

## **Nimrod - The Rebellious Panther**

By Noel Smith

Copyright @ 1951, 1952, 1954

BAPTIST BIBLE TRIBUNE     Springfield, Missouri

### **CHAPTER NINE -**

#### **A VIOLENT DEATH**

All along I have tried to give everybody credit; and especially have I tried to give due credit to Alexander Hislop ("*The Two Babylons*"). Of course, I haven't leaned on him altogether; but he has served as a faithful guide. But I have to leave him at Saint Peter's; I do not believe that the Vatican answers to the demand of the universality of the seventeenth chapter of Revelation. I shall give my reasons in one of the two or three concluding articles of the series.

In this article today I am especially indebted to Hislop's early pages for the basic ideas expressed here.

Nimrod was the founder and guiding genius of the Babylonian-Assyrian world. He led the first organized rebellion against GOD. And Nimrod - died.

How did Nimrod die? If the question can be answered, how do we arrive at the answer?

I have stated that in Babylon, Assyria, Phoenicia and Palestine, Nimrod was worshipped as Tammuz, and that in Egypt he was worshipped as Osiris.

Now here is the question you are naturally asking: Just how is Nimrod identified with the Egyptian god Osiris?

Nimrod was a Hamite - the grandson of Ham, the son of Cush. Nimrod was a Negro. Hislop cites Plutarch for authority that in Egypt there was a tradition that Osiris was black. And he goes on to say that in Egypt where the general complexion was dusky, it must have implied something more than ordinary darkness when Osiris was considered as the 'black' god.

There is additional evidence that Osiris was a Negro. Hislop reproduces from Wilkinson a figure of Osiris. The features of this figure, as those who have seen it know, are those of a Negro. The head and mouth are those of a Negro, and plainly so.

And this Negro is clothed in leopard skin. "Nimr-rod: from Nimir, a leopard, and rada or rad, to subdue." Nimrod means "the subduer of the Leopard." Some will remember that in the first article I cited authority for the title of these articles: *Nimrod - The Rebellious Panther* (leopard).

This is by no means all the authoritative evidence which links Osiris and Nimrod; I cite it as an illustration of how we arrive at the answer to the question.

In Egypt Nimrod is Osiris. In Babylon, Assyria, Phoenicia and Palestine, Nimrod is Tammuz. Nimrod was also worshipped as Bacchus. Nimrod was worshipped as Adonis.

And now, what fundamental thing do Osiris, Tammuz, Bacchus and Adonis have in common? (To mention but four)

First, they all died a violent death. Osiris' body was cut to pieces and its parts scattered throughout the country. In the last article I quoted a part of Ishtar's lamentation for Tammuz: "Thou wast cruelly (violently) taken away."

The symbol of Bacchus was the "spotted fawn." The devotees of Bacchus tore an image of a spotted fawn to pieces as a symbol of how Bacchus died.

Adonis was the famous Huntsman, for whose death Venus made bitter lamentations.

The violent death of a person of vast power and influence! Followed - in Babylon, in Assyria in Phoenicia, in Palestine - by bitter weeping and lamentations!

You can't take all that for granted. Behind all of that there is a fact of vast consequences. Nimrod died a violent death. Nimrod came to an untimely death.

What was responsible for the violent, untimely death of this mighty wicked man? What were the immediate results? To take the first step toward the answer, let us turn to SHEM.

In that ancient world the name of Shem, the first son of Noah, was as mighty on the good side as Nimrod's was on the wicked side. Shem lived 502 years after the flood (Genesis 11:10 ff). Shem saw the flood, came through the flood, stepped from the ark into a de-populated world, saw the rise and career of Nimrod, saw the death of Nimrod: what a book Shem could write! What a relief it must have been to his lonely soul when he finally reached the shore where the hailstones and fireshowers never beat! Before the flood, through the flood, and 502 years beyond it!

The name of Shem was a mighty name. I have only to remind you that Shem is Sem, from whom descended the Semites. The black-haired, long-bearded Semites soon predominated over the Sumerians, the earliest of the Babylonian peoples. The Semites are found on the northern Babylonian scene as early as 3800 B.C., and it is known that they were the predominant people as early as 2500 B.C., and perhaps earlier.

