

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute,  
OR,  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

---

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

---

VOL. XXXV.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 8, Adelphi Terrace, Charing Cross, W.C.)

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1903.

## ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.\*

DAVID HOWARD, ESQ., D.L., F.C.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following candidates were elected :—

LIFE ASSOCIATE :—Rev. R. Ashington Bullen, M.A., F.G.S.

ASSOCIATES :—Rev. Prof. A. Barton, Ph.D.; George A. Manwaring, Esq., C.E.; Rev. Oswald J. Hogarth, M.A.; Rev. William E. Emmet, M.A.; The Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Honduras, D.D.

The following paper was then read by the author :—

*THE BABYLONIAN STORY OF THE CREATION,  
INCLUDING BEL'S FIGHT WITH THE DRAGON.*  
By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.

I HAVE to make a short statement before beginning my paper, partly touching on the delay referred to by the Secretary, but principally to show how it was that I wrote the paper.

Having given a short description of the Creation story of the Babylonians in my book which has just been published—*The Old Testament in the light of the legends and records of Assyria and Babylonia*, I thought it would be a good thing to make a complete translation of the tablets, including the two principal versions of the Creation story. This I began last year and finished it early this year, and here is the result. I then decided that it might, perhaps, be well to write a paper on the subject instead of giving a translation, word for word (as in the book), giving simply a paraphrase.

---

\* Monday, December 1st, 1902.

This I proceeded to do, and wrote rather more than half the paper, *i.e.*, almost the complete story of the Semitic version of the Creation. Then I communicated with Professor Hull, our Secretary, and he said it would be very acceptable to the Institute. Later on circumstances occurred which caused an interruption of the work, and afterwards it was decided that it was to be read to-day. In the meanwhile another book, containing much new material, had been announced, and I have been waiting for it. I had to go on with my paper to prepare it for this evening, and I found that if I incorporated all I could from that book which was issued only a few days ago, I could not finish my paper. That is the position in which I was placed, and I therefore decided to finish my paper and to ask your indulgence for its not containing an account of all those latest discoveries of which our Secretary has spoken. Those will be inserted in the paper in full, I hope, when it is finally printed in the Journal of the Society\* ; but I trust that you will nevertheless find the paper in its present state sufficiently interesting.

---

MANY years have passed since the late George Smith, who first discovered the nature of the tablets referring to the Creation, published, in his *Chaldean Genesis*, translations of all the inscriptions of the series then known to him, and since that time the study of these tablets has attracted the attention of a large number of students, each of whom has added his quota to the elucidation of the text. Among those who have worked at it may be named the late Fox Talbot, Professors Sayce, Oppert, Delitzsch, Hommel, Jensen, and many others, among whom Professor Zimmern, though one of the last, is not the least, his examination of the text in Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* having been well received, and attracted much attention.

It is not the intention on the present occasion to traverse all the ground covered by the scholars who have written on this interesting subject, but simply to examine the legend, in its present comparatively complete state, detailing its contents, and stating the results of my own researches, combined with all the essential elucidations of the text by those who have preceded me in the work. Certain other documents bearing on the subject, which have come down to us, will receive special attention.

---

\* This promise has been duly fulfilled.

The Babylonian Legend of the Creation, as far as it is at present known, is supposed to have been inscribed on seven tablets, each containing as it were a chapter of the work. None of these documents are preserved in a perfect state, but as, in most cases, one or several fragments of duplicates exist, wanting parts can frequently be restored, and the sequence of the narrative is, in consequence, fairly well preserved. The number of the fragments, including the duplicates, amounts to about fifty, and though many of them (there are forty-nine exhibited in the British Museum) come from Assyria—from the royal library of Aššur-bani-âpli at Nineveh—the largest and most solid pieces were found in Babylonia. When in a complete state, these tablets measured probably from 7 to 9 inches long by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches wide, their thickness in the middle being about an inch—more or less. As a rule the obverse or page 1 is flat, whilst the reverse or page 2 is somewhat curved. It will thus be seen that to describe them as “bricks,” as is often done, is incorrect. They rather resemble tiles, and were they of the same thickness throughout, this would be a very good name for them. The smaller tablets are very much like cakes of soap, but as those of the Creation series are all large, this description can naturally not apply to them.

As may easily be imagined, the large number of fragments of duplicates implies that this legend was exceedingly popular not only among the Babylonians, but also among the Assyrians, who, speaking the same language as the Babylonians, naturally regarded the literature of “the land of Merodach” as their own. Judging from some of the mythological tablets originating in Assyria, Merodach was generally identified with their national god Aššur, so that the story of the conflict with and the defeat of the Dragon, with the account of the creation of the world, interested both nations equally. As a literary composition, moreover, it is not without its merits, and as it was probably well suited for recitation, the popularity which it enjoyed is not to be wondered at.

The first tablet of the Babylonian story of the Creation, as far as it is preserved, begins as follows:—

## I.

“When on high the heavens were unnamed,  
 Beneath the earth recorded not a name :  
 The primæval ocean was their producer ;  
 Mummu Tiānthu was she who begot the whole of them.

The waters in one then united themselves.  
 The plains were not outlined, marshes were not to be seen.  
 When none of the gods had come forth,  
 They bore no name, the fates (had not been determined).  
 There were produced the gods within the h[eavens?]:  
 Lahmu and Lahamu went forth (as the first ?)  
 The ages were great (the times were long ?).  
 Anšara and Kišara were produced over th[em ?]  
 Long grew the days, extended (was the time of their existence ?)  
 The god Anu their son . . . . .  
 Anšara, the god Anu . . . . .  
 Nudimmud, whom his fathers begot . . . . .”

It is unfortunate that this introductory portion, though completed from different fragments, is so very imperfect. Notwithstanding this defect, however, it contains some exceedingly interesting information as to the beliefs of the Babylonians regarding the earliest period of the Creation of the World, and the origin of the gods whom they worshipped. A very noteworthy point about it is, that just this portion has been made known to us by the old Syrian writer, Damascius, who communicates to us its substance in the following words:—

“ But the Babylonians, like the rest of the Barbarians, pass over in silence the one principle of the universe, and they constitute two, Tauthé and Apasōn, making Apasōn the husband of Tauthé and denominating her the mother of the gods. And from these proceeds an only-begotten son, Moÿmis, which, I conceive, is no other than the intelligible world proceeding from the two principles. From them, also, another progeny is derived, Daché and Dachos; and again a third, Kissaré and Assōros, from which last three others proceed, Anos, and Illinos, and Aos. And of Aos and Dauké is born a son called Bēlos, who, they say, is the fabricator of the world: the Creator.”

It is needless to say that, in this interesting inscription and the Greek paraphrase, we have not only a remarkable parallel account, but also a noteworthy proof of the correctness of the translation, as far as the text is complete, and a proof—if proof be needed—that we have the key to these inscriptions. This proof, it will easily be recognized, lies principally in the likeness in the names, which agree excellently, all things considered. Tiāmthu, or, rather, Tiāwthu, is naturally the Tauthé of Damascius, and means “the sea.” Apasōn, her husband, is the Babylonian Apsū, which I have rendered “the primæval ocean,” *i.e.*, the waters which were supposed to lie under the earth, later regarded as the abode of Êa, the god of the deep, to whom reference will be made later on. In this part of the legend

there is no real statement that Apasōn was the husband of Tiāmthu, though this may be regarded as implied, and the fact comes out more clearly—though not so clearly as might be wished—in the second tablet. In the succeeding tablets of the series, however, the husband of Tiāmthu bears an entirely different name, but whether this indicate the same or a different mythological personage, is not known.

In Daché and Dachos, it is easy to see that there has been a confusion between the Greek letters Delta and Lambda, which so closely resemble each other. Daché and Dachos should therefore be corrected to Laché and Lachos (as has been often pointed out by the Assyriologists who have preceded me) the Laḥmu and Laḥamu (better Laḥwu and Laḥawu), of the Babylonian text. These deities were the male and female personifications of the heavens, and are mentioned, in the lists, with Anu and Anatu, the god and goddess of the heavens, though in what these two groups of names differed (for they must have differed in some way) is at present uncertain. Anšara and Kišara are the Syrian author's Assōros and Kisaré, the meaning of which, according to the bilingual inscriptions, should be "Host of Heaven" and "Host of Earth" respectively. The three proceeding from them, Ano, Illinos, and Aos, are Anu, the god of the heavens, Ellila, the god Bel in Akkadian (afterwards identified with Merodach), and Aa or Êa, the god of the waters, the deep, and of unsearchable wisdom. This deity was the husband of Damkina (better, perhaps, Dawkina), the Dauké of Damascius. From these last, as he says (and the tablets confirm this statement), Bēlos, *i.e.*, Bel-Merodach, was born, and if this last deity did not "fabricate the world," he at least ordered it anew, after his great fight with the Dragon of Chaos, as we shall see when dealing with the other tablets of the series.

What will in all probability strike many of my audience is the remarkable correctness of the statements of the ancient author whom I have quoted. Evidently he was quoting a document with which he was well acquainted. It forms part of the mass of material contained in his work entitled *Doubts and Solutions of the first Principles*. As this author, who was a Syrian of Damascus, lived at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century of the present era, the question as to the source of his information is not without interest. It is stated that the well-known temple tower at Borsippa, near Babylon, was as late as the fourth century still a place of Babylonian worship, the old rites and ceremonies being even at

that late date carried on there, and this being the case, it would seem to be by no means improbable that people were in the time of Damascius yet living who were well aware of the teachings of the ancient Babylonians concerning the beginnings of things, and there may have been even professors of their schools of philosophy. With these Damascius probably became acquainted when on his way to or from Persia, or when staying there, he having fled to that country on the closing of the heathen schools of philosophy at Athens by Justinian—Damascius was, in fact, one of the last of their professors.

