

571ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, JUNE 7TH, 1915,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.LITT., LL.D., D.D., TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. Pinches needed no introduction to the Members of the Victoria Institute, as he had favoured them with important addresses on several occasions. He would therefore ask him to read his paper on the Old and New Versions of the Babylonian Creation and Flood Stories.

*THE OLD AND NEW VERSIONS OF THE BABYLONIAN
CREATION AND FLOOD STORIES.*—By THEOPHILUS
G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

FORTY years have passed since the late George Smith published his *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, dedicated to Sir Henry Rawlinson, the great English pioneer of Assyriology. We all remember, or at least realize, what a sensation Smith's discoveries made, especially the account of the Flood, which traversed the same ground, point by point, as the Hebrew version in Genesis. It was a triumph for our self-taught countryman, and we all know, moreover, to what it led—namely, the despatch of the enterprising Museum-official to the East, first for the *Daily Telegraph*, and later for the trustees of the British Museum. He was favoured with a fair amount of success, for he found a fragment which was at first supposed to fill a gap of the eleventh tablet of the Gilgameš-series, which gives the story of the Flood—in reality it was a portion of another version—as well as fragments of Creation-stories. His third and last trip to the nearer East, however, had fatal results, and he never saw his native land again. He had acquired, nevertheless, a large amount of chronological material, and Biblical scholars are his debtors for that as much as for his acquisitions in the realm of Babylonian tradition.

Though the two legends which Smith discovered were written in Semitic Babylonian—now known to be Akkadian—it was clear to all, from the names of the deities and other personages, that they were of non-Semitic or Sumerian origin. The Creation-series, which seems to have been written on six tablets, later increased to seven, recorded how everything was at first created and brought forth by Tiawath, “the sea,” and Apsû, “the Deep” or “Ocean.” From these came an only son, named Mummu. Other primeval deities, however, were later regarded as the children of Tiawath—Laḫmu and Laḫamu: Anšar and Kišar, the host of heaven and the host of earth; and then came Anu, the god of the heavens (with, it may be supposed, his spouse Anatum). At this point the record breaks off, but Damascius supplies the wanting portion, namely, the information that the successors of Anu were Illinos (cuneiform Illila) and Aos (*i.e.*, Ea or Aa). Of Illila, the god of the earth, the spouse was called Ninlila: and the spouse of Ea or Aa is given by Damascius as Dauke, the Dam-kinia of the inscriptions. “And of Aos and Dauke,” adds Damascius, “was born a son called Belos, who, they say, is the fabricator of the world—the Creator.”

After this period, hostility arose between the gods of the heavens on the one side, and Tiawath, Apsû, and Mummu on the other. On Apsû complaining that he had no peace by day or rest by night on account of the ways of the gods, their sons, they at last decided to make war upon them. The preparations for this are told at great length, and news of the plot at last reached heaven. At first it was thought that the power of Anu would be sufficient to allay Tiawath’s rage, but when he tried to subdue her, he failed, and turned back. After this Nudimmud, a deity identified with Aa or Ea, sallied forth to overcome the monster, but with equal want of success. Finally Merodach, the son of Aa, was asked to be the champion of the gods, and having accepted, made a long preparation, and overcame her with the aid of his own miraculous powers and those conferred upon him by “the gods of his fathers.” Having divided her body into two parts, and placed one of these as a covering for the heavens (“the waters above the firmament”), he imprisoned her followers. The spoils which he took were the Tablets of Fate held by Kingu, Tiawath’s husband. With their aid, and supported by the gods who had helped him, he began to order the world anew, and decide the Fates. First of all he made a glorious abode for his father Nudimmud, built the palace É-šarra, “house of the host,” a name designating the heavens, and finally constructed the strongholds of Anu, Bel, and Aa. Then came the ordering of

the stars, the planets, and the moon to rule the night, with its sabbath-rest in the middle of the month. The sixth tablet records the creation of man with the help of Merodach's own blood, but there is much that is wanting at this point, and it is probable that numerous other acts of creation on his part will be found recorded when we have the legend complete. The seventh tablet contains a list of the glorious names conferred upon him. Many of these are of a mystic nature, and one seems to refer to the creation of mankind as having for its object the redemption of the rebellious followers of Tiawath.

Such is, in short, an outline of this remarkable composition—a composition full of poetry, if we could only translate it worthily, like the Hebrew Bible or the classics of Greece and Rome. It is a legend complete in itself, intended, apparently, to teach definite doctrines—the twofold principle of the universe; the origin of the gods, by evolution, from that chaotic twofold principle; its defeat, in the person of Tiawath, Kingu, and their followers, by Merodach, their descendant; the ordering of the world and the creation of mankind to be the “redeemers,” so to say, of the rebellious gods; and the reign of Merodach evermore as king of the gods and divine head of the Babylonian people—even as Yahwah was the heavenly king of Israel. Whether the monotheistic idea is intended in the seventh tablet, or not, is uncertain, but it may be noted that the giving of their names, by the gods, to Merodach, identified them with him, and it is in this way that they became his manifestations, as indicated by the tablet published by me in the *Journal of this Institute*, in 1895.

Another story of the Creation, unfortunately incomplete, is a comparatively short one; but that, too, has for its theme the glorification of Merodach. This is the now well-known bilingual version, prefixed to an incantation for the purification and hallowing of the great temple of Nebo at Borsippa—Ê-zida, “the everlasting house.” This does not describe the creation of the heavens and the earth, and has no mention of Tiawath and Apsû as personages, but simply states that (in the beginning) nothing existed—neither the glorious house of the gods (the heavens), nor a plant, nor a tree, nor a brick, nor a beam, nor a house, nor a city, nor a community. Niffer and its temple, Erech and its temple, the Abyss and the sacred city Êridu, had not been constructed, but

The whole of the lands were sea.

When, however, movement came into that sea, Êridu and

Ê-sagila, "the house of head-raising" within the Abyss, and Babylon with the Ê-sagila there, were built and completed, and the gods and the Anunnaki, or spirits of the great waters, were created. Merodach then dammed back the waters and made a foundation—the tract wherein Babylonia lay, that the gods might dwell in a pleasant place—the land of their temples and their worship.

Then, as the most important thing, he made mankind, and the goddess Aruru—the "mother-goddess," whom we shall meet with farther on under various names—made the seed of mankind with him. He made likewise the beasts of the field and the living creatures of the desert, and he set the Tigris and the Euphrates in their place—"Well proclaimed he their name." After this he produced the plants, the verdure of the plain; lands, marsh, thicket, cattle, plantations and forests; and wild animals, typified by the wild goats. Lastly he made everything which had not yet been brought into being—the plant and the tree; the brick and the beam; the house, the city, and the community; Niffer, Erech, and their temples.

