

Prithivi Rája, was the last Hindu ruler of Delhi. In 1191 came the invasion of Muhammad of Ghor. Defeated on this occasion, Muhammad returned two years later, overthrew the Hindus, and captured and put to death Prithivi Rája. Delhi became henceforth the capital of the Mahometan Indian empire, Kutab-ud-dín (the general and slave of Muhammad of Ghor) being left in command. His dynasty is known as that of the slave kings, and it is to them that old Delhi owes its grandest remains, among them Kutab-ud-dín's mosque and pillar, a few miles south of the modern city. The slave dynasty retained the throne till 1288, when it was subverted by Jalál-ud-dín Ghilzái. The most remarkable monarch of this dynasty was Ala-ud-dín, during whose reign Delhi was twice exposed to attack from invading hordes of Mughuls. On the first occasion, Ala-ud-dín defeated them under the walls of his capital; on the second, after encamping for two months in the neighbourhood of the city, they retired without a battle. The house of Ghilzái came to an end in 1321, and was followed by that of Taghlak. Hitherto the Pathán kings had been content with the ancient Hindu capital, altered and adorned to suit their tastes. But one of the first acts of the founder of the new dynasty, Ghiás-ud-dín Taghlak, was to erect a new capital about four miles further to the east, which he called Taghlakábád: The ruins of his fort remain, and the eye can still trace the streets and lanes of the long deserted city. Ghiás-ud-dín was succeeded by his son Muhammad Taghlak, who reigned from 1325 to 1351, and is described by Elphinstone as "one of the most accomplished princes and most furious tyrants that ever adorned or disgraced human nature." Under this monarch the Delhi of the Taghlak dynasty attained its utmost growth. His successor Firoz Sháh Taghlak transferred the capital to a new town which he founded some miles off, on the north of the Kutab, and to which he gave his own name, Firozábád. In 1398, during the reign of Mahmud Taghlak, occurred the Tartar invasion of Timurlane. The king fled to Guzerat, his army was defeated under the walls of Delhi, and the city surrendered. The town, notwithstanding a promise of protection, was plundered and burned; the citizens were massacred. The invaders at last retired, leaving Delhi without a Government, and almost without inhabitants. At length Mahmud Taghlak regained a fragment of his former kingdom, but on his death in 1412 the family became extinct. He was succeeded by the Sayyid dynasty, which held Delhi and a few miles of surrounding territory till 1444, when it gave way to the house of Lodi, during whose rule the capital was removed to Agra. In 1526 Baber, sixth in descent from Timurlane, invaded India, defeated and killed Ibrahim Lodi at the battle of Pánipat, entered Delhi, was proclaimed emperor, and finally put an end to the Afghan empire. Baber's capital was at Agra, but his son and successor, Humáyun, removed it to Delhi. In 1540 Humáyun was defeated and expelled by Sher Sháh, who entirely rebuilt the city, inclosing and fortifying it with a new wall. In his time Delhi extended from where Humáyun's tomb now is to near the southern gate of the modern city. In 1555 Humáyun, with the assistance of Persia, regained the throne; but he died within six months afterwards, and was succeeded by his son, the illustrious Akbár.

During Akbár's reign and that of his son Jahángir, the capital was either at Agra or at Lahore, and Delhi once more fell into decay. Between 1638 and 1658, however, Sháh Jahán rebuilt it almost in its present form; and his city remains substantially the Delhi of the present time. The imperial palace, the Jámá Masjid or great mosque, and the restoration of what is now the western Jumna canal, are the work of Sháh Jahán. The Mughul empire rapidly

expanded during the reigns of Akbár and his successors down to Aurungzebe, when it attained its climax. After the death of the latter monarch, in 1707, came the decline. Insurrections and civil wars on the part of the Hindu tributary chiefs, Sikhs and Marhattás, broke out. Aurungzebe's successors became the helpless instruments of conflicting chiefs. His grandson, Jahándar Sháh was, in 1713, deposed and strangled after a reign of one year; and Farrakhsiyar, the next in succession, met with the same fate in 1719. He was succeeded by Muhammad Sháh, in whose reign the Marhattá forces first made their appearance before the gates of Delhi, in 1736. Three years later the Persian monarch, Nádir Sháh, after defeating the Mughul army at Karnál, entered Delhi in triumph. While engaged in levying a heavy contribution, the Persian troops were attacked by the populace, and many of them were killed. Nádir Sháh, after vainly attempting to stay the tumult, at last gave orders for a general massacre of the inhabitants. For fifty-eight days Nádir Sháh remained in Delhi, and when he left he carried with him a treasure in money amounting, at the lowest computation, to eight or nine millions sterling, besides jewels of inestimable value, and other property to the amount of several millions more.

From this time (1740) the decline of the empire proceeded unchecked and with increased rapidity. In 1771 Sháh Alam, the son of Alamgir II., was nominally raised to the throne by the Marhattás, the real sovereignty resting with the Marhattá chief, Sindhia. An attempt of the puppet emperor to shake himself clear of the Marhattás, in which he was defeated in 1788, led to a permanent Marhattá garrison being stationed at Delhi. From this date, the king remained a cipher in the hands of Sindhia, who treated him with studied neglect, until the 8th September 1803, when Lord Lake overthrew the Marhattás under the walls of Delhi, entered the city, and took the king under the protection of the British. Delhi, once more attacked by a Marhattá army under the Marhattá chief Holkar in 1804, was gallantly defended by Colonel Ochterlony, the British resident, who held out against overwhelming odds for eight days, until relieved by Lord Lake. From this date a new era in the history of Delhi began. A pension of £120,000 per annum was allowed to the king, with exclusive jurisdiction over the palace, and the titular sovereignty as before; but the city, together with the Delhi territory, passed under British administration.

