

# CHAPTER V

## THE PATRIARCHS BEFORE THE FLOOD

BABYLONIAN LONG-LIVED KINGS. COMPARISON WITH GENESIS 5. COMPARISON WITH GENESIS 4.

**1. Babylonian Long-lived Kings.**---It has long been known from the writings of Berossus, a Babylonian priest who died about 260 B.C., that the Babylonians had a list of long lived kings who lived before the Flood. The cuneiform original of this list has not been recovered. The tablets which contain this list contain also the names of dynasties of kings who are said to have ruled after the Flood, some of whom it is said ruled some hundreds of years each. Efforts have been made to show that the names of the antediluvian patriarchs in Genesis are identical with those of Berossos' antediluvian kings. The recovery of the cuneiform originals puts the whole matter in a new light. The cuneiform texts read as follows:

### Column I

1. Sovereignty descended from heaven;
2. at Eridu was the sovereignty.
3. Alulim exercised
4. the sovereignty 28,800 years;
5. Alamar exercised it 36,000 years:
6. 2 kings
7. 64,800 years exercised it.
8. Eridu was overthrown;
9. the sovereignty to Badgugurru
10. went
11. At Badgurgurru
12. exercised (sovereignty) 43,200 years;
13. Enmengalanna
14. exercised it 28,800 years;
15. Dumuzi the shepherd exercised it 36,000 years:
16. 3 kings
17. their years were 108,000
18. Badgurgurra was overthrown
19. the sovereignty passed to Larak.
20. At Larak Sibzianna
21. exercised kingship 28,800 years.
22. 1 king
23. exercised it 28,800 years
24. Larak was overthrown;
25. the sovereignty to Sippar
26. passed.
27. At Sippar Enmenduranna
28. exercised kingship 21,000 years:
29. 1 king
30. exercised it 21,000 years:
31. Sippar was overthrown;

32. the sovereignty passed to Surrippak
33. At Surripak Uberratum
34. exercised sovereignty 18,600 years:
35. 1 king
36. exercised sovereignty passed to Surrippak.
37. 5 cities,
38. 8 kings
39. exercised it 241,200 years
40. The deluge overthrew the land.
41. After the deluge had overthrown
42. the sovereignty descended from heaven---
43. the sovereignty was at Kish.
44. at Kish Gaur
45. was king.
46. He exercised (sovereignty) 1200 years.
47. Khulla-Nidaba, the divine maiden,
48. exercised it 960 years.

Translated from S. Langdon's *Oxford Edition of Cuneiform Texts*, Vol II, Oxford, 1923  
 Langdon transliterates the name Ensibzianna, but in his publication of the cuneiform text the En is omitted.

**Column II**

- 1 .....buum
2. exercised (sovereignty) 900 (?) years
- 3 .....
- 4.....
5. were companions
6. they completed (?)
7. Galumum
8. ruled 900 (?) years;
9. Zugabib
10. ruled 840 (?) years;
11. A-ri-pi, son of Mashgag,
12. ruled 720 years;
13. Etanan, the shepherd,
14. who ascended to heaven,
15. who subdued all lands,
16. ruled 635 years;
17. Pilikam,
18. son of Etana.
19. ruled 350 years,
20. Enmenunna
21. reigned 611 years ;
22. Melam-Kish,
23. son of Enmenunna,
24. ruled 900 years;
25. Barsalnunna,

**Column III**

- .....
1. from Kish
2. the kingdom
3. passed from Eanna
4. in Eanna
5. Meskingashir,
6. son of Shamash
7. as lord,
8. as king,
9. ruled 325 years.
10. Meskingashir
11. entered into
12. and went out from.....
13. Enmeirgan.
14. 15. son of Meskingashir,
16. king of Erech
17. the people of Erech
18. strengthened
19. as king
20. as king
21. Lugalbanda, the shepherd,
22. ruled 1200 years
23. Dumuzi, the hunter
24. Whose city is among fishes,
25. Ruled 420 years
26. Gilgamesh
27. Whose father
28. was lord of Kullab,
29. ruled 126 years.

26. son of Enmenunna,
27. ruled 1200 years;
28. Mes (?) zamu, son of Barsalnunna,
29. ruled.....years;
30. ....son of Barsalnunna,

From tablets written during the dynasty of Isin between 2300-2100 B.C. , one tablet from Nippur published by Poebel and the other from an Oxford collection. Both were translated in George A. Barton, *Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, New Haven 1929.