After describing the creation or production of the gods, comparing their intelligence apparently with that of Tiāmthu and her companions, the narrator goes on to describe the origin of the conflict which took place between the powers of good and evil, as typified by the divine and eternal beings introduced to the reader in the preceding lines. It was at first thought that Tiāmthu herself was the originator of the conflict, but from the fragments recently identified by Mr. King, this would seem to be doubtful, as Apsū (and Mummu) seem to have stirred her up. The first view, however, had some justification, for in more than one place it is stated that it was she who had conceived hatred for the gods her children, and there is no suggestion that her first spouse\* and her son were the first instigators. It has also been supposed that the cause of the quarrel was the creation of light, which prevented Apsū from having rest, either by day or by night. For this, however, there is no justification—it was evidently the doings of the gods, whose ways were not the ways of Tiāmthu, Apsū, and Mummu, which caused the desire to bring about their destruction. It would seem that the mother of all things, as Tiāmthu is called, conceived hatred of the gods her children on account of what had been reported to her concerning them, and gathered together all the deities who sided with her. Among these last, strange to say, were some who had been created by the very gods whom she desired to destroy (apparently there were prototypes of the pro-Boers even at the Creation). Storming, planning, chafing, and raging, not resting night nor day, they took up the conflict, and meeting together, “prepared hostility” to those gods whom the Babylonians regarded as the sources of all that is good and noble.

“Mother Hubur,” as she is in this place poetically named, in the meanwhile busied herself in making preparations to annihilate her descendants, producing irresistible weapons, giant serpents,

---

\* Her second consort, as will be seen further on, was named Kingu.

sharp of tooth, unsparing with their stings, and filled with poison as if it were blood. Fierce dragons then she clothed with terrors, and surrounding them with dazzling splendour, left them on high in order that their monstrous aspect might of itself annihilate those whom she deemed her foes, whilst their towering forms remained undismayed. To these she added other monsters, which may be rendered tentatively by the expressions cockatrice and basilisk, and there were likewise some which resembled in form the god of the heavens, Lahamu, with other great monsters, raging dogs, and scorpion-men. Then there were certain swift-moving monsters, fish-men, and mountain-rams. All these wielded unsparing weapons, and feared not the conflict, being pledged to obey her powerful, irresistible commands. Altogether, the number of the different kinds of monsters which she created was eleven.

These were naturally quite independent of the gods, some of whom were her offspring, and who, it is noteworthy, are described as her firstborn. These, too, prepared for the fray, and over them she set Kingu, whom "she made great among them, (among) those going in front before the army (as) leaders of the host," who excited their followers to the strife. Having delivered the chief leadership into Kingu's hand, and set him on the rampart, she is represented as reminding him how she had set firm his word, and made him great in the assembly of the gods, delivering the rule of the gods, "all of them," into his hand. She exhorts him then to be "exceeding great," and, apparently as an additional inducement to act up to his exalted position, she calls him "her only spouse." Delivering to him the "Tablets of Fate," which she places in his breast, she informs him that, for the future, his command shall not be changed, and shall stand firm—a power which was apparently regarded as due to the possession of the documents in question. "Now," continues the Babylonian bard, "is Kingu raised on high, assuming Anu's dignity, among the gods (who are) her sons, he holdeth the command." This apparently means, in other words, that the position now occupied by Kingu among the powers of evil, was similar to that of Anu among the gods of heaven, and that he would occupy this place in the case of Tiamthu's success. Kingu now seems to address to his followers a short exhortation to act valiantly—to be fearful in the fight, and let resistance be laid low. But the passage is a difficult one, and the meaning of the lines therefore not altogether certain.

At this point the first tablet of the Semitic Babylonian legend of the Creation comes to an end, and from the parallel passages

of the other inscriptions we see that the account of the revolt of Tiāmthu and her followers also terminated here. It is an appropriate place for the conclusion of the first chapter.

## II.

Naturally these preparations could not long be kept secret from the gods, and Ēa, the wise one among them, was the first to hear about it, and it was he who carried the news of the revolt of Tiāmthu and her followers to his father Anšara, the deity apparently representing the heavenly host, and to his divine companions. The succeeding lines of the tablet therefore give the words of the messenger in announcing his news, and he tells the whole history of the uprising of the goddess of the watery waste exactly as it is related in the first tablet. Though such repetitions are exceedingly tedious, especially when at such length, they nevertheless serve to carry on the narrative, and their variants enable us to control the text, and sometimes form a valuable aid in explaining it.

Having heard what had taken place, Anšara gave way to despair, striking his breast and biting his lips (such is the restoration suggested here). With a loud cry, he called out to Anu, his son, whom he urges to join him in resisting the enemy; and judging from what remains, Anu is instructed to attack Apsū, the son of Tiāmthu, whilst Anšara occupies herself with the mother. For this restoration of the passage, however, I am not responsible, the rendering here adopted being that of Delitzsch and Jensen; and there is no doubt that the suggestions of these scholars are at least very probable.\*

A gap occurs here, after which another fragment takes up the story, and from this piece it would seem that, in the end, it was decided that Anu should undertake the task of defeating the Dragon alone. The conversation between Anšara and Anu apparently ends with a final word of instruction, in which the latter is told to speak to her, giving the message of them both, so that, should she be defiant, and not hear his voice (at first), she might at least be appeased afterwards. Anu then set out, but seeing Tiāmthu's snarling face, and finding himself powerless to do anything against her, he turned back and reported his non-success to his father Anšara.

---

\* King has a different rendering, but as the text is defective, I allow the above to remain for the present.

At this point there is a further gap in the story, but it is clear, from the context, that another deity, namely, Nudimmud (the god Aê), likewise undertook the task of defeating her, but was not more successful than Anu. The heavenly powers then decided to ask Merodach to be their "avenger," as the legend has it. This commission was at once accepted with eagerness by the chief of the Babylonian pantheon, as the fragment referring to this portion of the legend indicates:

"Rejoiced then the Lord at the word of his father—  
 His heart was glad, and to his father he said :  
 ' Lord of the gods, fate of the great gods,  
 If then I (am to be) your avenger—  
 (If) I bind Tiāmthu, and save you.  
 Convene an assembly, cause to be great, and proclaim ye, my fate.  
 In Upšukenaku sit ye then joyfully together, and  
 When my mouth opens, let me, like you, the fates decide ;  
 (Then) whatever I do, even I, shall not be changed—  
 Let the utterance of my lips nor turned nor altered be.' "

Here Merodach is represented as receiving his commission joyfully, but, whilst accepting, asking for a reward, as if of opinion that the gods would be under an obligation to him—as is, in fact, implied farther on, where Anšara is spoken of as having sent Merodach, or having urged him to undertake the task. There is then no doubt as to how the championship of Merodach was thought to originate.

This time, fortunately, there is no gap in the text, the lines translated above being the last of the second tablet, the third following immediately on.

### III.

Without wasting time in words of thanks or rejoicing, Anšara immediately gives instructions to his messenger Gaga to go to Laḥmu and Laḥamu, the two deities of the heavens, to invite all the gods to a feast in the place of assembly (Upšukenaku), where, having eaten bread and prepared the wine, they may decide the fate "for Merodach their avenger." The words of the message are then given, Gaga being told to say to Laḥmu and Laḥamu that Anšara, their son, had despatched him to announce to them the desire of his heart; the description of Tiāmthu's revolt, and the preparations which she had made for her conflict with the gods being then repeated in the same words as in the first tablet, where the story of her iniquities is introduced. Two lines suffice, however, to relate the powerlessness

of Anu and the fear of Nudimmud (the god Êa) in the presence of the terrible foe. Then comes the request made to Merodach, and his answer, also given in the original terms. Having received this long message:

“Gaga went, he betook himself to his path,  
In the place of Laḥmu and Laḥamu, the gods his fathers,  
He stood, and kissed the ground beneath them—  
He advanced, stood still, and spoke to them.”

Here follows again the whole of Anšara's message, with which Gaga, the divine messenger, had been intrusted—Tiāmthu, her revolt, Anu's failure, Nudimmud's fear, the request made to Merodach, and the answer of the last named. In fact, this portion of the legend reminds one, in a measure, of a certain classic of our youth, though on a lengthier scale.

On hearing the account of the danger which threatened the gods, Laḥmu and Laḥamu cried aloud, and all the Igigi, or gods of the heavens, groaned bitterly, announcing, at the same time, their inability to understand Tiāmthu's acts. The great gods, all of them, then went to Anšara's place, where the feast was to be held. There they “made tongue,” whatever that may mean—perhaps it signifies that they discussed the matter, and having eaten wheaten bread and prepared the wine, that sweet must which was to do away their sadness and refresh their minds and bodies:

“For Merodach, their avenger, they decided the fate.”

And with these words the third tablet—or chapter, if that be thought a good alternative term—ends.

#### IV.

We now come to the fourth tablet, which, after the first, is one of the most interesting. In this the honours which were conferred upon Merodach by the other gods—“the gods his fathers”—are recounted. They founded for him a princely chamber, and he stood there to rule “in the presence of his fathers.” The gods then address him in the following words:—

“Thou art now the honoured one among the great gods,  
Thy destiny is without rival, thy command is (that of) Anu.  
Merodach, thou art the honoured one among the great gods,  
Thy destiny is without rival, thy command is (that of) Anu.”

From to-day shall thy command not be changed,  
 To raise and abase, let it be thy hand  
 Let the utterance of thy mouth stand firm, unailing (be) thy command.  
 None among the gods thy boundary shall cross ;  
 Care is the requirement of the chamber(s) of the gods, so  
 May thy place be the place of their desire.  
 Merodach, thou art our avenger,  
 We have given thee the dominion—the universe of all complete :  
 Sit (?) then in the assembly, let thy command be high ;  
 May thy weapon not fail, may it destroy thine enemy.  
 O Lord, who trusts in thee, protect thou his life ;  
 And he who takes up evil things, pour thou his life away."

