A HEBREW DELUGE STORY
IN CUNEIFORM
AND OTHER EPIC FRAGMENTS IN
THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY

BY
ALBERT T. CLAY

NEW HAVEN
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON · HUMPHREY MILFORD · OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
MDCCCCXXII
To my Colleague and Friend

Professor Charles Cutler Torrey
FOREWORD

The title of this little monograph tells its own story, namely, that an ancient Hebrew deluge tradition written in cuneiform is here presented. It is not a recent discovery, nor is it the first time that it has appeared in print. It was first published a number of years ago, but owing to a faulty copy of the text originally presented, its importance has never been understood.

This story of the deluge which had found its way into Babylonia, where it was made to conform largely to the Akkadian dialect, fully betrays its origin; it came from the same source whence the Hebrew traditions came, namely from the people who lived in Amurru (Syria and Mesopotamia), called the Amorites. As was the case in pre-Mosaic days, and to a large extent in early Israel, when henotheism prevailed, "God" is the foremost deity. We learn from this tradition, and also from its redaction written centuries later, that a long famine preceded the deluge, which is not referred to in the Old Testament, that the famine had been sent because men had multiplied, and also because of their clamor, reminding us of the causes given for the deluge in the Old Testament.

The great importance of this inscription, which was copied about the time of Abraham from an older tablet, together with other facts here presented, is that it will require that the prevailing view be abandoned that the Hebrew traditions were borrowed from Babylonia. This involves many scholarly works written in recent decades upon the early history of Israel. It has been generally held that these stories are of Babylonian origin; that Canaan was a domain of Babylonian culture in the time of Moses; and that Israel had assimilated this foreign culture as well as its religion, "feathers and all." Not only is the Israelitish cult held to be dependent upon the Babylonian, but also many of the chief characters are said to have descended from Babylonian mythology. In Germany where these views developed, some scholars have gone to great extremes; only a change of names had taken place, and Marduk or Bel was transformed into Christ. In America a more moderate position has generally been accepted, in which
the extreme views were toned down, and the Pan-Babylonian theory made more palatable. Nevertheless, it is generally held that these traditions had been brought from Babylonia in the time of Abraham, or in the Amarna Period, or at the time of the exile; and that many of the characters had their origin in myth.

Twelve years ago the writer took issue with this general position, holding that the traditions of the Hebrews were indigenous in the land of the Amorites; and that contrary to the prevailing view, this land was not dependent for its population upon Arabs who migrated from Arabia a little before and after the time of Abraham, but upon an indigenous people, the antiquity of whose culture is as high as that known in Egypt or Babylonia; and also that the Semites who moved into the lower Euphrates valley mainly came from this quarter, and brought with them their culture. He has also consistently maintained that such familiar Biblical characters as the patriarchs and others, instead of being the creations of fiction writers, were historical personages.

While the new point of view was accepted by many scholars, and the tremendous flow of Pan-Babylonian literature was suddenly and very materially reduced in volume, only a few of those who had written upon the subject acknowledged the gains that had been made, and reversed their positions. Even some scholars in their efforts to nullify the advances, instead of facing the real issue in their reviews, dwelt upon and held up as proof of the writer's thesis some extraneous suggestions which had been intended for consideration in filling in the background of the two or more millennia of Amorite history prior to Abraham.

The writer's thesis in brief is, that the Arabian origin of the Semites living in ancient Syria and Babylonia, including the Hebrews, is baseless; but that the antiquity of the Amorite civilization is very great; and also the assertion that the culture and religion of Israel were borrowed from Babylonia is without any foundation; for they were indigenous; and that the Semites who migrated to Babylonia with their culture were mainly from Amurru. In the judgment of the writer the material presented in this little monograph, as well as in his recently published *Empire of the Amorites*, will require a very extensive readjustment of
many views bearing upon the subject, as well as the abandonment of many others. Moreover, it also has bearings of a far-reaching character on many other Old Testament problems.

Amurru, called "the land of the Amorites," it might be added, is a geographical term which was used in ancient times for the great stretch of territory between Babylonia and the Mediterranean. By reason of its products and its position this land had been attractive to other peoples ever since one strove to obtain what the other possessed, resulting in almost innumerable invasions and conflicts taking place in this land. Within the historical period we know that the Babylonians, Egyptians, Hittites, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Turks, and other peoples controlled this territory. It should be added that this country in turn also prevailed at times over other lands, notably Babylonia and Egypt. In these pages we have evidence that one of its rulers conquered Babylonia as early as 4000 B.C.

This country has always represented ethnologically a great mixture. Linguistically, as far as is known, a Semitic language has always prevailed in this great stretch of territory. The Amorite or Hebrew language, being the oldest of which we have knowledge, was followed by the Aramaic, and later by the Arabic which now prevails. To what extent the Akkadian dialect was used in certain parts, and what script was employed in the early period, are as yet undetermined. Excavations at one or two well selected sites will throw light on this and many other questions, and furnish us with the material whereby we will be able to reconstruct many chapters of its early history.

It gives the writer great pleasure to inscribe this little contribution to his colleague and friend, Professor Charles Cutler Torrey, who not only has watched sympathetically these investigations advance, but also in reading the manuscript has made a number of suggestions as well as several identifications of roots which are indicated in the foot notes.

Albert T. Clay.

New Haven, Conn.,
May 19, 1922.
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I

AN ANCIENT HEBREW DELUGE STORY

This fragment of a large tablet was published in text, transliteration and translation nearly twenty-five years ago, before it had come into the possession of the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection of Babylonian Inscriptions; in the meantime many other translations have appeared.\(^1\) Moreover, owing to the form in which the tablet had been presented, due somewhat to its not having been thoroughly cleaned, its importance has only been slightly appreciated. While it was understood that it had the same general application as a legend preserved in the British Museum, known as the Ea and Atra-ḫasis legend, and belonging to a later period, the latter, owing to its fragmentary condition, could not be said to refer to the deluge. Moreover, while it was apparent that the present text did refer to the deluge, it was considered even by one who examined the tablet that it "contained little more than a few phrases and words, without any coherent connection."\(^2\) Further study, however, as will be seen from what follows, reveals the fact that this is a mistake; that it is a part of an old version of what should properly be called the Atra-ḫasis Epic, which is a very ancient Hebrew or Amorite Deluge Story; and that the so-called Ea and Atra-ḫasis Legend of the Assyrian period, which has also been translated by a number of scholars,\(^3\) is a late redaction of it. The later version or redaction was put into a magical setting for incantation purposes. In the Appendix will be found the transliteration and translation of all the versions of this deluge story or stories, both cuneiform and Greek. The ancient dated text is designated as A, and the late redaction as B.

\(^1\) Scheil Recueil de Travaux 20 (1898) 55 ff; Jensen KB VI 1 288 ff; Dhorme Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens 120 ff; Ungnad Altorientalische Texte und Bilder I, 57 ff; Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 104 ff; etc.

\(^2\) Hilprecht RE Ser. D, V 1 p. 44.

\(^3\) CT 15, 49. Translated by Zimmern ZA 14, 277 ff; Jensen KB VI 1 274 ff; Dhorme Ibidem 128 ff; Ungnad ATB I 61 ff; Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 113 ff and others.
A small fragment in the British Museum, ostensibly from a version of the Atra-ḫasis Epic, for it mentions the hero's name, which was also written in the late period, furnishes us with the conversation between the god Ea and Atra-ḫasis concerning the construction of the ship, and with what it should be loaded. This is designated in the Appendix as C.

A few years ago there was published a brief epitomized history of the world, written in Sumerian, beginning with the creation, followed by an account of the building of cities and the story of the deluge. This tablet was found during the excavations at Nippur conducted by the University of Pennsylvania. The tablet was written after the Sumerian language had ceased to be spoken in its purity, some time between the middle of the First Dynasty of Babylonia and the second Nīsin era, that is between 2300 and 1300 B.C. Like the other legend written in the late period, it seems to have been used for incantation purposes. It is evidently based upon the same story as that from which the Gilgamesh Epic story has descended, as is apparent from several expressions found in it. The phrase in the Sumerian version "when for seven days and nights the flood overwhelms the land" (D, V: 3, 4) is paralleled in the Semitic by "six days and nights the wind drives; the deluge-tempest overwhelms the land, when the seventh day arrives, the tempest subsides in the onslaught" (E, 128-130). The reference also to "the wall," when the hero was apprised of the impending deluge, is in both. Further, the title of the hero, Um-napishtim, is replaced in the Sumerian by Zi-ū-suddu, which is composed of three elements, Zi (napishtim) "life," and ū (um) "day," to which the element suddu (rēqu) "to be distant" has been added. It is not impossible that Um-napishtim, which contains two of the three elements of the Sumerian name, is an abbreviated form of the original (see below). This version is designated as D.

The hero of the other and well known deluge story, which in the late period had been woven into the Gilgamesh Epic, is Atra-ḫasis,

*Delitzsch Assyr. Lex.* p. 101; *KB VI 1 254 ff.* etc.

*See Poebel *Historical and Grammatical Texts* No. 1; and *Historical Texts* 14 ff; and 66 ff.*
but his title, which is better known in connection with the story, is Um-napishtim, or Uta-napishtim. This is designated as E.

Besides these versions or fragments of versions there is also known a little fragment of thirteen partially preserved lines, written probably in the Cassite period (about 1400 B.C.), in which neither the name of a god nor that of the hero is preserved. This is designated as F.

The deluge story handed down by Berossus, in which the hero is Xisuthros (Σωσθρος), which name represents a transposition of the elements of Atra-Ḥasis, i.e., Ḥasis-atra, is still another version of the epic. This is designated as G.

The only dated version written in cuneiform is the one in the Pierpont Morgan Collection. It was copied from a still earlier inscription by a junior scribe named Azag-Aya, on the 28th day of Shebet, in the 11th year of Ammi-zaduga (1966 B.C.), which date is about 1300 years earlier than the time of the Library of Ashurbanipal (668-626 B.C.), to which the late redaction of it, now in the British Museum, belonged. The original from which the scribe copied had already been injured in the 12th line, which is indicated by the word ḫibīš "broken." How much earlier the previous text was written, cannot be surmised; but there are reasons for believing it is a very ancient legend, probably written two thousand years earlier (see below).

Unfortunately, the tablet has been injured since it was first published twenty-five years ago. Several small pieces have been lost from the surface of it. In the copy of the inscription, given in the Appendix, these parts are based upon the original copy made twenty-five years ago, and are indicated by small ink dots, easily recognized.

---


7 Hilprecht BE Ser. D V 1 p. 48. This fragment, if it actually came from Nippur, belongs to the Cassite period. This conclusion is based on a palaeographical and linguistic study of texts found at Nippur belonging to the Hammurabi and the Cassite periods. If the text came from Sippar, which is more likely, or from some other Semitic city, then it is possible that it was written at a somewhat earlier time.

8 See Zimmern KAT 543 f.
The fragment shows that the tablet, of which it was a part, had eight columns. This can be determined from the shape of the fragment, the second column of which, not being complete, does not reach the thickest part of the tablet, i.e., the middle. It can also be determined that it had eight columns from the number of lines.\(^9\) Deducting those of the last column, namely 37, from the total number of the tablet, which is 439, leaves 402; which divided into the remaining seven columns, gives 57 or 58 for each. This can be verified by adding 37 to the nearly 20 preserved in the seventh column, which equals 57.

This fragment of the ancient version contains the opening lines of what was the second tablet of the series, which was entitled or known by the words \textit{I-nu-ma i-lu a-we-lum}. This is an incomplete sentence meaning "When God, man," etc.\(^10\) It recalls the well known title \textit{Enuma Anu Enlil} "When Anu, Enlil," the complete form of which is known: "When Anu, Enlil, and Ea, the great gods, entrusted the great laws of heaven," etc. \textit{Inuma ilu awēlum} were doubtless the initial words of the first tablet of the series.

What the content of the first tablet was cannot be surmised. Like the Sumerian text found at Nippur, and the first chapter of Genesis, it may have contained an account of the creation. This second tablet of the ancient version opens with a reference to the famine, as in the late redaction. In the latter we learn that the famine lasted six, probably seven years; and that it became so severe that human flesh was eaten. The Biblical story makes no reference to a famine preceding the deluge; nor does the Gilgamesh Epic story; yet in the light of the Atra-hasis Epic this would seem to be implied in the Gilgamesh story in the message which Ea tells Um-napishtim to give to the people, namely, "it will rain for you abundance," after the ship is built.

The famine in the ancient Atra-hasis version came after men began to multiply, and the land had become satiated "like a bull." This fact is hinted at in the late redaction where we have the line "[The people] have not become less; they are more numerous than before" (B, III: 39). It was ordered that the fig tree be cut off,

\(^9\) This was determined when the tablet was originally published; see Scheil \textit{RT} 20 55 ff.
\(^10\) This was originally incorrectly read \textit{i-nu-ma sal-lu a-we-lum} (see below).
that Adad withhold the rain; that the rivers be restrained at their source; that the fields withhold their produce; and that the womb be closed. The lines of the seventh column refer to the intervention of the god Ea, after Adad had opened the heavens and sent a deluge. The promise to preserve the seed of life is also referred to, as well as the entering into the ship.

What is preserved of the redactor’s work makes no reference to the flood. Whether the redactor included in his work also the account of the deluge, the main theme of the epic, can be determined only when other parts of his incantation are found. The ancient version, however, enables us to ascertain where he obtained his account of the famine, which he used for incantation purposes, in connection with sickness and the bearing of children. The story of the famine involving the lack of fertility lent itself to such a purpose. That he modified, enlarged, and glossed it, is perfectly clear from the transliteration and translation of the two texts, the ancient and the redaction.

Complete translations of all the cuneiform deluge stories are given in the Appendix; but in order to have the related parts of the two texts of the Atra-ḫasis Epic together for the purpose of comparison, the following selections are here given: A, I: 1 to 19 of the former, and B, III: 2 to 8 and 37 to 59 of the latter.

**Selection from the Early Version Lines 1-19.**

1 [li]-(?)-bi-il [ri]-ig-[maš-i]-n
   bal-ṭi-a(?)
   ma-tum ir-ta-bi-iš ni-[šu im]-ti-da
   [m]a-tum ki-ma li-i i-ša-ab-bu
   [i-na] ḫu-bu-ri-ši-na i-lu it-ta-ah-da-ar
   5 [.....] iš-te-me ri-gi-im-ši-in
   [iž]-za-kar a-na el(?)-li ra-bu-tim
   iq-ta-ab-ta ri-gi-im a-wi-lu-ti
   i-na ḫu-bu-ri-ši-na iz-za-kar ma-ši-it-ta

I will bring (?) their clamor (?)
......

The land had become great; the people had multiplied.

The land like a bull had become satiated.

[In] their assemblage God was absent.

...... heard their clamor.

He said to the great gods (?) Those observing the clamor of men.

In their assemblage he spoke of desolations.
Let the fig tree for the people be cut off.
[In] their [fields], let the plant become a weed (?).
...... the sheep let Adad destroy.
[The fountains of the deep] let not flow.
[That the flood rise not at the source.
Let the wind blow.
Let it drive mightily.
Let the clouds be held back, that [Rain from the heavens pour not forth.
Let the field withhold its fertility.
[Let a change come over] the bosom of Nisaba.

[Concerning] their clamor he became troubled.
[He spoke in] their assemblage to those untouched [by the desolations].
[Enlil] held [his] assembly.
[He said to the gods his children, Those observing the clamor of men:
[Concerning] their clamor I am troubled.
[He said in] their assemblage to those untouched by the desolations.
[Enlil] held his assembly; he speaks to the gods his children.
...... I will put them to death.
[The people] have not become less; they are more numerous than before.

[Concerning] their clamor I am troubled.

He said in] their assemblage to those untouched by the desolations:

Let the fig tree for the people be [cut off.]

[I]n their bellies let the plant be wanting.

Above, let Adad make his rain scarce.

Below let (the fountain of the deep) be stopped that the flood rise not at the source.

Let the field withhold its fertility. Let a change come over the bosom of Nisaba; by night let the fields become white.

Let the wide field bear weeds (?).

Let her bosom revolt, that the plant come not forth, that the sheep become not pregnant.

Let calamity be placed upon the people.

Let the [womb] be closed, that it bring forth no infant.

The fig tree was cut [off] for the people.

In their bellies, the plant was wanting.

Above, Adad made scarce his rain. Below (the fountain of the deep) was stopped, that the flood rose not at the source.

The field withheld its fertility.

A change came over the bosom of Nisaba; the fields by night became white.
The critical historical study of the late redactor’s work is comparatively easy in this instance, because we have an original from which his work has descended. In the thirteen hundred years many copyists and redactors had doubtless taken part in transmitting the legend. How many times the text had been re-copied during the two or three thousand years of its history prior to the time the present early version was inscribed, cannot be surmised.

This old version contains absolutely nothing to suggest the idea that it had originally been written in Sumerian. On the contrary, it is clearly evident that it is of Amorite origin. Not only are the hero and the deities Amorite, but also certain words, which were not in current use in Akkadian.

One of the most striking Amorite words in the text is ḫuburu (line 4), which also is found in the redaction. This has been left untranslated in all the translations known to the writer except one, where the meaning “totalité” is given. The word unquestionably is West Semitic, and means “assemblage, association.” It is found also in the Creation Story, in ummu ḫubur “mother of the assembly (or association)” of gods, the title of Tiāmat, “the mother of them all” (muallidat gimrišun), who was of West Semitic origin. The redactor, fearing the word would not be understood by his Assyrian readers, inserted a line which follows in his transcription, reading “[En]-lil established his assembly”; in which he used the regular Assyrian word for “assembly” (puhru).

