

occurred. However, I do not think it necessary to hold this view since the elements which are in common, it seems to me, might actually be the same in two stories without their being related. However, there is more probability, I think, of a relationship between the two flood stories than in any other case.

Some have maintained that most of the elements in the story of Christ are derived from the Babylonian Gilgamish story. One German professor has gone to great extremes on this point. Actually the similarities consist of picking a point here and there, without any fundamental similarity between the two personalities. For instance, the Bible represents Christ as being fully God and fully man. The Babylonian story mentions Gilgamish as two-thirds man and one-third God. To say that one is the origin of the other is hardly necessary. In describing the great power of a mighty hero, it was certainly natural for the Babylonians to say that he was part God. It is interesting that they chose this queer fraction of one-third and two-thirds.

A very interesting cause for many apparent similarities between Babylonian and Biblical stories is as follows: Many of the Babylonian texts are badly broken. A Babylonian scholar has a tablet before him. He is trying to translate the entire tablet. When he finds broken places he tries to fill in the breaks. Frequently, he can find a similar passage in some other Babylonian tablet and copy some words from it, in brackets to show what possibly was at this point in the story which he is copying. When such a similarity is lacking, he either uses his imagination or tries to find some other source for a good suggestion as to what may have stood in the gap.