

# In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 1

**Dick Fischer**  
**P. O. Box 50111,**  
**Arlington, VA 22205**

From *PSCF* 45 (December 1993): 241.

*Human beings appear to be related by common ancestry that extends back in time 100,000 years or more. If Genesis has accurately presented the surrounding environment in the beginning chapters, and if weight is given to recent archaeological findings, Adam's niche in time and space is about 5000 to 4000 BC in Southern Mesopotamia, thus precluding his being the progenitor of the entire human race. The garden of Eden probably required irrigation via a canal network to sustain Adam and his immediate family. Although Adam may very well have been specially created by God, intermarriages between the covenant line of Adam and the indigenous populations assure even Adam's descendants a link to the distant past. All this can be deduced not only from archaeological finds and ancient cuneiform tablets, but from clues in the Scriptures as well.*

**F**or those who believe Genesis is historically accurate, Adam and Eve were *de facto* historical figures, not symbolic representations concocted by Moses or some other source. Indeed, the historicity of the covenant couple is implied in the New Testament as well. It is the purpose of this series of two articles to show that Adam appears to have actually been an historic personality who had a moment and a place in history. Furthermore, a specially created Adam dictated by the Scriptures is entirely compatible with this thesis.

Bible interpreters have had a propensity to conclude that the Genesis text confers upon Adam the distinction of being the biological head of the entire human race. The Bible does position Adam as the first "man" (I Cor. 15:45), but what definition is to be applied? Could Adam have been the first hominoid or hominid, an *Australopithecine* perhaps; or first of the genus *Homo*, such as *Homo habilis* or *Homo erectus*? Was Adam first of the archaic *Homo sapiens*, first of the modern *Homo sapiens*, the first Caucasian, or was he the first of a Near East people from which present-day Jews, Arabs, and some others have derived? Remember, Adam was a unique person who could have lived only once.

Small amounts of secular history were incorporated in Luke and Acts. As a result, readers many centuries removed have had minimal trouble determining when and where the events took place. In the beginning of Genesis also, sufficient peripheral information is recorded to give us a fairly accurate historical perspective. We are told just enough about the culture of Adam's day that we can get some idea as to his approximate time frame.

The genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 are especially helpful in pinpointing Adam, both in time and place. (The secular surroundings of Adam and his kin will be explored in the second article in this series of two, to be published in the March 1994 issue of *Perspectives*.)

## Mitochondrial Eve

The "Eve hypothesis" was developed from pioneering work in mitochondrial DNA published by Wilson and Sarich in 1987. According to them, and subsequent researchers, there is evidence that all human beings have descended from one common female genotype who lived in Africa about 200,000 to 100,000 years ago.<sup>1</sup>

Support for the "out of Africa" model can be derived from the morphological diversity seen among black Africans today. African peoples must therefore be very ancient, since presumably more time should be required to produce such diverse populations from common stock.

Researchers at the Natural History Museum in London prefer the "out of Africa" model. It is believed that only there *Homo erectus* gave rise to modern humans. They spread throughout Europe and Asia, displacing whatever remnant populations they may have encountered in their migrations.

A number of distinguished paleontologists disagree, and have published data suggesting a co-mingling between ancient and more modern peoples. Their evidence supports "regional continuity," meaning that local populations of archaic ancestors eventually begat modern types. An analysis of human fossils found in Israel and Africa, when compared with older *Homo erectus* remains, led researchers to place *Homo erectus* directly in the line of hominids that culminated in modern man. *Science* reported:

These modern-looking fossils all date to about 100,000 years and appear at the end of a sequence of fossils that stretches back to 400,000 years ago, which seem to show a gradual transition from their *Homo erectus*-type forebears to early modern humans.<sup>2</sup>

What unity there is among contending parties was summed up:

In spite of the contention, all parties can agree on one thing. The proto-human fossil record begins in Africa, with a species now called *Homo erectus*. After evolving in an African homeland, all concur, *Homo erectus* migrated to Europe and Asia about 1 million years ago. But after that, comes the Great Divide in paleoanthropology.<sup>3</sup>

Although two theories are competing for prominence, what has been generally agreed upon by both molecular biologists and paleoanthropologists is that all humans are biologically connected, as evidenced by our DNA signatures<sup>4</sup> (and confirmed in Acts 17:26). When and under what circumstances ancient "Eve" got here is still an open question.

