



The Biblical Nimrod and the Kingdom of Eanna

Author(s): Joseph Poplich

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1929, Vol. 49 (1929), pp. 303-317

Published by: American Oriental Society

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/593008>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JSTOR

THE BIBLICAL NIMROD AND THE KINGDOM OF EANNA

JOSEPH POPLICHA

ST. CASIMIR'S RECTORY, MAHANOX CITY, PA.

IN THIS ARTICLE I am going to advance a hypothesis concerning the Biblical Nimrod, a man of Cushitic origin who became a Babylonian ruler. It has been suggested that Nimrod is identical with one of the kings of the first dynasty of Uruk, Gilgamesh (commonly) or Lugalbanda (Deimel). We have at present no certain historical reports of that old epoch. We know only the views of the Babylonian historians who left us the lists of Babylonian kings of the oldest times. The lists we have were written about 2000 B. C. Their truthfulness for later periods is generally proved by historic inscriptions from the time of Lugalzaggisi, king of Uruk. As for the older epoch the value of these lists is not yet certain. Besides, there are in the Babylonian literature some historical legends concerning the oldest kings of Uruk, but we have no means of learning their historical values. These conditions cannot encourage anyone to make an inquiry concerning the Biblical Nimrod. My reason for trying it lies in the curious notice that Nimrod was of Cushitic origin. In the Babylonian tradition we find Meskingasher, the founder of the first dynasty of Uruk, bearing some Hamitic (Egyptian) features. Perhaps there is some connection between the Hamite of Uruk and the Cushite Nimrod. It is worth while to compare the Biblical notice of Nimrod with the views of the Babylonian historians concerning the first dynasty of Uruk. The results cannot be quite certain, but they can give some useful hints concerning the Old Babylonian history.

The first book of the Bible says in the tenth chapter, vv. 8-12, as follows:

Cush had begotten Nimrod. He was the first mighty man on earth. He was a mighty hunter before Jahweh; so it is said "as Nimrod, a mighty hunter before Jahweh". His first kingdom was Babel and Erekh and Akkad and Kalneh in the land Shin'ar. From this land he went out to Ashur and built Niniveh and Rehoboth 'ir and Kalaḥ and Resen between Niniveh and Kalaḥ—it is the great city.

There are two different parts in this notice, a proverb concerning Nimrod the great hunter and a series of statements concerning the empire of Nimrod. Chiefly on account of this proverb Nimrod was identified with Gilgamesh or Lugalbanda. The historical statements have not been exploited sufficiently, although they are more accurate and therefore more welcome than the proverb. They are very concise and do not concern Israel, therefore they seem to have been taken from some Babylonian source.

Concerning the Old Babylonian history they suggest:

That Nimrod was son of Cush;
 That he was the first mighty man on earth (or in the country);
 That in the beginning his empire comprised the cities, Babel,
 Erekh, Akkad, Kalneh in Shin'ar.

The Babylonian views concerning the first dynasty of Uruk are given in the texts CBS 13981 and W. B. 444,¹ which relate:

The kingdom of Kish passed to Eanna.
 In Eanna Meskingasher, son of the Sungod, as lord and king,
 reigned 325 years. Meskingasher went into the sea, went
 up on the mountain.
 Enmerkar, son of Meskingasher, king of Uruk, who built Uruk,
 reigned 420 years.
 God Lugalbanda, the shepherd, reigned 1200 years.
 God Dumuzi, the fisherman, whose city was HA-A^{ki} reigned
 100 years.
 God Gilgamesh, whose father was a fool, lord of Kulab, reigned
 126 years.
 Ur-^dNungal, son of Gilgamesh etc.

We have to find out what is the relation between the first five kings of Eanna and the Biblical Nimrod.

Nimrod son of Cush.

