc. Nevertheless they ignore this *pluralis majestatis* of the noun agreeing with a verb in the singular form. Zeus, Jupiter, Osiris etc. possess the same richness of divine epithets, and the Greeks especially were certainly a people of refined and high courtesy in regard to their gods. When we see a disagreement between the divine noun and the verb, it is rather in the singular of the first and the plural of the latter. And this fact happens in Genesis only when Elohim—who, we will see immediately, is not Elohim at all—is speaking to himself, takes council with himself. "Let us make a man in our image."⁸ But in the narrative the singular of the verb is always used.

No, this *pluralis majestatis* of Elohim is not to be taken seriously.

Another more important question arises which, as we will see, is in close connection with the first.

⁷ בראשית ברא אלהים

⁸ נעשה אדם בצלמנו

How is it possible that whereas all other cosmogonies begin with the creation of the gods, the Bible alone shows us a *Deus ex machina*, ready made, without indicating how he was created or of what matter he was formed?

As we said both questions are closely connected. Both are included in the same word, and the double explanation will be found in the etymology of *Elohim* itself. It will show us for instance that the plural form of *Elohim* is *not a plural at all*; it will show us further *how the God of Genesis was created* before he became creator in his turn.

Elohim is composed of two words,⁹ and the explanation lies in their separation. *El* being now in the singular form, the verb *bara*, "created," agrees with the noun in the most natural way. *El bara*, "El created." This is the first solution.

The other is most interesting, although it seems more complicated in its exposition and final deductions.

El haiom, the Seagod.

El being *El haiom*, the Seagod, the God *who started from the water*, we discover to our surprise the most interesting mythological phenomenon, viz., that the same fate that governs the gods of all the theogonies, governs also the Hebrew *El*.

In all the cosmogonies the first factor of creation starts from water. Water is the origin of the universe. The earth originates from water, and as we will see *El* means "earth." The heaven itself is nothing else but water as the word *shamaim* indicates and as we will see later. All creatures, beasts and birds, formed by *El haiom*, are made of water (see Genesis).

The scribe of the Bible is guilty of this little fault of contraction that concealed during centuries how the God of Genesis was created and the Masoretic doctors—perhaps Ezra before them—impregnated with Jehovistic ideas, did nothing toward revealing the mistake—rather did everything to hide it,—and they voweled the contracted words with the point-vowels *Elohim*, which thus became a plural form.

El from the Standpoint of Comparative Philology and Mythology.

But let us examine thoroughly the two words from the standpoint of comparative philology and mythology.

Hebrew, *El*; Sanskrit, *il*; Babyl. *Elu*; Phœnic. *ila*; Arab. *ilah*, *allah*; Greek, ἦλος; Lat. *Sol*.

אלהים = אל הים⁹

El then means earth and is to the Hebrews as *Elu* is to the Babylonians, *Helios* to the Greeks, and *Sol* to the Romans, at first a *terrestrial god par excellence*. And as *Elu* becomes a heavenly god, as *Helios* becomes a heavenly god representing the Sun, as *Sol* becomes a heavenly god on the same condition as *Helios*, *El* will become a heavenly god, as we will see later, though he will remain the terrestrial god, occupied with the general affairs of mankind like the other gods, at least those who started from the waters and who became friends, teachers and saviours of mankind. This fact brings *El* in near connection with the corresponding gods of the other nations as will be seen when we shall have studied his apposition *iam*.

Iam, ים, *Mai*, מַי, *Maia*.

Iam in Hebrew means "sea," (*ha* is the article). The inversion of *iam* is *mai*, Assyr. *mei*, "water." The corresponding term in Sanskrit is *maia*.

The mythological result obtained from the philological analogy of *Mai* and *Maia* is as conclusive as it is interesting.

Maia is the water and the mother of *Brahma* (earth, at first a demiurgus like *El*). *Mai*, the inversion of *iam*, is the water and the mother of *El*. *El* is therefore identical with *Brahma* as he is identical with *Elu*, *Helios*, *Sol*.