Fifty-three years of quiet prosperity for Delhi were brought to a close by the mutiny of 1857. Its capture by the mutineers, its siege, and its subsequent recapture by the British have been often told, and nothing beyond a short notice is called for here. The outbreak at Meerut occurred on the night of the 10th May 1857. Immediately after the murder of their officers, the rebel soldiery set out for Delhi about 35 miles distant, and on the following morning entered the city, where they were joined by the city mob. Mr Fraser, the commissioner, Mr Hutchinson, the collector, Captain Douglas, the commandant of the palace guards, and the Rev. Mr Jennings, the residency chaplain, were at once murdered, as were also most of the civil and non-official residents whose houses were situated within the city walls. The British troops in cantonments consisted of three regiments of native infantry and a battery of artillery. These cast in their lot with the mutineers, and commenced by killing their officers. The Delhi magazine, then the largest in the north-west of India, was in the charge of Lieutenant Willoughby, with whom were two other officers and six non-commissioned officers. The magazine was attacked by the mutineers, but the little band defended to the last the enormous accumulation of munitions of war stored there, and, when further defence was hopeless, fired the magazine. Five of the nine were killed by the explosion, and

Lieutenant Willoughby subsequently died of his injuries; the remaining three succeeded in making their escape. The occupation of Delhi by the rebels was the signal for risings in almost every military station in North-Western India. The revolted soldiery with one accord thronged towards Delhi, and in a short time the city was garrisoned by a rebel army variously estimated at from 50,000 to 70,000 disciplined men. The pensioned king, Bahádur Sháh, was proclaimed emperor; his sons were appointed to various military commands. About fifty Europeans and Eurasians, nearly all females, who had been captured in trying to escape from the town on the day of the outbreak, were confined in a stifling chamber of the palace for fifteen days; they were then brought out and massacred in the court-yard.

The siege which followed forms one of the memorable incidents of the British history of India. On the 8th June, four weeks after the outbreak, Sir H. Barnard, who had succeeded as commander-in-chief on the death of General Anson, routed the mutineers with a handful of Europeans and Sikhs, after a severe action at Badli-ka-Sarái, and encamped upon the ridge that overlooks the city. The force was too weak to capture the city, and he had no siege train or heavy guns. All that could be done was to hold the position till the arrival of reinforcements and of a siege train. During the next three months the little British force on the ridge were rather the besieged than the besiegers. Almost daily sallies, which often turned into pitched battles, were made by the rebels upon the over-worked handful of Europeans, Sikhs, and Gurkhás. A great struggle took place on the centenary of the battle of Plassey, June 23, and another on the 25th August; but on both occasions the mutineers were repulsed with heavy loss. General Barnard died of cholera in July, and was succeeded by General Archdale Wilson. Meanwhile reinforcements and siege artillery gradually arrived, and early in September it was resolved to make the assault. The first of the heavy batteries opened fire on the 8th September, and on the 13th a practicable breach was reported. On the morning of the 14th the assault was delivered, the points of attack being the Kashmir bastion, the water bastion, the Kashmir gate, and the Lahore gate. The assault was thoroughly successful, although the column which was to enter the city by the Lahore gate sustained a temporary check. The whole eastern part of the city was retaken, but at a loss of 66 officers and 1104 men killed or wounded, out of the total strength of 9866. Fighting continued more or less during the next six days, and it was not till the 20th September that the entire city and palace were occupied, and the reconquest of Delhi was complete. During the siege, the British force sustained a loss of 1012 officers and men killed, and 3837 wounded. Among the killed was General John Nicholson, the leader of one of the storming parties, who was shot through the body in the act of leading his men, in the first day's fighting. He lived, however, to learn that the whole city had been recaptured, and died on the 23d September. On the flight of the mutineers, the king and several members of the royal family took refuge at Humáyun's tomb. On receiving a promise that his life would be spared, the last of the house of Timur surrendered to Major Hodson; he was afterwards banished to Rangoon. Delhi, thus reconquered, remained for some months under military authority. Owing to the murder of several European soldiers who strayed from the lines, the native population was expelled the city. Hindus were soon afterwards readmitted, but for some time Mahometans were rigorously excluded. Delhi was made over to the civil authorities in January 1858, but it was not till 1861 that the civil courts were regularly reopened. The shattered walls of

the Kashmir gateway, and the bastions of the northern face of the city, still bear the marks of the cannonade of September 1857. Since that date, Delhi has settled down into a prosperous commercial town, and a great railway centre. The lines which start from it to the north, south, east, and west bring into its bazaars the trade of many districts. But the romance of antiquity still lingers around it, and Delhi was selected for the scene of the Imperial Proclamation on the 1st January 1877.

An excellent chapter on Delhi will be found in Mr Keene's *Full of the Moghul Empire*. In preparing the above account, the materials have been chiefly drawn from the official *Statistical Account of Delhi District*, together with Sir J. W. Kaye's *History of the Sepoy War*. (W. W. H.)

DELIA, a festival of Apollo held in Delos. It included athletic and musical contests, for which the prize was a branch of the sacred palm. This festival was said to have been established by Theseus when returning from Crete. The Athenians took special interest in maintaining its splendour.

DELILLE, JACQUES (1738-1813), a French poet, was born on the 22d of June 1738, at Aigues-Perse in Auvergne. He was an illegitimate child, and was connected by his mother with the family of the Chancellor de l'Hôpital. With very slender means of support he was educated at the college of Lisieux in Paris, and made such progress in his studies as augured well for his future distinction. When his education was completed, he was forced to accept of a very humble situation as elementary teacher in the college of Beauvais; but this was soon exchanged for the more honourable station of professor of humanity at Amiens. After returning to Paris, where he obtained a professorship at the Collège de la Marche, he speedily acquired a considerable poetical fame, which was greatly increased by the publication (1769) of his translation of the *Georgics* of Virgil, which he had begun at Amiens. Voltaire was greatly struck with the enterprise and the success of Delille; and without any personal acquaintance with the poet he, of his own accord, recommended him and his work to the good graces of the Academy. He was at once elected a member, but was not admitted until 1774 owing to the opposition of Richelieu, who alleged that he was too young. He now aimed at a higher distinction than even a finished translation of the most finished poem in the world could confer upon him; and in the *Jardins*, which he published in 1782, he made good his pretensions as an original poet. Before he had gone far in the composition of his next poem, which was not, indeed, published till after many of his other works, he made a journey to Constantinople in the train of the ambassador M. de Choiseul Gouffier. On his return to Paris he lectured, in his capacity of professor, on the Latin poets, and was attended by a numerous audience, who were delighted, not only with his critical observations, but with his beautiful recitation. Delille continued to advance in fame and fortune, though without hazarding any more publications, till the period of the Revolution, when he was reduced to poverty, and sheltered himself in retreat from the disasters which surrounded him. He quitted Paris, and retired to St Dié, the native place of Madame Delille; and here he completed, in deep solitude, his translation of the *Æneid*, which he had begun many years before. A residence in France, however, soon became very undesirable, and he emigrated first to Basle and then to Glairasse in Switzerland, a charming village on the Lake of Biene, opposite Rousseau's island of St Pierre. Much delighted with this enchanting country, and with the reception which he met from its inhabitants, he occupied himself constantly in the composition of poetry, and here finished his *Homme des Champs*, and his poem on the *Trois Règnes de la*

Nature. His next place of refuge was in Germany, where he composed his *La Pitié*; and finally, he passed two years in London, chiefly employed in translating *Paradise Lost*. In 1801, finding that he might return safely to Paris, he did so, carrying with him his immense *Poetical Encyclopædia*. He resumed his professorship and his chair at the Academy, but lived in retirement. His later poems were very numerous, but were not fitted to increase his reputation, which rests mainly on his translation of the *Georgics* and his *Jardins*. In his later years he became blind. He died on the 1st May 1813.