They then set a garment in their midst, and telling Merodach that destruction and creation were in his power, asked him to speak, commanding its destruction, and to address it again, commanding its re-creation. This he did :

"He spoke then with his mouth, the garment was destroyed ;  
 He spoke to it again, and the garment was reproduced."

Having thus tested his powers successfully, the gods rejoiced, and did him homage, saying "Merodach is king." They then transferred to him sceptre, throne, and emblem of reign, and giving him an unsurpassed weapon, "destroying those who hate," they said :

"Come then, cut off the life of Tiāmthu,  
 Let the wind carry her blood into hidden places !"

"Thus," the record continues, "did the gods, his fathers, fix the fate of Bel—a path of peace and goodwill they caused him to take as his road."

Then began Merodach to arm himself for the fray, testing (so it would seem) his spear or dart, raising the divine weapon, which he placed at his right, and hanging his bow and quiver at his side. In addition to these, he set the lightning before him, the well-known emblem and weapon of thundering Jove, whose Babylonian original and counterpart he was ; and moreover he filled his body with flashing flame, or, if another rendering be preferred, with the darting thunderbolt. Not least in his plentiful armoury, however, was the net which he had made wherewith to catch the great enemy of the gods, who, in the place where this is referred to, has an addition to her name, to wit, *kirbiš*, which seems to mean "in the midst," referring, apparently, to her dwelling under the earth. This net (which practically proves the identity of Merodach with Nimrod, "The mighty hunter" or "trapper" of Gen. x, 9) is described as having been held by the four winds, whom (as they

are practically personified, we may use this pronoun) he also employed to bring the net, which was the gift of his father Anu, the god of the heavens. Other winds—"the hurricane (an evil wind), the storm, the gale, the four(fold) wind, the seven(fold) wind, the troubling(?) wind, the uncontrollable wind,"—seven in all, are described as having been made by him to be his helpers, and these, rising behind him to confuse Kirbiš-Tiāmthu, he took with him. Another of his means of defence was "the storm-flood, his great weapon," but no clue as to the way in which he made use of this appears in the legend.

Having thus prepared for the fray, he mounted his irresistible and terrifying chariot, with its fourfold yoke of steeds "unsparing, sweeping down, swift of flight, sharp of tooth, poison-bearing," such as knew how to overthrow and to dash aside, not fearing battle, dreadful in resistance, attacking right and left, and exceedingly steadfast. Nor did Merodach forget his own appearance. He covered himself with the cloak of his dreadful majesty, and placed his overwhelming brilliance on his head. Being now ready, he sallied forth to meet the foe, breathing defiance, grasping in his hand, as Jensen has it, the plant of incantation, for evidently he wished to leave no stone unturned in the accomplishment of his task.

"In that day they clustered around him, the gods clustered around him—  
The gods his fathers clustered around him, they clustered around him.  
Then the lord advanced, the retreat of Tiāmthu closely regarding,  
Noting the snarling of Kingu, her spouse.  
But whilst he looked, his mind (?) was troubled,  
His understanding cast down, and his intention wavered ;  
And the gods, his helpers, who went by his side,  
Saw their leader's confusion—their glance was troubled too."

Tiāmthu, Merodach's opponent, stood firm and defiant, simply uttering words to all appearance scornful, but the mutilation of this passage does no more than enable one to surmise that she regarded them all—Merodach as well as his fathers—as rebels or conspirators. In his turn the god makes answer to the effect that she who was great and exalted had rebelled against the gods, raising Kingu to be her consort, giving him command of the "heavenly ones," and seeking and setting evil against the gods of his fathers. Telling her to gather her host together, and bind on her weapons, he ends with the challenge :

"Stand then—I and thou, let us make battle together !"

Furious, shouting wildly, trembling with rage, uttering incantations and charms, whilst the gods of battle called upon their weapons not to fail them, Tiāmthu and the wise one of the

gods, Merodach, stood forward for the conflict and approached to do battle. At once Merodach spread forth his net, and caused it to enclose her, sending forth the evil wind which followed behind him. At that moment Tiāmthu opened her mouth, and before she could close it, the wind entered, so that she could not shut her lips. The angry winds filled out her body, her heart was overpowered, and she lay with open mouth deprived of strength. With his spear then he killed her, cut asunder her body, split her open, cut out her heart, and overcame her. Her life having been destroyed, he threw her down, and stood upon her prostrate corpse. Next came the turn of her helpers, whose force was scattered and sundered, and the gods going by her side—apparently those sons of Anu who had joined her—turned and fled, each seeking to save his life. They found themselves surrounded, however, by an enclosure, unable to flee, and the god who had conquered their leader then shut them in, and broke their weapons. Being thrown into the net, and sitting in bonds, their groaning filled all the region where they were, and they found themselves obliged to bear the anger of Merodach, shut up in prison.

After this came the turn of the eleven beings whom Tiāmthu had created, and made so terrible—the troop of devils, as the original seems to say, going by her side. These Merodach set in bonds, deprived of their power, and trampled beneath him. Lastly, he is represented as turning his attention to Kingu, the spouse of Tiāmthu, who, having been bound, was reckoned worthy to be the peer of Ugga, the god of death. Like unto the moment when Merodach overcame Tiāmthu, this also was a period of supreme triumph to the god of heaven, for at last he was able to gain possession of the things which he desired above all, namely, the tablets of Fate, which Tiāmthu had given to Kingu. These now being in his hands, he pressed his seal upon them, and grasped them to his breast.

“After he had captured and overthrown his opponent,  
 The dreadful foe he completely (?) rooted out (?).  
 He set up the power of Anšara over the enemy completely,  
 And the mighty Merodach attained Nudimmud’s desire.  
 Over the conquered gods he strengthened then his hold,  
 Returned against Tiāmthu, whom captive he had made.  
 Trampled then the lord upon Tiāmthu’s breast (?),  
 With his unsparing weapon cleft he then her skull,  
 Cut through the veins of her blood,  
 And caused the north wind to carry it away to secret places.  
 When his fathers saw him, they rejoiced, and were glad,  
 And caused gifts and offerings to be brought to him, even to him.

Rested then the lord, looking upon her corpse ;  
 He divided her trunk (?), making therewith clever things.  
 He sundered her then, like a divided (?) fish, into two parts.  
 Half of her he placed, and covered therewith the heavens,  
 Pushed the bolt, set a watchman (there) :  
 Her waters, those are not to be allowed to come forth, he bade.  
 He traversed the heavens, examined the places, and  
 Set the Abyss in front, the abode of Nudimmud.  
 Then measured the lord the Abyss's extent :  
 An edifice in its likeness he set—Ê-šarra.  
 The edifice Ê-šarra, which he built, is the heavens :  
 (As for) Anu, Bel, and Êa, he founded their strongholds."

Thus, according to the legend, did Merodach, who was called Bel, "the lord," attain to the position of king over the gods, who, though throughout called "his fathers," are represented as willingly consenting to be ruled by their son. This, as will be seen farther on, has a certain amount of importance, not only for the question of the composition of the poem, but also for the history of the Babylonian religion, upon which point—a point of exceeding interest—I shall touch, in the course of the present paper. Fortunately, the tablet above translated is one of the most complete of the series ; and it is well that it is so, for this portion of the story, with its fulness of incident and detail, contains many important and interesting facts, some of them closely connected with religious thought even during the Christian era.

## V.

The fifth tablet of the series continues the account of Merodach's acts after the destruction of Tiāmthu, when he began his work of ordering the world anew.

He erected the stations of the great gods, whose emblems are the stars ; he set the Zodiac, designated the year, outlined the constellations, giving to each of the twelve months three stars, or, rather, groups—thirty-six in all, "from the day when the year begins"—that is, from the month Nisan (March-April), and these were to be for signs, for such was one of the uses of the heavenly bodies, as is expressly stated in the first chapter of Genesis. Next

"He founded the station of Nibiru, to make known their limit,  
 That none might err, nor go astray."

Nibiru means "the traverser," and has been identified by Jensen with the planet Jupiter, Merodach's own star, and so

called by the nations of the ancient world on that account, for Jove and Merodach, as is well known, are one and the same, the former being his western, and the latter his eastern name. As Merodach was king of the gods, so was Jupiter, the planet, the overseer of the stars, traversing and crossing the heavens from end to end, and preventing them from leaving their paths or their stations in the celestial vault.

His next work, according to the tablet, was to place with his own the stations of Bel and Êa, with the great gates on both sides, and the bolts right and left, the zenith (such seems to be the meaning of the word) being set between. To all appearance this is a description of the heavens according to the ideas of the Babylonians, who thought of the great blue vault as possessing these things; for through the doors which were opened for this at the beginning of each day, the sun came forth, "as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, who rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course." According to the hymn to the setting sun which was chanted at the Birs Nimroud, anciently called Ê-zida, and identified by tradition with the tower of Babel, the spouse of the sun-god went to meet her lord at the close of the day, and the doors and the bolts of the high heavens gave him greeting, thus verifying what is stated in the Semitic Babylonian story of the Creation at this point with regard to the arrangement of the heavens in Babylonian cosmology.

First among the remaining heavenly bodies is mentioned the moon, in this place called Nannaru, which was caused to shine forth, and ruled the night. He was set as an adornment of the night, to make known the days (*i.e.*, the festivals and divisions of time). Monthly, without ceasing, he was provided with a crown, an expression which probably means that he appeared in the form of a narrow crescent. Appearing in the land at the beginning of the month, the horns are described as shining forth to make known the seasons, and the crown is said to be perfected on the seventh day, when the crescent, having become a half-disc, no longer had the form which the Babylonians were accustomed to regard as a crown. Considerable doubt exists as to the real meaning of the lines which follow, the inscription being very imperfect at this point, but there seems—merely seems—to be a reference to the luminary being full when opposite the sun, and if this be the case, there is just the possibility that the Babylonians had noticed that the moon shone with light borrowed from the sun.