The name Cush is used in the Bible to indicate the people settled in Africa, south of Egypt. Closely connected with the African Cush are the people of South Arabia called in the Bible the Sons

¹ CBS 13981, published in A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 2; W. B. 444, published in Stephen Langdon, *Weld-Blundell Collection*, Vol. 2.

of Cush. It cannot be determined whether we are to consider Nimrod as belonging to Cush itself or to the Sons of Cush, but his home is certainly south of Egypt and Babylonia; he is a Hamite and a foreigner in Babylonia.

Babylonian literature gives us at present no information as to whether the first dynasty of Uruk is of Hamitic or other foreign origin; we find, however, in the tradition concerning Meskingasher, the first king of the dynasty, some Egyptian elements. He is said to have made a posthumous journey through water on a mountain, and his entering the water and emerging on the mountain are expressed in the words used to express the Sunset and the Sunrise. I have shown elsewhere² that he is probably identical with Utanapishtim the deluge-hero and the narrative of his posthumous journey was based on Egyptian ideas of the Sungod traveling in a boat through darkness and light. It resembled the posthumous journey of the dead man well known from the Egyptian religion. This resemblance, striking as it is, cannot yet be a proof of Egyptian influence on Babylonian literature, for it can be credited to some psychological factors which were common to Babylonians as well as to Egyptians. But Meskingasher has yet other Egyptian traits. He is called Son of the Sungod. This is a common title of Egyptian kings from the fifth dynasty; nevertheless in the Babylonian literature it was only given to Meskingasher and his son Enmerkar.³ Moreover, Meskingasher is the highest religious and political ruler (En Lugal) who resides in the temple Eanna. These features resemble the Egyptian idea of royal dignity and we do not find them in other Babylonian rulers.⁴ They are in no connection with the posthumous journey of Meskingasher and there is no trace of them in the story of Utanapishtim. We have then some religious and political ideas, independent of one another, connected with the person of Meskingasher, corresponding with Egyptian beliefs rather than with Babylonian ones. It is as unexpected

² *JAOS* 47, 298 ff.

³ W. B. 162. Stephen Langdon, *Weld-Blundell Collection*, Vol. I.

⁴ The Babylonian tradition about Meskingasher resembles what is written in the Papyrus Westcar about Userkaf, the first king of the fifth Egyptian dynasty, being a son of the Sungod, a king and highpriest of Annu. (Erman, *Maerchen des Papyrus Westcar*, I, 11, 19-20. in: *Mitteil. a. d. orient. Samml. d. k. Museen zu Berlin*, Heft V.). Meskingasher is a Son of the Sungod, a highpriest and king who resides in Eanna.

as the Biblical statement of Nimrod the Babylonian ruler being of Cushitic origin. The Cushites and Egyptians inhabited adjacent territories and belong to the Hamite group of nations. Perhaps we have to combine the Biblical statement about Nimrod with the Babylonian tradition of Meskingasher; it would be obvious then that the first dynasty of Uruk was founded by some Hamitic people imbued with elements of Egyptian civilisation. The possibility of such a conjecture will be discussed later.

Nimrod the first mighty man on earth.

The Biblical words, mighty man on earth, are not clear. They are the only title Nimrod is granted in the Bible as a ruler of some Babylonian cities; they must therefore be connected with his royal dignity, and we can seek their explanation in the oldest Babylonian titles of kings.

In the Babylonian lists of kings the first ruler of each dynasty is expressly called King while the other rulers have no title at all except in the case of the first dynasty of Uruk, for its first king, Meskingasher, bears the title Lord and King, while the second, Enmerkar, has the title of King of Uruk. Perhaps we can find some connection between Meskingasher's unusual title and Nimrod's designation as the first mighty man on earth.

We learn from the inscriptions of Old Babylonian kings that there were two different titles of kings in the oldest times of Sumero-Akkadian history, a simple title King and a compound title Lord and King. The compound title was used in South Babylonia in the cities of Uruk and Ur, the simple title was employed in North Babylonia where Kish was the main royal seat. Kish and Uruk were the most glorious royal cities at the time of Sargon of Akkad, as one of the inscriptions shows.⁵ The high dignity of Kish appears in the inscriptions of Eannatum king of Lagash,⁶ even of Ammiditana of the first Babylonian dynasty,⁷ while the inscriptions of Lugalzaggisi praise the high dignity of Uruk.⁸ The simple title, King, was used without change but for the name of the royal city which was adjoined differently in various dynasties. On the con-

⁵ L. Legrain, *Historical Fragments*, pl. V, 49 ff.

⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *Sumero-Akkadische Königsinschriften*, 24. f, 1; 22. 6, 4.

⁷ L. King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, III, 207, No. 100.

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 152 ff.

trary the compound title, Lord and King, underwent some changes. Various forms of this title are as follows: ⁹

En	kiengi	lugal	kalam	(king Enshakushanna)
En	ki Unug ^{ki}	lugal	ki Uri ^{ki}	(king Lugalzaggisi)
Lugal	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	kalam	(king Lugalzaggisi)
Lugal	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	Uri ^{ki}	(k. Lugalkigubnidudu, Lugalkisalsi)
En	Unug ^{ki}	lugal	Uri ^{ki}	(king Ur-Engur)
Lugal	kiengi	ki-uri	(kings of the third dynasty of Ur).

The last title is the final product of the evolution and it has been used without change by kings of Babylonia and Assyria. It is characterised by unity of dignity, for it contains only the title King, *Lugal*, and the duality of territory, *kiengi ki-uri* meaning Sumer and Akkad, the two different parts of Babylonia. In the older forms of the title there is duality of dignity marked in the names Lord and King, *En Lugal*, which denote the highest religious and political dignity, combined with the names of the South Babylonian cities Uruk and Ur (*Unug^{ki}-Uri^{ki}*), the peculiar title En being connected with the name of Uruk. The Babylonian tradition adorns Meskingasher, the founder of the kingdom of Uruk, with the title *En-Lugal* of Eanna, the temple of the city of Uruk founded subsequently, thus combining duality of dignity with unity of territory. The same tendency appears in the title *En kiengi lugal kalam*, for *kiengi* and *kalam* notably denote the same territory. This title would suit even Meskingasher and could be used before the city of Uruk was founded. It is known from the old inscription of Enshakushanna only and perhaps can be regarded as the oldest form of this kind of title.

The meaning of *En kiengi lugal kalam* is not known. The usual translation of these words, Lord of Sumer king of the land, is not clear. Poebel's explanation of this title, that it comprehends the highest dignity of Nippur and Uruk, is not satisfactory, for neither the title *En* nor "King" was used in connection with Nippur. We have to seek another explanation.

⁹ According to the texts collected in Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, and A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34, and the inscription of Enshakushanna.

The meaning of *En*, Lord or Highpriest, and of *Lugal*, King, is certain. Not so *kiengi* and *kalam*. *Kiengi* has the meanings: land, country (*matu*),¹⁰ city of Nippur,¹¹ land of Sumer,¹² place of offerings for the dead.¹³ In any case it means some territory. On the contrary *kalam* seems not to mean a territory but the people of some territory. This appears from the sign *kalam* which has some connection with *ukù*, and from some texts. A Semitic text of Gilgamesh-epic reads:

the kingdom of the people (*šarrutu ša niši*) destined for thee,
the god Enlil.¹⁴

A Sumerian text uses in a similar sentence the words *nam-lugal kalam* parallel to *šarrutu ša niši*.¹⁵ The same meaning of *kalam* appears in the title of Rimsin, the shepherd of all *kalam* of the territory of Nippur,¹⁶ and in some other texts.¹⁷ The most natural meaning of the title *En kiengi lugal kalam* would be Lord of *kiengi*-territory, king of its people.

The question is now what territory is *kiengi*. In the texts of Lugalzaggisi¹⁸ and Sharganisharri¹⁹ it is identical with Nippur. This is suggested also by the just-cited title of Rimsin. But this meaning of *kiengi* can be of later origin, for the texts from Fara, older than the epoch of Lugalzaggisi and Sharganisharri, relate that Uruk Adab Nippur Shurippak belong to *kiengi* (*En-gi-ki*).²⁰ Besides, the title *En* is never found in connection with Nippur. Since in the texts of Fara *kiengi* means a place of offerings for the dead, it is probable that its primitive meaning was a hallowed territory without regard to its situation or greatness.²¹ It could be used

¹⁰ Georg Reisner, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*, 130 (VATh 246), vv. 24-27.