Delille left behind him little prose. His preface to the translation of the *Georgics* is an able essay, and contains many excellent hints on the art and difficulties of translation. He wrote the article "La Bruyère" in the *Biographie Universelle*. The following is the list of his poetical works:—*Les Géorgiques de Virgile, traduites en vers français*, Paris, 1769, 1782, 1785, 1809; *Les Jardins*, en quatre chants, 1780, new edition, London, 1800, Paris, 1802; *L'Homme des Champs, ou les Géorgiques Françaises*, 1800; *Poésies Fugitives*, 1802; *Dithyrambe sur l'Immortalité de l'Âme, suivi du passage du Saint Gothard*,—poème traduit de l'Anglais de Madame la Duchesse de Devonshire, 1802; *La Pitié*,—poème, en quatre chants, London and Paris, 1803; *L'Enéide de Virgile, traduite en vers français*, 1805; *L'Imagination*, poème en huit chants, 1806; *Les Trois Règnes de la Nature*, 1809; *La Conversation*, 1812. A collection given under the title of *Poésies Diverses*, 1801, was discovered by Delille.

DELIRIUM, a temporary disorder of the mind generally occurring in connection with some form of bodily disease. It may vary in intensity from slight and occasional wandering of the mind and incoherence of expression, to fixed delusions and violent maniacal excitement, and again it may be associated with more or less of coma or insensibility (see **MENTAL DISEASES**). Delirium is apt to occur in most diseases of an acute nature, such as fevers or inflammatory affections, in injuries affecting the brain, in blood diseases, in conditions of exhaustion, and as the result of the action of certain specific poisons, such as opium, Indian hemp, belladonna, chloroform, and alcohol. The form of delirium which is due to the action of the last-named substance is one of great importance from its comparative frequency, and is well known by the name of Delirium Tremens.

Delirium Tremens is one of a train of symptoms of what is termed in medical nomenclature acute alcoholism, or recent excessive indulgence in alcohol. It must, however, be observed that this disorder, although arising in this manner, rarely comes on as the result of a single debauch in a person unaccustomed to the abuse of stimulants, but generally occurs in cases where the nervous system has been already subjected for a length of time to the poisonous action of alcohol, so that the complaint might be more properly regarded as acute supervening on chronic alcoholism. It is equally to be borne in mind that many habitual drunkards never suffer from delirium tremens.

It was long supposed, and is indeed still believed by some, that delirium tremens only comes on when the supply of alcohol has been suddenly cut off; but this view is now generally rejected, and there is abundant evidence to show that the attack comes on while the patient is still continuing to drink. Even in those cases where several days have elapsed between the cessation from drinking and the seizure, it will be found that in the interval the premonitory symptoms of delirium tremens have shown themselves, one of which is aversion to drink as well as food—the attack being in most instances preceded by marked derangement of the digestive functions. Occasionally the attack is precipitated in persons predisposed to it by the occurrence of some acute disease, such as pneumonia, by accidents, such as burns, also by severe mental strain, and by the deprivation of food, even where the supply of alcohol is less than would have been likely to produce it otherwise. Where, on the other hand, the quantity of alcohol taken has been very large, the attack is sometimes ushered in

by fits of an epileptiform character. Males are much more frequently the subjects of delirium tremens than females.

One of the earliest indications of the approaching attack of delirium tremens is sleeplessness, any rest the patient may obtain being troubled by unpleasant or terrifying dreams. During the day there is observed a certain restlessness and irritability of manner, with trembling of the hands and a thick or tremulous articulation. The skin is perspiring, the countenance oppressed-looking and flushed, the pulse rapid and feeble, and there is evidence of considerable bodily prostration. These symptoms increase each day and night for a few days, and then the characteristic delirium is superadded. The patient is in a state of mental confusion, talks incessantly and incoherently, has a distressed and agitated or perplexed appearance, and a vague notion that he is pursued by some one seeking to injure him. His delusions are usually of transient character, but he is constantly troubled with visual hallucinations in the form of disagreeable animals or insects which he imagines he sees all about him. He looks suspiciously around him, turns over his pillows, and ransacks his bed-clothes for some fancied object he supposes to be concealed there. There is constant restlessness, a common form of delusion being that he is not in his own house, but imprisoned in some apartment from which he is anxious to escape to return home. In these circumstances he is ever wishing to get out of bed and out of doors, and, although in general he may be persuaded to return to bed, he is soon desiring to get up again. The trembling of the muscles from which the name of the disease is derived is a prominent but not invariable symptom. It is most marked in the muscles of the hands and arms and in the tongue. The character of the delirium is seldom wild or noisy, but is much more commonly a combination of busy restlessness and indefinite fear. When spoken to the patient can answer correctly enough, but immediately thereafter relapses into his former condition of incoherence. Occasionally maniacal symptoms develop themselves, the patient becoming dangerously violent, and the case thus assuming a much graver aspect than one of simple delirium tremens.

In most cases the symptoms undergo abatement in from three to six days, the cessation of the attack being marked by the occurrence of sound sleep, from which the patient awakes in his right mind, although in a state of great physical prostration, and in great measure if not entirely oblivious of his condition during his illness.

Although generally the termination of an attack of delirium tremens is in recovery, it occasionally proves fatal by the supervention of coma and convulsions, or acute mania, or by exhaustion, more especially when any acute bodily disease is associated with the attack. In certain instances delirium tremens is but the beginning of serious and permanent impairment of intellect, as is not unfrequently observed in confirmed drunkards who have suffered from frequent attacks of this disease.

The treatment of delirium tremens has given rise to much discussion among medical men, and the result has been that more rational views now prevail on the subject than formerly. This change is doubtless in great measure to be ascribed to the clearer ideas respecting the real nature and true cause of the malady which extensive and accurate observation has afforded. The theory once so widely accepted, that delirium tremens was the result of the too sudden breaking off from indulgence in alcohol, led to its treatment by regular and often large doses of stimulants, a practice fraught with mischievous results, since however much the delirium appeared to be thus calmed for the time, the continuous supply of the poison which was the original source of the disease inflicted serious damage upon the

brain, and led in many instances to the subsequent development of insanity. The former system of prescribing large doses of opium, with the view of procuring sleep at all hazards, was no less pernicious; and there is reason to fear that not a few cases of delirium tremens have ended in fatal coma from what was in reality opium poisoning. In addition to these methods of treatment, mechanical restraint of the patient was the common practice.