The temptation among some Bible apologists has been to postulate that Adam must have lived at a similar early date as mitochondrial Eve, and thus the origins issue is seemingly resolved. The problem with this idea is that even if the Bible was accommodating (and it isn't), how do you explain the various precursors predating that point in history, such as *Homo erectus*" Can they just be swept under the rug?

According to the Bible, Adam was the first to have a covenant relationship with the Creator, the first to be accountable, the first to sin and suffer the consequences, and the first in the line of promise leading to the Savior. That does not necessarily mean, however, that Adam was the first biped with an opposable thumb and a cranial capacity of 1300 to 1400 cubic centimeters.

### **Adam - Ancient or Recent"**

Placing Adam's time frame in the distant past infers the Genesis record must have omitted the names of hundreds of generations who supposedly lived between Adam and Abraham. The rationale is that the word "begat" does not necessarily mean "the immediate father of," so the named patriarchs in Genesis 5 and 11 would be only a representative sampling.<sup>5</sup>

The elasticity of Hebrew grammar can be seen to permit genealogical stretching. The Hebrew word "*ben*" for "son" can also mean "grandson," "children," or even "descendant."<sup>6</sup> Jesus is called "the son of David," for example (Matt. 1:1). Conversely, the word - '*ab*' for "father" can mean "ancestor." So the means for accommodation are in place, and many Bible scholars have taken this path.

These interpreters point out inconsistencies in Bible genealogies by comparing Old Testament authors with New Testament authors, and then saying, for example: "Aha! Matthew dropped three relatives out of Jesus's lineage that are clearly listed in II Kings (Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah)."<sup>7</sup>

Thus these inconsistencies and allowances in Hebrew grammar are seen as somehow establishing a precedent which makes the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 and in Luke 3 fair game, and therefore, expandable at will. Like many other devices, this one will not stand up to scrutiny.

Seth has to be the immediate son of Adam (Gen. 4:25). The identical phraseology which sets Adam's age at the birth of his son, Seth, is repeated from Seth to Noah (Gen. 5:3-29). If there are no intermediate generations from Adam to Seth, then that should indicate the same thing down the line.

In Jude 1:14, Enoch is "the seventh from Adam," inhibiting additional unnamed patriarchs for the first seven generations. Methuselah died near the time of the flood, presumably before the rain started. That ties in the age of the patriarch at his death with the date of the flood, thereby precluding any additions of time between Methuselah and Noah.

---

**Thus these inconsistencies and allowances in Hebrew grammar are seen as somehow establishing a precedent which makes the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 and in Luke 3 fair game, and therefore, expandable at will. Like many other devices, this one will not stand up to scrutiny.**

---

So if there is no space to stick in hundreds of generations from Adam to Enoch, and Enoch's son, Methuselah, died in the year of the flood (assuming a recent flood), that is the *coup de grace* to the expanding genealogies method. Inserting additional time or generations is not a workable proposition from Adam to Noah.

The idea that Noah or Shem would have recorded ten forefathers, detailing the age of each at the birth of their first son, or son of the line of promise, and the age at death, while omitting hundreds of intermediate generations, is beyond reason. There is no justification for postulating intermediate, unnamed generations in Genesis 5. Even if it were theoretically possible to insert extra generations, the specific language used giving the age of the father at the birth of each succeeding son prohibits inserting more *time*. So it is a moot point. Archer maintains:

...for even allowing the numerous gaps in the chronological tables given in Genesis 5 and Genesis 10 it is altogether unreasonable to suppose that a hundred times as many generations are omitted in these tables as are included in them.<sup>8</sup>

---

**More importantly, the background information surrounding Adam and his generations to Noah, and from the flood to Abraham, is far too modern in description to have happened at such an early period in man's history.**

---

More importantly, the background information surrounding Adam and his generations to Noah, and from the flood to Abraham, is far too modern in description to have happened at such an early period in man's history. How would livestock raising and farming (Gen. 4:2) have come before hunting and gathering" Could sophisticated musical instruments (Gen. 4:21) predate simple bone flutes" How could metal working (Gen. 4:22) have preceded the Neolithic (late Stone Age) period" It serves no useful purpose to render the Genesis account incredible in order to extend a hermeneutical helping hand the Bible can do without.