¹¹ L. King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, Vol. I, 217; v. 5.

¹² The usual meaning.

¹³ Deimel in *Biblica*, 1921, 72.

¹⁴ St. Langdon, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Pl. 63 ff., Rev. col. III, vv. 32 f.

¹⁵ St. Langdon, *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*, No. 11, rev. 4.

¹⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 216a, 218c.

¹⁷ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*, 74; 9, 30: 214d.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 154.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 164d; 216a; 218c.

²⁰ Deimel in *Biblica*, 1921, 72.

²¹ We may venture the explanation of En-gi-ki as a place (KI) hallowed

to indicate any sacred city or country. In the title *En kiengi* it should mean the territory that was under the power of *En* or simply the country. The old title of the kings of South Babylonia would be then: Lord of the country, king of the people. This would be the developed form of the title Meskingasher is granted in the lists of kings.

Nimrod is called *gibbor ba'areš*, the (first) mighty man on earth (or, in the country). There is a slight resemblance between *gibbor ba'areš* and *en kiengi*, for *kiengi* and the Hebrew *'ereš* can have the same meaning, while *gibbor* seems to be quite different from the Sumerian *en* although there is some idea of power in *en*.²² However, some connection between *gibbor ba'areš* and *en kiengi* is possible. The Old Babylonian rulers used to appropriate the titles of former kings, translating them, if necessary, from the Sumerian to the Semitic language²³ or *vice versa*.²⁴ Lugalzaggisi, king of Uruk, was the last great king who used the title *En-Lugal* frequently. His conqueror Sargon, the founder of the dynasty of Akkad, used this title at least partially. In his Semitic inscriptions²⁵ after the titles King of Akkad, King of Kish, we find the title *Lugal kalam* sometimes preceded by the words Priest of Anu. His successors Rimush and Manishtusu do not call themselves either king of Akkad or *lugal kalam* but simply King of Kish. Naram-Sin introduces a new double-title, The mighty man, King of the four quarters of the world. Its origin is unknown, but since we have seen the founder of Akkad using the titles of North and South Babylonia we may suppose that his successors went the same way. Some of them used the Northern title King of Kish, Naram-Sin could make use of the Southern title *En, Lugal kalam*. This Sumerian title had to be rendered into Semitic, and so it could have been the prototype of The mighty man, King of the four quarters of the world (*Dannum šar kibratim arbaim*). The word *Dannum* (the mighty man) which always occupies the first place, should correspond with *En* and the subsequent *Sar kibratim arbaim*

by some influence (GI) of the lord (EN). It would mean then dominion or empire.

²² According to Dyneley Prince, *Sumerian Lexicon*.

²³ *lugal kiengi kiuri* = *šar šumerim u akkadim*.

²⁴ *šar ki-ib-ra-tim ar-ba-im* = *lugal an-ub-da tab-tab-ba*.

²⁵ A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34.

(the king of the four quarters of the world) with *Lugal kalam*. The Old Sumerian title disappears and even the South Babylonian kings of the third dynasty of Ur use the titles of Naram-Sin translated into Sumerian *nitah kal-ga lugal an-ub-da tab-tab-ba*, but this is no proof against the possible connection of this title with *En-Lugal*.

Since the Babylonian *dannum* is identical with the Hebrew *gibbor*, Nimrod's title *gibbor ba'ares* can correspond in this way with *En kiengi*: the statement of his being the first *En kiengi* would agree with the Babylonian tradition of Meskingasher being the first who bore this title. This conjecture cannot prove the connection of Nimrod with the first dynasty of Uruk, but may serve to enlighten it when proved by other data.