In this place, after an interval, Professor Jensen inserts a fragment which may well belong to this series. It seems, on

the obverse, to refer to the temple Ê-sagila (probably the heavenly fane of that name), and afterwards speaks of Mero-dach's net and his bow, the cunning work of which the gods admired. Anu, the god of the heavens, taking up the bow, kissed it, and proclaimed its names, "the long wood," and "the star of the bow," fixing it afterwards in the heavens (which were his special domain), apparently under that name. It is not improbable that this is simply inserted in the legend to explain the name of the constellation of the Bow, which occurs in the list of the thirty-six constellations to which reference has already been made. After speaking of the setting of a throne, the fragment breaks off.

Another broken piece which is supposed to come in here seems to refer to the frothy foam of Ti(āmthu), but in what connection, does not appear. Farther on, the god Anšara speaks to the winds, evidently appointing them to their several places. After this, there is apparently a mention of the cutting through of the nostrils of Tiāmthu, to pouring out, and to water-springs, probably a symbolical explanation of some natural phenomenon or other.

The lines which follow refer to the troop (?) of the Abyss, and give a conversation concerning Anšara, who, as one of the gods of the heavens (his name means "the heaven-host"), speaks, seemingly, of the construction of the upper Abyss, opposite Ê-šarra, as his work, and announces the production of other things—a house and a citadel, probably in the Abyss. After this, "constant lamentation" is twice referred to, and it may be guessed that this was described as proceeding from the followers of Tiāmthu, and it is not impossible that this portion of the legend was devoted to the description of the provisions made for their safe keeping. Next the things created by a deity whose name is wanting, but who was probably this same Anšara, are spoken of. Of special interest in this part is the line referring to the city of Aššur, here indicated by the characters *Bala-sumun*, with the prefix for city, the whole meaning, as indicated by Delitzsch long ago, "the city of the old realm," or "government." It will easily be recognized that the mention of the city Aššur in connection with Anšara is most natural, the name of the god being written with the same characters as that of the Assyrian god Aššur. A further confirmation of the identity of the two names is furnished by Damascius, who does not write the name of Anšara as Ansaros or Assaros, but as Assōros, with *ō* instead of *a*. Evidently there was a tendency to pronounce Anšara as Assōra or Assōr, the

close similarity of which to Aššur (Asshur) is evident. Should these inferences turn out to be correct—and there is every probability that they are so—then the reading of the Authorized Version for Gen. x, 11, “Out of that land went forth Asshur,” and not “He (Nimrod) went out into Assyria,” is the only possible rendering, as it seems, in fact, to be the more reasonable.

## VI.

The following is the translation of the beginning of the sixth tablet, published by Mr. King a few days before this paper was read, and referred to on that occasion, though the translation was withheld until the final preparation of the paper for press:—

“Merodach, on hearing the words of the gods,  
 [Is] moved in his heart to make [cunning things ?]  
 [He opened] his mouth, [saying] to [his father] Aê—  
 That which he thought in his heart he imparted to him :—  
 Let me gather my blood, let me . . . . . bone ;  
 Let me then set up a man, let the man . . . . .  
 Let me create then a man, dwelling . . . . .  
 May the service (or work) of the gods be established, and (as for)  
 them, may they [construct ?] the shrin[es].  
 Let me alter then the ways of the gods, let me chan[ge their paths ?],  
 As one may they be honoured, and to the two may . . . . .”

Here the speech of Merodach ends, and fragments of the answer of Aê, too defective to allow any connected sense to be made out, appear. This is unfortunate, as the text, if better preserved at this point, would undoubtedly have rendered what remains of the opening lines more comprehensible. Such as it is, however, it is a welcome addition to the legend, and it is to be expected that this portion will receive sooner or later such supplementary matter as will give it its full value.

The story of the creation of man by Merodach, from his own blood, is one of the most interesting of the statements concerning the god, though there is apparently but little in it which bears upon the creation of man as detailed in the first two chapters of Genesis. It confirms, on the other hand, in a most satisfactory way, the statements on the subject made by Berosus, who, as priest of Belus (Bel-Merodach), must have been well acquainted with all the teaching of his predecessors and contemporaries upon the subject. As will be remembered, the Babylonian writer (after the description of the destruction

of the woman Tīāwthu) states that the deity (Belus) cut off his own head; upon which the other gods mixed the blood, as it gushed out, with the earth; and from that men were formed; and it is on account of this that men are rational, and partake of divine knowledge. After this Belus divided the light from the darkness, separated the heavens from the earth, and reduced the universe to order. But the animals so recently created, not being able to bear the prevalence of light, died.

All the inhabitants of the world being thus destroyed, other men and animals were again formed from the blood of Belus mixed with earth, in much the same way as the first creation. These were able to bear the light. There is hardly any doubt that some allegorical signification lies in this, light not only standing for the physical rays from the sun by which things are made visible to us, but also for enlightenment and its kindred ideas, including religious fervour, which causes men to turn to their creator in worship. There is probably in these two creations some analogy to the "sons of god" and the "daughters of men" in the sixth chapter of Genesis, the former standing for the good and pious, and the latter for the indifferent or evil. The completion of the legend will be looked forward to by all, in the hope that further confirmations may result. The reference to "bone," which occurs in the Semitic Babylonian legend at this point, and its possible analogy with the description of the creation of Eve, I leave for future consideration. The text is at present too imperfect.

According to the copy published, this sixth tablet of the series contained 146 lines, of which, however, only those at the beginning and portions of the last eight are preserved. The latter refer to the further honours conferred upon Merodach by the gods.

## VII.

There was some doubt as to whether the tablet, now known to have been entitled "The Tablet of the 51 names," formed part of the Creation-series or not, but the catch-line at the end of the sixth tablet seems to prove that the opinion of G. Smith and all who have written upon the subject of the Babylonian legend after him was correct upon this point. This interesting text is a list of the names conferred by the gods upon Merodach as the creator. As we know from other inscriptions, the name of this deity expressing best his character of originator of all things is Tutu, a word in which a mystic charm was to all appearance regarded as residing. In con-

sequence of this, it is placed on the left-hand edge of some of the copies of the seventh tablet of the series, at the head of certain of the paragraphs.

In a list of divine names, many or all of which are Merodach's, we find the explanation of this mystic reduplicate word, namely, *mullid ilāni, māddis ilāni*, "begetter of the gods, renewer of the gods," showing clearly in what way the ancient Babylonians thought of him. How Merodach, who is described in the earlier tablets of the Creation-legend itself as a descendant of the god Anu, grandson of the older Bel, and son of Aê, could be the creator of the gods, is difficult to explain. Perhaps this etymology of Tutu rests upon a play upon words, the Sumerian *utu* or *tu*, which are apparently shortened forms of *utudda* or *tudda*, meaning, according to the bilingual lists, "to bring forth," "to beget." The ordinary meaning of Tutu, however, as a reduplicate of the root *tu*, is "to cross," and this may, in fact, be the real meaning, one of the names of Merodach, as the planet Jupiter, being (as we have seen) Nibiru, "the traverser," so called, according to Jensen, on account of his movements upon the ecliptic. As the tablet says, he was to control the paths of the stars of heaven, and pasture (or, perhaps, shepherd) the stars, all of them, like sheep.

The following is a rendering of the principal part of this tablet, and will serve to show the style of the composition:—

"Asari, bestower of planting, [institutor of irrigation (?)],  
Who has created grain and plants, causing [verdure to grow].  
Asari-alim, who in the house of counsel is honoured, [who increaseth counsel]—

The gods pay him homage, fe[ar besetteth them].

Asari-alim-nunna, the princely one, light of the [father who begot him],

Director of the decrees of Anu, Bel, [and Aê];

He is their patron, the announcer of . . . . .

Who maketh its\* adornment, abundance, to grow . . . . .

Tutu, the maker of their renewal, [is he];

May he purify their desires, and as for them, let them [be at ease];

Let him make then the incantation, may the gods [be at rest].

Angrily have they arisen, let him restrain [their opposition].†

Verily he has been made high in the assembly of the gods . . . . .

None among the gods shall [forsake him].

Tutu (is) Zi-ukkina, the life of the people‡ [of the] gods.

Who set for the gods the glorious heavens.

Their paths they took, they instituted . . . . .§

May the deeds [which he performed] not be forgotten among men.

Tutu Zi-azaga, thirdly, they called—the possessor of purification.

\* Or "his."

† Lit. "their breast."

‡ Or "host."

§ Or "He instituted their way, he ordained [their path ?]."

Lord of the good wind (? inspiration), lord of obedience and favour,  
 Creator of fulness and plenty, institutor of abundance,  
 He who changes small things to great.  
 In our dire need we scented his sweet breath—  
 Let (men) speak, let them glorify, let them do him homage.  
 Tutu (is) Aga-azaga, fourthly. May he make the crowns glorious,  
 The lord of the glorious incantation bringing the dead to life,  
 He who had mercy on the gods who had been overpowered,  
 Who made heavy the yoke laid on the gods his enemies,  
 For their redemption created mankind.  
 The merciful one, he with whom is the giving of life,  
 May his word be established, and not forgotten,  
 In the mouth of the black-headed ones\* whom his hands have made.  
 Tutu (is) Mu-azaga, fifthly. May their mouth make known his glorious  
 incantation,  
 Him who with his glorious charm rooteth out all the evil ones.  
 Ša-zu—he who knoweth the heart of the gods, who looketh at the  
 inward parts,  
 He who letteth not evil-doers go forth against him,  
 He who assembleth the gods, who appeaseth their hearts,  
 He who subdueth the disobedient, . . . . .  
 He who directeth righteousness and justice . . . . .  
 Who setteth aside injustice, . . . . .  
 Tutu (is) Zi-si, he who bringeth about silence . . . . .  
 He who sendeth forth the stillness, . . . . .  
 Tutu (is) Suh-kur, annihilator of the enemy, . . . . .  
 Dissolver of their agreements, . . . . .  
 Annihilator of everything evil . . . . .”