Here the text breaks off, which is exceedingly unfortunate, as we should all like to know how this story of the Creation formed the introduction to the incantation of which the end is given on the reverse. Were it complete, there is every probability that we should see the plan upon which it was written, and the principle underlying it. Naturally it is less important than the longer Semitic story of the Creation, the more especially so in that its great value lay, seemingly, in the magic power attached to the story, to its words, and its phraseology. But perhaps many would regard it as more important on this account.

Coming to the best-known Flood-story—that first translated by the late George Smith, we find here something so wonderfully like that given in the sixth and two following chapters of Genesis, that we recognize at once the identity of the two accounts, notwithstanding their many variations. Let us go over the main features of this narrative.

The hero Gilgameš, king of Erech, had lost Enki-du, his dear friend and companion, and desired to bring him back from the abode of the dead. To all appearance, moreover, Gilgameš was suffering from some dire malady, for which he wished to find a cure. In his wanderings, he reaches the place where dwelt Ut-napišti^m, otherwise Athra-basis, the Babylonian Noah, who had attained to immortality, like the Biblical Enoch, without passing the gates of death. Gilgameš asks Ut-napišti^m how he

had attained life in the assembly of the gods. In reply, Ut-napišti^m relates to him the story of the Flood.

It was in the city of Šurippak, an old foundation, that the gods decided to bring about this catastrophe. The gods in question were Anu, Ellila, Ninip, and En-nu-gi. Nin-igi-azaga, "the bright-eyed lord," came to know of it, and communicated the gods' decision to the earth and to the Babylonian Noah himself. The "lord of the bright Eye," who is none other than the god Ea, tells him to build a ship, and convey therein all the seed of life. In answer to enquiries, he was to say that he quitted the country because the god Ellila hated him, and he could not dwell in that land—he was going down to the Abyss to take up his abode with Êa or Aa, his lord.

The ship having been built and provisioned, Ut-napišti^m took into it all he possessed, with the seed of life, his family, and his relations. To these were added the beasts of the field, and apparently the artificers who had helped him to build the ship. After the sun-god had fixed the time, the navigation of the ship was given into the hands of Buzur-Amurri, the pilot.

Then came the storm, with thunder and lightning, and great darkness, so that people could not see each other. Hadad's destruction, which reached to heaven, terrified even the gods. The goddesses, however, were filled, seemingly, with pity, for Ištār spake "like a mother," or, as the variant says, "with loud voice"; and the "lady of the gods," the mother-goddess Maḥ, called out, making her voice resound, probably in lamentation. When she consented to the destruction of her people—such, apparently, is what is meant by the goddess having "spoken evil" in the Assembly of the gods—she spoke of their destruction in battle, not in the raging waters, which destroyed all alike, and where, comparable with fishes, they filled the sea. For six days the storm raged, and on the seventh it ceased: the raging flood quieted down, and the sea shrank back. Opening his window, the light fell upon Ut-napišti^m's face, and he sank back dazzled, as it were, and sitting down, he wept, apparently at the destruction which had been wrought. The ship had been stopped by the mountain of Nišir, and there it remained for seven days. On that day he sent forth a dove, which, finding no resting-place, returned. A swallow was next sent out, with the same result. The third and last attempt to find out the state of the earth was made by sending forth a raven, and this bird, seeing the rushing of the waters, which left the land dry, ate, wading, and croaking joyfully at the contemplation of such a feast and the many others which

promised to follow it. Ut-napištim then sent forth to the four winds, and pouring out a libation, made an offering on the mountain-peak; and the gods, gathering like flies over the sacrificer, found gratification that divine service was held in their honour again. Then the mother-goddess Maḥ came, and raising the "great signets"* which Anu had made for her, swore by the lapis-stone of her neck that she would not forget these days. All the gods were to come to the sacrifice except Ellila, who had made a flood, and consigned her people to destruction. Ellila, however, when he came, was angry that mankind had escaped total destruction, but Ēa argues with him, reproaching him with having sent the flood without due consideration. If it were needful to punish mankind, let it be by wild animals (the lion and the hyæna), by famine, or by the god Ura (pestilence). As for himself, he had not revealed to Atraḥasis the decision of the great gods—he had caused him to see a dream, and the princely patriarch had thus gained knowledge of their decision. Then Ēa went up into the ship, and led the patriarch up with his wife, and having touched them, he blessed them, saying: "Formerly Ut-napištim was a man—now let him and his wife be like unto us gods, and dwell afar at the mouths of the rivers." So Ut-napištim was taken and placed afar at the mouths of the rivers.

The patriarch, having completed his narrative, gives instructions for the restoration of Gilgamesh's health, and how he might see the life—eternal life, it may be supposed, like that of Ut-napištim himself—which he sought.

Such is an outline of this interesting legend, the likeness of whose details with the account in Genesis has been recognized from the first. With regard to the variant versions of the story, there is no need for me to touch upon them here. As far as we know them, they are much too fragmentary to make analysis profitable. That of which a very small piece was discovered by George Smith at Kouyunjik, details the command to build and enter the ship, and Atraḥasis' reply. This narrative is told, not in the first, but in the third person. A fragment of an archaic tablet with another version (apparently) was discovered and translated by Father V. Scheil some years ago, and now forms part of the Pierpont Morgan Collection; and a fragment of a fourth tablet, also archaic, was discovered by Professor Hilprecht, and described by me in the *Journal* of this Institute for 1911. This also gives the god's instructions for the

* Or perhaps, "rings," meaning the rainbow.

building of the ship, and is in the Semitic language of Babylonia. It is regarded as being, in the fragments of lines preserved, more like the Biblical version than any of the others.

THE NON-SEMITIC ACCOUNT OF THE CREATION AND THE FLOOD FROM NIFFER (identified with the Calneh of Genesis x, 9).

In April last year, I had the pleasure of giving an account of the new story of the Creation and the Flood, as outlined by Dr. Arno Poebel in the *Pennsylvania Museum Journal* for June, 1913 (see the *Journal* of this Institute for 1914, lecture read on April 14th). As the same scholar has now given, in the official publication of the Pennsylvania University Museum, the text of this document, with a full translation and very complete commentary, I am able to treat of the inscription much more satisfactorily.

The tablet is described as being 5½ inches (14·3 centimetres) wide by 7 inches (17·8 centimetres) high. About a third of the original text has been preserved to us. Each side has three columns, and as the existing portion is the lower part of the obverse and the upper part of the reverse, both the beginning and the end are wanting, as well as two-thirds of the matter between columns one and two, two and three, four and five, and five and six. It is thought that further fragments belonging to the text may ultimately be found, either at Philadelphia or at Constantinople, where other tablets of the same collection lie. Besides the wanting portions, there are several places where the text is defaced, but, as was to be expected in the case of such an important religious inscription, it has seemingly been very carefully written.