Why force something that isn't there" If we believe paleontologists, anatomically modern humans go back some 100,000 years; archaic *Homo sapiens* first appeared about 300,000

years ago; and hominids of some description can be traced back 2.5 million years with precursors to 4 million years ago. And if we trust the biblical text, Adam fits best at about 5000 to 4000 BC. Schroeder addresses this issue in *Genesis and the Big Bang*:

For the Bible scholar, it is not an easy task to accept as reality that for the past 100,000 years there existed animals such as hominids and that the skeletons of these ancient animals are near replicas of those of modern man. But the fossil evidence is abundant and irrefutable. It is folly, no it is counterproductive, to close one's eyes to this fact.<sup>9</sup>

Of course, a figure like 100,000 years ago for the emergence of anatomically modern humans may undergo revision in the future, but barring any drastic changes, there really is no comfortable niche for Adam any time before communicative bipedal creatures had already commenced on planet Earth. What became of *them* is the real issue.

These creatures either died out, leaving the world devoid of humanity until Adam was created, or else they left progeny who were busy populating the earth when Adam arrived on the scene. Adam either evolved or was nonexistent - notions the Bible rejects - or else he was inserted, so to speak, into the train of humanity. This is the solution we will explore.

### **A Time for Adam**

The task of finding some place to inject Adam into human history can be simplified if we let the Bible do the talking. References to tents, farming, and raising livestock suggest that Adam was not a cave dwelling hunter-gatherer.

Archaeologists place the beginnings of modern man 10,000 years ago with the advent of farming techniques<sup>10</sup> Adam's placement at roughly 5000 to 4000 BC from the Genesis genealogies, combined with the mention of farming, makes this a compatible time frame.

Lamech, a descendant of Cain, had three sons by his two wives (Gen. 4:19-22). Jabal "was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle." A second son Jubal, "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ."

In just eight generations counting Adam, there are tents, livestock, and musical instruments; not caves, woolly mammoths, and hand axes. For many reasons, we can conclude that Adam was not contemporary with the "Flintstones." A wealth of Stone Age artifacts have been uncovered giving silent testimony to a culture long disappeared at this point. So where does Adam fit in the history of man? The next verse is explicit.

In Genesis 4:22, one of Cain's descendants, Tubal-cain, was "an instructor of every worker in brass and iron." The Hebrew word for "brass" also means "copper," and copper tools were not in use before 10,000 years ago. Although iron smelting would be out of the question, there is evidence that bog iron was beaten into rudimentary tools, and iron was known as far back as 4000 BC,<sup>11</sup> or else what may have looked like iron could have been tin. Copper and tin together make bronze, and the Bronze Age is identifiable in history, starting about 3000 BC.<sup>12</sup>

That is the proverbial smoking gun. Adam belongs after the old Stone Ages, near the threshold of the Bronze Age, in a period called the Chalcolithic, when traditional stone tools were being gradually augmented by crude copper implements. Adam's descendants saw the dawning of the Bronze Age.

In the initial period of the Middle Eastern civilizations, from about 3000 BC, there was a truly remarkable development of metallurgy. This is seen in the beginning of the Bronze Age, when alloys of arsenic and copper, or tin and copper (in both cases known as bronze), came into being...<sup>13</sup>

Stone tools would have been of little use to Noah when he needed to construct a massive watertight ark. Metal tools suitable for such an undertaking would have only been available if the pre-flood patriarchs lived in the period of what archaeologists call "modern man;" that is, after 10,000 years ago. The Stone Age periods may not have completely passed by Adam's day, but apparently human history was well into the Bronze Age by the time of Tubal-cain and Noah. And a late entry for Adam puts him in the company of unrelated indigenous populations.

### **Why Cain Feared for His Life**

Cain's lament in Genesis 4:13-14 highlights the issue of whether Adam was alone or not. By murdering Abel, only Cain and his parents were left. Cain's first words upon hearing the Lord's punishment were out of fear that someone would kill him. Is it likely that his immediate worry was that his parents would retaliate, or that he would be tracked down and killed by future and thus far unborn generations from Adam? Cain would have had a whole world in which to hide.

God answered Cain's plea by providing a sign for him (Gen. 4:15). Cain's anxieties were justified as evidenced by the Lord taking action to quiet his fears. We have no way of knowing what that sign or mark was, but evidently it was necessary. From Cain's point of view, the entire human race would have reached a dead end at that point - unless there were other human beings about.<sup>14</sup> There must have been potentially hostile tribes of men in the vicinity. Cain was aware of it, and the Lord's action attested to his justifiable fear.