The views of the disease which now prevail, recognizing the delirium as the effect at once of the poisonous action of alcohol upon the brain and of the want of food, encourage reliance to be placed for its cure upon the entire withdrawal, in most instances, of stimulants, and the liberal administration of light nutriment, in addition to quietness and gentle but firm control, without mechanical restraint. In mild attacks this is frequently all that is required. In more severe cases, where there is great restlessness, sedatives have to be resorted to, and many substances have been recommended for the purpose. Opiates administered in small quantity, and preferably by hypodermic injection, are undoubtedly of value; and chloral, either alone or in conjunction with bromide of potassium, often answers even better. Such remedies, however, should be administered with great caution, and only under medical supervision.

Stimulants may be called for where the delirium assumes the low or adynamic form, and the patient tends to sink from exhaustion, or when the attack is complicated with some other disease. Such cases are, however, in the highest degree exceptional, and do not affect the general principle of treatment already referred to, which inculcates the entire withdrawal of stimulants in the treatment of ordinary attacks of delirium tremens. (J. O. A.)

DELITZSCH, a town of Prussia, in the province of Saxony, at the head of a district in the department of Merseburg, situated on the Lober, an affluent of the Mulde, 12 miles north of Leipsic at a railway junction. Its public buildings comprise an old castle of the 14th century now used as a female penitentiary, one Roman Catholic and three Protestant churches, a normal college (*Schullehrerseminar*) established in 1873, and several other educational institutions. Besides *Kukschwanz*, a peculiar kind of beer, it manufactures tobacco, cigars, shoes, and Eosiere; and coal-mining is carried on in the neighbourhood. Originally a settlement of the Sorbian Wends, and in the 12th century part of the possessions of the bishops of Merseburg, Delitzsch ultimately passed to the Sachsen-Merseburg family, and on their extinction in 1738 was incorporated with Electoral Saxony. Ehrenberg, the famous naturalist, was born in the town in 1795. Population in 1875, 8235.

DELOLME, JEAN LOUIS (1740–1806), jurist and constitutional writer, was born at Geneva in 1740. He studied for the bar, and had entered on the profession of an advocate in his native town when he was obliged to emigrate on account of the publication of a pamphlet entitled *Examen de trois parts de droit*, which gave offence to the authorities of the town. He found an asylum in England, where he lived for several years on the meagre and precarious income derived from occasional contributions to various journals. He maintained an honourable independence, however, until 1775, when he found himself compelled to accept aid from a charitable society to enable him to return home. He died at Seven, a village in the canton of Schwytz, on the 16th July 1806. During his exile Delolme made a careful study of the English constitution, the results of which he published in his *La Constitution de l'Angleterre* (Amsterdam, 1771), of which an enlarged and improved edition in English appeared in 1772, and was several times reprinted. The work excited

much interest as the production of a foreigner, and as containing many acute observations on the causes of the excellence of the English constitution as compared with that of other countries. It is, however, wanting in breadth of view, being written before the period when constitutional questions were treated in a philosophical manner. Several editions were published after the author's death, the latest being in 1853 by MacGregor. Delolme also wrote *A Parallel between the English Government and the former Government of Sweden* (1772), *A History of the Flagellants* (1782), based upon a work of Boileau's, *An Essay on the Union of Scotland and England* (1787), and one or two smaller works.

DELOS, now *Mikra Dili*, or Little Delos, to distinguish it from *Megali Dili*, or Great Delos, an island in the Ægean, the smallest but most famous of the Cyclades, and, according to the ancient belief, the spot round which the group arranged itself in a nearly circular form. It is a rugged mass of granite, about 12 square miles in extent, in 37° 23' N. lat. and 25° 17' E. long., about half a mile to the east of Megali Dili, or Rheneia, and two miles to the west of Myconos. Towards the centre it rises to its greatest height of 350 feet in the steep and rocky peak of Mount Cynthus, which, though overtopped by several eminences in the neighbouring islands, is very conspicuous from the surrounding sea. It is now completely destitute of trees; but it abounds with brushwood of lentisk and cistus, and here and there affords a patch of corn-land to the occasional sower from Myconos. Of the many traditions that were current among the ancient Greeks regarding the origin of Delos—or, as they sometimes named it, Asteria, Ortygia, Chlamydia, or Pырpile—the most popular describes it as struck from the bed of the sea by a dint of Neptune's trident, and drifting devious through the Ægean till moored by Jupiter as a refuge for his persecuted Latona. It was soon after flooded with the birth-radiance of Apollo and Diana, and became for ever sacred to these twin deities of light. The island first appears in history as an Ionian colony and the seat of a great Ionic festival to which the Athenians, among the rest, were accustomed annually to despatch a *Θεωπία*, or sacred ship, with a number of Delians, *Θεωπολά*, or sacred delegates. In the 6th century B.C. the influence of the Delian Apollo was at its height; Polycrates of Samos dedicated the neighbouring island of Rheneia to his service, and Pisistratus of Athens caused all the area within sight of the temple to be cleared of the tombs by which its sanctity was impaired. About a hundred years afterwards, in the sixth year of the Peloponnesian war (426 B.C.), the Athenians instituted a more elaborate lustration, caused every tomb to be removed from the island, and established a law that ever after any one whose condition seemed to threaten its pollution by either birth or death should be at once conveyed from its shores. And even this was not accounted sufficient; for, in 422, they expelled all its secular inhabitants. After the overthrow of Corinth, in 146 B.C., the commercial element which had in all probability been present from the first in the religious gatherings, came prominently forward, and Delos became the central mart of the Ægean. In the Mithridatic war it was laid waste by Menophanes, the general of the Bithynian king; and it never recovered its former prosperity, though it is said that, under the Roman empire, 10,000 slaves were sometimes put up for sale in a single day. Hadrian attempted to found a city which was to bear the proud name of New Athens; but, when visited by Pausanias towards the close of the same century, the whole island was almost depopulated. It is now absolutely without a permanent inhabitant, though during the summer months a few shepherds cross over with their flocks from Myconos or Rheneia. As a religious centre it is replaced by Tenos.

and as a commercial centre by the flourishing port of Syra. Besides the site of the chief settlement or city, the following are the spots of antiquarian interest which can still be identified:—the temple of Apollo, a splendid building of the Doric order which, in the words of Mr Tozer, now forms "a confused heap of white marble fragments, columns, bases, and entablatures, lying indiscriminately together;" the portico erected by Philip of Macedon; the base (within the temple area) of the colossal statue dedicated to the Delian Apollo by the people of Naxos; a theatre of Parian marble on the slope of Mount Cynthus; a temple to Isis, further up the hill, which probably explains the myth of the connection between the brook Inopus and the Nile; the so-called "treasury" of Delos; an Ionic temple on the summit; and the circular tank or lake which supplied the water for the religious rites. The ordinary buildings on the island were constructed of native granite, but marble was imported for the nobler edifices, which were destined to serve as so many quarries to the mediæval builders of Constantinople and Venice.