In the first column a goddess, either Nin-tu, the "lady of reproduction," or Nin-ḫursaga, "the lady of the mountain," speaks of the destruction of mankind, which she apparently wishes to discuss, as well as the question of her creation in general. The people, however, were seemingly to return to their settlements (*ki-ura-bi-ta*), and were to rebuild the cities (*uru-ki-me-a-bi ḫimīndu*), and unite under their (the gods') protection. They were to lay the brickwork of (the gods') houses in a pure locality, and in such a place were the gods' vessels to be fashioned (?). The foundation-stones or bricks were to be "set aright" by fire, and the divine law was to be perfected therein. At this point comes the doubtful phrase *kia immabgu diga muningar*, and then we have the statement that Ana-Enlila, Enki, and the goddess Nin-ḫursaga had created the black-headed ones (mankind, especially the people

of Babylonia), had planted in the ground the root of the ground (a phrase not altogether certain in the original), and then the gods had called into existence suitably the four-limbed beasts of the field.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have here several doubtful phrases—and such are always to be expected in the present state of our knowledge—it must be admitted that, as far as it goes, this portion reads exceedingly well.

After this is a considerable gap, caused by the loss of the upper part of the second column (about two-thirds of its contents), and where it resumes the lines are unfortunately very defective.

Apparently some divine personage is still speaking, and there is a reference to looking upon someone—probably the creator of all things. This personage had created the insignia (apparently) of royalty, and also perfected the divine law; and it was seemingly he who proclaimed by their names five cities, allotting them to certain commanders (*kab-duga*). First on the list is the central city (so called, apparently, because regarded as the mid-point of the earth), Uru-duga or Éridu, which was given to the chieftain Nudimmud (the god Éa). The second was the *tunugira*, apparently the Dûr-Kis or “fortification of Kis,” which he gave. The third was Larak (Larancha), given to the god Papil-hursag. The fourth city was Zimbir (Sippar), given to Utu, the sun-god, patron of that divine site. Fifth and last comes Šuruppak, given to the god of that name, who seems also to have been called Sukurru. “These cities he proclaimed by their names, and appointed to a commander.” The next line, of which Poebel only translates the pronouns, seems to state that he (the deity) dug the watercourses, made plentiful the rains, and set (by this means) water therein. The last line of the column then states that he made the small rivers or canals, and their branches (?) by which they increased in volume.

This agrees with the bilingual account of the Creation in making the artificial constructions of Babylonia, such as cities and irrigation-channels (as distinct from the rivers), the creation of the gods.

The third column is, unfortunately, just as mutilated where it opens as the second, and about two-thirds of the text it contained are wanting. Poebel sees in the much-defaced opening lines references to “the people” and “a rainstorm,” suggesting the destruction of mankind by a flood. “At that time Nintu screamed like a woman in travail,” translates and completes the Editor—a completion evidently inspired by the corresponding passage in the story of the Flood first translated by George

Smith (see p. 305, above). . Some such rendering as this is suggested by the more complete line which follows: "the holy Istar wailed on account of her people"—who were to be consigned to destruction. Enki, the god of the sea, now took counsel with himself, and they all—Anu, Enlil, Enki, and Nin-hursaga, the gods of heaven and earth, invoked the name of Ana-Enlila—apparently the compound deity so much in favour in Babylonia after the land had lost its independence.

At this point we have the first mention of Zi-û-suddu, the Babylonian Noah, and prototype, apparently, of the Ut-napišti^m of the Flood-story already outlined. As read by Poebel, this royal patriarch was an anointing-priest of the class or order called by the Akkadians (Semitic Babylonians) *pašišu*, and he is said to have made some object expressed by the characters *an-sag gur-gur* (or *nigin-nigin*, or *nigin* simply), and if this be the case, the words would probably indicate a great net, with which Zi-û-suddu hoped to save the drowning people. Then, in humility prostrating himself, daily and perseveringly standing (in reverence), by hitherto unexisting dreams, apparently, he forecasted the fate (of mankind), invoking the name of heaven and earth—for what reason does not appear, but his object may have been to stir the creators of the universe to action, so as to preserve the living creatures which they had produced.

Here the third column, which is that on the extreme right of the obverse, ends, and the fourth column (reverse) follows on immediately, without any other gap than a lost word or two at the end of its last line. The fourth column, however, is itself exceedingly defective and mutilated, and less than a third part remains, especially when we remember that the end of every line is wanting.

The following is an outline of the contents of this mutilated section:—

- "At the enclosure of the gods is a wall (?)
- Zi-û-suddu, standing at its side, heard
- "At the support on my left hand stand
- "At the support I will speak a word to thee
- "My hallowed one, thine ear (to me incline).
- "At our hands (?) a water-flood upon the mighty (?)
will be (sent),
- "To destroy the seed of mankind
- "The decision is the pronouncement of the assembly
[of the gods].
- The command of Ana-Elilla
- His kingdom, his rule
- To him

Perhaps the translation in this column is in certain respects less doubtful than in the three preceding columns—in any case, the revelation of the coming of the Flood would seem to have been direct, and not made by a dream, as in the case of the version published by George Smith. The defective state of the record deprives us of the name of the person who revealed the coming catastrophe to Zi-û-suddu, but there is every probability that this was the god Éa or Enki, the lord of the ocean and of deep wisdom. As in the record already known, the gods in general consent to the destruction of mankind, but the actual command came from the combined deity, Ana-Enlilla, who is designated Enlilla simply in G. Smith's version.

We now come to the central column of the reverse—col. 5—rather less than one-third of the whole. It describes the breaking of the storm, and is not without poetical merit :

“ All the powerful wind-storms as one rushed forth
 A water-flood over the [hostile] raged.
 After for 7 days and 7 nights
 The water-flood had raged over the land—
 After the mighty boat had been carried away by the wind-storms
 upon the swollen waters,
 Utu (the sun-god) came forth again, on heaven and earth making
[day.
 Zi-û-suddu opened a window of the mighty boat—
 The hero Utu makes his light to enter within the mighty boat.
 Zi-û-suddu, being king,
 In the presence of Utu prostrated himself.
 The king sacrifices an ox, slaughters a sheep
 Whilst (?) . . . the great horn . . .
 he . . . s for him.
 filled it
 doubled (?)

Here we have again the incidents of the Flood-story translated by Smith—the rain-storm lasting seven days and seven nights, the sun shining after that length of time again into the ark, and Zi-û-suddu's sacrifice to the deity, though here it would seem to have taken place whilst still in the vessel, and not after he had come forth—unless two acts of sacrifice were recorded.

