
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

England. But it is written with so much humanity, so much sympathy and humour and enthusiasm, that one may very well read it more than once. The author's opinion of the Australian aborigines is a surprise. He says: 'It is my deliberate opinion that the aboriginals at Yarrabah have shown themselves as capable of those qualities of discipline, unselfishness, self-restraint, and fixity of purpose which go to make up civilized social life as any other race.' Afterwards he tells a delightful story of an aboriginal, called Neighbour, who was being taken in chains to prison somewhere on a charge of theft although innocent, and who plunged into the flooded river, chains and all, to save the life of the constable who was escorting him.

What is it after all but that the Australians are just a little younger in the world's history than ourselves? Bishop White tells us about an official church awakener, who 'had an ancient black rod with a silver top, originally, I fancy, part of an umbrella, with which he went round and prodded every member of the congregation who fell asleep under the sometimes very long-winded exhortations of the native deacons.' Have we not heard of that official ourselves in the days of our fathers?

In *God, the War, and Britain* (Stock; 1s. net) the Rev. C. C. Dobson, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Paddington, gives the Devil the whole credit for the war (the Kaiser being presumably his instrument). But he gives God the power (over the Devil) to turn the war into good. And we shall see that justice and judgment are always in the earth.

There is a small book published in Edinburgh about *How St. Andrew came to Scotland*, by a writer who knows—knows both history and philology—though he is too modest to give us his name (Turnbull & Spears; 1s. net).

The book which Principal W. E. S. Holland has published, through the United Council for Missionary Education, under the title of *The Goal of India* (2s. net), is unpretending without and within, but we advise those who have any interest in missions or in India to read it. Every word is weighty. Knowledge and responsibility and the love of the Hindu and of Christ make together for exceptional impressiveness.

The *R.P.A. Annual* for 1918 (Watts; 1s. net) is as rationalistic as ever but less warlike. The war is in it certainly, especially in Mr. C. T. Gorham's article 'The World after the War.' The first article is a poem, reminiscent of Lucretius in the length of its lines and some of its antipathies; but Mr. Eden Phillpotts is not calm enough for immortality. Professor Gilbert Murray writes on 'The Essence of Christianity,' and Dr. E. S. Hartland on 'Religion among the Indians of Guiana.' These are the articles that give the Annual its distinction. Mr. William Archer's paper on 'Humanity the Best Policy' is third because of its brevity, but it is a good third.

The Gardener in the Epic of Paradise.

By S. Langdon, M.A., Shillito Reader of Assyriology, Oxford.

Readers of The Expository Times will remember that a somewhat violent discussion has been conducted concerning the writer's volume, *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise: The Flood and the Fall of Man*, a discussion marked with all the vituperation so characteristic of Assyriology. Those among us who steadfastly seek peace even at the sacrifice of truth will venture into this soiled arena with great misgiving, but clothed at any rate with the armour of goodwill towards all those critics who seriously study the facts and honestly seek to understand the author's work. The main points raised by the remarkable six-column Sumerian tablet now in the Nippur Collection of the University Museum of Philadelphia were as follows:[1]

[1] These theses rest naturally upon my interpretation of the Sumerian text as the theses of my critics repose upon their own. When other scholars assert with vehemence that there is no Paradise, or that there is no Fall of Man in this text, they mean, of course, that their interpretation of the text leads them to these results. That would be the truly critical way of stating their case in the interest both of science and of justice. Until the French edition of my volume is ready, the author begs to refer to his corrections in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 1917, 250-260.

(A) Columns I. and II. of the obverse describe the Sumerian legend of Paradise which, according to the writer's interpretation, endured for a vast period of time, from the creation of the world to the Flood, in which man lived to fabulous ages, and knew neither disease nor trouble. Paradise was located in Dilmun, on the eastern shore of the Persian Gulf.[1]

(B) In Column II. of the obverse, Enki, the water-god, source of all wisdom and art, ruler of mankind in Dilmun, became angered against mankind because they failed to keep the rule of the cults, and decided to destroy mankind by a deluge. Column III. of the obverse describes how the mother goddess Nintud appealed to Enki through the messenger Isimu on behalf of a pious man who is said by Enki to be unatoned. Nevertheless Enki prepares a boat for him, and then again the deluge which will come is described. Finally this pious son of man is atoned, the deluge descends, mankind dissolve like fat in the waters. After the Deluge we find the mother goddess in conversation with one Tagtug,[2] who has the title of a god, and is called a gardener.