Every divine being with the Hindus has his *Maia*. Every divine being in the theogonies of the other nations has his *Maia*. *Moses* has his *Mar-jam* (the "drop of the sea," i. e., the water). *Christ* has his *Maia* (Latin *mare*, *maris*, whence *Mari-a*, the *a* forming the feminine). The mother of *Bacchus*, the saviour of mankind, was *Myrrha* or *Maia*. The mother of *Hermes*, *Krishna*, *Buddha*, *Adonis* etc., was called *Myrrha* or *Maia*; *Maia*, *Maria* (a pleonasm form of *Maia*) was also called the mother of the Siamese Savior, *Samona Cadona*.

Mai or *Maia* represents here as there the productive power of the female principle. The first factor born of it is the male, who becomes creator in his turn. Every saviour of mankind is therefore a *firstborn*. He is also a *virgin-born*, because *Maya*, the mother, produced him without fecondation by the male principle. But the male principle of fecundation in nature being the *sun*, or the fire representing the sun, all *Earthgods* will represent the sun: *El*, *Brahma*, *Elu*, *Helios*, *Sol*, etc. The most characteristic illustration of the fire residing in the water as the lightning resides in the

clouds, gives us the Vedic sacrifice whence the Christian communion is borrowed. Both offerings, the sacred liquor Soma and the cake prepared of butter and flower, are presented to the holy fire. Agni (the fire-god) resides in both. The chalice contains also the mother of Agni, Maia, because Maia, the flame, can start from Maia, the liquor.

Iom, Ioni.

We have seen that Mai or Maia are identical terms with identical significations and represent similar mythical personifications. The root of the words *Iom* (*Yama, Yamuni*) will show us other mythical similarities with *El-ha-iom*, which will appear to be new personalities, but which are really the same as the deities already mentioned. The root of *iom* is the Sanskrit *yu*, the same as of the term *Yoni*.

Iom and *Ioni* having the same root, have also the same signification. *Yoni* or *Yonis* means the womb, the matrix, the life-giving element, the water. Although representing the female organ of generation, both *iom* and *yon* are of a masculine form. It is true that the later Sanskrit uses *Yoni* as both masculine and feminine. But *Yoni* is rarely feminine in the older language. *Iom* in Hebrew is always masculine: *Iom hagadol* etc.

This curious linguistic phenomenon showing the words *yon* and *iom*, which are representing the female organ, in a masculine form, is observed also with the word *mata*, mother, that is masculine in Rig-Veda. More than that, in the Georgian language *mama* signifies *father*.

The reason of this strange phenomenon may be found in the fact that these words were created in a matriarchal epoch, when the mother, having the entire care of her children, who often ignored their father, represented the acting personality, the nourisher and defender, the strength, the male, the father.

The life-giving *Yom* or *Yoni*, the nurses of all living creatures, are in the same case. *El-ha-iom* and *El-yoni* will then have the same signification. He is the fire or the sun residing in the *iom* or *Ioni* and starting out as creator and saviour of mankind. He is therefore identical with *Jonas* (Jonah), with *Oannes*, with *Okeanos*, who are the same mythological personifications [derived from the same word *yu* or *Yoni*] and with all the *Jona* that we will find later with the most diverse nations. I would state here that the etymology of all these words was unknown until the present day.

El-ha-iom and the Sea-Deities.

I do not know whether the beginning of Genesis describing the creation of *El-ha-iom* and his other peculiarities is lost, or if the theogonic part is written intentionally in condensed terms for the reason that the Jehovahists wished to conceal a mythological fact that seemed to conflict with their new theological ideas. The exterior form of El, his personality, is not depicted as that of the other sea-gods whom he resembles in his essence.. Indeed every sea-god we enumerated bears a peculiarity that is characteristic of an aquatic being, as he bears in his love for mankind a characteristic of mankind. The head is generally that of a man and the body and the tail those of a fish.

It is natural that the *Iom* or the *Joni* being the liquor and the fire residing in the liquor [El and Iom, Agni and Maya, Helios and Thetis, etc.] the fish will represent the watering element and the fire. Hence in all the cosmogonies the fish will represent the sun and all the sungods will be in their own turn represented by the fish. Indeed, we see all the saviours appearing in the form of a fish. Vishnu became a fish to save the seventh Manu, the progenitor of the human race from the universal deluge.