The sixth and last column occupies the left-hand portion of the reverse, and contains about fourteen lines—or twelve, if we take them in their poetical divisions. Where the text opens, to all appearance some divine person is speaking:—

“By the soul of heaven, by the soul of earth, ye shall conjure
that he may be well-disposed with you.” [him
Ana-Enlilla conjured they by the soul of heaven and the soul of
and he was well-disposed with them. [earth
The root (?) growing from the earth they took up (?).
Zi-û-suddu being king,
Before Ana-Enlilla prostrated himself.
Life like a god he gives him—
Eternal life like a god he confers upon him.
Zi-û-suddu being king.
The name of the root (?) “seed of mankind” he called—
In another land, the land of Tilmun they made it
After they had made it live [live.

(On the left-hand edge is a somewhat defaced line in which the editor reads again the name of Zi-û-suddu, and from its position and the line which precedes it, it seems as though it ought to be inserted between lines 7 and 8, in which case its presence here would be due to an omission on the part of the scribe.)

This final fragment of the legend is of considerable interest on account of the light it throws on Babylonian beliefs. Here two beings are invoked—“the spirit (or soul) of heaven and of earth,” and the context shows that the invocation was effective. The appropriateness of this will be recognized when we remember that Ana was the god of heaven and Enlila the god of the earth. The prime mover in bringing the Flood was, as we have seen, this combined deity, and the invocation of the appropriate spirits evidently brought about the desired effect. Moreover, the disposition of Ana-Enlila was so influenced that when Zi-û-suddu prostrated himself before him, that patriarch received eternal life like that of a god—in other words, he was deified. From the final imperfect lines we see that the “seed of mankind” was made to live again in the land of Tilmun—the southern portion of Babylonia, and the district regarded by them as being in a special way that of the Babylonian Paradise. We shall learn more about this sacred land of Tilmun in the second inscription from Nippur.

Judging from the style of the writing, the tablet probably belongs to the beginning of the second millennium B.C., but the date of the legend's composition was probably much earlier than this. The deities mentioned are Nin-tu or Nin-hursaga, the great mother-goddess; Ištar, the goddess of love, probably another form of the mother-goddess; Ana, the god of the heavens; Enlila, the god of the earth; and Enki, or Éa, the god of the sea. We may therefore conclude that the inscription belongs to the

period before the influence of the "merciful Merodach" attained its full force—in other words, before Babylon, Merodach's city, acquired its position as capital of the Babylonian confederated states. The reference to Dûr Kis and Zimbar (Sippar), however, shows that the northern states had already acquired prominence, though Babylon had seemingly not attained the renown of the other cities mentioned.

THE PHILADELPHIA TABLET REFERRED TO BY PROFESSOR LANGDON.

The very important Sumerian inscription whose nature was discovered by Professor Langdon, of Oxford, is a record of considerable length. When first described by the learned Assyriologist, only the lower part of the obverse and upper part of the reverse was known to him. After he left Philadelphia, however, the authorities at the University discovered and joined to the portion in question almost the whole of the remainder of the document, which, though much mutilated, adds considerably to its completeness. It will, therefore, be easily understood that Professor Langdon had to modify somewhat his first impressions of the legend which he had published.

The tablet, which is made of clay, seems to be about $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide by $6\frac{1}{2}$ high, and is inscribed on each side with three columns of somewhat archaic writing—six columns in all. When complete, the record probably bore a total of about 240 lines, so that it is a composition of considerable length. In his preliminary account of it, Professor Langdon describes it as a hymn to the goddess Nin-hursag, "the lady of the mountain"—probably some sacred spot in the Babylonian district or province of Tilmun. As the "mother-goddess," Nin-hursag was much venerated by the Babylonians and Assyrians, and the remnants of the first two columns apparently sing of her heroic deeds, "and the events which took place in her city Opis." The text chiefly treats, however, of the above-named holy place called Tilmun, on the Persian Gulf—which, it is to be noted, then extended much farther inland than now. The composition is in poetical form, and there is a great deal of repetition, but as the style is remarkably good, where we can make a satisfactory rendering, the text reads well.

[The land of Tilmun] is [glorious], where ye are—

[The land of Til]mun is glorious.

[The land of Tilmun is glorious], where ye are—

[The land of Ti]lmun is glorious.

Tilmun is glorious, Tilmun is pure—

Tilmun is bright, Tilmun shines exceedingly.
 Alone in Tilmun he took rest—
 Where Enki with his spouse took rest,
 That place is pure, that place shines exceedingly.
 Alone (in Tilmun he took rest—)
 Where Enki with Nin-ella (took rest),
 That place is pure, (that place shines exceedingly).
 In Tilmun the raven croaked not.
 The *turri*-bird the voice of the *turri*-bird uttered not.
 The lion slew not.
 The wolf plundered not the lambs.
 The dogs approached not the kids in repose.
 The boar devouring the grain did not
 He did not
 The bird of heaven his young forsook (?) not.
 The dove did not take to flight (?).
 As for the sore eye : " I am sore-eyed," one said not.
 As for the head-sick : " I am sick-headed " (mad ?), one said not.
 As for the old woman : " I am an old woman," one said not.
 As for the old man : " I am an old man," one said not.
 As for the maiden, one did not put her to shame in the city.
 " A man has changed a waterway," one said not.
 The prince withheld not his wisdom (?) (so Langdon).
 " A deceiver deceives," one said not (so Langdon).
 " The city-chief is a despot (?)," one said not.
 Nin-ella to her father Enki
 spake :
 " My city thou hast founded, my city thou hast founded, my
 fate thou hast set.
 " Tilmun, my city, thou hast founded, my city thou hast
 founded, my fate thou hast set."

This is practically the last complete line of the first column, which originally had eight or ten more, some of them at least of the same nature.

How much of allegory there may be in the substance of this first column is uncertain, but the purity, the glory, and the exceeding brightness attributed to the land of Tilmun is probably due to the fierce, dazzling sunshine of the summer months, during which, like Enki and his spouse, the great desire of the inhabitant of that holy place was to lie down and take rest. Here, again, we have Enki, "the lord of the land," who is generally identified with Ea, the god of the waters and the streams of Babylonia. In this double character—i.e., as god of the land and of water too—he became one of the great creators of the living things in the world. As, in the 31st line

Nin-ella is said to speak to "her father Enki" (*aa-ni^a.Enki*), there would seem to be no doubt as to their relationship in Babylonian mythology.

Noteworthy is the fact that everything was regarded as perfect in that glorious land. There were no unclean and slaughtering birds; and lions, wolves (or hyænas) and dogs kept themselves from ravaging and terrifying. There was no old age, and bodily defects were apparently wanting—for although the bodily ills specified are few, it is evident that a part only is put for the whole—there was no need to extend the list, as the listener would understand what was referred to. The epoch referred to was evidently a period in the history of Babylonia—or at least of the state of Tilmun—corresponding with the golden age of the ancient classics, and the parallel is rendered still stronger by the fact that Enki or Éa seems to be the Cronos of the Greeks, the Saturn of the Romans, in whose time the golden age existed.