The root of it-ta-ah-da-ar (A, 4) is not found in Akkadian, but it is in Hebrew, in ‘adar “[to be absent, to be lacking;” in which

---

1 See notes beneath the transliteration in the Appendix.
2 King read it as a name ummu Ḫubur; see Seven Tablets of Creation, p. 17. Zimmern translated Ḫubur “Tiefe, Totenreich” KAT VI 642 f; Jensen translated “Die Mutter des Nordens” KB VI 1, p. 7, and suggested other possibilities, as Ἑλέαννα, Getō, Sünde, Gesamtheit” pp. 308 and 541; Ungnad “Mutter Ḫubur” ATB I 9; and Ebeling “Die Mutter der Tiefe” Altorientalische Texte und Untersuchungen II 4, p. 22.
3 See Clay Amurru the Home of the Northern Semites 49 f.
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language the verbal forms occur also in the Niphal, see 2 Sam., 17: 26, Isaiah 40: 26, etc. Apparently the redactor did not understand the word, for he changed the sense, and wrote in his paraphrase "Concerning their clamor he was troubled" (*ittadir*) (B, III: 2).

The word *ig-ta-ab-ta* (A, 7) does not occur in Akkadian; it is Amorite. In Ethiopic and Aramaic, 'aqab means "to observe, mark," etc. It is found in Hebrew with the meaning "to follow at the heel."

The word *ma-si-it-ta* "desolations" (A, 8) is Hebrew; see Job 30: 3; Psalm 74: 3, etc. In the redaction, the word used is *ni-si-tu*. This also is Hebrew (see Psalm 88: 13).

A very striking and important proof that the original story was Amorite or Hebrew is to be seen in the use of the word *te-i-na* (A, 9), which is the Hebrew word for "fig tree." This the early redactors had allowed to stand, but a later scribe, feeling that this would not be understood in his country where the fig was practically unknown, replaced the Hebrew word *te-i-na* with *ti-ta*, the Babylonian word for "fig tree." In Babylonian and Assyrian literature the word *titu* or *tittu* is little more than known. In Hebrew literature, as in the present text, the word "fig tree" is synonymous with "prosperity." It was not in Babylonia nor in Assyria that man "dwelt under" and ate "every one of his fig tree," but in Syria (see Mic. 4: 4; Is. 36: 16, etc.).

Owing to the injury of the tablet it is not possible to say that *šu* (A, 11), translated "flock," is not the pronominal suffix, but the word *šu* which does occur in the redactor's paraphrase, is another Hebrew word meaning "flock, sheep," which is frequently found in the Old Testament.

In *li-sa-aq-ti-il* (A, 11) is to be seen an Amorite word which had not been used in Akkadian. Whether the redactor understood its meaning, we do not know; but he changed the wording; and he also condensed the six lines of the original which follow (A, 12 to 16) into one line (see B, II: 30 and III: 45). Not only do we find *lišaqtil* instead of *lušaqtil*, but note also *limtanni, lištarriq, lišasznin*, and perhaps also *lierrri* and *imassid*. This probably is a peculiarity of the early Amorite language in which the legend had been written.
In line 12 the word ḫibiš indicates that a previous tablet had been injured. The words [i]a [li]-i-l-li-ka "let not flow" are preserved at the end of the line. Probably the words e-na-ša ma-ta-ta "fountains of the deep," as in Genesis 7:11, stood in the original, and an Akkadian scribe who lived in Babylonia, a land where springs are unknown, being in doubt as to the reading, wrote ḫibiš, "injured."

The root of li-e-ir-ri (A, 15) is doubtless to be found in Hebrew in the common yarah "to throw, hurl." This root was not in current use in Babylonia.

The root of li-im-ta-an-ni-ma (A, 16), is evidently the familiar Hebrew mana't "to withhold, to hold back," used in connection with rain, Amos 4: 7; of "showers," Jer. 3: 3, etc., but the root was not in current use in Babylonia.

If we had no other data to show that Nisaba (A, 19), the goddess of fertility, is Amorite, this passage would be sufficient; but we have. Naturally no one would question that Adad is the Amorite Hadad. And there can be no doubt, but that Ea also had his origin in the West.15

These words are all found in the first nineteen lines of the text. Naturally the words currently used in Babylonia, as well as in Amurru, are not discussed. It is to be noted that the hero, Atra-hasis, bears an Amorite name.16

15 Scholars generally agree that Adad (dIM) and Nisaba are West Semitic. On Ea as an Amorite god, see Chiera Lists of Personal Names p. 39 f.; and Clay Empire of the Amorites p. 175.

16 This name is generally considered to be two words meaning "exceedingly wise," "the very wise one." While the Babylonians used it as synonymous with these words, it was nevertheless a personal name, and this does not seem to have been its original meaning. Names compounded with Atar and Attar, also written Atra, Atram, with and without the determination, are numerous among West Semitic names, cf. Atar-bi'ē (-idri, -gabri, -sūri, -nāri, -hammu, -gamu, etc.), see Tallqvist APN 252 and NBN 231. The Babylonians in making use of these West Semitic legends, having their own word atru, meaning "surplus," "abundant," made an etymological play upon the name, as was done so frequently in the O. T., interpreting it in their own legends as being synonymous with "very wise," as is done in the Etana and Adapu Epics. It will be noticed that in the Adapa fragment discussed below, the word At-ru-ba-si-sa is not written grammatically as two words in the sentence, but is looked upon as a name, synonymous with the idea "clever one." The same is true in the Etana Legend (KB VI 1 106: 39), where A-ter-ša-si-sa is in apposition with ad-mu ši-iḫ-ru, which is in the nominative case.
for man is placed before it, especially in this early period, makes it impossible to regard it here as being an epithet for a hero bearing another name.

These facts and others which follow, especially those in connection with the name Ilu "God" for the chief deity’s name in this legend, prove conclusively that this was originally a Hebrew or Amorite Deluge Story.

If this is an Amorite legend we would expect to find also in the work of the late redactor or glossarist, Amorite words which had not been adopted by the Semitic Babylonians; and in this we are not disappointed. A comparison of the two texts shows how the redactor inserted glosses or parallel phrases in connection with ḫuburišina, iqṭabla, etc., and as we already have seen, how he replaced the Hebrew teina with the Babylonian titu, and used the Hebrew word šu “flock.” The following, however, will show that all the Hebrew or Amorite words had not been eliminated in the thirteen hundred years which intervened between the dates when the two tablets were written.

The word zi-ba-ni-it “treasures” (B, I: 33), is Amorite from the root šapan “to hide, to treasure.” This root is not in current use in Akkadian.

The words a-na pat-te (B, I: 36) do not mean “aussitôt,” nor is the reading a-na kurmate “for food” correct; but pat-te is the Hebrew word pat in the plural, meaning “morsels;” and the sentence reads “they prepare the child for morsels.” This being a word foreign to the Akkadians, the redactor wrote the gloss which precedes, “They prepare the daughter for a meal.”

The ma at the beginning of B, I: 43 ma-bēl māti has been left wholly unaccounted for in all the translations. This is the Hebrew waw conjunctive.

The word i-ri-ha-ma (B, II: 50) is not Akkadian but Amorite. The word 'aruhah “meal, food,” is found several times in the Old Testament, see Jer. 40: 5, etc.

The word la-šu (B, II: 56) has been construed by all the translators as the negative particle, three of whom, recognizing the difficulty, added a question mark to their conjectural translation of it; but la-šu is the Amorite inseparable preposition with the
pronominal suffix, meaning “to him.” The redactor glossed la-šu
with the Akkadian word it-šu which precedes. In the passage
which is exactly parallel (B, III: 20), it is omitted.

The word i-sa-ba-ta (B. III: 3), translated as if Akkadian from
the root sabatu “to take,” makes an insurmountable difficulty;
but considering that it is from the Hebrew root ‘asab “to grieve,”
see Isaiah 54: 6; I Chron. 4: 10, etc., the difficulty disappears.

The word ni-ši-tu “desolation” (B, III:3), as referred to above
in connection with ma-ši-it-ta of the ancient version, is Amorite.

The me which follows Atra-hasis (B, III:29) is not an enclitic
or emphatic particle attached to that name, but the Hebrew waw
consecutive. The fact that me is written instead of ma may
probably be due to compensative lengthening as in Hebrew.

There are other Amorite words in the late text which are dis-
cussed in the foot notes of the transliteration and translation.

The study of the late redaction also shows that it goes back to
a Hebrew or Amorite original. In no other way can the Hebrew
words found in its composition be explained.

The legend had been Akkadianized before the early text was
written, in 1966 B. C. In the long period which preceded it had
suffered many changes when redactors had made the original
Amorite text conform to the dialect in current use in Babylonia;
fortunately, as we have seen, all the words peculiar to the West
had not been eliminated. We see how this process went on in the
writing of personal names of those coming fresh from the West
in the Hammurabi period; for example, names like Ishbi-Urra,
Ishme-Dagan etc., had become Akkadianized, but on the arrival
from the West of others bearing those names, we find that they
were written Yashbi-Urra, Yashme-Dagan, etc. Even the position
of the verbs in the sentence had suffered changes; for while they
are frequently found at the beginning, as in Hebrew, they are also
found placed at the end, or indifferently in the sentence, as is the
case in Akkadian.

The story of the deluge, as contained in the Gilgamesh Epic,
certain scholars maintain, embraces elements of more than one
tradition. They say Um-napishtim is the hero of the epic, yet it

See notes beneath the word in the transliteration in the Appendix.
nevertheless also refers to Atra-ḥasis. This has prompted some scholars to identify him with Um-napishtim, while others consider that, as has already been noted, in this late story the name Atra-ḥasis is used as a synonym for “a very wise man,” as is the case in several of the epics. However, it seems to the writer that the situation is entirely misunderstood. As stated above (foot note 16) Atra-ḥasis is a personal name. The passage, “the wise one, Atra-ḥasis” (B, III: 17), could hardly be translated “the wise one, the very wise;” and it doubtless shows also where the later etymologists got their idea for their play upon the name. In all the versions except the Sumerian the hero’s name is Atra-ḥasis. After the flood he was given a title. Although not fully understood it is Um(or Uta)-napishtim rûqim (rûgam, also ina rûqi), which in the Sumerian paraphrase is written Zi-ū-suddu. This title has been variously translated: “He who lengthened the days of life,” “He who made life long of days,” etc. Certainly this is not a personal name, which fact the Gilgamesh Story fully recognizes. When Ea (in the Gilgamesh Story E, 196) tells the gods how the hero learned that the flood would occur, he does not say, “I made Um-napishtim see a dream;” for at that time he had not been thus designated; but Ea says “I made Atra-ḥasis see a dream.” That was his name; he had not yet earned the title. In short, this is no confusion of names, as some have inferred, but an exact statement. And the use of the title instead of the name in the Sumerian paraphrase is a proof that it is borrowed from the Semitic legend.

The writer has previously maintained, simply on a basis of the personal names found in the Gilgamesh Epic story, that it is largely from a Hebrew or Amorite original. Let us inquire whether a study of the language used in its composition will betray its original source.

The first Hebrew word to be noted in the Gilgamesh Epic story is niširtu “secret,” (E, 9). This word, as far as known to the writer, was not in current use in Akkadian; but the Hebrew word meaning “hidden thing” from this root is known in the Old Testament (see Isaiah 48: 6, etc.).

The word for part of the boat called la-an (E, 60), which was
the “hull” or “bottom,” is Hebrew from the root \textit{lin} “to lodge,”
doubtless, because there is where the people lodged.

The word used for “the roof” of the boat, namely \textit{ša-a-ši} (E, 60), is Amorite (see note in Appendix).

The word \textit{qiru}, used for the outside wall of the ship (E, 66), is not Akkadian, but it is the common word for “wall” in Hebrew.

The word \textit{sussullu} “basket” (E, 68) was not used in Akkadian but it is found in Hebrew, see Jer. 6: 9.

The root of \textit{u-pa-az-zi-ru} (E, 70) is the common Hebrew \textit{bašar} “to gather, gather in, enclose.”

The root of the word \textit{e-ši-en-ši} “I loaded it” (E, 81) is found in all the Semitic languages except the Akkadian dialect. In Isaiah 33: 20 we have reference to “a tent that shall not be moved,” i. e., “loaded.”

In \textit{pi-ḫi-i} (E, 95) is to be seen the common Hebrew word \textit{pehah} “governor,” which was not in current use in Akkadian.

The word \textit{ḫa-aia-al-ti} has been translated “army” (E, 131), but this is Amorite; it is not found in Akkadian.

Where one text reads \textit{ū-mu} (E, 133) the variant text reads \textit{ta-ma-ta}. The former word has been translated “day,” and the latter “sea.” Certainly \textit{ūmu} is the Hebrew \textit{yâm} “sea,” as the context and the variant clearly show.

The word \textit{na-a-ši} (E, 142) is not Akkadian; it is from the Hebrew root \textit{nūs} “to escape.”

There are other Hebrew words discussed in the notes beneath the translations, some of which are tentatively offered, while others are reasonably certain. There are also glosses. Doubtless, further study will reveal more which were rarely, if ever, used in Akkadian. If the Um-napishtim story was originally written in Sumerian, or even in Akkadian, certainly it becomes necessary to explain how these foreign Hebrew words, even in this late version of the Assyrian period, came to be used in the Epic.

It is the writer’s opinion that no other conclusion can be arrived at but that this deluge story, which probably embraces some elements indigenous to Babylonia, was mainly an Amorite legend which the Semites from Amurru brought with them from the West.

Since we know that other peoples of the early period had deluge
stories, it would be precarious to say that the Sumerians and the Babylonians did not have their own, especially as this land must have suffered even more than others, and because this legend refers to Shurippak. But with this exception there is nothing in the Gilgamesh Epic story that can be said to be distinctively Babylonian. Even the word translated "reed hut" is very probably an archaic West Semitic word. And on the other hand, there are, as we have seen, a number of Hebrew words used in the Epic, which were not current in Babylonia; which together with other facts show that the story is mainly Amorite. Moreover, it is not at all improbable that the reference to Dilmun in the Sumerian version, if that name is to be identified with the region of the Persian Gulf, is also a part of the local coloring the legend received after it was brought into Babylonia.

Since it has been shown that the Sumerian story, whose hero was named Zi-ú-suddu, is connected with the Um-napishtim story and that it was probably written at a time when Sumerian as a spoken language had survived in a more or less corrupt style, some time between 2300 and 1300 B.C., it seems, in light of the above, until other evidence is forthcoming, the only conclusion at which we can arrive is that it must be regarded as a short paraphrase of the Amorite story, which may include some features of a Sumerian tradition. It has even taken over the Akkadian word puhru; which, as we have seen, had displaced the Amorite huburu.

The fact that Sumerian was used for official communications, for legal documents, as well as for literature in general, in certain Babylonian cities in the latter half of the third millennium B.C., makes it possible to understand why such very ancient stories, which had been brought into Babylonia from Amurru, should also be found written in Sumerian. Nearly every inscription from Nippur of this period is written in Sumerian. It was the legal and liturgical language. In some of the neighboring cities it was not so; for example, Sippara; whence probably came the ancient version of the Amorite Atra-ḥasis Epic. This city was pre-eminently Semitic.

17 See note under E, 20.
18 Poebel Historical Texts 66 f.
It has been claimed that the little Semitic fragment, containing thirteen partially preserved lines, now in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, was originally written in Sumerian, and that it was brought to Canaan at the time Abraham "left his home on the Euphrates and moved westward." But the few lines of this supposed Sumerian story are full of Hebrew words which were not in current use in Akkadian.

The word *ub-bu-ku* "overthrow" (F, 5) has not as yet been found in either language; but it is from the very common Hebrew root meaning "to overthrow," which root, excepting two substantives, was not in current use in Akkadian.

Instead of reading *lu-pu-ut-tu ḫu-ru-šu* "destruction, annihilation" (F, 5), the present writer prefers to read *lu-pu-ut-tu ḫu-ru-šu* "verily give attention to silence." The root of the latter in Hebrew means "to be silent, to be speechless." In other words, the hero is told of the proposed flood, to keep silence, and to build a ship.

The word *ga-be-e* "high" or "height" (F, 7) is found in Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic; but not in Akkadian.

Instead of *ba-bil* (F, 8) the reading is *ma-šum-ša* "and its name;" this contains the Amorite *waw conjunctive*.

Certainly it must be admitted that it seems strange that the Akkadian translator of this supposed Sumerian story should have used so many Hebrew words which were not in current use in Babylonia, in making the translation of these few lines into Akkadian.

The writer fully appreciates the fact that at any time cuneiform inscriptions may be found in Babylonia which will contain examples of these Hebrew words other than those already known; because of the flow of Western Semites in nearly all periods into this land; nevertheless, it will be possible to continue to maintain that they were not in current use in the Akkadian dialect.

Nearly all scholars who have published discussions of the Biblical deluge traditions in recent years have conceded that they are of Babylonian origin. This view can be said to have been very generally accepted by scholars. Some hold that these stories were brought from Babylonia to Canaan by Abraham; others say that they were transmitted to the West in the Amarna period, but the
great majority of scholars hold that knowledge of them was obtained in Babylonia at the time of the exile. Two arguments are generally advanced for this position; the one is, the great age of Babylonian civilization, which involved the idea that civilization in the West had only developed a little before 2000 B.C., by Arabs from Arabia; and the other argument is based on the frequency of inundations in Babylonia, which gave rise to these so-called nature myths.