### 318

#### Column IV

(The kingdom

1. of Erech
2. passed to Ur.
3. In Ur
4. Mesannipada
5. was king;
6. he ruled 80 years.
7. Meskiagnunna,
8. son of Mesannipada
9. ruled 30 years.
10. Elu.....
11. ruled 25 years.
12. Balu.....
13. 36 years.
14. 4 kings
15. ruled 171 years
16. As to Ur
17. the kingdom
18. passed to Awan

5. in Kish
6. total 22 kings
7. their years were 2610
8. 6 months, 15 days.
9. Five times
10. in Erech
11. total 13 kings---
12. their years were 396---
13. ruled
14. Three times
15. in Ur
16. total 3 kings—
17. their years were 356—
18. ruled
19. Once
20. in Awan:
21. total 1 king---
22. his rule was 7 years.
23. Once
24. in.....

#### Column V

1. ruled 21 years.
2. Ishme-Dagan
3. son of Idin-Dagan
4. ruled 21 years
5. Libit-Ishtar,
6. son of Idin-Dagan
7. ruled 11 years.
8. Ur-Ninib,
9. son of Im.....

#### Column VI

1. Total 51 kings
2. their years were 18000
3. 9 years...months
4. Four times

#### Column VII

1. (total.....) kings---
2. (their years) were 196---
3. ruled.
4. Twice in Agade:
5. total 21 kings
6. their years were 125 years
7. 40 days---ruled
8. Once
9. in the people
10. of Gutium
11. total 11 kings---
12. their years were 159 years---
13. ruled
14. in Isin (?).
15. Eleven
16. royal cities
17. Total 134 kings.
18. Grand total 28876+

A brief examination of this list of kings is sufficient to convince one that until we reach the first dynasty of Ur the material is mythical or a combination of myths and legends. Real men do not reign 900 years, nor even 140 years, much less 21,000 years--- not to mention larger numbers. When we find names of gods mixed in the list, that is additional proof that the material is not historical. It is, of course, possible that some of the names in these earlier dynasties may be those of real men, the length of whose lives has been greatly exaggerated by mixing them up with myths. With the first dynasty of Ur we come upon historical ground. An inscription of King Annipadda, son of Mesannipadda, has been found.

A comparison of Berossos' list of kings who reigned before the Deluge with those given in this text will convince any scholar that a list like this was the source of Berossos' information. When we make allowance for changes in pronunciation in Babylonian which would be sure to occur in the course of 2000 years, and for the corruptions which would naturally occur in passing from a Babylonian to a Greek spelling, the two lists are seen to be the same, though in the 2000 years that passed between the writing of our tablets and Berossos, the lengths of the reigns of these kings were greatly exaggerated. The following parallel column will make this clear:

Cuneiform List		List of Berossos	
Alulim,	28,800 years	Alorus,	36,000 years
Alalmar,	36,000 years	Alaparos,	10,800 years
Enmenluanna,	43,200 years	Amelon,	46,800 years
		Ammenon,	43,200 years
Enmengalanna,	28,800 years	Megalaros,	64,800 years
Dumuzi,	36,000 years	Daonos or Daos,	36,000 years
Sibzianna,	28,800 years	Euedorachos,	64,800 years
Enmenduranna,	21,000 years	Amempsinos,	36,000 years
Uburatum,	18,600 years	Otiartes,	28,800 years
		Xisouthros	64,800 years
Total,	<u>241,200 years</u>	Total	<u>432,000 years</u>

It will be noticed that Berossos added to the list Xisouthros, the hero of the Deluge, which the earlier list did not contain, and that his list contains two corruptions of the name Enmenluanna. Otherwise his list of names corresponds to the cuneiform except that he transposes Sibzianna (Amempsinos) and Enmduranna. With

one conflation, one transposition, and one addition, his list is identical with the ancient cuneiform, except that the numbers of regnal years have in most cases been exaggerated.

**2. Comparison with Genesis 5.**---The interest of all this for the Biblical student centers in the antediluvian Patriarchs. Many attempts have been made to show that the names of these Patriarchs was really identical with Berossos' list of names of antediluvian kings, and, the earlier editions of this book, the present writer thought that possible. The recovery of the cuneiform

names of those kings by the discovery and publication of the Oxford prism, translated at the beginning of this chapter, puts the whole problem in a new light.

It is true that some of the names of the antediluvian patriarchs of the Bible could be derived from those of this old Sumerian list of antediluvian kings. Amelon, into which Enmenluanna was corrupted, became in Akkadian, as the Semitic-Babylonian language was called, namely, which means “man.” This could in its turn be translated into Hebrew by two words, ‘*adham*, “man” or ‘*enosh*, “man”---words which, when taken as proper names, become, respectively, Adam and Enosh. Alaparos might conceivably be corrupted into Abel. Ammenon, another of the forms in to which Enmuenluanna was corrupted, is in Akkadian *ummanu*, “artificer,” “artisan,” which, when translated into Hebrew, become “Jared,” “descendeant.” Eudorachos might conceivably be shortened to Enoch. The Summerian, Enmenduranna, possibly translated into Akkadian as Mutu-sall-elu, might appear in Hebrew as Methuselah. We may, then, from these antediluvian Babylonian kings possibly obtain the following table of equivalents:

<i>Cuneiform Sumerian</i>	<i>Berossos</i>	<i>Hebrew</i>
Alulim	Alorus	Abel?
Alalmar	Alaparos	Adam and Enosh
Enmenluanna	Ammelon	Kenan and Cain
Enmenluanna	Ammenon	Mahalelel
Enmengalanna	Megalaros	Jared
Dumuzi	Daonos	Enoch
Enmenduranna	Euedorachos	Methuselah
Enmenduranna		

It should be noted also the name of the city Badgurgurru means “fortress of workers in bronze.” In Genesis 4:22, Tubalcain is said to have been a metal worker, and in 4:17 Cain is said to have built a city. It does seem improbably that we have here another form of the Biblical tradition.

By no ingenuity, so far as I can see, can the names of Seth and Lamech—two of the Biblical antediluvian Patriarchs, be derived from the names of the Sumerian antediluvian Patriarchs, be derived from the names of the Sumerian antediluvian kings. It is noteworthy too, that the ages assigned in Genesis 5 to the antediluvian Patriarchs correspond closely to those of the reigns of the Babylonian kings who are said to have reigned just after the Flood. It is, therefore, possible that the Hebrews, recognizing that it was ludicrous to suppose that men could reign as long as the Babylonian kings are said to have reigned, derived the names of the antediluvian Patriarchs from the names of kings who reigned after the Flood. Let us see how this hypothesis will work out: The name, Aripi, the fifth king after the Flood whose name is preserved, may also have been read Adime, and perhaps was so read by the Sumerians themselves. If it came to the Hebrews in this form they would naturally equate it with the Hebrews in this form they would naturally equate it with the Hebrew Adam, which means “man.”

Etana, the shepherd, is said in this list to have gone to heaven. This at once suggests the fate of Enoch, who “was not; for God took him” (Gen. 5:24). In the Sumerian the words “to heaven” are AN-SU, which may also read AN-KU. If these words were not fully understood by the Hebrews, to whom Sumerian was not only a foreign language but a dead language, they might easily be mistaken for a proper name, and would in Hebrew give us Enoch. Another suggestion as to the method of borrowing is also possible. Later traditions cherished the name of a king, Enmeduranki, whom they called a king of Sippar or Agade. Enmeduranki means “the hero who

binds together heaven and earth.” Etana is in our list of kings called a king of Kish, but in later times kings of Kish were also called kings of Agade. It is altogether probable, therefore, that the “hero who binds together heaven and earth” is simply another

### 322

designation of Etana who went to heaven. The last two syllables of Enmeduranki, i.e., AN-KI, “heaven and earth,” would, if taken over into Hebrew, also give Enoch. If we assume that Etana and Enoch are the same, we may at a later point be able to determine by which of these processes the name is most likely to have come into Hebrew. In an old poem, fragments of which have been found on some broken tablets from Nineveh, the fortunes of Etana were given in detail. He is said to have been carried to heaven on the back of an eagle. If he be really the prototype of Enoch, this lends a touch of realism to the narrative.

The Sumerian name Enmenunna means “exalted hero” or “exalted man.” A natural translation of this into Semitic Babylonian about 2000 B.C. would be Mutu-elu, or, in one word, *amelu*, and an equally natural translation of this into Hebrew would give us Enosh.

Pilikam, the next name, means in Sumerian “with intelligence to build.” In Babylonian Semitic it would literally *Ina-uznieresu*, or, rendered in one word, *ummanu*, “artificer.” The Hebrew translation of this is Kenan, which means artificer.” Melamkish gives us the Hebrew Lamech by the simple elision of the first and last consonants. All people are lazy and words sometimes wear away both at the beginning and at the end.

Barsolnunna, translated into Semitic Babylonian, becomes Shitu-elu. Seth may well be a transfer of a part of this name to Hebrew. The final radical of the first part of the name may have worn away or have been accidentally omitted.

Meskingashir is resolvable into four elements, MES-KI\_INGA –SHIR, “the hero” or “man who is great” or “exalted.”

### 323

Translate this into Semitic Babylonian and it becomes Mutu-salaleqla, and Mahalalel is a much closer transfer of the first two elements of this to Hebrew than are Sennacherib, Esar-haddon, Merodach-baladan, and Evil-merodach of the names Sin-akhi-irba, Ashur-akhi-iddina, Marduk-apal-iddin, and Amel-Marduk. Finally Dumuzi means “son of life,” or “living son,” and Jared means “descendant.”

The equivalent of Noah does not appear in this list, but there is no doubt that he was Ziugiddu, otherwise called Ut-napishtim, of the Babylonian accounts of the flood.

