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PREFACE

In these lectures an attempt is made, not so much to restate familiar facts, as to accommodate them to new and supplementary evidence which has been published in America since the outbreak of the war. But even without the excuse of recent discovery, no apology would be needed for any comparison or contrast of Hebrew tradition with the mythological and legendary beliefs of Babylon and Egypt. Hebrew achievements in the sphere of religion and ethics are only thrown into stronger relief when studied against their contemporary background.

The bulk of our new material is furnished by some early texts, written towards the close of the third millennium B.C. They incorporate traditions which extend in unbroken outline from their own period into the remote ages of the past, and claim to trace the history of man back to his creation. They represent the early national traditions of the Sumerian people, who preceded the Semites as the ruling race in Babylonia; and incidentally they necessitate a revision of current views with regard to the cradle of Babylonian civilization. The most remarkable of the new documents is one which relates in poetical narrative an account of the Creation, of Antediluvian history, and of the Deluge. It thus exhibits a close resemblance in structure to the corresponding Hebrew traditions, a resemblance that is not shared by the Semitic-Babylonian Versions at present known. But in matter the Sumerian tradition is more primitive than any of the Semitic versions. In spite of the fact that the text appears to have reached us in a magical setting, and to some extent in epitomized form, this early document enables us to tap the stream of tradition at a point far above any at which approach has hitherto been possible.
Though the resemblance of early Sumerian tradition to that of the Hebrews is striking, it furnishes a still closer parallel to the summaries preserved from the history of Berossus. The huge figures incorporated in the latter’s chronological scheme are no longer to be treated as a product of Neo-Babylonian speculation; they reappear in their original surroundings in another of these early documents, the Sumerian Dynastic List. The sources of Berossus had inevitably been semitized by Babylon; but two of his three Antediluvian cities find their place among the five of primitive Sumerian belief, and two of his ten Antediluvian kings rejoin their Sumerian prototypes. Moreover, the recorded ages of Sumerian and Hebrew patriarchs are strangely alike. It may be added that in Egypt a new fragment of the Palermo Stele has enabled us to verify, by a very similar comparison, the accuracy of Manetho’s sources for his prehistoric period, while at the same time it demonstrates the way in which possible inaccuracies in his system, deduced from independent evidence, may have arisen in remote antiquity. It is clear that both Hebrew and Hellenistic traditions were modelled on very early lines.

Thus our new material enables us to check the age, and in some measure the accuracy, of the traditions concerning the dawn of history which the Greeks reproduced from native sources, both in Babylon and Egypt, after the conquests of Alexander had brought the Near East within the range of their intimate acquaintance. The third body of tradition, that of the Hebrews, though unbacked by the prestige of secular achievement, has, through incorporation in the canons of two great religious systems, acquired an authority which the others have not enjoyed. In re-examining the sources of all three accounts, so far as they are affected by the new discoveries, it will be of interest to observe how the same problems were solved in antiquity by very different races, living under widely divergent conditions, but within easy reach of one another. Their periods of contact, ascertained in history or suggested by geographical considerations, will prompt the further question to what extent each body of belief was evolved in independence of the others. The close correspondence that has long been recognized and is now confirmed between the Hebrew and the Semitic-Babylonian systems, as compared with that of Egypt, naturally falls within the scope of our inquiry.

Excavation has provided an extraordinarily full archaeological commentary to the legends of Egypt and Babylon; and when I received the invitation to deliver the Schweich Lectures for 1916, I was reminded of the terms of the Bequest and was asked to emphasize the archaeological side of the subject. Such material illustration was also calculated to bring out, in a more vivid manner than was possible with purely literary evidence, the contrasts and parallels presented by Hebrew tradition. Thanks to a special grant for photographs from the British Academy, I was enabled to illustrate by means of lantern slides many of the problems discussed in the lectures; and it was originally intended that the photographs then shown should appear as plates in this volume. But in view of the continued and increasing shortage of paper, it was afterwards felt to be only right that all illustrations should be omitted. This very necessary decision has involved a recasting of certain sections of the lectures as delivered, which in its turn has rendered possible a fuller treatment of the new literary evidence. To the consequent shifting of interest is also due a transposition of names in the title. On their literary side, and in virtue of the intimacy of their relation to Hebrew tradition, the legends of Babylon must be given precedence over those of Egypt.

For the delay in the appearance of the volume I must plead the pressure of other work, on subjects far removed from archaeological study and affording little time and few facilities for a continuance of archaeological and textual research. It is hoped that the insertion of references throughout, and the more detailed discussion of problems suggested by our new literary material, may incline the reader to add his indulgence to that already extended to me by the British Academy.

L. W. KING.
LECTURE I

EGYPT, BABYLON, AND PALESTINE, AND SOME TRADITIONAL ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

Object of the lectures to examine Hebrew traditions concerning the early ages of mankind, in the light of important evidence published in America since the outbreak of the war; new material furnished by Sumerian literary texts of an early period, involving also a comparison of Egyptian and Babylonian mythology, 1-3; character of Hebrew tradition and justification for choice of subject, 3-4; Egypt and Babylon in Hebrew tradition and in history, 4; geographical factors in problem, 4-6; lines of early contact, 7-8; commercial and political relations of Syria to valleys of Nile and Euphrates, 8-10; tendencies in Hebrew history after settlement in Canaan, 10; continuity of human culture, and comparative method of study, 10-11; that the vehicle of religious ideas may be of composite origin, illustrated in another medium, 11 ff.; Egyptian and other foreign elements in Semitic art exemplified in Phoenician and Ammonian products, 11-14; striking material effects of Assyrian influence in Syria, 15-16; the Semite's adaptability, 17; cherished traditions of the past applicable, by analogy, to composition of Hebrew literature, 17-18; Babylon's influence in antiquity, 18; the site of Nippur, 18-20; Tel-shib and the river Chebar, 20; our new material, 21-2; the merging of history into legend and myth, 22.

Unbroken cultural sequence in Egypt from neolithic stage; but contrast of her written historical records to those of Mesopotamia, 22; the Palermo Stela and the newly recovered fragments, 23-4; the 'Worshippers of Horus', 24; new predynastic rulers of Upper Egypt, 25; oral tradition before invention of writing, 26; historical accuracy of Manetho confirmed, 26-7; Manetho and Berossus, 27; upper limit of archaeological evidence, in Euphrates Valley, to bronze-age culture, 28; records of a more remote past, relating to cradle of Babylonian civilization, 28-9; legendary elements in the early texts, and the age of the gods on earth, 29; correspondence of Sumerian and Greek traditions, 30; the Antediluvian kings of Berossus and some new Sumerian prototypes, 31-3; Sumerian patriarchs of the Dynastic List, 34-6; 'the book of the generations of Adam', 37; Hebrew echoes from Sumer through Babylon, 38; the Nephilim and their stratum of tradition, 39; new light on traditional origins of civilization, 39-40.
LECTURE II

DELUGE STORIES AND THE NEW SUMERIAN VERSION

Hebrew and Babylonian Versions of the story, 41-2; age of the Sumerian Version, 43; widespread occurrence of similar stories, 44; former astrological interpretations, 44-5; recent synthetic tendencies in research, 45-6; solar interpretation of Deluge myth incidentally revived, 47; Egyptian 'Legend of the Destruction of Mankind', 48; the Sumerian Version and its literary connexion with Creation myth, 49-50; magical setting of the narrative, 50-1; extant portions of the text, 51-2. (i) Introduction to myth and account of Creation, 52-8; (ii) the Antediluvian cities of Sumer and of Berossus, 58-62; (iii) the Council of the gods and Ziusudra's piety, 62-9; (iv) the Dream-warning, and Sumerian dream-divination, 69-76; (v) the Flood, the escape of the Great Boat, and the Sacrifice to the Sun-god, 76-85; (vi) the Propitiation of the angry gods, and Ziusudra's immortality, 85-91; unmistakable evidence of magical use, 85-9; close of the version, 89-91.

Cumulative effect of evidence that the new text contains a primitive Sumerian Version of the Semitic Deluge story, 91-2; general result of comparison with Hebrew Versions, 92-3; grouping, on certain points, of Sumerian and Hebrew Versions against those of Babylon, 93; more complete reproduction of Sumerian tradition in Hellenistic period, 94; local survival of Sumerian mythological texts, and Neo-Babylonian interest in the more ancient versions, 94-5; absence of astrological colouring in the Sumerian narrative, 95; contrast presented by Nile to Tigris and Euphrates, 95-6; character of floods in Mesopotamia, and attested disasters during later historical period, 96-9; the local Sumerian Flood fitted to later political horizons, 99; flood traditions in area of Eastern Mediterranean, 99-100; Babylonian, Hebrew, and Greek Deluge stories traced to basis of historical fact in Euphrates Valley, and the probable origins of other Deluge stories, 100; 'observation myths', as applied to the floods of Duski and Dardanus, 100-1; conclusion, 101.

LECTURE III

CREATION AND THE DRAGON MYTH; AND THE PROBLEM OF BABYLONIAN PARALLELS IN HEbrew TRADITION

Legend and myth, 102; sources of our knowledge of Egyptian mythology, 102-3; mythological conceptions of the universe, 103-4; poetry and myth, 104; philosophical and materialistic interpretations of myth, 104-5; Hesiod's Creation, and the Potter at work, 105-6; the Sun-god and the primaeval water, 107; Egyptian religious syncretism, 107; absence of Egyptian parallels in Hebrew tradition, 107-8; contrast of Creation myths in Egypt and Babylonia during the latter's Semitic period, 108; the Sumerian Creators and their later cosmic activities, 109-10; the 'Lady of the Mountains' and mother of mankind, 111-12; what was the Sumerian conception of the universe and its origin?, 113-14; composite character of the Semitic poem of Creation, and deductions from the Sumerian original of the Seventh Tablet, 114; the Semites' intentional combination of existing myths, 114-15; traces of incongruous elements in the poem, 115-16; independent existence of the Dragon combat, 116-17; a new Semitic version of the Dragon myth, 117-18; the Sumerian Dragon motif, 118-19; the Birth of the gods and the evidence of Dannahua, 120-1; generation from primaeval water, 121-3; the later Sumerian Version under Semitic reduction, 123-4; Gilgamesh's method of creating dry land, 124-5; irrigation myth of Enki and Ninetta, 125-6; employment and significance of myth in magic, 126-7; Osiris and a Sumerian prototype, 127; the Euphrates as creator, 127-8; myths suggested by the two aspects of the Mesopotamian rivers, 128; their combination a reflection of political development, 128-9; comparison with Hebrew Versions, 129-30; vivid Semitic-Babylonian colouring of Hebrew narratives, 130-1; primitive ancestry of the later traditions, 131.

Periods and process by which Hebrews became acquainted with Babylonian ideas, 131-2; possibilities of pre-exilic influence, 132; Ezekiel and the Epic of Gilgamesh, 132-5; Babylonian echoes suggestive of oral tradition, 135-6; three debatable periods of pre-exilic contact, 136-7; the patriarchal age and the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch, 137-8; the settlement in Canaan and evidence from Tell el-Amarna, 138; the later Judaeo-monarchy and the notorious adoption of Assyrian customs and beliefs, 138-9; Jewish exiles and Babylonian mythology, and the respective influence of Babylon and Egypt upon Hebrew tradition, 139; lack of Hebrew response to Egypt except in material ideals, 139; the Arabian nomad and the 'Hamitic' problem, 139-40; effects of racial division and affinity, 140.

APPENDIXES:

I. COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SUMERIAN, SEMITIC-BABYLONIAN, HELLENISTIC, AND HEBREW VERSIONS OF CREATION, ANTEDILUVIAN HISTORY, AND THE DELUGE

II. THE ANTEDILUVIAN KINGS OF BEROSSUS AND THE SUMERIAN DYNASTIC LIST

INDEX
LEGENDS OF BABYLON AND EGYPT
IN RELATION TO HEBREW TRADITION

LECTURE I

EGYPT, BABYLON, AND PALESTINE, AND SOME TRADITIONAL ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

At the present moment most of us have little time or thought to spare for subjects not connected directly or indirectly with the war. We have put aside our own interests and studies; and after the war we shall all have a certain amount of leeway to make up in acquainting ourselves with what has been going on in countries not yet involved in the great struggle. Meanwhile the most we can do is to glance for a moment at any discovery of exceptional interest that may come to light.

The main object of these lectures will be to examine certain Hebrew traditions in the light of new evidence which has been published in America since the outbreak of the war. The evidence is furnished by some early literary texts, inscribed on tablets from Nippur, one of the oldest and most sacred cities of Babylonia. They are written in Sumerian, the language spoken by the non-Semitic people whom the Semitic Babylonians conquered and displaced; and they include a very primitive version of the Deluge story and Creation myth, and some texts which throw new light on the age of Babylonian civilization and on the area within which it had its rise. In them we have recovered some of the material from which Berossus derived his dynasty of Antediluvian kings, and we are thus enabled to test the accuracy of the Greek tradition by that of the Sumerians themselves. So far then as Babylonia is concerned, these documents will necessitate a re-examination of more than one problem.

The myths and legends of ancient Egypt are also to some extent involved. The trend of much recent anthropological research has been in the direction of seeking a single place of
origin for similar beliefs and practices, at least among races which were bound to one another by political or commercial ties. And we shall have occasion to test, by means of our new data, a recent theory of Egyptian influence. The Nile Valley was, of course, one of the great centres from which civilization radiated throughout the ancient East; and, even when direct contact is unproved, Egyptian literature may furnish instructive parallels and contrasts in any study of Western Asiatic mythology. Moreover, by a strange coincidence, there has also been published in Egypt since the beginning of the war a record referring to the reigns of predynastic rulers in the Nile Valley. This, like some of the Nippur texts, takes us back to that dim period before the dawn of actual history, and, though the information it affords is not detailed like theirs, it provides fresh confirmation of the general accuracy of Manetho's sources, and suggests some interesting points for comparison.

But the people with whose traditions we are ultimately concerned are the Hebrews. In the first series of Schweich Lectures, delivered in the year 1908, the late Canon Driver showed how the literature of Assyria and Babylon had thrown light upon Hebrew traditions concerning the origin and early history of the world. The majority of the cuneiform documents, on which he based his comparison, date from a period no earlier than the seventh century B.C., and yet it was clear that the texts themselves, in some form or other, must have descended from a remote antiquity. He concluded his brief reference to the Creation and Deluge Tablets with these words: "The Babylonian narratives are both polytheistic, while the corresponding biblical narratives (Gen. i and vi–ix) are made the vehicle of a pure and exalted monotheism; but in spite of this fundamental difference, and also variations in detail, the resemblances are such as to leave no doubt that the Hebrew cosmogony and the Hebrew story of the Deluge are both derived ultimately from the same original as the Babylonian narratives, only transformed by the magic touch of Israel's religion, and infused by it with a new spirit." Among the recently published documents from Nippur we have at last recovered one at least of those primitive originals from which the Babylonian accounts were derived, while others prove the existence of variant stories of the world's origin and early history which have not survived in the later cuneiform texts. In some

1 Driver, Modern Research as illustrating the Bible (The Schweich Lectures, 1908), p. 23.
trod even; and, had there been no new material to discuss, I think I should have preferred a less contentious theme. The new material is my justification for the choice of subject, and also the fact that, whatever views we may hold, it will be necessary for us to assimilate it to them. I shall have no hesitation in giving you my own reading of the evidence; but at the same time it will be possible to indicate solutions which will probably appeal to those who view the subject from more conservative standpoints. That side of the discussion may well be postponed until after the examination of the new evidence in detail. And first of all it will be advisable to clear up some general aspects of the problem, and to define the limits within which our criticism may be applied.

It must be admitted that both Egypt and Babylon bear a bad name in Hebrew tradition. Both are synonomous with captivity, the symbols of suffering endured at the beginning and at the close of the national life. And during the struggle against Assyrian aggression, the disappointment at the failure of expected help is reflected in prophecies of the period. These great crises in Hebrew history have tended to obscure in the national memory the part which both Babylon and Egypt may have played in moulding the civilization of the smaller nations with whom they came in contact. To such influence the races of Syria were, by geographical position, peculiarly subject. The country has often been compared to a bridge between the two great continents of Asia and Africa, flanked by the sea on one side and the desert on the other, a narrow causeway of highland and coastal plain connecting the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. 1 For, except on the frontier of Egypt, desert and sea do not meet. Further north the Arabian plateau is separated from the Mediterranean by a double mountain chain, which runs south from the Taurus at varying elevations, and encloses in its lower course the remarkable depression of the Jordan Valley, the Dead Sea, and the 'Arabah. The Judaean hills and the mountains of Moab are merely the southward prolongation of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, and their neighbourhood to the sea endows this narrow tract of habitable country with its moisture and fertility. It thus formed the natural channel of intercourse between the two earliest centres of civilization, and was later the battle-ground of their opposing empires.

The great trunk-roads of through communication run north and south, across the eastern plateaus of the Hauran and Moab, and along the coastal plains. The old highway from Egypt, which left the Delta at Pelusium, at first follows the coast, then trends eastward across the plain of Esdraelon, which breaks the coastal range, and passing under Hermon runs northward through Damascus and reaches the Euphrates at its most westerly point. Other through tracks in Palestine ran then as they do to-day, by Beersheba and Hebron, or along the 'Arabah and west of the Dead Sea, or through Edom and east of Jordan by the present Hajj route to Damascus. But the great highway from Egypt, the most westerly of the trunk-roads through Palestine, was that mainly followed, with some variant sections, by both caravans and armies, and was known by the Hebrews in its southern course as the 'Way of the Philistines' and farther north as the 'Way of the East'.

The plain of Esdraelon, where the road first trends eastward, has been the battle-ground for most invaders of Palestine from the north, and though Egyptian armies often fought in the southern coastal plain, they too have battled there when they held the southern country. Megiddo, which commands the main pass into the plain through the low Samaritan hills to the southeast of Carmel, was the site of Thothmes III's famous battle against a Syrian confederation, and it inspired the writer of the Apocalypse with his vision of an Armageddon of the future. But invading armies always followed the beaten track of caravans, and movements represented by the great campaigns were reflected in the daily passage of international commerce.

With so much through traffic continually passing within her borders, it may be matter for surprise that far more striking evidence of its cultural effect should not have been revealed by archaeological research in Palestine. Here again the explanation is mainly of a geographical character. For though the plains and plateaus could be crossed by the trunk-roads, the rest of the country is so broken up by mountain and valley that it presented few facilities either to foreign penetration or to external control. The physical barriers to local intercourse, reinforced by striking differences in soil, altitude, and climate, while they precluded Syria herself from attaining national unity, always tended to protect her separate provinces, or 'kingdoms', from the full

---

effects of foreign aggression. One city-state could be traversed, devastated, or annexed, without in the least degree affecting neighbouring areas. It is true that the population of Syria has always been predominantly Semitic, for she was on the fringe of the great breeding-ground of the Semitic race and her landward boundary was open to the Arabian nomad. Indeed, in the whole course of her history the only race that bade fair at one time to oust the Semite in Syria was the Greek. But the Greeks remained within the cities which they founded or rebuilt, and, as Robertson Smith pointed out, the death-rate in Eastern cities habitually exceeds the birth-rate; the urban population must be reinforced from the country if it is to be maintained, so that the type of population is ultimately determined by the blood of the peasantry. Hence after the Arab conquest the Greek elements in Syria and Palestine tended rapidly to disappear. The Moslem invasion was only the last of a series of similar great inroads, which have followed one another since the dawn of history, and even perhaps in prehistoric times. It is probable that Syria formed one of the links by which we may explain the mixture of human and bird elements in the figure, though not precisely paralleled at this early period, is not out of harmony resemblance between the early Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations, see Sayce, The Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, chap. iv, pp. 101 ff.

The latter line of contact is suggested by an interesting piece of evidence that has recently been obtained. A prehistoric flint knife, with a handle carved from the tooth of a hippopotamus, has been purchased lately by the Louvre, and is said to have been found at Gebel el-'Arak near Naga' Hamadi, which lies on the Nile not far below Koptos, where an ancient caravan-track leads by Wadi Hammâmât to the Red Sea. On one side of the handle is a battle-scene including some remarkable representations of ancients boats. All the warriors are nude with the exception of a loin girdle, but, while one set of combatants have shaven heads or short hair, the others have abundant locks falling in a thick mass upon the shoulder. On the other face of the handle is carved a hunting scene, two hunters with dogs and desert animals being arranged around a central boss. But in the upper field is a very remarkable group, consisting of a personage struggling with two lions arranged symmetrically. The rest of the composition is not very unlike other examples of prehistoric Egyptian carving in low relief, but here attitude, figure, and clothing are quite un-Egyptian. The hero wears a sort of turban on his abundant hair, and a full and rounded beard descends upon his breast. A long garment clothes him from the waist and falls below the knees, his muscular calves ending in the claws of a bird of prey. There is nothing like this in prehistoric Egyptian art.

Perhaps Monsieur Bénédite is pressing his theme too far when he compares the close-cropped warriors on the handle with the shaven Sumerians and Elamites upon steles from Telloh and Susa, for their loin-girdles are African and quite foreign to the Euphrates Valley. And his suggestion that two of the boats, flat-bottomed and with high curved ends, seem only to have navigated the Tigris and Euphrates, will hardly command acceptance. But there is no doubt that the heroic personage upon the other face is represented in the familiar attitude of the Babylonian hero Gilgamesh struggling with lions, which formed so favourite a subject upon early Sumerian and Babylonian seals. His garment is Sumerian or Semitic rather than Egyptian, and not precisely paralleled at this early period, is not out of harmony with the early Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations, see Sayce, The Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, chap. iv, pp. 101 ff.

1 See Smith, Religion of the Semites, p. 12 f.; and cf. ibid., Hist. Geogr., p. 10 f.
2 Cf. Sumer and Akkad, pp. 322 ff.; and for a full discussion of the points of
with Mesopotamian or Susan traditions. His beard, too, is quite different from that of the Libyan desert tribes which the early Egyptian kings adopted. Though the treatment of the lions is suggestive of proto-Elamite rather than of early Babylonian models, the design itself is unmistakably of Mesopotamian origin. This discovery intensifies the significance of other early parallels that have been noted between the civilizations of the Euphrates and the Nile, but its evidence, so far as it goes, does not point to Syria as the medium of prehistoric intercourse. Yet then, as later, there can have been no physical barrier to the use of the river-route from Mesopotamia into Syria and of the tracks thence southward along the land-bridge to the Nile’s delta.

In the early historic periods we have definite evidence that the eastern coast of the Levant exercised a strong fascination upon the rulers of both Egypt and Babylonia. It may be admitted that Syria had little to give in comparison to what she could borrow, but her local trade in wine and oil must have benefited by an increase in the through traffic which followed the working of copper in Cyprus and Sinai and of silver in the Taurus. Moreover, in the cedar forests of Lebanon and the north she possessed a product which was highly valued both in Egypt and the treeless plains of Babylonia. The cedars procured by Sneferu from Lebanon at the close of the IIIrd Dynasty were doubtless floated as rafts down the coast, and we may see in them evidence of a regular traffic in timber. It has long been known that the early Babylonian king Sharru-kin, or Sargon of Akkad, had pressed up the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and we now have information that he too was fired by a desire for precious wood and metal. One of the recently published Nippur inscriptions contains copies of a number of his texts, collected by an ancient scribe from his statues at Nippur, and from these we gather additional details of his campaigns. We learn that after his complete subjugation of Southern Babylonia he turned his attention to the west, and that Enlil gave him the lands ‘from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea’, i.e. from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf. Fortunately this rather vague phrase, which survived in later tradition, is restated in greater detail in one of the contemporary versions, which records that Enlil ‘gave him the upper land, Mari, Iarmuti, and Ibla, as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains’.1


MARI was a city on the middle Euphrates, but the name may here signify the district of Mari which lay in the upper course of Sargon’s march. Now we know that the later Sumerian monarch Gudea obtained his cedar beams from the Amanus range, which he names *Amanum* and describes as the ‘cedar mountains’.1 Doubtless he felled his trees on the eastern slopes of the mountain. But we may infer from his texts that Sargon actually reached the coast, and his ‘Cedar Forest’ may have lain farther to the south, perhaps as far south as the Lebanon. The ‘Silver Mountains’ can only be identified with the Taurus, where silver mines were worked in antiquity. The reference to Iarmut is interesting, for it is clearly the same place as Iarimuta or Iarimmuta, of which we find mention in the Tell el-Amarna letters. From the references to this district in the letters of Rib-Adda, governor of Byblos, we may infer that it was a level district on the coast, capable of producing a considerable quantity of grain for export, and that it was under Egyptian control at the time of Amenophis IV. Hitherto its position has been conjecturally placed in the Nile Delta, but from Sargon’s reference we must probably seek it on the North Syrian or possibly the Cilician coast. Perhaps, as Dr. Poebel suggests, it was the plain of Antioch, along the lower course and at the mouth of the Orontes. But his further suggestion that the term is used by Sargon for the whole stretch of country between the sea and the Euphrates is hardly probable. For the geographical references need not be treated as exhaustive, but as confined to the more important districts through which the expedition passed. The district of Ibla which is also mentioned by Narâm-Sin and Gudea, lay probably to the north of Iarmut, perhaps on the southern slopes of Taurus. It, too, we may regard as a district of restricted extent rather than as a general geographical term for the extreme north of Syria.

It is significant that Sargon does not allude to any battle when describing this expedition, nor does he claim to have devastated the western countries.2 Indeed, most of these early expeditions to the west appear to have been inspired by motives of commercial enterprise rather than of conquest. But increase of

---

2 In some versions of his new records Sargon states that ‘5,400 men daily eat bread before him’ (see Poebel, *op. cit.*, p. 172); though the figure may be intended to convey an idea of the size of Sargon’s court, we may perhaps see in it a not inaccurate estimate of the total strength of his armed forces.
wealth was naturally followed by political expansion, and Egypt's dream of an Asiatic empire was realized by Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty. The fact that Babylonian should then have been adopted as the medium of official intercourse in Syria points to the closeness of the commercial ties which had already united the Euphrates Valley with the west. Egyptian control had passed from Canaan at the time of the Hebrew settlement, which was indeed a comparatively late episode in the early history of Syria. Whether or not we identify the Khabiri with the Hebrews, the character of the latter's incursion is strikingly illustrated by some of the Tell el-Amarna letters. We see a nomad folk pressing in upon settled peoples and gaining a foothold here and there.1

The great change from desert life consists in the adoption of agriculture, and when once that was made by the Hebrews any further advance in economic development was dictated by their new surroundings. The same process had been going on, as we have seen, in Syria since the dawn of history, the Semitic nomad passing gradually through the stages of agricultural and village life into that of the city. The country favoured the retention of tribal exclusiveness, but ultimate survival could only be purchased at the cost of some amalgamation with their new neighbours. Below the surface of Hebrew history these two tendencies may be traced in varying action and reaction. Some sections of the race engaged readily in the social and commercial life of Canaanite civilization with its rich inheritance from the past. Others, especially in the highlands of Judah and the south, at first succeeded in keeping themselves remote from foreign influence. During the later periods of the national life the country was again subjected, and in an intensified degree, to those forces of political aggression from Mesopotamia and Egypt which we have already noted as operating in Canaan. But throughout the settled Hebrew community as a whole the spark of desert fire was not extinguished, and by kindling the zeal of the Prophets it eventually affected nearly all the white races of mankind.

In his Presidential Address before the British Association at Newcastle,2 Sir Arthur Evans emphasized the part which recent archaeology has played in proving the continuity of human culture from the most remote periods. He showed how

1 See especially Professor Burney's forthcoming commentary on Judges (passim), and his forthcoming Schweich Lectures (now delivered, in 1917).
which he adjures princes and men not to open his resting-place since there are no jewels therein, concluding with some potent curses against any violation of his tomb. One of the latter implores the holy gods to deliver such violators up to a mighty prince who shall rule over them, and was probably suggested by Alexander’s recent occupation of Sidon in 332 B.C. after his reduction and drastic punishment of Tyre. King Eshmun-azar was not unique in his choice of burial in an Egyptian coffin, for he merely followed the example of his royal father, Tabnith, priest of Ashtart and king of the Sidonians, whose sarcophagus, preserved at Constantinople, still bears in addition to his own epitaph that of its former occupant, a certain Egyptian general Penptah. But more instructive than these borrowed memorials is a genuine example of Phoenician work, the stele set up by Yehaw-milk, king of Byblos, and dating from the fourth or fifth century B.C. In the sculptured panel at the head of the stele the king is represented in the Persian dress of the period standing in the presence of Ashtar or Astarte, his Lady, Mistress of Byblos. There is no doubt that the stele is of native workmanship, but the influence of Egypt may be seen in the technique of the carving, in the winged disk above the figures, and still more in the representation of the goddess in her character as the Egyptian Hathor, with disk and horns, vulture head-dress and papyrus-sceptre. The inscription records the dedication of an altar and shrine to the goddess, and these too we may conjecture were fashioned on Egyptian lines.

The representation of Semitic deities under Egyptian forms and with Egyptian attributes was encouraged by the introduction of their cults into Egypt itself. In addition to Astarte of Byblos, Baal, Anath, and Reshef were all borrowed from Syria in comparatively early times and given Egyptian characters. The conical Syrian helmet of Reshef, a god of war and thunder, gradually gave place to the white Egyptian crown, so that as Reshet he was represented as a royal warrior; and Qadesh, another form of Astarte, becoming popular with Egyptian women as a patroness of love and fecundity, was also sometimes modelled on Hathor.

Semitic colonists on the Egyptian border were ever ready to adopt Egyptian symbolism in delineating the native gods to whom they owed allegiance, and a particularly striking example of this may be seen on a stele of the Persian period preserved in the Cairo Museum. It was found at Tell Defenneh, on the right bank of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, close to the old Egyptian highway into Syria, a site which may be identified with that of the biblical Tahpanhes and the Daphneae of the Greeks. Here it was that the Jewish fugitives, fleeing with Jeremiah after the fall of Jerusalem, founded a Jewish colony beside a flourishing Phoenician and Aramean settlement. One of the local gods of Tahpanhes is represented on the Cairo monument, an Egyptian stele in the form of a nose with the winged solar disk upon its frieze. He stands on the back of a lion and is clothed in Asiatic costume with the high Syrian tiara crowning his abundant hair. The Syrian workmanship is obvious, and the Syrian character of the cult may be recognized in such details as the small brazen fire-altar before the god, and the sacred pillar which is being anointed by the officiating priest. But the god holds in his left hand a purely Egyptian sceptre and in his right an emblem as purely Babylonian, the weapon of Marduk and Gilgamesh which was also wielded by early Sumerian kings.

The Elephantine papyri have shown that the early Jews of the Diaspora, though untrammeled by the orthodoxy of Jerusalem, maintained the purity of their local cult in the face of considerable difficulties. Hence the gravestones of their Aramaean contemporaries, which have been found in Egypt, can only be cited to illustrate the temptations to which they were exposed. Such was the memorial erected by Abseli to the memory of his parents, Abba and Ajaññ, in the fourth year of Xerxes, 481 B.C. They

---

3. Muller, op. cit., p. 80 f., pl. 40. Numismatic evidence exhibits a similar readiness on the part of local Syrian cults to adopt the veneer of Hellenistic civilization while retaining in great measure their own individuality; see Hill, Some Palestinian Cults in the Graeco-Roman Age, in Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. V (1912).
4. It may be admitted that the Greek platonicized cult of Isis and Osiris had its origin in the fusion of Greeks and Egyptians which took place in Ptolemaic times (cf. Scott-Moncrieff, Paganism and Christianity in Egypt, p. 33 f.). But we may assume that already in the Persian period the Osiris cult had begun to acquire a tinge of mysticism, which, though it did not affect the mechanical reproduction of the native texts, appealed to the Oriental mind as well as to certain elements in Greek religion. Persian influence probably prepared the way for the Platonic exegesis of the Osiris and Isis legends which we find in Phutarch; and the latter may have been in great measure a development, and not, as is often assumed, a complete misunderstanding of the later Egyptian cult.
had evidently adopted the religion of Osiris, and were buried at Saqqarah in accordance with Egyptian rites. The upper scene engraved upon the stele represents Abhâ and his wife in the presence of Osiris, who is attended by Isis and Nephthys; and in the lower panel is the funeral scene, in which all the mourners with one exception are Asians. Certain details of the rites that are represented, and mistakes in the hieroglyphic version of the text, prove that the work is Aramaean throughout.1

If our examples of Semitic art were confined to the Persian and later periods, they could only be employed to throw light on their own epoch, when through communication had been organized, and there was consequently a certain pooling of commercial and artistic products throughout the empire.2 It is true that under the Great King the various petty states and provinces were encouraged to manage their own affairs so long as they paid the required tribute, but their horizon naturally expanded with increase of commerce and the necessity for service in the king’s armies. At this time Aramaic was the speech of Syria, and the population, especially in the cities, was still largely Aramaean. As early as the thirteenth century sections of this interesting Semitic race had begun to press into Northern Syria from the middle Euphrates, and they absorbed not only the old Canaanite population but also Hittite immigrants from Cappadocia. The latter indeed may for a time have furnished rulers to the vigorous North Syrian principalities which resulted from this racial combination, but the Aramaean element, thanks to continual reinforce-

1 A very similar monument is the Carpentras Stele (C.I.S., II. i, tab. XIII, No. 141), commemorating Taha, daughter of Taha-i, an Aramaean lady who was also a convert to Osiris. It is rather later than that of Abhâ and his wife, since the Aramaic characters are transitional from the archaic to the square alphabet; see Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, pp. xxviii f., and Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 195 ff. The Vatican Stele (op. cit., tab. XIV, No. 462), which dates from the fourth century, represents inferior work.