Notwithstanding the perfection with regard to mankind and the animals, there were seemingly certain natural defects to be overcome, and these the goddess, apparently, proceeds to refer to in what seems to be the continuation of her speech, though it is more probably the answer of Euki assenting to the requests which Nin-ella had made:

“ May thy city constantly drink abundant water—
 May Tilmun constantly drink abundant water.
 May thy well of bitter water like a well of sweet water flow.
 May thy city be the land's assembly-house—
 May Tilmun be the land's assembly-house.
 For the making of heat, Utu (the sungod) kindles (his) light—
 Utu and Anna (the heavens) together.”

The next few lines are difficult and I do not venture to translate them from the half-tone reproduction which is alone available to me at present. Farther on the lines record the accomplishment of the deities' wishes at Tilmun—Tilmun constantly drank abundant water, the well of bitter water became sweet, the field produced grain, the city became the land's assembly-house, and Utu kindles his light to make heat.

After this there are several rather complete lines, practically translatable, but they do not make very good sense, so I omit them. Then comes a reference to the invoking of the spirit of heaven, followed by an announcement concerning the destruction of a field and the sending of an inundation. The following

is a rendering of these lines, which are among the most important in the text:—

Enki the (water-god) in the house of Damgal-nunna uttered the word.

“Of Nin-hursagga one has destroyed the field—
To the field I will give life,” Enki declared.

Or, perhaps better :

Enki in the house of Damgal-nunna announced :

“I have destroyed the field of Nin-hursagga.
To the field she will give life,” Enki declared.

The day was 1, its month 1 :

The day was 2, its month 2 :

The day was 3, its month 3 :

The day was 4, its month 4 :

The day was 5, its month 5 :

The day was 6, its month 6 :

The day was 7, its month 7 :

The day was 8, its month 8 :

The day was 9, its month 9—the month of the periodical offering.

Here come three lines of which the beginnings are wanting, and the renderings of these are therefore somewhat uncertain. Professor Langdon translates them as follows:—

Like fat, like fat, like tallow,
Nin-tud, the mother of the land,
Had created them.

Bizarre as the rendering seems to be, there is no doubt that it is correct in the main, but I am inclined to think that there are three gaps—there are certainly two—and I would translate what remains somewhat as follows:—

Like fat, like fat, like the fat of cream (? butter),
 the mother of the land,

 produced.*

What this refers to is uncertain, but Langdon suggests that it is a simile comparing the dissolution of living things to melted

* [Zal-li-] dim zal-li-dim zal hi-nun-na-dim
 ama kalama — ka

 -in — tu — ud

fat. But anything which floats on the surface of the water, like grease, would suit the passage. If Langdon be right in restoring the name of the goddess Nin-tu(d), man would naturally be intended.

The next column is the third—the extreme right-hand column, which, when one has to work from a photograph, is always unsatisfactory, as the characters at the end, in the case of the longer lines, are almost certain to be written “round the corner,”—*i.e.*, on the right-hand edge. This portion seemingly refers to certain goddesses who, on being appealed to, said or represented themselves as not being wroth with the seed of the pious, or words to that effect. The first was Nin-šar, or Nin-mu (“the lady of growing things”), and the statement was made twice, apparently through her messenger. After this we have the words:

“ My king reverently approached (?),
His foot alone on the ship he set (?).”

Here come two lines which are too difficult to translate :

Enki had devastated the field—
“ to the field she will give life,” Enki announced.

The day was 1, its month 1 :
The day was 2, its month 2 :
The day was 9, its month 9.

And after this we have again the lines apparently comparing the floating corpses to fat or butter (?) on the water.

One or two uncertain lines follow, and then the same words come again, coupled with the name of the goddess Nin-kurra, “the lady of the mountain.” This, too, has the reference to days 1 to 9, with their corresponding months, followed by the comparison with fat. After this is a line with a reference to Nin-kurra, but in what connection does not appear. According to Langdon’s rendering of the line which follows, she reveals secrets “to the divine Tagtug.” In the next line, another goddess, Nin-turi, speaks to him somewhat as follows :

“ Verily, I will declare thy purity my purity . . .
I will tell thee, and my words . . .
O thou lone man, for me [he has reckoned these]—
Enki for me [has reckoned these, yea has reckoned these].”

Traces of one line follow this.

It is difficult to see how this legend can be a story of the

Flood like the account we find in Genesis and in the 11th tablet of the Gilgamesh-series. Judging from the recurrence of the period of nine months, represented, to all appearance, by nine days or periods, it would seem as though three Floods were referred to, though it must be admitted that one and the same catastrophe only may be intended. With regard to the "divine Tagtug,"* he would seem to correspond with the Biblical Noah, called Ut-napištim and Athra-hasis in the other Babylonian legends.

With this we reach the end of the obverse, which is followed by a damaged and illegible portion. Where the text is again readable, we have, as Professor Langdon describes it, a reference to Tagtug and his two pilots tending a garden. The watercourses therein—*e* and *pa = iku* and *palgu* (the latter the Hebrew *peleg* or "brook")—words commonly met with in Babylonian inscriptions referring to agriculture—meet us, and naturally stamp the narrative characteristically. They build a temple for Enki and irrigate the barren land. "The primæval paradise has been lost, the earth has become barren, and consequently man must toil." He notes that in the Biblical account of the Flood there is an exact parallel, for Noah, too, becomes a gardener, or, rather, an orchard-keeper. We gather this from the fact that Noah planted a vine. After this God communed with him, and gave him power over the living creatures of the earth similar to the authority conferred upon Adam. According to the learned discoverer of the text, "we have something parallel to this in our tablet, for now Enki summons Tagtug the gardener to the temple which he had built:—

Enki beheld him, a sceptre in his hand he grasped.

Enki for Tagtug waited.

At his temple he cried 'Open the door, open the door—

Who is it that thou art?'

'I am a gardener joyful

. †I will give unto thee.'

The divine Tagtug with glad heart opened the temple's door.

Enki unto the divine Tagtug revealed secrets.

His he gave unto him gladly. ‡

* Naturally, the question arises whether the name is rightly read. For *tag* we might substitute *šum*, and for *kug*, *ku* or *dur*. If he was "the institutor of sacrifice," his name should be *Šum-ku*, or, as the "intelligent sacrificer," we might transcribe *Šum-tug*. Other readings are also possible.

† -*mašku šu kurkurra*.

‡ Gladly his offering (?), unto him he presented.