The Assyrians and Babylonians worshiped the fish Dagan representing the sun. The Talmud announced the Saviour under the form of a fish. The earliest symbol of Christ was a fish, and he himself is called a fish. Buddha is called *Dag-Po* or *Fo*, the Fish. Jonah, lying for three days in the body of a fish represents the winter solstice (from the 22d to the 25th of December) when the sun is in the lowest regions. But in Jonah and the fish the same mythical personification is divided into two, and such divisions are frequent in all theogonies. They represent the various manifestations of the same natural phenomenon.—The fact that neither *El ha-iom* nor Jonah nor Noah appears under the form characterizing the Chaldæan or Greek sea-gods, as for instance Oannes or Okeanos, brings the Jewish myth nearer to the Aryan source. Indeed, I do not doubt for a moment that the myth of Noah was at first borrowed from the Aryans, and that much later the Hebrews took a second graft of the same account from the Chaldæans. No doubt, there are two variations of the same deluge-story in Genesis. Hence the numerous contradictions. Struck with wonder by the similarity of the Biblical and Chaldæan myth discovered in the cuneiform inscriptions, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch did not push his investigations

to the last etymological and linguistic consequences. And the names of Noah and his sons Cham, Shem and Japhet seem to me as important as the deluge story itself.

Noah or Novach and Agni-Novich.

As far as I know neither the meaning nor the etymology of the word Noah and that of the names of his sons have found a conclusive or even plausible solution up to the present day. The general acceptation that Noah means "who reposes" is not admissible and conflicts obviously with the high mission with which Noah was invested.¹⁰

The true significance of the word may be found in the corresponding Sanskrit term. The identical Sanskrit term for *Noah* or *Novach*—the name read without the masoretic point-vowels—is *Navaja* or *Navika*. Now let us see where *Nava-ja* or *Navi-ka* are derived from.

Nau or *nava* in Sanskrit means a ship, a boat, a vessel¹¹; Greek *ναῦς*; Latin *navis*; old German *nach*; modern German *Nachen*; Anglo-Saxon, *naco*; Bav. *naue*.

Noah or *Novach* or the Sanskrit *Novich* or *Nava-ja* mean therefore the steerer of a boat, the pilot, Greek *ναῦ-τη-ς*; Latin *nau-t-a*.

The etymology of the word Noah appears so natural and so simple that we are indeed surprised that no linguist has made the application before.

But let us return to the myth.

One of the epithets of Agni is *Agni-Novich*, "Agni the pilot." But Agni is Vishnu and we saw Vishnu in the form of a fish saving the seventh Manu from the deluge. Now who is the seventh Manu? Another form of the first Manu, born from the sun, hence representing the sun. Who is Noah? Another form of Adam, the first man. When we open the book of Enoch we find this wonderful story about Noah's birth: Lamech's¹² wife brought forth a child, the flesh of which was white as snow and red as a rose, the hair of whose head was white like wool and long (all the solar gods have long hair, Samson, Phœbus, Hercules etc.) and whose eyes were beautiful.

¹⁰ Some scholars translate Noah "the consoler." They see the consolation in the wine.

¹¹ The ark of Noah is called in Hebrew *teba*, without the masoretic points *tba* or rather *twa*, the *b* being soft without *dagash*; Sanskrit *twac* from the verb *twac*, "to cover"; Latin *tego*; Old German *dekin*; modern German *decken*; Lith. *denjin*, a bark, a peeling, a protecting cover. Bunsen derives *tewa* from the Egyptian *tba*, a chest; *tpt*, a boat.

¹² *Lamech*, Sanskrit *Lamash*, "the bull," the emblem of the sun.

When he opened them they "illuminated all the house like the sun," and when he was taken from the hand of the midwife, opening also his mouth, "he spoke to the Lord of righteousness," etc. We know that all the saviours of mankind spoke immediately after their birth. We know also that the fire is considered by the Hindus as the first ancestor of mankind. There is no mistake: Noah, Manu and Agni-Novich are the same mythical personification. They are the fire or the sun residing in the water. The deluge may overwhelm the whole universe, but Noah, the sun-pilot, starts triumphantly from the waters. This allegorical solar boat-steerer has the same *raison d'être* in the Bible as in the Vedas, since the Biblical heaven was made of water like the Vedic heaven—as we will see later—and the sun starting in the morning from the waters under the firmament, piles the whole day in the waters above the firmament.