And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. (Genesis 4:16)

Throughout the Bible the "land of Canaan" or the "land of Egypt" refers to an area populated by those particular peoples; such as Canaanites and Egyptians. Why have Bible interpreters not considered that the "land of Nod" might well have been populated by "Nodites," who were minding their own business before Cain arrived, and might have been the very ones Cain feared? In Hebrew, "*nod*" means "wandering." This would be an apt designation for a band of nomads who might have been in the area at the time, "*nod*" being simply a form of the word, "nomad."

### **Removing the Shackles of Prejudgment**

Once we hold up to scrutiny the traditional assumption that Adam was the first human, and consider the probability that other human beings were already living in Adam's proximity, previous pitfalls in the Genesis narrative disappear. Passages that had obscure meanings become clear. The "Nephilim" or "giants" in Genesis 6:4 may now be identified as prehistoric, or pre-Adamic - not in Adam's line of descendants, or ancestry.

If we can shed our preconceptions, we may view Genesis from a new perspective. Yes, the early chapters are lacking an abundance of details. Paleontologists also differ over the course of man's descent due to sparse fossil evidence of early hominids. And it is too early for gene research to give us a conclusive picture.

Nevertheless, if we can cast off the shackles of prejudgment, we can examine the Genesis text with a view toward what may not be entirely provable, but is certainly possible, plausible, and, if I may be so bold, indeed probable.

## **The Image of God**

So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. (Genesis 1:27)

What does it mean to be created in God's image? "The ancient Orient shows us with ever increasing clarity that the purpose and function of an image consists in representing someone," Edmond Jacob writes in *Theology of the Old Testament*. "An image, that is to say a statue of a god is the real presence of this god..."<sup>15</sup>

In that context, Adam would have been God's representative to the world, and an already populated world to boot. Humbert raised another possibility; that man was given the same "physical outward appearance" as the deity.<sup>16</sup> However, the human physique has a certain functionality necessitated by our physical environment that is not required by a Creator-God.

By using the term "God's image," the writer of Genesis may have been alluding to the inner essence of us which is an integral part and yet unseen - our soul, or our spirit. That may not have been an altogether unique feature. We are in the dark with respect to Adam's neighbors, even though Adam was apparently infused with something which gave him a kind of kinship with the deity.

Who is the "them" referred to in Genesis 1:27? It has been argued that the plural "them" should be applied to generic man, and not exclusively to Adam and his generations. But most Bible scholars believe this passage applies solely to Adam and Eve, and their descendants who came under the Adamic covenant. This is expressly implied in Genesis 5:1-3:

This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.

It is true that traditionally most Bible scholars have thought all of humanity started with Adam. This stand has been taken, however, with a certain nonchalance for not only the fossil record and the genetic evidence, but even the qualifiers in the Scriptures themselves. Adam was created, and then Eve, but it is unwarranted to presume ancient precursors are encompassed by Genesis 1:27.

Adam, as God's chosen, was the first man capable of achieving God's kingdom, and that was passed down through his generations until Christ's sacrifice at the cross changed the equation and brought a new covenant. Presumably any outsiders in Adam's day would have been outside the covenant, and unable to enjoy this unique status, which included the hope of redemption through (1) the Adamic bloodline, (2) the discipline of self righteousness, and (3) the ritual of animal sacrifice.

As the first type of Christ, Adam may have had a similar mission. Adam's task was probably to bring the word of God's kingdom to the polytheistic heathen living all around him. We can only guess. We can never know with certainty what it was Adam was supposed to have done, or could have done had he not yielded to Satan's odious deception so early on.

### **A Place for Adam**

In terms of place, Southern Mesopotamia is clearly indicated by the Bible. The rivers, Hiddekel (Tigris) and Euphrates, the cities of Erech and Ur (and much more we will explore in depth) all point to this region" - a region that came to be called "Sumer." Jacquetta Hawkes describes it in *The Atlas of Early Man*:

The fourth millennium in Sumer is one of the most remarkable passages in human history. Already at its beginning old settlements such as Eridu, Uruk, Ur, Lagash and Nippur had become substantial towns and from 3500 BC they waxed into cities. The citizens now included large numbers of specialist artisans - "potters, carpenters, makers of mudbrick, coppersmiths - and fine sculptors too."<sup>17</sup>

Identifying the various cultures which have flourished in the Near East has been done with meticulous care made possible by years of carefully compiled archaeological data. The earliest identifiable people belong to the Neolithic Natufian culture, which was spread from Palestine to Syria, and date from about 12,500 to 10,500 years ago, clearly a pre-Adamic date. The oldest city identified with Natufian culture was Jericho.<sup>18</sup>

In 1961-1963, the excavation at Catal Huyuk in south-central Turkey was excavated in the early 1960s. It was dated from 6500 to 5400 BC, and supported the concept of regional areas of Neolithic development instead of a single nuclear area, such as a city.