In 1909 the present writer endeavored to show that the Babylonian origin of the Biblical deluge stories was without any foundation; but that they were indigenous to the West; and that, on the other hand, the Babylonian story of the deluge, as preserved in the Gilgamesh Epic, contained West-Semitic elements; showing that no other conclusion could be arrived at, but that extensive influences had been felt from Amurru.\footnote{Clay Amurru the Home of the Northern Semites 71 ff.} The arguments for these views were based almost entirely upon such literary evidence as the names of the gods, who are mentioned in the story, as being Amorite, as well as the name of the pilot of the ship, Buzur-Amurru.\footnote{On the name Buzur-Amurru see Clay Amurru 82.} In the above discussion additional proof is offered from a linguistic point of view for this thesis.

These discoveries show that there is no need to find the origin of the Biblical stories in Babylonia, because of the theory that the West in the early period did not have an indigenous literature, and did not have a civilization. The present version, and other data presented in the discussion in another chapter, forever disprove this hypothesis; and require its abandonment. Moreover, it is necessary that a general readjustment be made of views advanced by Pan-Babylonists, and Pan-Egypto-Babylonists, whose positions have been based upon the supposed Arabic origin of the Semites in Amurru; and upon the supposedly late rise and development of civilization in that land.

The discoveries made since 1909, when the present writer first contested this position, clearly show that we have reasons for believing that the civilization of the Western Semites synchronizes with the earliest that has been found in Babylonia and
Egypt. More recently the writer has shown also that the theory must be abandoned that the so-called Egypto-Babylonian culture brought forth the earliest civilization in the thousand years between four thousand and three thousand B. C., while all the rest of the world continued to live in stone age barbarism or savagery;²¹ for there is every reason to believe that in Amurru, with its natural agricultural districts over wide-spread areas such as those about Hit, Aleppo, Haran, etc., with its wonderfully wooded districts, as in the Lebanon region, with its mines and natural products, which in ancient times, as at present, have been so attractive for other peoples; and also in Elam, with its valleys so well adapted for agriculture, with its hills for grazing, its quarries for stone, its mines for metal, and its forests for wood; as well as in other lands in Asia, man throve before the time when through intelligence and labor, it was possible for him to control the annual floods in alluvial Babylonia, and dwell there. And further, if the Egyptian chronology of the Berlin School is correct, there is every reason to believe that in Syria there was a civilization which greatly antedated the Egyptian;²² for, as will be seen, we now have additional discoveries that prove beyond doubt that civilization in Syria has as great an antiquity as in Babylonia. The importance of this will be readily recognized, in connection with the discovery of the Hebrew or Amorite Deluge Legend; in that it furnishes us with the background for the civilization to which it belonged; and it also makes it appear more reasonable that the Biblical legends of the deluge could be indigenous.  

There is another very important fact which the old version has revealed, and that is the occurrence of I-\( \textit{lu} \) "God," in the title of the series, as well as in the text, for the foremost deity’s name. This title was originally incorrectly read \textit{Inuma șallu awēlum}, and since translated many times “when a man lay down to sleep”; but \( I-\textit{lu} \) is perfectly clear on the tablet, in the legend’s context and in the colophon. \( I\textit{lu} \) “God” here takes the place of AN in the early Semitic and Sumerian texts, and of Anu of later texts. The ideogram \( AN \) in the early period in nearly all such connections has been generally read \( Anu \) or \( Ana \).

²¹ Breasted Scientific Monthly 1919, p. 577.
It is well known that the god whose name was written with the sign AN “god,” was the highest of the gods; who had created mankind; and who was worshipped as the supreme ruler of the universe. In the text here published, we learn that the Western Semites in this early period called the Godhead I-\(\text{lu}\), or El “God,” the same as in the Old Testament; and there can be little doubt but that in the early period, the Akkadians did the same.

It is not impossible that the Sumerians, before they came to Babylonia, called their foremost deity Ana or Anna; but there is no proof for this. To the writer it seems more probable that after they had conquered the land, and created or furnished the people with the cuneiform syllabary, they wrote AN, which in their language meant “heaven,” as well as dingir “god,” for the name of the most high god of the Semites, namely Ilu. Certainly in the early syllabaries (see below), AN represented Ilu. In time AN became Semitized into Anu, in the same way that En-lil “lord of the storm” became Ellil. It is also not improbable that the West Semitic Anu-Ilu, whose influence was so extensively felt in the West, even in Egypt, is the origin of the Erechian Anu. Moreover, we know for a certainty that while Anu of Erech later generally replaced Ilu, this fact was fully appreciated by later generations when they used Anu and Antu with the generic sense of “god” and “goddess.”

This explanation of the origin of Anu or Anu\((m)\), also written Annum, and in Sumerian texts An and An-na, and the fact that Anu had the meaning “god,” which was pointed out many years ago, gives us reasons why the Erechian Anu “the creator,” “the father of the gods,” was never displaced as the head of the pantheon. And it seems that these reasons satisfactorily account for the name being written without the determinative for deity, even after the ideogram AN had become Babylonized into A-num, as is the case in the “Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic”; where, except A-num, all the gods, even the heroes, have the determinative. This can only mean that Anu at that time meant “god.” And although the Babylonian word or name Anu “god” had its origin in the Amorite word or name Ilu, the deity

---

Footnotes:
23 See Clay Empire of the Amorites, 168 f.
designated by these words or names in time became quite distinct. This becomes apparent especially in periods when fresh migrations from the homeland take place.

The reading *Anu* for *AN* in the initial line of the Hammurabi Code is being very generally adopted; but it is a mistake. When *Anu* of Erech is referred to in the Code, his name is written *Anum*,-num), whereas the chief deity’s name, “the father of the gods,” who together with *Ellil*, as Hammurabi says, “raised the towers of Babylon,” is written *Ilu (AN)*. This clear-cut distinction must be recognized. Moreover, the present text containing *ilu*, as well as the hundreds of personal names belonging to this early period compounded with *ilu*, and other facts, clearly show that the Western Semites, as well as the early Akkadians, used the word *ilu* “God” to represent their creator and supreme ruler. Naturally, this fully confirms the impression we get from the Old Testament, that the Semites, in the land called Amurru by the Babylonians, which included Aram, used the word *il (u)* or *el (u)* to designate their most high god, their *El Elyon*.

Ea was not a Sumerian god, but the second in the Amorite triad, *Ilu*, *Ea* and *Adad*. His name was written phonetically *dE-a*, and ideographically *dEn-Ki* “lord of the land,” because he was Ba‘al, so well known to us in the inscriptions of the West, including the Old Testament. While *Ilu* was supreme, *Ea* was the lord of the earth, of the rivers, of the springs, of the wells, and of the waters beneath the earth. It was only after the Semites had carried his worship to the southern part of the great alluvium, where a temple was erected for him at Eridu on the sea, that his cult took on the peculiar Babylonian aspect with which we are so familiar. In this alluvium, wells are dug, but springs of the

---

24 Scheil originally read *ilu*. He was followed by Peiser, Winckler, Pinches, and others; but since Harper read *Anu*, not a few have followed this reading. Throughout the Code, *ilu* is used for “the god.” Did the codifier in the body of the laws avoid the use of Marduk or Shamash, the god of laws, so that his code would be acceptable in places where these deities were not worshipped; or does not the use of *ilu* show rather the West Semitic origin of the Code?

25 See 2: 46; and 44: 51.

26 See 1: 1; 1: 31; 40: 64; 42: 45.

27 Cf. the important contribution on the subject, Hehn *Die Biblische und die Babylonische Gotteside* 150 ff.
earth are unknown. The rivers and the rain alone bring fertility to the soil. Ea having presided over the waters of the earth naturally became in Eridu the god of the deep and of the rivers. But this is a local and a late conception of Ea, the great Amorite Ba‘al. Simply because excavations have been conducted in Babylonia where the almost imperishable clay tablets have been recovered in such masses, and in Amurru little or nothing of this kind has as yet been done, where also the perishable papyrus and skin was used so extensively for writing material, is responsible for the faulty conception that exists at present not only of the god Ea, but of the entire historical situation prior to the time of Hammurabi.

Adad, the god of the elements, usually called the “storm god,” is Hadad of Amurru, the third of the early triad. At a very early time his worship was brought into Babylonia. It is generally conceded that he is an Amorite god, and that he had been adopted as a member of the Babylonian pantheon. The ideogram <IM> read Adad, as is well known, stands for other names of the storm-god, as Ramman, Amurru, Mar<sup>n</sup>, Mur, Sharu, etc.

At Nippur, the foremost deity was such a god as Adad. His name was written ideographically <IM>En-Lil, “the lord of the storm,” which in time was used as his name, and even pronounced Ellil. It is possible that the Sumerians, who at an early time took possession of this city, also had a storm god; but this cannot be proved. The writer feels that <IM>En-Lil was originally Adad. In the Gilgamesh Epic, he instead of Adad is the destructive god; in other words he had supplanted him after Nippur became the supreme city in the land. En-lil also displaced Ea, when he became the bēl mātāti, “lord of the lands;” and thereafter he took the place of Ea as the second god in the triad; so that instead of Ilu, Ea, and Adad, the triad became Ilu(AN), Enlil, and Ea. Later, when Babylon became the centre of the hegemony, Enlil was displaced by Marduk, the god of that city, who himself became the Ba‘al, or Bêl.

This forcibly recalls the fact that a large name syllabary found at Nippur, belonging to the early period, contains several groups

<sup>2</sup> See Chiera’s important contribution on the subject, Lists of Personal Names 39 f.
of Semitic names compounded with those of Amorite gods. One
of these groups, occurring several times, contains $AN$, $E-a$ and $dIM$,
and the other contains $dDagan$, $Ishtar$ and $Gaga$; while $dEnlil$, in
whose school of scribes the tablet was written, occurs only twice
among its several hundred names.\textsuperscript{28} We have knowledge of cer-
tain syllabaries having been repeated for millenniums; and it is
not impossible that this particular one was originally written
prior to the time when Nippur's god became "the lord of lands";
in other words, prior to the time when the foremost triad became
$AN$, Enlil, and Ea. Certainly we can understand why Ea, who
figures in the early myths and legends in a much higher position
and role than the storm-god Adad (or Enlil), originally followed
the foremost deity. Yes, even in the West Semitic creation myth,$Anu$ and Ea are the creators, while the storm-god, who is there
called Marduk, fights the great Tiámat. And we can also under-
stand how, subsequent to the time when Nippur's Enlil became
"lord of the lands," that god came to take the place of Ea next to
the most high god. Moreover, it seems that conclusive proof of
this position is to be found in the "Explanatory Lists of Gods."
In the most ancient (II R 59), $Ilu$ ($AN$) is followed by Ea (and his
consort), and Enlil (and his consort). In the later and fuller lists,
which were also written in an early period, this order is maintained,
but $Anu$, and a consort $Antu$ who was created by the force of
analogy, take the place of $Ilu$.

In consideration of all available data, it is reasonable to con-
jecture that this Amorite deluge story, which preserves the names
of the foremost original triad, goes back to a time as early as
4000 B. C.
ANCIENT FRAGMENT OF THE ETANA LEGEND

Through the discovery of dynastic lists and other historical data the great antiquity of Babylonian civilization is now fully determined. We now have lists of rulers which carry us back to the fifth millennium B.C. Instead of the earliest period known representing the beginning of civilization, there is every reason to believe that millenniums of history, not of savagery, but of civilized man, precede what we now know as the earliest; and when systematic excavations are conducted in Central Asia, in Asia Minor, and in Syria, we shall have data whereby the gap between prehistoric man of millenniums ago and man of the earliest historic period will be considerably reduced.

In the Appendix will be found the reconstructed list of ruling cities and kings. Excluding the two earliest dynasties, to the reigns of which fabulous numbers of years are given, we find ourselves at a period about 4000 B.C. (Others make the date earlier, see below.) Etana belongs to the first of the two dynasties which precede this period; which ruled in the fifth millennium B.C.

The first eight names of the earliest dynasty, namely that of Kish, are fragmentary, or are wanting. The first five that are fully preserved are Semitic; and several of these, at least, are unquestionably West Semitic. The fourth ruler, who has been heretofore regarded as mythical, is Etana; he is now restored to his place as a ruler.

It is generally understood that in certain Aryan lands gods became men. Many scholars maintain that the same has occurred with the Semites. They have said that Nimrod, the patriarchs, and many other Biblical characters were originally deities, that Etana, Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh and many other Babylonian rulers had also descended from the realms of mythology. Fortunately clay tablets, which are not so perishable as skins or papyrus, have recently furnished us with the material whereby some of the so-called deities are restored to their places in dynastic
lists, and whereby it is possible to assert that it cannot be proved that gods ever became mortals in the Semitic world. The order must be exactly reversed. While anthropomorphic ideas are attributed to the deities, we have no instance of a Semitic god becoming a man.

This fragment of an old version of the Etana Legend was written about 2000 years earlier than the fragments found in the Library of Ashurbanipal (668-626 B. C.). It has also been previously published. It contains the opening and the closing lines of a large tablet, which had three columns on the obverse and three on the reverse. It seems to the writer that the complete tablet must have contained about 275 lines. Among the fragments of the Epic written in the Assyrian period there is one which duplicates partially some lines of the present text. An outline of the legend as now known from the different fragments follows:

The deity had deserted the city; and in consequence, anarchy and confusion prevailed, and productivity ceased; the sheep no longer bore young. The gods desiring to bring this state to an end designated Ishtar to go to the rescue; and Etana was installed as king. About this time an Eagle and a Serpent formed an alliance to carry on the work of destruction. Each, accompanied by a brood, went to the mountain for prey; each killed an animal; and then shared them with their broods. Although warned not to do so by one of her offspring, the Eagle pounced upon and devoured the young of the Serpent. The Serpent appealed to Shamash, the god of justice, and was advised to conceal herself in the carcass of a bull that they had slain, and when the Eagle swooped down upon it, to seize and tear her to pieces. This was done, and the Eagle was left to die in a hole in the mountain. The Eagle in turn appealed to Shamash, promising eternal obedience if rescued. Daily Etana also pleaded with Shamash to show him the "plant of

1 Scheil Recueil de Travaux 23, 18 ff. A transliteration and translation on the basis of the same text was published by Jensen KB VI 1 100 ff., and 581 ff. See also Frank Studien zur Babylonischen Religion 105 ff.

2 George Smith Chaldean Genesis 138 ff published the first three known fragments. E. J. Harper published seven other fragments, BA II 441 ff., and 503 ff. Jastrow BA III 379 ff, and JAOS 30, 101 ff, published two others. See also Jensen KB VI 1 100 ff. For a discussion of all the fragments, see Jastrow JAOS 30, 101 ff.
that fertility might be restored. The god told him to seek
the hole in the mountain into which the Eagle had been thrown,
and there the plant would be shown him. Upon his arrival at the
hole the Eagle appealed to Etana for help, promising in return
to fly with him to the dwelling of the gods, probably with the idea
of obtaining immortality. Etana mounted upon the back of the
Eagle, and together they reached the heaven of Anu. The Eagle
urged Etana to proceed to the dwelling of Ishtar, the planet Venus;
but after a flight of six hours, either through exhaustion or the
intervention of the goddess, a precipitous descent to the earth was
made. The fragmentary character of the end of the legend leaves
us in doubt whether or not it proved fatal. There can be little
question but that many details of the legend are still wanting,
as seems to be indicated by the art of the seal cylinders, depicting
the ascent.3

The content of the beginning of the present text points to its
being the opening part of probably the second tablet of the series
which contained the legend. The closing lines refer to the resus-
citation of the Eagle at the mountain hole with the assistance
of Etana. Unfortunately the tablet did not contain a colophon.
The fact that the last column is not completely filled out, would
indicate that it was copied from a still earlier inscription. While
it is not impossible that the legend was originally written in
Sumerian, there is nothing in this ancient version to suggest that
this was the case.

The early dynastic lists of Babylonia, given in the Appendix,
show that Etana, "the shepherd," who lived in the fifth millennium
B. C., was an usurper, and became the twelfth ruler of the first
dynasty of Kish, who "ruled all lands."4 In the omen text dis-
cussed below, he is called "king."

The name Etana is West Semitic, as are several of the first
five rulers of the early Kish dynasty, which have been preserved.
In this fragment of the early version, besides the god Anu, only
the Anunnaki and the Sibitu are mentioned. In the late version
many other Semitic gods are referred to, some of whom may have

---

1 See Ward The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia, 142 ff.
2 See Poebel Historical Texts p. 88.
been introduced in the later period. An interesting parallel to this is the adding of Ishtar’s name as one of the gods of Eanna in the late redaction of the Gilgamesh Epic, whereas in the early version, the temple Eanna is the dwelling place of Anu alone.\(^5\)

It is not impossible that the Etana Legend has an historical background, as in the case of the Lugal Mardia, the Gilgamesh, and other epics (see below). As in the case of the so-called “Zu bird,” the Eagle and the Serpent may represent two powers which were ravaging the lands, probably at a time when a famine prevailed; and upon their having difficulties between themselves, Etana aided the Eagle. His aspirations in connection with ruling all lands, whereby he would become immortal, having been urged and abetted by the Eagle, received a set-back; which allegorically is told in the story of his ascent to heaven. The power represented by the Eagle is probably to be identified with the “Zu bird” (see below), to whom the Serpent refers as a “worker of evil” in his address to the god Shamash.\(^6\) The fact that the Serpent is told “to take the road to the mountains,” and that Etana found the Eagle in a hole in the mountain, would show that the scene was not laid in Babylonia, but in a mountainous district, probably the West.