Nimrod's kingdom in Babylonia.

The four names, Babel, Erekh, Akkad, Kalneh, representing the four cities belonging to the primitive kingdom of Nimrod, have been identified with the Babylonian cities, Babili, Uruk, Akkad, Kullab.²⁶ Only two of them, viz., Uruk and Kullab, appear in the oldest period of Sumero-Akkadian history, Babili and Akkad not being mentioned until in the epoch of dynasty of Akkad. The name of Akkad, the city founded by Sargon, obliges us to put the Biblical Nimrod in a very late period of Sumero-Akkadian history, and as the Bible itself exposes Nimrod as a man of an ancient past, the names Babel and Akkad are incoherent with the Biblical view.

It is neither a geographical or a historical point of view nor a religious or political motive that placed the four Babylonian cities in this order, which cannot be explained by any inscription of the known later dynasties of Akkad, Ur, Isin. The inscriptions of the dynasty of Akkad mention the cities Akkad and Kish, those of the dynasty of Ur the city Ur, those of Isin the cities Nippur, Ur, Eridu, Uruk. The only text containing four names parallel to the four Biblical names of cities is the list of kings of the first-dynasty of Uruk. These names are:

²⁶ The identity of Kalneh with KUL-UNU^{ki} = Kullab, is suggested by Delitzsch and Jensen. It is more probable than the identification of Kalneh with Nippur promoted by Hilprecht and Hommel. The notice of Nimrod, if of any value, must have been taken from Babylonian sources, and in Babylonian inscriptions Nippur takes the first place, not the last one.

in the Babylonian text, Eanna, Uruk, HA-A^{ki}, Kullab;
in the Bible, Babel, Erekh, Akkad, Kalneh.

Both these series have the second and the fourth part identical. Moreover, the first Biblical name, Babel, can be related to Eanna because of similar meaning and writing. *Bab-ili* means Gate of God, *Eanna* means House of Heaven. Both meanings are used promiscuously in the Bible.²⁷ The name of the city Babel can be written *Shu-anna* even without the affirmative *ki*.²⁸ Its difference from *E-anna* is not remarkable. Besides, Eanna is not a name of a city and it was quite easy for a foreign author to confound it with the city of Babel.

The third pair of names, HA-A^{ki} and Akkad cannot yet be explained, because the city HA-A^{ki} is almost unknown. As the city of Akkad founded by Sargon seems to be incompatible with the Biblical view about Nimrod, there is a possibility of some relationship between these names.

We see then that the four names mentioned in the Bible as Nimrod's cities do not yet prove his connection with the first dynasty of Uruk, but the list of rulers of this dynasty is the only known text that can explain the Biblical statement about the cities of Nimrod.

The meaning of the Biblical notice of Nimrod.

We have seen that the three Biblical statements concerning Nimrod can be applied to what we know about the first dynasty of Uruk. Nimrod himself, according to the ingenious suggestion of P. Jensen, is identical with the great Babylonian and Assyrian god NIN-IB commonly read Nimurta.²⁹ This god is identical

²⁷ The house of god—the gate of the heaven, Gen. 28, 17-19.

²⁸ I R 49, col. 1-2.

²⁹ Nimrod is a great Assyrian god according to the Bible (Micah 5, 5). So is NIN-IB. The sign IB in this name was pronounced Urta (Ungnad, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1917, 1 ff.). The whole name was pronounced like Namirtu (Hans Ehelolf, *Ein Wortfolgeprinzip im Assyrisch-Babylonischen*, p. 33. Leipzig 1919). The reading god Nimurta is now generally accepted, therefore it will be used in this article. Professor Barton reads the name uNIN-IB = Nin-Urash, which may be quite correct, but this name is not used in this article lest there be confusion of the female deity NIN-IB of the family of Anu, whose name is doubtlessly Nin-Urash, with the male god NIN-IB of the family of Enlil.