See Leake, *Northern Greece*; Sallier, "Histoire de l'Isle de Délos," in *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscrip.*; Schwenck, *Delosorum*, part I. 1825; Tozer, "Delos and Rheneia," in *Academy*, 1875; Lebègue, *Recherches sur Délos*, Paris, 1876.

DE LOUTHERBOURG, PHILIP JAMES (1740–1812), an artist of remarkably versatile ability and interesting personality. He was born at Strasburg, 31st October 1740, where his father, the representative of a noble Polish family, practised miniature painting in a semi-amateur manner; but he spent the greater part of his life in London, where he was naturalized, and exerted a considerable influence on the scenery of the English stage, as well as on the artists of the following generation, Turner, Martin, &c.

Young De Louthembourg was intended for the Lutheran ministry, and was educated at the university of Strasburg. As the calling, however, was foreign to his nature, he insisted on being a painter, and placed himself under Vanloo in Paris. The result was the immediate and precocious development of extraordinary powers. Besides this triumph, and independently of it, he became a figure in the fashionable society of that day, and the friend of such men as Diderot, who had just then mainly contributed to make Gesner celebrated. He was elected into the French Academy below the age required by the law of the institution, and painted landscapes, sea-storms, battles, all of which had a celebrity above those of the specialists then working in Paris. By temperament whatever was extraordinary and sensational was attractive to him, and the *bizarre* appeared in all he did. His *début* was made by the exhibition of twelve pictures, including Storm at Sunset, Night, Morning after Rain; and when he painted common things, as a group of asses, he gave the picture such a fantastic title as—Father and Mother, Little Fanfan, Aunt and Uncle à la Bretagne, Cousin Germain, and the Perruquier of all the Family. In the next stage of his life we find him travelling in Switzerland, Germany, and Italy, distinguishing himself as much by mechanic inventions as by painting. One of these, constructed at his native city, was the wonder of the day, showing quite new effects produced in a model theatre. The exhibition of lights behind canvas representing the moon and stars, the illusory appearance of running water produced by clear blue sheets of metal and gauze, with loose threads of silver, and so on, were his devices. Charles Blanc says one of these curious models, called "Le Séraphin," still existed in the Palais Royal at the date of publication of his work, *École Française*. Having repaired to London, De Louthembourg was employed by Garrick, who offered him £500 a year to apply his mechanisms to Drury Lane, and to superintend the scene-painting, which he did with complete success,

making a new era in the adjuncts of the stage. Garrick's own piece, the *Christmas Tale*, and the pantomime, 1781–2, introduced the novelties to the public, and the delight not only of the masses, but of Reynolds and the artists, was unbounded. The green trees gradually became russet, the moon rose and lit the edges of passing clouds, and all the world was captivated by effects we now take little notice of. A still greater triumph awaited him on his opening an entertainment he called the "Eidophusicon," which showed the rise, progress, and result of a storm at sea—that which destroyed the great Indiaman, the "Halsewell,"—and the Fallen Angels raising the Palace of Pandemonium. De Louthembourg has been called the inventor of the panorama, but this honour does not belong to him, although it first appeared about the same time as the eidophusicon. The first panorama was painted and exhibited by Barker the elder.

All this mechanism did not in the least prevent De Louthembourg from painting. Lord Howe's Victory off Ushant, 1794, and other large naval pictures, were commissioned for Greenwich Hospital Gallery, where they still remain. His grandest work, the Destruction of the Armada, is one of the finest sea-fights ever realized on canvas. He painted also the Great Fire of London, and several historical works, one of these being the Attack of the Combined Armies on Valenciennes, 1793. He was made R.A., in addition to other distinctions, in 1781, shortly after which date we find an entirely new mental impulse taking possession of him. He joined Balsamo, Comte de Cagliostro, and travelled about with this extraordinary person,—happily leaving him, however, before the priests in Rome condemned him to death. We do not hear that Mesmer had attracted De Louthembourg, or that the Revolution carried him away, nor do we find an exact record of his connection with Cagliostro; but there exists a pamphlet published in 1789, *A List of a few Cures performed by Mr and Mrs De Louthembourg without Medicine*, which relates some very remarkable examples of such cures. Cagliostro had led him to seek the philosopher's stone, but his success was frustrated by a female relative breaking in on his nocturnal experiments and destroying the crucible at the very moment of projection. He died 11th March 1812. His publications are few,—some sets of etchings, and *English Scenery*, 1805. His colour is hot and brown, which has injured his fame as a painter.

DELPHI, Δελφοί, a town of ancient Greece in the territory of Phocis, famous as the seat of the most important temple and oracle of Apollo. It was situated about six miles inland from the shores of the Corinthian Gulf, in a rugged and romantic glen, closed on the N. by the steep wall-like under-cliffs of Mount Parnassus known as the Phædriades, or Shining Rocks, on the E. and W. by two minor ridges or spurs, and on the S. by the irregular heights of Mount Cirphis. Between the two mountains the Pleistus flowed from east to west, and opposite the town received the brooklet of the Castalian fountain, which rose in a deep gorge in the centre of the Parnassian cliff. The site of the ancient town is now occupied by the village of Castrì, and the natural features of the scene have been somewhat altered by the earthquake of 1870; but the main points of interest can still be distinguished.