In Ê-bara-gu-du-du he gave unto him :
 In Ê-[rab]-ga-ra-an he gave unto him.
 The divine Tagtug was entrusted. The left hand he raised :
 the *right* hand he folded (on his waist)."

It is unfortunate that Professor Langdon's proof went down with the *Lusitania*, as, through his kind offer, I might have been able to verify some of these lines. As it is, I can only suggest that the 9th line may refer rather to Tagtug than to the god Enki, and that the missing word is "offering," or something similar. He finds in them, however, a real parallel with the priestly narrative in Genesis.

The above lines form the end of the fourth column, the first of the reverse, and after that the text is defective, the number of lines wanting or exceedingly mutilated being about 16. At this point, however, "we come to the real fall of man according to the doctrines of Nippur." The tablet, Professor Langdon goes on to point out, gives a list of the plants which grew in the garden (their names, at least in part, were in the 16 lines which are lacking). The text here reads as follows, but it is right to state that my rendering differs somewhat from that of the learned professor:—

"Her herald, the divine Isimu, returned to her :
 As for the plants, their fate I have decided—
 Something it is—something it is."*
 Her herald Isimu returned to her :
 "My king concerning the woody-plants has commanded—
 He may cut them—he shall cut.
 My king concerning the . . . -plants has commanded :
 He may pluck them, he shall eat.
 My king concerning the *maš* . . . -*an* (?) has commanded :
 He may cut them, he shall eat.
 My king concerning the *u-a-pa-sar* commanded :
 He may pluck it, he shall eat.
 My king concerning the herb of the mountains commanded :
 He may pluck it, he shall eat."

Here the text again practically breaks off, but four lines of the same nature, and with the same repetition, must have followed. According to Professor Langdon, the instructions refer to seven classes of plants—the sacred number, which was so popular, and which exercised so much influence on the minds

* "It is such and such, such and such."

of the Babylonians, whether Sumerians or Akkadians, from exceedingly early times. In consequence of the change in the phraseology, Professor Langdon infers that man was forbidden to eat of the plant or plants which had not been included in these seven classes. As far as preserved, the lines following these do not seem to differ in sense—it is the same formula which they contain, practically—but the author of the paper which I quote, and who has seen the original text, translates as follows:—

“ [My king] the cassia plant approached,
 He plucked, he ate.
 the plant, its fate she had determined; therein she
 came upon it.
 Nin-hursag in the name of Enki uttered a curse.
 ‘The face of life until he dies shall he not see.’
 The Annunnaki in the dust sat down (to weep).—
 Angrily to Enlila she spoke:
 ‘I, Nin-hursag, begat thee children, and what is my reward?’
 Enlila the begetter angrily replied:
 ‘Thou, Nin-hursag, hast begotten children, and
 “In thy city two creatures I will make for thee,” shall thy name
 be called.’ ”

It is difficult to follow the sequence of these lines, which, although I have verified them as far as is possible upon a half-tone reproduction, apparently leave something to be desired. The following, however, is apparently the explanation in fewer words and in plainer English. For “my king” we may read Tag-tug, who, in the above rendering, approaches and eats the *amharu*-plant, identified by Professor Langdon with the cassia. Upon this plant, however, Nin-hursag (or the god Enki) had placed a certain fate, namely, that it was not to be touched by man and used as food. Nin-hursag, therefore, in the name of Enki, the god of the fertilizing waters, uttered a curse, and announced that he, Tagtug, or mankind in general, which he seems to have represented, should not see life—that is, real life—until after death. Why Nin-hursag vents her anger upon the god Enlil, “the older Bel,” is not clear, and one does not see any anger in his answer. I suspect a misreading somewhere, but perhaps Enlil was the instigator of the temptation.

Commenting upon this passage, Professor Langdon corrects his previous opinion. He points out that here there is no question of a tree of life or of knowledge. It is simply the cassia plant which is referred to and the prohibition to eat it

was simply to test Tagtug's obedience. The disaster resulting therefrom, in his opinion, was a later and popular development.

And this leads him to speak of the possible connection of this seeming temptation-legend with the third chapter of Genesis. I quote here his words:—

“This was the form which this doctrine took in the minds of the ancient Hebrew teachers who wrote Genesis iii. The mother goddess here becomes the wife of Adam, who tempts him to eat. Now, we know that in Sumerian religion this mother goddess, Nintud, like the major type of mother goddess Innini, was connected with serpent worship from most primitive times. In other words, the idea developed that a serpent deity had tempted man. Moreover, we long since knew that Eve, who created Cain with the aid of Jahweh, is really an old Canaanitish serpent deity. When the Hebrews made her into Adam's wife, the serpent tradition was naturally separated from her; under the influence of the Sumerian tradition that a serpent goddess had tempted man they fashioned the legend to read that a serpent tempted the wife, who in turn tempted man.”

I cannot say that I am in a position to follow the learned Oxford professor, and comment upon the above theory would carry me too far. That Eve, “the mother of all living,” may have a Sumerian name, *i.e.*, Ḥawwah, from (*H*)*awa*, “mother,” the Greek Eve (*Eῦαν*, accusative), is not by any means improbable, but the idea of a serpent-goddess might just as well have been developed from that of Eve and the serpent as the latter from the former.

The inscription completes the doctrine regarding the origin of man's present state, says Professor Langdon, by describing how Nin-ḥursag provided eight divine patrons of civilization to aid humanity in their hard lot. She had produced or created or brought forth for him Ab-u, the master over or protector of the pastures (herbs, etc.); Nin-tulla, patroness of farming; Nin-katutu, the lady directing birth; Nin-ka-si, also called Siris, apparently a goddess of herbs and the drinks made therefrom; Na-zi, of doubtful character, but perhaps “protector of life,” or the like; Da-zi-im-a or Da-zi-ni-a, also doubtful, but perhaps having to do with the sending of rain; Nin-ti, a goddess identified with Dam-kina, the spouse of Enki or Ea—Langdon calls her simply a patroness of women; and En-šag-me, apparently meaning “lord of what is good and wise.”

As a parallel to these, Professor Langdon quotes "the J. version of the Hebrew," which "describes how, after the expulsion from Eden there arose patrons of culture." These were Abel the shepherd, Cain the agriculturist, Enoch the founder of cities, Lamech, "whose name is identical with Lumbā,* the Sumerian title of Ea, as god of psalmody"; his three sons, Jabal, patron of Bedouin-life; Jubal, patron of music; and Tubal, patron of metal workers.