Who were the two great peoples? The Hamites and the Semites. Who was head of the Hamites? Nimrod. Who was head of the Semites? Shem.

Sem (I shall thus refer to him to the end) received a distinct blessing from Noah, who spoke as a prophet. "**Blessed be the Lord God of Shem . . .**" Sem means 'name'. Sem was a mark of greatness. This, Nimrod and his crowd knew at Babel " . . . **let us make US a name**" (a Sem). What is the name of the most fabulous woman of that world? It is Semiramis, of whom Nimrod's wife was the grand original. Indeed, Semiramis is said to have been the name of Nimrod's wife.

"Let us make us a Sem." *Semiramis*

They all knew and understood that Sem was a great and lofty name. They all understood that Sem was a name associated with the true worship of the one and only GOD. When they took that name to themselves and perverted it, they knew what they were doing. - just as the atheistic, cold-blooded Communists know what they are doing in this country when they take to themselves the name of Abraham Lincoln. It's an old game.

Sem knew all about the promise given to Adam and Eve, the promise of the Deliverer. "**And I will put enmity between thee and the woman; and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel**" (Genesis 3:15). Sem understood this promise. Nimrod knew all about this promise, and he understood its implications. There is an abundance of evidence that the whole ancient world understood it. Which is nothing to be wondered at, if Adam and Eve understood it; and if it was handed down from father to son, as it certainly was.

Nimrod knew Sem. Sem knew Nimrod. Nimrod knew what he (Nimrod) was doing, and Sem knew what Nimrod was doing.

What was Sem doing all the time that Nimrod was conquering the earth and leading its inhabitants to rebel against GOD?

You don't think that a man with the name, power and influence of Sem was doing nothing, do you? GOD has never left Himself without a great and powerful witness. We know how actively Noah, Abraham and Job witnessed to GOD in that ancient time. Should we conclude that Sem did less? Isn't the fact that the Semites soon became the predominating people of the Babylonian world, a testimony to the activity, power and influence of their head?

What is more logical and reasonable than to affirm that all through his mighty and wicked career, Nimrod had a great and resourceful opponent in Sem? Nimrod established a monarchy, organized empires, organized the people around him as the center. Are we to conclude that Sem had less sense, less energy and less courage than Nimrod had (although Sem's weapons were spiritual!) Has there ever been an age when GOD did not "**lift up a standard**" against the Devil? GOD is not less active than the Devil. Abel was not less active than Cain - to go back to the very beginning.

For the technical evidence that has been cited to the effect that Sem ultimately prevailed over Nimrod, and that Nimrod was judicially put to death, I return to Hislop.

We have seen that Osiris and Tammuz came to violent deaths. Concerning the death of Tammuz, Hislop quotes Maimonides:

"When the false prophet (note "false prophet") named Thammuz preached to a certain king that he should worship the seven stars and the twelve signs of the Zodiac, that king ordered him to be put to a terrible death. On the night of his death all the images assembled from the ends of the earth into the temple of Babylon, to the great golden image of the Sun, which was suspended between Heaven and earth. That image prostrated itself in the midst of the temple, and so did all the images around it, while it related to them all that had happened to Thammuz. The images

wept and lamented all the night long, and then in the morning they flew away, each to his own temple again, to the ends of the earth. And hence arose the custom every year, on the first day of the month Thammuz, to mourn and weep for Thammuz."

In that legend three significant facts stand out: Tammuz (of course also Thammuz) was (1) a "false prophet," and (2) he was put to a terrible death by (3) "a certain king." Which means that a ringleader of apostasy was judicially put to death.

Hislop cites a second piece of evidence. There was Hercules.

The most primitive Hercules was known in Egypt as having, "by the power of the gods" fought against and overcome "the Giants."