Here the obverse breaks off, and there is a gap of several lines, after which the inscription is continued on the reverse:—

“ . . . the constellation . . . (which shineth forth in the heavens)  
 Then seized he the back part of the head, which he pierced (?)  
 And as Kirbiš-Tiāmthu he circumvented restlessly,  
 Let his name be Nībiru, the seizer of Kirbišu.  
 The paths of the stars of heaven let him control,  
 Let him pasture like sheep the stars, all of them.  
 Let him confine Tiāmthu, bring her life into pain and anguish.  
 In man's remote ages, in lateness of days,  
 Let him arise, and he shall not cease, let him continue (?) to the future.  
 As he made the (heavenly) place, and formed the firm (ground).  
 Father Bel called his name ‘Lord of the world,’  
 The appellation (by which the Igi, all of them, call him),  
 Aê heard, and he rejoiced in his heart,  
 Thus (he spake): ‘He, whose renowned name his fathers have so  
 glorified,  
 Shall be like me, and Aê shall be his name.  
 The total of my commands, all of them, let him possess, and  
 The whole of my pronouncements let him, (even) him, make known.’  
 By the appellation ‘Fifty’ the great gods

\* Mankind, or the Semitic and Sumerian races.

Proclaimed his fifty names, and they caused his career to be great  
(beyond all).

May they be accepted, and may the primæval one make (them) known,

May the wise and the understanding together well consider (them),

May the father repeat and teach (them) to the son,

May they open the ears of the shepherd and the leader.

May they rejoice for the lord of the gods, Merodach,

May his land bear in plenty, and as for him, may he have peace.

Firm is his word, unchanging is his command—

No god hath yet made to fail that which cometh forth from his mouth.

If he frown down in displeasure, he turneth not his neck ;

In his anger, there is no god who can withstand his wrath.

Wide is his heart, vast is the kindness of his . . . . .

The sinner and evildoer before him are (ashamed?).”

A duplicate gives the remains of four lines which seem to have differed from the corresponding portion of the principal tablet here translated. These are couched in the same strain as the portions of the final tablet of the series which are preserved, and it may therefore be supposed that the remainder of this inscription, if we possessed it, would end with a poetical climax similar in form to the lines translated here.

It is unnecessary to refer to the literary form and merit of this portion of the composition (especially the obverse), that being self-evident. Perhaps the writer noticed how monotonous his long poetical narrative was, and varied it by introducing the Sumerian forms of the names bestowed upon Merodach, with a free translation, and expansions of the idea contained in them. I have said that the translation of these names of Merodach into Semitic Babylonian is very free, and this will easily be recognized by anyone acquainted with the two languages. Thus, though Zi-ukkina might easily be translated “the life of the universe,” or, rather, “of the people,” Zi-azaga cannot by any possibility be regarded as meaning “the possessor of purification,” any more than Aga-azaga can mean “May he make the crowns glorious.” There is, therefore, hardly any doubt that the names given to him mean “the pure life,” “the glorious crown,” “the glorious incantation,” “heart-knowing,” “the silent life,” “annihilator of the enemy.” Perhaps, however, they are not intended as translations at all, but merely as amplifications of the ideas contained in the names, which are to all appearance mystic, and connected with the character attributed to Merodach. As he had saved the world from destruction at the hands of Tiāmthu, giving it thereby new life, he was “the life of the universe,” and as he, compared with her and her followers, was everything that was pure and holy, so he was “the pure life” for all to imitate.

What "the glorious crown" refers to is doubtful, but there is every probability that Merodach is so named as the desire of all the faithful among his worshippers, who, on leaving this life, would go forth from earth to live with him. "The glorious incantation is easier to comprehend, Merodach being the lord of all such things, and one of them had, in the words of the text, rooted out all the evil ones. Just as the god Ninip is called "the supreme word," so Merodach could be called in a similar way "the glorious incantation," because of the efficacy of that which he had uttered when attacking Tiāmthu. What "the silent life" or "spirit of silence" (either may be the translation of Zi-si) refers to is not known, but the completion of the inscription (when that happens) will probably make this clear to us. "The annihilator of the enemy" needs no explanation, as it is evident that Tiāmthu is referred to. She, with her helpers, was the type of all evil, and it is doubtless his triumph over them which caused this name to be given to him.

With regard to the rest of the inscription of this last tablet of the series, it is noteworthy that Merodach is said to have seized Tiāmthu by the back part of the head, a statement which seems to differ from the account of her destruction in the earlier part of the legend. His creation of heaven and earth is also spoken of, but chiefest of all would seem to have been the formation of mankind, either in the room of the rebellious gods, or in lasting remembrance of their evil-doing. Throughout this part, the gratitude due to him, his mercy and goodness, his glory in having overcome the source of evil, and his renown in after ages among men on account of his glorious deeds, are the points especially touched upon. It is noteworthy that also here, as in the preceding tablets of the legend, the fixity of his word, the changelessness of his command, and the powerlessness of the other gods against him with regard to these things, are again stated. Worthy of special attention is also the statement that the other deities called Merodach by their own names, thereby conferring upon him, at the same time, their attributes, and making him as it were participator in their being. Whilst, therefore, he was the manifestation of the whole of them collectively, they were at the same time individually manifestations of him, as other tablets of a religious nature from Babylonia abundantly prove.

## VIII.

In the absence of the account of the creation of man and the

beasts of the earth in the Semitic account of the Creation, of which an outline has just been given, this is probably the place to refer to the bilingual version, of which I published translations in 1890 and 1891.

The second text is of an entirely different nature, bringing the work of creation before us with the intention of showing how, among other things, the great and holy cities of Babylonia came into existence; and in this the origin of evil, as typified by the dragon of Chaos, and its destruction, are left entirely aside. If we may judge from one of the omen-tablets, it was the custom among the Babylonians to make pilgrimages to the holy places of the land, with the expectation of obtaining benefit therefrom, and there is no doubt that the cities founded by Merodach, and mentioned in this inscription, namely, Babylon, Erech and Ur, with Êridu, were classed as the chief among them. It is apparently on this account that the bilingual story of the Creation was written, for it is nothing more nor less than the introduction to an incantation, in which the temple of Nebo at Borsippa, now called the Birs-Nimroud, and generally identified with the tower of Babel, is poetically spoken of in a way which suggests that the writer of this text wished it to be regarded as of equal importance with the great shrines and cities created by Merodach, or existing from the period of the gods before him.

It begins with a reference to the time when the glorious house of the gods (apparently the heavens) had not been made, a plant had not been brought forth, and a tree had not been created; when a brick had not been laid, a beam not shaped, a house not built, a city not constructed, and no human site had been formed. Niffer and its temple-tower Ê-kura, Erech and its temple-tower Ê-ana, the abyss or waters under the earth, and Êridu, "the good city," and the glorious seat of the house of the gods, had also not been made, and "the whole of the lands were sea." When within the sea there was a stream, at that time Êridu was formed, Ê-sagila, "the lofty-headed house," was constructed—Ê-sagila, which the god Lugal-du-azaga, "the lord of the glorious abode," had founded within the abyss. Then, too, the city of Babylon, and the earthly Ê-sagila within it, were completed; and in connection with this it is worthy of note that the word used allows it to be inferred that this fane, which Nebuchadnezzar calls "the tower of Babylon," had been begun at an earlier date, but that the work had been interrupted. The word "completed," however, may be simply due to the desire not to use the same expression too often.

It is at this point there is a reference, for the first time, to the creation of living things—not animals or men, but beings of a much higher station, namely, the gods and the Annunaki, who were made by a being unnamed, though it may be inferred that their creator was possibly the Lugal-du-azaga mentioned before in the text. The same deity (apparently) then “proclaimed as supreme the glorious city, the seat of the joy of their hearts.” The god Merodach (whose name here appears for the first time in the narrative) now bound together a foundation before the waters, made soil (*épiri ibnû*), and poured it out with the foundation, in order that the gods might have a dwelling which should satisfy their hearts.

Up to this point the narrative relates to the earth, the Abyss, and the gods, but here a change comes in, introduced by the single line, “He made mankind,” which is followed by the addition: “The goddess Aruru made the seed of mankind with him.” After this he made the beasts of the field and the living creatures of the plain, set the Tigris and the Euphrates in their places, and “proclaimed their name well”—a phrase which recalls that of Genesis, “and God saw that it was good.” The deity (it is apparently still Merodach who is referred to) then created grass, the plants of the marshes and the forests, the verdure of the plain, land, marsh, and thicket-grown tracts. This was followed by the creation of oxen and other large cattle, with sheep, and the meadows and thickets where they fed or dwelt. “Lord Merodach” then raised a bank (lit. “filled a filling”) on the sea-shore, produced water-plants and the place where they grow, and the things mentioned in the first few lines as being non-existent were then made by him—plants and trees, bricks and beams, houses and cities; Niffer and its temple Ê-kura, Erech and its temple Ê-ana.