Noah is the eternal solar pilot.

When we pursue our mythical investigation, we find in the compound word *nava-bandano* (ship-binding) the name of the highest peak of the Himalayas (the Mt. Ararat of the Hebrews) to which Manu is said to have anchored his ship in the great flood.¹³

Shem, Cham, Japhet—Soma, Kam, Pra-Japati.

The analogy of the linguistic and mythological facts becomes more evident, when we consider the sons of Noah, *Shem, Cham, Japhet*.

These three sons, it is said in Genesis, became the progenitors of the new mankind. Now let us compare them with the Aryan progenitors Soma, Kam or Kama and Pra-Japati (corresponding to the Babylonian Zorovanus, Titan and Japethostes) the three sons of the Hindu ark-preserved Manu.

¹³ The Hindu legend of the deluge is as follows: Many ages after the creation of the world Brahma resolved to destroy it with a deluge on account of the wickedness of the people. There lived at that time a pious man, Saty-vrata, (*Saty-vrata* is not a proper name, but an epithet meaning *pious man*. Noah also was named a pious man) and as the lord of the universe loved this pious man and wished to preserve him from the sea of destruction which was to appear on account of the depravity of the age, he appeared before him in the form of Vishnu and said: In seven days from the present time the worlds will be plunged in an ocean of death, but in the midst of the destroying waves a large vessel, sent by me for thy use, shall stand before thee. Then shalt thou take all medicinal herbs, all the variety of foods, and accompanied by seven saints, surrounded by pairs of all animals, thou shalt enter the spacious ark, and continue in it secure from the flood on one immense ocean without light, except the radiance of thy holy companions. When the ship shall be agitated by an impetuous wind, thou shalt fasten it with a large sea-serpent on my horn; for I will be near to thee (in the form of a fish; Vishnu-Noah-Jonah) drawing the vessel with thee and thy attendants. I will remain on the ocean until a night of *Brahma* shall be completely ended. Etc.

Kam or *Kama*, in Sanskrit, means: "he who follows the dictates of passion or desire." *Kama* is the god of love, Hebrew *Cham*,¹⁴ "hot," substantive "heat, ardor." He represents the necessary heat for fecundation and generation, that is for Soma and Pra-Japati.

Soma represents the sacred liquor (of libation and fecundation) and the god himself. *Soma* means "to distil, to extract, to sprinkle, to generate," the act of pressing out the Soma juice being compared to the act of begetting. (*Surā*, the sun, represents also the spirituous liquor.) Soma is therefore the life-giving god, the generator of mankind as Shem is said to be.

Pra-Japati, lord of creatures, was an epithet originally applied to Savitri, Soma, Indra and Agni (all these gods represent the fire or the sun and are therefore generators), afterwards he became the name of a separate god presiding over procreation. Pra-Japati is Japhet.

Noah himself is said to have been a wine-grower. In a moment of drunkenness he uncovers his body. The nakedness of his father amuses Cham and he calls his brothers to see it. Noah curses Cham and makes him a servant of Shem and Japhet. This malediction has a natural significance. Love is the slave of passion and desire. Cham is the natural servant of Shem and Japhet.

Like Soma in the Vedas, so Shem is the most important of Noah's three sons. The blessing of Noah cannot be understood in any other way than this.

"Blessed be the Lord, the *God of Shem*;

"And let Canaan be his servant.

"God enlarge Japhet and let him in the tents of Shem,

"And let Canaan be his servant."

Canaan (*Kamama*) "the libidinous, the lustful," is the eternal servant of the drunkenness of the senses, of passion and desire, of Soma, and of the final act of procreation, of Prajapati who as we saw is an epithet of Soma.

"Let Japhet in the tenth of Shem" signifies "let Soma be Pra-japati," "let the sacred liquor of generation end in fecundation.