with god Lugalbanda (or Lugalmarada), the third king of the first dynasty of Uruk;³⁰ it seems then quite possible that it is Lugalbanda whose deeds the Biblical writer relates when speaking of Nimrod. However, the author mentions the Assyrian city Kalhu as a city of Nimrod; since it was first founded in the second millennium B. C., we cannot connect it with the king Lugalbanda but with the god NIN-IB himself. Then the Biblical notice of Nimrod seems to indicate that the Assyro-Babylonian god Nimurta (NIN-IB) was of Cushitic origin and that he was closely connected with the kingdom of Uruk which was founded by Cushites. These statements sound improbable, but perhaps it is worth while to inquire if they can be true. We will try the Cushitic origin of the kingdom of Uruk first.

The Cushitic origin of the kingdom of Uruk.

We have found in the Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk some Egyptian elements not noted either in the antecedent or in subsequent dynasties. They are connected with Meskingasher, the founder of the dynasty.³¹

The civilizations of Egypt and Babylonia have some common features, but there is no evidence of their intimate relation in historic times. As for the prehistoric epoch, according to Flinders Petrie, predynastic Egypt was influenced at one time by the Elamites and by the Nubians. Both these groups influenced Egyptian civilization independently, or the Elamites may have entered the Nile Valley from the Red Sea up in Nubia and have brought down the Nubian type with them, but this, according to Flinders Petrie, is less likely.³²

On the other side H. Frankfort has proved that some people imbued with South Mesopotamian (Sumerian) culture arrived in Egypt and that the type of boat they used influenced Egyptian art as far back as the end of the predynastic period.³³

³⁰ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1921, 123 ff. Since in the same list appears the name Shulgi (Dungi) a king of the last dynasty of Ur, we have no reason to doubt that the god Lugalbanda is identical with the third king of the first dynasty of Uruk.

³¹ See above, p. 305.

³² W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Prehistoric Egypt*, London 1920, p. 49.

³³ H. Frankfort, *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*, I, p. 138-141 (London, 1924).

Since no intimate relation between Egypt and South Mesopotamia is probable we are obliged to conclude that some maritime folk traveling in peculiar boats arrived in Egypt as well as in South Mesopotamia and influenced them both.³⁴ We do not know any thing more about that people, but it would be no mistake to call them Cushites, for the lands of the Cushites (East Africa, South Arabia) were certainly under the influence of those seamen.

The influence of this people on South Mesopotamia can be traced most distinctly in the tradition of Uruk concerning the oldest rulers of this city; consequently the Biblical report of the Cushites having founded the kingdom of Uruk seems to have been taken from some truthful Babylonian historical tradition. This result will help us in considering the other, more hazardous, statement that the god Nimurta (NIN-IB) is of Cushitic origin.

Cushitic origin of the god Nimurta (NIN-IB).

The connecting link between the god Nimurta and the first dynasty of Uruk is Lugalbanda, the third king of the dynasty. He has no peculiar position in the lists of kings except his title of god and his long rule. His extraordinary dignity appears in the myth of god Zu and god Lugalbanda,³⁵ the contents of which are:

God Zu, the divine bird, has stolen the tablets of fates from Enlil the supreme god. God Lugalbanda restores them to Enlil and so merits the divine worship in Ekur, the temple of Enlil in Nippur.

This myth was proclaimed to be of the same character as the myths relating to a god who combats an enemy, conquers him, and so receives the highest honors. However, in this myth there is no warfare and Lugalbanda does not become the supreme god for restoring the tablets of fates to Enlil. We are rather compelled to suppose that it is a historical legend of Lugalbanda, and we can see here a report of some religious alteration in Babylonia. Possibly Enlil, the supreme god, has lost his power and Lugalbanda restored it to him, receiving as a reward the high dignity in the Pantheon of Nippur and the worship in Ekur. On this supposition is based

³⁴ The Egyptian idea of the Sungod traveling in a boat which we have found in the myth of Uruk would suit a maritime people.