There are many details of this inscription which are of interest, but it is impossible to touch upon them all in the compass of a single paper. It would be important, for instance, to know whether Merodach was the creator, not only of men and things of the earth, but of the gods and the Annunaki, or “spirits of the earth” as well, as the lists of gods indicate was the belief. Noteworthy is the fact, that nothing existed until “there was a stream” or “current within the sea,” pointing also in this version to the belief that the existence of life was somehow connected with the presence of water. At this time Êridu, the Paradise of the Babylonians, was made, and Ê-sagila, which the god Lugal-du-azaga had founded within the Abyss. As Lugal-du-azaga

—the name means “the king of the glorious abode” was one of the names of the god Aê, Merodach’s father, it is clear that he, and the “glorious Abode” over which he ruled, were not created by Merodach. But if this be the case, then Babylon, Merodach’s own city, is in the same doubtful position. As it is certain that he was regarded as the founder of the city—there is no record of its existence being due to his father Aê, and it was, moreover, the beginning of Nimrod’s (*i.e.*, Merodach’s) kingdom—it would seem likely that the whole narrative is purposely invested with doubt in order to lead the reader to suppose that even the things about which no statement is made were the work of Merodach, as Babylon and the other cities of Babylonia, in the legends of the country, certainly were.

The way in which Merodach made mankind is not described—there is mention only of the simple fact, that Aruru, the goddess of Sippar, made the seed of mankind with him. As the reference to this goddess comes in rather suddenly here, it is probable that the line was inserted simply because the inscription was a copy made for the city of Sippar, and just as Aššur-banî-âpli had his own name inscribed in at least one bilingual inscription, and his scribes left out the references to Isin and Larag or Larancha in “the Lament of the Daughter of Bel,” in like manner also this text may have been edited by the scribe who wrote it out; the name of Aruru, who, possibly according to some legend of the city, had made the seed of mankind at the creation, being inserted here to fill up what he may have considered a regrettable omission.

The incantation on the reverse, which calls down all kinds of blessings on the city of Borsippa, and Ê-zida, its celebrated temple-tower, implies that this foundation also desired to be admitted into the number of places regarded as holy, and on the same footing as Babylon, Ur, Erech, and Êridu—in fact, there is every probability that the prefixing of the story of the Creation to it by way of introduction is due to this circumstance.

There is probably but little doubt that the Semitic story of the Creation is the older of the two. This is shown by the fact that, though Merodach is the central figure in each, larger space is devoted, in the Semitic version, to the divinities who preceded him in the rule of the universe. Of course it is not impossible that the actual composition of the legend was comparatively late; but everything points to a period preceding that when it assumed the form in which we now have it. In the bilingual account, on the other hand, the wording throughout

suggests that Merodach had long been recognized as chief of the Babylonian pantheon.

The fact that there were other gods who exercised dominion in the kingdom of heaven before Merodach, seems to show that changes had taken place in the religion of the country, and it is not impossible that these changes are a reflection of its political history. Thus, from the first tablet of the Semitic story, we see that Anu, god of the heavens, was the chief divinity, and head of the pantheon. This is followed by a reference to the older Bel, and then to Aê, the father of Merodach. Farther on in the legend, where the revolt of Tiâwthu is related, Anu and Aê are again spoken of, and this in such a way as to suggest that they had been failures in their mission, as it were. They both went in turn against the foe, but without success, being (at least in one case) terrified at her frightful appearance. The explanation of this would seem to be, that it is intended as a symbolical representation of the development of the Babylonian religion. First came Anu, the deity personifying the heavens, worshipped at Erech along with the goddess Ištar, and also at other places in Babylonia. He would seem to have been the first of the great divinities, and this leads to the supposition that a state where he was adored as patron-divinity became, at some early period, predominant among the early kingdoms of Babylonia. The next one who failed to meet the Dragon of Chaos was Aê, the principal seat of whose worship seems to have been Êridu, identified with Abu-shahreïn, near the Persian Gulf. Now the earliest period at which Erech came forward as chief state—or one of the chief states—of the Babylonian confederacy, was during the reign of Lugal-zag-gi-si, whose date is set down roughly at about 4,000 years before Christ; but, as far as we know, Êridu never had any great political predominance, though it may at some time have become the religious capital of the country. It would seem, however, to be certain that the adoption of Merodach as chief of the Babylonian pantheon was due to the rise of Babylon to the position of capital of the chief province, and the worship of this divinity continued in all probability until the decay of the city, when that of Anu-Bel took its place, that is, if we may accept the indications furnished by a tablet of the time of Hyspasines. Anu-Bel was worshipped at the well-known temple of Ê-saggil, which contained the great shrine of Bel at Babylon, and it may be supposed that, in consequence of a change in the teaching of the priests, Merodach

had at that date become identified with Anu, and worshipped under the double name.

It may therefore be taken as an established fact, that Mero-dach, being the divinity of Babylon, had been generally adopted as the chief of the Babylonian pantheon on that account, for all would naturally recognize the claims of the great god of the capital of the new empire. It must not be thought, however, that his kingship was accepted by all without question. There were naturally many who would have none of these innovations, and among them the Babylonian Noah (whose name has been found to read Uta-na(v)jštim) seems to have been counted. When the patriarch asked the god Aê what answer he was to give when questioned as to why he was building the ship (the ark), he was instructed to answer as follows:—

“It has been told me (that) the God Bel hates me,  
I will not dwell in . . . and  
[In] the territory of Bel I will not set my face—  
[I shall] descend to the deep, with [Aê] my lord I shall (constantly)  
dwell.  
[As for] you, he will cause abundance to rain down upon you.”

As this is merely a legend, it may be supposed that the opinion here expressed, and put into the mouth of the Babylonian Noah, only reflects the attitude of a section of the people, who could not become reconciled to the new state of things, and remained faithful to the old belief in Aê as the head of the pantheon.

Fortunately, we are not without independent information as to what the Babylonian believed with regard to the genealogy of the divine personages which were the foundation of their faith, and the important inscriptions for this are the lists of gods. These texts are, luckily, numerous, but on the other hand are often in a fragmentary condition, which naturally places the student at a disadvantage when examining them. One of the most important of these lists, for its bearing on what is stated in the Semitic Babylonian Creation-Legend, is that published in the second volume of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, Plates 55 and 56. It will be remembered that Damascius says that the Babylonians denominated Tauthé or Tiäwthu the mother of the gods, pointing to a time when she was not the evil genius she is represented in the inscriptions dealt with in the present paper. If my comparisons be correct, this is confirmed by the list of gods to which I have referred, for we find there, at the beginning,

forty-one names of a divinity called "the lady of the gods," a goddess who is described in the recently issued fourteenth part of *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, as having brought forth offspring on three different occasions. She was certainly not regarded as anything very evil, however, for this new text is described as a song concerning her — a song "better than honey and wine, better than grapes and apples (or something of the kind), purer even than butter" (which, as is well known, is clarified in the East).

Though there are neither in the names of the "lady of the gods," nor in those of her spouse Dun-sig-ê, any which resemble (as far as they are preserved) the names of Tiāwthu and her spouse Kingu, a few parallels at least occur, which make some sort of an identification possible. Thus the spouse of "the lady of the gods" has, apparently, two sets of names, each consisting of five—ten in all. Of these the second group is explained as *bennu*, a word used in the sense of "malady" in the recently discovered laws of King Ḥammurabi. The conjecture that *bennu* in this list of gods means "evil principle," or something of the kind, lies, therefore, very close. None of these names, to all appearance, contains any indication of the idea here suggested, except the third of the second group, A-ga-giga-dugga, which may be translated "the evil-speaking inundation"—a not inappropriate name. Upon the exception here referred to I do not wish to lay any stress. The list may not have anything to do with Tiāwthu and her consort at all, notwithstanding the seeming probability of it, but the two name-lists of the consort of "the lady of the gods" is followed by the names of three divinities who were possibly their attendants, and the third of this triad was, as it seems, called Tud-udda, "the offspring of Death." The deity Ugga, "Death," has already been referred to in the description of the Semitic story of the Creation, and it is noteworthy that Tiāwthu's spouse Kingu was counted worthy, for his evil deeds, to be his companion.

The above is immediately followed by the names of the deities belonging to Ê-maḥ, "the supreme temple," but whether this be an earthly temple of that name, or one in heaven or elsewhere of which that in Babylon was the type, does not appear. This section of the list ends with the names of the fourteen sons of the goddess Maḥ (were they the overseers of the fourteen precincts of Hades which the legend of Nergal and Eres-ki-gala allows us to presuppose?), and of her four porters or gate-keepers, and the question naturally arises

therefore whether she may not have been a form of the goddess of the underworld. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that in the text published in Delitzsch's *Lesestücke*, 3rd ed., p. 104, and in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iii, Plates 67 and 68, Maḥ is likewise identified with "the lady of the gods," showing that all the text of the list I have been describing, up to the point where the section mentioning the goddess Maḥ ends, refers to her, her consort, her attendants, her court, and her servants. There would seem then, to be but little doubt that she is the same as Tiāwthu in her earlier and probably more noble and beneficent form.

With regard to the succeeding portions of this noteworthy list of gods, very little doubt can exist, the agreement with the Semitic story of the Creation being most striking. Immediately following the family and the train of the goddess Maḥ, comes the name of Aê, the second opponent of Tiāmthu, and the king of the gods immediately preceding Merodach. He has thirty-six names, after which are given those of Damkina (Dawkina, the Dauké of Damascius), his consort, who has eleven. The next on the list is Merodach, eldest son of Aê, who had more than eight names (the text is unfortunately broken here, so that the exact number is doubtful). The members of his court follow, and probably included his consort Zer-panitum; his attendants, including the divine door-keepers of his temple Ê-sagila, and his four dogs, Ukkumu, Akkulu, Ikšuda, and Iltebu ("Seizer," "Eater," "Grasper," and "Holder"). Next we have the names of the river-god, whom we see, farther on, to be none other than our old friend Aê, who, having abdicated the throne in favour of his son Merodach, was henceforth simply the divinity of the deep, the sea, rivers, and water in general, as well as lord of deep unsearchable wisdom. His spouse, messengers, attendants, and doorkeeper (or doorkeepers) follow, after which the text breaks off. That the god Aê should occur twice in this list, as detailed here, is significant, and may be regarded as in noteworthy agreement with the legend which forms the subject of this paper.