We must all admit the likeness there is here, but the differences are noteworthy. In Genesis, everything happens in a natural way—these pioneers of civilization—by the way, does Bedouin-life come under that heading?—being the descendants of Adam and Eve in the ordinary course of descent from their ancestors, whilst all the "patrons of civilization" in this new tablet are divine personages created or produced, apparently simultaneously, by the mother-goddess. It has long been my opinion that in any two accounts of the Creation—sensible accounts, worthy of being taken into consideration,—there are bound to be likenesses, even though composed quite independently, by people having no communication with each other. Every account of the Creation must speak of the formation of the heavens and the earth; the sun, the moon, and the stars; recognize the existence of land and water; treat of the creation of plants and trees; birds, beasts, and fishes; preceded or followed, as the case may be, by the formation of man—first in order if his importance be considered, last in order if the provision for his needs be the prominent thing in the composer's eyes. In like manner the arts and sciences must be referred to, and the chances are that polytheists will attribute their introduction in some way to their gods, as the Babylonians did, whilst monotheists will attribute them to famous and celebrated men, as in the case of the Hebrews.

In Professor Langdon's second paper, an account of the pre-Semitic version of the fall of man (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, November, 1914), he seems to regard the new tablet which he is publishing as a story of the Creation rather than of the Flood. It is true that a personage corresponding with Noah—the divinity whose name is read Tagtug—is referred to, and seems to go on board a ship or boat (*giš ma*), but it is doubtful whether this personage can be regarded as the same as the Ut-napišti^m or Athra-ḥasis of the Flood-story of the

* This is doubtful, the last radical being 𐤊, *k*, in Hebrew not 𐤍, *h*.

11th tablet of the Gilgamesh and other legends, or the Zi-û-suddu of the very interesting version published by Poebel. Whatever parallels with the Biblical account be found, we must, I think, regard Professor Langdon's version as a thing apart. Whether its completion—should that ever take place—will modify our views of it in this respect, is impossible to say. Though found at Nippur, it would seem to be the Creation-story of Tilmun, an old Babylonian state on the shores of the Persian Gulf, from whose waters, according to Berossus, the fish-gods of old came forth to teach the Babylonians the arts and crafts of their national life, of which they made such good use. Enki or Ea, who is mentioned so often in Professor Langdon's text, was the great Babylonian water-god—god of creation and most of those arts and crafts—does this new text refer in some way to one or more of the divine visits of which Berossus speaks?

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was sure that the Meeting would feel, with him, that they were deeply indebted to Dr. Pinches for his very interesting paper. The subject was one of the greatest importance, for the documents which Dr. Pinches had described in the latter portion of the paper were Sumerian, and came from the library of Nippur, which had been destroyed before the birth of Abraham. The documents, therefore, were themselves very old; they were not merely copies or reproductions of older records. They are written in a pre-Semitic language and so give us the myths and legends which lay behind the Semitic traditions. This enables us to understand how it is that some of the Semitic versions of a Babylonian legend differ considerably from others; some had been translated literally from the Sumerian; others had been paraphrased; and in some cases poems of considerable literary merit had been based upon such paraphrases. One such poem is the story of the Flood as given in the great Epic of Gilgamesh, which was written by Sin-liki-unnini, who lived in the Abrahamic age. Hence we find different versions of the stories of the Creation and the Flood. In this way the difference in the names assigned to the hero of the Flood-story can be explained; Berossus called him Xisuthros, which was equivalent to the Babylonian Hasis-Atra, or Atra-Hasis, which meant "the very wise," and it was an epithet applied to other antediluvian patriarchs besides the Babylonian Noah. The tablet discovered by Dr. Poebel,—who, it is stated,

has been killed in the war,—gives this name as Ziu-suddu. This corresponds with the Greek name assigned to the Flood hero by Lucian (in the “*De Dea Syria*”), and signifies “life of long days,” the Sumerian equivalent of the Semitic *Ut-napišti*^m. On the tablet deciphered by Dr. Langdon the name appears as Tag-tug, of which the Semitic equivalent is Nahum or Nuhum, that is Noah. As regards the translation of Dr. Langdon’s tablet, he felt that we ought to wait before concluding that we can have a final and complete translation of it. When we have to deal with mutilated Sumerian texts of which there is no Semitic translation, our renderings are necessarily open to some uncertainty.

On one point he could not agree with Dr. Langdon, namely, that the tablet which represented Tagtug as having eaten a plant which brought about a curse, was an account of the Fall, by which death entered the world. So far from Tagtug introducing death into the world, the hero of the Flood is described as himself becoming immortal.

The great interest of these Babylonian accounts of the Creation and the Flood lay in their relation to the corresponding accounts in the Book of Genesis. One main fact governed the Babylonian accounts of Creation: the world is described as having been developed out of the watery deep. And the reason for this was that the original Babylonia did thus rise out of the Persian Gulf. Eridu, which was now 100 miles inland, had originally been a port on the shore of the Persian Gulf, and the Babylonians had seen the land, as it were, growing up out of the sea; that is to say, the alluvial deposit from the Euphrates and Tigris stretched out further and further year by year into the Gulf, and broad fields were formed where previously the sea had rolled. This region, therefore, the Babylonians took to be the home of the Creator, and in all the Sumerian speculations as to the origin of things they assumed that the earth had emerged from the watery deep. If they turned to the opening verses of the first chapter of Genesis, they would find the same fundamental idea underlying them.

The fullest Babylonian account of the Flood forms the 11th book of the Epic of Gilgameš. It presents an extraordinary likeness to the account of the Flood which we possess in Genesis. And it is important to note that this likeness is not confined to the portion of the Genesis narrative which is ascribed to the Elohist on the one

hand, or to the Jahvist on the other, but extends to the whole narrative as we find it in the existing text of Genesis. The Babylonian Flood-story, therefore, which was written in the age of Abraham, already represented the same complete narrative as that which we now have in the book of Genesis. More important still, the narrative in Genesis bears evident traces of having passed from Babylon to Palestine. Thus the dove returned to the ark with a leaf plucked off in her bill, which is stated to have been an olive leaf; and while the olive is the typical tree of Palestine, there are no olive trees in Babylonia or Armenia. In the Babylonian account, again, the ark is a house-boat; the navigation of the Euphrates was carried on in such boats. But in Genesis, it is called a *tēbāh*, which is an Egyptian word and signified the ark or boat in which the Egyptians carried the images of their gods in procession.

It is clear that if the literary analysts of Genesis are right, only one of two alternatives is possible:—Either the complete account in Genesis as we now have it must have been written in Babylonia in the time of Abraham; or the Elohist and Jahvist must themselves have been Babylonian writers of a still earlier age. And the analysts themselves will be the last to accept either alternative.