³⁵ CT XV, 39 ff.

our inquiry concerning the Cushitic origin of the god Nimurta. We shall proceed the following way: we shall combine the Biblical notice of Nimrod with the Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk and construct a hypothesis concerning the name and person of god NIN-IB, then we shall inquire whether Babylonian texts favor this hypothesis or not. Our hypothesis is as follows:

Some foreign (Cushitic) tribe invaded South Babylonia, subdued it, and inaugurated a new dynasty, the first of Uruk (Eanna). The political change was followed by a religious one. The old god Enlil of Nippur lost his supreme position, Eanna being now the religious centre of the kingdom. These conditions were intolerable for the priests of Nippur, who regarded them as an injury to Enlil, their God. The new dynasty, that had caused this situation, was not esteemed in Nippur. In the time of Lugalbanda, the third king of the dynasty, the conditions were changed in favor of Enlil. The king performed a religious alteration that gave back the supreme power to Enlil of Nippur. It was made in a peaceful manner and brought to Lugalbanda the highest praises in Nippur where he was acknowledged a god. The myth of the god Zu stealing the tablets of fates had to eternalize these facts. God Zu is a representative of the foreign element, hostile to Enlil, that had invaded Babylonia.

This would explain the overwhelming importance of Lugalbanda in this period of Old Babylonian history, but it remains unexplained why he became a god in Nippur. The idea of a man who became a god does not agree with the usual Babylonian ideas, but it is quite agreeable to Egyptian ones. The Egyptian kings of early dynasties had the name and dignity of the god Horus, and the hawk of this god was the emblem of their royalty.³⁶ Since the invaders who founded the kingdom of Uruk bore some Egyptian features, we can also attribute to them this custom of the old Egyptian kings. We suppose then that the first rulers of Uruk bore the dignity and name of the god Horus and used the divine bird of this god as emblem of their royalty. The priests of Nippur did not acknowledge the divine dignity of the invaders, the enemies of Enlil. The

³⁶ J. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 40 f., 112.

divine bird, the emblem of their royalty, was regarded in Nippur as the symbol of evil, and might be a prototype of the evil god Zu stealing the tablets of fates. The reformation performed by Lugalbanda ended the humiliation of Enlil of Nippur and reconciled the priests of Nippur with the invaders. The divine dignity of the king was acknowledged, but it was certainly difficult to put a human person into the Pantheon of Nippur. Fortunately, Lugalbanda, like his ancestors, had the name and the character of Horus, a real god. This god was now accepted in Nippur and as a real god, although identical with the man Lugalbanda, and was granted a high position in the Pantheon. His name developed into NIN-IB or Nimurta.

We have now to compare this hypothesis with Babylonian texts. That the kings of Uruk bore the title of the god Horus is favored by the text *VATh*, 7025. This text concerns the deification of the king Lipit-Ishtar of the dynasty of Isin.³⁷ The chief actor in the deification of the king is the god Anu, who confers the divine dignity on the king, grants to him lordship and kingship (*nam-en nam-lugal*) and finally proclaims him distinctly the god Urash (IB). The god Enlil is active in another part of the text, he also bestows benefits on the king, who is named his son and finally appears to be god IB and god NIN-IB (Urash and Nimurta). The title *En-Lugal* is connected closely with Uruk, Anu is the god of Uruk, the god Urash (IB) belongs to the family of Anu; we have then to suppose that these ceremonial actions had their origin in Uruk and that the kings of this city were deified and called god Urash (IB). This name resembles *Hr*, the Egyptian name of Horus, but remotely. However, there is in the Babylonian Pantheon a god Uru. He is identical with the god Urash³⁸ and has a peculiar connection with the god Nimurta like the god Urash.³⁹

³⁷ Heinrich Zimmern, "Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbabylonischer Zeit", No. 199, in: *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil. hist. Kl., 1916, 68, Heft 5.

³⁸ 𒌦Uru = 𒀭NIN-IB 𒍪sa alli (*CT* 25, 11, 26).

𒌦Urash = 𒀭NIN-IB 𒍪sa alli (*CT* 24, 40, 661).

³⁹ 𒌦IB = 𒀭NIN-IB = god Nimurta (commonly).

