



Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature

Author(s): Morris Jastrow, Jr.

Source: *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Jul., 1899), pp. 193-214

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/527847>

Accessed: 20/11/2014 00:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XV

JULY, 1899

NUMBER 4

ADAM AND EVE IN BABYLONIAN LITERATURE.

BY MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH.D.,

Professor of Semitic Languages at the University of Pennsylvania.

I.

Attempts have been made at various times to discover traces of the story of Adam and Eve among the Babylonians. These attempts are interesting chiefly as illustrations, in the domain of science, of the wish being father to the thought. George Smith, in his *Chaldean Account of Genesis*,¹ devoted a few pages to indications of supposed parallels between the biblical account of the fall of man and the contents of an Assyrian tablet, belonging to the so-called creation series. We now know that Smith's interpretation of the tablet was totally erroneous. What he took for an address of a god to the first human pair turns out to be a hymn in praise of Marduk as the conqueror of Tiamat (the symbol of primeval chaos), together with an epilogue in which mankind is enjoined not to forget the tale of the contest of the great Marduk, a god whose "power is irresistible, but who turns in mercy toward those whom he loves."² Smith also called attention to the design on a Babylonian cylinder which consisted of two sitting figures with a tree between them and a serpent behind one of the figures.³ In this representation Smith saw a confirmation of the view which supposed that the Bible story of the

¹ Pp. 87-92.

² Delitzsch's *Weltschöpfungsepos*, pp. 112-14.

³ *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, p. 91.

temptation and fall was familiar to the Babylonians and Assyrians. This evidence, too, has proven fallacious. While we need not go to the length to which Oppert⁴ went, who declared that what Smith and others regarded as a serpent was merely a dividing line in the cylinder, Baudissin⁵ is certainly right in his assertion that the scene may represent a good many other things besides a possible illustration of the famous incident in the third chapter of Genesis. The serpent is an exceedingly common emblem on Babylonian monuments, appearing on boundary stones, as well as on purely religious designs,⁶ and still more common is the representation of a tree, generally some variety of the palm, which appears in nigh endless variations on sculptured slabs and on seal cylinders. It is to be noted that in the cylinder in question each figure has its left hand stretched out toward the palm cones which hang on the tree. This attitude, which suggests some connection between the design and the very common scene of the winged figures, or priests, or kings, standing before a palm tree, should have served as a caution to scholars before instituting a comparison with the famous biblical tale. Yet even so careful a scholar as Friedrich Delitzsch advocated in strong terms a connection between the scene on the cylinder and the narrative in the third chapter of Genesis. This was in 1881.⁷ He probably does not hold the same view now. At all events, Schrader⁸ voices the general opinion of scholars present when he says there is not the slightest reference on the cylinder in question to the fall of man, and it is rather surprising that Zimmern, in his notes to Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, should not have protested against Gunkel's intimation, though tentatively made, that the scene on the cylinder may represent the Babylonian story of paradise.⁹

A few years ago, Sayce¹⁰ made an attempt to prove that the name Adapa occurring in a mythological tale on a cuneiform tablet from El-Amarna should be read Adama, and he accordingly recognized in this Babylonian personage the counterpart

⁴ *Götting. Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1878, No. 34, p. 1070.

⁵ *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I, p. 260.

⁶ So, *e. g.*, on the famous Abu Habba tablet (V R. 60). For the serpent on boundary stones see, *e. g.*, III R. 45, V R. 56, etc.

⁷ *Wo lag das Paradies?* pp. 90-91. He was followed by William Hayes Ward, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 222, and many others.

⁸ *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (Engl. translation), Vol. I, p. 38. See also Menant, *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscriptions*, 1880, pp. 270 sq.

⁹ P. 147, note 2.

¹⁰ *Academy*, 1893, No. 1055.

to the biblical Adam. Building, as he so frequently does, upon the slenderest foundations, Sayce elaborated an interpretation of the tale in question that was totally erroneous. The Adapa story in its present form is a nature myth to which a lesson has been attached. It is intended to teach the impossibility for man to attain immortality.¹¹ But, while there is scarcely anything in the tale that warrants the belief that Adapa is the first human being to be created,¹² Sayce's supposition of some resemblance between Adapa and the story of Adam's fall was not altogether unwarranted. The Adapa story furnishes the reason why man was condemned to die, and the third chapter in Genesis does the same. According to Genesis, death is sent as a punishment for man's disobedience of a divine decree; in the Babylonian story, the god and protector of humanity, Ea, deceives Adapa, and thus brings death upon him. Adapa is told by Ea not to eat of the food of life, nor to drink of the water of life, that will be offered him by Anu and his associates. Adapa *obeys* and thus foregoes the chance of securing immortal life. Had he been clever enough to detect Ea's design, which was to prevent Adapa from being immortal, and to disobey, he would have obtained the prerogative of the gods. As it is, Anu and his associates bewail Adapa's fate, but can do nothing for him. The fact that the same problem is introduced into both the Babylonian tales is not without significance, but the different manners in which the problem is put and solved is even more significant. It is not necessary for Adapa himself to stand in any direct connection with Adam to justify the conclusion of some ultimate relationship between the Adapa legend and the story of Adam's loss of immortality. A close study of the legends of Babylonia shows that the custom of using ancient myths and traditions as illustrations of doctrines developed in the Babylonian schools of religious thought was quite common. It is this attachment of morals to the tales, and the adaptation of the tales to the lessons, that forms a bond of union between the literary methods pursued by the Hebrew and by the Babylonian theologians, respectively. Precisely as in the book of Genesis, the creation narrative and the story of the deluge are

¹¹ For a fuller exposition see the writer's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 544, 555.