The symbol of an invader of the following dynasty, whose name was written Nin-Gish-Zidda in Sumerian, was the Serpent. The well-known goblet of Gudea with the caduceus, which in a later period was dedicated to this deified king; the bas-relief depicting this demi-god, who with heads of serpents protruding from his shoulders is leading Gudea, as well as the seal of this great patesi,\(^7\) clearly indicate that the serpent was the emblem of Nin-Gish-Zidda. It is also not improbable that the title \textit{usumgal}, which can be translated “the great serpent,” as well as “the great one,” so frequently used in connection with titles of Tammuz, the son of Nin-Gish-Zidda, also refers to the Serpent.

The worship of the Serpent is very general in Elam, Egypt, Phoenicia, Hatti, Persia, India, China, and Greece. Whether in

\(^5\) Cf. Jastrow-Clay \textit{An Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic} p. 64: 58 with \textit{KB VI} 1, 128: 37 etc.

\(^6\) Cf. \textit{KB VI} 1, 104: 13. This being true, the reference to Zu, the invader, being an anachronism, was added in some late redaction.

\(^7\) See Heuzey \textit{RA} 5, 137, and Meyer \textit{Sumerier und Semiten in Babylonien} Taf. VII.
the early period it was so universal, or whether for the ancient period additional information will show that it was merely local, cannot be surmised. It would, therefore, seem precarious to say more than that Tammuz and his father seem to have been identified with a state the emblem of which was probably the Serpent (širu).

In this connection we must not lose sight of the Dragon Legend (CT 13 33). It was after “the cities sighed” for relief when “Tamtu the Serpent (širu)” was the oppressor, that ŠUH was asked to stir up a cloud, a storm and a tempest, and by slaying the Dragon “to deliver the broad land.” No one seems to hold the view that the name Tamtu is Sumerian; and the writer feels that he has already shown there can be no question but that it is West Semitic (see Amurrur 51ff). The Eagle probably also represented a power in the West. The transliteration and translation of the ancient fragment of the Etana Epic follow:

Ra-bu-tum 4Anunnaki (A-Nun-na) ša-i-mu ši-im-tim
uš-bu im-li-ku mi-li-ik ša ma-a-ta-am
ba-nu ki-ib-ra-im ša-ki-nu ši-ki-it-tim
ši-ru a-na ni-ši i-lu I-gi-gu

5  i-zi-nam a-na ni-ši i-ši-mu
šar-ra-am la iš-ku-nu ka-lu ni-ši e-bi-a-tim
i-na lim-me-tim la ka-aš-ra-at ku-ub-šum me-a-nu
ù ḫa-at-tu-um uk-ni-a-am la ša-ab-ra-at
la ba-nu-ú iš-li-ni-iš pa-ra-ak-ku

10 si-bi-te ba-bu ud-du-lu e-lu da-ap-nim
ḫa-at-tu-um me-a-nu-um ku-ud-šum ū ši-bi-ir-ru
ku-ud-mi-iš A-ni-im i-na ša-ma-i ša-ak-nu
ū-ul i-ba-aš-ši mi-it-lu-ku ni-ši-ša
[šar]-ru-tum i-na ša-ma-i ur-da-am
........................ i-ši-i

45 ḫa-as-su iš-ba-ta-am si-bi-e it ... 
ša-am-na-am wa-ar-ḫa-am ū-ši-te-ga šu-ut-ta-as-su
e-ru-ú ma-ḫi-ir ú-ku-ul-ta-am ki-ma ni-ši-im na-e-ri
e-mu-ga-am i-šu
e-ru-um pa-a-šu i-pu-ša-am-ma a-na E-ta-na-ma
iz-za-ga-ar-šu

50 ib-ri lu-ú it-ba-ra-nu a-na[-ku] ū at-ta
qi-bi-a-am-ma ša te-e-ir-ri-ša-an-ni lu-ud-di-ši-ma
The great Anunnaki who decide fate,
Sat down, took counsel concerning the land.
Builders of the quarters, the authors of nature,
The Igigi, being against the people,

Determined upon enmity for the people.
They established not a king; they shut up the people in the dwellings.
In that time (?) a headgear was not bound, a crown
And a sceptre of lapislazuli had not been possessed.
They had not built together a shrine.

The Sibitu locked the gates against the mighty.
The sceptre, crown, headgear, and staff,
As in former times, before Anu in the heavens was placed.
There is no counsel for its people.
The kingship has gone down from the heavens.

45 Took care; on the seventh ..............
On the eighth month he proceeded to his hole.
The eagle having received food, like a roaring lion
Became strong.
The eagle opened his mouth, and to Etana spoke to him:

50 'My friend, truly we are friends, I and thou.
Command, and when thou hast cured me, I will kill.'
Etana opened his mouth, and to the eagle spoke to him:

................. covered
A FRAGMENT OF THE ADAPA LEGEND.

The third fragment contains a portion of the well-known Adapa Legend; but, unfortunately, it has not been possible as yet to determine in what period Adapa lived.

What is known of the legend of Adapa is based upon several fragmentary tablets which at one time belonged to the Library of Ashurbanipal (668-626 B.C.), including the present text, which also had been published about twenty-five years ago, and upon one that was found among the Egyptian archives of Amenophis III and IV, of the fourteenth century B.C. The present text is from a fragment which contains the first part of the legend. A brief outline of the story follows, as it has been recovered up to the present.

Adapa, a semi-divine seer, who was priest of the temple of Ea, in Eridu, had been granted wisdom by his father, the god Ea, but not eternal life. One day, in exercising one of the functions of his office, namely fishing in the Persian Gulf, a sudden squall from the south upset his boat. Angered at this, he broke the wings of the south wind so that for seven days it did not blow the cooling breezes of the sea over the land. In consequence Adapa was summoned by the god Anu to appear before him in heaven. Thereupon his father Ea told him how to excite the sympathy of Gish-Zidda and Tammuz, two deified kings (see last chapter), who stood at the portals of heaven. Being cautioned by his father not to partake of the food and the drink that would be set before him, he refused; but excess of caution was responsible

---

1 See K.8219, published by Strong PSBA 16, 274 ff; and K.8743, published by Jensen KB VI 1, XVII ff.
2 This text, and its translation were originally published by Scheil, Recueil de Travaux 20 (1898), 127 ff. Zimmern from a photograph, in Gunkel Schöpfung und Chaos 420 ff, offered several improved readings. These were utilized by Jensen KB VI 1, 93 ff, as well as by others. For other translations see Ungnad ATB I 34 ff; Barton Archaeology and the Bible 260 ff; and Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 67 ff.
3 See Winekler and Abel Thontafelfund von El-Amarna No. 340; and Schroeder VS, 12, 194. For the transliteration and translation see Knudtzon Die El-Amarna Tafeln No. 356, p. 964 ff.
for his not receiving the food and water of life, whereby eternal life would have been gained.

Scholars have pointed out certain resemblances of the story to that of Adam in Genesis; and some even have contended that the Adapa Legend is the origin of the Hebrew narrative. They point to the "food of life" as corresponding to the "tree of life"; that Adapa, like Adam, had gained knowledge that was regarded as an attribute of divinity, etc. However, it was through disobedience, in order to become like God, that Adam ate of the fruit; while Adapa failed to obtain eternal life owing to his obedience to his father's counsel in not eating of it. Others have contended that Adapa and Adam are different forms of the same name; while still others hold that the name Adapa is the same as Alaparos\(^4\) (which name they change to read Adaparos), the second of the antediluvian kings handed down by Berossus.

The present writer is inclined to believe that Adapa was what the text informs us, namely a ruler, a "sage," a "man of Eridu"; and that when excavations reveal the history of that city we shall become familiar with the history of his reign, when he will take his place with Etana, Gilgamesh, and others in the list of kings or patesis. Owing to the reference to the deified Gish-Zidda and Tammuz in the legend, although it does not necessarily follow, in view of additions made in the later redactions, the time Adapa lived may have been subsequent to the early Erech dynasty. Following is a transliteration and a translation of the fragment now in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection.

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots \text{iš-tum} \\
\text{qi-bit-su ki-ma qi-bit ilu} \ldots \text{lu-\ldots ..} \\
\text{uz-na rapaštum(-tum) ú-šak-tiš-su u-šu-rat máti mu-šu-mu} \\
\text{a-na šu-a-tu ni-me-qā iiddin-šu napištam(-tam) ċaritam(-tam) uł} \\
\text{iddīn-su} \\
5 \text{ina ú-me-shu-ma ina ša-na-a-ti ši-na-a-ti ab-bal-lum mår} \text{^dEridu} \\
\text{E-a ki-ma rid-di ina a-me-lu-ti ib-ni-šu} \\
\text{ab-bal-lum qi-bit-su ma-am-man uł ú-šam-sak}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\)The name Adapa is frequently written A-da-pa. For Alaparos = Adapa see Zimmern \textit{KAT}, 522; King \textit{Schweich Lectures} 1916 144; Langdon \textit{Sumerian Epic} p. 64; Ungnad \textit{ATB} I 39 note 1. This is a West Semitic name, and is equivalent to \textit{Alap-Uru}, perhaps 'Ox of the god Uru'; cf. \textit{Im-me-ir-i-li} "Lamb of God," \textit{A-ga-al-Marduk} "Calf of Marduk" \textit{BA} VI 5, 98; see Clay \textit{Empire of the Amorites} p. 78.
III FRAGMENT OF THE ADAPA LEGEND

In those days, in those years, the sage, the man of Eridu, Ea, made him like a riddi among men;
A sage, whose command no one could oppose;
The mighty one, the Atra-hasis of the Anunaki, is he;
Blameless, clean of hands, anointer, observer of laws.

With the bakers, he does the baking;
With the bakers of Eridu, he does the baking.
The food and water of Eridu daily he provides.
With his clean hands he sets (binds) the table;
And without him, the table is not cleared (loosened).

The ship he steers; he does the fishing and hunting for Eridu.
Then Adapa, the Erechian,
The son of Ea, in retiring (?) upon the bed,
Daily the bolting of Eridu gives attention to.
In the pure rampart of Kar-Nannar, he embarked upon the sailing ship.

With the oar he steered his ship.

........ upon the wide sea.

Li. 3. The text contains the sign mu, as Scheil originally published, and not kul. If kul is correct, it is a mistake of the scribe.
Li 17. For the restoration cf. A-da-pa ma-ar dEa. KB VI 1, 94:11.
AN EARLY CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF AMURRU AND BABYLONIA.

We now have considerable data for the reconstruction of a chapter in the history of Babylonia, and incidentally also that of Syria, of a very early period, namely, the second earliest known post-diluvian dynasty, which began to rule about or prior to 4000 B.C. (see Dynastic List in the Appendix). There are no extant inscriptions belonging to this period that have as yet been found, but references to three of the rulers of this dynasty and their contemporaries are frequently made in later inscriptions. These furnish us with material which make it possible to rewrite a fairly complete outline of the history covering the reigns of these three important kings, Lugal Marda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh.

The so-called “Legend of the Zu bird,” found in the Library of Ashurbanipal, has been known for many years. It acquaints us with the fact that an enemy designated as “Zu the storm-bird” had robbed Enlil of Nippur of the “tablets of destiny.” This, of course, can only mean his supremacy as “lord of lands.” But Zu, whose name was written dIm-Dugudlu, was not a bird, nor the “personification of some solar deity,” but a human being, an invader, who lived in an inaccessible distant mountain.

We learn that Lugal Marda, “a shepherd,” came to the rescue of the land; by some kind of strategy, succeeded in bringing back the “tablets of destiny”; and in restoring Enlil to his position. For this act he is in time credited with the title: “The Enlil of Kullab, Lugal Marda,” which was adopted as the name of a star.¹ Kullab was a part of Erech, and is doubtless where he erected his palace. It was to the “distant mountain Sābu” that Lugal

¹ Ungnad makes the date of the beginning of the third known dynasty, that of I Ur, at 3927 B.C. (ZDMG 1917, 166). Meissner put it at about 3900 B.C. (Babylonien und Assyrien p. 23); Weidner 4148 B.C. (MVAG 1921 61); Legrain, 4340 B.C. (Historical Fragments 11).

¹ Rawlinson, 46, 1:27.
Marda went, in pursuit of Zu. Sābu was in the Lebanon range. In other words, the enemy Zu represented an Amorite or West Semitic power, which doubtless had invaded Babylonia. There can be little doubt but that the so-called "Legend of the Zu bird" was intended to commemorate the overthrow of this power by Lugal Marda. The writer has no desire to identify Zu with the power whose emblem was the eagle, but this identification is not improbable; in which case we would naturally think of the state represented by that bird in the Etana Legend (see above), and probably also in the fable concerning Gilgamesh (see below).

Years ago it was conjectured that the name Nimrod was from Nu-Marad, "man of Marad." More recently another has suggested that the original form of that name was En-Marad, standing for Lugal-Marad "King of Marad." It seems that he may have become En Marad "High-priest of Marad," since we know that Gilgamesh was En Kullab as well as king. We must, however, keep in mind that he was not a native of Babylonia for he was a gurum kurra "offspring of the mountains." If this "shepherd" king, who apparently was the most powerful ruler of this period, should prove to be Nimrod, his Old Testament title, "the mighty hunter," or "ensnarer," may have reference to the strategy he employed in overthrowing the so-called "Zu bird."

Lugal Marda is credited with having ruled longer than any other of his dynasty. The fragment of an historical text recently published shows that he conquered Ḫalma (Aleppo) and Tidnum in the West; and it can be assumed that he ruled the West land. This would give sufficient reason why his name should have been preserved in the traditions of the West. Nimrod is the only name of a Babylonian ruler of the early period, prior to Amraphel, that is preserved in the Old Testament. Moreover, his own habitat, or that of his ancestors, may originally have been in that land, for his wife's name, although written in Sumerian Nin-Sun, was

---

* Jensen KB VI 1, p. 578; Zimmern KAT p. 574, note 3.
* A city Su was identified with Mari, CT 25, 35r 24-27. On Su as an element in geographical names, cf. Delitzsch Wo lag das Paradies p. 234 ff., and Empire of the Amorites p. 177.
* Delitzsch Wo lag das Paradies, p. 220.
* Kraeling, in Prince's article, JAOS 41, 201.
Semitic, namely, Rimat-Bêlit; and her father bore the Amorite name Semak-Ur (Semachoros), a name like the Old Testament Semak-Jahu (Semachiah). Nin-Sun, who became the mother of Gilgamesh (see below), bears the title rimtu ša supuri in the Gilgamesh Epic. This title of the queen of the great Lugal Marda has been translated by some scholars "the wild cow of the stall." Since the ideogram Sun in her Sumerian name means rimtu "beloved," would not rimtu ša supuri "Beloved of the fortified city," and Rimat-Bêlit "Beloved of Bêlit," be somewhat more appropriate as translations for the title and name of the queen mother who dwelt in her magnificent palace, which had probably been built by her former husband, the powerful king Lugal Marda.

Tammuz followed Lugal Marda as king of Erech. It would seem that Babylonia had suffered another upheaval when Nin-Gish-Zidda, his father, had "ravaged the land"; which we learn from an omen (see below). Besides this fact the latter is known only as a deity, with his habitat at Lagash. Doubtless he had been king of that city.

Tammuz was not originally "the personification of the son of the springtime," or even "the personification of some kind of wood," as has been said, but, as the new dynastic list shows, he was a human being, and the fourth king of this early Erech dynasty.

In Babylonia the legends and hymns concerning Tammuz and Ishtar are exceedingly numerous. Here they are identified especially with the city of Erech, where he ruled. From the many inscriptions relating to the cult we learn that in the fourth month, which was named Tammuz, at the time vegetation began to decay, the women mourned his death. From the cult tablets also certain facts are ascertained which enable us to know something about his family connections.

The cuneiform inscriptions inform us that the mother of Tammuz was named Zertu (which name is also written Sirdu).
Certainly Zertu seems to be Semitic. The name Tammuz was reproduced by two Sumerian words or ideograms, which represented the pronunciation, namely, Dumu-Zi, meaning "faithful son"; but this is no proof that Tammuz was a Sumerian. In fact the meaning of the ideograms speaks against the possibility of his being a Sumerian; "faithful son" would not be appropriate for a personal name, but rather as an epithet. His father's name, Nin-Gish-Zidda, is also in a Sumerian dress; but this very probably also represents a Semitic name. This suggestion is based on the connection of his son Tammuz with the West, and on the name of his wife Zêrtu. His having ruled at Lagash would fully account for his name being written in Sumerian. He was an invader, a fact, as already mentioned, which we learn from the omen texts.