𒌦Uru = 𒀭NIN-Uru = god Nimurta (*CT* 25, 12, 20; 25, 13, 30; 24, 7, 10 ff).

It is remarkable that 𒀭NIN-Uru is a name of Nimurta and of his goddess-consort (*CT* 25, 12, 20; 24, 7, 14).

Since the sign IB is read in a different way in the names of the gods IB and NIN-IB as Urash and Urta, we may suppose that the name of the god IB was pronounced in some different way and perhaps the name Uru can be related to Urash and Urta. This would bring the god IB more closely to the Egyptian *Hr'* or Horus. Finally, it may be noted that according to our hypothesis the kingdom of Uruk is of Cushitic origin and the elements it has in common with some Egyptian dynasties are properly Cushitic, consequently some difference between the Egyptian and the Babylonian name of some Cushitic deity is admissible.

That the kings Lugalbanda and Gilgamesh were friendly toward Nippur we learn from the myth of Zu and from the history of the Tum-mal of the goddess Ninlil.⁴⁰ That on the contrary Meskingasher was hostile toward Nippur seems to follow from his character as the religious ruler in Eanna, the temple of Uruk. Meskingasher and Enmerkar are distinguished by the title Sons of the Sungod⁴¹ which their successors do not use, being called gods instead. Some difference between Enmerkar and the subsequent kings is noted in the tale of Gilgamesh in Aeliani *De natura animalium* XII, 21, where that king is pictured as the grand-father and also as the enemy of Gilgamesh, whom he desires to kill. However, these hints cannot be regarded as great support for our hypothesis.

The connection of the god Nimurta with the god Horus depends on the relationship of the god Urash with Horus. The god Urash is identical with the god Nimurta. According to the lists of gods Urash (¹IB) belongs to the family of Anu⁴² and to the circle of Nimurta.⁴³ In either group he has a different goddess-consort; in the family of Anu her name is ¹NIN-IB, in the group of Nimurta her name is ¹NIN-Urû.

God Nimurta himself belongs to the family of Enlil, his name is written ¹NIN-IB, his goddess-consort is ¹NIN-Nippur (lady of Nippur). Then the name ¹NIN-IB appears in the lists of gods as a female name of goddess-consort of ¹IB and as the name of the

⁴⁰ A. Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 6.

⁴¹ See above, p. 305.

⁴² *CT* 24, Pl. I.

⁴³ Heinrich Zimmern, in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1911, 119.

male god Nimurta. The female name and character of the goddess NIN-IB, who belongs to the family of Anu, are clear; the male character of Nimurta in spite of his female name ¹¹NIN-IB belonging to the family of Enlil is not clear. This shows that the god Nimurta (NIN-IB) is a product of some changes performed on the name and character of the god Urash (IB). The name of his goddess-consort Lady of Nippur shows his connection with that city, and his connection with the god IB shows that his origin was in the city of Anu, Uruk.

That the hawk of Horus as emblem of the kingdom of Uruk could have been the prototype of Zu stealing the tablets of fates from Enlil seems to be favored by the texts of Lagash. God Zu (^dIm-gig^{hu}) is depicted there as a symbol of might and emblem of the city Lagash and god Ningirsu,⁴⁴ with whom he is closely connected. The god Ningirsu is identical with the god Nimurta; his connection then with the god Urash is quite possible; thus he becomes related to the god Horus and his divine bird to the hawk of Horus.

We may conclude that our hypothesis concerning the origin of the god Nimurta does not appear impossible when compared with Babylonian texts.

The result of our inquiry is that the Biblical narration of Nimrod is a valuable historical notice. It can be combined with Babylonian tradition concerning the first dynasty of Uruk and so contribute to our knowledge of this epoch of Babylonian history. It seems to be based on some truthful Babylonian tradition, but as the historical value of Babylonian texts concerning this epoch is not known, our hypothesis based on them remains doubtful.

⁴⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *SAK* 178i; 44e, 92 ff., 112 ff.