¹² The identification of Adapa with Alaparos, who is mentioned by Berosus as the second of the "ten patriarchs," does not decide the question. Zimmern, who follows Scheil and Hommel in accepting this identification, recognizes the weak points in the argument. See his article, "Lebensbrot und Lebenswasser im Babylonischen und in der Bibel" (*Archiv. für Religionswissenschaft*, II, p. 169, note 1).

introduced as a medium for illustrating certain views held of the deity, of his relationship to mankind, and for impressing certain ethical standards and moral precepts upon the people, so the Babylonian *literati* frequently attach a purpose to the popular tales to which a literary form was given. In both cases these popular tales were used because, being so well known, they could serve as the purpose of illustrations, and in both cases the tales were preserved in literature, simply again because, being popular, they could not be suppressed or set aside. The Babylonian traditions regarding creation are modified upon passing through the hands of the literary priests of Babylon and made to serve the purpose of a glorification of Marduk,¹³ the head of the latter Babylonian pantheon. In the Gilgamesh epic the problems of immortality and of the condition of the dead in the great gathering place, known as Aralû, are introduced in connection with some of the adventures of the hero;¹⁴ and we even find the same tale recounted in variations with different lessons attached. In view of this there may be an agreement between the problem dealt with in some Babylonian tale and one found in a biblical story, without any direct connection between the two stories. The researches of Gunkel, as embodied in his valuable work, *Schöpfung und Chaos*,¹⁵ have made it clear that the meeting point of Hebrew and Babylonian myths and traditions lies much nearer to the earlier contact between the two, before the settlement of Hebræo-Aramaic clans in Palestine, than to the later one. The influence exerted by Babylonia upon the Hebrews during the so-called Babylonian exile was literary rather than religious. Under the stimulus of the literary atmosphere of Babylonia, a definite and, in many cases, a final shape was given to ancient traditions. Tales and myths were interpreted and transformed, but the tales themselves had not only been the property of the Hebrews for many centuries previous, becoming part and parcel of their life, but had passed through various phases of development quite independent of Babylonian influence. We need not, therefore, expect to find *close* parallels between biblical and Babylonian traditions, even when those traditions can be traced to a common source. Indeed, a *close* parallel is an almost certain proof of direct borrowing from one side or the other, whereas in a comparative study of Hebrew and Babylonian traditions the factor of variation is as important as the points of

¹³ Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 409.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

¹⁵ See the summary, pp. 147-9 and pp. 168-70.

agreement. Perhaps the strongest objection against seeing, in the seal cylinder above referred to, any reference to the biblical story of the temptation and fall lies in the very fact that, inasmuch as the biblical tale, whatever its origin, bears clear evidence of high antiquity, and of having passed through phases of development distinctly Hebraic, the variations that one would be led to expect between the story and a possible Babylonian counterpart, either in a primitive form or transformed by totally different influences from those to which the Hebrew story was subjected, are not accounted for. The resemblance, it may be said, though in one way superficial, is in another too close to be of any value.

But, since it is clear that the story of creation, the story of the tower of Babel, and the story of the deluge originated in a Babylonian environment, it is but fair to expect that at least some phases of the biblical story of Adam and Eve, or the story in some form, should also be met with in Babylonian literature. The Adapa legend may be regarded as representing such a phase. The food of life and the water of life, instead of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil and of the tree of life, are just the kind of variations that we have a right to expect on the assumption of an independent development by the Hebrews and Babylonians, respectively, of an ancient tradition derived from a common source, or once held in common by them.

The attachment of the same story (and of the doctrine conveyed by the tale) to two such different personages as Adapa and Adam finds a ready explanation likewise on the same assumption of independent development. On the other hand, such a common touch in the two tales as the fear of Ea lest Adapa may attain immortality, and the dread of Yahweh-Elohim lest Adam eat also of the tree of life "and live forever," points with convincing force to some ultimate common source for certain features of the two tales. The solution of the problem in the Babylonian version is as characteristic of Babylonian thought, as the biblical solution is in accord with the peculiarities of religious thought among the Hebrews at a certain period in their intellectual and religious life.

II.

There is, however, another phase of the Adam and Eve story to which a Babylonian counterpart exists, but which, so far as I can see, has escaped the attention of scholars. Whatever may be

the judgment regarding the force of the arguments that I shall present for my thesis, the assurance can at least be given that, in this instance, "the wish was not father to the thought," for the Gilgamesh epic, where, as I shall endeavor to show, this counterpart is to be found, is the last place where one would think of looking for any parallel to the biblical tale of Adam and Eve. The Gilgamesh epic is, as I trust I have satisfactorily established in my work on *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*,¹⁶ a composite production in which various tales, originally independent, have been interwoven. The hero of the epic is Gilgamesh, but incidents are introduced into the adventures of Gilgamesh with which originally he had nothing to do, and which formed no part of his career. Gilgamesh becomes a favorite personage, to whom floating traditions were attached, in part by popular fancy and in part by the deliberate efforts of literary compilers. In this epic, faint historical traditions are introduced, but so blended with nature myths that Gilgamesh appears, now as an earthly ruler, and again as a solar deity.¹⁷ That such a personage as Gilgamesh once existed there is every reason to believe. The theory of *creatio ex nihilo* will not suffice for the rise of legendary lore. Next to Gilgamesh, the most prominent figure in the epic is Eabani. He is introduced in the second tablet of the epic, and the manner in which he is brought into association with Gilgamesh reveals at once the original independence of the Eabani episode. Gilgamesh has taken possession of the city of Uruk (or Erech) and probably of the district of which Uruk was the capital. He has played havoc with the inhabitants of Uruk. A hero of irresistible power, he has snatched husbands away from their wives, and has bereft mothers of their virgin daughters. In their distress the inhabitants of Uruk appeal to Aruru, the great mother-goddess. She who has created Gilgamesh is now asked to produce a creature strong enough to take up the fight against him. Aruru, who elsewhere in Babylonian literature appears as the creator of mankind, hears the appeal and fashions Eabani. The manner in which she does this is strikingly like Elohim's creation of the first man. We read:¹⁸

"Aruru upon hearing this forms a man of Anu.