As is well known, there are many myths and legends that have been handed down concerning Tammuz (who is also called Adonis, etc.) and Ashirta (also called Astarte, Ashtaroth, Ashtar, Ishtar, Venus, Aphrodite, etc.). The cult bearing especially upon the death and resurrection of Tammuz typified the decay of vegetation which was followed by the long dry summer, and also the reviving of the earth in the spring. While the legends are exceedingly widespread, they are especially identified with Syria. Even in the Book of Ezekiel we learn that women sat in the temple weeping for Tammuz (8:14). Traces of the cult are handed down by the Classical writers; it is also referred to by Mandaic and Syriac writers of the post Biblical period. In Syria they cluster especially about a vale near Aphaca, at present represented by the modern 'Afqa, at the head of the wild romantic wooded gorge of the Adonis river, in the Lebanon region, midway between Byblos and Ba‘albek. Here tradition says the mangled body of the hunter Tammuz was buried. Here are to be found many ruined monuments of his worship, one of which is a great temple of Astarte which Constantine destroyed. Another of the memorials that have kept the legends alive is now to be seen at Ghineh, where reliefs of Tammuz and Ashirta are carved upon the rocks. Tammuz is there portrayed with a spear awaiting the wild boar by which he was slain, while Ashirta, who mourned for him, and who, the
myth tells us, descended to the underworld to deliver him from death, is seated near by in a sorrowful attitude.

The city, Ha-A, whence Tammuz came, and probably also his father, has not been located; but connections of Tammuz with Syria, and especially the passage concerning him in a lamentation hymn, which reads: "at the sacred cedar, a distant place where he was born" (or "where his mother bore him"), point to the West as his birthplace. Extant tradition identifies him especially with the modern Gebail, the ancient Byblos. Not a few passages, however, in the cuneiform inscriptions, show that he was especially worshipped at Hallab (Aleppo). Certainly it would seem that his connection with Ashirta and the West would imply that he was a Semite, rather than a Sumerian. Moreover, it can be gathered from several passages that he very probably met a premature death by drowning, while associating, in the Lebanon region, with his contemporary Ashirta, who was called Ishtar in Babylonia. She seems to have been a "Queen of Sheba" or a "Cleopatra" of this early era, with her seat of government at Hallab.

As already mentioned, the chief seat of the cult of Ashirta, the Ashtoreth of the Old Testament, or Ishtar, in Babylonia was at Erech; but Hallab seems to have been her home. In one of these Babylonian lamentation hymns we have this passage: "The queen of Erech for her husband; the queen of Hallab for her husband (waits)." This and many other couplets referring to Ishtar or to Tammuz and Ishtar show that these two cities were intimately identified with each other. One of the earliest religious texts at present known tells us that this goddess had a shrine at Nippur and that she was from the land of Hallab. In the Gilgamesh Epic when she proposes to Gilgamesh, king of Erech, she says: "Come, Gilgamesh, be thou my spouse. Present me with thy offspring; be thou my husband, let me be thy wife; and I will set thee in a chariot, etc. . . . Into our house, under the fragrance of the cedar tree, enter. And when thou enterest our house [they shall

\[\text{\textit{Empire of the Amorites} p. 83.}\]
\[\text{CT 15, 26:5.} \quad \text{Tradition in the West makes him the son of Cinyras of Cyprus.}\]
\[\text{Scheil RA 8, 162, 4-5; CT 15, 19: 4-7; etc.}\]
\[\text{Barton Babylonian Inscriptions I, col. 13:6.} \quad \text{See also Poebel HGT 26: 19-20.}\]
place thee upon a throne; they shall kiss thy feet.” Gilgamesh, in refusing her advances, asked her what she had done with her husband Tammuz, and her other husbands; whereupon she told the god Anu that Gilgamesh had upbraided her on account of her evil deeds; and she asked for vengeance.

While a temple at Adab was dedicated to Ishtar, as the brick stamp of Naram-Sin shows, and she was worshipped in many cities in Babylonia and Assyria, Erech and Hallab stand out as the two cities with which she was peculiarly associated. It seems to the writer that Hallab is prominently mentioned in these cult tablets because that city is the home of her worship. And it is probable that it is she to whom Hammurabi refers in one of the titles he gives himself, namely, migir tēlitum mušaklīl tērītum ša Hallab “the beloved of the exalted one, who put into execution the laws of Aleppo.” Since Hammurabi was an Amorite, it is not improbable that the body of his Code mainly came from that city.

Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to show that the Babylonians not only looked upon her as having been a mortal, but also upon the West as having been her habitat. Moreover, since Lugal Marda and his queen Nin-Sun, Nin-Gish-Zidda and his queen Zērtu, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and Humbaba (see below), in other words, all the kings and queens of this period, were worshipped as deities, some of whom became very important gods, the suggestion that Ashirta, called Ishtar in Babylonia, the wife of Tammuz, had also been a mortal, seems to the writer to be perfectly reasonable. Certainly there is no available evidence to disprove this; her name does not appear in the nomenclature prior to this period. That the worship of this deified woman and her consort should have become so widespread was doubtless due not only to the nature of the cult, which has its parallels now in harvest festivals, but also to the peculiarity of it which involved disgraceful rites that appealed to the sensuality of man. Throughout Syria, including Phoenicia and Canaan, the unspeakable abominations of her licentious cult took deep root. As far as we know at present, its influence was not so general in Babylonia and Assyria, especially in the early period; the one city which seems to stand out with peculiar prominence in having temple prostitutes is
Erech. It is doubtless this fact which prompted an Assyriologist long ago to say that “Erech was essentially a Semitic city.”1

In short, in consideration of all that we know of Erech’s contact with the West, where doubtless Western Semites settled at a much earlier period than in Babylonia, it is not difficult to understand how her cult migrated to the great alluvium from that region, and especially as this “Queen of Hallab” had become the consort of Tammuz.

Gilgamesh was connected, not with the family of Tammuz, but with that of the latter’s predecessor. He was the son of Rimat-Bêlit, the wife of Lugal Marda, and of the high priest of Kullab, a part of Erech, perhaps the Semitic quarter of that city.

There is a fable that has been handed down by Aelian that ought not to be lost sight of in this connection.15 From it we gather that Gilgamos (Gilgamesh) was born in secret, and was thrown from the acropolis where his mother was imprisoned, and that in his fall an eagle caught him and carried him to a garden whose keeper reared him. We are led in this connection to inquire what is the significance of the legend; why is the eagle here introduced? Has it anything to do with the power represented by the eagle in the Etana legend, and perhaps also with the Zu bird in the Lugal Marda epic?

As we have seen, Tammuz and his father were identified

14 Gifford Lectures 1903, p. 342.

15 The fable of Aelian (de Natura Animalium 12, 21) reads as follows: It is characteristic of animals also to love human beings. For example, an eagle brought up a baby. I wish to tell the whole story, that it may bear witness to my statement. When Semachoros (Seuechoros) reigned over the Babylonians, the Chaldaeans said that the son of his daughter would take the kingdom away from the grandfather. He was alarmed at this, and if I may speak somewhat jocularly, he became an Acrisius to the girl, for he guarded her very strenuously. But, without his knowledge—for fate was stronger than the Babylonian—the girl was made a mother by a man of low degree, and bore a child. Her guards, in fear of the king, threw it from the acropolis; for it was there that the aforesaid girl was imprisoned. Well, an eagle very quickly saw the child’s fall, and before it was dashed upon the earth got underneath it and received it upon his back. Taking it to a garden, he set it down very cautiously. The caretaker of the place, seeing the pretty child, was fond of it and reared it; it was called Gilgamos, and reigned over the Babylonians. If anybody thinks this a fable, I admit that on testing it I thought lightly of its validity myself. But I am told that Achaemenes, the Persian, from whom the Persian nobility descends, was an eagle’s nursling. (Translated from the Greek by Prof. A. M. Harmon.)
with the emblem of the serpent. Are we to understand that perhaps Gilgamesh, the son of the former queen, Rimat-Bêlit, when born, perhaps during the reign of Tammuz, was secretly carried away and reared in the land which the eagle represents? When Rimat-Bêlit said to her son concerning Engidu, “Some one, O Gilgamesh, who like thee in the field was born, and the mountain has reared, thou wilt see”; does this imply such an order of events? What was the affinity that was responsible for Gilgamesh and Engidu being drawn together? We read in the Nin-evite version these words: “Ere thou camest down from the mountain, Gilgamesh beheld thee in a dream.” When the expedition to the West was being planned, Engidu said: “Know, my friend, when I moved about with the cattle in the mountains, I penetrated to the distance of a double measure into the heart of the cedar forest where Humbaba lived.” He knew “the paths through the cedar forest”; and it seems reasonable to ask whether the nation, whence he came, is not to be identified with the power whose emblem was the eagle.

We are led to believe from the Epic of Gilgamesh that in the early part of his career, Erech was subservient to another throne, and we inquire whether it can be ascertained what power had humiliated Babylonia at this time.

The character Humbaba in the Epic has not been regarded as historical. He has been looked upon as a mythical personage who played a part in a nature myth which had been woven into the exploits of Gilgamesh. Engidu is another mythical character who has been regarded as “a type of præmaeval man.” The stronghold of Humbaba, with whom Gilgamesh fought, as related in the epic, has in the past generally been located in Elam; and it has also been generally held that his name is Elamitic. These conclusions have not rested upon the fact that cedar forests were known to have existed in Elam; for all the numerous references to cedars in the inscriptions have been understood to refer to the Lebanon and Amanus ranges.

The conclusions that Humbaba was Elamitic, and that the scenes took place in Elam rested solely upon the slight resemblance of

the name Ḥumbaba to that of the well known Elamite god Ḥumba, whose name was variously written Ḥumman, Ḥumba, Ḥumban, Umman, Umba, etc. The identification of Ḥumbaba with this deity was also one of the reasons why emphasis was placed upon the Gilgamesh Epic being based upon a foundation of myth, being in part astral, and in part a nature myth. A comparison of the name was made with Kombabos of the Legend of Lucian, concerning the building of the temple at Hierapolis; but the name continued to be identified with the Elamite god.\textsuperscript{17} Others realized that the description of the cedars seemed to suggest the districts in the West; nevertheless the forests were considered to be in Elam.\textsuperscript{18} In the light of what follows, however, this must be abandoned.

In the omen literature there is a word which has been read ḥu-pi-pi. It occurs several times, and has been generally regarded to be the name of an animal; it has even been translated "hyena."\textsuperscript{19} The same word occurs as a personal name in the temple administrative archives of the early period. This word, strange to say, has also been regarded as an Elamitic loan-word, but on the basis of the reduplication of the final consonant.\textsuperscript{20}

A few years ago an Amorite Name-Syllabary was published which had been excavated by Haynes at Nippur, and which contained the personal name Ḥu-pi-pi.\textsuperscript{21} More recently there was discovered in the Yale tablet of the old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, that the familiar name Ḥumbaba, or Hubaba, is written exactly the same, namely Ḥu-PI-PI. Since the sign PI has also the value wa, and wa and ba in this period interchange, the correct reading of the word in the omen texts, and of the personal name, was not Ḥu-pi-pi, but it was Ḥu-wa-wa; and this reproduced the pronunciation of Ḥu-ba-ba.

It followed from this discovery that the name was the same as that of Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses (Num. 10:29); and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] Ungnad-Gressmann \textit{Das Gilgamesch-Epos} p. 77.
\item[18] Ungnad-Gressmann ibidem p. 111.
\item[19] Holma \textit{Namen der Körperteile} p. 151, note 2.
\item[21] Chiera \textit{Lists of Personal Names} p. 122.
\end{footnotes}
since it unquestionably was Amorite or West Semitic, there could be little doubt but that it was the same as Kombabos of Lucian. Furthermore, it naturally followed that the reference to the conflict between Gilgamesh of Erech and Ḫubaba or Ḫumbaba of the West was an allusion to an important historical event of the early period. Additional light is now thrown upon the situation from a passage in an omen text in the Pierpont Morgan Collection (see below), which fully substantiates the inferences which the writer made.

It is a well established idea that the definite historical allusions to which omens refer, were originally supplied by actual events that followed the appearance of the prognosticating signs which the priests had observed. Following are a few of the omens referring to historical events:

"If the foetus is male and female (a monstrosity), it is the omen of Bau-ellit, who ruled the land; the king’s country will be seized." It is now definitely known that this woman, Bau-ellit, overthrew the rule of Akshak, and established the fourth dynasty of Kish.

No less than eleven historical omens are known which bear upon Sargon’s reign. In one of them the expression “he possessed no foe nor rival,” meaning that he had subdued the neighboring lands, is fully borne out by many discoveries.

There are two well known omens relating to Narâm-Sin, one referring to his overthrow of Apirak, and the other to his conquest of Magan. The former is summarized in the eighteenth line in the Morgan text, which reads: “If the tirani is like a woolen rope, it is the omen of Narâm-Sin, who overthrew Apirak in arms.” This is fully confirmed by the chronicles of Babylonian kings.

Another omen referring to the founder of a dynasty reads: “If a sheep gives birth to an ox, etc., it is the omen of Ishbi-Urra, who did not have a rival.”

We now have historical data to show

---

22 It is not improbable that Lucian’s tradition contains a reflection of the ancient Humbaba, who may have built or rebuilt the temple.
23 Empire of the Amorites p. 88.
24 CT 28, 6: 1 f.
25 King Chronicles I, 32 ff.
that this Amorite, from the city of Mari, overthrew the third dynasty of Ur, and became the founder of the Nisin dynasty.\textsuperscript{27} These examples suffice to show that omens of this character unquestionably refer to historical events, and notably to great conquerors who overthrew dynasties, as well as to subjugating enemies.

The two omens referring to Huwawa have been known for some time; one reads: “If a woman give birth to the face of Huwawa; the king and his sons will leave the city.”\textsuperscript{28} The other is: “If a sheep bear a lion, and it has the face of Huwawa, the prince will not have a rival; he will destroy the land of the enemy.”\textsuperscript{29} In an omen text of the Pierpont Morgan Collection (BRM IV, 13), the following is found in line 65: “If the tirani is like the face of \textit{dHum-Hum}, a usurper of the land will rule the world.” A fragment in the British Museum duplicates the first part of six consecutive lines of this text (i.e., 63 to 68), the third of which reads: “If the tirani is like the face of \textit{Hum-ba-ba},” etc.,\textsuperscript{30} showing that the ideogram \textit{dHum-Hum} is to be read Humbaba or Huwawa. These omens can only be interpreted as meaning that Humbaba was a usurper, who like Bau-ellit, Sargon, and Ishbi-Urra, overthrew a dynasty, conquered the lands, and was without a rival. The third interprets the other two; together they clearly indicate that Humbaba or Huwawa had been a mighty conqueror, and that he had doubtless subjugated Babylonia.

What the characteristic feature was which enabled the priests to associate the omen-sign with Huwawa is not clear. Jastrow has shown that Huwawa in omens is contrasted with \textit{tigru} “dwarf.”\textsuperscript{31} The character of Huwawa or Humbaba is described in the Gilgamesh Epic as \textit{dapini} “terrible one,” “whose roar is a deluge, whose mouth is fire, whose breath is death.” The elders in their effort to dissuade Gilgamesh from attempting to overthrow him, asked: who has ever penetrated to his dwelling place

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Empire of the Amorites} p. 107.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{CT} 27, 3: 17; 4: 9; and 6: 4.
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{CT} 27, 21: 8. See also \textit{CT} 28, 14: 12. Cf. also \textit{Hu-um-ba-bi-tu} \textit{CT} 27, 4: 8.
\textsuperscript{30} Boissier \textit{Divination} p. 91.
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Religion Babyloniens II}, 913 f.
or capital in the heart of the cedar forest? Who has ever opposed his weapon? In short, the references to the despot seem to convey the idea that he was a powerful personage.

Gilgamesh figures also in the divination texts; among which the following has been found: "If a woman give birth, and the (child) has the head of a snake; (it is) the omen of Nin-Gish-Zidda who ravaged the land; (and it is) the omen of Gilgamesh who ruled the land, and who became 'the king of hosts' in the land." It is clear from the Gilgamesh Epic that Gilgamesh in the early part of his reign was subservient to another, and that he was able to overthrow the enemy.

We learn therefore from the omen texts that one named Humbaba, who had usurped the throne of the West, had conquered the land; and we learn from the Gilgamesh Epic that about this time a personage named Engidu, which Sumerian name was very probably originally Semitic, Ea-tâbu or Ba'al-tôb, appeared on the scene and became the ally of Gilgamesh. Possibly we may later ascertain that the power which Humbaba represented was designated by the eagle. At present, however, this can only be regarded as conjectural. Moreover, the epic bearing the name of Gilgamesh was originally written to commemorate the overthrow of Humbaba, which when accomplished doubtless enabled Gilgamesh to become the 'king of hosts.'

The fact that Humbaba, who bears an Amorite name, is a historical personage, that he lived in a cedar district of the West, and that he humiliated Babylonia at the time of Gilgamesh, about 4000 B.C., prove conclusively the writer's contentions concerning the antiquity of the Amorite civilization.

Among the historical documents found at Nippur, there has come to light more than one effort on the part of ancient scribes, who lived prior to the time of Abraham, to give a history of the world, beginning with a creation story, the building of cities, a deluge story, and dynastic lists extending to the time the tablets were written. Unfortunately nearly all tablets of this period have come down to us in a fragmentary condition. They, however, forcibly remind us of the efforts of the Biblical writer; and give us the know-

\[CT\text{ 27, 1: 8-9.}\]
ledge that the Babylonians also had outline histories of man from the beginning. Moreover, the knowledge that the Babylonians had several creation myths, and more than one version of the deluge, parallels what the literary analysis of the Pentateuch had long ago determined, namely that in the Old Testament there are two creation stories and two of the flood, as well as other duplicate traditions, such as are found in Babylonian libraries. And further, the discovery that the Atra-ḫasis Epic is of Amorite origin gives us another West Semitic or Hebrew tradition of the deluge.