2 Cf. Bevan, House of Seleucia, Vol. I, pp. 5, 260 ff. The artistic influence of Mesopotamia was even more widely spread than that of Egypt during the Persian period. This is suggested, for example, by the famous lion-weight discovered at Abydos in Mydia, the town on the Hellespont famed for the loves of Hero and Leander. The letters of its Aramaic inscription (C.I.S., II. i, tab. VII, No. 106) prove by their form that it dates from the Persian period, and its provenance is sufficiently attested. Its weight moreover suggests that it was not merely a Babylonian or Persian importation, but cast for local use, yet in design and technique it is scarcely distinguishable from the best Assyrian work of the seventh century.

ment, was numerically dominant, and their art may legitimately be regarded as in great measure a Semitic product. Fortunately we have recovered examples of sculpture which prove that tendencies already noted in the Persian period were at work, though in a minor degree, under the later Assyrian empire. The discoveries made at Zenjirli, for example, illustrate the gradually increasing effect of Assyrian influence upon the artistic output of a small North Syrian state.

This village in north-western Syria, on the road between Antioch and Mar`ash, marks the site of a town which lay near the southern border or just within the Syrian district of Sam`al. The latter is first mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions by Shalmaneser III, the son and successor of the great conqueror, Ashur-nasir-pal; and in the first half of the eighth century, though within the radius of Assyrian influence, it was still an independent kingdom. It is to this period that we must assign the earliest of the inscribed monuments discovered at Zenjirli and its neighbourhood. At Gerjin, not far to the north-west, was found the colossal statue of Hadad, chief god of the Aramaeans, which was fashioned and set up in his honour by Panammu I, son of Qarai and king of Ya`di.1 In the long Aramaic inscription engraved upon the statue Panammu records the prosperity of his reign, which he ascribes to the support he has received from Hadad and his other gods, El, Reesh, Rekub-`el, and Shamash. He had evidently been left in peace by Assyria, and the monument he erected to his god is of Aramaean workmanship and design. But the influence of Assyria may be traced in Hadad’s beard and in his horned head-dress, modelled on that worn by Babylonian and Assyrian gods as the symbol of divine power.

The political changes introduced into Ya`di and Sam`al by Tiglath-pileser IV are reflected in the inscriptions and monuments of Bar-rekub, a later king of the district. Internal strife had brought disaster upon Ya`di and the throne had been secured by Panammu II, son of Bar-sur, whose claims received Assyrian

1 See F. von Luschan, Synchronistik, I (1898), pp. 40 ff., pl. vi; and cf. Cooke, North Sem. Insers., pp. 159 ff. The characters of the inscription on the statues are of the same archaic type as those of the Mesha Stone, though unlike them they are engraved in relief; so too are the inscriptions of Panammu’s later successor Bar-rekub (see below). Gerjin was certainly in Ya`di, and Winckler’s suggestion that Zenjirli itself lay in that district but near the border of Sam`al may be provisionally accepted; the occurrence of the names in the inscriptions can be explained in more than one way (see Cooke, op. cit., p. 158).
support. In the words of his son Bar-rekub, he 
lay hold of the skirt of his lord, the king of Assyria, who 
was gracious to him; and it was probably at this time, and 
as a reward for his loyalty, that Ya'di was united with the 
neighbouring district of Sam'al. But Panammu's devotion 
to his foreign master led to his death, for he died at the 
siege of Dumaena, in 738 or 732 B.C., in the camp, while 
following his lord, Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria.

His kinsfolk and the whole camp bewailed him, and his body 
was sent back to Ya'di, where it was interred by his son, who 
set up an inscribed statue to his memory. Bar-rekub followed 
in his father's footsteps, as he leads us to infer in his palace-inscrip-
tion found at Zenjirli: 'I ran at the wheel of my lord, the king 
of Assyria, in the midst of mighty kings, possessors of silver and 
possessors of gold.' It is not strange therefore that his art 
should reflect Assyrian influence far more strikingly than that of 
Panammu I. The figure of himself which he caused to be carved 
in relief on the left side of the palace-inscription is in the 
Assyrian style, and so too is another of his reliefs from Zenjirli. 
On the latter Bar-rekub is represented seated upon his throne with 
eunuch and scribe in attendance, while in the field is the emblem 
of full moon and crescent, here ascribed to Ba'al of Harran, 
the famous centre of moon-worship in Northern Mesopotamia.

The detailed history and artistic development of Sam'al and 
Ya'di convey a very vivid impression of the social and material 
possessions of the latter Bar-rekub is represented seated upon his throne with 
eunuch and scribe in attendance, while in the field is the emblem 
of full moon and crescent, here ascribed to Ba'al of Harran, 
the famous centre of moon-worship in Northern Mesopotamia.

1 Sandcliff, IV (1911), pl. lvi. Attitude and treatment of robe are both 
Assyrian, and so is the arrangement of divine symbols in the upper field, 
though none of the latter are given under unfamiliar forms. The king's close-
fitting peaked cap was evidently the royal headdress of Sam'al; see the royal 
figure on a smaller stele of inferior design, op. cit., pl. lvi.

2 Op. cit., pp. 237, 346 ff., and pl. lx. The general style of the sculpture and 
most of the detail are obviously Assyrian. Assyrian influence is particularly 
noticeable in Bar-rekub's throne; the details of its decoration are precisely 
similar to those of an Assyrian bronze throne in the British Museum. The full 
moon and crescent are not of the familiar form, but are mounted on a standard 
with tassels. Perhaps the most interesting figure in the composition is the 
scribe with shaven head, who stands before the king. He is probably an 
Egyptian, for in his left hand he carries an Egyptian scribe's writing-palette, 
with place for ink and case for brushes. The writing-tablet under his arm, 
which looks like a bound volume, may possibly be a double tablet with hinge, 
or a single tablet with a register ruled ready for entries down one side. One 
would like to know in what characters he took down Bar-rekub's instructions.

The twin sphinxes of Zenjirli, Sakje-Geuzi, and Carchemish were ultimately 
derived from Egypt, but in view of the absence of other traces of Egyptian 
influence in the Zenjirli sculptures, the scribe's presence at the royal court 
is quite unexpected.

Effects upon the native population of Syria, which followed the 
westward advance of Assyria in the eighth century. We realize 
not only the readiness of one party in the state to defeat its rival 
with the help of Assyrian support, but also the manner in which 
the life and activities of the nation as a whole were unavoidably 
affected by their action. Other Hittite-Aramaean and Phoenician 
monuments, as yet undocumented with literary records, exhibit 
a strange but not unpleasant mixture of foreign motifs, such as 
we see on the stele from Amrit in the inland district of Arvad. But perhaps the most remarkable example of Syrian art we 
possess is the King's Gate recently discovered at Carchemish.

The presence of the hieroglyphic inscriptions points to the 
survival of Hittite tradition, but the figures represented in the 
reliefs are of Aramaean, not Hittite, type. Here the king is seen 
leading his eldest son by the hand in some stately ceremonial, 
and ranged in registers behind them are the younger members 
of the royal family, whose ages are indicated by their occupations.

The employment of basalt in place of limestone does not disguise 
the sculptor's debt to Assyria. But the design is entirely his 
own, and the combined dignity and homeliness of the composition 
are refreshingly superior to the arrogant spirit and hard execution 
which mar so much Assyrian work. This example is particularly 
instructive, as it shows how a borrowed art may be developed in 
skilled hands and made to serve a purpose in complete harmony 
with its new environment.

Such monuments surely illustrate the adaptability of the 
Semitic craftsman among men of Phoenician and Aramaean 
strain. Excavation in Palestine has failed to furnish examples 
of Hebrew work. But Hebrew tradition itself justifies us in 
regarding this trait as of more general application, or at any 
rate as not repugnant to Hebrew thought, when it relates that 
Solomon employed Tyrian craftsmen for work upon the Temple.
and its furniture; for Phoenician art was essentially Egyptian in its origin and general character. Even Eshmun-azur's desire for burial in an Egyptian sarcophagus may be paralleled in Hebrew tradition of a much earlier period, when, in the last verse of Genesis, it is recorded that Joseph died, 'and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt'. Since it formed the subject of prophetic denunciation, I refrain for the moment from citing the notorious adoption of Assyrian customs at certain periods of the later Judaean monarchy. The two records I have referred to will suffice, for we have in them cherished traditions, of which the Hebrews themselves were proud, concerning the most famous example of Hebrew religious architecture and the burial of one of the patriarchs of the race. A similar readiness to make use of the best available resources, even of foreign origin, may on analogy be regarded as at least possible in the composition of Hebrew literature.

We shall see that the problems we have to face concern the possible influence of Babylon, rather than of Egypt, upon Hebrew tradition. And one last example, drawn from the later period, will serve to demonstrate how Babylonian influence penetrated the ancient world and has even left some trace upon modern civilization. It is a fact, though one perhaps not generally realized, that the twelve divisions on the dials of our clocks and watches have a Babylonian, and ultimately a Sumerian, ancestry. For why is it we divide the day into twenty-four hours? We have a decimal system of reckoning, we count by tens; why then should we divide the day and night into twelve hours each, instead of into ten or some multiple of ten? The reason is that the Babylonians divided the day into twelve double-hours; and the Greeks took over their ancient system of time-division along with their knowledge of astronomy and passed it on to us. So if we ourselves, after more than two thousand years, are making use of an old custom from Babylon, it would not be surprising if the Hebrews, a contemporary race, should have fallen under her influence even before they were carried away as captives and settled forcibly upon her river-banks.

We may pass on, then, to the site from which our new material has been obtained—the ancient city of Nippur, in central Babylonia. Though the place has been deserted for at least nine hundred years, its ancient name still lingers on in local tradition, and to this day Niffer or Nafir is the name the Arabs give the...
wall, to the south-west, a large triangular mound, christened 'Tablet Hill' by the excavators, yielded a further supply of records. In addition to business-documents of the First Dynasty of Babylon and of the later Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Persian periods, between two and three thousand literary texts and fragments were discovered here, many of them dating from the Sumerian period. And it is possible that some of the early literary texts that have been published were obtained in other parts of the city.

No less than twenty-one different strata, representing separate periods of occupation, have been noted by the American excavators at various levels within the Nippur mounds, the earliest descending to virgin soil some twenty feet below the present level of the surrounding plain. The remote date of Nippur's foundation as a city and cult-centre is attested by the fact that the pavement laid by Naram-Sin in the south-eastern temple-court lies thirty feet above virgin soil, while only thirty-six feet of superimposed débris represent the succeeding millennia of occupation down to Sassanian and early Arab times. In the period of the Hebrew captivity the city still ranked as a great commercial market and as one of the most sacred repositories of Babylonian religious tradition. We know that not far off was Tel-âbib, the seat of one of the colonies of Jewish exiles, for that lay 'by the river of Chebar,' which we may identify with the Kābaru Canal in Nippur's immediate neighbourhood. It was 'among the captives by the river Chebar' that Ezekiel lived and prophesied, and it was on Chebar's banks that he saw his first vision of the Cherubim. He and other of the Jewish exiles may perhaps have mingled with the motley crowd that once thronged the streets of Nippur, and they may often have gazed on the huge temple-tower which rose above the city's flat roofs. We know that the later population of Nippur itself included a considerable Jewish element, for the upper strata of the mounds have yielded numerous clay bowls with Hebrew, Mandaean, and Syriac magical inscriptions; and not the least interesting of the objects recovered was the wooden box of a Jewish scribe, containing his pen and ink-vessel and a little scrap of crumbling parchment inscribed with a few Hebrew characters. Of the many thousands of inscribed clay tablets which were found in the course of the expeditions, some were kept at Constantinople, while others were presented by the Sultan Abdul Hamid to the excavators, who had them conveyed to America. Since that time a large number have been published. The work was necessarily slow, for many of the texts were found to be in an extremely bad state of preservation. So it happened that a great number of the boxes containing tablets remained until recently still packed up in the store-rooms of the Pennsylvania Museum. But under the present energetic Director of the Museum, Dr. G. B. Gordon, the process of arranging and publishing the mass of literary material has been 'speeded up'. A staff of skilled workmen has been employed on the laborious task of cleaning the broken tablets and fitting the fragments together. At the same time the help of several Assyriologists was welcomed in the further task of running over and sorting the collections as they were prepared for study. Professor Clay, Professor Barton, Dr. Langdon, Dr. Edward Chiera, and Dr. Arno Poebel have all participated in the work. But the lion's share has fallen to the last-named scholar, who was given leave of absence by Johns Hopkins University in order to take up a temporary appointment at the Pennsylvania Museum. The result of his labours was published by the Museum at the end of 1914. The texts thus made available for study are of very varied interest. A great body of them are grammatical and represent compilations made by Semitic scribes of the period of Hammurabi's dynasty for their study of the old Sumerian tongue. Containing, as most of them do, Semitic renderings of the Sumerian words and expressions collected, they are as great a help to us in our study of the Sumerian language as they were to their compilers; in particular they have thrown much new light on the paradigms of the demonstrative and personal pronouns and on Sumerian verbal forms. But literary texts are also included in the recent publications.

When the Pennsylvania Museum sent out its first expedition, lively hopes were entertained that the site selected would yield material of interest from the biblical standpoint. The city of
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1 See Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands, pp. 289 ff., 540 ff.; and Fisher, Explorations at Nippur, Pt. I (1905), Pt. II (1906).
2 Ezek. i. 13, 14; iii. 15; and cf. x. 15, 20, 22, and xliii. 3.
3 See J. A. Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur, 1913.
Nippur, as we have seen, was one of the most sacred and most ancient religious centres in the country, and Enlil, its city-god, was the head of the Babylonian pantheon. On such a site it seemed likely that we might find versions of the Babylonian legends which were current at the dawn of history before the city of Babylon and its Semitic inhabitants came upon the scene. This expectation has proved to be not unfounded, for the literary texts include the Sumerian Deluge Version and Creation myth to which I referred at the beginning of the lecture. Other texts of almost equal interest consist of early though fragmentary lists of historical and semi-mythical rulers. They prove that Berossus and the later Babylonians depended on material of quite early origin in compiling their dynasties of semi-mythical kings. In them we obtain a glimpse of ages more remote than any on which excavation in Babylonia has yet thrown light, and for the first time we have recovered genuine native tradition of early date with regard to the cradle of Babylonian culture. Before we approach the Sumerian legends themselves, it will be as well to-day to trace back in this tradition the gradual merging of history into legend and myth, comparing at the same time the ancient Egyptian's picture of his own remote past. We will also ascertain whether any new light is thrown by our inquiry upon Hebrew traditions concerning the earliest history of the human race and the origins of civilization.

In the study of both Egyptian and Babylonian chronology there has been a tendency of late years to reduce the very early dates that were formerly in fashion. But in Egypt, while the dynasties of Manetho have been telescoped in places, excavation has thrown light on predynastic periods, and we can now trace the history of culture in the Nile Valley back, through an unbroken sequence, to its neolithic stage. Quite recently, too, as I mentioned just now, a fresh literary record of these early predynastic periods has been recovered, on a fragment of the famous Palermo Stele, our most valuable monument for early Egyptian history and chronology. Egypt presents a striking contrast to Babylonia in the comparatively small number of written records which have survived for the reconstruction of her history. We might well spare much of her religious literature, enshrined in endless temple-inscriptions and papyri, if we could but exchange it for some of the royal annals of Egyptian Pharaohs. That historical records of this character were compiled by the Egyptian scribes, and that they were as detailed and precise in their information as those we have recovered from Assyrian sources, is clear from the few extracts from the annals of Thothmes III's wars which are engraved on the walls of the temple at Karnak.¹ As in Babylonia and Assyria, such records must have formed the foundation on which summaries or chronicles of past Egyptian history were based. In the Palermo Stele it is recognized that we possess a primitive chronicle of this character.

Drawn up as early as the Vth Dynasty, its historical summary proves that from the beginning of the dynastic age onward a yearly record was kept of the most important achievements of the reigning Pharaoh. In this fragmentary but invaluable epitome, recording in outline much of the history of the Old Kingdom,² some interesting parallels have long been noted with Babylonian usage. The early system of time-reckoning, for example, was the same in both countries, each year being given an official title from the chief event that occurred in it. And although in Babylonia we are still without material for tracing the process by which this cumbersome method gave place to that of reckoning by regnal years, the Palermo Stele demonstrates the way in which the latter system was evolved in Egypt. For the events from which the year was named came gradually to be confined to the fiscal ‘numberings’ of cattle and land. And when these, which at first had taken place at comparatively long intervals, had become annual events, the numbered sequence of their occurrence corresponded precisely to the years of the king’s reign. On the stele, during the dynastic period, each regnal year is allotted its own space or rectangle,³ arranged in horizontal sequence below the name and titles of the ruling king.

The text, which is engraved on both sides of a great block of black basalt, takes its name from the fact that the fragment hitherto known has been preserved since 1877 in the Museum of Palermo. Five other fragments of the text have now been published, of which one undoubtedly belongs to the same monument as the Palermo fragment, while the others may represent parts of one or more duplicate copies of that famous text. One of the four Cairo fragments ⁴ was found by a digger for sekhbet at Mitrahneh.

¹ See Breasted, Ancient Records, I, p. 4, II, pp. 163 ff.
² O. cit., I, pp. 57 ff.
³ The spaces are not strictly rectangles, as each is divided vertically from the next by the Egyptian hieroglyph for ‘year’.
⁴ See Gautier, Le Musée Égyptien, III (1915), pp. 29 ff., pl. xxiv ff., and
(Memphis); the other three, which were purchased from a dealer, are said to have come from Minieh, while the fifth fragment, at University College, is also said to have come from Upper Egypt, though it was purchased by Professor Petrie while at Memphis. These reports suggest that a number of duplicate copies were engraved and set up in different Egyptian towns, and it is possible that the whole of the text may eventually be recovered. The choice of basalt for the records was obviously dictated by a desire for their preservation, but it has had the contrary effect: for the blocks of this hard and precious stone have been cut up and reused in later times. The largest and most interesting of the new fragments has evidently been employed as a door-sill, with the result that its surface is much rubbed and parts of its text are unfortunately almost undecipherable. We shall see that the earliest section of its record has an important bearing on our knowledge of Egyptian predynastic history and on the traditions of that remote period which have come down to us from the history of Manetho.

From the fragment of the stele preserved at Palermo we already knew that its record went back beyond the 1st Dynasty into predynastic times. For part of the top band of the inscription, which is there preserved, contains nine names borne by kings of Lower Egypt or the Delta, which, it had been conjectured, must follow the gods of Manetho and precede the Worshippers of Horus, the immediate predecessors of the Egyptian dynasties. But of contemporary rulers of Upper Egypt we had hitherto no knowledge, since the supposed royal names discovered at Abydos and assigned to the time of the Worshippers of Horus, the immediate predecessors of the Egyptian dynasties, are probably not royal names at all. With the possible exception of two very archaic slate palettes, the first historical memorials recovered from the south do not date from an earlier period than the beginning of the Ist Dynasty. The largest of the Cairo fragments now helps us to fill in this gap in our knowledge.

On the top of the new fragment we meet the same band of rectangles as at Palermo, but here their upper portions are broken away, and there only remains at the base of each of them the outlined figure of a royal personage, seated in the same attitude as those on the Palermo stone. The remarkable fact about these figures is that, with the apparent exception of the third figure from the right, each wears, not the Crown of the North, as at Palermo, but the Crown of the South. We have then to do with kings of Upper Egypt, not the Delta, and it is no longer possible to suppose that the predynastic rulers of the Palermo stele were confined to those of Lower Egypt, as reflecting northern tradition. Rulers of both halves of the country are represented, and Monsieur Gautier has shown, from data on the reverse of the inscription, that the kings of the Delta were arranged on the original stone before the rulers of the south who are outlined upon our new fragment. Moreover, we have now recovered definite proof that this band of the inscription is concerned with predynastic Egyptian princes; for the cartouche of the king, whose years are enumerated in the second band immediately below the kings of the south, reads Ahet, a name we may with certainty identify with Athothes, the second successor of Menes, founder of the 1st Dynasty, which is already given under the form Atho in the Abydos List of Kings. It is thus quite certain that the first band of the inscription relates to the earlier periods before the two halves of the country were brought together under a single ruler.

Though the tradition of these remote times is here recorded on a monument of the 5th Dynasty, there is no reason to doubt its general accuracy, or to suppose that we are dealing with purely mythological personages. It is perhaps possible, as Monsieur Foucart suggests, that missing portions of the text may have

---

1 In this upper band the spaces are true rectangles, being separated by vertical lines, not by the hieroglyph for ‘year’ as in the lower bands; and each rectangle is assigned to a separate king, and not, as in the other bands, to a year of a king’s reign.

2 The difference in the crown worn by this figure is probably only apparent and not intentional; M. Foucart, after a careful examination of the fragment, concludes that it is due to subsequent damage or to an original defect in the stone; cf. Bulletin, XII, ii, p. 162.


4 In Manetho’s list he corresponds to Khennuye, the second successor of Menes, according to both Africanus and Eusebius, who assign the name Athothes to the second ruler of the dynasty only, the Teta of the Abydos List. The form Athothes is preserved by Eusebius (by both of Menes’ immediate successors).
carried the record back through purely mythical periods to Ptah and the Creation. In that case we should have, as we shall see, a striking parallel to early Sumerian tradition. But in the first extant portions of the Palermo text we are already in the realm of genuine tradition. The names preserved appear to be those of individuals, not of mythological creations, and we may assume that their owners really existed. For though the invention of writing had not at that time been achieved, its place was probably taken by oral tradition. We know that with certain tribes of Africa at the present day, who possess no knowledge of writing, there are functionaries charged with the duty of preserving tribal traditions, who transmit orally to their successors a remembrance of past chiefs and some details of events that occurred centuries before. The predynastic Egyptians may well have adopted similar means for preserving a remembrance of their past history.

Moreover, the new text furnishes fresh proof of the general accuracy of Manetho, even when dealing with traditions of this prehistoric age. On the stele there is no definite indication that these two sets of predynastic kings were contemporaneous rulers of Lower and Upper Egypt respectively; and since elsewhere that lists assign a single sovereign to each epoch, it has been suggested that we should regard them as successive representatives of the legitimate kingdom. Now Manetho, after his dynasties of gods and demi-gods, states that thirty Memphite kings reigned for 1,790 years, and were followed by ten Thinite kings whose reigns covered a period of 350 years. Neglecting the figures as obviously erroneous, we may well admit that the Greek historian here alludes to our two pre-Menite dynasties. But the fact that he should regard them as ruling consecutively does not preclude the other alternative. The modern convention of arranging lines of contemporaneous rulers in parallel columns had not been evolved in antiquity, and without some such method of distinction contemporaneous rulers, when enumerated in a list, can only be registered consecutively. It would be natural to assume that, before the unification of Egypt by the founder of the Ist Dynasty, the rulers of North and South were inde-

1 M. Foucart illustrates this point by citing the case of the Bushongos, who have in this way preserved a list of no less than a hundred and twenty-one of their past kings: op. cit., p. 182, and cf. Terdey and Joyce, 'Les Bushongos', in Annales du Musée du Congo Belge, sér. III, t. II, fasc. i (Brussels, 1911).

2 Foucart, loc. cit.

3 While the evidence of Herodotus is extraordinarily valuable for the details he gives of the civilizations of both Egypt and Babylonia, and is especially full in the case of the former, it is of little practical use for the chronology. In Egypt his report of the early history is confused, and he hardly attempts one for Babylonia. It is probable that on such subjects he sometimes misunderstood his informants, the priests, whose traditions were more accurately reproduced by the later native writers Manetho and Berossus. For a detailed comparison of classical authorities in relation to both countries, see Griffith in Hogarth's Authority and Archaeology, pp. 161 ff.

archaeological evidence also comes suddenly to an end. Thus the earliest picture we have hitherto obtained of the Sumerians has been that of a race employing an advanced system of writing and possessed of a knowledge of metal. We have found, in short, abundant remains of a bronze-age culture, but no traces of preceding ages of development such as meet us on early Egyptian sites. It was a natural inference that the advent of the Sumerians in the Euphrates Valley was sudden, and that they had brought their highly developed culture with them from some region of Central or Southern Asia.

The newly published Nippur documents will cause us to modify that view. The lists of early kings were themselves drawn up under the Dynasty of Nisin in the twenty-second century B.C., and they give us traces of possibly ten and at least eight other 'kingdoms' before the earliest dynasty of the known lists. One of their novel features is that they include summaries at the end, in which it is stated how often a city or district enjoyed the privilege of being the seat of supreme authority in Babylonia. The earliest of their sections lie within the legendary period, and though in the third dynasty preserved we begin to note signs of a firmer historical tradition, the great break that then occurs in the text is at present only bridged by titles of various 'kingdoms' which the summaries give; a few even of these are missing and the relative order of the rest is not assured. But in spite of their imperfect state of preservation, these documents are of great historical value and will furnish a framework for future chronological schemes. Meanwhile we may attribute to some of the later dynasties titles in complete agreement with Sumerian tradition. The dynasty of Ur-Engur, for example, which preceded that of Nisin, becomes, if we like, the Third Dynasty of Ur. Another important fact which strikes us after a scrutiny of the early royal names recovered is that, while the text is at present only bridged by titles of various 'kingdoms' which the summaries give; a few even of these are missing and the relative order of the rest is not assured. But in spite of their imperfect state of preservation, these documents are of great historical value and will furnish a framework for future chronological schemes. Meanwhile we may attribute to some of the later dynasties titles in complete agreement with Sumerian tradition. The dynasty of Ur-Engur, for example, which preceded that of Nisin, becomes, if we like, the Third Dynasty of Ur. Another important fact which strikes us after a scrutiny of the early royal names recovered is that, while two or three are Semitic, the great majority of those borne by the earliest rulers of Kish, Erech, and Ur are as obviously Sumerian.

It is clear that in native tradition, current among the Sumerians themselves before the close of the third millennium, their race was regarded as in possession of Babylonia since the dawn of history. This at any rate proves that their advent was not sudden nor comparatively recent, and it further suggests that Babylonia itself was the cradle of their civilization. It will be the province of future archaeological research to fill out the missing dynasties and to determine at what points in the list their strictly historical basis disappears. Some, which are fortunately preserved near the beginning, bear on their face their legendary character. But for our purpose they are none the worse for that.

In the first two dynasties, which had their seats at the cities of Kish and Erech, we see gods mingling with men upon the earth. Tammuz, the god of vegetation, for whose annual death Ezekiel saw women weeping beside the Temple at Jerusalem, is here an earthly monarch. He appears to be described as 'a hunter', a phrase which recalls the death of Adonis in Greek mythology. According to our Sumerian text he reigned in Erech for a hundred years.

Another attractive Babylonian legend is that of Etana, the prototype of Icarus and hero of the earliest dream of human flight. Clinging to the pinions of his friend the Eagle he beheld the world and its encircling stream recede beneath him; and he flew through the gate of heaven, only to fall headlong back to earth. He is here duly entered in the list, where we read that 'Etana, the shepherd who ascended to heaven, who subdued all lands', ruled in the city of Kish for 635 years.

The god Lugal-banda is another hero of legend. When the 'young animal, lamb', the latter zaljētam, 'scorpion'; cf. Poebel, Hist. Texts, p. 111. The occurrence of these names points to Semitic infiltration into Northern Babylonia since the dawn of history, a state of things we should naturally expect. It is improbable that on this point Sumerian tradition should have merely reflected the conditions of a later period.

1 See Poebel, Historical Texts, pp. 73 ff., and Historical and Grammatical Texts, pl. ii–iv, Nos. 2–5. The best preserved of the lists is No. 2; Nos. 3 and 4 are comparatively small fragments; and of No. 5 the obverse only is here published for the first time, the contents of the reverse having been made known some years ago by Hilprecht (cf. Mathematical, Metrolological, and Chronological Tablets, p. 46 f., pl. 30, No. 47). The fragments belong to separate copies of the Sumerian dynastic record, and it happens that the extant portions of their text in some places cover the same period and are duplicates of one another.

2 Cf., e.g., two of the earliest kings of Kish, Galumum and Zugagib (see below, p. 34). The former is probably the Semitic-Babylonian word ūlānumu, the latter zaljētam, 'scorpion'; cf. Poebel, Hist. Texts, p. 111. The occurrence of these names points to Semitic infiltration into Northern Babylonia since the dawn of history, a state of things we should naturally expect. It is improbable that on this point Sumerian tradition should have merely reflected the conditions of a later period.

3 See further, p. 119, n. 1.

4 The Egyptian conception of the deceased Pharaoh ascending to heaven as a falcon and becoming merged into the sun, which first occurs in the Pyramid texts (see Gardiner in Cumont's Études Syriennes, pp. 109 ff.), belongs to a different range of ideas. But it may well have been combined with the Etana tradition to produce the funerary eagle employed so commonly in Roman Syria in representations of the emperor's apotheosis (cf. Cumont, op. cit., pp. 87 ff., 113).
hearts of the other gods failed them, he alone recovered the Tablets of Fate, stolen by the bird-god Zîu from Enlil’s palace. He is here recorded to have reigned in Erech for 1,200 years.

Tradition already told us that Erech was the native city of Gilgamesh, the hero of the national epic, to whom his ancestor Ut-napishtim related the story of the Flood. Gilgamesh too is in our list, as king of Erech for 126 years.

We have here in fact recovered traditions of Post-diluvian kings. Unfortunately our list goes no farther back than that, but it is probable that in its original form it presented a general correspondence to the system preserved from Berossus, which enumerates ten Antediluvian kings, the last of them Xisuthros, the hero of the Deluge. Indeed, for the dynastic period, the agreement of these old Sumerian lists with the chronological system of Berossus is striking. The latter, according to Syncellus, gives 34,090 or 34,080 years as the total duration of the historical period, apart from his preceding mythical ages, while the figure as preserved by Eusebius is 33,091 years. The compiler of one of our new lists, writing some 1,900 years earlier, reckons that the dynastic period in his day had lasted for 32,243 years. Of course all these figures are mythical, and even at the time of the Sumerian Dynasty of Naism variant traditions were current with regard to the number of historical and semi-mythical kings of Babylonia and the duration of their rule. For the earlier writer of another of our lists, separated from the one already quoted by an interval of only sixty-seven years, gives 28,876 4 years as the total duration of the dynasties at his time. But in spite of these discrepancies, the general resemblance presented by the huge totals in the variant copies of the list to the alternative figures of Berossus, if we ignore his mythical period, is remarkable. They indicate a far closer correspondence of the Greek tradition with that of the early Sumerians themselves than was formerly suspected.

Further proof of this correspondence may be seen in the fact that the new Sumerian Version of the Deluge story, which I propose to discuss in the second lecture, gives us a connected account of the world’s history down to that point. The Deluge hero is there a Sumerian king named Ziusudra, ruling in one of the newly created cities of Babylonia and ministering at the shrine of his city-god. He is continually given the royal title, and the foundation of the Babylonian ‘kingdom’ is treated as an essential part of Creation. We may therefore assume that an Antediluvian period existed in Sumerian tradition as in Berossus. And I think Dr. Poebel is right in assuming that the Nippur copies of the Dynastic List begin with the Post-diluvian period.