The principal building of Delphi was the temple of Apollo, which stood immediately under the shelter of the northern cliff. It appears to have been of the Doric order outside, and of the Ionic within. The front was built of Parian marble, and the sculptural decorations were extremely rich. One pediment was adorned with representations of Latona, Diana, Apollo, and the Setting Sun, and the other with Dionysus and the Thyiades; the eastern architrave was hung with gilded shields presented

by the Athenians from the spoils of Marathon, and the western with similar trophies taken by the Ætolians from the Gauls; while among the subjects of the metopes are mentioned Hercules slaying the Lernean Hydra, Bellerophon and the Chimæra, Zeus and Mimas, Pallas and Enceladus, and Dionysus and a Giant. In the *pronaos* were inscribed the maxims of the Seven Sages of Greece; in the *cella* was the sacred hearth with a perpetual fire and the *δμφαλός*, or navel-stone, which was supposed to mark the centre of the world; and in the *adytum* was the sacred tripod and the subterranean chamber from which the vapour of prophecy ascended. Of less important buildings may be mentioned the *Lesche*, or public hall, the walls of which were adorned with the works of Polygnotus and other master-pieces of ancient art; the theatre, where the musical contests connected with the Pythian games were held; the *Stadium*, of which there are still considerable remains; and, in the suburb of the same name, the *Pylos*, or assembly hall of the Amphictyonic Council. The town was entered from the east by a road from Bœotia known as the Schiste, or Cloven Way, and from the west by the great Crissean road, which was used by the pilgrims who came from the Corinthian Gulf, and by another which stretched north-west to Amphissa. These roads were regarded almost as the property of the temple, and shared in its sacredness; and each Amphictyonic state was bound to keep them in repair within its own boundaries. About seven miles to the north of the town, on the side of Mount Parnassus, was the famous Corycian cave, a large grotto in the limestone rock, which afforded the people of Delphi a refuge during the Persian invasion. It is now called in the district the Sarant' Aulai, or Forty Courts, and is said to be capable of holding 3000 people.

Of the origin of the Delphian oracle nothing is known. One legend told how the prophetic virtues of the site were discovered by a shepherd whose goats began to frisk about under the influence of the subterranean vapour; and another related how Apollo, after he had slain the great serpent Pytho on the spot, boarded a Cretan ship in the neighbouring gulf, and consecrated the crew to his service. It seems almost certain that the place was the seat of a religious establishment previous to its connection with the worship of Apollo; but its whole historic importance—which can hardly be over-estimated—is entirely due to this connection. The first temple of stone was reputed to have been built by the semi-mythical personages Trophonius and Agamedes. It was burned down in 548 B.C., but was soon after replaced by the building which has already been described. The contract for the work was taken by the Athenian family of the Alcmeonids, who were at that time in exile from the tyranny of Hippias. They employed the architect Spintarus, and acquired great credit for the disinterested liberality with which they accomplished their task. The principal facts in the history of Delphi have already been narrated in the article ΑΜΦΙΚΤΥΟΝΥ (vol. i. p. 772), where the reader will also find an account of the relation in which the temple stood to the states of Greece. It only remains to tell how the sanctuary and its treasures, which had been miraculously saved from the Persians and the Gauls, were put under contribution by Sulla for the payment of his soldiers; how Nero removed no fewer than 500 brazen images from the sacred precincts; and how Constantine the Great enriched his new city by the sacred tripods, the statues of the Heliconian Muses, the Apollo, and the celebrated Pan dedicated by the Greek cities after the conclusion of the war with the Medes. Julian afterwards sent Oribasius to restore the temple; but the oracle responded to the emperor's enthusiasm with nothing but a wail over the glory that had departed.

See Pausanias for a detailed description of the town in the second century of the Christian era; the *Ion* of Euripides for many interesting descriptions; and among modern works Wilster, *De religione et oraculo Apollinis Delphici*, Copenhagen, 1827; Hullmann, *Würdigung des Delphischen Orakels*, 1837; Götze, *Das Delphische Orakel*, 1839; Curtius, *Anecdota Delphica*, 1843; Schliemann in *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1874.

DELPHINIA, a festival of Apollo held annually on the 7th of the month Munychion (April) at Athens, where he was styled Delphinios. All that is known of the ceremonies is that a number of girls proceeded to his temple carrying suppliants' branches and seeking to propitiate Apollo, probably as a god having influence on the sea. It was at this time of year that navigation opened again after the storms of winter.

DELTA. See PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY.

DELUC, JEAN ANDRÉ (1727–1817), geologist and meteorologist, born at Geneva, February 8, 1727, was descended from a family which had emigrated from Lucca and settled at Geneva in the 15th century. His father, François Deluc, was the author of some publications in refutation of Maundeville and other rationalistic writers, which are best known through Rousseau's humorous account of his ennui in reading them; and he gave his son an excellent education, chiefly in mathematics and natural science. On completing it he engaged in commerce, which principally occupied the first forty-six years of his life, without any other interruption than that which was occasioned by some journeys of business into the neighbouring countries, and a few scientific excursions among the Alps. During these, however, he collected by degrees, in conjunction with his brother Guillaume Antoine, a splendid museum of mineralogy and of natural history in general, which was afterwards increased by his nephew André Deluc. He at the same time took a prominent part in politics. In 1768 he was sent to Paris on an embassy to the Duc de Choiseul, whose friendship he succeeded in gaining. In 1770 he was nominated one of the Council of Two Hundred. Three years later unexpected reverses in business made it advisable for him to quit his native town, which he only revisited once for a few days. The change was welcome in so far as it set him entirely free for scientific pursuits, and it was with little regret that he removed to England in 1773. He was made a fellow of the Royal Society in the same year, and received the appointment of reader to Queen Charlotte, which he continued to hold for forty-four years, and which afforded him both leisure and a competent income. In the latter part of his life he obtained leave to make several tours in Switzerland, France, Holland, and Germany. In Germany he passed the six years from 1798 to 1804; and after his return he undertook a geological tour through England. When he was at Göttingen, in the beginning of his German tour, he received the compliment of being appointed honorary professor of geology in that university; but he never entered upon the active duties of a professorship. He was also a correspondent of the Academy of Sciences at Paris, and a member of several other scientific associations.

His favourite studies were geology and meteorology. The situation of his native country had naturally led him to contemplate the peculiarities of the earth's structure, and the properties of the atmosphere, as particularly displayed in mountainous countries, and as subservient to the measurement of heights. He inherited from his father a sincere veneration for the doctrines of Christianity, and a disposition to defend the Mosaic account of the creation against the criticism whose principal weapons were furnished by his favourite science. His royal patroness was most anxious to encourage and promote his labours in this field; and he was generally supposed to have had

great success in removing the objections which had been advanced by his antagonists against the comparatively recent formation of the present continents. According to Cuvier, he ranked among the first geologists of his age. His principal geological work, *Lettres physiques et morales sur l'histoire de la terre* (6 vols. 8vo, The Hague, 1778), was dedicated to Queen Charlotte. It dealt with the appearance of mountains and the antiquity of the human race, explained the six days of the Mosaic creation as so many epochs preceding the actual state of the globe, and attributes the deluge to the filling up of cavities supposed to have been left void in the interior of the earth. This attempt to reconcile religion and science, so often since repeated, was ingenious and for a time successful with most minds. The theory of the Mosaic days was maintained in one form or other by several later geologists of high repute, though it is scarcely now thought worth discussion by any to whom that title can justly be applied.