At all events one thing is clear. The writer of Genesis has persistently and deliberately altered the Babylonian narrative in one particular. From beginning to end he has set himself to contradict and deny the polytheism of Babylon, and the superstitions connected with it. The Babylonian ascribed the Flood to one god, the intercession for mankind to another, the scheme for the saving of mankind to a third. There are no separate gods in Genesis. The God Who sends the Flood is the same as He Who saves the remnant. In the Babylonian narrative, the door of the ark is closed by the hero himself; in Genesis it is God Who shuts him in.

In one or two points the Babylonian narrative explains that which was difficult in the narrative in Genesis. Thus there was something which appeared to be wrong in the account of the sending out of the birds: the dove is said to have been sent twice; why should it have been sent first of all before the raven, and why should it have returned to the ark the first time that it was sent out? When we turn to the Babylonian account, the explanation is clear: three birds were sent, first a dove, secondly a swallow, thirdly a raven; but the swallow, which was “the bird of destiny,” and thus connected with

Babylonian superstition, has been omitted from the narrative of Genesis.

Mr. ROUSE: Both the Bilingual Account of Creation and the Sumerian Account, now before us, have the curious statement that men and domestic animals were all created before any plants were made for them to feed upon—a statement in striking contrast with Genesis i, which tells us that all plants were made on the third day and all land animals on the sixth.

The inferiority of the Semitic Babylonian story of the Flood to the Biblical narrative is seen not only in its polytheism (with the divergent views of Bel and the other gods, and the undignified flight of the gods to “cower down like dogs in the heaven of Anu”), but also in its polygamy; since the good man takes into his ark for himself, not one wife alone but a number of slave-wives also. The Sumerian story, however, that Doctor Pinches now gives us appears to be simpler in its theology, and so will probably be found to be purer in its morality, lying nearer, as it does, in date of composition to the fountain head. As regards the Second Tablet, of which Doctor Pinches has given us a verbal account outside his paper, and Professor Langdon has in hand for translation, I would here record my protest against the professor’s theory that the Genesis story of the Fall is derived from the fact that Ishtar, regarded by the Babylonians as the mother of mankind, was also a serpent goddess. That Ishtar, who wept over the destruction of men by the Deluge as that of her children, was Eve there is little doubt; since Isha was the first name given to his wife by Adam, while in the well-known Græco-Egyptian story, Isis appears as the first queen of the world. But how does the worship of the serpent appear in the Babylonians’ own picture of the Fall of Mankind engraved as an archaic seal? There, both a woman and a man are seen seated, as though of equal rank, and plucking fruit from a tree, while the serpent stands behind the woman’s back; there is not the least sign of any worship tendered to this creature.

The Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S.: I should like to express my very hearty thanks to Dr. Pinches for the paper he has given us this afternoon. We are much indebted to him for keeping us abreast with the discoveries which are being made from time to time.

We are all grateful also, I am sure, to Professor Sayce for his very

instructive address. He has shown us very clearly that the literary analysis, to which the story of the Flood in Genesis has been subjected, is untenable, and with that analysis a good many other things go as well. It is well for us to weigh the fact that the copy of the Tablet, discovered by George Smith, is dated in the 7th century B.C., *i.e.*, before one if not both of the sections "J." and "P." are supposed to have come into existence, although the substance of them appears in Genesis and in almost the same order of succession.

Mr. Langdon, of Oxford, is so obsessed by this fanciful analysis that he tries to correlate "P." with a Nippur version, and "J." with an Eridu version, but in the fragment of a fourth tablet mentioned in Dr. Pinches' paper, to which he called our attention in 1911, "the bird of the heavens," which is supposed to belong to "J.," appears among other elements supposed to belong to "P." It is impossible for the critics to square with their theories the innumerable facts which are against them. Indeed they do not try.

May I differ from Professor Sayce on one point? I do not think the Genesis account contains any local colouring. The olive is not peculiar to Palestine, and Mount Ararat, where the ark is said to have rested, is a long way from Palestine. With regard to the sending out of the dove, it is said that, before the invention of the mariner's compass, seamen were accustomed to take doves or pigeons with them, and when they did not know in which direction the land lay to let them fly, and mark the direction of their flight. If no land was near they would return to the ship.

Rev. J. J. B. COLES remarked: How superior in dignity and solemnity of language and in accuracy of statement are the Biblical accounts of the Creation and of the great catastrophe of the Flood—to all the records of the Chaldeans and the tablets of the Gilgameš-series! The inspired collator and writer of the early chapters of Genesis corrected and removed the accretions and mythical perversions of earlier records. George Stanley Faber, in his *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, shows that Paganism was derived from the history of the Flood, and that the myths and legends of antiquity were perversions and corruptions of patriarchal revelations.

Professor LANGHORNE ORCHARD expressed his agreement with Mr. Tuckwell's remark concerning the olive tree. They were all deeply indebted to Dr. Pinches and Professor Sayce for their addresses this afternoon. But there was one point on which he

ventured to differ from Professor Sayce :—Professor Sayce considered that the accounts of the Creation and Deluge in Genesis were derived from the Babylonian stories. Why should they be? Might it not have been the other way about? Could not God have given the account of Creation to Adam? could not Noah have written the account of the Flood? Genesis as a whole was no doubt written by Moses, but these two accounts may have existed in written form before him. In his view these portions of Genesis were earlier than the Babylonian accounts; it was undeniable that in simplicity and dignity of language, Genesis far excelled any Babylonian account. It is a common characteristic of tradition that it becomes encumbered, by lapse of time, with accretions and embellishments; the language becoming of that kind which we associate with myths. Evidently this has been the case with the Babylonian narratives. In these narratives the simple “ark” of the Genesis record appears as “the ship” and “the mighty boat”; and, to bring an interesting story more fully up to date, the “ship” is supplied with a “pilot” (introduced to us by name), and the swallow—sacred bird of the Chaldeans—takes his place with the raven and the dove.

How did the idea originate that the Babylonian account was earlier than that of Genesis? Probably from a supposition that the Genesis account was not anterior to the time of *Moses*,—a supposition inconsistent with facts.

The command given to Moses to write “in the Book”* may be fairly taken as indicating that *before* that early time a Bible record was in existence.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Meeting to express their great indebtedness to Dr. Pinches for his important paper; and Professor E. HULL proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Professor Sayce for coming to take the Chair that afternoon. Both votes were carried by acclamation.

The Meeting adjourned at 6.25 p.m.

NOTE BY THE LECTURER.

Professor Stephen Langdon’s monograph not having appeared at the date of correcting the above paper, I find myself unable to

* See the Hebrew in Exodus xvii, 14.

revise further the description of the newest version of the Babylonian Creation-story, given on pp. 312 to 322. After the appearance of the book, however, I shall supplement, if need be, these pages, and correct any errors, at present unavoidable, that I may discover.

On p. 307, above, in the third line from below, the possible translation of the Sumerian phrase is: "When he spake, he made the decree."