Aruru washes her hands, takes a bit of clay and throws it on the ground. She creates Eabani, a hero, a lofty offspring, the possession of Ninib."

¹⁶ Chap. xxiii. ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 470. ¹⁸ Haupt, *Das babylonische Nimrodepos*, pp. 8, 11, 33-5.

Eabani is thus not only formed of the earth like Adam, but is called a man of Anu. Anu is the god of heaven, but the name is often used in the sense of divine, "lofty," so that an "Anu man" forms a kind of parallel to the biblical phrase which declares that man was made "in the image of Elohim."¹⁹ The name Ea-bani signifies "Ea is the creator."²⁰ and Jensen²¹ has pointed out traces of a tradition current in parts of Babylonia which made Ea the "creator of humanity." To a late day, Ea—originally the god of the Persian gulf—is viewed as the protector of mankind *par excellence*, so that it is but natural that he should have been regarded also as the one who produced mankind. In making Eabani the creation of Aruru, the Gilgamesh epic follows another tradition regarding the origin of the human race. There actually exists a version of the creation story in which Aruru appears as the one who created the seed of mankind²² It is true that Marduk is associated with Aruru in this work, but the introduction of Marduk is the work of the theologians of Babylon who could not afford to ignore their patron god. Elsewhere Aruru is described as the mistress of mankind, and, since Ishtar is commonly given this title, it is plausible to assume that Aruru is a form of Ishtar and represents, perhaps, the oldest name of the chief goddess of Uruk, who is generally termed Nanā.²³ In the version of the creation story discovered by George Smith²⁴ it is Marduk who is said to create mankind, and here without any associate, but there are distinct traces in this very version that at an early period in Babylonian history, when Bel of Nippur stood preëminent among the gods, he was regarded as the one who fashioned mankind. Such varying traditions point to the existence of various centers of religious thought, and since religion and political conditions react on one another in ancient Babylonia, the claims made in one place for Ea, in another for Aruru-Ishtar, in a third for Bel, and in a fourth for Marduk, point to political as well as to doctrinal rivalry. One who bears such a name as Eabani might fairly be expected to have been created by Ea. The Gilgamesh epic in naming Aruru as the creator of mankind

¹⁹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים (Gen. 1:27).

²⁰ A third element like "of the son" or "offspring" or "man" is perhaps omitted.

²¹ *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, pp. 293-4.

²² Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 448.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 449. Nanā signifies merely "the lady."

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 437.

betrays the influences at work in giving the composition its final shape. A mixture of traditions has taken place. Eabani survived as a figure from a gray antiquity. Who he originally was we are no longer in a position to say, but he has been used as an appropriate personage to whom to attach traditions that aim to recall the primitive state of the human race. The description given of Eabani in the epic shows at a glance that he belongs to an entirely different period of culture from the one represented by Gilgamesh. He goes about naked. His body is covered with hair. He has long flowing locks, and he lives with the animals about him :

“Eating herbs with gazelles,
Drinking from a trough with cattle,
Sporting with the creatures of the waters.”²⁵

This Babylonian “wild man of the woods” is evidently a picture of man living in a savage state, and the description here given accords with the representation of Eabani on seal cylinders.²⁶ The real Eabani is a figure who belongs to the period when popular monsters of hybrid formation, half man, half beast. If not actually the first man, he is certainly a most primitive man. Such a personage has clearly nothing in common with Gilgamesh, who belongs to a different age. The course of the narrative is not affected by the narrative of Eabani’s career, which has been deliberately and rather artistically forced into connection with Gilgamesh. Gilgamesh frustrates the plan of the inhabitants of Uruk by sending a messenger known as Šaidu, *i. e.*, “the hunter,” and described as a “wicked being,” to capture Eabani. We should expect a hero like Gilgamesh to proceed directly against Eabani. The introduction of Šaidu is a further cause for suspecting the original existence of an independent Eabani story. The hunter obeys Gilgamesh, but at sight of Eabani draws back in fear and is unable to catch him. Gilgamesh hereupon instructs Šaidu as follows:²⁷

“Go, hunter mine, and take with thee Ukhat,
When the cattle come to the trough,
Let her tear off her dress and disclose her nakedness,
He will see her and approach her,
His cattle which grew up on his field will forsake him.”

²⁵ Haupt, *Nimrodepes*, p. 8, ll. 39-41.

²⁶ See, *e. g.*, Menant, *La glyptique orientale*, pp. 84-91.

²⁷ For the quotations from the Gilgamesh epic I may refer in general to chap. xxiii of my *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*.

Ukhat or ukhâte occurs in another passage of the epic²⁸ as one of the classes of sacred prostitutes who acted as a species of priestesses in the cult of Ishtar; and it is plausible to regard those sacred harlots as taking part in the rites which to Herodotus appeared obscene;²⁹ but the ukhat who is to ensnare Eabani has no religious rank whatsoever. The word appears to be used in the epic as a general designation for woman, just as in Arabic *hurmâ*—identical with Babylonian *kharimtu*—becomes the general word for a woman—a wife or daughter. If Haupt is correct in connecting ukhat. with akhu, which means a “net,”³⁰ another analogy would be established between the Babylonian and Arabic terms, for in Hebrew the word *herem* has likewise the sense of “net.”³¹

Eabani falls a victim to Ukhat's attractions:

“Ukhat exposed her breast, revealed her nakedness, took off
her clothing
Unabashed she enticed him.”

The details of the meeting of Eabani and Ukhat are described with a naïveté and frankness that point to the antiquity of the legend. We are told that

“For six days and seven nights Eabani enjoyed the love
of Ukhat.