We have then the following equivalents, four of which are Hebrew translations of Sumerian names; three, transfers into Hebrew of the whole or of parts of Semitic Babylonian equivalents of these Sumerian names, two of which are transfers to Hebrew of portions of a Sumerian original, and one of which, Noah, is still unexplained.

<i>Sumerian</i>	<i>Semitic Babylonian</i>	<i>Hebrew</i>
Adime		Adam
Barsalunna	Shithu-ellu	Seth
Enmenunna	Mutu-elu (or amelu)	Enosh
Pelikam	Ina-uzni-ereshu (or ummanu)	Kenan
Enmeirgan	Mutu-salal-gan	Mahalalel

Dumuzi	Apal-natpisti	Jared
Etana		Enoch
Meskingashir	Mutu-sa-elu	Methuselah
Melamkish		Lamech
Ziugiddu		Noah

Of course, it may be objected that our list of kings did not furnish the originals of these patriarchs, since there are more kings than patriarchs, even though some of the names of kings have been lost by the breaking of the tablet. In this connection, whoever one should remember that in 1 Chronicles 1-9, many names which appear in the earlier books of the Bible are omitted, and that in Matthew 1:8, three kings—Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah---are omitted from the genealogy of Christ. (Compare 2 Kings 11-15.) It appears, then, that Biblical writers did not always copy a full list.

It thus seems that the tablet translated above may be related to the text of Genesis 5 in the names of the patriarchs through one or

the other of its lists, as well as in the matter of their ages. When we recall that the tablet was apparently written in the year 2170 B.C. it seems possible that it may be a source from which the Biblical names came.

**3. Comparison with Genesis 4.**---But our examination of the matter cannot stop here. In Genesis 4:16-23 there is a list of the descendants of Cain strikingly similar to the list of the descendants of Cain strikingly similar to the list of the descendants of Seth in Genesis 5. If the names of Adam and Abel be supplied from Genesis 4:1, 2, the two lists appear as follows:

<b>Genesis 4</b>			<b>Genesis 5</b>
Adam			
	Abel	Seth	Seth
		Enosh	Enosh
Cain			Kenan
Enoch			Mahalalel
Irada			Jared
Mehujael			Enoch
Methushael			Methuselah
Lamech			Lamech
			Noah

The close parallelism of these two lists of names is really greater than it appears to the English reader to be. Cain, which means “artificer,” is in Hebrew the same word as Kenan, lacking only one formative letter at the end. Irada and Jared differ in Hebrew only by wearing away of one consonant. Mehujael is as much like Mahalalel, and Methushael as the Assyrian name of Tiglath-pileser, Tukultu-apal-esharra, is like Tiglath-pileser, while Enoch and Lamech are the same.

The importance of this likeness arises from the fact that the so-called critical scholars claim that these two lists of names are in reality the same original lists as it come through two lines of tradition and was worked up differently by two writers. This view has been vigorously opposed by some conservative scholars, notably by the late Professor Green of Princeton.

Between rival critical hypothesis it is not the function of archaeology to decide. It must be admitted, however, that the names of the descendants of Genesis 4 can be equated with those of our Babylonian kings, as well as those of Genesis 5. Adam, Seth, Enosh,

Professor Green of Princeton, *Unity of the Book of Genesis*, New York, 1895, Chapter II.

---

325

Cain, Enoch, Mehujael, and Methushael would be derived exactly as it has been explained that the corresponding names of Genesis 5 could be derived. It only remains to explain the names of Abel and Irad. It will be noticed that Abel occupies in the list a position next to Adam and Cain; Abel is also said to have been a shepherd. In the list of Babylonian kings Eatana the shepherd comes in between Adime (Aripi) and Pilikam, the equivalent of Cain. It is probable, therefore, that Etana is the king that corresponds to Abel. Etana is described in the Sumerian as "the shepherd who went to heaven," SIBA LU AN-SU NI-IB-E-DA. If the two words SIBA LU became detached and misunderstood as a proper name, the s at the beginning, according to a well known phonetic law, could become h and give us the Hebrew Abel. Irad may also be ir-tu, a corruption of ZI-IR-TU, a name of the mother of Dumuzi, who may at times have been referred to as the son of ZI-IR-TU. These possibilities are not proof that the names arose as suggested, but are not without weight.

If Abel arose from the traditions of Etana and Enoch did also, and if the names of Genesis 4 are derived from the list of Babylonian kings, then Etana figures twice in the fourth chapter of Genesis. If Enoch is a fragment of the name Enmeduranki, a possibility already recognized, it is not difficult to understand how Etana came into the tradition twice.

The possible connection of Abel with the Alaparos of Berossos, pointed out above, p. 321, should also be borne in mind.

---

327