Though Professor Barton, on the other hand, holds that the Dynastic List had no concern with the Deluge, his suggestion 1

---

1 See below, pp. 65 ff. 2 See below, p. 58; and cf. p. 69.

Of course it does not necessarily follow that the figure assigned to the duration of the Antediluvian or mythical period by the Sumerians would show so close a resemblance to that of Berossus as we have already noted in their estimates of the dynastic or historical period. But there is no need to assume that Berossus’ huge total of a hundred and twenty ‘sars’ (432,000 years) is entirely a product of Neo-Babylonian speculation; the total 432,000 is explained as representing ten months of a cosmic year, each month consisting of twelve ‘sars’, i.e., 12 × 36,000 = 432,000 years. The Sumerians themselves had no difficulty in picturing two of their dynastic rulers as each reigning for two ‘sars’ (1,200 years), and it would not be unlikely that ‘sars’ were distributed among still earlier rulers; the numbers were easily written. For the unequal distribution of his hundred and twenty ‘sars’ by Berossus among his ten Antediluvian kings, see Appendix II, p. 144, n. 4.

The inclusion of the Antediluvian period from the list may perhaps be explained on the assumption that its compiler confined his record to ‘kingdom’, and that the mythical rulers who preceded them did not form a ‘kingdom’ within his definition of the term. In any case we have a clear indication that an earlier period was included before the true ‘kingdoms’; or dynasties, in an Assyrian copy of the list, a fragment of which is preserved in the British Museum from the Library of Ashur-bani-pal at Nineveh; see Chron. conc. Early Bab. Kings (Studies in East Hist., II f.), Vol. I, pp. 182 ff., Vol. II, pp. 49 ff., 143 f. There we find traces of an extra column of text preceding that in which the first Kingdom of Kish was recorded. It would seem almost certain that this extra column was devoted to Antediluvian kings. The only alternative explanation would be that it was inscribed with the summaries which conclude the Sumerian copies of our list. But later scribes do not so transpose their material, and the proper place for summaries is at the close, not at the beginning, of a list. In the Assyrian copy the Dynastic List is brought up to date, and extends down to the later Assyrian period. Formerly its compiler could only be credited with incorporating traditions of earlier times. But the correspondence of the small fragment preserved of its Second Column with part of the First Column of the Nippur texts (including the name of ‘Enumenunma’) proves that the Assyrian scribe reproduced an actual copy of the Sumerian document.
that the early names preserved by it may have been the original source of Berossus’ Antediluvian rulers may yet be accepted in a modified form. In coming to his conclusion he may have been influenced by what seems to me an undoubted correspondence between one of the rulers in our list and the sixth Antediluvian king of Berossus. I think few will be disposed to dispute the equation: 

Δανως τουμπη = Ετανα.

Each list preserves the hero’s shepherd origin and the correspondence of the names is very close, Daonos merely transposing the initial vowel of Etana. That Berossus should have translated a Post-diluvian ruler into his Antediluvian dynasty would not be at all surprising in view of the absence of detailed correspondence between his later dynasties and those we know actually occupied the Babylonian throne. Moreover, the inclusion of Babylon in his list of Antediluvian cities should make us hesitate to regard all the rulers he assigns to his earliest dynasty as necessarily retaining in his list their original order in Sumerian tradition. Thus we may with a clear conscience seek equations between the names of Berossus’ Antediluvian rulers and those preserved in the early part of our Dynastic List, although we may regard the latter as actually Post-diluvian in Sumerian belief.

This reflection, and the result already obtained, encourage us to accept the following further equation, which is yielded by a renewed scrutiny of the lists:

‘Αμμένος = Ενμενομα.

Here Ammenon, the fourth of Berossus’ Antediluvian kings, presents a wonderfully close transcription of the Sumerian name. The η of the first syllable has been assimilated to the following consonant in accordance with a recognized law of euphony, and the resultant doubling of the η is faithfully preserved in the Greek. Precisely the same initial component, Εμμένος, occurs in the name Enmeduranki, borne by a mythical king of Sippar, who has long been recognized as the original of Berossus’ seventh Antediluvian king, Ενμέδορας. There too the original η has been assimilated, but the Greek form retains no doubling of the η and points to its further weakening.

I do not propose to detain you with a detailed discussion of Sumerian royal names and their possible Greek equivalents. I will merely point out that the two suggested equations, which I venture to think we may regard as established, throw the study of Berossus’ mythological personages upon a new plane. No equivalent has hitherto been suggested for Δανως; but ‘Αμμένος has been confidently explained as the equivalent of a conjectured Babylonian original, Ummann, lit. ‘Workman.’ The fact that we should now have recovered the Sumerian original of the name, which proves to have no connexion in form or meaning with the previously suggested Semitic equivalent, tends to cast doubt on other Semitic equations proposed. Perhaps ‘Αμμένος or ‘Αμμέλες may after all prove to be the equivalent of Amelu, ‘Μαν’, or ‘Αμμέβος of that of Amēl-Sin. Both may find their true equivalents in some of the missing royal names at the head of the Sumerian Dynastic List. There too we may provisionally seek ‘Αμανος, the ‘first king’, whose equation with Aruru, the Babylonian mother-goddess, never appeared a very happy suggestion. The ingenious proposal, on the other hand, that his successor, ‘Αμάνος, represents a miscopied ‘Αλάνος, a Greek rendering of the name of Adam, may still hold good in view of Etana’s presence in the Sumerian dynastic record. Ut-napishtim’s
title, Khasisatra or Atrakhasi, "the Very Wise", still of course remains the established equivalent of Ἑδώρος; but for Οὔρφρος (Ὅυρφρος), a rival to Ubar Tutu, Ut-napištim's father, may perhaps appear. The new identifications do not of course dispose of the old ones, except in the case of Ummān; but they open up a new line of approach and provide a fresh field for conjecture. 1 Semitic, and possibly contracted, originals are still possible for unidentified mythical kings of Berossus; but such equations will inspire greater confidence, should we be able to establish Sumerian originals for the Semitic renderings, from new material already in hand or to be obtained in the future.

But it is time I read you extracts from the earlier extant portions of the Sumerian Dynastic List, in order to illustrate the class of document with which we are dealing. From them it will be seen that the record is not a tabular list of names like the well-known Kings' Lists of the Neo-Babylonian period. It is cast in the form of an epitomized chronicle and gives under set formulae the length of each king's reign, and his father's name in cases of direct succession to father or brother. Short phrases are also sometimes added, or inserted in the sentence referring to a king, in order to indicate his humble origin or the achievement which made his name famous in tradition. The head of the First Column of the text is wanting, and the first royal name that is completely preserved is that of Galumum, the ninth or tenth ruler of the earliest 'kingdom', or dynasty, of Kish. The text then runs on connectedly for several lines:

Galumum ruled for nine hundred years.
Zugagib ruled for eight hundred and forty years.
Arpi, son of a man of the people, ruled for seven hundred and twenty years.
Etana, the shepherd who ascended to heaven, who subdued all lands, ruled for six hundred and thirty-five years. 2
Pili ... son of Etana, ruled for four hundred and ten years.
Emmenumna ruled for six hundred and eleven years.
Melamkish, son of Emmenumma, ruled for twelve hundred years.
Barasalnuna, son of Emmenumma, ruled for twelve hundred years.
Mesaz ... son of Barasalnuna, ruled for [ ... ] years.
[ ... ] son of Barasalnuna, ruled for [ ... ] years.

A small gap then occurs in the text, but we know that the last

1 See further Appendix II, pp. 144 ff.
2 Possibly 625 years.
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two representatives of this dynasty of twenty-three kings are related to have ruled for nine hundred years and six hundred and twenty-five years respectively. In the Second Column of the text the lines are also fortunately preserved which record the passing of the first hegemony of Kish to the 'Kingdom of Eanna', the latter taking its name from the famous temple of Anu and Ishtar in the old city of Erech. The text continues:

The kingdom of Kish passed to Eanna.
In Eanna, Meskingsher, son of the Sun-god, ruled as high priest and king for three hundred and twenty-five years.
Meskingsher entered into [ ... ] and ascended to [ ... ].
Enmerkar, son of Meskingsher, the king of Erech who built this is [ ... ] with the people of Erech, 2 ruled as king for four hundred and twenty years.
Lugalbalnuna, the shepherd, ruled for twelve hundred years.
Dumuzi, 4 the hunter (?), whose city was ... , ruled for a hundred years.
Gish-gal-games, 4 whose father was A, 6 the high priest of Kullab, ruled for one hundred and twenty-six 6 years.

1 The verb may also imply descent into.
2 The phrase appears to have been imperfectly copied by the scribe. As it stands the subordinate sentence reads 'the king of Erech who built with the people of Erech'. Either the object governed by the verb has been omitted, in which case we might restore some such phrase as 'the city'; or perhaps, by a slight transposition, we should read 'the king who built Erech with the people of Erech'. In any case the first building of the city of Erech, as distinguished from its ancient cult-centre Eanna, appears to be recorded here in the tradition. This is the first reference to Erech in the text; and Enmerkar's father was high priest as well as king. See further, pp. 36 and 56.
4 i.e. Tammuz. 4 i.e. Gilgamesh.
6 The name of the father of Gilgamesh is rather strangely expressed by the single sign for the vowel a and must apparently be read as A. As there is a small break in the text at the end of this line, Dr. Poebel not unnaturally assumed that A was merely the first syllable of the name, of which the end was wanting. But it has now been shown that the complete name was A; see Forteck, Orient. Lit.-Zelt., Vol. XVIII, No. 12 (Dec., 1915), col. 367 ff. The reading is deduced from the following entry in an Assyrian explanatory list of gods (Can. Texts in the Brit. Mus., Pt. XXIV, pl. 25, II 29-31): 'The god A, who is also equated to the god Dubbisaguri (i.e. "Scribe of Ur"), is the priest of Kullab; his wife is the goddess Ninguesirka (i.e. "Lady of the edge of the street"); A, the priest of Kullab and the husband of a goddess, is clearly to be identified with A, the priest of Kullab and father of Gilgamesh, for we know from the Gilgamesh Epic that the hero's mother was the goddess Ningusar (see below, p. 39, n. 3). Whether Ninguesirka was a title of Ninsun, or represents a variant tradition with regard to the parentage of Gilgamesh on the mother's side, we have in any case confirmation of his descent from priest and goddess. It was natural that A should be subsequently deified. This was not the case at the time our text was inscribed, as the name is written without the divine determinative.
6 Possibly 186 years.
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[...]ugal, son of Gishilgames, ruled for [...] years.

This group of early kings of Erech is of exceptional interest. Apart from its inclusion of Gilgamesh and the gods Tammuz and Lugalbanda, its record of Meskingasher’s reign possibly refers to one of the lost legends of Erech. Like him Melchizedek, who comes to us in a chapter of Genesis reflecting the troubled times of Babylon’s First Dynasty, 1 was priest as well as king. 2 Tradition appears to have credited Meskingasher’s son and successor, Enmerkar, with the building of Erech as a city around the first settlement Eanna, which had already given its name to the ‘kingdom’. If so, Sumerian tradition confirms the assumption of modern research that the great cities of Babylonia arose around the still more ancient cult-centres of the land. We shall have occasion to revert to the traditions here recorded concerning the parentage of Meskingasher, the founder of this line of kings, and that of its most famous member, Gilgamesh. Meanwhile we may note that the closing rulers of the ‘Kingdom of Eanna’ are wanting. When the text is again preserved, we read of the hegemony passing from Erech to Ur and thence to Awan:

The kingdom of Erech passed to Ur.

In Ur Mesannipada became king and ruled for eighty years.

Meskiagnunna, son of Mesannipada, ruled for thirty years.

Elu[...] ruled for twenty-five years.

Balu[...] ruled for thirty-six years.

Four kings (thus) ruled for a hundred and seventy-one years.

The kingdom of Ur passed to Awan.

With the ‘Kingdom of Ur’ we appear to be approaching a firmer historical tradition, for the reigns of its rulers are recorded in decades, not hundreds of years. But we find in the summary, which concludes the main copy of our Dynastic List, that the kingdom of Awan, though it consisted of but three rulers, is credited with a total duration of three hundred and fifty-six years, implying that we are not yet out of the legendary stratum. Since Awan is proved by newly published historical inscriptions from Nippur to have been an important city of Elam at the time of the Dynasty of Akkad, 1 we gather that the ‘Kingdom of Awan’ represented in Sumerian tradition the first occasion on which the country passed for a time under Elamite rule. At this point a great gap occurs in the text, and when the detailed dynastic succession in Babylonia is again assured, we have passed definitely from the realm of myth and legend into that of history. 2

What new light, then, do these old Sumerian records throw on Hebrew traditions concerning the early ages of mankind? I think it will be admitted that there is something strangely familiar about some of those Sumerian extracts I read just now. We seem to hear in them the faint echo of another narrative, like them but not quite the same.

And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.

And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enosh: and Seth lived after he begat Enosh eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters: and all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years: and he died.

... and all the days of Enoch were nine hundred and five years: and he died.

... and all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and eight years: and he died.

... and all the days of Mahalalel were eight hundred ninety years: and he died.

... and all the days of Jared were nine hundred sixty and two years: and he died.

... and all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years: and he died.

... and all the days of Lamech were seven hundred seventy and seven years: and he died.

And Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

Throughout these extracts from ‘the book of the generations of Adam’, 3 Galumum’s nine hundred years 4 seem to run from
almost like a refrain; and Methuselah's great age, the recognized symbol for longevity, is even exceeded by two of the Sumerian patriarchs. The names in the two lists are not the same, but in both we are moving in the same atmosphere and along similar lines of thought. Though each list adheres to its own set formulae, it estimates the length of human life in the early ages of the world on much the same gigantic scale as the other. Our Sumerian records are not quite so formal in their structure as the Hebrew narrative, but the short notes which here and there relieve their stiff monotony may be paralleled in the Cainite genealogy of the preceding chapter in Genesis. There Cain's city-building, for example, may pair with that of Enmerkar; and though our new records may afford no precise equivalents to Jubal's patronage of nomad life, or to the invention of music and metal-working ascribed to Jubal and Tubal-cain, these too are quite in the spirit of Sumerian and Babylonian tradition, in their attempt to picture the beginnings of civilization. Thus Enme-duranki, the prototype of the seventh Antediluvian patriarch of Berossus, was traditionally revered as the first exponent of divination. It is in the chronological and general setting,
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nineteen hundred years. This inference our new material supports; but when due allowance has been made for a resulting disturbance of vision, the Sumerian origin of the remainder of his evidence is notably confirmed. Two of his ten Antediluvian kings rejoin their Sumerian prototypes, and we shall see that two of his three Antediluvian cities find their place among the five of primitive Sumerian belief. It is clear that in Babylonia, as in Egypt, the local traditions of the dawn of history, current in the Hellenistic period, were modelled on very early lines. Both countries were the seats of ancient civilizations, and it is natural that each should stage its picture of beginnings upon its own soil and embellish it with local colouring.

It is a tribute to the historical accuracy of Hebrew tradition to recognize that it never represented Palestine as the cradle of man's earliest history and first progress in the arts of life. And it is in the East, in the soil of Babylonia, that we may legitimately seek material in which to verify the sources of that traditional belief.

The new parallels I have to-day attempted to trace between some of the Hebrew traditions, preserved in Gen. iv–vi, and those of the early Sumerians, as presented by their great Dynastic List, are essentially general in character and do not apply to details of narrative or to proper names. If they stood alone, we should still have to consider whether they are such as to suggest cultural influence or independent origin. But fortunately they do not exhaust the evidence we have lately recovered from the site of Nippur, and we will postpone formulating our conclusions with regard to them until the whole field has been surveyed. From the biblical standpoint by far the most valuable of our new documents is one that incorporates a Sumerian version of the Deluge story. We shall see that it presents a variant and more primitive picture of that great catastrophe than those of the Babylonian and Hebrew versions. And what is of even greater interest, it connects the narrative of the Flood with that of Creation, and supplies a brief but intermediate account of the Antediluvian period. How then are we to explain this striking literary resemblance to the structure of the narrative in Genesis, a resemblance that is completely wanting in the Babylonian versions? But that is a problem we must reserve for the next lecture.

LECTURE II

DELUGE STORIES AND THE NEW SUMERIAN VERSION

In the first lecture we saw how, both in Babylonia and Egypt, recent discoveries had thrown light upon periods regarded as prehistoric, and how we had lately recovered traditions concerning very early rulers both in the Nile Valley and along the lower Euphrates. On the strength of the latter discovery we noted the possibility that future excavation in Babylonia would lay bare stages of primitive culture similar to those we have already recovered in Egyptian soil. Meanwhile the documents from Nippur had shown us what the early Sumerians themselves believed about their own origin, and we traced in their tradition the gradual blending of history with legend and myth. We saw that the new Dynastic List took us back in the legendary sequence at least to the beginning of the Post-diluvian period. Now one of the newly published literary texts fills in the gap beyond, for it gives us a Sumerian account of the history of the world from the Creation to the Deluge, at about which point, as we saw, the extant portions of the Dynastic List take up the story. I propose to devote my lecture to-day to this early version of the Flood and to the effect of its discovery upon some current theories.

The Babylonian account of the Deluge, which was discovered by George Smith in 1872 on tablets from the Royal Library at Nineveh, is, as you know, embedded in a long epic of twelve Books recounting the adventures of the Old Babylonian hero Gilgamesh. Towards the end of this composite tale, Gilgamesh, desiring immortality, crosses the Waters of Death in order to beg the secret from his ancestor Ut-napishtim, who in the past had escaped the Deluge and had been granted immortality by the gods. The Eleventh Tablet, or Book, of the epic contains the account of the Deluge which Ut-napishtim related to his kinsman Gilgamesh. The close correspondence of this Babylonian story with that contained in Genesis is recognized by
every one and need not detain us. You will remember that in some passages the accounts tally even in minute details, such, for example, as the device of sending out birds to test the abatement of the waters. It is true that in the Babylonian version a dove, a swallow, and a raven are sent forth in that order, instead of a raven and the dove three times. But such slight discrepancies only emphasize the general resemblance of the narratives.

In any comparison it is usually admitted that two accounts have been combined in the Hebrew narrative. I should like to point out that this assumption may be made by any one, whatever his views may be with regard to the textual problems of the Hebrew Bible and the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch. And for our purpose at the moment it is immaterial whether we identify the compiler of these Hebrew narratives with Moses himself, or with some later Jewish historian whose scrupulously preserved his two texts, and, even when they differ, he has given each as he found it. Thanks to this fact, any one can disentangle the two versions for himself. He will find each gives a consistent story. One of them appears to be simpler and more primitive than the other, and I will refer to them as the earlier and the later versions, though the points of resemblance are more detailed in the earlier of the two.

Now the tablets from the Royal Library at Nineveh inscribed with the Gilgamesh Epic do not date from an earlier period than the seventh century B.C. But archaeological evidence has shown that the traditions themselves were current during all periods of Babylonian history; for Gilgames and his half-human friend Enkidu were favourite subjects for the seal engraver, whether he lived in Sumerian times or under the Achaemenian kings of Persia. We have also, for some years now, possessed two early fragments of the Deluge narrative, proving that the story was known to the Semitic inhabitants of the country at the time of Hammurabi’s dynasty. Our newly discovered text from Nippur was also written at about that period, probably before 2100 n.C. But the composition itself, apart from the tablet on which it is inscribed, must go back very much earlier than that. For instead of being composed in Semitic Babylonian, the text is in Sumerian, the language of the earliest known inhabitants of Babylonia, whom the Semites eventually displaced. This people, it is now recognized, were the originators of the Babylonian civilization, and we saw in the first lecture that, according to their own traditions, they had occupied that country since the dawn of history.

The Semites as a ruling race came later, though the occurrence of Semitic names in the Sumerian Dynastic List suggests an early infiltration from Arabia. After a long struggle the immigrants succeeded in dominating the settled race; and in the process they in turn became civilized. They learnt and adopted the cuneiform writing, they took over the Sumerian literature. Towards the close of the third millennium, when our tablet was written, the Semurians as a race had almost ceased to exist. They had been absorbed in the Semitic population and their language was no longer the general language of the country. But their ancient literature and sacred texts were still long preserved in some of the older schools.

---

1 In the combined account in Gen. vi. 5-ix. 17, if the following passages be marked in the margin or underlined, and then read consecutively, they will be seen that they give a consistent and almost complete account of the Deluge: Gen. vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 11, 13-16 (down to ‘as God commanded him’), 17 (to ‘after the earth’), 18-21, 24; viii. 1, 2 (to ‘were stopped’), 3 (to ‘and after’). The marked passages represent the ‘later Hebrew Version’. If the remaining passages be then read consecutively, they will be seen to give a different version of the same events, though not so completely preserved as the other; these passages substantially represent the ‘earlier Hebrew Version’. In commentaries on the Hebrew text they are, of course, usually referred to under the convenient symbols J and P, respectively the earlier and the later version. For further details, see any of the modern commentaries on Genesis, e.g. Driver, Book of Genesis, pp. 85 ff.; Skinner, Genesis, pp. 147 ff.; Ryle, Genesis, p. 96 ff.

2 See above, p. 29 ff., n. 2.
carefully preserved and continued to be studied by the Semitic priests and scribes. So the fact that the tablet is written in the old Sumerian tongue proves that the story it tells had come down from a very much earlier period. This inference is not affected by certain small differences in idiom which its language presents when compared with that of Sumerian building-inscriptions. Such would naturally occur in the course of transmission, especially in a text which, as we shall see, had been employed for a practical purpose after being subjected to a process of redaction to suit it to its new setting.

When we turn to the text itself, it will be obvious that the story also is very primitive. But before doing so we will inquire whether this very early version is likely to cast any light on the origin of Deluge stories such as are often met with in other parts of the world. Our inquiry will have an interest apart from the question itself, as it will illustrate the views of two divergent schools among students of primitive religious literature and tradition. According to one of these views, in its most extreme form, the tales which early or primitive man tells about his gods and the origin of the world he sees around him, are never to be regarded as simple stories, but are to be consistently interpreted as symbolizing natural phenomena. It is, of course, quite certain that, both in Egypt and Babylonia, mythology in the later periods received a strong astrological colouring; and it is equally clear that some legends derive their origin from nature myths. But the theory in the hands of its more enthusiastic adherents goes farther than that. For them a complete absence of astrological colouring is no deterrent from an astrological interpretation; and, where such colouring does occur, the possibility of later embellishment is discounted, and it is treated without further proof as the base on which the original story rests. One such interpretation of the Deluge narrative in Babylonia, particularly favoured by recent German writers, would regard it as reflecting the passage of the Sun through a portion of the ecliptic. It is assumed that the primitive Babylonians were aware that in the course of ages the spring equinox must traverse the southern or watery region of the zodiac. This, on their system, signified a submergence of the whole universe in water, and the Deluge myth would symbolize the safe passage of the vernal Sun-god through that part of the ecliptic. But we need not spend time over that view, as its underlying conception is undoubtedly quite a late development of Babylonian astrology.

More attractive is the simpler astrological theory that the voyage of any Deluge hero in his boat or ark represents the daily journey of the Sun-god across the heavenly ocean, a conception which is so often represented in Egyptian sculpture and painting. It used to be assumed by holders of the theory that this idea of the Sun as ‘the god in the boat’ was common among primitive races, and that that would account for the widespread occurrence of Deluge-stories among scattered races of the world. But this view has recently undergone some modification in accordance with the general trend of other lines of research. In recent years there has been an increased readiness among archaeologists to recognize evidence of contact between the great civilizations of antiquity. This has been particularly the case in the area of the Eastern Mediterranean; but the possibility has also been mooted of the early use of land-routes running from the Near East to Central and Southern Asia. The discovery in Chinese Turkestan, to the east of the Caspian, of a prehistoric culture resembling that of Elam has now been followed by the finding of similar remains by Sir Aurel Stein in the course of the journey from which he has lately returned. They were discovered in an old basin of the Helmand River in Persian Seistan, where they had been laid bare by wind-erosion. But more interesting still, and an incentive to further exploration in that region, is another of his discoveries last year, also made near the Afghan border. At two sites in the Helmand Delta, well above the level of inundation, he came across fragments of pottery inscribed in early Aramaic characters, though, for obvious reasons, he has left them with all his other collections in India. This unexpected find, by the way, suggests for our problem possibilities of wide transmission in comparatively early times.

The synthetic tendency among archaeologists has been reflected in anthropological research, which has begun to question the separate and independent origin, not only of the more useful arts and crafts, but also of many primitive customs and beliefs. It is suggested that too much stress has been laid on environment; and, though it is readily admitted that similar needs and

1 See further, p. 49.
experiences may in some cases have given rise to similar expedients
and explanations, it is urged that man is an imitative animal and
that inventive genius is far from common. Consequently the
wide dispersion of many beliefs and practices, which used
generally to be explained as due to the similar and independent
working of the human mind under like conditions, is now often
 provisionally registered as evidence of migratory movement or
cultural drift. Much good work has recently been done in
tabulating the occurrence of many customs and beliefs, in order
to ascertain their lines of distribution. Workers are as yet in
the collecting stage, and it is hardly necessary to say that
explanatory theories are still to be regarded as purely tentative
and provisional. At the meetings of the British Association
during the last few years, the most breezy discussions in the
Anthropological Section have undoubtedly centred around this
subject. There are several workers in the field, but the most
comprehensive theory as yet put forward is one that concerns us,
as it has given a new lease of life to the old solar interpretation
of the Deluge story.

In a land such as Egypt, where there is little rain and the sky
is always clear, the sun in its splendour tended from the earliest
period to dominate the national consciousness. As intercourse
increased along the Nile Valley, centres of Sun-worship ceased to
be merely local, and the political rise of a city determined the
fortunes of its cult. From the proto-dynastic period onward,
the ‘King of the two Lands’ had borne the title of ‘Horus’ as the
lineal descendant of the great Sun-god of Edfu, and the rise of
Ra in the Vth Dynasty, through the priesthood of Heliopolis,
was confirmed in the solar theology of the Middle Kingdom.
Thus it was that other deities assumed a solar character as forms
of Ra. Amon, the local god of Thebes, becomes Amen-Ra with
the political rise of his city, and even the old Crocodile-god,
Sebek, soars into the sky as Sebek-Ra. The only other move
ment in the religion of ancient Egypt, comparable in importance
to this solar development, was the popular cult of Osiris as God of
the Dead, and with it the official religion had to come to terms.
Horus is reborn as the posthumous son of Osiris, and Ra gladdens
his abode during his nightly journey through the Underworld.

The theory with which we are concerned suggests that this
dominant trait in Egyptian religion passed, with other elements
of culture, beyond the bounds of the Nile Valley and influenced
the practice and beliefs of distant races.

This suggestion has been gradually elaborated by its author,
Professor Elliot Smith, who has devoted much attention to the
anatomical study of Egyptian mummification. Beginning with
a scrutiny of megalithic building and sun-worship, he has subse-
sequently deduced, from evidence of common distribution, the
existence of a culture-complex, including in addition to these two
elements the varied practices of tattooing, circumcision, ear-
piercing, that quaint custom known as couvade, head-deformation,
and the prevalence of serpent-ouls, myths of petrifaction and
the Deluge, and finally of mummification. The last ingredient
was added after an examination of Papuan mummies had dis-
closed their apparent resemblance in points of detail to Egyptian
mummies of the XXIst Dynasty. As a result he assumes the
existence of an early cultural movement, for which the descriptive
title ‘heliolithic’ has been coined. Starting with Egypt as its
centre, one of the principal lines of its advance is said to have
lain through Syria and Mesopotamia and thence along the coast-
lands of Asia to the Far East. The method of distribution and
the suggested part played by the Phoenicians have been already
criticised sufficiently. But in a modified form the theory has
found considerable support, especially among ethnologists inter-
ested in Indonesia. I do not propose to examine in detail the
evidence for or against it. It will suffice to note that the Deluge
story and its alleged Egyptian origin in solar worship form one
of the prominent strands in its composition.

One weakness of this particular strand is that the Egyptians
themselves possessed no tradition of a Deluge. Indeed the annual
inundation of the Nile is not such as would give rise to a legend
of world-destruction; and in this respect it presents a striking
contrast to the Tigris and Euphrates. The ancient Egyptian’s
conception of his own gentle river is reflected in the form he
gave the Nile-god, for Hapi is represented as no fierce warrior
or monster. He is given a woman’s breasts as a sign of his

pp. 122 ff.; and for earlier tendencies, particularly in the sphere of mythological
exegesis, see S. Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, t. IV (1912), pp. 1 ff.


3 See in particular his monograph ‘On the significance of the Geographical
Distribution of the Practice of Mummification’ in the *Memoirs of the Manches-
ter Literary and Philosophical Society*, 1915.

4 See below, pp. 96 ff.
The nearest Egyptian parallel to the Deluge story is the "Legend of the Destruction of Mankind," which is engraved on the walls of a chamber in the tomb of Seti I. The late Sir Gaston Maspero indeed called it "a dry deluge myth," but his paradox was intended to emphasize the difference as much as the parallelism presented. It is true that in the Egyptian myth the Sun-god causes mankind to be slain because of their impiety, and he eventually pardons the survivors. The narrative thus betrays undoubted parallelism to the Babylonian and Hebrew stories, so far as concerns the attempted annihilation of mankind by the offended god, but there the resemblance ends. For water has no part in man's destruction, and the essential element of a Deluge story is thus absent. Our new Sumerian

1 It was first published by Monsieur Naville, Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch., IV (1874), pp. 1 ff. The myth may be most conveniently studied in Dr. Budge's edition in Egyptian Literature, Vol. I, "Legends of the Gods" (1912), pp. 14 ff., where the hieroglyphic text and translation are printed on opposite pages; cf. the summary, op. cit., pp. xxvi ff., where the principal literature is also cited. See also his Gods of the Egyptians, Vol. I, chap. xii, pp. 388 ff.

2 The undoubted points of resemblance, as well as the equally striking points of divergence, presented by the Egyptian myth when compared with the Babylonian and Hebrew stories of a Deluge may be briefly indicated. The impiety of men in complaining of the age of Ra finds a parallel in the wickedness of man upon the earth (J) and the corruption of all flesh (P) of the Hebrew Versions (see above, p. 42, n. 1). The summoning by Ra of the great Heliopolitan cosmic gods in council, including his personified Eye, the primaeval pair Shu and Tefnut, Keb the god of the earth and his consort Nut the sky-goddess, and Nu the primaeval water-god and originally Nut's male counterpart, is paralleled by the pṳ̂gur ili(m), or "assembly of the gods," in the Babylonian Version (see Gilg. Epic, XI, 1, 120 ff., and cf. li, 10 ff.); and they meet in "the Great House," or Sun-temple at Heliopolis, as the Babylonian gods deliberate in Shuruppak. Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hebrew narratives all agree in the divine determination to destroy mankind and in man's ultimate survival. But the close of the Egyptian story diverges into another sphere. The slaughter of men by the Eye of Ra in the form of the goddess Hathor, who during the night wades in their blood, is suggestive of Africa; and so too is the drinking of men's blood mixed with the narcotic mandrake and with seven thousand vessels of beer, with the result that drunkenness she ceased from laughter. The latter part of the narrative is directly connected with the cultivation and beer-drinking at the festivals of Hathor and Ra; but the destruction of men by slaughter in place of drowning appears to belong to the original myth. Indeed, the only suggestion of a Deluge story is supplied by the presence of Nu, the primaeval water-god, at Ra's council, and that is explicable on other grounds. In any case the points of resemblance presented by the earlier part of the Egyptian myth to Semitie Deluge stories are general, not detailed; and though they may possibly be due to reflection from Asia, they are not such as to suggest an Egyptian origin for Deluge myths.

The tablet on which our new version of the Deluge is inscribed was excavated at Nippur during the third Babylonian expedition sent out by the University of Pennsylvania; but it was not until the summer of 1912 that its contents were identified, when the several fragments of which it is composed were assembled and put together. It is a large document, containing six columns of writing, three on each side; but unfortunately only the lower half has been recovered, so that considerable gaps occur in the text. The sharp edges of the broken surface, however, suggest that it was damaged after removal from the soil, and the possibility remains that some of the missing fragments may yet be recovered either at Pennsylvania or in the Museum at Constantinople. As it is not dated, its age must be determined mainly by the character of its script. A close examination of the writing suggests that it can hardly have been inscribed as late as the Kassite Dynasty, since two or three signs exhibit more archaic forms than occur on any tablets of that period; and such linguistic corruptions as have been noted in its text may well be accounted for by the process of decay which must have already affected the Sumerian language at the time of the later kings of Nisîn. Moreover, the tablet bears a close resemblance to one of the newly published copies of the Sumerian Dynastic List from Nippur; for both are of the same shape and composed of the same reddish-brown clay, and both show the same peculiarities of writing. The two tablets in fact appear to have been written by the same hand, and as that copy of the Dynastic List was probably drawn up before the latter half of the First Dynasty of Babylon, we may assign the same approximate date for the writing of our text. This of course only fixes a lower limit for the age of the myth which it enshrines.