After he had satiated himself with her charms,
He turned his countenance to his cattle.
The reposing gazelles saw Eabani,
The cattle of the field turned away from him.
Eabani was startled and grew faint,
His limbs grew stiff as his cattle ran off.”

In these lines we must seek for the real meaning and purpose of the incident. Through Ukhat, Eabani is led away from his association with the “cattle” and “creatures of the field.” “Living” with the gazelles and cattle clearly implies³² the satisfaction of the sexual passion through intercourse with them. It is only after Eabani has tasted the charms of Ukhat that he deserts his former associates, or, what amounts to the same thing,

²⁸ In the 6th tablet of Haupt's edition, p. 49, ll. 184-5; also in the Dibbarra legend. See E. T. Harper in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, I, p. 428.

²⁹ Book I, §§ 181, 182, 199.

³⁰ Delitzsch, *Assyrisches HWB.*, 41a.

³¹ *E. g.*, Ezek. 32:3, etc.

³² As shown by Ukhat's address to Eabani below.

that they desert him. The gazelles and cattle see the change that has come over Eabani and run away. They feel that he no longer belongs to them, and the amazement of Eabani, who but half realizes what has happened, is well portrayed. A new force, a totally different factor, has been introduced into his life, and he is overpowered by his emotions. Held captive by the love of Ukhat, and feeling that she henceforth belongs to him and he to her,

“He again turns in love enthralled at the feet of the harlot,
Looks up into her face and listens as the woman speaks to him :
‘Lofty art thou, Eabani, thou wilt be like a god,’³³
Why dost thou lie with the beasts ?
Come, I will take thee to walled Uruk.’”

In these words there is a very clear indication that Eabani had hitherto satisfied his passions by association with beasts, and no less significant is the implication that Eabani will become the equal of the gods in following and clinging to Ukhat as a worthier companion. But at this point, the connection of the Eabani story with the adventures of Gilgamesh is again moved into the foreground. Ukhat asks Eabani to follow her to “walled Uruk,” which she describes as

“The seat of Gilgamesh, perfect in power,
Surpassing men in strength, like a mountain bull.”

Eabani yields to her entreaty,

“He was obedient to the word that she spoke to him
In the wisdom of his heart, he recognized a companion.”³⁴

In the continuation of Gilgamesh's adventures, Eabani becomes the companion of the hero, but it is evident that the title was originally applied to Ukhat, who becomes the “mate” of Eabani. With the introduction of Uruk the connection between Gilgamesh and Eabani is established, but the Ukhat-Eabani episode also comes to an abrupt end. There is no further mention of Ukhat, and no intimation is given as to the reason for

³³ In my *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 477, I translated, “Lofty art thou like to God,” but I am now convinced that the words *kima ili tabaši* must be rendered, “Thou wilt be like a god,” as Haupt proposed in a note attached to his *Nimrodepos*, p. 12 (*cf.* also *Beitr. zur Assyriol.*, I, p. 104). Ukhat offers Eabani, as an inducement to abandon his affiliation with animals, that by following her he will become like a god. Interpreted in this way the words form a striking parallel to the biblical words (Gen. 3:5), “ye will be like Elohim,” addressed by the serpent to Adam and Eve. The importance of this parallel will be dwelt on in the course of the article.

³⁴ Jeremias (*Nimrodepos*, p. 18) translates “seeks a friend,” and refers the words to Gilgamesh, but see my note in *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 478.

her disappearance. This in itself is a feature meriting attention. Eabani and Gilgamesh together proceed upon various adventures, but again it must be noted that these are all such in which Eabani takes no direct part. The two are portrayed as fighting against Humbaba,³⁵ but Gilgamesh alone is celebrated as the victor. In a subsequent part of the epic, Gilgamesh refuses to marry the goddess Ishtar. The latter's father, Anu, creates a divine bull—Alu—to destroy Gilgamesh. Eabani and Gilgamesh in company proceed to dispatch the bull, but in reality Eabani has nothing to do with this episode. The insult offered the goddess by Gilgamesh is no concern of Eabani. Both Eabani and Gilgamesh, however, are punished for killing the bull, the former with death, the latter with a loathsome disease. We seek in vain in the epic for an answer to the obvious question: Why should Eabani receive a more grievous punishment than the real offender? Though Gilgamesh is portrayed as bewailing the loss of Eabani, the hero's career proceeds undisturbed. Eabani's disappearance is as superfluous as his introduction, so far as the adventures of Gilgamesh are concerned. We may conclude, then, that the Ukhath-Eabani episode is attached to the career of Gilgamesh, just as in the eleventh tablet the strange story of Parnapishtim-Adrakhasis is introduced, though having nothing to do with Gilgamesh. In order to bring the two together, Gilgamesh is described as having encountered Parnapishtim in the course of his wanderings, and, in reply to a question, Parnapishtim tells the marvelous story of his rescue from a disastrous flood.³⁶ Finally, in the last tablet of the epic, in which the problem of the fate of mankind after death is illustrated by Gilgamesh's supposed anxiety to know what has become of Eabani, the latter is once more introduced. Gilgamesh is accorded a sight of Eabani's ghost or shadow,³⁷ and through the latter learns as much, or rather as little, of the sad and joyless condition of those dwelling in the other world as is permitted to be revealed to a mortal. This last tablet, as I have endeavored to show,³⁸ is an addition to the epic of a purely scholastic character, tacked on for the purpose of dealing with a problem that interested the theologians of Babylonia.

³⁵ Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 480-82.

³⁶ On the proper interpretation of the Parnapishtim-Adrakhasis narrative see an article of the writer in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. XIII, pp. 288-301.

³⁷ Ekimmu.

³⁸ *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 512-14.