There would seem to be little doubt that the names of the patriarchs, which are given in the Old Testament, belong to the Hebrew or the Aramaean branch of the Semitic race; and that other lists of contemporaneous rulers among the Semites were also in existence. The antediluvian list of kings handed down by Berossus is one of these. All kinds of efforts have been made to show that the Hebrew list is taken from this one; but they have utterly failed. They have in common only one thing, that is the tenth antediluvian in each list is a hero of the flood, in one case Noah, and in the other Atra-ḫasis. If it should be found that the Amorites of Mesopotamia used clay for their writing material in the early period, it is highly probable that in time similar lists will be found. Certainly the discoveries made in Babylonia would indicate that lists of rulers and similar traditions existed in the library of every great temple.

The second important result of these discoveries is the realization of the fact that underlying the Old Testament outline of history, as well as these chronicles of the Babylonians, there is real history. The claim that the Biblical patriarchs and the early kings of Babylonia are the creation of a fiction writer, or belong to mythology, has no support from the discoveries made in the past decade. In every instance in which archaeology has thrown light upon the subject, we find that we have historical characters to deal with. There may be only a few names given, and they may be made to represent a period which actually covered many millennia of history, nevertheless, there are reasons for believing that the names represent actual persons who lived. Man
may be depicted as riding to heaven on the back of an eagle, turning into a pillar of salt, fighting with an angel, or living in a whale’s belly for three days, but nevertheless we have reasons to believe that their names represent historical characters. Again and again have we had the experience of transferring names from what has been regarded as the realm of mythology, or what has been regarded as the creation of an ancient fiction writer, to the pages of history. The discoveries of the past decades have played such an important role in this connection that it is now possible to assert that it is impossible for those scholars who relegate to the region of myth certain Biblical or Babylonian characters to substantiate their position. In short, as already stated, it cannot be shown from the literature of the ancients that in the Semitic world a single god ever became a mortal. We find a process analogous to what took place in Greece and elsewhere; epics and traditions were directly based upon historical personages; moreover, many deities have already turned out to be deified persons, especially kings.

Prior to 1909, when the present writer first contested this general position, it had been demonstrated that the Hammurabi dynasty was Amorite, with the understanding, however, that Amorites were Arabs. Those who held the view that the periodic Arab migrations accounted for the peoples in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, maintained that an early wave furnished Babylonia with Semites late in the fourth millennium B. C., that a second wave between 2400 and 2100 B. C. furnished Syria and Mesopotamia with Amorites; that between 1500 and 1300 a third wave furnished Palestine and adjacent lands with Aramaeans and Hebrews; and that in the seventh century of the Christian era, Western Asia and Europe received Arabs, namely Mohammedans. Another who accepted and promulgated the theory completed the thousand year “spilling over” process by inserting another wave from the fifth century B. C., when Nabataeans moved upon Petra; in short, these periodical outbursts or “sporadic waves of hungry tribesmen,” occurring about every thousand years when Arabia became so full that this spitting out process was necessary, furnished Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia with its inhabitants.
In *Amurru the Home of the Northern Semites* (1909), and more recently in *The Empire of the Amorites* (1919), the writer contested this theory, as accepted by many adherents, largely on the basis of a study of the nomenclature found in the Babylonian inscriptions. Hundreds of data were offered in proof of the new position, some of which were facts, others were based upon different interpretations, or upon what seemed to be implied, and, as would be expected, upon suggestions which had no direct bearing upon the thesis, but which seemed to throw light upon the historical background of these peoples. While admitting that Arabs have in all periods filtered into these lands, the writer contends that this wave theory is baseless; and he has presented many discoveries to show that the civilization of Syria and Mesopotamia, that is, the land of the Amorites, synchronized with the earliest known in Babylonia and Egypt. Some additional discoveries were presented in an article on the Antiquity of Babylonian Civilization published in 1921, which are augmented in the present treatise. In short, while an abundance of material has been discovered during the past decade which permits of the gradual reconstruction of the history of Amurru, and which tends to confirm the writer's position, he knows of nothing that has come to light which supports the contested theories.

In conclusion, the writer's position is summarized in the following two points, both of which imply the negation of prevailing theories.

First, while Arabs have always filtered into adjacent lands there is no basis for the theory that within the period covered by the written history of man, the inhabitants of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia were dependent upon Arabia for their Semites and their culture; on the contrary, the Semites in Syria and Mesopotamia had an indigenous existence and civilization which synchronizes with the earliest known in Babylonia and Egypt.

Second, that the position of the Pan-Babylonists, namely that Israel's culture and religion was of Babylonian origin, is without foundation, for the culture is indigenous, excepting the interchange of cultural elements which ordinarily takes place between neighboring peoples; on the contrary, the Semites of Babylonia came into
the great alluvium pre-eminently from Syria and Mesopotamia, as is echoed in the tradition "and it came to pass as they jour-
neyed eastward that they found a plain in the land of Shinar;" and they brought with them their religion and culture which, under the influence of the Sumerians, resulted in what we call Akkadian or Semitic-Babylonian. These two points summarize the writer's position.
APPENDIX.

A. AN EARLY VERSION OF THE ATRA-HASIS EPIC.

TRANSLITERATION.

COLUMN I.

1 [li]-'(?)-bi-il [ri]-ig-[maš−i]n bal-ši-

a(?)

ma-tum ir-ta-bi-iš ni-[šu im]-ti-da

[m]a-tum ki-ma li-i i-ša-ab-bu

[i-na] ḫu-bu-ri-ši-na i-lu it-ta-ab-da-ar

5 [. . . . .] iš-te-me ri-gi-im-ši-in

[iz]-za-kar a-na el(?)-li ra-bu-tim

iq-ta-ab-ta ri-gi-im a-wi-lu-ti

I will bring(? their clamor(?)) the land had become great; the people had multiplied.

The land like a bull had become satiated.

[In]their assemblage God was absent.

...... heard their clamor.

He said to the great gods(?),

Those observing the clamor of men,

4 Scheil Recueil de Travaux 20 55ff; Jensen Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek VI 1 288 ff; Dhorme Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens 120ff; Ungnad Altorientalische Texte und Bilder I 57ff; and Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 104ff.

A, 4. The word ḫu-bu-ri-ši-na, which occurs several times in the redaction, was left untranslated by all except Dhorme, who rendered it "totalité." The root of this word in Hebrew and Aramaic means "to join, to associate;" cf. בָּרָא "company, association;" בָּרָא "associate, companion." The corresponding word in Babylonian was puḫru, which the redactor employed in his paraphrases.

A, 4. The only root in Hebrew or Aramaic to which it-ta-ab-da-ar could belong is רע "to be absent, lacking." I am indebted to Professor Torrey for this identification. It is probable that a redactor did not understand the word, for he changed the thought in his paraphrase, and used a word similar in appearance, eli rigmēšina ittadīr "concerning their clamor he was troubled."

A, 5. En-lil is probably to be restored (see note under B, III:4). It is to be regretted that one of the three passages (see also B, III:37) does not preserve the name intact.

A, 6. The words el(?)-li ra-bu-tim are replaced in the late redaction by ana īlānī mārē-šu "to the gods, his children" (see B, III:5).

A, 7. Ig-ta-ab-ta, written [iq]-tab-ta-ma in the redaction (B, III:6), seems to be from the root בחר "to trace, investigate, search out." It is found in all the Semitic languages except Akkadian. In Hebrew it especially means "to follow at the heel." Cf. the form iša-ba-ta (B, III:3), which was used in the redactor's paraphrase.
The root of *mašš-ta* is the Hebrew רושי 'to devastate, to be desolate,' a root which is parallel in meaning to רושי; cf. רושי Psalm 74:3, and also the noun רושי, as well as רושי 'desolation,' Is.24:12. Compare רושי in the redactor's paraphrase (B, III:3), which is somewhat similar in meaning. In V R 31:30 *mašš-ti* is parallel to רושי-tum. These have been construed as meaning 'to forget' from the Akkadian *mašš*, see Delitzsch HWB 486a. However, it must be said that there is a possibility of רושי being identified with רושי or רושי. The context suggests that perhaps the verb was a denominative, meaning something like 'to become weeds, thorns;' cf. *seru palku Olid idranu* (B, III:4) 'let the wide field bear weeds(?);' which the gloss probably indicates was not understood by the scribe of the late text (see below). The writer tentatively restores [i-na ga-da]-ti-gi-na (instead of kargisina as in the redaction, because he feels the redactor in writing the paraphrase did not understand the passage.

A, 9. This is the Amorite word רושי meaning 'fig tree;' in the redaction the Akkadian *titu* is used (see also Chap. 1).

A, 10. The root of רושי-su is not known to the writer. In B, III:43 the same expression is found where רושי-su is used; see also *emo-su* B, III:53. It would appear that the root is not *anāsu* 'to be little, wanting,' but *mašš* or *wašš*. The context suggests that perhaps the verb was a denominative, meaning something like 'to become weeds, thorns;' cf. *seru palku lălid idranu* (B, III:4) 'let the wide field bear weeds(?);' which the gloss probably indicates was not understood by the scribe of the late text (see below). The writer tentatively restores [i-na ša-da]-ti-ši-na (instead of karššima as in the redaction, because he feels the redactor in writing the paraphrase did not understand the passage.

A, 11. Scheil originally regarded the root of רושי-šu as meaning 'to kill;' this is Hebrew. The form רושי should be noted. As already stated, similar forms are found in the text, like רושי, etc.

A, 12. The words which appeared in the line before the text was injured were perhaps the Hebrew רושי דומדומד, written *tma-ti* 'fountains of the deep.' Since the parallel passage B, III:45 has רושי-šo-šir, probably this word stood also in the original text instead of רושי-šu, which would give us a line parallel to Gen. 8:2, where the same verb is used.

A, 13. This passage is restored with the help of the late text, B, III:45 and 55.

A, 15. [na]-ag-bi-va seems also to be Amorite from the root רושי; cf. *rosh* 'mighty.'

A, 15. The root of רושי-ši is to be found in the Hebrew רושי 'to throw, hurl.' It has been suggested by Professor Torrey that this may be the root of רושי-ši, see Delitzsch HWB p. 130b.
Let the clouds be held back, that rain from the heavens pour not forth.
Let the field withhold its fertility.
Let a change come over the bosom of Nisaba.

COLUMN II.

Let ....
Let him destroy ....
On the morrow let him cause it to rain mightily
Let him give in the night ....
Let him cause it to rain a tempest ....
Let it come upon the field like a thief.

Which Adad had created in the city ....
They cried out and became furious ....
They sent up a clamor ....
They feared not ....

COLUMN VII.

Ea ....
Ea his mouth [opened and]
Spake to ....
Why hast thou commanded ....
I will stretch out my hand to the pe[ople] ....
The flood, which thou hast ordered ....

A, 16. The root of li-im-ta-an-ni-ma is evidently the familiar Hebrew ינות "to withhold hold back;" used of rain, Amos 4:7; of showers, Jer. 3:3; etc. I owe this identification to Professor Torrey.
A, 17. This and the following two lines are restored from the late redaction; see B, III:46, 47, 56 and 57.
A, 18. The meaning "'Ertrag, produce,'" etc., have been offered for išbiku (see Jensen KB VI 1 278 note 8). In Hebrew, the root besides the general meaning "to pour out" means also "to shed blood," "to pour out one's soul, one's personality."
A, 70. The word ib-ba-ra apparently is Amorite; cf. the Hebrew יפל "mighty."
A, 75. It seems as if ma is waw consecutive.
Who is he? I ........................
I truly will bear ............
His work he shall suppress ............
Let be restrained; ............
His god will bear; and his goddess(?)

Let them go into the [ship]
The ship-mast ............
Let them go ............

Atram-hasis opened his mouth, and
Spoke to his lord.

The second tablet (of the series) “When
God, man.”
Its total is 439 (lines)
By the hand of Azag-dAya, the junior
scribe.
Month Shebet, day 28th
of the year when Ammi-zaduga, the king,
built the city Dur-Ammi-zaduga
at the mouth
of the Euphrates (11th year).

B. A LATE REDACTION OF THE ATRA-HASIS EPIC.²

TRANSLITERATION.

COLUMN I.

[II] ša[ttu] [i-na ka-ša-di-šu] ....... [When] the second year [arrives] .......

A, 398. The root of tarkullu or רכע was not in current use in Akkadian.
² The text is published in CT 15, 49; it was translated by Zimmern ZA 14 277ff; Jensen
KB VI 1 274ff; Dhorme Choix 128ff; Ungnad ATB I 61ff; and Rogers Cuneiform Parallels
104ff.
The people in their ... become changed.

When the fourth year arrives, their position was miserable.

The wide ... their ... became oppressed.

The people [wan]der in the streets with the head [bowed].

When the fifth year arrives, the daughter looks for the entering of the mother.

The mother opens not [her] door to the daughter.

The daughter [looks] upon the treasures of the mother.

[The mother] looks upon the treasures of the daughter.

When the sixth year arrives, they prepare the [daughter] for a meal.

For morsels they prepare the child .... were full (?) ....

One house [devours] another.

B, I:28. Dhorme reads ma-ğu[ or za]-si-s'u-nu, and translates "leurs villes(?)" and is followed by Rogers; Jensen and Ungnad leave untranslated.

B, I:30. The first part of the line is read qa-t(a) is(z)-? by Jensen; qa-da-šu by Dhorme, and ga-da-niš by Rogers. It is not improbable that the third sign is qad, in which case the first word would be qa-da-qad = Hebrew לַעֲדוּת "crown of the head."

B, I:33. It seems to the writer that the root of the word zi-ba-ni-it "scales" is the תropolis "to hide, treasure up," which was not in current use in Akkadian. "Treasured things, stores" would make better sense than "scales", as usually translated, in the above passage. The word sapanisu occurs in the Amarna Letters. Knudtzon translates u ṣ-i-nu-ṭar i-na ṣa-pa-ni-su "und wiederkehrt bei seinem Verschwinden" (147:10). This, the writer suggests, should be translated "who is mindful of his treasure."

B, I:36. The words a-na pat-te have been translated by Dhorme "aussitôt," by Ungnad "zur Zehrung(?)," perhaps reading kurmate(-to), who is followed by Rogers reading a-na pat-te "for food(?)." The word seems to be the Hebrew מְלֹל "morsel." Not being current in Babylonia and Assyria the redactor wrote the gloss which precedes: "they prepare the daughter for a meal."

B, I:37. The word i-ri-ḥa-ma restored from II:50, is Amorite, although the only occurrence of the root in the O. T. is in מְלֹל "meal, food" (Gesenius Heb. Dict. 17 p. 65). The root arāḥu occurs in IV R 49, 29b, and is explained as meaning ṣabā’u "to eat," cf. Delitzsch HEB p. 132.
Like ghosts their faces [they cover].
The people [live] in violence.

They took a messenger ....
They entered, and ....
An oracle ....
And the lord of the land .... the return

COLUMN II.

Above [Adad made scarce his rain].
Be[low] (the fountain of the deep) was stopped, [that the flood rose not at the source].
The field diminished [its fertility].
A change came over the bosom of Nisaba. [By night the fields became white].
The wide plain bore weeds(?).
The plant came not forth; the sheep [did not become pregnant].
[Calamity was put upon the people].
[The womb was closed, and the child came not forth].

B, I:38. Jensen reads ki-i simti: simtiti "gemäss dem, was gehörig ist," Dhorme ki-i simtiti "au lieu .... i d'ornaments." Ungnad and Rogers leave untranslated. For sedimmu and idimmu "ghost" see Muss-Arnolt Die. 1016a.

B, I:39. Jensen reads su-ut(-)k(q)e-e-zi bal-ta-at without translating. Dhorme reads su-par-ki-e napiṣṭi bal-ṭa-at "Les gens vivaient d'une vie éteinte." Ungnad did not translate, and Rogers followed Dhorme, translating "the people lived with bated breath." The root paraku "to display violence" is used in Akkadian.

B, I:43. This ma is left wholly unaccounted for in the translations. The writer proposes that it is the waw conjunctive.

B, II:33. Different meanings have been offered for the word idranu, as "ashes, alkali, salt-peter, salt, weeds, thorns." For the latter see Hinke A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzer p. 248. I am indebted to Dr. W. Muss-Arnolt for this reference. It was doubtless an Amorite word, and probably was not understood by the scribe, who living in Babylonia, where the surface of neglected fields turns white with salt, wrote the gloss "by night the fields became white."
When the second year arrives, the people became changed. When the third year arrives, the people in their position became oppressed. When the fourth year arrives, their position became miserable. The wide mankind their people became oppressed.

The people wander in the street with head bowed down. When the fifth year arrives, the daughter looks for the entering of the mother. The wide people their life live in violence. The wise Atra-hasis, the man, to his lord, his thought turns. He speaks with his god. His lord Ea speaks with him. By the river he places his bed. The door of his god. The people seek his rains.

B, II:56. Instead of la-šu Jensen read la-a, and considers it to be the negative particle. Dhorme also read it as the particle. Ungnad, and Rogers while regarding it as the negative, appreciated the difficulty added a question mark. It appears to be the Hebrew inseparable preposition with the pronominal suffix, which the scribe glossed with it-ti-šu. B, II:59. Me-ti-ra-tu-šu has been translated "rains," see Dhorme. Jensen, Ungnad and Rogers do not translate. This is the Hebrew ניסי in the plural, as recognized by Dhorme.
[Concerning] their cry he became troubled.  