Deluc's original experiments relating to meteorology are more valuable to the natural philosopher than most of his geological work; and he discovered many facts of considerable importance relating to heat and moisture. He noticed the disappearance of heat in the thawing of ice about the same time that Black founded on it his ingenious hypothesis of latent heat. He ascertained that water was more dense about 40° Fahr. than at the temperature of freezing, expanding equally on each side of the maximum; and he was the originator of the theory afterward re-advanced by Dalton, that the quantity of aqueous vapour contained in any space is independent of the presence or density of the air, or of any other elastic fluid; though it appears difficult to reconcile this opinion with some of the experiments of Deluc's great rival, Saussure, a philosopher who, as he very candidly allows, made in many respects more rapid progress in hygrometry than himself. Deluc's comparative experiments on his own hygrometer and on Saussure's show only that both are imperfect; but it may be inferred from them that a mean between the two would in general approach much nearer to the natural scale than either taken separately. It appears also probable that Saussure's is rather less injured by time than Deluc's, which has been found to indicate an increasing amount of mean moisture every year.

Deluc was a man of warm feelings, and of gentle and obliging manners, and his literary and scientific merits, as well as his unremitting attention to the service of the queen, insured her respect and kindness. He saw her daily for many years, and in his last illness, which was long and painful, she showed him repeated marks of benevolent regard. He died at Windsor on the 7th of November 1817.

A brief notice of his more important works, in addition to that mentioned above, will give a clear idea of the nature and range of his scientific activity. His *Recherches sur les modifications de l'Atmosphère* (2 vols. 4to, Geneva, 1772; 4 vols. 8vo, Par. 1784), contains many accurate and ingenious experiments upon moisture, evaporation, and the indications of hygrometers and thermometers, applied to the barometer employed in determining heights. In the *Phil. Trans.*, 1773, appeared his account of a new hygrometer, which resembled a mercurial thermometer, with an ivory bulb, which expanded by moisture, and caused the mercury to descend. The first correct rules ever published for measuring heights by the barometer were those he gave in the *Phil. Trans.*, 1771, p. 158. His *Lettres sur l'Histoire physique de la Terre* (8vo, Par. 1798) were addressed to Professor Blumenbach. The substance had already appeared in the *Journal de Physique*, for 1790, 1791, and 1798. The volume contains an essay written for a prize at Haarlem in 1791, but without success, on the existence of a General Principle of Morality. It also gives an interesting account of some conversations of the author with Voltaire and Rousseau. Deluc was an ardent admirer of Bacon, on whose writings he published two works, — *Bacon tel qu'il est* (8vo, Berlin, 1800), shewing the bad faith of the French translator, who had

omitted many passages favourable to revealed religion, and *Précis de la Philosophie de Bacon* (2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1802), giving an interesting view of the progress of natural science. *Lettres sur le Christianisme* (Berlin and Hanover, 1801, 1803) was a controversial correspondence with Dr Teller of Berlin in regard to the Mosaic cosmogony. His *Traité élémentaire de Géologie* (8vo, Paris, 1809, also in English, by Delafite, the same year), was principally intended as a refutation of the Vulcanian system of Hutton and Playfair, who deduced the changes of the earth's structure from the operation of fire, and attributed a higher antiquity to the present state of the continents than is required in the Neptunian system adopted by Deluc after Dolomieu. He sent to the Royal Society, in 1809, a long paper on separating the chemical from the electrical effect of the pile, with a description of the electric column and aerial electroscopie, in which he advanced opinions so little in unison with the latest discoveries of the day, that the council deemed it inexpedient to admit them into the *Transactions*. He had, indeed, on other occasions shown somewhat too much scepticism in the rejection of new facts; and he had never been convinced even of Cavendish's all-important discovery of the composition of water. The paper was afterwards published in Nicholson's *Journal* (xxvi.), and the dry column described in it was constructed by various experimental philosophers. Many other of his papers on subjects kindred to those already mentioned are to be found in the *Transactions* and in the *Philosophical Magazine*. See *Philosophical Magazine*, November 1817.

DELUGE, a submersion of the world, related by various nations as having taken place in a primitive age, and in which all, or nearly all, living beings are said to have perished. By this definition we exclude all partial floods, and also the theory which would account for deluge-stories as exaggerations of traditions of local inundations. Upon a low level of culture, as Von Hahn has shown, the memory of the most striking events is hardly preserved even for a few generations. It is best therefore to regard the story of the deluge as a subdivision of the primitive man's cosmogony. The problem with which he had to deal was a complicated one,—given the eternity of matter to account for the origin of the world. The best solution which presented itself (and that only to the shrewder races) was to represent creation as having taken place repeatedly, and the world as having passed through a series of demolitions and reconstructions. (See COSMOGONY). This explains the confusion between the creation and the deluge noticed by various travellers, e.g., among the Iroquois and the Santals—a confusion, however, which is only apparent, for the deluge is, when thoroughly realized, practically a second creation. Thus Manui the hero of the Indian flood-story, was, by permission of Brahma, the creator of the present human race. Noah is called by Arabic writers "the second Adam," and Maui might with as good a right be called the Noah of New Zealand. We, in the adult age of the world, have renounced those mythical forms of expression, but we still retain much of the feeling which prompted them. The wonder of creation is even to us constantly renewed in spring; to primitive man it was renewed in a special sense in each of the great world-cycles of mythology. We may lay it down, then, as a canon at the outset, that the various deluge-stories must be viewed in combination, and explained on a common principle. At the same time we must be careful not to confound different "deposits" of tradition, and must regard primarily the earliest and most original forms of myths. As in the case of the cosmogonies, a few typical specimens will be all that can here be described.