That the composition is in the form of a poem may be seen at
a glance from the external appearance of the tablet, the division of many of the lines and the blank spaces frequently left between the sign-groups being due to the rhythmical character of the text. The style of the poetry may be simple and abrupt, but it exhibits a familiar feature of both Semitic-Babylonian and Hebrew poetry, in its constant employment of partial repetition or paraphrase in parallel lines. The story it tells is very primitive and in many respects unlike the Babylonian Versions of the Deluge which we already possess. Perhaps its most striking peculiarity is the setting of the story, which opens with a record of the creation of man and animals, goes on to tell how the first cities were built, and ends with a version of the Deluge, which is thus recounted in its relation to the Sumerian history of the world. This literary connexion between the Creation and Deluge narratives is of unusual interest, in view of the age of our text. In the Babylonian Versions hitherto known they are included in separate epics with quite different contexts. Here they are recounted together in a single document, much as they probably were in the history of Berosus and as we find them in the present form of the Book of Genesis. This fact will open up some interesting problems when we attempt to trace the literary descent of the tradition.

But one important point about the text should be emphasized at once, since it will affect our understanding of some very obscure passages, of which no satisfactory explanation has yet been given. The assumption has hitherto been made that the text is an epic pure and simple. It is quite true that the greater part of it is a myth, recounted as a narrative in poetical form. But there appear to me to be clear indications that the myth was really embedded in an incantation. If this was so, the mythological portion was recited for a magical purpose, with the object of invoking the aid of the chief deities whose actions in the past are there described, and of increasing by that means the potency of the spell. In the third lecture I propose to treat in more detail the employment and significance of myth in magic, and we shall have occasion to refer to other instances, Sumerian, Babylonian, and Egyptian, in which a myth has reached us in a magical setting.

In the present case the inference of magical use is drawn from certain passages in the text itself, which appear to be explicable only on that hypothesis. In magical compositions of the later period intended for recitation, the sign for ‘Incantation’ is usually prefixed. Unfortunately the beginning of our text is wanting; but its opening words were given in the colophon, or title, which is engraved on the left-hand edge of the tablet, and it is possible that the traces of the first sign there are to be read as EN, ‘Incantation’. Should a re-examination of the tablet establish this reading of the word, we should have definite proof of the suggested magical setting of the narrative. But even if we assume its absence, that would not invalidate the arguments that can be adduced in favour of recognizing the existence of a magical element, for they are based on internal evidence and enable us to explain certain features which are inexplicable on Dr. Poebel’s hypothesis. Moreover, we shall later on examine another of the newly published Sumerian compositions from Nippur, which is not only semi-epical in character, but is of precisely the same shape, script, and period as our text, and is very probably a tablet of the same series. There also the opening signs of the text are wanting, but far more of its contents are preserved and they present unmistakable traces of magical use. Its evidence, as that of a parallel text, may therefore be cited in support of the present contention. It may be added that in Sumerian magical compositions of this early period, of which we have not yet recovered many quite obvious examples, it is possible that the prefix ‘Incantation’ was not so invariable as in the later magical literature.

It has already been remarked that only the lower half of our tablet has been recovered, and that consequently a number of gaps occur in the text. On the obverse the upper portion of each of the first three columns is missing, while of the remaining three columns, which are inscribed upon the reverse, the upper portions only are preserved. This difference in the relative positions of the textual fragments recovered is due to the fact

1 It will be seen that the subject-matter of any myth treated in this way has a close connexion with the object for which the incantation was performed; see further, p. 126 f.

2 See below, p. 126 f.
that Sumerian scribes, like their later Babylonian and Assyrian imitators, when they had finished writing the obverse of a tablet, turned it over from bottom to top—not, as we should turn a sheet of paper, from right to left. But in spite of the lacunae, the sequence of events related in the mythological narrative may be followed without difficulty, since the main outline of the story is already familiar enough from the versions of the Semitic-Babylonian scribes and of Berosus. Some uncertainties naturally remain as to what exactly was included in the missing portions of the tablet; but the more important episodes are fortunately recounted in the extant fragments, and these suffice for a definition of the distinctive character of the Sumerian Version. In view of its literary importance it may be advisable to attempt a somewhat detailed discussion of its contents, column by column; and the analysis may be most conveniently divided into numbered sections, each of which refers to one of the six columns of the tablet. The description of the First Column will serve to establish the general character of the text. Throughout the analysis of the tablet parallels and contrasts will be noted with the Babylonian and Hebrew Versions. It will then be possible to summarize, on a surer foundation, the literary history of the traditions, and finally to estimate the effect of our new evidence upon current theories as to the origin and wide dispersion of Deluge stories.

The following headings, under which the six numbered sections may be arranged, indicate the contents of each column and show at a glance the main features of the Sumerian Version:

I. Introduction to the Myth, and account of Creation.
II. The Antediluvian Cities.
III. The Council of the Gods, and Ziusudra’s piety.
IV. The Dream-Warning.
V. The Deluge, the Escape of the Great Boat, and the Sacrifice to the Sun-god.
VI. The Propitiation of the Angry Gods, and Ziusudra’s Immortality.

I. Introduction to the Myth, and Account of Creation.—The beginning of the text is wanting, and the earliest lines preserved of the First Column open with the closing sentences of a speech, probably by the chief of the four creating deities, who are later on referred to by name. In it there is a reference to a future destruction of mankind, but the context is broken; the lines in question begin:

‘As for my human race, from (or in) its destruction will I cause it to be [ . . . ],

‘For Nin-tu my creatures [ . . . ] will I . . . .’

From the reference to ‘my human race’ it is clear that the speaker is a creating deity; and since the expression is exactly parallel to the term ‘my people’ used by Ishtar, or Dilit-ili, ‘the Lady of the gods’, in the Babylonian Version of the Deluge story when she bewails the destruction of mankind, Dr. Poebel assigns the speech to Ninkharsagga, or Nintu, the goddess who later in the column is associated with Anu, Enlil, and Enki in man’s creation. But the mention of Nintu in her own speech is hardly consistent with that supposition, if we assume with Dr. Poebel, as we are probably justified in doing, that the title Nintu is employed here and elsewhere in the narrative merely as a synonym of Ninkharsagga. It appears to me far more probable that one of the two supreme gods, Anu or Enlil, is the speaker, and additional grounds will be cited later in support of this view. It is indeed possible, in spite of the verbs and suffixes in the singular, that the speech is to be assigned to both Anu and Enlil, for in the last column, as we shall see, we find verbs in the singular following references to both these deities. In any case one of the two chief gods may be regarded as speaking and acting on the behalf of the human race; and the evidence is already familiar enough from the versions of the Semitic-Babylonian Version.

1 See below, p. 63 f.
3 It necessitates the taking of (tingir) Nin-ta-ra as a genitive, not a dative, and the very awkward rendering ‘my, Nintu’s, creations’.
4 Another of the recently published Sumerian mythological compositions from Nippur (see above, p. 51) includes a number of myths in which Enki is associated first with Ninlil, referred to also as Nintu, ‘the Goddess of Birth’, then with Ninshar, referred to also as Ninkurra, and finally with Ninkharsagga (see further, p. 125 f.). This text exhibits the process by which separate traditions with regard to goddesses originally distinct were combined together, with the result that their heroines were subsequently often identified with one another. There the myths have not been subjected to a very severe process of editing, and in consequence the welding is not so complete as in the Sumerian Version of the Deluge.
5 If Enlil’s name should prove to be the first word of the composition (see above, p. 51, n. 1), we should naturally regard him as the speaker here and as the protagonist of the gods throughout the text, a rôle he also plays in the Semitic-Babylonian Version.
6 See below, p. 56.
behalf of both, though it may be that the inclusion of the second name in the narrative was not original but simply due to a combination of variant traditions. Such a conflated use of Anu-Enlil would present a striking parallel to the Hebrew combination Yahweh-Elohim, though of course in the case of the former pair the subsequent stage of identification was never attained. But the evidence furnished by the text is not conclusive, and it is preferable here and elsewhere in the narrative to regard either Anu or Enlil as speaking and acting both on his own behalf and as the other's representative.

This reference to the Deluge, which occurs so early in the text, suggests the probability that the account of the Creation and of the founding of Antediluvian cities, included in the first two columns, is to be taken merely as summarizing the events that led up to the Deluge. And an almost certain proof of this may be seen in the opening words of the composition, which are preserved in its colophon or title on the left-hand edge of the tablet. We have already noted that the first two words are there to be read, either as the prefix 'Incantation' followed by the name 'Enlil', or as the two divine names 'Anu (and) Enlil'. Now the signs which follow the traces of Enlil's name are quite certain; they represent 'Ziusudru', which, as we shall see in the Third Column, is the name of the Deluge hero in our Sumerian Version. He is thus mentioned in the opening words of the text, in some relation to one or both of the two chief gods of the subsequent narrative. But the natural place for his first introduction into the story is in the Third Column, where it is related that 'at that time Ziusudru, the king' did so-and-so. The prominence given him at the beginning of the text, at nearly a column's interval before the lines which record the creation of man, is sufficient proof that the Deluge story is the writer's main interest, and that preceding episodes are merely introductory to it.

What subject then may we conjecture was treated in the missing lines of this column, which precede the account of Creation and close with the speech of the chief creating deity? Now the Deluge narrative practically ends with the last lines of the tablet that are preserved, and the lower half of the Sixth Column is entirely wanting. We shall see reason to believe that the missing end of the tablet was not left blank and uninscribed, but contained an incantation, the magical efficacy of which was ensured by the preceding recitation of the Deluge myth. If that

---

were so, it would be natural enough that the text should open with its main subject. The cause of the catastrophe and the reason for man's rescue from it might well be referred to by one of the creating deities in virtue of the analogy these aspects of the myth would present to the circumstances for which the incantation was designed. A brief account of the Creation and of Antediluvian history would then form a natural transition to the narrative of the Deluge itself. And even if the text contained no incantation, the narrative may well have been introduced in the manner suggested, since this explanation in any case fits in with what is still preserved of the First Column. For after his reference to the destruction of mankind, the deity proceeds to fix the chief duty of man, either as a preliminary to his creation, or as a reassertion of that duty after his rescue from destruction by the Flood. It is noteworthy that this duty consists in the building of temples to the gods 'in a clean spot', that is to say 'in hallowed places'. The passage may be given in full, including the two opening lines already discussed:

'As for my human race, from (or in) its destruction will I cause it to be [...].
'For Nintu my creatures [...] will I [...].
'The people will I cause to ... in their settlements,
'Cities ... shall (man) build, in their protection will I cause him to rest,
'That he may lay the brick of our houses in a clean spot,
'That in a clean spot he may establish our ...!'

In the reason here given for man's creation, or for his rescue from the Flood, we have an interesting parallel to the Sixth Tablet of the Semitic-Babylonian Creation Series. At the opening of that tablet Marduk, in response to 'the word of the gods', is urged by his heart to devise a cunning plan which he imparts to Ea, namely the creation of man from his own divine blood and from bone which he will fashion. And the reason he gives for his proposal is precisely that which, as we have seen, prompted the Sumerian deity to create or preserve the human race. For Marduk continues:

'I will create man who shall inhabit [...].
'That the service of the gods may be established and that their shrines may be built.'

---

1 See above, p. 51, n. 1.

1 See The Seven Tablets of Creation, Vol. I, pp. 86 ff.
The interpretation of the third line is obscure, but there is no doubt that it records the creation of something which is represented as having taken place between the creation of mankind and that of animals. This object, which is written as nig-gil-ma, is referred to again in the Sixth Column, where the Sumerian hero of the Deluge assigns to it the honorific title, ‘Preserver of the Seed of Mankind’. It must therefore have played an important part in man’s preservation from the Flood; and the subsequent bestowal of the title may be paralleled in the early Semitic Deluge fragment from Nippur, where the boat in which Utanapishtim escapes is assigned the very similar title ‘Preserver of Life’. But nig-gil-ma is not the word used in the Sumerian Version of Ziusudra’s boat, and I am inclined to suggest a meaning for it in connexion with the magical element in the text, of the existence of which there is other evidence. On that assumption, the prominence given to its creation may be paralleled in the introduction to a later magical text, which described, probably in connexion with an incantation, the creation of two small creatures, one white and one black, by Nin-igi-azag, ‘The Lord of Clear Vision’, one of the titles borne by Enki or Ea. The time of their creation is indicated as after that of cattle, beasts of the field and creatures of the city’, and the composition opens in a way which is very like the opening of the present passage in our text. In neither text is there any idea of giving a complete account of the creation of the world, only so much of the original myth being included in each case as suffices for the writer’s purpose. Here we may assume that the creation of mankind and of animals is recorded because they were to be saved from the Flood, and that of the nig-gil-ma because of the part it played in ensuring their survival.

The discussion of the meaning of nig-gil-ma may best be postponed till the Sixth Column, where we find other references to...
Meanwhile it may be noted that in the present passage the creation of man precedes that of animals, as it did in the earlier Hebrew Version of Creation, and probably also in the Babylonian Version, though not in the later Hebrew Version. It may be added that in another Sumerian account of the Creation the same order, of man before animals, is followed.

II. THE ANTEDILUVIAN CITIES.—As we saw was the case with the First Column of the text, the earliest part preserved of the Second Column contains the close of a speech by a deity, in which he proclaims an act he is about to perform. Here we may assume with some confidence that the speaker is Anu or Enlil, preferably the latter, since it would be natural to ascribe the political constitution of Babylonia, the foundation of which is foreshadowed, to the head of the Sumerian pantheon. It would appear that a beginning had already been made in the establishment of the kingdom, and, before proceeding to his further work of founding the Antediluvian cities, he follows the example of the speaker in the First Column of the text and lays down the divine enactments by which his purpose was accomplished. The same refrain is repeated:

The supreme decrees he made perfect for it.

The text then relates the founding by the god of five cities, probably in clean places, that is to say on hallowed ground. He calls each by its name and assigns it to its own divine patron or city-god:

[In clean places he founded five cities].

And after he had called their names and they had been allotted to divine rulers(?),—

The ... of these cities, Eridu, he gave to the leader, Nudimmud,

Secondly, to Nugira (?) he gave Bad-... 2

Thirdly, Larak he gave to Pabilkharsag.

Fourthly, Sippar he gave to the hero, the Sun-god,

Fifthly, Shuruppak he gave to the God of Shuruppak,—

After he had called the names of these cities, and they had been allotted to divine rulers (?),

The completion of the sentence, in the last two lines of the column, cannot be rendered with any certainty, but the passage

1 The precise meaning of the sign-group here provisionally rendered 'divine ruler' is not yet ascertained.
2 Cf. Poebel, op. cit., p. 41.
3 See above, p. 25. That record, by the way, illustrates the meaning of the phrase 'in clean places' when applied to the Antediluvian cities. For Erech, though of Post-diluvian origin, was also founded in a clean spot, namely around the ancient cult-centre of Eanna.
4 See Lecture III, p. 123 f. The city of Nippur does not occur among the first four 'kingdoms' of the Sumerian Dynastic List (see above, pp. 34 f.); but we may probably assume that it was the seat of at least one early 'kingdom', in consequence of which Enlil, its city-god, attained his later pre-eminent rank in the Sumerian pantheon.
It is noteworthy that no human rulers are mentioned in connexion with Eridu and the other four Antediluvian cities; and Ziusudra, the hero of the story, is apparently the only mortal whose name occurred in our text. But its author's principal subject is the Deluge, and the preceding history of the world is clearly not given in detail, but is merely summarized. In view of the obviously abbreviated form of the narrative, of which we have already noted striking evidence in its account of the Creation, we may conclude that in the fuller form of the tradition the cities were also assigned human rulers, each one the representative of his city-god. These would correspond to the Antediluvian dynasty of Berossus, the last member of which was Xisuthros, the later counterpart of Ziusudra.

In support of the exclusion of Nippur and Erech from the myth, it will be noted that the second city in the list is not Adab,2 which was probably the principal seat of the goddess Ninkharsagga, the fourth of the creating deities. The names of both deity and city in that line are strange to us. Larak, the third city in the series, is of greater interest, for it is clearly Larakhia, which according to Berossus was the seat of the eighth and ninth of his Antediluvian kings. In commercial documents of the Persian period, which have been found during the excavations at Nippur, Larak is described as lying on the bank of the Old Tigris, a phrase which must be taken as referring to the Shatt el-Hai, in view of the situation of Lagash and other early cities upon it or in its immediate neighbourhood. The site of the city should perhaps be sought on the upper course of the stream, where it tends to approach Nippur. It would thus have lain in the neighbourhood of Bismâya, the site of Adab. Like Adab, Lagash, Shurrupak, and other early Sumerian cities, it was probably destroyed and deserted at a very early period, though it was reoccupied under its old name in Neo-Babylonian or Persian times. Its early disappearance from Babylonian history perhaps in part accounts for our own unfamiliarity with Pabilsag; but it is hardly likely that the two should be identified.

In Sippar, the fourth of the Antediluvian cities in our series, we again have a parallel to Berossus. It has long been recognized that Pantibiblon, or Pantibiblia, from which the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh of his Antediluvian kings all came, was the city of Sippar in Northern Babylonia. For the seventh of these rulers, Esedapassos, is clearly Enmeduranki,1 the mythical king of Sippar, who in Babylonian tradition was regarded as the founder of divination. In a fragmentary composition that has come down to us he is described, not only as king of Sippar, but as 'beloved of Anu, Enlil, and Enki', the three creating gods of our text; and it is there recounted how the patron deities of divination, Shamash and Adad, taught him to practise their art.3 Moreover, Berossus directly implies the existence of Sippar before the Deluge, for in the summary of his version has been preserved Xisuthros, under divine instruction, buries the sacred writings concerning the origin of the world in 'Sispara', the city of the Sun-god, so that after the Deluge they might be dug up and transmitted to mankind. Ebabbar, the great Sun-temple, was at Sippar, and it is to the Sun-god that the city is naturally allotted in the new Sumerian Version.

The last of the five Antediluvian cities in our list is Shuruppak, in which dwelt Ut-napishtim, the hero of the Babylonian version of the Deluge. Its site has been identified with the mounds of Fara, in the neighbourhood of the Shatt el-Kár, the former bed of the Euphrates; and the excavations that were conducted there in 1902 have been most productive of remains dating from the prehistoric period of Sumerian culture.4 Since our text is concerned mainly with the Deluge, it is natural to assume that the foundation of the city from which the Deluge-hero came would be recorded last, in order to lead up to the central episode of the text. The city of Ziusudra, the hero of the Sumerian story, is unfortunately not given in the Third Column, but, in view of Shurrupak's place in the list of Antediluvian cities, it is not improbable that on this point the Sumerian and Babylonian Versions agreed. In the Gilgamesh Epic Shurrupak is the only Antediluvian city referred to, while in

---

1 See above, p. 33.
3 See Hitt. of Sum. and Akk., pp. 24 ff.
the Hebrew accounts no city at all is mentioned in connexion
with Noah. The city of Xisuthros, too, is not recorded, but as
his father came from Laranba or Larak, we may regard that
city as his in the Greek Version. Besides Laranba, the only
Antediluvian cities according to Berossus were Babylon and
Sippar, and the influence of Babylonian theology, of which we
here have evidence, would be sufficient to account for a dis-
turbance of the original traditions. At the same time it is not
excluded that Larak was also the scene of the Deluge in our text,
though, as we have noted, the position of Shuruppak at the close
of the Sumerian list points to it as the more probable of the two.
It may be added that we cannot yet read the name of the deity
to whom Shuruppak was allotted, but as it is expressed by the
city's name preceded by the divine determinative, the rendering
'the God of Shuruppak' will meanwhile serve.

The creation of small rivers and pools, which seems to have
followed the foundation of the five sacred cities, is best explained
on the assumption that they were intended for the supply of
water to the cities and to the temples of their five patron gods.
The creation of the Euphrates and the Tigris, if recorded in our
text at all, or in its logical order, must have occurred in the
upper portion of the column. The fact that in the later Sumerian
account their creation is related between that of mankind and
the building of Nippur and Erech cannot be cited in support of
this suggestion, in view of the absence of those cities from our
text and of the process of editing to which the later version has
been subjected, with a consequent disarrangement of its episodes.

III. THE COUNCIL OF THE GODS, AND ZIUSUMFA PIETY. From
the lower part of the Third Column, where its text is first pre-
served, it is clear that the gods had already decided to send
a Deluge, for the goddess Nintu or Ninkharsagga, here referred
to also as 'the holy Innanna', wails aloud for the intended
destruction of 'her people'. That this decision had been decreed
by the gods in council is clear from a passage in the Fourth
Column, where it is stated that the sending of a flood to
destroy mankind was 'the word of the assembly [of the gods].

The first lines preserved in the present column describe the
effect of the decision on the various gods concerned and their
action at the close of the council.

In the lines which described the Council of the Gods, broken

1 See below, p. 70.
represented as lamenting, Nintu or Bēîtil-ili and Inanna or Ishtar. For Inanna as a separate goddess had no share in the Sumerian Creation, and the reference to 'her people' is there only applicable to Nintu. Dr. Poebel has to assume that the Sumerian names should be reversed in order to restore them to their original order, which he suggests the Babylonian Version has preserved. But no such textual emendation is necessary. In the Semitic Version Ishtar definitely displaces Nintu as the mother of men, as is proved by a later passage in her speech where she refers to her own bearing of mankind. The necessity for the substitution of her name in the later version is thus obvious, and we have already noted how simply this was effected.

Another feature in which the two versions differ is that in the Sumerian text the lamentation of the goddess precedes the sending of the Deluge, while in the Gilgamesh Epic it is occasioned by the actual advent of the storm. Since our text is not completely preserved, it is just possible that the couplet was repeated at the end of the Fourth Column after mankind's destruction had taken place. But a further apparent difference has been noted. While in the Semitic Version the goddess at once deplores the divine decision, it is clear from Ishtar's words in the Gilgamesh Epic that in the assembly of the gods she had at any rate concurred in it. On the other hand, in Bēîtil-ili's later speech in the Epic, after Ut-napishtim's sacrifice upon the mountain, she appears to ascribe the decision to Enlil alone. The passages in the Gilgamesh Epic are not really contradictory, for they can be interpreted as implying that, while Enlil forced his will upon the other gods against Bēîtil-ili's protest, the goddess at first reproached herself with her concurrence, and later stigmatized Enlil as the real author of the catastrophe. The Semitic narrative thus does not appear, as has been suggested, to betray traces of two variant traditions which have been skilfully combined, though it may perhaps exhibit an expansion of the Sumerian story. On the other hand, most of the apparent discrepancies between the Sumerian and Babylonian Versions disappear, on

1 Gilg. Epic, XI, l. 123.
2 Cf. l. 121 f., 'Since I commanded evil in the assembly of the gods, (and) commanded battle for the destruction of my people'.
3 Cf. ii. 165 ff., 'Ye gods that are here! So long as I forget not the jewels of lapis lazuli upon my neck, I will keep these days in my memory, never will I forget them! Let the gods come to the offering, but let not Enlil come to the offering, since he took not counsel but sent the deluge and surrendered my people to destruction.'
syllabary between those of Gilgamesh and Enkidu, evidently in consequence of the association of the Deluge story by the Babylonians with their national epic of Gilgamesh. The name Ziusudu may be rendered 'He who lengthened the day of life' or 'He who made life long of days', which in the Semitic form is abbreviated by the omission of the verb. The reference is probably to the immortality bestowed upon Ziusudu at the close of the story, and not to the prolongation of mankind's existence in which he was instrumental. It is scarcely necessary to add that the name has no linguistic connexion with the Hebrew name Noah, to which it also presents no parallel in meaning.

It is an interesting fact that Ziusudu should be described simply as 'the king', without any indication of the city or area he ruled; and in three of the five other passages in the text in which his name is mentioned it is followed by the same title without qualification. In most cases Berossus tells us the cities from which his Antediluvian rulers came; and if the end of the line had been preserved it might have been possible to determine definitely Ziusudu's city, and incidentally the scene of the Deluge in the Sumerian Version, by the name of the deity in whose service he acted as priest. We have already noted some grounds for believing that his city may have been Shuruppak, as in the Babylonian Version; and if that were so, the divine name read as 'the God of Shuruppak' should probably be restored at the end of the line.  

Zi-u-sud-fat (cf. Univ. of Penns. Mus. Publ., Bab. Sec., Vol. X, No. 1, p. 80, pl. iv a; the presence of the phonetic complement du may be cited in favour of this reading, but it does not appear to be supported by the photographic reproductions of the name in the Sumerian Deluge Version given by Dr. Poebel (Hist. and Gram. Texts, pl. lxxvii f.). It may be added that, on either alternative, the meaning of the name is the same.

The meaning of the Sumerian element in the name, rendered as in the Semitic form, is rather obscure, and Dr. Poebel left it unexplained. It is very probable, as suggested by Dr. Langdon (cf. Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch., XXXVI, 1914, p. 190), that we should connect it with the Semitic udhu, in that case, in place of 'breath', the rendering he suggests, I should be inclined to render it here as 'day', for udhu has the meaning 'dawn' and the sign UD is employed both for 'dawn' and 'day'.

The employment of the royal title by itself accords with the tradition from Berossus that before the Deluge, as in later periods, the land was governed by a succession of supreme rulers, and that the hero of the Deluge was the last of them. In the Gilgamesh Epic, on the other hand, Ut-napishtim is given no royal nor any other title. He is merely referred to as a 'man of Shuruppak, son of Ubar-Tutu', and he appears in the guise of an ancient hero or patriarch not invested with royal power. On this point Berossus evidently preserves the original Sumerian tradition, while the Hebrew Versions resemble the Semitic-Babylonian narrative. The Sumerian conception of a series of supreme Antediluvian rulers is of course merely a reflection from the historical period, when the hegemony in Babylonia was contested among the city-states. The growth of the tradition may have been encouraged by the early use of logad, 'king', which, though always a term of secular character, was not very sharply distinguished from that of godsd and other religious titles, until, in accordance with political development, it was required to connote a wider dominion. In Sumer, at the time of the composition of our text, Ziusudu was still only one in a long line of Babylonian rulers, mainly historical but gradually receding into the realms of legend and myth. At the time of the later Semites there had been more than one complete break in the tradition and the historical setting of the old story had become dim. The fact that Hebrew tradition should retain itself in this matter with Babylon rather than with Sumer is important as a clue in tracing the literary history of our texts.

The rest of the column may be taken as descriptive of Ziusudu's activities. One line records his making of some very great object or the erection of a huge building; and since the following lines are concerned solely with religious activities, the reference is possibly to a temple or some other structure of a sacred character. Its foundation may have been recorded as striking evidence of man's destruction. His rivalry of Enlil, the God of the Earth, is implied in the Babylonian Version (cf. Gilg. Epic, XI, II, 30-42), and in the Sumerian Version this would naturally extend to Anu, the God of Heaven.

The element pur-gur, 'very large' or 'huge', which occurs in the name of this great object or building, am-sipur-gur, is employed later in the term for the 'huge boat', gishma-pur-gur, in which Ziusudu rode out the storm (see below, p. 76, n. 3). There was, of course, even at this early period a natural tendency to picture on a superhuman scale the lives and deeds of remote predecessors, a tendency which increased in later times and led, as we shall see, to the elaboration of extravagant detail; see further, p. 81 f., n. 2.
his devotion to his god; or, since the verb in this sentence depends on the words ‘at that time’ in the preceding line, we may perhaps regard his action as directly connected with the revelation to be made to him. His personal piety is then described: daily he occupied himself in his god’s service, prostrating himself in humility and constant in his attendance at the shrine. A dream (or possibly dreams), ‘such as had not been before’, appears to him, and he seems to be further described as conjuring ‘by the Name of Heaven and Earth’; but as the ends of all these lines are broken, the exact connexion of the phrases is not quite certain.

It is difficult not to associate the reference to a dream, or possibly to dream-divination, with the warning in which Enki reveals the purpose of the gods. For the later versions prepare us for a reference to a dream. 1 If we take the line as describing Ziusudu’s practice of dream-divination in general, ‘such as had not been before’, he may have been represented as the first diviner of dreams, as Enmeduranki was held to be the first practitioner of divination in general. 2 But it seems to me more probable that the reference is to a particular dream, by means of which he obtained knowledge of the gods’ intentions. On the rendering of this passage depends our interpretation of the whole of the Fourth Column, where the point will be further discussed. Meanwhile it may be noted that the conjuring ‘by the Name of Heaven and Earth’, which we may assume is ascribed to Ziusudu, gains in significance if we may regard the setting of the myth as a magical incantation, 3 an inference in support of which we shall note further evidence. For we are furnished at once with the grounds for its magical employment. If Ziusudu, through conjuring by the Name of Heaven and Earth, could profit by the warning sent him and escape the impending fate of mankind, the application of such a myth to the special needs of a Sumerian in peril or distress will be obvious. For should he, too, conjure by the Name of Heaven and Earth, he might look for a similar deliverance; and his recital of the myth itself would tend to clinch the magical effect of his own incantation. 4

The description of Ziusudu has also great interest in furnishing us with a close parallel to the piety of Noah in the Hebrew

---

1 See below, p. 71 f.
2 See above, p. 61.
3 See above, p. 60 f.
4 See further, p. 86 f.
relating how the great gods in Shuruppak had decided to send a deluge, continues as follows in the right-hand column:

**Sumerian Version.**

For [ ] the gods a [ ]...[ ] ... { (20) And he repeated their word to the house of reeds: }

1 Nin-igi-azag, 'the Lord of Clear Vision', a title borne by Enki, or Ea, as God of Wisdom; cf. p. 57.

2 The Sumerian term amur, here used for the flood and rendered as 'rainstorm' by Dr. Poebel, is explained in a later syllabary as the equivalent of the Semitic-Babylonian word *ubûs* (cf. Meissner, S.A.L., No. 8909), the term employed for the flood both in the early Semitic version of the Atrakhasis story dated in Ammisaduga’s reign (see above, p. 48, n. 1) and in the Gilgamesh Epic. The word *ubûs* is often conventionally rendered ‘deluge’, but should be more accurately translated ‘flood’. It is true that the tempests of the Sumerian Version probably imply rain; and in the Gilgamesh Epic heavy rain in the evening begins the flood and is followed at dawn by a thunderstorm and hurricane. But in itself the term *ubûs* implies flood, which could take place through a rise of the rivers unaccompanied by heavy local rain. The annual rainfall in Babylonia to-day is on an average only about 8 in., and there have been years in succession when the total rainfall has not exceeded 4 in.; and yet the *ubûs* is not a thing of the past (see below, p. 97 f.).

3 The word here rendered ‘assembly’ is the Semitic loan-word *babûrum*, in Babylonian *babûruum*, the term employed for the ‘assembly’ of the gods both in the Babylonian Creation Series and in the Gilgamesh Epic. Its employment in the Sumerian Version, in place of its Sumerian equivalent *uḫkin*, is an interesting example of Semitic influence. Its occurrence does not necessarily imply the existence of a recognized Semitic Version at the period our text was inscribed. The substitution of *babûrum* for *uḫkin* in the text may well date from the period of Hammurabi, when we may assume that the increased importance of the city-council was reflected in the general adoption of the Semitic term (cf. Poebel, *Hist. Texte*, p. 83).

**Semitic Version.**

Nin-igi-azag, the god Ea, set with them, and [ ] ...

The commands of Anu (and) En[lil...]

1 Cf. 1. 195 f.: ‘I did not divulge the decision of the great gods. I caused Atrakhas to behold a dream and thus he heard the decision of the gods.’
Ut-napishtim overhears him. The version of Berossus, that Kronos himself appears to Xisuthros in a dream and warns him, is rejected by Dr. Poebel, who remarks that here the 'original significance of the dream has already been obliterated'. Consequently there seems to him to be 'no logical connexion' between the dreams or dream mentioned at the close of the Third Column and the communication of the plan of the gods at the beginning of the Fourth Column of our text. 2

So far from Berossus having missed the original significance of the narrative he relates, I think it can be shown that he reproduces very accurately the sense of our Sumerian text; and that the apparent discrepancies in the Semitic Version, and the puzzling references to a wall in both it and the Sumerian Version, are capable of a simple explanation. There appears to me no justification for splitting the Semitic narrative into the several versions suggested, since the assumption that the direct warning and the dream-warning must be distinguished is really based on a misunderstanding of the character of Sumerian dreams by which important decisions of the gods in council were communicated to mankind. We fortunately possess an instructive Sumerian parallel to our passage. In it the will of the gods is revealed in a dream, which is not only described in full but is furnished with a detailed interpretation; and as it seems to clear up our difficulties, it may be well to summarize its main features.