... ir-ta ......

[elî] rig(ri-gi)-me-ši-na it-ta-d[ir]

[iizzakar ina] ḫu-ḫu-ri-ši-na la i-ša-ba-ta [ni-ši-tu]

[En-l]il il-ta-kăn pu-ḫur-[šu]

[iz-za]-ka-ra a-na ilâni met marêmet šú [iq]-tab-ta-ma [r]i-ši-im a-me-lu-te

[elî] rîg(ri-g[i])]-me-[ši-n]a at-ta-a-(di-ir) dir

[iizzakar ina] ḫu-[ḫu]-ri-ši-na la i-ša-ba-ta ni-ši-tu

... ma šu-ru-bu-ḫu liš-ši

[sur-r]iš li-ši ri-gim-ši-na nam-tar

[ki-m]a me-hi-e li-zi qa-ši-na-ti-ma

[mur-šu] ṣi-šu ru-bu-šu a-sa-ku

... ma šu-ru-bu-šu liš-ši

[sur]-riš(ri-iš) i-ši ri-gim-ši-na nam-tar

[ki-ma] me-hi-e i-zi qa-ši-na-ti-ma

[mur]-ṣu ṣi-šu ru-bu-šu a-sa-ku

[bēl tu]-ši-im-ti A-tar-hasis amēlu

[ana bēl]i-šu Ḫ-e a uzni-šu pi-ta-at

[i-t]a-mu it-ti ili-šu

[20 bēl]i-šu Ḫ-e a it-ti-šu i-ta-mu

[Concerning] their assemblage to those untouched [by the desolations].

[He spoke in] their assemblage to those untouched [by the desolations].

... let there be malaria.

[Hast]ily let fate make an end to their clamor.

[Li]ke a storm, let it overwhelm them.

[Sic]kness, headache, malaria, calamity.

... and they had malaria.

[Hast]ily fate made an end to their cry.

[Like] a storm it overwhelmed them,

[Sick]ness, headache, malaria, calamity.

The wi[se lord] Atra-hasis, the man,

To Ea, his [lord], his thought turns.

[He sp]eaks with his god.

His [lord] Ea speaks with him.
A-tar-ḥasis pa-šu epuša(-ša) i-qab-bi a-na ʾE-a beli-šū
bēlu ut-ta-za-ma ta-ni-še-ti
lu-ku-mu-ma e-kal ma-tu

25 [ʾE]-a belu ut-ta-za-ma ta-ni-še-ti
.... ša ilānimēl-ša e-kal ma-tu
.... ma te-ib-nu-na-ši-ma
[lī-ip-par]-sa mur-ša ti-ʾu šū-bu-ru-u
a-sa-šu
[ʾE]-a pa-šu epuša(-ša) i-qab-bi a-na
A-tar-ḥasis me-izkur-šū

30 ....... ka-lu-ša-pu-u i-na ma-ti
.... a tu-sa-pa-a ʾIštar-ku-un
.... ka i-la par-ši-šu 33 .... tu nigu
34 .... ana qud-mēša 35 .... qat
ra-ba-ma 36 .... nu-ka-at ..... [i]l-ta]-kan (ka-an) qat-su
[ʾEn-lil.] il-ta-kan pu-ḫur-šū : izakkara
a-na ilānimēl marēmēl-šū
.... ra me-e-ta aš-ku-na-ši-na-ti
[nišē] la im-ṭa-a a-na ša pa-na i-ta-at-ra

40 [ʾelī] rig-me-ši-na at-ta-a-dir
[izakkar ina] ḫu-bu-ri-ši-na la i-ša-ba-ta ni-ši-tu
[līp-par]-sa-ma a-na ni-še-c ti-ta
[i-n]a kar-ši-ši-na li-me-šu ša-mu-mu
[ʾe]-liš ʾAdad zu-un-na-šu lu-ša-gir

Atra-ḥasis opened his mouth, and speaks
To ʾEa, his lord.
O lord, mankind is in misery.
Your power consumes the land.
[ʾE]a, O lord, mankind is in misery.
[The anger] of the gods consumes the land.

.... thou who hast created us
Let sickness, headache, malaria, calamity cease.
[ʾEa opened his mouth], he speaks to
Atar-ḥasis, and tells him:

.... in the land.
.... pray to your goddess.
.... god, his command.

[ʾEnlil] held his assembly; he speaks to
the gods his children.
.... I will put them to death.
[The people] have not become less; they are
more numerous than before.
[Concerning] their cry I am troubled.
[He said in] their assemblage to those
untouched by the desolations.

Let the fig tree for the people be cut off.
[I]n their bellies let the plant be wanting.

Above, let Adad make his rain scarce.

B, III:29. All the translations construe me as an emphatic particle. The writer regards it as the waw consecutive.

B, III:33. This has been read .... ra-mo e ta-aš-ku-na-ši-na-ti ‘do nothing for them.’ Me-e-ta seems to be the Hebrew נשת. However, as the passage is incomplete, this can only be regarded as conjectural.

B, III:42. In the four transliterations the reading is given ni-še e-ti-ta, and is left untranslated except by Dhorme, ‘aux gens la plante épineuse.’ See note under A, 9.

B, III:44. In the old version we have .... šu ʾAdad li-ša-aq-ti-ʾi-il, see A, 11. Probably a Babylonian scribe did not know the Hebrew word, and changed the sense.
Below let (the fountain of the deep) be stopped, that the flood rise not at the source.
Let the field withhold its fertility.
Let a change come over the bosom of Nisaba; by night let the fields become white.
Let the wide field bear weeds(?)
Let her bosom revolt, that the plant come not forth, that the sheep become not pregnant.
Let calamity be placed upon the people.
Let the [womb] be closed, that it bring forth no infant.
The fig tree was cut [off] for the people.
In their bellies, the plant was wanting.
Above, Adad made scarce his rain.
Below (the fountains of the deep) was stopped, that the flood rose not at the source.
The field withheld its fertility.
A change came over the bosom of Nisaba; the fields by night became white,
The wide field bore weeds(?) ; her womb revolted.
The plant came not forth; the sheep did not become pregnant.
Calamity was placed upon the people.
The womb was closed, and brought forth no baby.

B, III:45. As already observed, A, 12 had been injured when the early text was written, and the subject of the verb was lost. It is also wanting in this text. We find the subject in Gen. 8:2, in the words "fountains of the deep." In Genesis the same form from the same verb is used, except that it is in the plural, namely הָלְבָּד .
B, III:49. Jensen translated שְׂעָ-עַ ia i-’-ru "'Korn nicht ....ess!" Dhorme read שְׂע-ע ia i-’-ru "'qu'elle ne germe pas!'" Ungnad "'Getride nicht kommen (?)!'". Rogers, reading שְׂע-ע i-’-im-ru, translated "'lams shall not fatten.'" There are two occurrences of שְׂע in the Annals of Sargon, see Delitzsch HWB 632. This also is the Hebrew word בָּשָׂ "one of a flock" (a sheep or a goat), here used collectively as in the O. T. The verb must be i-’-ru following B, III:59. This is the root בָּשָׂ "to conceive.'
... [d]E-a iz-za-kar
...... ú-sham(ša-am)-na-ši
...... [tam]-nu ši-ip-ta : iš-tu-ma tam-nu-ú ši-pa-sa
..... i]-ta-di eli ți-iť-ti-ša
5 [XIV gi-ir]-ši taq-ri-iš : VII gi-ir-ši
..... ana įmni taš-ku-un :
[VII gi]-ir-ši ana šumēli taš-ku-un :
i-na be-rušu-nu i-ta-di libitta
..... a ap-pa-ri pa-ri-iq a-bu-un-na-te
..... tip-te-ši
...... [iš]-ši-ma ir-še-te mu-te-ti
[VII] u VII šu-su-ra-ti : VII u-ba-na-a
..... zikarêmesı
10 [VII] ú-ba-na-a sinnišâtimesı
[š]á-su-ru ba-na-at ši-im-tu
ši-na-šan(ša-na) ú-ka-la-la-ši-na
ši-na-šan(ša-na) ú-ka-la-la maš-ru-ša
ú-su-ra-te ša nişâmesı ma ú-ša-ar ˘ Ma-mi
..... ina bit a-li-te ha-riš-ti : VII úmêmesı
..... li-na-di libittu
i-lut istu bit ˘ Maḥ e-riš-ta ˘ Ma-mi
šab-su-šu-un-ma ina bit ha-riš-ti li-îb-du
ak-ki a-li-it-tu u-la-du-ma
ummi šir-ri lu-ḫar-ri-ša ra-ma-an-[niša]
20 [zi]-ka-ru .... 22 .... el-li ....

C. ASSYRIAN FRAGMENT.3

.... lu-...)
.... ki-ma kip-pa-ıı .........

..... Ea said.
.... he shall cause her to recite.
..... [reci]ted an incantation. After
she recited the incantation;
[She sp]at upon her clay.
[Fourteen pieces] she pinched off; seven
pieces she laid on the right.
[Seven] pieces she laid on the left; be-
tween them she placed a brick.
Offspring is delivered, the birth-stool(?).
She then called the wise ....
Seven and seven mothers, seven formed
boys.
Seven formed girls
The mother, the creator of destiny.
Them(?) , they finished them.
Them(?) , they finished before her.
The figures of people, Mami formed.
In the house of the bearing one the mid-
wife, shall let the brick for seven days
lie.
Divinity(?) from the temple of Maḥ, the
wise Mami,
They that are angry in the house of the
midwife, let be happy.
When the bearing one is about to give
birth,
Let the mother of the child conceive it
like into herself.
Male .............

3 The text was published by Pinches IV R 2 Additions p. 9; and Delitzsch Assyrische
Lesestücke 2 p. 101. It was translated by Haupt KAT 3 61; Jensen Kosmologie 371f; KB
VI 1 254f; Winckler Textbuch 94f; Jeremia ATA O 233; Dhorme Choix 126f; Ungnad
ATB I 57; Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 104; and Jastrow Heb. and Bab. Trad. 344.
... let it be strong above and below,
...... close ....
...... the time I will send thee.

enter and close the door of the ship.

in it thy grain, thy possessions, and thy property,
Thy [wife], thy family, thy relatives and the craftsmen,
The cattle of the field, the beasts of the field, as many as dev[our] grass,
I will send thee, and they will guard thy door.
Atra-ḫasis opened his mouth, and spoke.
He said to Ea, his lord:
How long! I have not built a ship.
Upon the earth draw a plan!
The plan let me see, and I will build the ship.

The plan let me see, and I will build the ship.

upon the ground he drew.

which thou hast commanded.

D. A DELUGE STORY IN SUMERIAN.⁴

COLUMN III.
The beginning of the column is wanting.

The .... place .... 11 The people ....
12 The flood .... 13 .... 14 .... the made, ....
At that time Nintu [cried aloud] like [a woman in travail].
The holy Ishtar lamented for her people.
......
Ea in his own heart held counsel.

⁴The text, transliteration and translation were published by Poebel Historical and Grammatical Texts No. 1, and Historical Texts 14ff and 66ff. Translations are also found in Barton Archaeology and the Bible 280f; Jastrow Heb. and Bab. Trad. 335ff; and King Legends of Babylon and Egypt 62ff.
An dEn-lil dEn-ki dNin-ḫarsag-ga- 

g[ē] ....
dingir-an-ki-gē mu An dEn-lil mu-

n[i]-.....
20 ū-ba Zi-ū-sūd-du lugal-ām pašiš ......

AN-SAG-gūr-gūr mu-un-dim-dim en

......
nam-BŪR-na KA-sī-sī-gi nī-ter-gā ......

ū-šu-uš-e sag-uš-gub-ba ........
ma-mū-nu-me-a ē-dē KA-bal ......

25 mu-ăn-ki-bi-ta pā-pā-dé ......

Anu, Enlil, Ea and Nin-Ḫarsag ....
The gods of heaven and earth inv[oked] the name of Anu (and) Enlil.
At that time Zi-ū-su-dda the king, the priest of ......

A great ...... he made ......

In humility he prostrates himself, in rever-

ence ......

Daily he stands in attendance ......

A dream, as had not been before, comes forth ......

By the name of heaven and earth he con-

jures. ........

COLUMN IV.

[...]-.šū dingir-ri-e-ne GIŠ ......
Zi-ū-su-ddu da. bi(?) gub-ba giš-mu...
iz-zi-da ā-gūb-bu-mu gub-ba ......
iz-zi-da i(nim)-ga-ra-ab-dū-dū ......
5 na-ri-ga-mu giš-TU-P[I] .......
šā-me-a a-ma-ru u-dū kab-d[i]-ga ba-

......
numun-nam-lū-qāl ḫa-lam-e-d[ē] ....
di-til-la i(nim)-pu-uh-ru-[um dingir-

ri-e-ne-ka..] ......
dū-dū-ga An dEn-[līl] ......
10 [n]am-lugal-bi bal-bi ......
e(?)-[n]e-sū ......
[......]-na mu- ......

For ...... the gods. ........
Zi-ū-su-ddu standing at its side heard ......

At the wall on my left side stand ......

At the wall I will speak a word to thee.

My holy one, give attention!

By our hand(?) a flood will be sent;

To destroy the seed of mankind ....

Is the decision, the word of the assembly ....

of the gods]
The commands of Anu (and) En[li]l ......
Its (their) kingdom, its (their) reign ......

To him (them) ......

The rest of the column, or about three-fourths of the text, is missing.

COLUMN V.

im-ḥul-im-ḥul-nī-gūr-gūr-gēl dū-a-bi All the mighty windstorms together 

ur-bi ni-lāḫ-gi-eš 

a-ma-ru u-dū kab-dū-ga ba-an-da-ab-

ūr-ūr

D, IV:8. As Poebel has pointed out pu-uḥ-ru-[um] is Akkadian.
When for seven days, for seven nights
The flood overwhelmed the land.

When the storm drove out the great boat
over the mighty waters.
Shamash (the sun-god) came forth shedding light over the heaven and earth.
Zi-û-su-du opened the [hatch] of the great boat.
The light of the hero Shamash enters into the interior (?) of the great boat.
Zi-û-su-du, the king,
Prostrates himself before Shamash.
The king sacrifices an ox; a sheep he slaughters (?)

The rest of the column is missing.

By the soul of heaven, by the soul of earth ye shall conjure him,
That he may be .... with you.
Anu (and) Enlil by the soul of heaven,
by the soul of earth shall ye conjure;
He will be .... with you.
The niggilma of the ground rises in abundance.
Zi-û-su-du, the king,
Before Anu (and) Enlil prostrates himself
Life like (that of) a god he gives to him;
An eternal soul like (that of) a god he creates for him.
At that time Zi-û-su-du, the king,
The name of the niggilma (he named)
"Presence of the seed of mankind"
E. THE DELUGE STORY IN THE GILGAMESH EPIC.⁵

Gilgamesh said to him, to Ūm-napishtim, the distant one:
I look upon thee, O, Ūm-napishtim;
Thy appearance is not changed, for I am like thou art.
And thou art not different, for I am like thou art.
There is perfection of heart unto thee to make combat.
And in resting thou liest upon thy back.

[Tell me], how hast thou stood up, and found life in the assembly of the gods?
Ūm-napishtim spoke to him, even to Gilgamesh;
I will reveal, O Gilgamesh, the secret story;
And the decision of the gods to thee I will relate.
Shurippak, a city which thou knowest,
Is situated (on the bank) of the Euphrates,

George Smith published the first translation in The Chaldean Account of Genesis 263ff (1876). The text is published in Delitzsch AL⁴ 101ff; Haupt Nimrod-Epos 133ff; and Pinches IV B² 43f. Translations have been published also by Fox Talbot, Oppert, Lenormant, Haupt, Jensen, Jeremias, Winckler, Zimmern, King, Ball, Jastrow, Mass-Arnold, Rogers, Barton and others. For comparative purposes the following four are freely quoted in the discussions in the notes: Jensen KB VI 1 228ff; Dhorme Choix 100ff; Ungnad ATB I 50ff; and Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 90ff.

E, 6. Instead of the usual reading [u i-n]a a-hi na-da-at e-li ši-ri-ka "thou liest down upon thy side, upon thy back" the writer proposes the above.
E, 9. The word nisirtu meaning "hidden thing," as already noted, is Amorite.
APPENDIX—DELUGE STORY IN GILGAMESH EPIC

That city was old when the gods within it,
The great gods, brought their hearts to send a deluge.
[These drew near] their father, Anu;
Their counselor, the warrior Enlil;
Their herald, En-Urta;
Their hero, Ennugi.
The lord of wisdom, Ea counseled with them; and
He repeated their words to the qikkiš:

Qikkiš, qikkiš! Wall, wall!
O, qikkiš, hear! O wall, give attention!
Man of Shurippak, son of Ubara-Tutu,
Tear down the house, build a ship!
Leave possessions, take thought for life!
Abandon property; save life!
Bring into the ship the seed of life of everything!
The ship which thou shalt build,
Let its dimensions be measured!
Like the apsu, protect it with a roof (šašši)!

E, 20. The writer feels that qikkiš or qiqqis is an archaic Amorite word which is glossed by igaru “wall.” A wooden wall would alone furnish material for the construction of the boat. Si-me-ma is also apparently a gloss for hi-is-sa-as.