(C) The reverse, Column I., relates how Tagtug, lone survivor of the Flood, became a gardener,[3] and received revelations from the god of wisdom, Enki.

(D) Reverse II. describes how Enki decreed the fate of a plant,[4] whereupon the mother goddess asks Enki's messenger what this may be. In reply the messenger says that Enki orders man to eat from eight kinds of plants, ending with the cassia. But the messenger says that Enki had placed the plant of fate in the centre of the garden. Since Ninharsag the mother goddess at once pronounces the curse:

> The face of life[5] until he dies[6] not shall he see.

it seems evident that the loss of perfect health followed upon the eating of the plant of fate.[7] The gods bewail the fate of man. The Flood had ended the Utopian age, and the curse of Ninharsag had taken away the priceless gift of health and longevity.

(E) In Reverse III. the gods send eight patrons of the arts and cultures to aid man in his sorrowful existence. There is an undoubted connexion of ideas between these eight patrons and those of the Hebrew story in Gn 4. [The writer never maintained a philological connexion between these names, a view that has been most unjustly attributed to him. But the idea of divine patrons arising to aid mankind after the loss of Paradise is as clear in the Sumerian legend as it is in the Hebrew version.]

The writer discussed at length and in detail the Eridu version of the Fall of Man as known from the poem of Adapa, and pointed out its connexion with the version of the Fall in the Jahvistic document of the Hebrew, whereas the Nippur tablet in general agrees with the Priestly Code, so far as we know its version of the Fall of Man. Now these are far-reaching results which ought to have been discussed by the critics *sine ira et con sinceritate*. This great belief in a lost Paradise permeated Sumerian theology, and evidences of it lie on every hand. It gave rise in the middle of the third millennium B.C. to a passionate longing for the restitution of the age before the Flood, and the belief in deified kings who had come as messiahs, begotten of the gods, to restore the lost age. I do not mean to say that this myth of a lost Paradise was entirely responsible for the extraordinary cults of deified kings which dominate Sumerian religion in the last centuries of its existence. But the hymns sung in the worship of kings such as Dungi of Ur and Ishme-Dagan of Isin afford all the evidence we can desire that the Sumerian people actually

[1] The first line of this epic is, 'They that slept, they that slept are ye.' At the left edge is a break, hence the first half of the line rests upon a restoration. Jastrow and Barton restore [*ki-azag-ga-*]*ám*, and render 'In a holy place.' This is impossible. Forms ending in *ám* are usually not locative but emphatic, and in this case, if this restoration be made, the rendering would be, 'It is an holy place, they that slept are ye,' which is meaningless. Moreover, the restoration *ki-azag* violates liturgical usage in which the first line is repeated with the proper addition in the second (or third here). For the liturgical style at the beginning of a passage, see *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, pp. 38, 52, 96, compare lines 1 and 3.

[2] Reading *Tagdur* also possible.

[3] Some of the critics began by denying that the word for garden exists in the text. That objection was unfortunately founded on conjecture, for the word is clearly written (*Rev.* i. 26, 41) and is no longer questioned.

[4] *Rev.* ii. 17.

[5] *I.e.* good health. [6] *I.e.* as long as he lives.

[7] To those who raise the objection that no forbidding injunction concerning this plant is issued, and the text does not describe a transgression of eating therefrom, those who have been initiated into the style of Sumerian poetry will reply that such an hiatus characterized all their compositions. The same kind of omissions recur in the great Gudea Cylinders and in all of their great poems.

believed that these rulers were gods made flesh to dwell among men and restore him to his lost estate.[1] In one of the liturgies chanted in the adoration of Dungi there is a passage which distinctly confirms the writer's interpretation not only of the Epic itself, but of the profound theological ideas which moved the minds and inspired the souls of men in those great days of our religious history. The passage referred to occurs in a liturgy which praises the god king for having brought peace and happiness to the land of Sumer. And it refers to the Flood as the time when the cruel age of toil began.