Gilgamesh and Eabani are chosen as appropriate personages to serve as illustrations. The story of Gilgamesh really comes to an end in the eleventh tablet, which closes with the return of Gilgamesh to Uruk after a long series of wanderings—partially cured of his disease, but unable to learn the secret of immortal life. The wanderings of Gilgamesh, in the twelfth tablet, in search of Eabani are suggested by the wanderings described in the previous tablets; they are a “duplicate” of these former wanderings. Separating the parts of the Gilgamesh epic in this way, we find two episodes: one, the Eabani-Ukat story, the other, the tale of Parnapishtim-Adrakhasis attached to the adventures of Gilgamesh, though originally having nothing whatsoever to do with the hero. The same process may be observed in other parts of the epic, but these two illustrations suffice to make clear the method of composition in the case of the epic, which is strikingly analogous to the growth of the Arabian romance of Antur, and also has points of resemblance with the method followed in the *Thousand and One Nights*.

Stripped of the connection with the Gilgamesh epic, the Eabani-Ukat episode reverts to some popular tradition, recalling the separation of man from the early savage state when he lived his life with the animals about him. Among various nations tales recalling such a period are current, and the curious beliefs, so widely spread, which led groups living in a state of primitive culture to predicate their descent from animals, belong to the same order of ideas. It is the woman who, by arousing the sexual instinct (or passion), leads Eabani away from association with the animal world and directs him to the road which leads to civilization. To her Eabani cleaves as a companion, when once he has become enchained by her power. The separation from the animals is coincident with the birth of the sense of the superior dignity of man, and the Babylonian legend properly emphasizes this separation as a first and necessary step before man can assume the position mapped out for one who is to be “like to a god,” created in the image of Anu. The figure of Eabani, or, as we may also put it, the rôle assigned to Eabani, thus turns out to be as close an approach to the “first man” as one can expect to find in Babylonian literature. We are now prepared to approach the question as to the possible connection between the Eabani-Ukat episode and the biblical story of Adam and Eve.

III.

It is noteworthy that in the biblical tale, according to the Yahwistic narrative, Adam lives in close communication with the animals about him. From Gen. 2:20, where Adam "assigns names" to all the cattle, birds, and beasts, we are permitted to conclude that a conception was once current which placed him, precisely like Eabani, in touch with the animal world. The assigning of a name, in oriental parlance, is much more than a formal act; it implies close relationship to the thing named. Adam does not assign names to the sun, moon, or stars, or to the fish of the sea. Be it noted, also, that his assigning of names to beasts takes place before the creation of Eve. When Eve is created, he assigns a name to her (2:23; 3:20); and since the creation of Eve is followed by sexual intercourse (Gen. 2:24) between the first pair, one gains the impression that the phrase "assigning of names" is nothing but a veiled expression for this intercourse—a euphemism suggested by a more refined age. The expression is only a degree less veiled than the one found in the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter,³⁹ "clinging together and becoming one flesh." Moreover, immediately after the phrase, "and Adam assigned names to all the cattle," etc., we read the strange words, "but for Adam there was not found a helpmate corresponding to him." The connection between these words and the giving of names to animals would be unintelligible unless the act of giving names meant something more than the bare words conveyed. In a recent article touching on this verse, Professor Stade⁴⁰ makes the suggestion that Yahweh's motive for asking Adam to give names to the animals was the hope that he would find a helpmate among them. In the light of the Babylonian tale which pictures Eabani living with animals, Stade's suggestion receives a striking illumination, though requiring the modification just set forth. The verse actually implies association of man with animals; only, that the biblical writer, besides veiling this association under a euphemistic phrase, also indicates Adam's dissatisfaction with the life led by him at the time when he "assigned names" to the animals. Man, according to the Yahwistic narrative, feels the unworthiness of the association even before the woman was

³⁹ Gen. 2:24.

⁴⁰ *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1897, p. 200.

actually brought to him. Such a modification and departure from the Babylonian version is precisely of the kind that we have a right to expect in the form assumed by ancient traditions among a people which passed through a religious development so unique as did the Hebrews. But we may feel certain that, unless the compilers of the Yahwistic narrative had received from some source a tradition which brought Adam into close affiliation with the animals, they would not have embodied so strange an incident as the "assignment of names" to the animal world into their text.⁴¹ The act in itself has no bearings whatsoever on the narrative of creation. It cannot have been intended to account for the fact that the animals have names, for the luminaries, the heavens, and the deep also have names without their being "assigned" by Adam.

There is no reference in the Eabani-Ukhat episode to the actual creation of woman, but another parallel between the Babylonian and the biblical tales, and a most significant one, is furnished by vs. 22 of this same chapter of Genesis. After the creation of the woman we are told "Yahweh-Elohim brought her to Adam." The verb used, *wa-yebhiēhā*, is the one commonly employed to express sexual union,⁴² and in the Gilgamesh epic a verb is used, *tibu*, when Ukhat offers herself to Eabani,⁴³ which reverts to the same root as the Hebrew *bō*. The form of this verb used in the biblical narrative is the so-called Hiphil, the causative, and we are therefore perfectly justified in rendering "Yahweh-Elohim caused her to come to Adam," *i. e.*, induced her to offer herself to Adam—precisely as Ukhat offers herself to Eabani. At this point it may be proper to call attention to another parallel between the biblical and Babylonian tale. Eabani is described as being entirely naked, while Ukhat, when she comes to Eabani, strips herself of her clothing :

"Unabashed she enticed him."

Similarly we read of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:25) that they were "naked and unabashed." The variation that in the biblical story

⁴¹ The intercourse with animals was by no means a remote idea in the days of the compilers of the biblical records. The pentateuchal legislation, it will be recalled, felt obliged to provide for such cases, Lev. 20:15, 16; 18:23. The Midrash Rabba to Gen. 2:16 (§ 16) interprets the words *עַל-הַאָדָם* as containing a warning that man should restrict sexual intercourse to his wife, keeping away from intercourse with males or with animals. See also, *ibid.*, § 18 to Gen. 2:24.