How much we have still to learn about the religion of the Babylonians can at present hardly be estimated, but it must be something very considerable, our material, voluminous as it is, being in a rather fragmentary state. To mention only one document. The duplicate of the inscription giving the foregoing details is noted as being the largest tablet known, and its value, if complete, would be more than double what it is in

its present condition, which is saying much. In all probability the series to which it belonged, if not the tablet itself, contained the names of the deities of the Babylonian pantheon as far back as Tiāwthu, the first principle, herself, and it certainly contained explanations of the names of the gods under all their different attributes.

Other lists which exist give the Babylonian pantheon in another order, beginning with Anu and Anatu, the male and female personifications of the heavens. This is followed by other names, among them being Ansara and Kisara, "the host of heaven," and "the host of earth," Lahma and Lahama, who were synonymous with Anu and Anatu, and many others, all identified with these. The children of Anu and Anatu follow, and afterwards come Anu's messengers and attendants, including Gaga, who is stated in the Semitic story of the Creation to have taken the news of Tiāwthu's rebellion and Merodach's undertaking to subdue her to Lahma and Lahama. All these inscriptions seem, therefore, to be in agreement, though it is to be noted that there are others in which a different system is adopted. This, however, may be simply because they are extracts from larger texts, and not intended to give the names of the deities as they are supposed to have been created in chronological order.

Yet further inscriptions bearing on this legend are the astronomical tablets, of which a very important one was published in the fifth volume of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* in 1884. In this text are apparently given the names of certain constellations, among them being two which are described as "the weapon of the hands of Merodach," namely, the *gamlu* or "finisher" (to all appearance this, or something similar, is its meaning), the star or constellation of the Ram being described as its head; and the *mulmulla*, the name of which occurs in the account of Merodach's fight with the Dragon of Evil, and is generally rendered "spear," or something of the kind. In this text the "star of the king," probably Regulus, is explained as Merodach, and recalls the fact that he had that title as one of his names, and was also really a king in the earthly sense of the word. Indeed, it is he whose kingdom's beginning was "Babel, and Erech, and Akkad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar," Nimrod, to whom this domain is attributed in the tenth chapter of Genesis, being nothing else than a corruption of the name of Merodach, due to prefixing an *n* to the original form Amaruduk, taking off the last two letters, and changing the vowels. Another important inscription is that giving many of these and

other constellations, which I copied several years ago, and published in transcription in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1900, p. 573 ff. This has the star or constellation of the bow, the long chariot (perhaps the great chariot in which Merodach went forth to fight the Dragon), the Star of Death, with whose divinity Kingu, Tiāwthu's spouse, was associated, the constellation of the raging dog, probably one of those creatures described as Tiāwthu's helpers, and the Star of Merodach, "king of the Igigi," or gods of the heavens. In all, there are thirty-six constellations, being three for each month, as stated in that part of the legend where Merodach's creation and arrangement of the heavenly bodies are spoken of. From the fragments known to him, Mr. Robert Brown, jun., had already recognized this fact.

But in the compass of a single paper it is impossible to touch upon all the details of these interesting legends, every section of which presents several points of interest. Many, unfortunately, are of a somewhat technical nature, but I trust that what I have said concerning those of which I have spoken will not have been thought too dry. I should have liked also to touch upon those interesting glossaries of the last tablet of the Semitic series, but this I think best to reserve for the notes upon these legends which I hope to write later on. At present it will suffice to say that these fragments, which have been known to scholars for many years, show the importance which the ancient Babylonians attached to the last tablet of the series, and also to the legend as a whole. There is also part of a commentary bearing upon the first tablet of the series, as well as some fragments of late date which are possibly copies of early glossaries and commentaries. It is true that other inscriptions also had similar critical apparatus and aids to study, but there were probably but few which were so well provided. It was to all appearance their holy book—their Bible, hence the care which the early Babylonians lavished upon it. Whether the glossary to the last tablet of the Semitic version bears upon the question of the origin of the legend is uncertain, but it probably points to a Sumerian, that is, a non-Semitic source for it. Like all other explanatory lists from Babylonia and Assyria, it is written with the non-Semitic words in the left-hand column, and the Semitic translations on the right. This probably points, as in the case of other bilingual texts, to the probability that the Semitic version (notwithstanding that it is the only one with which we are acquainted) is not the original one. If this be the case, the original language was the dialect of Sumerian, in

which language many texts were written, such as the hymns to Tammuz and other divinities, and that which I have called "the lament of the Daughter of Sin."

As many nations are engaged in the work of unearthing the remains of Babylonia and Assyria, there is every probability that we shall sooner or later obtain still further inscription bearing on the text, and probably many completions. Whatever one may write, it is therefore certain before long to be superseded. No Assyriologist can therefore at present hope to do much of real permanent value. It is on that account that much of what I have written to read before you this afternoon already needs change and supplementing, but when my paper is printed in the *Journal of the Institute*, I trust that it will be found, within its compass, up to date.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we have all listened with great attention to this very valuable paper. It is difficult to in any way measure or estimate the amount of profound research and infinite patience—"that true mark of genius," as Carlyle expressed it—that this paper shows. To those of us who remember the beginning of the reading of the cuneiform inscriptions, it is especially interesting to have these highly developed, if not fully developed, discoveries of the thoughts and ideas of those very ancient people.

It may be a little perplexing to some of us to follow the thoughts in their minds, but one point presents itself to us, and that is the strong likeness we see in these people's ideas to those of Agnostics of the present day, and it is very interesting to find them recurring after these thousands of years.

Mr. W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN.—I hope you will excuse me when I say that I think it is hardly fair to discuss this extremely elaborate paper until it is printed. It is a good deal hampered, too, by the work that has appeared within the last few days. That work is certainly most up-to-date. But there are one or two points to which I would refer in these traditions, as I believe I was the

first person who brought them before the Victoria Institute.\* An immense amount of material, dating back to the seventh century B.C., has been collected within the last few years, from the library of Nineveh and other sources, and the Babylonian series constitute essentially an epic poem.

All must think, like the *Iliad* of Homer, that it is not a work or composition of one period, but a work composed of materials gathered together from various sources fused and blended into a great religious whole.

I think those who have read Dr. Pinches' paper, and especially those who have read Mr. King's valuable work on the subject, will see that, like the first chapter of Genesis, it contains material of more than one period.

Dr. Pinches refers to the great prominence given to God in the early part of the poem and in the account of the deluge. Some years ago Dr. Pinches published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* the bilingual legend of the Creation. That legend, to my mind, is much more important than the story of the Creation, and, I think, if Dr. Pinches takes the trouble to look through it, he will see that is a document that has undergone a most clumsy sub-editing, and that if he takes lines sixteen and seventeen and possibly nineteen from the text, he will find portions that are clumsily made to connect themselves with the school of Babylon, a city that took no very prominent part in the affairs of the dynasty; but as soon as the kings came into power there was a great change in government. The centralization of government and of law is shown by a series of laws which, curiously enough, were codified about 2200 B.C., and continued in use until about a century before the Christian era and were afterwards revived and handed on. During that period the epic was drawn up, and you find that both in the seventh tablet and during this bilingual period, the epithets of their gods have been taken and used for Merodach. Then, again, the epic seems to have undergone slight alteration at the hands of the Assyrian scribes, but not much—they were uneducated. There was no Assyrian literature really except the inscriptions.

---

\* "Cuneiform inscriptions as illustrative of the times of the Jewish Captivity," *Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. xviii (1884). Mr. Hormuzd Rassam has written on the same subject in vols. xiv and xvii.—Ed.

The epic was probably drawn up during that period, but prior to that there was a story that had been associated with the god mentioned here. He is not only the god of water, but the god of agriculture, and the very open lines of the new portions of the seventh tablet all distinctly show how prominent the god of agriculture was. The account of the real work of the Creation does not begin until the middle of the fourth tablet.

The composition of this legend shows that we have to go back prior to 2000 B.C. for the later portion of it, and that is clearly shown by this remarkable Semitic fragment which Dr. Pinches has referred to, and these remarkable hymns which have been published. Those hymns are really popular songs; but the interesting part of them is that their grammatical construction and peculiarities are the same as those found in the creation narrative. Go back to the creation week that appears in the first chapter of Genesis, in which everything culminates on the seventh day. We are constantly told by those who have been to Babylon (and I have been there myself), that the sabbath is a Babylonian institution. There is no proof of it. A sabbath applies to the seventh, fourteenth and twenty-first days; but it only applies to the kings. The king would not wash or change his clothing, or ride on those days that were so set apart, otherwise all the functions of life were carried out on the seventh day, and the king being, *ex officio*, a priest, it was connected with the priests.

I will close my remarks by saying that Dr. Pinches' paper will be extremely valuable to us. I think almost all Assyriologists have had a turn at these tablets, and I suppose we have now the most complete and ancient poem in the world.

MR. MARTIN ROUSE.—I would ask Mr. Boscawen if it is not the fact, as stated in Professor Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, that the days of the week were named by the Babylonians?

MR. BOSCAWEN.—Professor Sayce says so, but I have never found it so.

MR. ROUSE.—Granted that is not correct, how is it that the king is told not to light a fire or drive in his chariot on a certain day, and that the day is called "the day of rest to the heart"; and further, that even the prophets were not to prophecy on that day? It is a very remarkable thing.

MR. BOSCAWEN.—It is nothing of the kind, sir.

Mr. ROUSE.—It is so stated in Professor Sayce's *Higher Criticism*.

Mr. BOSCAWEN.—No; an augur does not make an augury.

Mr. ROUSE.—The so-called prophets of Babylon might not prophecy. An augur would be a priest, surely!

I would ask why we are to suppose that the documents that Mr. Boscawen says are to be attributed to Babylon should be when the text itself is so unlike them?