Once on a time the spirit, the wrathful word, the Deluge[2] gathered all.
The raging storm uttered its roar with terror.
The devastating spirit with its seven winds caused the heavens to moan.
The violent spirit caused the earth to quake.
The storm god in the vast heavens shrieked.
And there were little hail stones and there were great hail stones.
But now the brick walls of the Temple of the Seal shine with splendour.
A king am I[3]; the storm winds. . . .[4]

So in the joy of their emancipation under the incarnate god Dungi, the legend of the Fall of Man and the loss of Paradise is referred to in order to magnify the greatness of his achievement. Now the entire theology and cult literature of the age reflects the belief in the Fall of Man. It can be understood only in the light of this interpretation.

I should like to adduce now another religious document of the period which further substantiates in a most striking way the interpretation which the writer made of the deified Tagtug, the gardener of Paradise. This name has the determinative 'god' before it precisely as do the deified kings of the period. But the deification of heroes is much older in Sumerian religion than the age of which we have been speaking. Prehistoric rulers who for unknown reasons became the subjects of myth and legend appear in the traditions of the Sumerians with the rank of gods. So Gilgamish, half-human, half-divine, according to the Epic in which he is the chief hero, has the divine title, although he is known to have been an early ruler of the dynasty of Erech. Etana, hero of the poem which describes his flight to heaven on the wings of an eagle, has the divine title in the Semitic poem, although he was a ruler in a prehistoric dynasty. Two of these demigods actually attained a place in the theological lists of the real pantheon.[5]

^{d}Tagtug,[6] or the deified Tagtug, gardener in the Epic of Paradise, is obviously an ancient king, and, since he is the hero of the Flood in this version, the last king before the Flood. At any rate he was a hero made by tradition into a demigod and accorded the rôle of the founder of agriculture. The tablet to which I refer is a single column tablet of the Philadelphia Collection, carrying sixty-one lines, all but six quite well preserved.[7] The contents are divided in sense and style into two parts—Obverse 1–24 and Obverse 25 to the end. The first section describes the world after the creation, but before vegetation, animal life, and civilization had appeared. Lines 5–6 of the obverse have this remarkable statement:

5. (When) of the Land (of Sumer) its *saviour* (?) Tagtug had not been created.
6. (When) for Tagtug a foundation[8] had not been laid.

[1] The best examples of these liturgies to deified kings hitherto translated will be found in the writer's *Historical and Religious Texts*, Munich, 1914, pp. 9–18, two hymns to Dungi, king of Ur, in the 25th century, and in *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*, Philadelphia, 1917, pp. 136–140, hymn to Dungi; 143–9 and 178–84, hymns to Ishme-Dagan, 23rd century. Three more hymns of this kind will be found transcribed and translated by the writer in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1918. See also the remarkable text discussed and partially translated in the *Museum Journal*, vol. viii. No. 3, University Museum, Philadelphia.

[2] Sumerian *mar-ūr*, Semitic *abubu*, the ordinary word employed for the Flood in the Semitic legend as preserved in the eleventh book of the Epic of Gilgamish. The text here is not my own copy, but that of Myhrman, *Publications of the Babylonian Section*, of the University Museum, Philadelphia, vol. i. pl. 13; *Rev.* iii. 68.

[3] Liturgies chanted before the statues of these living deified kings often introduce them in the first person precisely as the liturgies to any of the major gods have passages in which they are represented as speaking to the people as though actually present.

[4] *Historical and Religious Texts*, p. 19.

[5] Enlilzi and Ur-Sin, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, 152 14 f.; Genouillac, *Tablettes de Drehem*, A.O. 5501 ii. 21; *Cuneiform Texts*, of the British Museum, vol. xxiv. 8. 1 (cf. 6, 20); *Babylonian Liturgies*, p. 147.

[6] The letter ^{d} is an abbreviation for *dingir*, 'god.'

[7] Ni. 14005, already published in transcription and translation by Professor G. A. Barton, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1917, vol. xxxvii. p. 36. The text is reserved by the same scholar for publication, hence the writer utilizes the text only so far as necessary.

[8] Said either of a palace or of a temple.