⁴² *E. g.*, in the very frequent phrase *וַיָּבֹא אֵלֶיהָ* "and he came in unto her."

⁴³ Haupt's edition, p. 11, l. 21.

both are portrayed as "unabashed" is, again, due to the transformation which the original tradition underwent in the course of time.

It has already been pointed out that the meeting of Adam and Eve is followed by the act of sexual contact. This act implied, as we have seen in the closing words of vs. 22, is more explicitly set forth in the closing words of vs. 24,⁴⁴ though still somewhat veiled. In this same verse there is, as I venture to think, a further reference to Adam's abandoning sexual association with animals after obtaining Eve as his mate. As the verse now stands, "therefore man forsakes his father and mother and clings to his wife," there does not appear to be any logical connection either with what precedes or with what follows. Because for man the woman is "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh" furnishes no good reason why he should abandon his parents, since he is also "bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh." The Hebrew verb translated "forsake" is a strong term, and means much more than merely to take leave of one's parents. It conveys the idea of setting them aside altogether. The social customs of Semitic society do not recognize the married man as a social unit. The latter belongs to a clan as much as he did before he took a partner. His status is not altered by marriage, except that in some forms of Semitic society he becomes a member of his wife's clan, instead of bringing his wife over to his clan. To see in the words of this verse a faint allusion to the matriarchate has not found favor in the eyes of scholars, and properly so, for even assuming that a man's children are reckoned to the mother's clan, this does not involve a desertion of his parents on the part of the man. If, however, we assume the existence of some ancient tradition according to which man, at one time in close association with the animals, abandons the latter upon encountering a mate who is a counterpart of himself, the survival of the phrase "forsake," as well as the new turn given to the tradition, becomes intelligible. It is a characteristic feature of the early chapters of Genesis, as Gunkel has pointed out,⁴⁵ that, despite the late date of their final

⁴⁴ וַדְּבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד. The rabbis have no hesitation in interpreting these words as referring to sexual intercourse. See Midrash Rabba Genesis to the verse (§ 18).

⁴⁵ *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 6, 7. Gunkel's words are worth quoting in full. In translation they read: "It is a common feature of old tales preserved in the form that they took on in later times, that certain traits which in the earlier connection had a good sense are carried along into the new version, although losing their purport. Such old traits, fragments of a former identity, but without a logical connection in the present state of the narrative, reveal to the investigator the existence and certain traits of an earlier form of the narrative."

reduction, the old phrases that stuck in the popular mind are retained, and other illustrations could be adduced of the manner in which these phrases are made to serve a meaning quite different from their original purport.⁴⁶ The old tradition which made Adam "forsake" the animals after encountering Eve had no meaning to a later age, that had passed far beyond the stage of belief which had given rise to the legend. The reshaping of legends and traditions is the inevitable fate to which they must succumb, if they are to survive the vicissitudes of time and of changed conditions. The same motives that led to the veiling of the affiliation of early man with animals under such a phrase as "assigning names" to cattle, birds, and beasts, led to the substitution of "father and mother" in the tradition which originally conveyed the idea that man "forsook" his animal associates upon finding a mate worthier of him. Adam's clinging to Eve finds a perfect parallel in Eabani's strong attachment to Ukhat — "enthralled at her feet."

The suggestion has already been thrown out that Eabani is not only a type of primitive man, but actually embodies a Babylonian tradition of the "first man." The description of the manner of his creation forms a further justification for comparing him to the biblical Adam.⁴⁷ Like the latter, he is created out of the dust of the ground, and when he dies, we are told in this same Gilgamesh epic,

"he is turned to clay."⁴⁸

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the startling resemblance of Eabani's fate to the one held in store for Adam (Gen. 3:19):

"Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

But the parallel between Eabani and Adam raises the important question as to the part taken by Šaidu in the Eabani-Ukhat episode. We have seen that Eabani's transfer to Uruk is due to the desire to connect him with Gilgamesh's adventures. On the other hand, the episode between Eabani and Ukhat could not have ended with a love scene between the two. That Eabani encountered a sad fate may be concluded from a fragment of a

⁴⁶ In a paper on "The Original Character of the Hebrew Sabbath" (*American Journal of Theology*, Vol. II, pp. 343-6) I have brought the proof that the words, Gen. 2:2, "and Elohim rested" are such an old phrase which originally had reference to the cessation of Yahweh's anger, and was afterward given the meaning of Yahweh's cessation from the work of creation.

⁴⁷ See above, pp. 198-9.

⁴⁸ Haupt's edition, p. 67, l. 12.

tablet belonging, perhaps, to another version of the Gilgamesh epic than the one known to us,⁴⁹ in which Eabani is introduced as cursing Ukhat whom, together with Šaidu, he holds responsible for having brought death upon him after promising that he would be "like a god," *i. e.*, immortal. He goes so far as to denounce Ukhat's charms, which turned out disastrous to him. Exactly what happened we are not told, or, rather, the fragmentary condition of the tablet in question does not enable us to determine, but it is clear that in some way Ukhat and Šaidu were concerned in Eabani's death. Šaidu, in fact, plays a part which bears a considerable analogy to the rôle of the serpent in the third chapter of Genesis. It is true that in Genesis the serpent does not make its appearance until after the meeting of Adam and Eve, but such a divergence between the two stories is again of a kind that we have a right to expect. The main point of the temptation and fall is that through the serpent and Eve Adam is led to a "knowledge of good and evil," which means not merely an exercise of reasoning powers, but vigorous manhood,⁵⁰ with the departure also that this implies from the customs of savage life. It is, perhaps, of some significance, also, that the rabbinical tradition associates the serpent with the sexual passion.⁵¹ But if the expression "knowledge of good and evil" be accepted as another veiled phrase for the sexual union, a plausible hypothesis suggests itself to account for the introduction of the serpent. The same stem which furnishes us with *Khawwâ*—the Hebrew name for Eve—is found in Arabic, and in the Aramaic dialects, as the common name for serpents.⁵² The rabbis themselves introduce a play upon the two names in their comments upon the third chapter of Genesis.⁵³ Is it not possible, therefore, that "the serpent" was originally and in reality merely the woman who, by arousing the sexual passion, leads man to a "knowledge of good and evil"? This suggestion is due to Professor Haupt,⁵⁴ and certainly has much in its favor. Instead of

⁴⁹ See Haupt in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, I, pp. 318-19, and Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 578.