Then as to the creation of man from the blood of Merodach, that is a little like man being made in God's own image and being a rational spirit. Are we to suppose that the Jews borrowed it from the Babylonians?

Again, there is something in the Bible itself which looks as if the Jews had forgotten their language in Babylon, for we find that when Ezra, the scribe, read out the law of God, the Levites had to give the people the sense of it. I should think, decidedly, it meant that they had forgotten their own tongue. Therefore, how is it conceivable that they should invent those ancient Hebrew manuscripts which are constantly referred to in other parts of the Bible?

I entirely deny that in any possible sense can that second chapter of Genesis be called "The Creation." If we suppose that to be called the creation, then, according to that, man is created on the bare earth with not a single herb in the ground, and then a garden is made and he is put in that, and everything outside is waste and empty until God makes the herbs of the field after he goes out of the garden, for it is never mentioned until after. Therefore, if that be an account of the creation, it is an exceedingly poor one.

May I ask Dr. Pinches who is referred to by that writer, Damascius, as "the only begotten son"?

Dr. PINCHES.—Merodach.

Mr. ROUSE.—That I hold to be a remarkable fact that this being, whose ancestors, the dragons, emblems of light and evil, is called "the only begotten son." We all know that in Egypt there is Isis and Osiris and their son Horus, and we have, certainly, accounts in Babylon of Istār and the son she is to have. Whether that is Merodach or not I will get Dr. Pinches to answer. Then we have the tradition of a wonderful woman, and her son, who was to work

a great deliverance in the world. Istär, as Professor Sayce has shown, is no other than Eve.

There is another point about Merodach. Dr. Pinches has told us on a previous occasion, and now, that Merodach is the same as *Nimrod*. In Professor Boscawen's lecture on "Discoveries made in Elam" he gives the actual name Namarandu as almost identical with Nimrod.

Mr. BOSCAWEN.—The name means "Lord," and "Namarandu" "Lord of the City."

Mr. ROUSE.—So it may in the Bible.

Mr. BOSCAWEN.—Certainly, that is what I say.

Professor ORCHARD.—I think we are all of opinion, on reflection, that this curious epic poem was founded on something in the nature of sober fact and history, and we shall, I think, be of opinion that the writer must have had before him the early chapters of Genesis. The imaginative point which has just been referred to (I may say painted on canvas and illustrated by nature), was doubtless founded on some very simple and unvarnished statement of facts. Those facts we find in the early chapters of Genesis. Who wrote those early chapters? We may think, I suppose, that Adam himself, or his immediate descendants, were those who first wrote them.

With regard to Nimrod, I think he had mistaken the prognostication of the promised Messiah who was promised to our first parents in the Garden of Eden. I have long been of opinion, and every day confirms me, that the more discoveries that are made, the more we shall find that the book of Genesis is, beyond all question, of Divine origin. It is very well able to take care of itself, I think.

The Rev. F. A. WALKER, D.D.—Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain you long at this hour. I only ask leave to put to the learned lecturer one question, viz., in what nation, he thinks, the lament over Tamus, to which he alluded, originated. We know it is a wide-spread classical tale in the poems of old. Its local habitation was doubtless Assyria; but I would ask Dr. Pinches whether he thinks the Assyrians were the first inventors of the legend, or the Babylonians? It also finds an honoured place in Ovid's poem and the "Idyls of Theocritus."

The Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S.—I should like to add a few words to what has been said on this most interesting and

valuable paper. We may congratulate ourselves that a very close investigation is being made at the present time of these Creation stories both in the Babylonian series of tablets and in Genesis; the more closely they are investigated the more we may be sure the truth concerning both will come out.

I think we may come to the conclusion, already, that the Babylonian story is very largely legendary. But whenever we find a legend it is natural to inquire whether there may not have been some basis for the legend. Now if we look into the Babylonian legend, we shall find some prominent points of it that we must admit to be matters of fact. First of all there is a chaos of the primeval elements of creation, with no distinct discrimination between land, sea and clouds. Then you have an extraordinary intervention of the power of Merodach—a fight with the dragon of chaos and a description of the separation between land and sea, and clouds and water, and then there follows something of an astronomical nature, and you have the constellations referred to. Subsequently to that you have the creation of different animals, plants and man.

Now both the story in Genesis and the story as described by modern science have arranged these facts in exactly the same order. You will remember that the geologist tells us about an universal ocean, and you have these words occurring in the Babylonian story, "The waters of the sea were one." Then in the first chapter of Genesis you have the account of the appointment of the sun and moon to regulate the day and night, and the appearance of the stars followed by the creation of plants, animals, and man.

Now I beg to submit that we have a most important question before us—How did the Babylonian legend become framed if there were not some knowledge of the facts before the legend came into existence? And if the facts were known before the legend came into existence (and I take it there is no possibility of denying that they must have been), there is then this very pertinent and difficult question. How came those facts to be known? If you compare the first chapter of Genesis with the Babylonian story, you have a simple unvarnished account of facts as they were. I challenge any charge against that chapter of any single incorrect word in the light of the most modern science from beginning to end.

Now where did that chapter come from? Mr. Boscawen may say that it came into existence in Babylon in the seventh century before Christ. I see no reason why we should say it came into existence then, rather 2,250 years before Christ. If the legend be based on the facts, they must have been known before the legend was composed, or as far back as 2,500 years B.C. But those facts could not have been known as the result of scientific investigation. They must have been supernaturally communicated. There was no known scientific investigation that could have revealed them. We are therefore brought, I think, to this conclusion, that there must have been a communication of these facts to mankind before they appeared, as Mr. Boscawen says, in Assyrian and Babylonian literature. So also with regard to the Hebrew account, there may have been editing; but composing such narratives as those is quite another thing. Editorial touches here and there there may be, but there is not the slightest foundation for believing in the existence of any Jehovistic or Elohistic documents. There is no trace of any such documents in all the literature of antiquity, and neither Jew nor Gentile knew anything about them until in recent years they were invented in the brains of the higher critics.

Dr. PINCHES, in reply, said: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think at this late hour I need address you at any length.

The remarks on my paper have been rather more of the nature of comment than criticism, and here I may say that I thank all who have joined in the discussion for their remarks, and especially Mr. Boscawen for his fairness.

It is a matter of great regret to me that I was unable to incorporate the discoveries of Mr. King in my paper in time to read it to-night, but I hope, as I have said, to make up deficiencies when my paper is in print.

It is needless to say that I agree with most of what Mr. Boscawen has said concerning the date of the legend and many other points. I shall certainly examine the lines which he mentions of the non-Semitic story of the creation—lines 16, 17 and 19—in order to go over, if I can, to his point of view.

Concerning the remarks of Mr. Rouse, I would mention the point of the week, and that I do without reference to any question as to the existence of the creative week. Certain days are mentioned as being unlucky days (the word used is *hul-gal*, "evil-making"), and

those days are said to be unsuitable for the king and other persons mentioned to do the things referred to. This is not quite what one would expect for the sabbath. The *hul-gal* and the sabbath are apparently two different institutions.

As to whether the Assyrian word *šabattu* is connected with the Hebrew sabbath or not I leave to your individual opinions, but it seems to me very probable that it is. The days with the Babylonians were not numbered from one to seven and then beginning again, but they began with the first day and went straight on to the 29th or 30th, as the case might be. In the lists there are certain days that have special names. Amongst other names quoted are *hul gal* and *šobat*, which latter was the fifteenth day of the month. So we have this little difficulty. Perhaps there is a confusion of the two terms, and the Hebrews, borrowing the word sabbath, may have applied it to their development of the term *hul-gal* which was *evil* in the eyes of the Babylonians.

Mr. BOSCAWEN.—There is no trace of it in any ordinary document.

Dr. PINCHES.—No, it only occurs in the list with the numbers of the days.

Concerning *Ištār* being the same as *Eve*. I leave that also to your individual opinions.

I do not know whether there is really anything in the story of the flood where *Anu* is spoken of in connection with the rainbow. I should like to have more information from the Babylonian inscriptions on that point before I pronounce an opinion.

Mr. MARTIN ROUSE.—I have read it from the translations several times.

Dr. PINCHES.—Yes, I know it has been translated so.

Then as to the question of *Merodach* and *Nimrod*, we must admit that *Ninmarad* is very similar to *Nimrod*, but I think, as I stated in my article in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, that certain names were manipulated by the Hebrew scribes simply because they were the names of Hebrew deities and because they were polytheistic they did not wish to commit them to paper. Of these *Nimrod* is one.

I do not know that anything calls for an answer in the remarks of Professor Orchard. I am much obliged to him for his kind expressions, and I will now pass to Dr. Walker's question concerning the lamentations for *Tammuz*. These go back certainly to 2,000

years B.C., or perhaps earlier. The inscriptions published by the British Museum lately are in the Akkadian language and have no Semitic translation at all. The probability therefore is, that they are very ancient indeed, and the earliest version of these hymns being in the Akkadian language, it is likely that they originated with those people. (I use the word Akkadian, but perhaps I should say Sumerian.)

I am much obliged to Mr. Tuckwell for his kind remarks. I do not think there is anything to answer there.

The vote of thanks having been put and carried unanimously, the meeting adjourned.

NOTE UPON THE NON-SEMITIC (BILINGUAL) STORY OF THE  
CREATION. (See pp. 33 and 38.)

This text is treated of in Section VIII. of this paper. The lines mentioned by Mr. Boscawen, "sixteen, seventeen and possibly nineteen," refer to "the glorious city," the seat of the joy of the gods' hearts, which Merodach had proclaimed as supreme; and speak of this deity binding together a foundation before the waters, in order that the gods might have a dwelling which should satisfy their hearts—"a seat of joy of heart," as the original text says. These lines, however, seem to me to belong so closely to the context that their elimination would impair the sense; and I am therefore unable to follow him in his argument, however much I should like to do so.