The Sumerian text is:

5. *kalama azag* (?) *-bi* ^{d}*Tag-túg nu-ub-da*[1] *-an-ḫim-ma-dȧ*.[2]
6. ^{d}*Tag-tug-ra*[3] *temen nu-mu-na-si-ga-dȧ*.

Unfortunately the second sign of line 5 is doubtful, which with the syntax assigned to this line[4] would more clearly specify the character of the hero.

Lines 17 f. of the obverse are likewise interesting:

17. Tagtug had not been born and had not been crowned.[5]
18. The lord, god of the floods,[6] the precious lord had not been born.'

Not only is Tagtug specifically defined here as one who ruled over mankind, but he is associated with that other hero of ancient mythology, Tammuz, who also appears as a prehistoric deified ruler in the dynasty of Erech. Of Tammuz, that incarnation of vicarious suffering who lives and dies, Sumerian and Babylonian religious texts have already informed us much. He was construed into the greatest of all culture heroes, and his worship spread throughout the ancient world. Tagtug certainly stood for equally deep motives in Sumerian religion, and these ideas are now partially disclosed by the records of Nippur. In the Barton tablet he symbolizes the beneficent rule of the heroic age whose inauguration the remainder of that tablet describes. Whether he actually ruled in Sumer is here of no vital consequence. In the legend of the Fall of Man he was chosen as the hero whose piety saved the race of man and whose indiscretion involved the loss of health and divine life on earth. Even so Adapa, most wise of mortals, according to the Fall of Man as propounded in the schools of Eridu, brought about this disaster through the cajolery of a jealous god.

Other searching suggestions are raised by these discoveries. Perhaps tempestuous discussion may still be unabated, but new ideas and new facts are upon us. A reconstruction of our most familiar theological cosmology is inevitable as the religious texts of Sumer slowly yield us their difficult secrets.

[1] This verbal form is passive, see *Sumerian Grammar*, § 199, p. 146. The *aš* at the end governs *nu* as a compound relative adverb = when. This *mu* occurs at the beginning of line 3 f., but is omitted at the beginning of line 5. Lines 3–6 are all dependent upon this compound adverb.

[2] Barton now renders this line, 'Tagtug created land and water.' Against this rendering can be urged the following points. Sumerian never places the subject after the object. At any rate examples are unknown to me. If *e* be read for the doubtful sign, *kalam-e-ki* cannot mean land and water, for *kalam* in Sumerian never means land in the material sense, but only land as an organized state. It commonly means Sumer, as '*the* land.' Again Sumerian cosmogony does not contemplate, in any of the texts which refer to the Creation, the creation of water. That is a principle which the legends universally assume as already existing in chaos. Finally the verb *dim* is not active with inserted *da* unless it can be shown that a postfixed *da* precedes the verb, whereby the idea of accompaniment is obtained. But no such construction exists here, and the verb must be passive. Finally lines 17 f. show that Tagtug was a deified man to whom the creation of the world would certainly not be attributed. Personally I prefer the value *dim* = *šurḫû*, 'to educate,' 'bring up,' and would suggest '^{d}Tagtug had not been reared.'

[3] At first thought one might conclude that *Tag-dur-ra* is the true reading, but *ra* is the post-positive particle, not the phonetic complement. See also the large Nippur tablet *Rev.* i. 38.

[4] The anticipative construct.

[5] Literally, 'had not lifted a crown.'

[6] *en mir-si*, ordinarily ^{d}*en-mir-si*, a frequent title of Tammuz as god of the waters in which he was annually drowned.

In the Study.

Michal.

'As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so is a fair woman without discretion.'—Pr 11[22].

THE women mentioned in the Books of Samuel are, for the most part, distinguished for their piety. But what shall be said of Michal?

No portrait in the Old Testament is drawn with more distinctness than that of this second daughter of Saul, the wife of Saul's rival and successor. There are lessons of a very valuable kind to be learnt from the delineation, but it does not appear that the sacred writer has taken special pains with the subject for the purpose of edification; rather the portrait is sharply defined because the original was herself a marked character with strong lineaments and an unmistakable personality.

I.

1. That Michal was impressionable and impulsive appears from more than one instance in the Bible story. When David, fresh and ruddy, rich