The occasion of the dream in this case was not a coming deluge but a great dearth of water in the rivers, in consequence of which the crops had suffered and the country was threatened with famine. This occurred in the reign of Gudea, patesi of Lagash, who lived some centuries before our Sumerian document was inscribed. In his own inscription 3 he tells us that he was at a loss to know by what means he might restore prosperity to his country, when one night he had a dream; and

1 Cf. Poebel, Hist. Texte, p. 51 f. With the god's apparent subterfuge in the third of those supposed versions Sir James Frazer (Ancient Stories of a Great Flood, p. 15) not unjustly compares the well-known story of King Midas's servant, who, unable to keep the secret of the king's deformity to himself, whispered it into a hole in the ground, with the result that the reeds which grew up there by their rustling in the wind proclaimed it to the world (Ovid, Metamorphoses, xi, 174 f.); see further, p. 76, n. 1.


INTERPRETATION OF SUMERIAN DREAMS

It was in consequence of the dream that he eventually erected one of the most sumptuously appointed of Sumerian temples and thereby restored his land to prosperity. Before recounting his dream he describes how the gods themselves took counsel. On the day in which destinies were fixed in heaven and earth, Enlil, the chief of the gods, and Ningirsu, the city-god of Lagash, held converse; and Enlil, turning to Ningirsu, described the sad condition of Southern Babylonia, and remarked that 'the decrees of the temple Eninnu should be made glorious in heaven and upon earth', or, in other words, that Ningirsu's city-temple must be rebuilt. Thereupon Ningirsu did not communicate his orders directly to Gudea, but conveyed the will of the gods to him by means of a dream.

It will be noticed that we here have a very similar situation to that in the Deluge story. A conference of the gods has been held; a decision has been taken by the greatest god, Enlil; and, in consequence, another deity is anxious to inform a Sumerian ruler of that decision. The only difference is that here Enlil desires the communication to be made, while in the Deluge story it is made without his knowledge, and obviously against his wishes. So the fact that Ningirsu does not communicate directly with the patesi, but conveys his message by means of a dream, is particularly instructive. For here there can be no question of any subterfuge in the method employed, since Enlil was a consenting party.

The story goes on to relate that, while the patesi slept, a vision of the night came to him, and he beheld a man whose stature was so great that it equalled the heavens and the earth. By the diadem he wore upon his head Gudea knew that the figure was a god. Beside the god was the divine eagle, the emblem of Lagash; his feet rested upon the whirlwind, and a lion crouched upon his right hand and upon his left. The figure spoke to the patesi, but he did not understand the meaning of the words. Then it seemed to Gudea that the Sun rose from the earth; and he beheld a woman holding in her hand a pure reed, and she carried also a tablet on which was a star of the heavens, and she seemed to take counsel with herself. While Gudea was gazing, he seemed to see a second man, who was like a warrior; and he carried a slab of lapis lazuli, on which he drew out the plan of a temple. Before the patesi himself it seemed that a fair cushion was placed, and upon the cushion was set a mould, and within the mould was a brick.
And on the right hand the patesi beheld an ass that lay upon the ground. Such was the dream of Gudea, and he was troubled because he could not interpret it.1 To cut the long story short, Gudea decided to seek the help of Ningirsu, the child of Eridu, who, as daughter of Enki, the God of Wisdom, could divine all the mysteries of the gods. But first of all by sacrifices and libations he secured the mediation of his own city-god and goddess, Ningirsu and Gatumdug; and then, repairing to Ningirsu’s temple, he recounted to her the details of his vision. When the patesi had finished, the goddess addressed him and said she would explain to him the meaning of his dream. Here, no doubt, we are to understand that she spoke through the mouth of her chief priest. And this was the interpretation of the dream. The man whose stature was so great, and whose head was that of a god, was the god Ningirsu, and the words which he uttered were an order to the patesi to rebuild the temple of Eninnu. The Sun which rose from the earth was the god Ningishzida, for like the Sun he goes forth from the earth. The maiden who held the pure reed and carried the tablet with the star was the goddess Nisaba; the star was the pure star of the temple’s construction which she proclaimed. The second man, who was like a warrior, was the god Nidub; and the plan of the temple which he drew was the plan of Eninnu. The brick which rested in its mould upon the cushion was the sacred brick of Eninnu; and the ass that lay upon the ground was the patesi himself.2

The essential feature of the vision is that the god himself appeared to the sleeper and delivered his message in words. That is precisely the manner in which Kronos warned Ximinthros of the coming Deluge in the version of Berosus; while in the Gilgamesh Epic the apparent contradiction between the direct warning and the dream-warning at once disappears. It is true that Gudea states that he did not understand the meaning of the god’s message, and so required an interpretation; but he was equally at a loss as to the identity of the god who gave it, although Ningirsu was his own city-god and was accompanied by his own familiar city-emblem. We may thus assume that the god’s words, as words, were equally intelligible to Gudea. But as they were uttered in a dream, it was necessary that the patesi, in view of his country’s peril, should have divine assurance that they implied no other meaning. And in his case such assurance was the more essential, in view of the symbolism attaching to the other features of his vision. That this is sound reasoning is proved by a second vision vouchsafed to Gudea by Ningirsu. For the patesi, though he began to prepare for the building of the temple, was not content even with Ningirsu’s assurance. He offered a prayer to Ningirsu himself, saying that he wished to build the temple, but had received no sign that this was the will of the god; and he prayed for a sign. Then, as the patesi lay stretched upon the ground, the god again appeared to him and gave him detailed instructions, adding that he would grant the sign for which he asked. The sign was that he should feel his side touched by a flame,3 and thereby he should know that he was the man chosen by Ningirsu to carry out his commands. Here it is the sign which confirms the apparent meaning of the god’s words. And Gudea was at last content and built the temple.4

We may conclude, then, that in the new Sumerian Version of the Deluge we have traced a logical connexion between the direct warning to Ziusudu in the Fourth Column of the text and the reference to a dream in the broken lines at the close of the Third Column. As in the Gilgamesh Epic and in Berosus, here too the god’s warning is conveyed in a dream; and the accompanying reference to conjuring by the Name of Heaven and Earth probably represents the means by which Ziusudu was enabled to receive a personal vision of the coming Deluge.

1 Cyl. A., col. xii, 10ff.; cf. Thureau-Dangin, op. cit., p. 166f., Germ. ed., p. 100f. The word translated ‘side’ may also be rendered as ‘hand’; but ‘side’ is the more probable rendering of the two. The touching of Gudea’s side (or hand) presents an interesting resemblance to the touching of Jacob’s thigh by the divine wrestler at Peniel in Gen. xxxii. 24ff. (J or JE). Given a belief in the constant presence of the unseen and its frequent manifestation, such a story as that of Peniel might well arise from an unexplained injury to the sciatic muscle, while more than one ailment of the heart or liver might perhaps suggest the touch of a beckoning god. There is of course no connexion between the Sumerian and Hebrew stories beyond their common background. It may be added that those critics who would reverse the roles of Jacob and the wrestler miss the point of the Hebrew story.

2 Even so, before starting on the work, he took the further precautions of ascertaining that the omens were favourable and of purifying his city from all malign influences.
verify its apparent meaning. The assurance which Gudea obtained through the priest of Ninâ and the sign, the priest-king Ziusudu secured by his own act, in virtue of his piety and practice of divination. And his employment of the particular class of incantation referred to, that which conjures by the Name of Heaven and Earth, is singularly appropriate to the context. For by its use he was enabled to test the meaning of Enki’s words, which related to the intentions of Anu and Enlil, the gods respectively of Heaven and of Earth. The symbolical setting of Gudea’s vision also finds a parallel in the reed-house and wall of the Deluge story, though in the latter case we have not the benefit of interpretation by a goddess. In the Sumerian Version the wall is merely part of the vision and does not receive a direct address from the god. That appears as a later development in the Semitic Version, and it may perhaps have suggested the excuse, put in that version into the mouth of En, that he had not directly revealed the decision of the gods. 1

The omission of any reference to a dream before the warning in the Gilgamesh Epic may be accounted for on the assumption that readers of the poem would naturally suppose that the usual method of divine warning was implied; and the text does indicate that the warning took place at night, for Gilgamesh proceeds to carry out the divine instructions at the break of day. The direct warning of the Hebrew Versions, on the other hand, does not carry this implication, since according to Hebrew ideas direct speech, as well as vision, was included among the methods by which the divine will could be conveyed to man.

V. THE FLOOD, THE ESCAPE OF THE GREAT BOAT, AND THE SACRIFICE TO THE SUN-GOD. The missing portion of the Fourth Column must have described Ziusudu’s building of his great boat in order to escape the Deluge, for at the beginning of the Fifth Column we are in the middle of the Deluge itself. The column begins:

All the mighty wind-storms together blew,
The flood .. . raged.
When for seven days, for seven nights,
The flood had overwhelmed the land,

1 In that case the parallel suggested by Sir James Frazer (see above, p. 72, n. 1) between the reed-house and wall of the Gilgamesh Epic, now regarded as a medium of communication, and the whispering reeds of the Midas story would still hold good.

THE COMING OF THE FLOOD

When the wind-storm had driven the great boat over the mighty waters,
The Sun-god came forth, shedding light over heaven and earth.
Ziusudu opened the opening of the great boat;
The light of the hero, the Sun-god, (he) causes to enter into the interior (?) of the great boat.
Ziusudu, the king.

(10) Dows himself down before the Sun-god;
The king sacrifices an ox, a sheep he slaughters (?)

The connected text of the column then breaks off, only a sign or two remaining of the following half-dozen lines. It will be seen that in the eleven lines that are preserved we have several close parallels to the Babylonian Version and some equally striking differences. While attempting to define the latter, it will be well to point out how close the resemblances are, and at the same time to draw a comparison between the Sumerian and Babylonian Versions of this part of the story and the corresponding Hebrew accounts.

Here, as in the Babylonian Version, the Flood is accompanied by hurricanes of wind, though in the latter the description is worked up in considerable detail. We there read 2 that at the appointed time the ruler of the darkness at eventide sent a heavy rain. Ut-napishtim saw its beginning, but fearing to watch the storm, he entered the interior of the ship by Ea’s instructions, closed the door, and handed over the direction of the vessel to the pilot Puzur-Amurri. Later a thunder-storm and hurricane added their terrors to the deluge. For at early dawn a black cloud came up from the horizon, Adad the Storm-god thundering in its midst, and his heralds, Nabû and Sharru, flying over mountain and plain. Nergal tore away the ship’s anchor, while Ninib directed the storm; the Anunnaki carried their lightning-torches and lit up the land with their brightness; the whirlwind of the Storm-god reached the heavens, and all light was turned into darkness. The storm raged the whole day, covering mountain and people with water. 2 No man beheld his fellow; the gods themselves were afraid, so that they retreated into the highest heaven, where they crouched down, cowering like dogs. Then

2 In the Atrakhasis version, dated in the reign of Amminaduš (see above, p. 43, n. 1), Col. 1, l. 5, contains a reference to the ‘cry’ of men when Adad the Storm-god, slays them with his flood.
follows the lamentation of Ishtar, to which reference has already been made,¹ the goddess reproaching herself for the part she had taken in the destruction of her people. This section of the Semitic narrative closes with the picture of the gods weeping with her, sitting bowed down with their lips pressed together.

It is probable that the Sumerian Version, in the missing portion of its Fourth Column, contained some account of Ziusudra's entry into his boat; and this may have been preceded, as in the Gilgamesh Epic, by a reference to 'the living seed of every kind', or at any rate to 'the four-legged creatures of the field',² and to his personal possessions, with which we may assume he had previously loaded it. But in the Fifth Column we have no mention of the pilot or of any other companions who may have accompanied the king; and we shall see that the Sixth Column contains no reference to Ziusudra's wife. The description of the storm may have begun with the closing lines of the Fourth Column, though it is also quite possible that the first line of the Fifth Column actually begins the account. However that may be, and in spite of the poetic imagery of the Semitic Babylonian narrative, the general character of the catastrophe is the same in both versions.

We find an equally close parallel, between the Sumerian and Babylonian accounts, in the duration of the storm which accompanied the Flood, as will be seen by printing the two versions together:

**Sumerian Version.**

When for seven days, for seven nights,
The flood had overwhelmed the land,

(5) When the wind-storm had driven the great boat over the mighty waters,

The Sun-god came forth shedding light over heaven and earth.

**Semitic Version.**

For six days and nights

The wind blew, the flood, the tempest overwhelmed the land.

(130) When the seventh day drew near, the tempest, the flood, ceased from the battle

In which it had fought like a host.

Then the sea rested and was still, and the wind-storm, the flood, ceased.

The two narratives do not precisely agree as to the duration of the storm, for while in the Sumerian account the storm lasts seven days and nights, in the Semitic-Babylonian Version it lasts only six days and nights, ceasing at dawn on the seventh day. The difference, however, is immaterial when we compare these estimates with those of the Hebrew Versions, the older of which speaks of forty days' rain, while the later version represents the Flood as rising for no less than a hundred and fifty days.¹

The close parallel between the Sumerian and Babylonian Versions is not, however, confined to subject-matter, but here even extends to some of the words and phrases employed. It has already been noted that the Sumerian term employed for 'flood' or 'deluge' is the attested equivalent of the Semitic word;² and it may now be added that the word which may be rendered 'great boat' or 'great ship' in the Sumerian text is the same word, though partly expressed by variant characters, which occurs in the early Semitic fragment of the Deluge story from Nippur.³

In the Gilgamesh Epic, on the other hand, the ordinary ideogram for 'vessel' or 'ship'⁴ is employed, though the great size of the vessel is there indicated, as in Berossus and the later Hebrew Version, by detailed measurements. Moreover, the Sumerian and Semitic verbs, which are employed in the parallel passages quoted above for the 'overwhelming' of the land, are given as synonyms in a late syllabary, while in another explanatory text the Sumerian verb is explained as applying to the destructive action of a flood.⁵ Such close linguistic parallels are instructive

1 See Appendix I, p. 142 f.; and cf. p. 181.
2 See above, p. 63 f.
3 The Sumerian term is (gis)ma-gur-gur, corresponding to the term written in the early Semitic fragment, l. 8, as (ipu)ma-gur-gur, which is probably to be read under its Semitized form magargarm; see above, p. 57, n. 1. In l. 6 of that fragment the vessel is referred to under the synonymous expression (ipidy)pa-ba-bu, 'a great ship'.
4 i.e. (GISH)MA, the first element in the Sumerian word, read in Semitic Babylonian as chippa, 'ship'; when employed in the early Semitic fragment it is qualified by the adj. ma-ba-bu, 'great' (see above, n. 3). There is no justification for assuming, with Prof. Hilprecht, that a measurement of the vessel was given in l. 7 of the early Semitic fragment.
5 The Sumerian verb ur, which is employed in l. 2 of the Fifth Column in the expression za-an-da-ab-ur-ur, translated as 'raged' (see above, p. 76), occurs again in l. 4 in the phrase kud-nu-sut kud-ur-ur, 'had overwhelmed the land'. That we are justified in regarding the latter phrase as the original of the Semitic šap-pa-nu urut (Gilg. Epic, XI, l. 123) is proved by the equation Sum. ur-ar = Sem. šap-pa-nu (Rawlinson, W. A. L., Vol. V, p. 42, l. 14 e) and by the explanation Sum. ur-ar = Sem. šap-ba-ta ša a-bi-bi, i.e. šarar = to smite, of
as furnishing additional proof, if it were needed, of the dependence of the Semitic-Babylonian and Assyrian Versions upon Sumerian originals.

It may be worth while to pause for a moment in our study of the text, in order to inquire what kind of boat it was in which Ziusudru escaped the Flood. It is only called 'a great boat' or 'a great ship' in the text, and this term, as we have noted, was taken over, semitized, and literally translated in an early Semitic-Babylonian Version.1 But the Gilgamesh Epic, representing the later Semitic-Babylonian Version, supplies fuller details, which have not, however, been satisfactorily explained. Either the obvious meaning of the description and figures there given has been ignored, or the measurements have been applied to a central structure placed upon a hull, much on the lines of a modern 'house-boat' or the conventional Noah's ark.2 For the latter interpretation the text itself affords no justification. The statement is definitely made that the length and breadth of the vessel itself are to be the same;3 and a later passage gives ten gar for the height of its sides and ten gar for the breadth of its deck.4 This description has been taken to imply a square box-like structure, which, in order to be seaworthy, must be placed on a conjectured hull.

I do not think it has been noted in this connexion that a vessel, approximately with the relative proportions of that described in the Gilgamesh Epic, is in constant use to-day on the lower Tigris and Euphrates. A puffah,5 the familiar pitched coracle of Baghdad, would provide an admirable model for the gigantic vessel in which Ut-napishtim rode out the Deluge. 'Without either stem or stern, quite round like a shield'—so Herodotus described the puffah of his day;6 so, too, is it represented on Assyrian slabs from a flood.1 (Oxst., XI, Pl. 50, Obs., l. 23); cf. Pococke, Hist. Textes, p. 54, n. 1.

1 See above, p. 76, n. 3 f.
2 Cf. c. g., Jastrow, Hebr. and Bab. Text., p. 329.
3 Gilg. Epic, XI, II. 28-30; see above, p. 71.
4 L. 38 f. The gar contained twelve cubits, so that the vessel would have measured 120 cubits each way; taking the Babylonian cubit, on the basis of Gudea's scale, at 495 mm. (cf. Thureau-Dangin, Journal Asiatique, Dix. Sér., t. XIII, 1909, pp. 78 ff., 97), this would give a length, breadth, and height of nearly 195 ft. For the measurements in the later Hebrew Version and in Berossus, see below, p. 81 f., n. 2.
5 Amb. puffah, pl. puffah; in addition to its common use for the Baghdad coracle, the word is also employed for a large basket.
6 Herodotus, I, 194.

The prototype of Noah's ark

Nineveh, where we see it employed for the transport of heavy building material;1 its form and structure indeed suggest a prehistoric origin. The puffah is one of those examples of perfect adjustment to conditions of use which cannot be improved. Any one who has travelled in one of these craft will agree that their storage capacity is immense, for their circular form and steeply curved side allow every inch of space to be utilized. It is almost impossible to upset them, and their only disadvantage is lack of speed. For their guidance all that is required is a steersman with a paddle, as indicated in the Epic. It is true that the larger puffah of to-day tends to increase in diameter as compared to height, but that detail might well be ignored in picturing the monster vessel of Ut-napishtim. Its seven horizontal stages and their nine lateral divisions would have been structurally sound in supporting the vessel's sides; and the selection of the latter uneven number, though prompted doubtless by its sacred character, is only suitable to a circular craft in which the interior walls would radiate from the centre. The use of pitch and bitumen for smearing the vessel inside and out, though unusual even in Mesopotamian shipbuilding, is precisely the method employed in the puffah's construction.

We have no detailed description of Ziusudru's 'great boat', beyond the fact that it was covered in and had an opening, or light-hole, which could be closed. But the form of Ut-napishtim's vessel was no doubt traditional, and we may picture that of Ziusudru as also of the puffah type, though smaller and without its successor's elaborate internal structure. The gradual development of the huge coracle into a ship would have been encouraged by the Semitic use of the term 'ship' to describe it; and the attempt to retain something of its original proportions resulted in producing the unwieldy ark of later tradition.8

1 The puffah is formed of wicker-work coated with bitumen. Some of those represented on the Nineveh sculptures appear to be covered with skins; and Herodotus (I, 194) states that 'the boats which come down the river to Babylon are circular and made of skins. But his further description shows that he is here referring to the lubik or skin-raft, with which he has combined a description of the puffah. The late Sir Henry Rawlinson had never seen or heard of a skin-covered puffah on either the Tigris or Euphrates, and there can be little doubt that bitumen was employed for their construction in antiquity, as it is to-day. These craft are often large enough to carry five or six horses and a dozen men.

2 The description of the ark is not preserved from the earlier Hebrew Version (J), but the latter Hebrew Version (P), while increasing the length of the vessel, has considerably reduced its height and breadth. Its measurements
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We will return now to the text and resume the comparison we were making between it and the Gilgamesh Epic. In the latter no direct reference is made to the appearance of the Sun-god after the storm, nor is Ut-napishtim represented as praying to him. But the sequence of events in the Sumerian Version is very natural, and on that account alone, apart from other reasons, it may be held to represent the original form of the story. For the Sun-god would naturally reappear after the darkness of the storm had passed, and it would be equally natural that Ziusudu should address himself to the great light-god. Moreover, the Gilgamesh Epic still retains traces of the Sumerian Version, as will be seen from a comparison of their narratives, 1 the Semitic Version being quoted from the point where the hurricane ceased and the sea became still.

**SUMERIAN VERSION.**

Ziusudu opened the opening of the great boat;

The light of the hero, the Sun-god, (he) causes to enter into the interior (?) of the great boat.

Ziusudu, the king,
(10) Bows himself down before the Sun-god;
The king sacrifices an ox, a sheep he slaughters (?).

**SEMITIC VERSION.**

When I looked at the storm, the uproar had ceased,
And all mankind was turned into clay;
(135) In place of fields there was a swamp.
I opened the opening (lit. 'hole'), and daylight fell upon my countenance.

The light of the hero, the Sun-god, (he) causes to enter into the interior (?) of the great boat.

Ziusudu, the king,
(137) I bowed myself down and sat down weeping;
Over my countenance flowed my tears.
I gazed upon the quarters (of the world)—all (?) was sea.

are there given (Gen. vi. 11) as 300 cubits in length, 50 cubits in breadth, and 30 cubits in height; taking the ordinary Hebrew cubit at about 18 in., this would give a length of about 450 ft., a breadth of about 75 ft., and a height of about 45 ft. The interior stories are necessarily reduced to three. The vessel in Berossus measures five stadia by two, and thus had a length of over three thousand feet and a breadth of more than twelve hundred.


It will be seen that in the Semitic Version the beams of the Sun-god have been reduced to 'daylight', and Ziusudu's act of worship has become merely prostration in token of grief.

Both in the Gilgamesh Epic and in Berossus the sacrifice offered by the Deluge hero to the gods follows the episode of the birds, and it takes place on the top of the mountain after the landing on the vessel. It is hardly probable that two sacrifices were recounted in the Sumerian Version, one to the Sun-god in the boat and another on the mountain after landing; and if we are right in identifying Ziusudu's recorded sacrifice with that of Ut-napishtim and Xisuthros, it would seem that, according to the Sumerian Version, no birds were sent out to test the abatement of the waters. This conclusion cannot be regarded as quite certain, inasmuch as the greater part of the Fifth Column is wanting. We have, moreover, already seen reason to believe that the account on our tablet is epitomized, and that consequently the omission of any episode from our text does not necessarily imply its absence from the original Sumerian Version which it follows. But here at least it is clear that nothing can have been omitted between the opening of the light-hole and the sacrifice, for the one act is the natural sequence of the other. On the whole it seems preferable to assume that we have recovered a simpler form of the story.

As the storm itself is described in a few phrases, so the cessation of the flood may have been dismissed with equal brevity; the gradual abatement of the waters, as attested by the dove, the swallow, and the raven, may well be due to later elaboration or to combination with some variant account. Under its amended form the narrative leads naturally up to the landing on the mountain and the sacrifice of thanksgiving to the gods. In the Sumerian Version, on the other hand, Ziusudu regards himself as saved when he sees the Sun shining; he needs no further tests to assure himself that the danger is over, and his sacrifice too is one of gratitude for his escape. The disappearance of the Sun-god from the Semitic Version was thus a necessity, to avoid an anti-climax; and the hero's attitude of worship had obviously to be translated into one of grief. An indication that the sacrifice was originally represented as having taken place on board the boat may be seen in the lines of the Gilgamesh Epic which recount how Enlil, after acquiescing in Ut-napishtim's survival of the Flood, went up into the ship and led him forth by the hand, although, in the preceding lines, he had already landed
and had sacrificed upon the mountain. The two passages are hardly consistent as they stand, but they find a simple explanation if we regard the second of them as an unaltered survival from an earlier form of the story.

If the above line of reasoning be sound, it follows that, while the earlier Hebrew Version closely resembles the Gilgamesh Epic, the later Hebrew Version, by its omission of the birds, would offer a parallel to the Sumerian Version. But whether we may draw any conclusion from this apparent grouping of our authorities will be best dealt with when we have concluded our survey of the new evidence.

As we have seen, the text of the Fifth Column breaks off with Ziusudu's sacrifice to the Sun-god, after he had opened a light-hole in the boat and had seen by the god's beams that the storm was over. The missing portion of the Fifth Column must have included at least some account of the abatement of the waters, the stranding of the boat, and the manner in which Ann and Enlil became apprised of Ziusudu's escape, and consequently of the failure of their intention to annihilate mankind. For in the Sixth Column of the text we find these two deities reconciled to Ziusudu and bestowing immortality upon him, as Enlil bestows immortality upon Ut-napishtim at the close of the Semitic Version. In the latter account, after the vessel had grounded on Mount Nisir and Ut-napishtim had tested the abatement of the waters by means of the birds, he brings all out from the ship and offers his libation and sacrifice upon the mountain, heaping up reed, cedar-wood, and myrtle beneath his seven sacrificial vessels. And it was by this act on his part that the gods first had knowledge of his escape. For they smelt the sweet savour of the sacrifice, and 'gathered like flies over the sacrificer'¹.

It is possible in our text that Ziusudu's sacrifice in the boat was also the means by which the gods became acquainted with his survival; and it seems obvious that the Sun-god, to whom it was offered, should have continued to play some part in the narrative, perhaps by assisting Ziusudu in propitiating Ann and Enlil. In the Semitic-Babylonian Version, the first deity to approach the sacrifice is Belit-ili or Ishtar, who is indignant with Enlil for perhaps by assisting Ziusudu in propitiating Ann and Enlil; and it is legitimate to suppose that Enki, like Enlil, should be content with less wholesale destruction, such as that wrought by wild beasts, famine, and plague. Finally he confesses that it was he who warned Ziusudu of the gods' decision by sending him a dream. Enlil thereupon changes his intention, and going up into the ship, leads Ut-napishtim forth. Though Ea's intervention finds, of course, no parallel in either Hebrew version, the subject-matter of his speech is reflected in both. In the earlier Hebrew Version Yahweh smells the sweet savour of Noah's burnt offering and says in his heart he will no more destroy every living creature as he had done; while in the later Hebrew Version Elohim, after remembering Noah and causing the waters to abate, establishes his covenant to the same effect, and, as a sign of the covenant, sets his bow in the clouds.

In its treatment of the climax of the story we shall see that the Sumerian Version, at any rate in the form it has reached us, is on a lower ethical level than the Babylonian and Hebrew Versions. Ea's argument that the sinner should bear his own sin and the transgressor his own transgression in some measure forestalls that of Ezekiel;¹ and both the Hebrew Versions represent the saving of Noah as part of the divine intention from the beginning. But the Sumerian Version introduces the element of magic as the means by which man can bend the will of the gods to his own ends. How far the details of the Sumerian myth at this point resembled that of the Gilgamesh Epic it is impossible to say, but the general course of the story must have been the same. In the latter Enil's anger is appeased, in the former that of Ann and Enlil; and it is legitimate to suppose that Enki, like Ea, was Ziusudu's principal supporter, in view of the part he had already taken in ensuring his escape.

VI. THE PROPITIATION OR THE ANGRY GODS, AND ZIUSUDU'S IMMORTALITY.—The presence of the puzzling lines, with which the Sixth Column of our text opens, was not explained by Dr. Poebel; indeed, they would be difficult to reconcile with his assumption that our text is an epic pure and simple. But if, as is suggested above, we are dealing with a myth in magical employment, they are quite capable of explanation. The problem these lines present will best be stated by giving a translation of

¹ Cf. Ezek. xviii, passim, esp. xviii. 20; and for a comparison of Ezek. xiv. 12-20, with Gilg. Epic, XI, II. 180-84, see below, pp. 182 ff.
the extant portion of the column, where they will be seen with
their immediate context in relation to what follows them:

'By the Soul of Heaven, by the Soul of Earth, shall ye
conjure him,
That with you he may . . . !'

'Anu and Enlil by the Soul of Heaven, by the Soul of
Earth, shall ye conjure,
And with you will he . . . !'

(5) 'The niggilma of the ground springs forth in abun-
dance (?)!' Ziusudu, the king,
Before Anu and Enlil bows himself down.
Life like (that of) a god he gives 1 to him,
An eternal soul like (that of) a god he creates for him.

(10) At that time Ziusudu, the king,
The name of the niggilma (named) 'Preserver of the Seed
of Mankind' in a . . . land, 2 the land 3 of Dilmun (?), they caused him
to dwell.

The first two lines of the column are probably part of the
speech of some deity, who urges the necessity of invoking or
conjuring Anu and Enlil 'by the Soul of Heaven, by the Soul of
Earth', in order to secure their support or approval. Now Anu
and Enlil are the two great gods who had determined on man-
kind's destruction, and whose wrath at his own escape from
death Ziusudu must placate. It is an obvious inference that
conjuring 'by the Soul of Heaven' and 'by the Soul of Earth'
is either the method by which Ziusudu has already succeeded in
appeasing their anger, or the means by which he is here enjoined
to attain that end. Against the latter alternative it is to be
noted that the god is addressing more than one person; and,
further, that Ziusudu is evidently already pardoned, for, so far
from following the deity's advice, he immediately prostrates him-
self before Anu and Enlil and receives immortality. We may
conjecture that at the close of the Fifth Column Ziusudu had
already performed the invocation and thereby had appeased the

1 For the probable explanation of these verbs in the singular, see above,
p. 55 f.
2 Possibly to be translated 'mountain'. The rendering of the proper name
as that of Dilmun is very uncertain. For the probable identification of Dilmun
with the island of Bahrain in the Persian Gulf, cf. Rawlinson, Journ. Roy. As-
Sc., 1890, pp. 20 ff.; and see further, Meissner, Orient. Lit.-Zeits., XX, No. 7,
col. 201 ff.
3 The traces of the signs preserved in l. 13 are not clear.

68 DELUGE STORIES AND THE SUMERIAN VERSION

divine wrath; and that the lines at the beginning of the Sixth
Column point the moral of the story by enjoining on Ziusudu and
his descendants, in other words on mankind, the advisability of
employing this powerful incantation at their need. The speaker
may perhaps have been one of Ziusudu's divine helpers—the Sun-
god to whom he had sacrificed, or Enki who had saved him from
the Flood. But it seems to me more probable that the words are
uttered by Anu and Enlil themselves. 1 For thereby they would
be represented as giving their own sanction to the formula, and
as guaranteeing its magical efficacy. That the incantation, as
addressed to Anu and Enlil, would be appropriate is obvious,
since each would be magically approached through his own
sphere of control. 2

It is significant that at another critical point of the story we
have already met with a reference to conjuring 'by the Name of
Heaven and Earth', the phrase occurring at the close of the Third
Column after the reference to the dream or dreams. 3 There, as
we saw, we might possibly explain the passage as illustrating one
aspect of Ziusudu's piety: he may have been represented as con-
tinually practising this class of incantation, and in that case it
would be natural enough that in the final crisis of the story he
should have propitiated the gods he conjured by the same means.
Or, as a more probable alternative, it was suggested that we might
connect the line with Enki's warning, and assume that Ziusudu
interpreted the dream-revelation of Anu and Enlil's purpose by
means of the magical incantation which was peculiarly associated
with them. On either alternative the phrase fits into the story
itself, and there is no need to suppose that the narrative is
interrupted, either in the Third or in the Sixth Column, by an
address to the hearers of the myth, urging them to make the
invocation on their own behalf.

On the other hand, it seems improbable that the lines in
question formed part of the original myth; they may have been
inserted to weld the myth more closely to the magic. Both
incantation and epic may have originally existed independently,
and, if so, their combination would have been suggested by their
contents. 4 For while the former is addressed to Anu and Enlil, in
the latter these same gods play the dominant parts: they are the
two chief creators; it is they who send the Flood, and it is their

1 One of them may have been the speaker on behalf of both; see above,
p. 55 f.
2 See above, p. 66 f., n. 3.
3 See above, pp. 65 and 68.
anger that must be appeased. If once combined, the further step of making the incantation the actual means by which Ziusudu achieved his own rescue and immortality would be a natural development. It may be added that the words would have been an equally appropriate addition if the incantation had not existed independently, but had been suggested by, and developed from, the myth.