Who are "the Giants"? In the fifth article of this series, I quoted no less an authority than Professor Thayler Lewis as saying that it was probable that what took place at the Tower of Babel was the foundation of the famous myths of the war of the Titans and the war of the Giants, and that they were one and the same. Here is what Professor Thayler, who was known as one of the ablest and most learned classical scholars of America, said:

"The more carefully the peculiar language of this Babel history is considered, and especially its Heaven-defying look, the more probable will appear the view, supported by Bryant, which regards it as the origin of the heathen fable of the war of the giants against the gods. The war of the Titans was probably the same, though it appeared as a duplicate of the event in Greek mythology."

That is pretty good evidence as to the origin of the Giants and the Titans.

If "the Giants" and "the Titans" were Nimrod and his followers, who was most likely the Hercules who "by the power of the gods" fought against and overcame "the Giants"?

In view of what has already been cited as to the name, the influence and power of Sem, who but he?

And here I want to quote a passage from Hislop:

"If 'Sem' then, was the primitive Hercules, who overcame the Giants, and that not by mere physical force, but by 'the power of God,' or the influence of the HOLY SPIRIT, that entirely agrees with his character; and more than that, it remarkably agrees with the Egyptian account of the death of Osiris. The Egyptians say, that the grand enemy of their god overcame him, not by open violence, but that, having entered into a 'conspiracy' with seventy-two of the leading men of Egypt, he got him into his power, put him to death, and then cut his dead body into pieces, and sent the different parts to so many different cities throughout the country.

The real meaning of this statement will appear, if we glance at the judicial institutions of Egypt. Seventy-two was just the number of judges, both civil and sacred, who, according to Egyptian law, was required to determine what was to be the punishment of one guilty of so high an offense as that of Osiris, supposing this to have become a matter of judicial inquiry.

In determining such a case, there were necessarily two tribunals concerned. First, there were the ordinary judges, who had the power of life and death, and who amounted to thirty; then there was, over and above, a tribunal consisting of forty-two judges, who, if Osiris was condemned to die, had to determine whether his body should be buried or no, for, before burial, every one after death had to pass the ordeal of this tribunal. As burial was refused him, both tribunals would necessarily be concerned; and thus there would be exactly seventy-two persons under Typho the president, to condemn Osiris to die and to be cut in pieces.

What, then, does the statement amount to, in regard to the conspiracy, but just to this, that the great opponent of the idolatrous system which Osiris introduced, had so convinced these judges of the enormity of the offense which he had committed, that they gave up the offender to an awful death, and to ignominy after it, as a terror to any who might afterwards tread in his steps. The cutting of the dead body in pieces, and sending the dismembered parts among the different cities, is paralleled, and its object explained, by what we read in the Bible of the cutting of the dead body of the Levite's concubine in pieces (Judges 19:29), and sending one of the parts to each of the twelve tribes of Israel; and the similar step taken by Saul, when he hewed the two yoke of oxen asunder, and sent them throughout all the coasts of his kingdom (I Samuel 11:7).

It is admitted by commentators that both the Levite and Saul acted on a patriarchal custom, according to which summary vengeance would be dealt to those who failed to come to the gathering that in this solemn way was summoned. This was declared in so many words by Saul, when the parts of the slaughtered oxen were sent among the tribes:, **'Whosoever cometh not forth after Saul and after Samuel, so shall it be done unto his oxen.'**

In like manner, when the dismembered parts of Osiris were sent among the cities by the seventy-two 'conspirators' - in other words, by the supreme judges of Egypt, it was equivalent to a solemn declaration in their name that 'whosoever should do as Osiris had done, so should it be done to him; so should he also be cut to pieces.'"

After I had finished copying the above passage, it occurred to me for the first time that there might be some connection between the manner of Nimrod's death and that of the death of the prophets of Baal. The grand original of Baal was Nimrod.

**"And Elijah said unto them, Take the prophets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them: and Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon, and slew them there"** (1 Kings 18:40).

Certainly Elijah had learned somewhere that death by the sword was the penalty to be visited upon the apostates who were turning the people from GOD to the Devil.

Nimrod died - but his influence did not die. It is more powerful in the world today than it ever has been, and it is heading for a great climax.

~ end of chapter 9 ~

\*\*\*