A hymn in the Rig-Veda, which is addressed to Soma, says:

"Where there is happiness and delight,
Where joy and pleasure reside,
Where *the desire of our desires is attained*,
There make us immortal."

And another more significant hymn says:

"Thou Soma, guardian of our bodies,
Makest thy dwelling in each member.
Lord of heaven! Though we transgress
Thy firm decree so often, be merciful
To us and kind and gracious."

"Soma, guardian of our bodies, dwelling in each member," is this not Shem who with his brother Pra-Japati is the guardian of the body of Noah whose nudity is mocked by the frivolous Cham, the libidinous god of love?

This mythical allegory of the natural and productive forces in action is, at least, nothing but a repetition of the first cosmogony of Genesis. Noah is *El-ha-iom*. Both started from the sea and both became progenitors of mankind. Like Noah, El curses his creatures, the serpent, Adam and Eve, who are three different forms of the same mythical personality like, at least, Cham is Shem and Japhet,—they also were cursed because of their act of generation. They were ashamed to be naked after they had eaten from the tree of knowledge, like Noah was ashamed to be naked after he had drunk the juice of the grape (of Soma, the sacred liquor of knowledge, because knowledge in Genesis is the act of procreation¹⁵). The *serpent* is like Cham (*Kama*) the stimulation, that awakens sexual desire; *Eve* (HWH, *Hava* written *hve*, any feminine or coquettish gesture tending to excite amorous sensations) for the purpose of procreation, *Adam*. This libidinous serpent becomes the slave of Eve and Adam, like Cham became the servant of Shem and Japhet. In all the mythologies the gods are jealous of the holy fire residing in the sacred liquor that gives to mankind the knowledge of creation. El-ha-iom forbids Adam to eat from the tree of knowledge and punishes him for going beyond his prohibition, like Jupiter who refuses the fire to mankind, punishes Prometheus for having stolen it for mankind. But when the myth of Noah comes directly from Aryan source¹⁶ and is later adulterated with the Chaldæan story of the deluge, the myth of Jonah, although having its root in Sanskrit, as we showed in another place, seems to be borrowed directly from the Chaldæan Oannes, which in turn was taken

¹⁵ There is no mistake, ידע is knowledge *only* in the sense of procreation.

יָדַע אָדָם אֶת חַוָּה אִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָרָר וְהָלַךְ בֵּן

"And Adam *knew* his wife Eve and she was pregnant and etc."

¹⁶ The ancient temples of Hindostan contain representations of Vishnu sustaining the earth while overwhelmed by the waters of the deluge. *A rainbow is seen on the surface of the subsiding waters.*

from the Greek Okeanos (*aca* or *aka* and *yoni*) inversion of *Yan-aka*, the ocean.

Oannes, Okeanos, El-yoni, etc.

Berosus and Alexander Polyhistor ascribe the *event of the creation* to the teaching of an amphibious monster called *Oannes*. His body consisted of the body of a man terminating in the tail of a fish. By day he ascended from the waters of the Erythean Sea and conveyed his instructions to the assembled multitude in a human voice, but at night he returned from the land and concealed himself within the recesses of the ocean.¹⁷

Berosus, no doubt, who according to his own report lived at the time of Alexander the Great, borrowed the name *Oannes* from the Greek *Okeanos*, whose etymology and Sanskrit origin we showed above. It is the more easy to affirm this fact as Berosus uses *thalatta* for *Tiamat*, and *thalatta* is the Greek *θάλασσα*, meaning water.

As we see all these seagods are the same; they are all teachers of mankind. Jonah goes to Niniveh to preach, *Oannes* comes from the sea to teach. *El-ha-iom* also is a teacher. He teaches Adam what fruits he ought to eat, plant a garden for him, makes him clothes, and so forth.

El-ha-iom, no doubt, is *El-yoni*, is *Aka-yoni* (*Okeanos*), is *Jonah*, is *Noah*, is *Oannes*, is the *Yona* of the Gauls, the *Jowna* or *Jona* of the Basques, the *John* of the Scandinavians, the old *Yona* of the Trojans, the *Yawna* of the Parsis.