In the third and eleventh lines of the column we have further references to the mysterious object, the creation of which appears to have been recorded in the First Column of the text between man’s creation and that animals. The second sign of the group composing its name was not recognized by Dr. Poebel, but it is quite clearly written in two of the passages, and has been correctly identified by Professor Barton. 1 The Sumerian word is, in fact, to be read nig-gil-ma,2 which, when preceded by the determinative for ‘pot’, ‘jar’, or ‘bowl’, is given in a later syllabary as the equivalent of the Semitic word mashkhalu. Evidence that the word mashkhalu was actually employed to denote a jar or vessel of some sort is furnished by one of the Tel el-Amarna letters which refers to ‘one silver mashkhalu’ and ‘one (or two) stone mashkhalu’.3 In our text the determinative is absent, and it is possible that the word is used in another sense. Professor Barton, in both passages in the Sixth Column, gives it the meaning ‘curse’; he interprets the lines as referring to the removal of a curse from the earth after the Flood, and he compares Gen. viii. 21, where Yahweh declares he will not again ‘curse the ground for man’s sake’. But this translation ignores the occurrence of the word in the First Column, where the creation of the niggalma is apparently recorded; and his rendering ‘the seed that was cursed’ in l. 11 is not supported by the photographic reproduction of the text, which suggests that the first sign in the line is not that for ‘seed’, but is the sign for ‘name’, as correctly read by Dr. Poebel. In that passage the niggalma appears to be given by Ziusudu the name ‘Preserver of the Seed of Mankind’, which we have already compared to the title bestowed on Ut-napishtim’s ship, ‘Preserver of Life’.4 Like the ship, it must have played an important part in man’s preservation, which would account not only for the honorific title but for the special record of its creation.

If we may connect the word with the magical colouring of the myth, we might perhaps retain its known meaning, ‘jar’ or ‘bowl’, and regard it as employed in the magical ceremony which must have formed part of the invocation ‘by the Soul of Heaven, by the Soul of Earth’. But the accompanying references to the ground, to its production from the ground, and to its springing up, if the phrases may be so rendered, suggest rather some kind of plant;1 and this, from its employment in magical rites, may also have given its name to a bowl or vessel which held it. A very similar plant was that found and lost by Gilgamesh, after his sojourn with Ut-napishtim; it too had potent magical power and bore a title descriptive of its peculiar virtue of transforming old age to youth. Should this suggestion prove to be correct, the three passages mentioning the niggalma must be classed with those in which the invocation is referred to, as ensuring the sanction of the myth to further elements in the magic. In accordance with this view, the fifth line in the Sixth Column is probably to be included in the divine speech, where a reference to the object employed in the ritual would not be out of place. But it is to be hoped that light will be thrown on this puzzling word by further study, and perhaps by new fragments of the text; meanwhile it would be hazardous to suggest a more definite rendering.

With the sixth line of the column it is clear that the original narrative of the myth is resumed.5 Ziusudu, the king, prostrates himself before Ann and Enlil, who bestow immortality upon him and cause him to dwell in a land, or mountain, the name of which may perhaps be read as Dilmun. The close parallelism between this portion of the text and the end of the myth in the Gilgamesh Epic will be seen from the following extracts,6 the magical portions being omitted from the Sumerian Version:

1 The references to ‘the ground’, or ‘the earth’, also tend to connect it peculiarly with Enlil. Enlil’s close association with the earth, which is, of course, independently attested, is explicitly referred to in the Babylonian Version (cf. Gilg. Epic, XI, l. 39-42). Suggested reflections of this idea have long been traced in the Hebrew Versions; cf. Gen. viii. 21 (J), where Yahweh says he will not again curse the ground, and Gen. ix. 13 (P), where Elohim speaks of his covenant ‘between me and the earth’.

2 It will also be noted that with this line the text again falls naturally into couplets.

3 It will also be noted that with this line the text again falls naturally into couplets.

1 See American Journal of Semitic Languages, Vol. XXXI, April 1915, p. 226.
2 It is written niggil in the First Column; see above, 56 f.
3 See Winckler, M. Amarna, pl. 35 f. No. 38, Obv., Col. II, l. 45, Rev., Col. I, l. 69; and Knudtzon, El-Am. Taf., pp. 115, 122; the vessels were presents from Amemophis IV to Barnaburish.
4 See above, p. 57.
SEMITIC VERSION.

Then Enlil went up into the ship; he took me by the hand and led me forth.

He brought out my wife and caused her to bow down at my side; he touched our brows, standing between us and blessing us:

Formerly was Ut-napishtim of mankind, but now let Ut-napishtim be like the gods, even us!

And let Ut-napishtim dwell afar off at the mouth of the rivers!

Then they took me and afar off, at the mouth of the rivers, they caused me to dwell.

The Sumerian Version thus apparently concludes with the familiar ending of the legend which we find in the Gilgamesh Epic and in Berossus, though it here occurs in an abbreviated form and with some variations in detail. In all three versions the prostration of the Deluge hero before the god is followed by the bestowal of immortality upon him, a fate which, according to Berossus, he shared with his wife, his daughter, and the steersman. The Gilgamesh Epic perhaps implies that Ut-napishtim's wife shared in his immortality, but the Sumerian Version mentions Ziusudu alone. In the Gilgamesh Epic Ut-napishtim is settled by the gods at the mouth of the rivers, that is to say at the head of the Persian Gulf, while according to a possible rendering of the Sumerian Version he is made to dwell on Dilmun, an island in the Gulf itself. The fact that Gilgamesh in the Epic has to cross the sea to reach Ut-napishtim may be cited in favour of the reading 'Dilmun'; and the description of the sea as 'the Waters of Death', if it implies more than the great danger of their passage, was probably a later development associated with Ut-napishtim's immortality. It may be added that in neither Hebrew version do we find any parallel to the concluding

1 Or, 'On a . . . mountain, the mountain of', &c.
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1 See above, p. 2 f.

2 For details see especially Skinner, Genesis, pp. 177 ff.
of the Sumerian tradition, while not affecting Babylon and Assyria, have left their stamp upon the Hebrew narratives; but that is not an exhaustive statement of the case. For we have also seen that a more complete survival of Sumerian tradition has taken place in the history of Berossus. There we traced the same general framework of the narratives, with a closer correspondence in detail. The kingly rank of Ziusudu is in complete harmony with the Berossian conception of a series of supreme Antediluvian rulers, and the names of two of the Antediluvian cities are among those of their newly recovered Sumerian prototypes. There can thus be no suggestion that the Greek reproductions of the Sumerian tradition were in their turn due to Hebrew influence. On the contrary we have in them a parallel case of survival in a far more complete form.

The inference we may obviously draw is that the Sumerian narrative continued in existence, in a literary form that closely resembled the original version, into the later historical periods. In this there would be nothing to surprise us, when we recall the careful preservation and study of ancient Sumerian religious texts by the later Semitic priesthood of the country. Each ancient cult-centre in Babylonia continued to cling to its own local traditions, and the Sumerian desire for their preservation, which was inherited by their Semitic guardians, was in great measure unaffected by political occurrences elsewhere. Hence it was that Ashur-bani-pal, when forming his library at Nineveh, was able to draw upon so rich a store of the more ancient literary texts of Babylonia. The Sumerian Version of the Deluge and of Antediluvian history may well have survived in a less epitomized form than that in which we have recovered it; and, like other ancient texts, it was probably provided with a Semitic translation. Indeed its literary study and reproduction may have continued without interruption in Babylon itself. But even if Sumerian tradition died out in the capital under the influence of the Babylonian priesthood, its re-introduction may well have taken place in Neo-Babylonian times. Perhaps the antiquarian researches of Nabonidus were characteristic of his period; and in any case the collection of his country's gods into the capital must have been accompanied by a renewed interest in the more ancient versions of the past with which their cults were peculiarly associated. In the extant summary from Berossus we may possibly see evidence of a subsequent attempt to combine

with these more ancient traditions the continued religious dominance of Marduk and of Babylon.

Our conclusion, that the Sumerian form of the tradition did not die out, leaves the question as to the periods during which Babylonian influence may have acted upon Hebrew tradition in great measure unaffected; and we may therefore postpone its further consideration to the next lecture. To-day the only question that remains to be considered concerns the effect of our new evidence upon the wider problem of Deluge stories as a whole. What light does it throw on the general character of Deluge stories and their suggested Egyptian origin?

One thing that strikes us forcibly in reading this early text is the complete absence of any trace or indication of astrological motif. It is true that Ziusudu sacrifices to the Sun-god; but the episode is inherent in the story, the appearance of the Sun after the storm following the natural sequence of events and furnishing assurance to the king of his eventual survival. To identify the worshipper with his god and to transfer Ziusudu's material craft to the heavens is surely without justification from the simple narrative. We have here no prototype of Ra sailing the heavenly ocean. And the destructive flood itself is not only of an equally material and mundane character, but is in complete harmony with its Babylonian setting.

In the matter of floods the Tigris and Euphrates present a striking contrast to the Nile. It is true that the life-blood of each country is its river-water, but the conditions of its use are very different, and in Mesopotamia it becomes a curse when out of control. In both countries the river-water must be used for maturing the crops. But while the rains of Abyssinia cause the Nile to rise between August and October, thus securing both summer and winter crops, the melting snows of Armenia and the Taurus flood the Mesopotamian rivers between March and May. In Egypt the Nile flood is gentle; it is never abrupt, and the river gives ample warning of its rise and fall. It contains just enough sediment to enrich the land without choking the canals; and the water, after filling its historic basins, may when necessary be discharged into the falling river in November. Thus Egypt receives a full and regular supply of water, and there is no difficulty in disposing of any surplus. The growth in such a country of a legend of world-wide destruction by flood is inconceivable.

In Mesopotamia, on the other hand, the floods, which come too late for the winter crops, are followed by the rainless summer
months; and not only must the flood-water be controlled, but some portion of it must be detained artificially, if it is to be of use during the burning months of July, August, and September, when the rivers are at their lowest. Moreover, heavy rain in April and a warm south wind melting the snow in the hills may bring down such floods that the channels cannot contain them; the dams are then breached and the country is laid waste. Here there is first too much water and then too little.

The great danger from flood in Babylonia, both in its range of action and in its destructive effect, is due to the strangely flat character of the Tigris and Euphrates delta.1 Hence after a severe breach in the Tigris or Euphrates, the river after inundating the country may make itself a new channel miles away from the old one. To mitigate the danger, the floods may be dealt with in two ways—by a multiplication of canals to spread the water, and by providing escapes for it into depressions in the surrounding desert, which in their turn become centres of fertility. Both methods were employed in antiquity; and it may be added that in any scheme for the future prosperity of the country they must be employed again, of course with the increased efficiency of modern apparatus.2 But while the Babylonians succeeded in controlling the Euphrates, the Tigris was never really tamed,3 and whenever it burst its right bank the southern plains were devastated. We could not have more suitable soil for the growth of a Deluge story.

It was only by constant and unremitting attention that disaster from flood could be averted; and the difficulties of the problem were and are increased by the fact that the flood-water of the Mesopotamian rivers contains five times as much sediment as the Nile. In fact, one of the most pressing of the problems the Sumerian and early Babylonian engineers had to solve was the keeping of the canals free from silt.4 What the floods, if left unchecked, may do in Mesopotamia, is well illustrated by the decay of the ancient canal-system, which has been the immediate cause of the country's present state of sordid desolation. That the decay was gradual was not the fault of the rivers, but was due to the sound principles on which the old system of control had been evolved through many centuries of labour. At the time of the Moslem conquest the system had already begun to fail. In the fifth century there had been bad floods; but worse came in A.D. 629, when both rivers burst their banks and played havoc with the dikes and embankments. It is related that the Persian king Parviz, the contemporary of Mohammed, crucified Euphrates. A massive earthen dam, the remains of which are still known as 'Nimrod's Dam', was thrown across the Tigris above the point where it entered its delta; this served to turn the river over hard conglomerate rock and kept it at a high level so that it could irrigate the country on both banks. Above the dam were the heads of the later Nahrawan Canal, a great stream 400 ft. wide and 17 ft. deep, which supplied the country east of the river. The Nar Sharri or 'King's Canal', the Nahar Malkha of the Greeks and the Nahr el-Malik of the Arabs, protected the right bank of the Tigris by its own high artificial banks, which can still be traced for hundreds of miles; but it took its supply from the Euphrates at Sippar, where the ground is some 25 ft. higher than on the Tigris. The Tigris usually flooded its left bank; it was the right bank which was protected, and a breach here meant disaster. Cf. Willcocks, op. cit., and The Near East, Sept. 29, 1916 (Vol. XI, No. 282), p. 522; and see below, p. 96, n. 2.

1 Cf. Letters of Hammurabi, Vol. III, pp. xxxvi ff.; it was the duty of every village or town upon the banks of the main canals in Babylonia to keep its own section clear of silt, and of course it was also responsible for its own smaller irrigation-channels. While the invention of the system of basin-irrigation was practically forced on Egypt, the extraordinary fertility of Babylonia was won in the teeth of nature by the system of perennial irrigation, or irrigation all the year round. In Babylonia the water was led into small fields of two or three acres, while the Nile Valley was irrigated in great basins each containing some thirty to forty thousand acres. The Babylonian method gives far more profitable results, and Sir William Willcocks points out that Egypt to-day is gradually abandoning its own system and adopting that of its ancient rival; see The Near East, Sept. 29, 1916, p. 521.
in one day forty canal-workers at a certain breach, and yet was unable to master the flood.¹ All repairs were suspended during the anarchy of the Modern invasion. As a consequence the Tigris left its old bed for the Shatt el-Hai at Kât, and pouring its own and its tributaries' waters into the Euphrates formed the Great Euphrates Swamp, two hundred miles long and fifty broad. But even then what was left of the old system was sufficient to support the splendour of the Eastern Caliphate.

The second great blow to the system followed the Mongol conquest, when the Nahrawân Canal, to the east of the Tigris, had its head swept away by flood and the area it had irrigated became desert. Then, in about the fifteenth century, the Tigris returned to its old course; the Shatt el-Hai shrank, and much of the Great Swamp dried up into the desert it is to-day.² Things became worse during the centuries of Turkish misrule. But the sitting up of the Hillah, or main, branch of the Euphrates about 1865, and the transference of a great part of its stream into the Hindiyah Canal, caused even the Turks to take action. They constructed the old Hindiyah Barrage in 1890, but it gave way in 1903 and the state of things was even worse than before; for the Hindiyah branch then dried entirely.³

From this brief sketch of progressive disaster during the later

¹ See Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 27.
² This illustrates the damage the Tigris by itself is capable of inflicting on the country. It may be added that Sir William Willcocks proposes to control the Tigris floods by an escape into the Tharthar depression, a great salt pan at the tail of Wâli Tharthar, which lies 14 ft. below sea-level and is 200 ft. lower than the flood-level of the Tigris some thirty-two miles away. The escape would leave the Tigris to the S. of Samarra, the proposed Beled Barrage being built below it and up-stream of 'Nimrod's Dam'. The Tharthar escape would drain into the Euphrates, and the latter's Habbânîyah escape (see above, p. 96, n. 2) would receive any surplus water from the Tigris, a second barrage being thrown across the Euphrates up-stream of Fallûjah, where there is an outcrop of limestone near the head of the Sakhlawiyah Canal. The Tharthar depression, besides disposing of the Tigris flood-water, would thus probably feed the Euphrates; and a second barrage on the Tigris, to be built at Kût, would supply water to the Shatt el-Hai. When the country is freed from danger of flood, the Baghdad Railway could be run through the cultivated land instead of through the eastern desert; see Willcocks, The Near East, Oct. 6, 1916 (Vol. XI, No. 283), p. 343 f.
³ It was then that Sir William Willcocks designed the new Hindiyah Barrage, which was completed in 1913. The Hindiyah branch, to-day the main stream of the Euphrates, is the old low-lying Falûkappas Canal, which branched westward above Babylon and discharged its waters into the western marches. In antiquity the head of this branch had to be opened in high floods and then closed again immediately after the flood to keep the main historical period, the inevitable effect of neglected silt and flood, it will be gathered that the two great rivers of Mesopotamia present a very strong contrast to the Nile. For during the same period of misgovernment and neglect in Egypt the Nile did not turn its valley and delta into a desert. On the Tigris and Euphrates, during ages when the earliest dwellers on their banks were struggling to make effective their first efforts at control, the waters must often have regained the upper hand. Under such conditions the story of a great flood in the past would not be likely to die out in the future; the tradition would tend to gather illustrative detail suggested by later experience. Our new text reveals the Deluge tradition in Mesopotamia at an early stage of its development, and incidentally shows us that there is no need to postulate for its origin any conviction of nature or even a series of seismic shocks accompanied by cyclone in the Persian Gulf.

If this had been the only version of the story that had come down to us, we should hardly have regarded it as a record of world-wide catastrophe. It is true the gods' intention is to destroy mankind, but the scene throughout is laid in Southern Babylonia. After seven days' storm, the Sun comes out, and the vessel with the pious priest-king and his domestic animals on board boards, apparently still in Babylonia, and not on any distant mountain, such as Mt. Nisir or the great mass of Ararat in Armenia. These are obviously details which tellers of the story have added as it passed down to later generations. When it was carried still farther afield, into the area of the Eastern Mediterranean, it was again adapted to local conditions. Thus Apollodorus makes Deucalion land on Parnassus,¹ and the pseudo-Lucian relates how he founded the temple of Derketo at Hierapolis in Syria beside the hole in the earth which swallowed up the Flood.² To the Sumerians who first told the story, the great Flood appeared to have destroyed mankind, for Southern Babylonia was for them the world. Later peoples who heard it have fitted the story to their own geographical horizon, stream full past Babylon, which entailed the employment of an enormous number of men. Alexander the Great's first work in Babylonia was cutting a new head for the Falûkappas in solid ground, for hitherto it had been in sandy soil; and it was while reclaiming the marches farther downstream that he contracted the fever that killed him.

¹ Hesiod is our earliest authority for the Deucalion Flood story. For its probable Babylonian origin, cf. Farnell, Greece and Babylon (1911), p. 184.
² De Syria dea, 12 f.
and in all good faith and by a purely logical process the mountain-tops are represented as submerged, and the ship, or ark, or chest, is made to come to ground on the highest peak known to the story-teller and his hearers. But in its early Sumerian form it is just a simple tradition of some great inundation, which overwhelmed the plain of Southern Babylonia and was peculiarly disastrous in its effects. And so its memory survived in the picture of Ziusudra’s solitary coracle upon the face of the waters, which, seen through the mists of the Deluge, tradition, has given us the Noah’s ark of our nursery days.

Thus the Babylonian, Hebrew, and Greek Deluge stories resolve themselves, not into a nature myth, but into an early legend, which has a basis of historical fact in the Euphrates Valley. And it is probable that we may explain after a similar fashion the occurrence of tales of a like character at least in some other parts of the world. Among races dwelling in low-lying or well-watered districts it would be surprising if we did not find independent stories of past floods from which few inhabitants of the land escaped. It is only in hilly countries such as Palestine, where for the great part of the year water is scarce and precious, that we are forced to deduce borrowing; and there is no doubt that both the Babylonian and the biblical stories have been responsible for some at any rate of the scattered tales. But there is no need to adopt the theory of a single source for all of them, whether in Babylonia or, still less, in Egypt.¹

I should like to add, with regard to this reading of our new evidence, that I am very glad to know Sir James Frazer holds a very similar opinion. For, as you are doubtless all aware, Sir James is at present collecting Flood stories from all over the world, and is supplementing from a wider range the collections already made by Lenormant, Andree, Winternitz, and Gerland. When his work is complete it will be possible to conjecture with far greater confidence how particular traditions or groups of tradition arose, and to what extent transmission has taken place. Meanwhile, in his recent Huxley Memorial Lecture,² he has suggested a third possibility as to the way Deluge stories may have arisen.

¹ This argument is taken from an article I published in Professor Headlam’s Church Quarterly Review, Jan., 1916, pp. 280 ff., containing an account of Dr. Pocel’s discovery.

LECTURE III
CREATION AND THE DRAGON MYTH; AND THE PROBLEM OF BABYLONIAN PARALLELS IN HEBREW TRADITION

In our discussion of the new Sumerian Version of the Deluge story we came to the conclusion that it gave no support to any theory which would trace all such tales to a single origin, whether in Egypt or in Babylonia. In spite of strong astrological elements in both the Egyptian and Babylonian religious systems, we saw grounds for regarding the astrological tinge of much ancient mythology as a later embellishment and not as primitive material. And so far as our new version of the Deluge story was concerned, it resolved itself into a legend, which had a basis of historical fact in the Euphrates Valley. It will be obvious that the same class of explanation cannot be applied to narratives of the Creation of the World. For there we are dealing, not with legends, but with myths, that is, stories exclusively about the gods. But where an examination of their earlier forms is possible, it would seem to show that many of these tales also, in their origin, are not to be interpreted as nature myths, and that none arose as mere reflections of the solar system. In their more primitive and simpler aspects they seem in many cases to have been suggested by very human and terrestrial experience. To-day we will examine the Egyptian, Sumerian, and Babylonian myths of Creation, and, after we have noted the more striking features of our new material, we will consider the problem of foreign influence upon Hebrew traditions concerning the origin and early history of the world.

In Egypt, as until recently in Babylonia, we have to depend for our knowledge of Creation myths on documents of a comparatively late period. Moreover, Egyptian religious literature as a whole is textually corrupt, and in consequence it is often difficult to determine the original significance of its allusions. Thanks to the funerary inscriptions and that great body of
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magical formulae and ritual known as 'The Chapters of Coming forth by Day', we are very fully informed on the Egyptian doctrines as to the future state of the dead. The Egyptian's intense interest in his own remote future, amounting almost to an obsession, may perhaps in part account for the comparatively meagre space in the extant literature which is occupied by myths relating solely to the past. And it is significant that the one cycle of myth, of which we are fully informed in its latest stage of development, should be that which gave its sanction to the hope of a future existence for man. The fact that Herodotus, though he claims a knowledge of the sufferings or 'Mysteries' of Osiris, should deliberately refrain from describing them or from even uttering the name,1 suggests that in his time at any rate some sections of the mythology had begun to acquire an esoteric character. There is no doubt that at all periods myth played an important part in the ritual of feast-days. But mythological references in the earlier texts are often obscure; and the late form in which a few of the stories have come down to us is obviously artificial. The tradition, for example, which relates how mankind came from the tears which issued from Ra's eye undoubtedly arose from a play upon words.

On the other hand, traces of myth, scattered in the religious literature of Egypt, may perhaps in some measure betray their relative age by the conceptions of the universe which underlie them. The Egyptian idea that the sky was a heavenly ocean, which is not unlike conceptions current among the Semitic Babylonians and Hebrews, presupposes some thought and reflection. In Egypt it may well have been evolved from the probably earlier but analogous idea of the river in heaven, which the Sun traversed daily in his boats. Such a river was clearly suggested by the Nile; and its world-embracing character is reminiscent of a time when through communication was regularly established, at least as far south as Elephantine. Possibly in an earlier period the long narrow valley, or even a section of it, may have suggested the figure of a man lying prone upon his back. Such was Keb, the Earth-god, whose counterpart in the sky was the goddess Nut, her feet and hands resting at the limits of the world and her curved body forming the vault of heaven. Perhaps still more primitive, and dating from a pastoral age, may be the notion that the sky was a great cow, her body,

1 Herodotus, II, 171.
speckled with stars, alone visible from the earth beneath. Reference has already been made to the dominant influence of the Sun in Egyptian religion, and it is not surprising that he should so often appear as the first of created beings. His orb itself, or later the god in youthful human form, might be pictured as emerging from a lotus on the primeval waters, or from a marsh-bird’s egg, a conception which influenced the later Phoenician cosmogony. The Scarabeus, or great dung-feeding beetle of Egypt, rolling the ball before it in which it lays its eggs, is an obvious theme for the early myth-maker. And it was natural that the Beetle of Khepera should have been identified with the Sun at his rising, as the Hawk of Ra represented his noonday flight, and the aged form of Atum his setting in the west. But in all these varied conceptions and explanations of the universe it is difficult to determine how far the poetical imagery of later periods has transformed the original myths which may lie behind them.

As the Egyptian Creator the claims of Ra, the Sun-god of Heliopolis, early superseded those of other deities. On the other hand, Ptah of Memphis, who for long ages had been merely the god of architects and craftsmen, became under the Empire the architect of the universe and is pictured as a potter moulding the world-egg. A short poem by a priest of Ptah, which has come down to us from that period, exhibits an attempt to develop this idea on philosophical lines. Its author represents all gods and living creatures as proceeding directly from the mind and thought of Ptah. But this movement, which was more notably reflected in Akhenaten’s religious revolution, died out in political disaster, and the original materialistic interpretation of the myths was restored with the cult of Amen. How materialistic this could be is well illustrated by two earlier members of the XVIIIth Dynasty, who have left us vivid representations of the potter’s wheel employed in the process of man’s creation. When the famous queen Hatshepsut, after the return of her expedition to Punt in the ninth year of her young consort Thothmes III, decided to build her temple at Deir el-Bahari in the necropolis of Western Thebes, she sought to emphasize her claim to the throne of Egypt by recording her own divine origin upon its walls. We have already noted the Egyptians’ belief in

1 See Lecture II, p. 46 f.
2 See Breasted, Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache, XXXIX, pp. 39 f., and History of Egypt, pp. 536 ff.

the solar parentage of their legitimate rulers, a myth that goes back at least to the Old Kingdom and may have had its origin in prehistoric times. With the rise of Thebes, Amen inherited the prerogatives of Ra; and so Hatshepsut seeks to show, on the north side of the retaining wall of her temple’s Upper Platform, that she was the daughter of Amen himself, the great God, Lord of the sky, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, who resides at Thebes. The myth was no invention of her own, for obviously it must have followed traditional lines, and though it is only employed to exhibit the divine creation of a single personage, it as obviously reflects the procedure and methods of a general Creation myth.

This series of sculptures shared the deliberate mutilation that all her records suffered at the hands of Thothmes III after her death, but enough of the scenes and their accompanying text has survived to render the detailed interpretation of the myth quite certain. Here, as in a general Creation myth, Amen’s first act is to summon the great gods in council, in order to announce to them the future birth of the great princess. Of the twelve gods who attend, the first is Menthu, a form of the Sun-god and closely associated with Amen. But the second deity is Atum, the great god of Heliopolis, and he is followed by his cycle of deities—Shu, ‘the son of Ra’; Tefnut, ‘the Lady of the sky’; Keb, ‘the Father of the Gods’; Nut, ‘the Mother of the Gods’; Osiris, Isis, Nephthys, Set, Horus, and Hathor. We are here in the presence of cosmic deities, as befits a projected act of creation. The subsequent scene exhibit the Egyptian’s literal interpretation of the myth, which necessitates the god’s bodily presence and personal participation. Thoth mentions to Amen the name of queen Aahmes as the future mother of Hatshepsut, and we later see Amen himself, in the form of her husband, Aa-kheperka-Ra (Thothmes I), sitting with Aahmes and giving her the Ankh, or sign of Life, which she receives in her hand and inhales through her nostrils. God and queen are seated on thrones above a couch, and are supported by two goddesses. After leaving the queen, Amen calls on Khnum or Khnumu, the flat-
hornd ram-headed god, who in texts of all periods is referred to as the 'builder' of gods and men; and he instructs him to create the body of his future daughter and that of her Ka, or 'double', which would be united to her from birth.

The scene in the series, which is of greatest interest in the present connexion, is that representing Khnum at his work of creation. He is seated before a potter's wheel which he works with his foot, and on the revolving table he is fashioning two children with his hands, the baby princess and her 'double'. It was always Hatshepsut's desire to be represented as a man, and so both the children are boys. As yet they are lifeless, but the symbol of Life will be held to their nostrils by Heqet, the divine Potter's wife, whose frog-head typifies birth and fertility. When Amenophis III copied Hatshepsut's sculptures for his own series at Luxor, he assigned this duty to the greater goddess Hathor, perhaps the most powerful of the cosmic goddesses and the mother of the world. The subsequent scenes at Deir el-Bahari include the leading of queen Aahmes by Khnum and Heqet to the birth-chamber; the great birth scene where the queen is attended by the goddesses Nepthys and Isis, a number of divine nurses and midwives holding several of the 'doubles' of the baby, and favourable genii, in human form or with the heads of crocodiles, jackals, and hawks, representing the four cardinal points and all bearing the gift of life; the presentation of the young child by the goddess Hathor to Amen, who is well pleased at the sight of his daughter; and the divine suckling of Hatshepsut and her 'doubles'. But these episodes do not concern us, as of course they merely reflect the procedure following a royal birth. But Khnum's part in the princess's origin stands on a different plane, for it illustrates the Egyptian myth of Creation by the divine Potter, who may take the form of either Khnum or Ptah. Monsieur Naville points out the extraordinary resemblance in detail which Hatshepsut's myth of divine maternity bears to the Greek legend of Zeus and Alkmene, where the god

3 In the similar scene at Luxor, where the future Amenophis III is represented on the Creator's wheel, the sculptor has distinguished the human child from its spiritual 'double' by the quaint device of putting its finger in its mouth.

2 This detail is not clearly preserved at Deir el-Bahari; but it is quite clear in the scene on the west wall of the 'Birth-room' in the Temple at Luxor, which Amenophis III evidently copied from that of Hatshepsut.
3 In the similar scene at Luxor, where the future Amenophis III is represented on the Creator's wheel, the sculptor has distinguished the human child from its spiritual 'double' by the quaint device of putting its finger in its mouth.

1 See Naville, op. cit., p. 12.
2 Cf., e.g., Herodotus, II, 43.
4 In Gods of the Egyptians, Vol. I, Chap. VII, pp. 280 ff., Dr. Budge gives a detailed comparison of the Egyptian pairs of primal deities with the very similar couples of the Babylonian myth. For the Sumerian origin of the latter, see below, pp. 120 ff.
account with the principal Semitic-Babylonian Creation narrative. The application of the Ankh, the Egyptian sign for Life, to the nostrils of a newly-created being is no true parallel to the breathing into man’s nostrils of the breath of life in the earlier Hebrew Version, except in the sense that each process was suggested by our common human anatomy. We should naturally expect to find some Hebrew parallel to the Egyptian idea of Creation as the work of a potter with his clay, for that figure appears in most ancient mythologies. The Hebrews indeed used the conception as a metaphor or parable, and it also underlies their earlier picture of man’s creation. I have not touched on the grosser Egyptian conceptions concerning the origin of the universe, which we may probably connect with African ideals; but those I have referred to will serve to demonstrate the complete absence of any feature that presents a detailed resemblance to Hebrew tradition.

When we turn to Babylonia, we find there also evidence of conflicting ideas, the product of different and to some extent competing religious centres. But in contrast to the rather confused condition of Egyptian mythology, the Semitic Creation myth of the city of Babylon, thanks to the latter’s continued political ascendency, succeeded in winning a dominant place in the national literature. This is the version in which so many points of resemblance to the first chapter of Genesis have long been recognized, especially in the succession of creative acts and their relative order. In the Semitic-Babylonian Version the creation of the world is represented as the result of conflict, the emergence of order out of chaos, a result that is only attained by the personal triumph of the Creator. But this underlying dualism does not appear in the more primitive Sumerian Version we have now recovered. It will be remembered that in the second lecture I gave some account of the myth, which occurs in an epitomized form as an introduction to the Sumerian Version of the Deluge, the two narratives being recorded in the same document and connected with one another by a description of the Antediluvian cities. We there saw that Creation is ascribed to the

1 See below, p. 130. For the wide diffusion, in the myths of remote peoples, of a vague theory that would trace all created things to a watery origin, see Parnell, Greece and Babylon, p. 180.
2 Gen. ii. 7 (J).
3 Cf., e.g., Isaiah xxix. 16, xliv. 9; and Jeremiah xviii. 2f.
4 See above, pp. 52 ff.

three greatest gods of the Sumerian pantheon, Ann, Enlil, and Enki, assisted by the goddess Ninkharsagga.

It is significant that in the Sumerian Version no less than four deities are represented as taking part in the Creation. For in this we may see some indication of the period to which its composition must be assigned. Their association in the text suggests that the claims of local gods had already begun to compete with one another as a result of political combination between the cities of their cults. To the same general period we must also assign the compilation of the Sumerian Dynastic record, for that presupposes the existence of a supreme ruler among the Sumerian city-states. This form of political constitution must obviously have been the result of a long process of development, and the fact that its existence should be regarded as dating from the Creation of the world indicates a comparatively developed stage of the tradition. But behind the combination of cities and their gods we may conjecturally trace anterior stages of development, when each local deity and his human representative seemed to their own adherents the sole objects for worship and allegiance. And even after the demands of other centres had been conceded, no deity ever quite gave up his local claims.