I. Among the Semitic races the seniority belongs to the Babylonians. Till lately, the only version of their story known to us was that of Berosus (Müller, *Fragmenta*, ii. 501), who relates that the god Kronos appeared to Xisuthrus; tenth king of Babylon [cf. Noah, tenth patriarch] in a dream, and warned him of the coming deluge. The details remind us a good deal of the biblical narrative, except that Xisuthrus is also accompanied by a steersman and by his near friends. Even the thrice repeated letting-out

of the birds is mentioned. At last the ship (as it is called) grounded "on a certain mountain," where Xisuthrus erected an altar and sacrificed; after which both he and his companions disappeared [cf. the "translation" of Enoch]. The duration of the deluge is not stated, and its cause is left to be inferred from the special commendation of Xisuthrus for his piety. Berosus has evidently drawn from cuneiform sources, but those sources have not yet been discovered. Our most valuable authority for the Babylonian deluge-story is the portion of the 11th lay of the great mythological epic, discovered by Mr George Smith. It came from the library of King Assurbanipal, and dates from about 660 B.C., but the Accadian original from which it was translated may well (says the cautious Assyriologue, Dr Schrader) have been composed between 1000 and 2000 B.C., while the myths themselves will of course be much older. The hero of the deluge bears the name of Tam-zi ("the sun of life," cf. Tammuz), for so, with Mr Sayce, the signs should most probably be read. He is called the son of Ubara-tutu, an Accadian name meaning "the splendour of sunset" (Lenormant, Sayce). This version of the story differs in several respects from that of Berosus. The deity who warns Tamzi is Hea (god of knowledge and of the waters), who orders him to build a ship, and to put into it his household and his wealth and the beasts of the field. All this is related by Tamzi to the (solar) hero "Izdubar." He tells how he coated the ship within and without with bitumen (cf. Gen. vi. 14), how he intrusted all to a "seaman," how Samas, the sun-god, and other gods (Hea is not now mentioned) sent rain, and how the ruin-flood "destroyed all life from the face of the earth." (Why the deluge was sent is a little uncertain, owing to the mutilated condition of the tablets.) On the seventh day there was a calm, and the ship stranded on the mountain Nizir. Another seven days, and Tamzi let out "a dove" (?), then a swallow, both of which returned; and a raven which did not return. Then he left the ship and made a libation; Mr Smith's "altar" is uncertain. Finally, Hea intercedes with Bel that there be no second deluge, after which "Tamzi and his wife, and the people, were carried away to be like the gods." Such are the leading authentic features of the Babylonian narrative, or rather narratives, for its inconsistencies and repetitions are such as to force upon us the hypothesis that two documents originally existed, which have been welded together by an editor.

II. The Jewish narrative, like the Babylonian, has been thought to consist of two documents, an Elohist and a Yahvistic, which have been connected by an editor. They appear to differ in various details,—e.g., in the duration of the flood (the Elohist extends it to a whole solar year), and in the description of the introduction of the animals into the ark (the Elohist alludes to the legal distinction between clean and unclean). But they have certainly the same origin, for they entirely coincide in the main outlines (e.g., in ascribing the flood to the depravity of mankind, in the mode of Noah's rescue, and in the promise that the catastrophe should not recur), and even in not a few expressions, among which are the names for the flood and the ark. They agree, further, in this important point, that some expressions point to a universal deluge, others to one which only affected a level inland region like that of Mesopotamia. We naturally ask, therefore, are the former involuntary exaggerations? or "survivals" of a primeval myth? Both views are held by respectable critics; but the latter is more favoured by analogy and by the remarkable parallelism between both the biblical narratives (especially the Yahvistic) and the Babylonian.

These two—the Babylonian and the Jewish—are the only fully developed deluge-stories told by any of the

Semitic nations. In what relation, then, do they stand to each other? Was the Babylonian borrowed from the Jewish (or from some earlier form of the story, of which the Jewish is an abridgment), or vice versa? On the one hand, the Babylonian story as a whole perhaps produces an impression of greater originality than the Jewish; for (not to mention other points) in the former the order in which the birds are sent out is much more natural. On the other, the "ark," or rather "chest," of the Jewish narrative sounds more archaic than the "ship" of the Babylonian. The word for "deluge" in Genesis is also evidently archaic, as appears from the facts that it only occurs once again (Psalm xxix. 3), and that the editor in Genesis needed to explain it by the word "water" (Gen. vi. 17, "the flood, viz., water"). It is possible, therefore, to hold that the Jewish story is a distinct offshoot of a common Semitic tradition. Bolder critics will maintain that the account in Genesis must be taken in connection with the other narratives which can be explained by, and are therefore possibly dependent upon, parallel Babylonian narratives. (See BABYLONIA and COSMOGONY). They will urge that "chest" may have been substituted for "ship" to avoid an anachronism, mankind in Noah's time not having perhaps reached the sea; and that the archaic word for "deluge" does not prove the antiquity of a developed deluge-story; also that there are traces in Genesis (see iv. 17–24, vi. 1–3) of another and presumably native Hebrew view, according to which the moral degeneration of man was explained without a deluge. The question is a large one, but may perhaps be reduced to this—Can the Yahvistic narrative in Genesis be safely broken up into several? There is some evidence, both internal and (see the prophetic references to Genesis) external to show that it can, but it would be premature in this place to pronounce whether the evidence is sufficient. It will hardly be possible, however, to derive the Yahvistic flood-story from Babylonia, and not the Elohist, as has been suggested; for though the former is nearest to the Babylonian story (e.g., it ascribes the flood entirely to a rain-storm, whereas the latter introduces also the waters below the firmament), the latter agrees with it in all essential points, and even in the minor point of the bitumen. Let it be remarked in passing that, even if the material of the biblical narratives be taken from the Babylonian, the former have received a peculiar and original stamp, both by their monotheism and by the moral significance so emphatically given to the catastrophe, just as by the addition of the lovely story of the rainbow the Elohist has produced a conclusion far superior, artistically speaking, to that of his Babylonian predecessor.

III. Another of the great countries by which the Israelites might have been influenced was Egypt; but in this, even more than in a former, case a direct Egyptian influence is out of the question. The deluge-story was entirely unknown in the Nile-valley. It is commonly said, but erroneously, that this was owing to the absence of sudden catastrophes of the nature of an inundation. But if the terrestrial deluge is really (see below) only a transformation of the celestial, there is no reason why the story should not have grown up in Egypt, if the imagination of its inhabitants had invited such a development; for the germs of the deluge-story certainly existed in Egypt. The *Book of the Dead* constantly refers to the sun-god, Ra, as voyaging in a boat on the celestial ocean; and a story in an inscription of the archaic period (Seti I.) embodies a conception altogether analogous to that of the narrative in Genesis. According to this myth—which is described by M. Naville—Ra, the creator, being disgusted with the insolence of mankind, resolves to exterminate them. The massacre causes human blood to flow to Heliopolis,