All these peoples worshiped the sun under the name of *Jona* ("born from the water"). *Jona* is the earth, the fish, the sun, the first-born, the god started from the waters. He is the Biblical seagod, he is *El-ha-iom* voweled in the Bible either erroneously or intentionally as *Elohim* and used as a plural without any plausible reason.

O. NEUFCHOTZ DE JASSY.

RIVERSIDE, ILL.

EDITORIAL POSTSCRIPT.

While making up the present number of *The Monist* we are in receipt of a second instalment from M. de Jassy, which is to corroborate his theory and adds more material of the same kind. Not

¹⁷ G. Smith, *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*.

being able to publish it here, we will at least summarize the ideas which it contains.

As to the beginning of Genesis, M. de Jassy is inclined to admit with Moses Gerundinus (Nachmonides) called by the Jews "the pious teacher," that the words

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ:

i. e., "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," may mean "In the beginning El-haiom created himself with heaven and earth."

The word *bara* is connected with the Sanskrit *bhara*, "to create," the root of which, *bhri*, reappears in the English verb *bear*, the German *gebären*, etc. The Sanskrit word *Bharu* means Lord, husband, in the sense of procreator, as the Hebrew *boreh* is used of Jehovah.

The word *rakia*¹ is referred to the Sanskrit *rakya* or *raka*, a flash of lightning, azure, crystal, firmament.

M. de Jassy believes that the Old Testament teaches a trinity like the Brahman Trimurti, which he means to prove by the three covenants. The first covenant is made by Elohim, or rather El-haiom, the god of the waters, and is symbolized by the rainbow. The second is the covenant of the burning bush which Ehjeh² makes with Moses. The name Ehjeh, according to the current view, is the Hebrew word substituted for the four holy consonants of the ineffable name Yahveh.³ The sentence in Ex. iii. 14, "*ehyeh asher ehyeh*," is translated in our English Bible by "I am that I am," implying that the name Yahveh is derived from *hajah*, "to be." M. De Jassy discovers in *ehyeh* the Sanskrit *Ejeh*, which is "the fallen dawn," and he explains it as the fire that comes down from heaven, viz., lightning. The third covenant is made between El Shaddai and Abraham, El Shaddai being the destroyer who promises to preserve his protégé Abraham on the condition of circumcision which is a partial mutilation. The word *mula*⁴ (circumcision) is supposed to be connected with the Sanskrit *mulya*, "to eradicate."

The passage (Deut. vi. 4),

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד:

Hear O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord,"

receives a peculiar interpretation. M. de Jassy denies that it contains any monotheistic idea, the word *echad*⁵ meaning not only "one"

¹ רָקִיעַ

² אֵהְיֶה

³ יְהוָה

⁴ מוּלָה

⁵ אֶחָד

but also "the first." The passage therefore may be translated, "Hear O Israel, Yahveh our God is the *first* one [the first in the trinity]." On the other hand M. de Jassy is inclined to see in *achad* (i. e., *echad*) a similarity with the Sanskrit *arhat*, which is commonly translated "holy," or with *ahata*, meaning "unsoiled" or "uninjured."

The phylacteries (in the Talmud called *tephilin*⁶) which even to-day the Jews tie to their foreheads and arms are little cases inscribed with the letter *S*⁷ and containing scrolls. The name *phylactery* indicates that they were for talismanic use, while the word *tephilin*, "prayers," shows the nature of the writing and the method by which the protection was accomplished. Now M. de Jassy claims that these cases, originally called *totophath*,⁸ can only have been Shivaistic emblems of a phallic nature. The letter *S* is the initial of Shaddai or Shiva, and the word *totophath* is identified with the Sanskrit *tattva*, which means "real thing."

* * *

In reply to the editorial introduction to his article M. de Jassy makes the following rejoinder:

M. de Jassy's Rejoinder.

The theory of mere "remarkable coincidences," as the editor of *The Monist* denominated our demonstration at first sight, will, we are afraid, prove a failure. We are proceeding by linguistic proofs, and our mythological comparisons are geometrical congruences. If objections are made—we do not fear them—they have to be made in the same way and under the same conditions. Science excludes casuistical conjectures and the old theological standpoint is out of date.