Enlil, the second of the four Sumerian creating deities, eventually ousted his rivals. It has indeed long been recognized that the role played by Marduk in the Babylonian Version of Creation had been borrowed from Enlil of Nippur; and in the Atrakhasis legend Enlil himself appears as the ultimate ruler of the world and the other gods figure as ‘his sons’. Ann, who heads the list and plays with Enlil the leading part in the Sumerian narrative, was clearly his chief rival. And though we possess no detailed account of Ann’s creative work, the persistent ascription to him of the creation of heaven, and his familiar title, ‘the Father of the Gods’, suggest that he once possessed a corresponding body of myth in Eanna, his temple at Erech. Enki, the third of the creating gods, was naturally credited, as God of Wisdom, with special creative activities, and fortunately in his case we have some independent evidence of the varied forms these could assume.

According to one tradition that has come down to us, after Ann had made the heavens, Enki created Apsû or the Deep,

1 See Weissbach, Babylonische Miscellen, pp. 32 ff.
his own dwelling-place. Then taking from it a piece of clay he proceeded to create the Brick-god, and reeds and forests for the supply of building material. From the same clay he continued to form other deities and materials, including the Carpenter-god; the Smith-god; Arazu, a patron-deity of building; and mountains and seas for all that they produced; the Goldsmith-god, the Stone-cutter-god, and kindred deities, together with their rich products for offerings; the Grain-deities, Ashman and Lakhar; Siris, a Wine-god; Ningishzida and Ninsur, a Gardengod, for the sake of the rich offerings they could make; and a deity described as 'the High priest of the great gods', to lay down necessary ordinances and commands. Then he created 'the King', for the equipment probably of a particular temple, and finally men, that they might practise the cult in the temple so elaborately prepared.

It will be seen from this summary of Enki's creative activities, that the text from which it is taken is not a general Creation myth, but in all probability the introductory paragraph of a composition which celebrated the building or restoration of a particular temple; and the latter's foundation is represented, on henotheistic lines, as the main object of creation. Composed with that special purpose, its narrative is not to be regarded as an exhaustive account of the creation of the world. The incidents are eclectic, and only such gods and materials are mentioned as would have been required for the building and adornment of the temple and for the provision of its offerings and cult. But even so its mythological background is instructive. For while Anu's creation of heaven is postulated as the necessary precedent of Enki's activities, the latter creates the Deep, vegetation, mountains, seas, and mankind. Moreover, in his character as God of Wisdom, he is not only the teacher but the creator of those deities who were patrons of man's own constructive work. From such evidence we may infer that in his temple at Eridu, now covered by the mounds of Abu Shahrain in the extreme south of Babylonia, and regarded in early Sumerian tradition as the first city in the world, Enki himself was once celebrated as the sole creator of the universe.

1 One of the titles of Enki was 'the Potter'; cf. Cun. Texts in the Brit. Mus., Pt. XXIV, p. 42 f., p. 43.
2 For the development of what was probably a later conception, that Enki's creative activities, like those of Marduk, were preceded by conflict, see below, p. 116 f.
3 See above, p. 99.
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The combination of the three gods Anu, Enlil, and Enki, is persistent in the tradition; for not only were they the great gods of the universe, representing respectively heaven, earth, and the watery abyss, but they later shared the heavenly sphere between them. It is in their astrological character that we find them again in creative activity, though without the co-operation of any goddess, when they appear as creators of the great light-gods and as founders of time divisions, the day and the month. This Sumerian myth, though it reaches us only in an extract or summary in a Neo-Babylonian schoolboy's exercise, may well date from a comparatively early period, but probably from a time when the 'Ways' of Anu, Enlil, and Enki had already been fixed in heaven and their later astrological characters had crystallized.

The idea that a goddess should take part with a god in man's creation is already a familiar feature of Babylonian mythology. Thus the goddess Aruru, in co-operation with Marduk, might be credited with the creation of the human race, as she might also be pictured creating on her own initiative an individual hero such as Enkidu of the Gilgamesh Epic. The rôle of mother of mankind was also shared, as we have seen, by the Semitic Ishtar. And though the old Sumerian goddess, Ninhursagga, the 'Lady of the Mountains', appears in our Sumerian text for the first time in the character of creatress, some of the titles we know she enjoyed, under her synonyms in the great God List of Babylonia, already reflected her cosmic activities. For she was known as

- 'The Builder of that which has Breath',
- 'The Carpenter of Mankind',
- 'The Carpenter of the Heart',
- 'The Coppersmith of the Gods',
- 'The Coppersmith of the Land', and
- 'The Lady Potter'.

1 See The Seven Tablets of Creation, Vol. I, pp. 124 ff. The tablet gives extracts from two very similar Sumerian and Semitic texts. In both of them Anu, Enlil, and Enki appear as creators 'through their sure counsel'. In the Sumerian extract they create the Moon and ordain its monthly course, while in the Semitic text, after establishing heaven and earth, they create in addition to the New Moon the bright Day, so that 'men behold the Sun-god in the Gate of his going forth'.
3 See above, p. 65 ff.
In the myth we are not told her method of creation, but from the above titles it is clear that in her own cycle of tradition Ninkharsagga was conceived as fashioning men not only from clay but also from wood, and perhaps as employing metal for the manufacture of her other works of creation. Moreover, in the great God List, where she is referred to under her title Malch, Ninkharsagga is associated with Anu, Enlil, and Enki; she there appears, with her dependent deities, after Enlil and before Enki. We thus have definite proof that her association with the three chief Sumerian gods was widely recognized in the early Sumerian period and dictated her position in the classified pantheon of Babylonia. Apart from this evidence, the important rank assigned her in the historical and legal records and in votive inscriptions, especially in the early period and in Southern Babylonia, accords fully with the part she hero plays in the Sumerian Creation myth. Eannatum and Gudea of Lagash both place her immediately after Anu and Enlil, giving her precedence over Enki; and even in the Kassite Kudurru inscriptions of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, where she is referred to, she takes rank after Enki and before the other gods. In Sumer she was known as 'the Mother of the Gods', and she was credited with the power of transferring the kingdom and royal insignia from one king to his successor.

Her supreme position as a goddess is attested by the relative insignificance of her husband Dunpae, whom she completely over shadows, in which respect she presents a contrast to the goddess Ninil, Enlil's female counterpart. The early clay figurines found at Nippur and on other sites, representing a goddess suckling a child and clasping one of her breasts, may well be regarded as representing Ninkharsagga and not Ninil. Her sanctuaries were at Kesh and Adab, both in the south, and this fact sufficiently explains her comparative want of influence in Akkad, where the Semitic Ishtar took her place. She does indeed appear in the north during the Sargonic period under her own name, though later she survives in her synonyms of Nimakh, 'the Sublime Lady', and Nintu, 'the Lady of Child-bearing'. It is under the latter title that Hammurabi refers to her in his Code of Laws, where she is tenth in a series of eleven deities. But as Goddess of Birth she retained only a pale reflection of her original cosmic character, and her functions were gradually specialized.

From a consideration of their characters, as revealed by independent sources of evidence, we thus obtain the reason for the co-operation of four deities in the Sumerian Creation. In fact the new text illustrates a well-known principle in the development of myth, the reconciliation of the rival claims of deities, whose cults, once isolated, had been brought from political causes into contact with each other. In this aspect myth is the medium through which a working pantheon is evolved. Naturally all the deities concerned cannot continue to play their original parts in detail. In the Babylonian Epic of Creation, where a single deity, and not a very prominent one, was to be raised to pre eminent rank, the problem was simple enough. He could retain his own qualities and achievements while borrowing those of any former rival. In the Sumerian text we have the result of a far more delicate process of adjustment, and it is possible that the brevity of the text is here not entirely due to compression of a longer narrative, but may in part be regarded as evidence of early combination. As a result of the association of several competing deities in the work of creation, a tendency may be traced to avoid discrimination between rival claims. Thus it is that the assembled gods, the pantheon as a whole, are regarded as collectively responsible for the creation of the universe.

It may be added that this use of ilâni, 'the gods', forms an interesting linguistic parallel to the plural of the Hebrew divine title Elohim.

It will be remembered that in the Sumerian Version the account of Creation is not given in full, only such episodes being included as were directly related to the Deluge story. No doubt the selection of men and animals was suggested by their subsequent rescue from the Flood; and emphasis was purposely laid on the creation of the niggilma because of the part it played in securing mankind's survival. Even so, we noted one striking parallel between the Sumerian Version and that of the Semitic Babylonians, in the reason both give for man's creation. But in the former there is no attempt to explain how the universe itself

---

1 See especially, Poebel, op. cit., pp. 24 ff.
2 See above, p. 60.
may credit them with considerable ingenuity in the combination of existing myths, but not with their invention. The whole poem in its present form is a glorification of Marduk, the god of Babylon, who is to be given pre-eminent rank among the gods to correspond with the political position recently attained by his city. It would have been quite out of keeping with the national thought to make a break in the tradition, and such a course would not have served the purpose of the Babylonian priesthood, which was to obtain recognition of their claims by the older centres in the country. Hence they chose and combined the more important existing myths, only making such alterations as would fit them to their new hero. Babylon herself had won her position by her own exertions; and it would be a natural idea to give Marduk his opportunity of becoming Creator of the world as the result of successful conflict. A combination of the Dragon myth with the myth of Creation would have admirably served their purpose; and this is what we find in the Semitic poem. But even that combination may not have been their own invention; for, though, as we shall see, the idea of conflict had no part in the earlier forms of the Sumerian Creation myth, its combination with the Dragon motif may have characterized the local Sumerian Version of Nippur. How mechanical was the Babylonian redactors' method of glorifying Marduk is seen in their use of the description of Tiamat and her monster brood, whom Marduk is made to conquer. To impress the hearers of the poem with his prowess, this is repeated at length no less than four times, one god carrying the news of her revolt to another.

Direct proof of the manner in which the later redactors have been obliged to modify the original Sumerian Creation myth, in consequence of their incorporation of other elements, may be seen in the Sixth Tablet of the poem, where Marduk states the reason for man's creation. In the second lecture we noted how the very words of the principal Sumerian Creator were put into Marduk's mouth; but the rest of the Semitic god's speech finds no equivalent in the Sumerian Version and was evidently inserted in order to reconcile the narrative with its later ingredients. This will best be seen by printing the two passages in parallel columns:

The comparison is justified whether we regard the Sumerian speech as a direct
The Sumerian Creator makes no distinctions; he refers to our announcement that the gods themselves must be punished and united and all are naturally regarded as worthy of man's worship. The order that the gods may have worshippers is at once followed by the their ways changed. In the Sumerian Version the gods are Semitic Version. For the statement that man will be created in version divine conflict has been introduced, and the future head houses, or temples, that shall be established. But in the later of the pantheon has conquered and humiliated the revolting deities. Their ways must therefore be altered before they are fit to receive the worship which was accorded them by right in their shrines may be built].

That the service of the gods may be established, and that [their] shrines [may be built].

1. 'I will alter the ways of the gods, and I will change [their paths]';
2. 'Together shall they be oppressed, and unto evil shall [they ...]'!

That in a clean spot he may establish our ...!

The welding of incongruous elements is very apparent in the Semitic Version. For the statement that man will be created in order that the gods may have worshippers is at once followed by the announcement that the gods themselves must be punished and their 'ways' changed. In the Sumerian Version the gods are united and all are naturally regarded as worthy of man's worship. The Sumerian Creator makes no distinctions; he refers to 'our houses', or temples, that shall be established. But in the later version divine conflict has been introduced, and the future head of the pantheon has conquered and humiliated the revolting deities. Their 'ways' must therefore be altered before they are fit to receive the worship which was accorded them by right in the simpler Sumerian tradition. In spite of the epitomized character of the Sumerian Version, a comparison of these passages suggests very forcibly that the Semitic-Babylonian myth of Creation is based upon a simpler Sumerian story, which has been elaborated to reconcile it with the Dragon myth.

The Semitic poem itself also supplies evidence of the independent existence of the Dragon myth apart from the process of Creation, for the story of Ea and Apsû, which it incorporates, is merely the local Dragon myth of Eridu. Its inclusion in the story is again simply a tribute to Marduk; for though Ea, now become Marduk's father, could conquer Apsû, he was afraid of Tiamat and turned back. The original Eridu myth no doubt represented preliminary to man's creation, or as a reassurance of his duty after his rescue from destruction by the Flood; see above, p. 55.

apocryphal additions to Daniel, we have direct evidence of the late survival of the Dragon motif apart from any trace of the Creation myth; in this connexion see Charbon, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. I (1913), p. 658 ff.

1. See above, p. 114.
2. See S. Ebeling, A Syrian tablet made for the library of Ashur-bani-pal.
3. 'The bēnu was the space that could be covered in two hours' travelling.
4. The Babylonian Dragon had progeny in the later apocalyptic literature, where we find very similar descriptions of the creatures' size. Among them we may perhaps include the dragon in the Apocalypse of Baruch, who, according to the Slavonic Version, apparently every day drinks a cubit's depth from the sea, and yet the sea does not sink because of the three hundred and sixty rivers that flow into it (cf. James, 'Apocrypha Anecdota', Second Series, in Arnhage Robinson's Texts and Studies, V, No. 1, pp. lixiv ff.). But Egypt's Dragon motif was even more prolific, and the Plato Sphynx undoubtedly suggested descriptions of the Serpent, especially in connexion with Hades.

Enki as conquering the watery Abyss, which became his home; but there is nothing to connect this tradition with his early creative activities. We have long possessed part of another local version of the Dragon myth, which describes the conquest of a dragon by some deity other than Marduk; and the fight is there described as taking place, not before Creation, but at a time when men existed and cities had been built. Men and gods were equally terrified at the monster's appearance, and it was to deliver the land from his clutches that one of the gods went out and slew him. Tradition delighted to dwell on the dragon's enormous size and terrible appearance. In this version he is described as fifty bēnu in length and one in height; his mouth measured six cubits and the circuit of his ears twelve; he dragged himself along in the water, which he lashed with his tail; and, when slain, his blood flowed for three years, three months, a day and a night. From this description we can see he was given the body of an enormous serpent.

A further version of the Dragon myth has now been identified on one of the tablets recovered during the recent excavations at Ashur, and in it the dragon is not entirely of serpent form, but is a true dragon with legs. Like the one just described, he is a male monster. The description occurs as part of a myth, of which the text is so badly preserved that only the contents of one column can be made out with any certainty. In it a god, whose name is wanting, announces the presence of the dragon: 'In the water he lies and i [...]' Thereupon a second god cries successively to Aruru, the mother-goddess, and to Pallit, another...
AN OMNIVOROUS MONSTER

Sumerian. It would be strange indeed if the Sumerians had not evolved a Dragon myth, for the Dragon combat is the most obvious of nature myths and is found in most mythologies of Europe and the Near East. The trailing storm-clouds suggest his serpent form, his fiery tongue is seen in the forked lightning, and, though he may darken the world for a time, the Sun-god will always be victorious. In Egypt the myth of 'the Overthrowing of Apep, the enemy of Ra' presents a close parallel to that of Tiamat; but of all Eastern mythologies that of the Chinese has inspired in art the most beautiful treatment of the Dragon, who, however, under his varied forms was for them essentially evil and beneficent. Doubtless the Semites of Babylonia had their own versions of the Dragon combat, both before and after their arrival on the Euphrates, but the particular version which the priests of Babylon wove into their epic is not one of them.

1 In his very interesting study of 'Sumerian and Akkadian Views of Beginnings', contributed to the "Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc., Vol. XXVI (1916), pp. 274 ff., Professor Jastrow suggests that the Dragon combat in the Semitic-Babylonian Creation poem is of Semitic not Sumerian origin. He does not examine the evidence of the poem itself in detail, but bases the suggestion mainly on the two hypotheses, that the Dragon combat of the poem was suggested by the winter storms and floods of the Euphrates Valley, and that the Sumerians came from a mountain region where water was not plentiful. If we grant both assumptions, the suggested conclusion does not seem to me necessary to follow, in view of the evidence we now possess as to the remote date of the Sumerian settlement in the Euphrates Valley (see Lecture I, pp. 27 ff.). Some evidence may still be held to point to a mountain home for the proto-Sumerians, such as the name of their early goddess Ninkhamaggag, 'the Lady of the Mountains'. But, as we must now regard Babylon itself as the cradle of their civilization, other data tend to lose something of their apparent significance. It is true that the same Sumerian sign means 'land' and 'mountain'; but it may have been difficult to obtain an intelligible profile for 'land' without adopting a mountain form. Such a name as Ekur, the 'Mountain House' of Nippur, may perhaps indicate size, not origin; and Ekur's association with metal-working (see above, p. 110) may be merely due to his character as God of Wisdom, and is not appropriate solely to a god whose home is in the mountains where metals are found. (op. cit., p. 286). It should be added that Professor Jastrow's theory of the Dragon combat is bound up with his view of the origin of an interesting Sumerian 'myth of beginnings', to which reference is made later; see below, p. 197.

2 Cf. Budge, "Gods of the Egyptians", Vol. I, p. 524 ff. The inclusion of the two versions of the Egyptian Creation myth, recording the Birth of the Gods (see above, p. 197), in the 'Book of the Overthrowing of Apep', does not present a very close parallel to the combination of Creation and Dragon myths in the Semitic-Babylonian poem, for in the Egyptian work the two myths are not really combined, the Creation Version being inserted in the middle of the spells against Apep, without any attempt at assimilation (see Budge, "Egyptian Literature", Vol. I, p. xvi).
We have thus traced four out of the five strands which form the Semitic-Babylonian poem of Creation to a Sumerian ancestry. And we now come back to the first of the strands, the Birth of the Gods, from which our discussion started. For if this too should prove to be Sumerian, it would help to fill in the gap in our Sumerian Creation myth, and might furnish us with some idea of the Sumerian view of 'beginnings', which preceded the acts of creation by the great gods. It will be remembered that the poem opens with the description of a time when heaven and earth did not exist, no field or marsh even had been created, and the universe consisted only of the primaeval water-gods, Apsû, Mummu, and Tiamat, whose waters were mingled together. Then follows the successive generation of two pairs of deities, Lakhmu and Lakhamu, and Anshar and Kishar, long ages separating the two generations from each other and from the birth of the great gods which subsequently takes place. In the summary of the myth which is given by Damascusius the names of the various deities accurately correspond to those in the opening lines of the poem; but he makes some notable additions, as will be seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damascusius</th>
<th>'Seven Tablets' I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsû — Tiamat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mummu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anshar — Kishar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu, Nudimmud (= Ea)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakhmu — Lakhamu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsû — Tiamat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the passage of the poem which describes the birth of the great gods after the last pair of primaeval deities, mention is duly made of Anu and Nudimmud (the latter a title of Ea), corresponding to the 'Apsû and 'Ašîš of Damascusius; but there appears to be no reference to Enlil, the original of 'Aûšû. It is just possible that his name occurred at the end of one of the broken lines, and, if so, we should have a complete parallel to Damascusius. But the traces are not in favour of the restoration.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Quaestiones de prörísimo principiis, cap. 128; ed. Kopp, p. 384.

\(^2\) Emended from the reading Δυάδες of the text.

\(^3\) Anu and Nudimmud are each mentioned for the first time at the beginning of a line, and the three lines following the reference to Nudimmud are entirely occupied with descriptions of his wisdom and power. It is also probable that the three preceding lines (II. 14-16), all of which refer to Anu by name, were entirely occupied with his description. But it is only in II. 18-19 that any reference to Enlil can have occurred, and the traces preserved of their second halves do not suggest the restoration.

\(^1\) Cf. Tabl. VII, I, 116.

Further evidence of this may be seen in the fact that Anu, Enlil, and Ea (i.e. Enki), who are here created together, are the three great gods of the Sumerian Version of Creation; it is they who create mankind with the help of the goddess Ninkharsagga, and in the fuller version of that myth we should naturally expect to find some account of their own origin. The reference in Damascusius to Marduk (Βηδαός) as the son of Ea and Damkina (Δαμκινα) is also of interest in this connexion, as it exhibits a goddess in close connexion with one of the three great gods, much as we find Ninkharsagga associated with them in the Sumerian Version.\(^2\) Before leaving the names, it may be added that, of the primaeval deities, Anshar and Kishar are obviously Sumerian in form.

It may be noted that the character of Apsû and Tiamat in this portion of the poem is quite at variance with their later actions. Their revolt at the ordered way of the gods was a necessary preliminary to the incorporation of the Dragon myths, in which Ea and Marduk are the heroes. Here they appear as entirely beneficent gods of the primaeval water, undisturbed by storms, in whose quiet depths the equally beneficent deities Lakhmu and

\(^2\) Damkina was the later wife of Ea or Enki; and Ninkharsagga is associated with Enki, as his consort, in another Sumerian myth (see above, p. 53, n. 4).

\(^3\) Tabl. I, II. 1-21.
Lakhmu, Anshar and Kishar, were generated. This interpretation, by the way, suggests a more satisfactory restoration for the close of the ninth line of the poem than any that has yet been proposed. That line is usually taken to imply that the gods were created 'in the midst of heaven', but I think the following rendering, in connexion with ll. 1-5, gives better sense:

When in the height heaven was not named,
And the earth beneath did not bear a name,
And the praeval Apê who begat them;
And Mammu, and Tiamat who bore them all.

(5) Their waters were mingled together,
(9) Then were created the gods in the midst of [their waters].

It the ninth line of the poem be restored as suggested, its account of the Birth of the Gods will be found to correspond accurately with the summary from Berossus, who, in explaining the myth, refers to the Babylonian belief that the universe consisted at first of moisture in which living creatures, such as he had already described, were generated. The praeval waters are originally the source of life, not of destruction, and it is in them that the gods are born, as in Egyptian mythology;

1 We may perhaps see a survival of Tiamat's original character in her control of the Tablets of Fate. The poem does not represent her as setting them in any successful fight; they appear to be already hers to bestow on Kingu, though in the later mythology they are 'not his by right' (cf. Tabl. I, II, 187 ff., and Tabl. IV, 1, 121).

2 i.e. the gods.

3 The ninth line is preserved only on a Neo-Babylonian duplicate (Seven Tablets, Vol. II, pl. 1). I suggested the restoration ki-rib ha-a-su-ri, 'in the midst of heaven', as possible, since the traces of the first sign in the last word of the line seemed to be those of the Neo-Babylonian form of 6a. The restoration appeared at the time not altogether satisfactory in view of the first line of the poem, and it could only be justified by supposing that bandmu, or 'heaven', was already vaguely conceived as in existence (op. cit., Vol. I, p. 8, n. 14). But the traces of the sign, as I have given them (op. cit., Vol. II, pl. 1), may also possibly be those of the Neo-Babylonian form of the sign ma; and I would now restore the end of the line in the Neo-Babylonian tablet as ki-rib ma-ki-mu, 'in the midst of their water', corresponding to the form mu-ki-mu in 1.5 of this duplicate. In the Assyrian Version 6a(plf)-ku-mu would be read in both lines. It will be possible to verify the new reading, by a re-examination of the traces on the tablet, when the British Museum collections again become available for study after the war.

4 ἐνωρίας γὰρ ἔτοι μετὰ τοῦ πικροῦ καὶ ζῶνος ἐν αὐτῷ δειδομένην [χρήσθη] εἰπ. His creatures of the praeval water were killed by the light; and terrestrial animals were then created which could bear (i.e. breathe and exist in) the air.

there Nu, the praeval water-god from whom Ra was self-created, never ceased to be the Sun-god's supporter. The change in the Babylonian conception was obviously introduced by the combination of the Dragon myth with that of Creation, a combination that in Egypt would never have been justified by the gentle Nile. From a study of some of the names at the beginning of the Babylonian poem we have already seen reason to suspect that its version of the Birth of the Gods goes back to Sumerian times, and it is pertinent to ask whether we have any further evidence that in Sumerian belief water was the origin of all things.

For many years we have possessed a Sumerian myth of Creation, which has come to us on a late Babylonian tablet as the introductory section of an incantation. It is provided with a Semitic translation, and to judge from its record of the building of Babylon and Esagila, Marduk's temple, and its identification of Marduk himself with the Creator, it has clearly undergone some editing at the hands of the Babylonian priests. Moreover, the occurrence of various episodes out of their logical order, and the fact that the text records twice over the creation of swamps and marshes, reeds and trees or forests, animals and cities, indicate that two Sumerian myths have been combined. Thus we have no guarantee that the other cities referred to by name in the text, Nippur, Erech, and Eridu, are mentioned in any significant connexion with each other. Of the actual cause of Creation the text appears to give two versions also, one in its present form impersonal, and the other carried out by a god. But these two accounts are quite unlike the authorized version of Babylon, and we may confidently regard them as representing genuine Sumerian myths. The text resembles other early accounts of Creation by introducing its narrative with a series of negative statements, which serve to indicate the preceding non-existence of the world, as will be seen from the following extract:

1 See below, p. 128 f. 2 Cf. p. 95.

3 The composite nature of the text is discussed by Professor Jastrow in his Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions, pp. 89 ff.; and in his paper in the Jour. Amer. Or. Soc., Vol. XXXVI (1916), pp. 279 ff., he has analysed it into two main versions, which he suggests originated in Eridu and Nippur respectively. The evidence of the text does not appear to me to support the view that any reference to a watery chaos preceding Creation must necessarily be of Semitic origin; see above, p. 119, n. 1. For the literature of the text (first published by Finches, Jour. Roy. Asiat. Soc., Vol. XXIII, pp. 308 ff.), see Sec. Tabl., Vol. I, p. 190.

4 Obv., ll. 5-12.
No city had been created, no creature had been made,  
Nippur had not been created, Ekur had not been built,  
Erech had not been created, Eanna had not been built,  
Apsu had not been created, Eridu had not been built,  
Of the holy house, the house of the gods, the habitation had  
not been created.

All lands1 were sea.

At the time when a channel (was formed) in the midst of the sea,  
Then was Eridu created, Esagila was built, etc.

Here we have the definite statement that before Creation all the  
world was sea. And it is important to note that the primaeval  
water is not personified; the ordinary Sumerian word for ©sea©  
is employed, which the Semitic translator has faithfully rendered  
in his version of the text.2 The reference to a channel in the  
sea, as the cause of Creation, seems at first sight a little obscure;  
but the word implies a ‘drain’ or ‘water-channel’, not a current  
of the sea itself, and the reference may be explained as suggested  
by the drainage of a flood-area. No doubt the phrase was  
elaborated in the original myth, and it is possible that what  
appears to be a second version of Creation later on in the text  
is really part of the more detailed narrative of the first myth.  
There the Creator himself is named. He is the Sumerian god  
Gilimma, and in the Semitic translation Mardik’s name is sub  
stituted. To the following couplet, which describes Gilimma’s  
method of creation, is appended a further extract from a later  
portion of the text, there evidently displaced, giving additional  
details of the Creator’s work:

(17) Gilimma bound reeds in the face of the waters,  
(18) He formed soil and poured it out beside the reeds.3

1 Sum. nigin kur-kur-ru-ge, Sem. nup-her na-te-a-tu, lit. ‘all lands’, i.e.  
Sumerian and Babylonian expressions for ‘the world’.

2 Sum. a-ab-bi, ‘sea’, is here rendered by ti-tum, not by its personified  
equivalent Ti-ninat.

3 The suggestion has been made that annu, the word in the Semitic version  
here translated ‘reeds’, should be connected with anamu, the word used for  
‘earth’ or ‘dry land’ in the Babylonian Creation Series, Tabl. I, 1, 2, and given  
some such meaning as ‘expanses’. The couplet is thus explained to mean that  
the god made an expanse on the face of the water, and then poured out dust  
‘on the expanse’. But the Semitic version in L. 18 reads erti ami, ‘beside the  
alpha’, not ina ami, ‘on the alpha’; and in any case there does not seem much  
significance in the act of pouring out specially created dust on or beside land  
already formed. The Sumerian word translated by annu is written gi-dir, with  
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(31) He1 filled in a dike by the side of the sea,  
(32) He . . . a marsh, he formed a marsh.  
(33) He . . . he brought into existence,  
(34) Reeds he formed,11 trees he created.

Here the Sumerian Creator is pictured as forming dry land  
from the primaeval water in much the same way as the early  
cultivator in the Euphrates Valley procured the rich fields for  
his crops. The existence of the earth is here not really  
assumed. All the world was sea until the god created land out  
of the waters by the only practical method that was possible in  
Mesopotamia.

In another Sumerian myth, which has been recovered on one  
of the early tablets from Nippur, we have a rather different picture  
of beginnings. For there, though water is the source of life, the  
existence of the land is presupposed. But it is bare and deso  
late, as in the Mesopotamian season of ‘low water’. The under  
lying idea is suggestive of a period when some progress in  
systematic irrigation had already been made, and the filling of  
the dry canals and subsequent irrigation of the parched ground  
by the rising flood of Enki was not dreaded but eagerly desired.  
The myth is only one of several that have been combined to  
form the introductory sections of an incantation; but in all of  
them Enki, the god of the deep water, plays the leading part,  
though associated with different consorts.3 The incantation is  

the element pi, ‘reed’, in L. 17, and though in the following line it is written  
under its variant form a-dir without pi, the equation gi-dir = annu is elsewhere  
attested (cf. Delitsch, Handwörterbuch, p. 77). In favour of regarding annu as  
some sort of reed, here used collectively, it may be pointed out that the  
Sumerian verb in L. 17 is ki, ‘to bind’, accurately rendered by ruba in the  
Semitic version. Assuming that L. 24 belongs to the same account, the creation  
of reeds in general beside trees, after dry land is formed, would not of course  
be at variance with the god’s use of some sort of reed in his first act of creation.  
He creates the reed-bundles, as he creates the soil, both of which go to form  
the first dike; the reed-beds, like the other vegetation, sprouting from the  
ground when it appears.

1 The Semitic version here reads ‘the lord Marduk’; the corresponding  
nname in the Sumerian text is not preserved.

2 The line is restored from l. 2 of the opposite of the text.

Amer. Or. Soc., Vol. XXXVI, pp. 122 ff., and in particular his detailed study of  
the text in Amer. Journ. Semit. Lang., Vol. XXXIII, pp. 91 ff. Dr. Langdon’s  
first description of the text, in Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch., Vol. XXXVI (1914),  
pp. 188 ff., was based on a comparatively small fragment only; and on his  

---
directed against various diseases, and the recital of the closing mythical section was evidently intended to enlist the aid of special gods in combating them. The creation of these deities is recited under set formulae in a sort of refrain, and the divine name assigned to each bears a magical connexion with the sickness he or she is intended to dispel. 1

We have already noted examples of a similar use of myth in magic, which was common in both Egypt and Babylonia; 2 and to illustrate its employment against disease, as in the Nippur document, it will suffice to cite a well-known magical cure for the toothache which was adopted in Babylon. 3 There toothache was believed to be caused by the gnawing of a worm in the gum, and a myth was used in the incantation intended to relieve it. The worm's origin is traced from Anu, the god of heaven, through a descending scale of creation; Anu, the heavens, the earth, rivers, canals and marshes are represented as each giving rise to the next in order, until finally the marshes produce the worm. The myth then relates how the worm, on being offered tempting food by Ea in answer to her prayer, asked to be allowed to drink the blood of the teeth, and the incantation closes by invoking the curse of Ea because of the worm's misguided choice. It is clear that power over the worm was obtained by a recital of her

completion of the text from other fragments in Pennsylvania, Professor Sayce at once realized that the preliminary diagnosis of a Deluge myth could not be sustained (cf. K. C. Times, Nov., 1918, pp. 88 f.). He, Professor Prince, and Professor Jastrow independently showed that the action of Enki in the myth in sending water on the land was not punitive but beneficent; and the preceding section, in which animals are described as not performing their usual activities, was shown independently by Professor Prince and Professor Jastrow to have reference, not to their different nature in an ideal existence in Paradise, but, on familiar lines, to their non-existence in a desolate land. It may be added that Professor Barton and Dr. Peters agree generally with Professor Prince and Professor Jastrow in their interpretation of the text, which excludes the suggested biblical parallel; and I understand from Dr. Langdon that he very rightly recognizes that the text is not a Deluge myth. It is a subject for congratulation that the discussion has materially increased our knowledge of this difficult composition.

1 Cf. Col. VI, II. 24 E.; thus Ab-nu was created for the sickness of the cow (ab); Nin-ta for that of their flock (n-ta); Nin-te-nu and Nin-la-ni for that of the month (bu); Nin-na for that of the ne-zi (meaning uncertain); Ma-ta-nu for that of the do-zi (meaning uncertain); Nin-ta for that of til (life); the name of the eighth and last deity is imperfectly preserved.