⁵⁰ That such is the force of the phrase follows from Deut. 1:39, where "the sons who know not good and evil" are the minors who have not yet reached the age of puberty.

⁵¹ Midrash Rabba to Genesis, § 20.

⁵² Arabic حَيَّة *hayye*; Aramaic חִיָּיָא; *i. e.*, *Hewya* or *Hiwya*.

⁵³ Midrash Rabba to Genesis, § 20.

⁵⁴ Proposed by him in the course of a discussion of this paper before the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, November 10, 1898.

the serpent, the narrative in its earliest form introduced *Khawwâ-Ukhat*, and an abettor of some kind. In the Babylonian tradition this abettor appears under the vague form of "Şâidu"—a wicked "hunter." Among the Hebrews this second personage, whose rôle can only be grasped in an uncertain manner, all but disappears, to reappear in the final shape given to the tradition, as a serpent, through a misinterpretation of a term by which in reality the woman was known. Complicated as this process appears to be, students of folklore know only too well the strange antics performed by popular tales in passing from one generation to another. So much, at all events, seems clear, that the story in the third chapter of Genesis is in part a doublet of the one introduced in the closing verses of the second chapter. In the third chapter, the three personages—man, woman, and a tempter—are introduced, just as in the Babylonian tale; and while certain features are omitted which are recounted at the end of the second chapter the tale in the third chapter is amplified by the addition of an episode—partly preserved in the Adapa legend, and partly implied in the fragment, in which Eabani curses Ukhat and Şâidu—which told how man, while successful in obtaining "the knowledge of good and evil," failed to secure immortality, although held out to him by *Khawwâ-Ukhat*. Eabani is deceived by Ukhat, and Adapa is deceived by Ea. Adam, likewise, is deceived by *Khawwâ*, interpreted by a later age as a "serpent," and although "created in the likeness of Elohim," it is this same Elohim who prevents Adam from attaining immortality, that properly belongs to a divine being. This pessimistic spirit which, in both the Babylonian and Hebrew tales, looks upon men's separation from animals in order to be directed into the path of civilization as an evil that eventually brings on death as a punishment, is not uncommon among ancient nations. Culture is not attained without a real or apparent opposition to what appear to be natural laws.

Lastly, attention might be directed to the name Ukhat, which has a surprisingly close resemblance to one of the names assigned by Adam to woman. In Gen. 2:23 he calls her *ish-shâ*; in Gen. 3:20, *Khawwâ*.⁵⁵ The double tradition indicates the existence of varying forms of the story. I do not, of course,

⁵⁵ Gen. 3:20, "mother of all living," *Khawwâ* being connected with *Khay*. The word *Khawwâ* is used elsewhere in the Old Testament for the Bedouin encampment, e. g., Numb. 32:41; Deut. 3:14.

mean to connect *Khawwâ* etymologically with Ukhat, but if it be borne in mind that the feminine ending *t* in Ukhat corresponds to the long vowel in *Khawwâ*, that *Khawwat* is therefore equivalent to *Khawwâ* (or Ukhat to Ukha), it is difficult to escape the conclusion that one of the names is *dependent* upon the other. The etymological interpretation proposed for *Khawwâ* in Genesis—*ēm kol hay**—is thoroughly unsatisfactory, and of modern attempts to account for the name, none answers all the necessary conditions. As a reminiscence, however, of an old term, no longer understood and imperfectly preserved in tradition, and then twisted, by a species of folk-etymology, into a form that lent itself more readily to an interpretation that appealed to a later age, the divergence between *Khawwâ* (or *Khawwat*) and Ukhat is not surprising.

IV.

If we now sum up the points of resemblance between the Eabani-Ukhat episode and the biblical story of Adam and Eve, they will, I think, be found sufficient to warrant us in regarding them as of common descent.

1. Eabani, like Adam, is specially created out of the earth. Of both it is said that they turn to earth or clay when they die.

2. Eabani recognizes in Ukhat a companion, precisely as Adam sees in Eve a "mate" worthy of him.

3. Eabani is led away through Ukhat from affiliation with animals and enters into sexual contact with Ukhat; of Adam the same story is related, and though veiled expressions are used, it is clearly implied that Adam, too, like Eabani at one time, "lay with animals."

4. Eabani and Ukhat are naked. Ukhat is "unabashed." Adam and Eve approach each other "naked and unabashed."

5. Through Eve, in conjunction with the "serpent," Adam becomes conscious of his human dignity and power, just as Eabani, through Ukhat and Šaidu, is directed to the path which leads to a higher form of existence.

6. In Genesis the attainment of this higher dignity is regarded as a misfortune, and a sin against divine decrees—for which the punishment is eventually death. Eabani curses Šaidu and Ukhat for having brought death upon him.

7. The dependence of the name *Khawwâ* upon the form Ukhat seems clear.

8. Šaidu plays the part of the tempter to Ukhat, bringing the latter face to face with Eabani, much as the serpent beguiles Eve. Ukhat, acting upon the initiative of Šaidu, offers herself to Eabani,

and, similarly, the narrative at the close of the second chapter of Genesis as well as in the beginning of the third chapter implies that it is Eve who makes the advances to Adam. Both Ukhat and Eve conquer the man by arousing his sexual passion or instinct.