Mr. Carus claims that Kabbalism has found many wonderful "coincidences" in cipher-combinations!—That may be! But "combinations" and "conjectures" are not scientific proofs. That the word *echad* (one) for example, gives the number 13 as the result of cipher addition of its three letters

$$\begin{array}{r} \aleph = 1 \\ \aleph = 8 \\ \aleph = 4 \\ \hline 13 \end{array}$$

is a proof neither that this number is a holy one, nor that it denotes the trinity in the unity in the separation of the two digits 1

⁶ תפילין

⁷ ש

⁸ טוֹטוֹפֹת

and 3. The same thing is true of the further result of the letters of Yahveh that give the number 26, i. e., twice the number 13.

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{י} = 10 \\
 \text{ה} = 5 \\
 \text{ו} = 6 \\
 \text{ה} = 5 \\
 \hline
 26
 \end{array}$$

There is no plausible proof that Jehovah represents *twice* the trinity in the unity and that *Jehovah Echad*, together expressing in the *Shemah* the Jewish monotheism, represent as an emphasis *three* times trinity in unity.

When you continue in this way, the word *El*, "God," represents *three* in *one* as well:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{א} = 1 \\
 \text{ל} = 30 \\
 \hline
 31
 \end{array}$$

and when you take the word *lo*,⁹ i. e. "not," the inversion of *El*,¹⁰ you arrive at the same cipher result:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{ל} = 30 \\
 \text{א} = 1 \\
 \hline
 31
 \end{array}$$

But *lo* means "not" and *El* means "God." In this case God would be nought. Such demonstrations are absurd!

These number-plays borrowed by the Jews from the Chaldæans, who in their turn took them from the Persians and Hindus, may amuse the childish minds of unscientific casuists. In such combinations and conjectures "coincidences" may find their application; but modern philology and comparative mythology are based upon other foundations.

When I am able to prove that the root *R* is the same as the root *R'*, as it was shown, for instance, in *shad* (the Hebrew root) and *shad* (the Sanskrit root); when I can prove that the term *T* is equal to the term *T'* as I showed in *Shadai* (the Hebrew word) and *Shad-ja* (the Sanskrit word) when, finally, I can prove that the mythological facts which characterize the personalities represented by these roots and terms are as identical as two geometrical triangles, it is no longer lawful to speak of "coincidences"; or when you

⁹ לו

¹⁰ לא

are speaking of coincidences, I accept them in their literal sense. These roots coincide, these terms and mythological facts coincide, because being the same, *they cannot but coincide*. Their point of departure, the idea they imply, the phenomena that accompany them, are identical, and they are based upon the same scientific principles. Only in this way can I accept for my thesis the word "coincidences." *Alterum non datur*.

A PRAGMATIC ZOOLOGIST.*

Andrea Giardina, in his recent work *Le discipline zoologiche e la scienza generale delle forme organizzate*,† takes occasion, apropos of certain criticisms previously made by him regarding the regulation of biological studies in our universities, to expound certain of his ideas on the methodology of the various departments of biology.

One of his main criticisms concerns the persistence of the distinction made between the teaching of zoology and that of comparative anatomy: a distinction which seems to him unjustifiable on any count, theoretical or practical, and to be explained only on historical grounds.

"To within a century the term 'zoology' applied exclusively to the study of the external forms of animals, and the best zoologists bent all their efforts to a careful investigation of the resemblances and differences of these outward forms; and zoology, outside of its bearings on the life and habits of animals, was a kind of comparative morphology confined wholly or largely to the exterior aspect of such organisms. Its main purpose was to elaborate a system of classification for animals which should be as simple as possible. The study of the internal organization, at first limited to man and those animals nearest related to him, arose chiefly as a result of the needs of medical science and did not attain so early to the rank of comparative morphology. The anatomists and naturalists who turned their attention to the dissection of the lower animals were few, and began perforce with the study of isolated forms. Anatomical monographs were not, and are not, things lightly to be dashed off: they took much time and labor; so that it was only gradually that there was amassed a body of material comparable in richness and variety with what was already possessed by zoology for external

*Translated from the Italian by Herbert D. Austin. This paper appeared originally in the *Leonardo*, Oct.-Dec., 1906.

† Pavia, 1906.