E, 26. If instead of na-ak-ru-ra the injured line should prove to read ma-ak-ru-ra, then si-ir-ma would probably be from ḫūb or ḫū ∀ “to turn aside,” and the preceding line would be a gloss; the Akkadian word i-zi-ir-ni “hates me” occurs a few lines below.


The word ša-a-šši is perhaps to be identified with the Amorite form of Shamash, namely šašši see Clay BE X:116. Nabopolassar in a late building inscription from Sippar calls himself
I understood, and said to Ea, my lord, I will observe, I will execute.

But what shall I answer the city, the people, and the elders?

Ea opened his mouth and spoke. He said unto me, his servant: Verily thou shalt say to them,

I may not dwell in your city; Nor on the soil of Enlil set my face.

I will go down to the ocean; with [Ea] my lord, I will dwell.

[Upon] you will he (Enlil) then rain abundance.

[A catch of] birds; a catch of fish,

.... a harvest, and

.... When the muir kukki, in the evening,

Will send you a heavy rain.

.... glows

.... heard ..........

About fifty lines missing.

bore the asphalt.

Strong ..... I brought the neces[s]ities.
On the fifth day, I raised its form.

I placed its walls about its perimeter 120 cubits high.

120 cubits was proportioned the length of its upper part.

I laid its hull; I enclosed it with a roof (šāši).

I covered it (i.e., made decks) six times.

I divided (into divisions) seven times.

I divided its interior nine times.

Water-tanks in its midst I constructed.

I inspected the compartments, and I installed the necessities.

Three sars of bitumen I smeared over the (outside) wall.

Three sars of bitumen I smeared over the inside.

Three sars of oil the basket bearers brought in.

I saved a sar of oil which sacrifices consumed.

Two sars of oil the shipman stowed away.

For [the people] oxen were slaughtered.
I slew sheep daily.
Must, sesame wine, oil and wine.
I gave the workmen to drink like water from the river.
[I made a feast like the Akitu festival, and
I opened [ed a box] of ointment. I completed my task (lit. laid down my hand).
Before (?) Shamash, the great ship was finished.

The ship ropes (?) which they made, they installed above and below.

With all that I had, I loaded it.
With all that I had of silver, I loaded it.
With all that I had of gold, I loaded it.
With all the seed of life that there was, I loaded it.

I caused to go up into the ship all my family and relatives.
The cattle of the field, the beast of the plain, the craftsmen, all of them, I caused to go up.
Shamash fixed a time (saying),
The muir kukki at even will send a heavy rain.
Enter the ship and close the door.

That time arrived.
The muir kukki at even sent a heavy rain.
Of the storm, I observed its appearance.
To behold the storm, I dreaded.
I entered the ship, and closed the door.

E, 76. In all the translations qa-ti ad-di is made to refer to the 'ointment.' It seems to the writer that it is an expression meaning, he finished the task.
E, 81. On e-si-en-ši from the Amorite root 'yV'; see Chap. I.
To the master of the ship, to Buzur-Amurru, the sailor,
I entrusted the great house, including its possessions.
On the appearance of the break of dawn,
There rises from the foundation of the heavens a black cloud.
Adad thunders in the midst of it.
Nebo and Sharru go before.
They go as messengers over mountain and land.
Urragal tears out the mast(?).
En-Urta proceeds; he advances the onset.
The Anunnaki raise the torches.
With their flashes they illuminate the land.
The fury of Adad reaches the heavens.
Everything that was bright turns [to darkness].
The gods fear the deluge.
They withdraw, they ascend to the heaven of Anu.
The gods cower like a dog; they lie down in the enclosure.
Ishar cries like a woman in travail.

E, 95. The word pi-hi-i is not Akkadian, but it is the Hebrew נחל; and it seems that to regard the latter as borrowed from the Babylonian pihatu "district," as is generally done, is a mistake.
The lady of the gods wails with her beautiful voice.
The former day is verily turned to clay.
When I spoke evil in the assembly of the gods—
O, that I spoke evil in the assembly of the gods—
For the destruction of my people, I ordered the cataclysm.
I verily will bear (again) my people, (which)
Like a spawn of fish fill the sea:
The gods of Anunnaki weep with her.
The gods are depressed; they sit weeping;
Their lips are silent; [they huddle] together.
Six days and six nights,
The wind tears, and the deluge-tempest overwhels the land.
When the seventh day arrives, the deluge-tempest subsides in the onslaught,
Which had fought like an army.
The sea rested; the hurricane had spent itself, the flood was at an end.
I looked upon the sea; the voice was silent.
And all mankind was turned to clay.

E, 131. As already mentioned, ḫa-aja-al-ti is Hebrew; see Jensen KB VI 1 p. 498.
E, 133. In the duplicate text ta-ma-ta takes the place of Ṽ-mu, showing that the latter should not be translated 'day,' as is done by all translators, but 'sea' (= מים).
Over my countenance ran my tears.
I looked in all directions; the sea was terrible.
On the twelfth day, an island arose.
Upon Mount Nisir, the ship grounded.
Mount Nisir held the ship that it moved not.

One day, a second day, Mount Nisir held it, that it moved not.

A third day, a fourth day Mount Nisir held it, that it moved not.

A fifth day, a sixth day Mount Nisir held it, that it moved not.

When the seventh day arrived,
I brought out and released a dove.
The dove went forth; it turned; It did not have a resting place; it returned.

I brought out and released a swallow.
The swallow went forth; it turned; It did not have a resting place; it returned.

I brought out and released a raven.
The raven went forth; it saw the drying up of the water; It approached; it waded; it croaked(?) it did not return.

I sent (everything) to the four winds. I offered a sacrifice.

I made a libation upon the summit of the mountain.

Seven and seven adagur pots I set out.
Beneath them I piled reeds, cedar wood and myrtle.
The gods smelled the savor.
The gods smelled the sweet savor.
The gods like flies gathered about the sacrificer.
When finally the lady of the gods arrived.
She raised the great jewel(†), which Anu had made according to her wish.
Ye gods here, I shall not forget my necklace.
Upon these days I shall think, so that forever I will not forget.
Let the gods come to the offering. Enlil shall not come to the offering; Because he took not counsel; and sent the deluge;
And my people he numbered for destruction.
When at last Enlil arrived,
He saw the ship; then Enlil was wroth; He was filled with anger against the Igigi gods.
Has anyone come out alive?
No man shall survive the cataclysm.
En-Urta opened his mouth, and spake, He said to the warrior Enlil; Who without Ea shall devise the command?
And Ea knows every matter.
Ea opened his mouth and spoke, He said to the warrior Enlil: Thou wise one(?) of the gods, O warrior,
Why, O why hast thou not taken counsel; and hast sent a flood?
On the sinner place his sin;
On the evil doer place his crimes;
APPENDIX—BABYLONIAN FRAGMENT

ru-um-me ai ib-ba-ti-iq šu-du-ud ai ...

That charity (?) be not cut off; that punishment be not ....

Instead of thy sending a deluge,
Let a lion come and diminish the people.

Instead of thy sending a deluge,
Let a wolf come and diminish the people.

Instead of thy sending a deluge,
Let there be a famine and ruin the land.

Instead of thy sending a deluge,
Let Urra come and destroy the people.

F. A FRAGMENT OF DELUGE STORY IN BABYLONIAN.6

.................. ša(?) ša(?) ........-ka

................ I will loosen;

................ will take all the people together.

6 Published by Hilprecht BE Ser. D V 133f. It was also translated by Rogers Cuneiform Parallels 108f; and by Jastrow Heb. and Bab. Trad. 343f.
After the death of Ardatos, his son Xisouthros reigned for eighteen sars; in his reign a great deluge took place, and the story has been recorded as follows.

Kronos appeared to him in his sleep and said that on the fifteenth of the month Daisios men would be destroyed by a deluge. He bade him therefore, setting down in writing the beginning, middle, and end of all things, to bury them in Sippara, the city of the Sun; to build a boat, and go aboard it with his family and close friends; to stow in it food and drink, to put in it also living creatures, winged and four-footed, and when all his preparations were complete, to set sail; when asked where he was sailing, to say, 'To the gods, in order to pray that men may have blessings.'

He did not disobey, but built the boat, five furlongs long, and family. Before the deluge comes; as many as there are I will bring destruction. Verily observe silence. Build a great ship; and the total height, shall be its structure. It (she shall be a magurgurrum (giant boat); and her name shall be 'the reserver of life.' Protect with a great cover. Which thou shalt make. Beast of the field, fowl of the heaven. For a number (or of a kind). And family. ....

G. BEROSSUS' VERSION OF THE ATRA-Hasis Epic.'

The text followed is that of A. Schoene Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo Vol. I pp. 20-24, except where differences are noted. The translation and notes here presented are by my colleague, Prof. A. M. Harmon of Yale University.
in length and two furlongs in width, assembled and stowed everything in accordance with the directions, and embarked his wife and children and his close friends.

After the deluge had begun and had quickly ceased, Xisouthros let some of the birds go; but as they found no food nor place to alight, they came back into the boat. Again after some days Xisouthros let the birds go, and they came back to the boat with their feet muddy. But when they were let go for the third time, they did not come back to the boat again. Xisouthros concluded that land had appeared; unstopping some part of the boat's seams and perceiving that the boat had grounded upon a mountain, he disembarked with his wife, his daughter, and the helmsman; and after he had done homage to the earth, built an altar, and sacrificed to the gods, disappeared with all those who had disembarked from the boat. Those who had remained in the boat disembarked when Xisouthros and his companions failed to come in, and looked for him, calling him by name. Xisouthros himself they never saw again, but a voice came from the air, telling them that they must be pious, for because of his piety he was gone to live with the gods; and that his wife, his daughter, and the helmsman had received a share in the same honor. He told them, too, that they would go back to Babylonia, and that it was fated for them to recover the writings at Sippara and publish them to men; also that the country where they were belonged to Armenia. On hearing this, they sacrificed to the gods and went by a roundabout way¹¹ to Babylonia. But of this boat that grounded in Armenia some part still remains there, in the mountains of the Kordyaloi in Armenia, and people get pitch from the boat by scraping it off, and use it for amulets.

They went, then, to Babylonia, dug up the writings at Sippara, founded many cities, built temples, and so repopulated Babylonia.

¹¹ πέρικ MS, πεῖδ Schoene.
### Dynastic Lists of Early Babylonia

#### I Kish Kingdom
- 4 ....-um-e
- 5 ....-an-
- 6 ....-vu-um
- 7 [Uph-] ba(†)
- 8 .... tabba
- 9 Kalumum 900 yrs.
- 10 Zugagib 840 "
- 11 Arwû, s. of a mushkenu 720 "
- 12 Etana, the Shepherd 625 "
- 13 Baliqam, s. 410 "
- 14 En-men-nun-na 611 "
- 15 Melam-Kish 900 "
- 16 Bar-sal-nun-na, s. 1,200 "
- 17 Mes-za-mug(†), s.
- 18 En-gis(†)-gu(†), s. of No. 16
- 19 En-me-dur-mes-e(†)
- 20 ....-za
- 21 En-me-bara-gi-šu(†)
- 22 ....
- 23 Ag(†), s. of En(†) 625 "

23 kings 18,000 + x

#### Eanna or I Uruk Kingdom
- 1 Mesh-kin-gasher, s. of Shamash 325 yrs.
- 2 En-mer-kár, s. 420 "
- 3 Lugal Marda, the Shepherd 1,200 "
- 4 Tammuz, the Hunter 100 "
- 5 Gilgamesh, s. of High-priest of Kullab 126 "
- 6 ....-lugal, s.

11(†) kings (about 5 missing) 2,171 + x

#### II Kish Kingdom
- 1 Mesilim
- 2 Al-zu(†)
- 3 Ur-sag-e 4(†) kings 3,792 yrs.

#### II Ur Kingdom
- 1 Annani
- 2 Lu-Nannar, s. 4(†) kings 108 yrs.

#### Awan Kingdom
- 3 kings 356 yrs.

#### II Adab Kingdom
- 1 Lugal-dalu
- 2 Me-igi-. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2(†) kings

#### II Adab Kingdom
- 1 Lugal-anni-mundu 1 king 90 yrs.

#### Mari Kingdom
- 1 Ansir 30 "
- 2 (†) gi I-[š]ar-Shamash 30+ yrs.

3(†) kings

#### I (?) Akshak Kingdom
- 1 Zuzu

---

The dynastic lists published by the writer in *JAOS* 41 244ff. are here reproduced with some modifications and additions based on a few additional finds published by Legrain *Historical Fragments* 10ff.
### III Kish Kingdom

1. Eannatum  
2. Lugal-tarsi  
3. Enbi-Ashtar

3 (?) kings

### II Uruk Kingdom

1. Enshagkushanna  
2. Lugal-kigub-nidudu  
3. Lugal-kisalsi

3 (?) kings

### II (?) Akshak Kingdom

1. Un-zi  
2. Un-da-lu-lu  
3. Ur-sag  
4. BA-SA-Saljan  
5. Ishu-il  
6. Gimil-Sin, s.

6 kings 99 years

### IV Kish Kingdom

1. Azag-Bau or Bau-ellit  
2. BA-SA-Sin, s.  
3. Ur-dZababa  
4. Zimutar  
5. Uzi-watar, s.  
6. El-muti  
7. Imu-Shamash  
8. Nania, the Jeweler

8 kings 106 years

### Akkad Kingdom

1. Sharru-kin  
2. Uru-mush, s.  
3. Manishtusu, s.  
4. Naram-Sin, s.  
5. Shargali-sharri, s.  
6. Manum šarru ma-num la šarru

7. Igigi  
8. Imi  
9. Nanum  
10. Ilulu  
11. Durdi  
12. Su-qar-kib, s.

12 kings 197 years

### IV Uruk Kingdom

1. Ur-nigin  
2. Ur-gigir, s.  
3. Kudda  
4. BA-SA-ilil  
5. Ur-Shamash

5 kings

### Gutium Kingdom

1. Imbia  
2. Ingishu  
3. Warlagaba  
4. Iarlarumar  
5. [ ]-gub  
6. [ ]-ti  
7. [ ]-an-gub  
8. [ ]-bi  
9. Arlagan  
10. E-ir-ri-du-pi-zi-ir  
11. Sarlak

55 years 2847?

15 “ 2792?

7 “ 2777?

56 “ 2770?

25 “ 2714?

12 kings 197 years

5 years 2624?

7 “ 2619?

6 “ 2612?

3? “ 2606?

5 years 2620?

8 “ 2616?

6 “ 2612?

3? “ 2606?

The dates from Utu-begal backward are uncertain, because the 25 years assigned that ruler are conjectural and also because it is not known whether any other kings intervened between his time and the reign of Ur-Engur of Ur. The date 2193 B.C., usually accepted for the beginning of Hammurabi’s reign, is used as a starting point.
Las-si-ra-ab
Si-ù-um
21 Tirigan

III Ur Kingdom
1 Ur-Engur 18 years 2474
2 Dungi, s. 58 “ 2456
3 Amar-Sin, s. 9 “ 2398
4 Gimil-Sin, s. 7 “ 2389
5 Ibi-Sin, s. 25 “ 2382

V Uruk Kingdom
1 Utu-ḥegal 25? years 2499?

Nisin Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>years</th>
<th>Larsa Kingdom</th>
<th>years</th>
<th>Babylon Kingdom</th>
<th>years B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2357</td>
<td>Ishbi-Urra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Naplanum</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sumu-abum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2325</td>
<td>Gimil-lishu, s.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emisz</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sumu-la-ilum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2315</td>
<td>Idin-Dagan, s.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Samâm</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2294</td>
<td>Ishme-Dagan, s.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zabaia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2274</td>
<td>Libit-Ishtar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gungunn</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2263</td>
<td>Ur-Enurta</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Abi-sarê</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2235</td>
<td>Bur-Sin, s.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sumu-īlum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214</td>
<td>Iter-pisha, s.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nûr-Immer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2209</td>
<td>Urra-imitti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sin-idinnam</td>
<td>7?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202</td>
<td>Sin(?)-</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>Sin-īribam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>Ellil-bâni</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sin-îqîsham</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2177</td>
<td>Zamba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2174</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Šili-Immer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2169</td>
<td>Ea. ....</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Warad-Sin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2165</td>
<td>Sin-mâgir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2154</td>
<td>Dâmiq-ilishu, s.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rim-Sin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years 225½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hûmûmûabi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE SITE OF NISIN

The site of Nisin, which has previously been sought for in vain, is very probably at last located. A little over two years ago cones of Libit-Ishtar were brought to Baghdad and offered to the writer for purchase. It seemed that the provenance of these cones would determine the site of the city. Recently Captain Bertram S. Thomas kindly informed the writer, in a letter dated March 22d, that Col. Kenlys L. Stevenson had found a cone at Bahriyat, about seventeen miles south of Nippur. The mounds are simply a series of the usual “mud pie variety,” as the English officers describe them. Bahriyat, it would seem, is the sought-for site.
EARLY VERSION OF THE ATRA-HASIS EPIC
A HEBREW DELUGE STORY IN CUNEIFORM (Obverse)
A HEBREW DELUGE STORY IN CUNEIFORM (REVERSE)
THE ADAPA LEGEND (OVERSE)
A HEBREW DELUGE STORY IN CUNEIFORM (REVERSE)
THE ADAPA LEGEND (REVERSE IS DESTROYED)
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