2 See above, pp. 86 f., 107; and cf. p. 68, 86 f., 119, n. 2.

3 See Thompson, Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia, Vol. II, pp. 100 E.; for a number of other examples, see Jastrow, J. A. O. S., Vol. XXXVI, p. 276, n. 7.

creation and of her subsequent ingratitude, which led to her present occupation and the curse under which she laboured. When the myth and invocation had been recited three times over the proper mixture of beer, a plant, and oil, and the mixture had been applied to the offending tooth, the worm would fall under the spell of the curse and the patient would at once gain relief. The example is instructive, as the connexion of ideas is quite clear. In the Nippur document the recital of the creation of the eight deities evidently ensured their presence, and a demonstration of the mystic bond between their names and the corresponding diseases rendered the working of their powers effective. Our knowledge of a good many other myths is due solely to their magical employment.

Perhaps the most interesting section of the new text is one in which divine instructions are given in the use of plants, the fruit or roots of which may be eaten. Here Usmu, a messenger from Enki, God of the Deep, names eight such plants by Enki's orders, thereby determining the character of each. As Professor Jastrow has pointed out, the passage forcibly recalls the story from Berossus, concerning the mythical creature Caimen, who came up from the Erythraean Sea, where it borders upon Babylonia, to instruct mankind in all things, including 'seeds and the gathering of fruits.' 1 But the only part of the text that concerns us here is the introductory section, where the life-giving flood, by which the dry fields are irrigated, is pictured as following the union of the water-deities, Enki and Ninlil. 2 Professor Jastrow is right in emphasizing the complete absence of any conflict in this Sumerian myth of beginnings; but, as with the other Sumerian Versions we have examined, it seems to me there is no need to seek its origin elsewhere than in the Euphrates Valley.

Even in later periods, when the Sumerian myths of Creation had been superseded by that of Babylon, the Euphrates never ceased to be regarded as the source of life and the creator of all things. And this is well brought out in the following intro-

1 Cf. Jastrow, J. A. O. S., Vol. XXXVI, p. 127, and A. J. S. L., Vol. XXXIII, p. 134 f. It may be added that the divine naming of the plants also presents a faint parallel to the naming of the beasts and birds by man himself in Gen. ii. 19 f.

2 Professor Jastrow (A. J. S. L., Vol. XXXIII, p. 115) compares similar myths collected by Sir James Frazer (Magic Art, Vol. II, chap. xi and chap. xii, § 9). He also notes the parallel the irrigation myth presents to the mist (or flood) of the earlier Hebrew Version (Gen. ii. 5 f.). But Enki, like Ea, was no mister; he had his dwelling in the Euphrates and the Deep (see below, p. 128).
Neo-Babylonian copies

ance of the fertile soil, after the receding inundation, doubtless suggested the idea of creation out of water, and the stream’s slow but automatic fall would furnish a model for the age-long evolution of primeval deities. When a god’s active and artificial creation of the earth must be portrayed, it would have been natural for the primitive Sumerian to picture the Creator working as he himself would work when he reclaimed a field from flood. We are thus shown the old Sumerian god Gilimmu piling reed-bundles in the water and heaping up soil beside them, till the ground within his dike dries off and produces luxuriant vegetation. But here there is a hint of struggle in the process, and we perceive in it the myth-redactor’s opportunity to weave in the Dragon motif. No such excuse is afforded by the other Sumerian myth, which pictures the life-producing inundation as the gift of the two deities of the Deep and the product of their union.

But in their other aspect the rivers of Mesopotamia could be terrible; and the Dragon motif itself, on the Tigris and Euphrates, drew its imagery as much from flood as from storm. When therefore a single deity must be made to appear, not only as Creator, but also as the champion of his divine allies and the conqueror of other gods, it was inevitable that the myths attaching to the waters under their two aspects should be combined. This may already have taken place at Nippur, when Enlil became the head of the pantheon; but the existence of his myth is conjectural.1 In a later age we can trace the process in the light of the Babylonian poem of Creation (see above, p. 114). It is significant that his first title, Asuri, should be interpreted as ‘Destroyer of the foe’; but the great majority of the titles and their Semitic glosses refer to creative activities, not to the Dragon myth.

---


2 The aspect of Enlil as the Creator of Vegetation is emphasized in Tablet VII of the Babylonian poem of Creation (see above, p. 114). It is significant that his first title, Asuri, should be interpreted as ‘Destroyer of the foe’; but the great majority of the titles and their Semitic glosses refer to creative activities, not to the Dragon myth.
connexion between those of the Semitic Babylonians and the Hebrews is far closer and more striking than that which can be traced when the latter are placed beside the Sumerian originals. We may therefore regard it as certain that the Hebrews derived themselves, but through Semitic channels from Babylon.

It will be unnecessary here to go in detail through the points of resemblance that are admitted to exist between the Hebrew account of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis and that preserved in the ‘Seven Tablets’. It will suffice to emphasize two of them, which gain in significance through our newly acquired knowledge of early Sumerian beliefs. It must be admitted that, on first reading the poem, one is struck more by the differences than by the parallels; but that is due to the polytheistic basis of the poem, which attracts attention when compared with the severe and dignified monotheism of the Hebrew writer. And if allowance be made for the change in theological standpoint, the material points of resemblance are seen to be very marked. The outline or general course of events is the same. In both we have an abyss of waters at the beginning denoted by almost the same Semitic word, the Hebrew tehom, translated ‘the deep’ in Gen. i. 2, being the equivalent of the Semitic-Babylonian Tiamat, the monster of storm and flood who presents so striking a contrast to the Sumerian primaeval water. 3 The second act of Creation in the Hebrew narrative is that of a firmament, which divided the waters under it from those above.* But this, as we have seen, has no parallel in the early Sumerian conception until it was combined with the Dragon combat in the form in which we find it in the Babylonian poem. There the body of Tiamat is divided by Marduk, and from one half of her he constructs a covering or dome for heaven, that is to say a firmament, to keep her upper waters in place. These will suffice as test passages, since they serve to point out quite clearly the Semitic

source to which all the other detailed points of Hebrew resemblance may be traced.

In the case of the Deluge traditions, so conclusive a demonstration is not possible, since we have no similar criterion to apply. And on one point, as we saw, the Hebrew Versions preserve an original Sumerian strand of the narrative that was not woven into the Gilgamesh Epic, where there is no parallel to the piety of Noah. But from the detailed description that was given in the second lecture, it will have been noted that the Sumerian account is on the whole far simpler and more primitive than the other versions. It is only in the Babylonian Epic, for example, that the later Hebrew writer finds material from which to construct the ark, while the sweet savour of Ut-napishtim’s sacrifice, and possibly his sending forth of the birds, though reproduced in the earlier Hebrew Version, find no parallels in the Sumerian account. As to the general character of the Flood, there is no direct reference to rain in the Sumerian Version, though its presence is probably implied in the storm. The heavy rain of the Babylonian Epic has been increased to forty days of rain in the earlier Hebrew Version, which would be suitable to a country where local rain was the sole cause of flood. But the later Hebrew writer’s addition of ‘the fountains of the deep’ to ‘the windows of heaven’ certainly suggests a more intimate knowledge of Mesopotamia, where some contributory cause other than local rain must be sought for the sudden and overwhelming catastrophes of which the rivers are capable.

Thus, viewed from a purely literary standpoint, we are now enabled to trace back to a primitive age the ancestry of the traditions, which, under a very different aspect, eventually found their way into Hebrew literature. And in the process we may note the changes they underwent as they passed from one race to another. The result of such literary analysis and comparison, so far from discrediting the narratives in Genesis, throws into still stronger relief the moral grandeur of the Hebrew text.

We come then to the question, at what periods and by what process did the Hebrews become acquainted with Babylonian ideas? The tendency of the purely literary school of critics has been to explain the process by the direct use of Babylonian

---

1 See the comparative table of Versions given as Appendix I, p. 142 f.
3 The invariable use of the Hebrew word tehom without the article, except in two passages in the plural, proves that it is a proper name (cf. Skinner, op. cit., p. 17); and its correspondence with Tiamat makes the resemblance of the versions far more significant than if their parallelism were confined solely to ideas (see above, p. 108, n. 1).
4 Gen. i. 6-8.
documents wholly within exilic times. If the Creation and Deluge narratives stood alone, a case might perhaps be made out for confining Babylonian influence to this late period. It is true that during the Captivity the Jews were directly exposed to such influence. They had the life and civilization of their captors immediately before their eyes, and it would have been only natural for the more learned among the Hebrew scribes and priests to interest themselves in the ancient literature of their new home. And any previous familiarity with the myths of Babylonia would undoubtedly have been increased by actual residence in the country. We may perhaps see a result of such acquaintance with Babylonian literature, after Jehoiachin's deportation, in an interesting literary parallel that has been pointed out between Ezek. xiv. 12-20 and a speech in the Babylonian account of the Deluge in the Gilgamesh Epic, XI, ll. 180-194. The passage in Ezekiel occurs within chaps. i-xiv, which correspond to the prophet's first period and consist in the main of his utterances in exile before the fall of Jerusalem. It forms, in fact, the introduction to the prophet's announcement of the coming of 'four sore judgements upon Jerusalem,' from which there 'shall be left a remnant that shall be carried forth.' But in consequence, here and there, of traces of a later point of view, it is generally admitted that many of the chapters in this section may have been considerably amplified and altered by Ezekiel himself in the course of writing. And if we may regard the literary parallel that has been pointed out as anything more than fortuitous, it is open to us to assume that chap. xiv may have been worked up by Ezekiel many years after his prophetic call at Tel-abib.

In the passage of the Babylonian Epic, Enlil had already sent the Flood and had destroyed the good with the wicked. Ea thereupon remonstrates with him, and he urges that in future the sinner only should be made to suffer for his sin; and, instead of again causing a flood, let there be discrimination in the divine punishments sent on men or lands. While the flood made the escape of the deserving impossible, other forms of punishment would affect the guilty only. In Ezekiel the subject is the same, but the point of view is different. The land the prophet has in mind in verse 13 is evidently Judah, and his desire is to explain why it will suffer although not all its inhabitants deserved to share its fate. The discrimination, which Ea urges, Ezekiel asserts will be made; but the sinner must bear his own sin, and the righteous, however eminent, can only save themselves by their righteousness. The general principle propounded in the Epic is here applied to a special case. But the parallelism between the passages lies not only in the general principle but also in the literary setting. This will best be brought out by printing the passages in parallel columns.


(180) Enlil opened his mouth and spake, 1
He said to the warrior Ea:
Thou director of the gods! O warrior!
Why didst thou not take counsel but didst cause a flood?
On the sinner lay his sin,
On the transgressor lay his transgression!
Be merciful, so that (all) be not destroyed! It, they should deliver! Be not cut off! Instead of causing a flood,
Let famine come and diminish mankind! Instead of causing a flood,

1 Both Babylonian words are in the singular, but probably used collectively, as is the case with their Hebrew equivalent in Ezek. xiv. 18.

Ezek. xiv. 12-20.

12 And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,
13 Son of man, when a land sinneth against me by committing a trespass, and I stretch out mine hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof, and send famine upon it, and cut off from it men and beast; 14 though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God.

15 If I cause wild beasts to pass through the land, and they spoil it, so that it be desolate, that no man may pass through because of the beasts; 16 though these three men were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters; they only shall be delivered, but the land shall be desolate.
(194) Let the Plague-god come and [slay] mankind!

17 Or if I bring a sword upon that land, and say, Sword, go through the land; so that I cut off from it man and beast; 18 though these three men were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither sons nor daughters, but they only shall be delivered themselves.

19 Or if I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood, to cut off from it man and beast; 20 though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness.

It will be seen that, of the four kinds of divine punishment mentioned, three accurately correspond in both compositions. Famine and pestilence occur in both, while the lions and leopards of the Epic find an equivalent in ‘noisome beasts’. The sword is not referred to in the Epic, but as this had already threatened Jerusalem at the time of the prophecy’s utterance its inclusion by Ezekiel was inevitable. Moreover, the fact that Noah should be named in the refrain, as the first of the three proverbial examples of righteousness, shows that Ezekiel had the Deluge in his mind, and increases the significance of the underlying parallel between his argument and that of the Babylonian poet. 1 This suggestion is in some measure confirmed by the Biblical Antiquities of Philo, ascribed by Dr. James to the closing years of the first century A.D.; for its writer, in his account of the Flood, has actually used Ezek. xiv. 21 ff. in order to elaborate the divine speech in Gen. viii. 21 ff. This will be seen from the following extract, in which the passage interpolated between verses 21 and 22 of Gen. viii is enclosed within brackets: ‘And God said: I will not again curse the earth for man’s sake, for the sake of man’s heart hath left off (sic) to his youth. And therefore I will not again destroy together all living as I have done. [But it shall be, when the dwellers upon earth have sinned, I will judge them by famine or by the sword or by fire or by pestilence (lit. death), and there shall be earthquakes, and they shall be scattered into places not inhabited (or, the places of their habitation shall be scattered).] But I will not again spoil the earth with the water of a flood, and in all the days of the earth seed time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and autumn, day and night shall not cease . . .’; see James, The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, p. 81, ill. 9. Here wild beasts are omitted, and fire, earthquakes, and exile are added; but famine, sword, and pestilence are prominent, and the whole passage is clearly suggested by Ezekiel. As a result of the combination, we have in the Biblical Antiquities a complete parallel to the passage in the Gilgamesh Epic.

many features in the story of Paradise, though no equivalent of the story itself has been recovered. In the legend of Adapa, for example, wisdom and immortality are the prerogative of the gods, and the winning of immortality by man is bound up with eating the Food of Life and drinking the Water of Life; here too man is left with the gift of wisdom, but immortality is withheld. And the association of winged guardians with the Sacred Tree in Babylonian art is at least suggestive of the Cherubim and the Tree of Life. The very site of Eden has now been identified in Southern Babylonia by means of an old boundary-stone acquired by the British Museum a year or two ago.

But I need not now detain you by going over this familiar ground. Such possible echoes from Babylon seem to suggest pre-exilic influence rather than late borrowing, and they surely justify us in inquiring to what periods of direct or indirect contact, earlier than the Captivity, the resemblances between Hebrew and Babylonian ideas may be traced. One point, which we may regard as definitely settled by our new material, is that these stories of the Creation and of the early history of the world were not of Semitic origin. It is no longer possible to regard the Hebrew and Babylonian Versions as descended from common Semitic originals. For we have now recovered some of those originals, and they are not Semitic but Sumerian. The question thus resolves itself into an inquiry as to periods during which the Hebrews may have come into direct or indirect contact with Babylonia.

There are three pre-exilic periods at which it has been suggested the Hebrews, or the ancestors of the race, may have acquired a knowledge of Babylonian traditions. The earliest of these is the age of the patriarchs, the traditional ancestors of the Hebrew nation. The second period is that of the settlement in Canaan, which we may put from 1200 B.C. to the establishment of David's kingdom at about 1000 B.C. The third period is that of the later Judaean monarchy, from 734 to 586 B.C., the date of the fall of Jerusalem; and in this last period there are two

1 Cf. especially Skinner, Genesis, pp. 90 ff. For the latest discussion of the Serpent and the Tree of Life, suggested by Dr. Skinner's summary of the evidence, see Frazer in Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway (1913), pp. 413 ff.

evidence of cultural contact. Thus the hypothesis that the Hebrew patriarchs were subjects of Babylon in Palestine is not required as an explanation of the facts; and our first period still stands or falls by the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, which must be decided on quite other grounds. Those who do not accept the traditional view will probably be content to rule this first period out.

During the second period, that of the settlement in Canaan, the Hebrews came into contact with a people who had used the Babylonian language as the common medium of communication throughout the Near East. It is an interesting fact that among the numerous letters found at Tell el-Amarna were two texts of quite a different character. These were legends, both in the form of school exercises, which had been written out for practice in the Babylonian tongue. One of them was the legend of Adapa, in which we noted just now a distant resemblance to the Hebrew story of Paradise. It seems to me we are here standing on rather firmer ground; and provisionally we might place the beginning of our process after the time of Hebrew contact with the Canaanites.

Under the earlier Hebrew monarchy there was no fresh influx of Babylonian culture into Palestine. That does not occur till our last main period, the later Judaean monarchy, when, in consequence of the westward advance of Assyria, the civilization of Babylon was once more carried among the petty Syrian states. Israel was first drawn into the circle of Assyrian influence, when Ahaz fought as the ally of Benhadad of Damascus at the battle of Karkar in 854 B.C.; and from that date onward the nation was menaced by the invading power. In 734 B.C., at the invitation of Ahaz of Judah, Tiglath-pileser IV definitely intervened in the affairs of Israel. For Ahaz purchased his help against the allied armies of Israel and Syria in the Syro-Ephraimitish war, Tiglath-pileser threw his forces against Damascus and Israel, and Ahaz became his vassal. To this period, when Ahaz, like Panammu II, ‘ran at the wheel of his lord, the king of Assyria’, we may ascribe the first marked invasion of Assyrian influence over Judah. Traces of it may be seen in the altar which Ahaz caused to be erected in Jerusalem after the pattern of the Assyrian altar at Damascus. We saw in the first lecture, in the monuments we have recovered of Panammu I and of Bar-rekub, how the life of another small Syrian state was inevitably changed and thrown into new channels by the presence of Tiglath-pileser and his armies in the West.

Hezekiah’s resistance checked the action of Assyrian influence on Judah for a time. But it was intensified under his son Manasseh, when Judah again became tributary to Assyria, and in the house of the Lord altars were built to all the host of heaven. Towards the close of his long reign Manasseh himself was summoned by Ashur-bani-pal to Babylon. So when in the year 586 B.C. the Jewish exiles came to Babylon they could not have found in its mythology an entirely new and unfamiliar subject. They must have recognized several of its stories as akin to those they had assimilated and now regarded as their own. And this would naturally have inclined them to further study and comparison.

The answer I have outlined to this problem is the one that appears to me most probable, but I do not suggest that it is the only possible one that can be given. What I do suggest is that the Hebrews must have gained some acquaintance with the legends of Babylon in pre-exilic times. And it depends on our reading of the evidence into which of the three main periods the beginning of the process may be traced.

So much, then, for the influence of Babylon. We have seen that no similar problem arises with regard to the legends of Egypt. At first sight this may seem strange, for Egypt lay nearer than Babylon to Palestine, and political and commercial intercourse was at least as close. We have already noted how Egypt influenced Semitic art, and how she offered an ideal, on the material side of existence, which was readily adopted by her smaller neighbours. Moreover, the Joseph traditions in Genesis give a remarkably accurate picture of ancient Egyptian life; and even the Egyptian proper names embedded in that narrative may be paralleled with native Egyptian names of a later period than that to which the traditions refer. Why then is it that the actual myths and legends of Egypt concerning the origin of the world and its civilization should have failed to impress the Hebrew mind, which, on the other hand, was so responsive to those of Babylon?

One obvious answer would be, that it was Nebuchadnezzar II, and not Necho, who carried the Jews captive. And we may readily admit that the Captivity must have tended to perpetuate and intensify the effects of any Babylonian influence that may

1 2 Kings xvi. 7 ff. 2 Kings xvi. 10 ff. 1 Cf. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 ff.
have previously been felt. But I think there is a wider and in that sense a better answer than that.

I do not propose to embark at this late hour on what ethnologists know as the 'Hamitic' problem. But it is a fact that many striking parallels to Egyptian religious belief and practice have been traced among races of the Sudan and East Africa. These are perhaps in part to be explained as the result of contact and cultural inheritance. But at the same time they are evidence of an African, but non-Negroid, substratum in the religion of ancient Egypt. In spite of his proto-Semitic strain, the ancient Egyptian himself never became a Semite. The Nile Valley, at any rate until the Moslem conquest, was stronger than its invaders; it received and moulded them to its own ideal. This quality was shared in some degree by the Euphrates Valley. But Babylonia was not endowed with Egypt's isolation; she was always open on the south and west to the Arabian nomad, who at a far earlier period sealed her Semitic type.

To such racial division and affinity I think we may confidently trace the influence exerted by Egypt and Babylon respectively upon Hebrew tradition.
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## APPENDIX I

### COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SUMERIAN, SEMITIC-BABYLONIAN, HELLENISTIC, AND HEBREW VERSIONS OF CREATION, ANTEDILUVIAN HISTORY, AND THE DELUGE

N.B.—Parallels with the new Sumerian Version are printed in heavy type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumerian Version</th>
<th>Seven Tablets</th>
<th>Gilgamesh Epic XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No heaven or earth</td>
<td>No heaven or earth</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Creation from primaeval water without conflict; cf. Later Sumerian Version</td>
<td>Primaeval water-gods: Apsê-Šamaûl, Mamiûm, Lakhmu-Lakhmu</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of great gods: Anu, Enlil, and Ninhursag, creating deities</td>
<td>Generation of: Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Ninhursag</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plant or herb</td>
<td>Ground watered by mist (or flood)</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of firmament, to divide heaven and earth</td>
<td>No plant or herb</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man from Creator's blood and from earth</td>
<td>Creation of vegetation, animals, and woman; The line of Cain</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of animals</td>
<td>Creation of luminaries (probable order)</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of kingdom</td>
<td>Creation of animals from earth</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Antediluvian cities: Eridu, Nippur, Larsa, Sippar, Shuruppak</td>
<td>Creation of animals able to bear the air</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nointu protesting</td>
<td>Conquest of Apsê by Enlil</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziusudu, hero of Deluge, king</td>
<td>Conquest of Tiamat by Marduk asSun-god</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning of Ziusudu</td>
<td>Creation of covering for heaven from half of Tiamat's body, to keep her waters in place</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning of Noah, and Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Creation of luminaries (probable order)</td>
<td>Creation of man from dust and Creator's breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Rest on Seventh Day</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nephilim</td>
<td>Antediluvian patriarchs [or flood]</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Destruction of all flesh decreed, because of its corruption</td>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning of Noah by Kronos in dream</td>
<td>Warning of Ut-napishtim by Ea in dream</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of ship: 500 x 200 x 100 cubits; 7 stories; 9 divisions</td>
<td>Size of ship: 120 x 120 x 120 cubits</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All kinds of animals</td>
<td>All kinds of animals</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatement of waters tested by birds</td>
<td>Abatement of waters tested by birds</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice to Sun-god in ship</td>
<td>Sacrifice to gods, after landing and paying adoration to earth</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amu and Emill appeased by Heaven and Earth</td>
<td>Sacrifice with sweet savour after landing</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortality of Ziusudu and his wife</td>
<td>Immortality of Ut-napishtim and his wife</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### APPENDIX I—continued

### COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SUMERIAN, SEMITIC-BABYLONIAN, HELLENISTIC, AND HEBREW VERSIONS OF CREATION, ANTEDILUVIAN HISTORY, AND THE DELUGE

N.B.—Parallels with the new Sumerian Version are printed in heavy type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darkness and water</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
<td>Earth without form and void; darkness on face of tohu, the primaeval water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of great gods: Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Ninhursag</td>
<td>Birth of great gods: 'Aven, 'Ummâs, 'Adû</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Apsê by Enlil</td>
<td>Conquest of Šamaûl by Ea</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Tiamat by Marduk as Sun-god</td>
<td>Conquest of Tiamat by Marduk as Sun-god</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of covering for heaven from half of Tiamat's body, to keep her waters in place</td>
<td>Creation of covering for heaven from half of Tiamat's body, to keep her waters in place</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of luminaries (probable order)</td>
<td>Creation of luminaries</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man from Creator's blood and from earth</td>
<td>Creation of animals able to bear the air</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man from Creator's blood and from earth</td>
<td>Creation of animals able to bear the air</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX I—continued

---

### APPENDIX I—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darkness and water</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
<td>Earth without form and void; darkness on face of tohu, the primaeval water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of great gods: Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Ninhursag</td>
<td>Birth of great gods: 'Aven, 'Ummâs, 'Adû</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Apsê by Enlil</td>
<td>Conquest of Šamaûl by Ea</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Tiamat by Marduk as Sun-god</td>
<td>Conquest of Tiamat by Marduk as Sun-god</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of covering for heaven from half of Tiamat's body, to keep her waters in place</td>
<td>Creation of covering for heaven from half of Tiamat's body, to keep her waters in place</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of luminaries (probable order)</td>
<td>Creation of luminaries</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man from Creator's blood and from earth</td>
<td>Creation of animals able to bear the air</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man from Creator's blood and from earth</td>
<td>Creation of animals able to bear the air</td>
<td>Creation of earth and heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Noah, hero of Deluge</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Noah's favor</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
<td>Creation of man in image of Creator, to have dominion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning of Noah by Kronos in dream</td>
<td>Warning of Ut-napishtim by Ea in dream</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of ship: 500 x 200 x 100 cubits; 7 stories; 9 divisions</td>
<td>Size of ship: 120 x 120 x 120 cubits</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All kinds of animals</td>
<td>All kinds of animals</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatement of waters tested by birds</td>
<td>Abatement of waters tested by birds</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice to gods, after landing and paying adoration to earth</td>
<td>Sacrifice with sweet savour after landing</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's promise to Noah</td>
<td>Noah's promise to Noah</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah not again to curse the ground</td>
<td>Noah not again to curse the ground</td>
<td>Noah's righteousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### APPENDIX I—continued
APPENDIX II

THE ANTEDILUVIAN KINGS OF BEROSSUS AND THE SUMERIAN DYNASTIC LIST

It may be of assistance to the reader to repeat in tabular form the equivalents to the mythical kings of Berossus which are briefly discussed in Lecture I. In the following table the two new equations, obtained from the earliest section of the Sumerian Dynastic List, are printed in heavy type. The established equations to other names are printed in ordinary type without brackets, while those for which we should possibly seek other equivalents are enclosed within brackets. Aruru has not been included as a possible equivalent for "Almuros."

1. AXcopos
2. ©AXaTrapos [?©AScurapos], Aλμορός, Alamarus
3. 'Ap©iA©O©S, Aacos
4. ©ET©p©X©S, Eieficopecr^os, Edoranchus
5. Masp©, Masp©, Masp©, Amegalarus
6. AXcopos, Axcopos, Axcopos, Alapaurus
7. Aruru has not been included as a possible equivalent for "AXcopos."
8. ©ET©p©X©S [? ©ilTrdp
9. ©OTldpr^s
10. [Adapa]
11. [Amelu]
12. Enmenemma
13. [Amel-Sin]
14. [Ubar-Tutu]
15. Khasisatra, Atrakhasis
16. [Ubar-Tutu]
17. [Mesaz[...]]
18. [Adapa]
19. [Amelu]
20. [Amel-Sin]
21. [Ubar-Tutu]
22. [Ubar-Tutu]
23. [Ubar-Tutu]

For comparison with Berossus it may be useful to abstract from the Sumerian Dynastic List the royal names occurring in the earliest extant dynasties. They are given below with variant forms from duplicate copies of the list, and against each is added the number of years its owner is recorded to have ruled. The figures giving the total duration of each dynasty, either in the summaries or under the separate reigns, are sometimes not completely preserved; in such cases an x is added to the total of the figures still legible. Except in those cases referred to in the foot-notes, all the names are written in the Sumerian lists without the determinative for 'god'.

KINGDOM OF KISH.

(23 kings; 18,000 + x years, 3 months, 3 days)

1. Meskingasher 325 years
2. Enmerkar 420
3. Lugalbanda 7 1,200
4. Meskasin 28,800
5. Melamkish 300
6. Barsalnunnna 1,200
7. Mesaz[...]
8. Khasisatra, Atrakhasis

KINGDOM OF EANNA (EEREH).

(About 10-12 kings; 2,171 + x years)

1. Meekingscher 325 years
2. Enmerkar 420
3. Lugalbanda 1,200

1 Gap of seven, or possibly eight, names.
2 The name Etana is written in the lists with and without the determinative for 'god'.
3 The reading of the last sign in the name is unknown. A variant form of the name possibly begins with Balii.
4 This form is given on a fragment of a late Assyrian copy of the list; cf. Studies in Eastern History, Vol. III, p. 143, and see above, p. 31, n. 4.
5 Gap of four, or possibly three, names.
6 Eanna was the great temple of Erech. In the Second Column of the list 'the kingdom' is recorded to have passed from Kish to Eanna, but the latter name does not occur in the summary; for the probable change in the title of the kingdom, see above, p. 36, n. 3.
7 The name Lugalbanda is written in the lists with and without the determinative for 'god'.
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4. Dumuzi (i.e. Tammuz) 100 years
5. Gishbilgames (i.e. Gilgamesh) 126 (or 186) years
6. [ ... ]ugel [ ... ] years

 Kingdom of Ur.
 (4 kings; 171 years)
 1. Mesannipada 80 years
 2. Meskiagnunna 30
 3. Elu [ ... ] years
 4. Bal[ ... ] years

 Kingdom of Awan.
 (5 kings; 366 years)

At this point a great gap occurs in our principal list. The names of some of the missing kingdoms may be inferred from the summaries, but their relative order is uncertain. Of two of them we know the duration, a second Kingdom of Ur containing four kings and lasting for a hundred and eight years, and another kingdom, the name of which is not preserved, consisting of only one king who ruled for seven years. The dynastic succession only again becomes assured with the opening of the Dynastic chronicle published by Pere Scheil and recently acquired by the British Museum. It will be noted that with the Kingdom of Ur the separate reigns last for decades and not hundreds of years each, so that we here seem to approach genuine tradition, though the Kingdom of Awan makes a partial reversion to myth so far as its duration is concerned. The two suggested equations with Antediluvian kings of Berossus both occur in the earliest Kingdom of Kish and lie well within the Sumerian mythical period. The second of the rulers concerned, Enmenunna (Ammenon), is placed in Sumerian tradition several thousand years before the reputed succession of the gods Lugalsagda and Tammuz and of the national hero Gilgamesh to the throne of Erech. In the first lecture some remarkable points of general resemblance have already been pointed out between Hebrew and Sumerian traditions of these early ages of the world.

INDEX

I. GENERAL.

A, priest and father of Gilgamesh, 85.
Ashmes, queen, 105.
Aaheper-ka-Bi, 105; see also Thoth-
mes I.
Abo, deity, 25.
Abo Shahrain, 80.
Abydos, in Mesop., 13; in Upper Egypt, 48.
Abydos List of Kings, 15.
Abyssinia, 55.
Aca, 13.
Achaemenian kings, 55.
Adab, 70, 112.
Adad, god, 55, 77.
Adapa, 83, 144.
Adel, 13.
African ideals, 108.
Africans, god, 74.
Aeg-Oby, 119; Book of the Overthrowing
of, 107, 119.
Apologetics, the, 5; of Baruch, 38, 117.
Apologetic literature, 117; visions, 74.
Apollo, 99.
Apollodorus, 55.
Apotheosis, of Roman emperors, 29; of
Xenophon, 143.
Apep, 119; Book of the Overthrowing
of, 107, 119.
Aram, 137.
Arimaspe, king, 144.
Armenia, 95.
Arpiu, 145; see Arpi.
Aruru, goddess, 88, 117.
Ark, 131.
Ark, 131, 145; original form of Noah's,
85 f.; measurements of, 81 f.; see also
Noah's ark.
Armageddon, 5.
Armenia, 95, 96.
Arpi, king, 84, 145.
Ard, 119; see Arp.
Arun, 131.
Artemis, goddess, 88, 117, 119.
Aristides, 17.
Astarte, 12, see Astarte.
Astarte, 12; see Astarte.
Astarte, 12; see Astarte.

INDEX

Ashur-bani-pal, 139; library of, 51, 94, 117.
Ashur-nasir-pal, king, 15.
Asi, 4, 26, 47 f.; Central and Southern, 45.
Asiatic costume, 18; empire of Egypt, 10.
As, symbolism of, 74.
Assyria, 45.
Assyrian, 12; westward advance of, 17, 138.
Assyrian influence in Syria, 15-17.
Ass, symbolism of, 74.
Astarte, 12.
Astarte, 12; empire of Egypt, 10.
Astarte, 12; influence, 2, 12 ff., 16, 49, 139 f.; kings, early, 8, 24-7; literature, 5, 106; mythology, 46, 102 f.; prehistoric art, 7.
Ateh, 25; see Athet.
Athena, 59, 109, 124; kingdom of, 36 f., 59, 146.
Athenian, 112.
Athletics, 47.
Atheism, 39, 83, 85.
Atheist, Teta.
Aten, 25; see Athet.
Atene, 25; see Teta.
Aten, 25; see Athet.
Athens, 32, 73; city of, 57, 109.