9. Ukhat promises Eabani that he will become divine, and so the serpent, whose rôle is confused with that of *Khawwâ*, or Eve, makes a similar promise. Originally, the promise was made to Adam alone. The alteration of the tradition enlarged it into a promise to both Adam and Eve.

If it be objected that the Babylonian and biblical tales thus interpreted have an element about them which wounds our sensibilities, we must bear in mind that an earlier age regarded such perfectly natural incidents in the life of man as the satisfaction of the sexual instinct, with a naïveté which it is hard for us at the present time to understand. At the same time, the biblical compilers recognized these objectionable features of the story, and skillfully concealed them, to a certain extent, under veiled expressions, or gave certain phases of the story a different turn. In doing this, the compilers did not act altogether in an arbitrary spirit, but were aided by the transformation which early traditions underwent among the Hebrews, to make them conform to the religious and social conditions prevailing at a later period. This transformation, which to a large extent was a popular process, is the factor which accounts for the important divergences of the biblical story of Adam and Eve in its final shape, from the more original and naïve features of the common tradition as preserved in the Eabani-Ukhat episode.

This episode has originally nothing to do with the career of Gilgamesh, but told in connection with the adventures of Babylon's favorite hero, such portions of it only were introduced into the epic as were needed to associate Eabani with Gilgamesh. That further stories were told of Eabani, and that, in fact, a complete Eabani narrative once existed, are plausible suppositions, though still requiring confirmation.

The biblical and Babylonian tales in question embody some of the traditions belonging to the period when man lived in close association with animals. These traditions were independently developed by the two peoples once holding them in common. The chief variations introduced into the Hebrew form of the tradition may be summarized as follows :

1. Instead of making Adam desert the animals upon encountering Eve, a more refined age substituted the interpretation that man through

his strong love for his wife even sets aside his parents. In the Semitic world, where parental attachment is strong, no more forcible illustration could be given of the power exerted by man's "clinging" to his wife.

2. The emphasis laid upon the love of man for woman leads also to the transfer of the temptation to a separate place in Adam's career, and has further prompted the introduction of the remarkable narrative of the manner in which the woman was created. This narrative, however, belongs to a different series of traditions, as instanced by the distinct and special name—*Ishsha*—given to the one who is taken from the "rib" of the first man. The creation of *Ishsha* has nothing to do with *Khawwā*, who is a distinct figure.

3. The fusion of these two traditions, namely, of *Ishsha* and *Khawwā*, was an important factor in dividing the original Adam-*Khawwā* episode into two sections now represented by (a) Gen. 2:18–20, 22c,⁵⁶ 24–25, and (b) Gen. 2:21–22b, 23; 3:1–19.

4. For our purposes it is needless to enter upon a further analysis of Gen. 3:1–19,⁵⁷ and it is sufficient to note (1) that the serpent is a "doublet" of Eve, introduced through a species of etymological confusion, instead of Šāidu.⁵⁸ In the oldest form of the tradition there was no mention of the serpent. (2) That in the third chapter of Genesis two distinct traditions have been thrown together. The phrase "knowledge of good and evil" being a euphemism like the "assigning of names" in Gen. 2:20, the one tradition was a version or "doublet" of the tale told Gen. 2:19–25, the "temptation" of Adam through *Khawwā*—the woman who leads primitive man away from association with animals, and by arousing a proper sense of human dignity prompts man to take the first step in the direction of a higher culture. To this tale there has been added a second story, though in a measure a continuation of the first, which related how man came to forego the immortality that was promised him and to which he had been told to look forward. He is prevented from eating of the fruit of a tree which contained the power to make him "live forever." This story is embodied in a Babylonian legend attached to a mysterious personage, Adapa,⁵⁹ and also alluded to in a fragment of the Gilgamesh epic. In the book of Genesis it is more logically connected with Adam, but there is every reason to believe that there was once current, among Hebrews, a fuller form of the story how man came to lose immortality, than the one we now have in the third chapter, fused with the other episode.

The divergences thus existing between the Babylonian and the biblical tales in question, and which are as instructive as the

⁵⁶ וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם. The details of the meeting are omitted in this version.

⁵⁷ I propose to do so in a future article.

⁵⁸ The theological and exegetical discussions, so popular at one time, as to the "serpent" being a tempter in human form, appear more reasonable in the light of the Babylonian tradition, where the tempter is actually a human being, and no mention is made of the serpent.

⁵⁹ See, now, Zimmern's suggestive and important article referred to above, in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, II, pp. 165–77.

points of agreement still warrant us, as I venture to think, in calling the Eabani-Ukhat episode a Babylonian counterpart to certain phases of the biblical story of Adam and Eve, a counterpart at once closer and much more significant than the connection between the Adapa legend and that phase of the Adam story, only partially preserved in Genesis, which tells of his failure to secure immortal life.

The divergences between the Eabani-Ukhat episode and the Adam-*Khawwâ* story, be it emphasized once more, are precisely of the kind that we have a right to expect, in view of the conditions under which the old popular traditions and legends of the Hebrews took shape. A similar divergence is found in the case of the biblical story of the creation when compared with the Babylonian parallel, and to a less degree also between the biblical and Babylonian versions of the deluge,⁶⁰ but here, again, as in the case of the two tales that form the subject of this paper, the resemblances are close enough to establish the thesis that the Babylonians and Hebrews had traditions in common regarding the beginning of things, and man's early adventures and method of life, while the divergences show that each nation developed these traditions in its own way, transforming the ancient tales to suit peculiar conditions, and giving them an interpretation in keeping with the religious doctrines that were unfolded through the combined efforts of the popular genius and of the religious guides. A study of the Eabani-Ukhat episode in comparison with the story of Adam and Eve adds, as I believe, further proof of the correctness of this position.

⁶⁰ See the writer's *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 450-53 and 500-507.