Contrasts among Jericho, Catal Huyuk, Jarmo, and Umm Dabaghiyah - all about 6000 BC - suggest a considerable regionalization within widely scattered Neolithic communities of the Near East.<sup>19</sup>

In the Tigris and Euphrates floodplain, the ancient cultures leading to the development of Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations can be traced from late Neolithic

villages of around 5500 BC to towns and urban areas of the highly developed Sumerians of 2500 BC.

The Hassuna culture takes its name from the mound of Tell Hassuna in northwestern Iraq, and dates to 6000-5250 BC. Numerous agricultural villages have been unearthed in Iran, Turkey, and Palestine that were contemporary with the Hassuna.

The coarse pottery wares identified with the Hassuna were gradually replaced by the remnants of the Samarra culture, starting about 5500 BC. At Tell-es Sawaan in Iraq alabaster female figurines were discovered, along with ornaments of turquoise, carnelian, greenstone, and copper. The presence of widely disparate materials in one location indicates trading practices, and shows that trade routes had already been established by that time.<sup>20</sup>

Dating from 5500 to 4700 BC, the Halaf culture succeeded, but overlapped the Samarran. Halafian ceramics have been discovered from the Mediterranean coast to Iran, though the Tigris-Euphrates region south of Baghdad may have been uninhabited at this early date.

From similarities in pottery shards and other artifacts, the highly developed Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations that flourished in the third and second millennium periods can be traced to the late Neolithic villages of around 5500 BC. There is no break that one would expect to see if there had been a catastrophic termination of mankind and a subsequent renewal, a theory that is popular among "gap" proponents.

---

**The highly developed Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian civilizations that flourished in the third and second millennium periods can be traced to the late Neolithic villages of around 5500 BC.**

**There is no break that one would expect to see if there had been a catastrophic termination of mankind and a subsequent renewal, a theory that is popular among "gap" proponents.**

---

Located four miles from the ancient city of Ur is the small archaeological mound of al-'Ubaid. The settlements in southern Mesopotamia dating from 4500-3500 BC are collectively assigned to the Ubaid culture. Whether or not pre-Ubaid sites exist in southern Mesopotamia is a subject of controversy. Some archaeologists believe that fluctuations in the level of the Persian Gulf may have erased any traces of earlier settlements.

The origin of the Ubaid culture is unknown. The Halafians were flourishing in the north at about the same time Ubaidan farmers began to settle the southern delta of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. The climatic conditions seem unlikely for a Garden of Eden until the advancement of irrigation could bring its blessing of water to the area. This began to happen during the Ubaid period.

By 3500 BC, the Ubaidans were living in townships from Mesopotamia to Syria to Turkey. The subsequent flood at the time of Noah could have wiped out the Ubaidans, although there is some evidence the Sumerian culture may have derived from the Ubaidan. Broken pieces of pottery show subtle transition from Ubaid ware to Uruk ware. This is more indicative of gradual change through the influence of friendly contact with neighboring cultures than it is of a foreign invasion and replacement by conquest. Yet some archaeologists prefer the displacement model, and believe the Sumerians were a discrete population.

The purpose of designating these ancient populations as Halafian, Ubaidan, or Sumerian is primarily to place them in time and place context, and need not necessarily imply ethnic differences. The flood must have devastated Southern Mesopotamia, leaving behind ruined cities which the next generations of Sumerians could build on and repopulate. Whether Ubaidan fathers had Sumerian sons is unknown.

---

**The flood must have devastated Southern Mesopotamia leaving behind ruined cities which the next generations of Sumerians could build on and repopulate.**

---

When it comes to identifying candidates who may have been enjoying the Tigris and Euphrates region prior to Adam's creation, there are two or three choices depending on the precise date of Adam's arrival. We can select the earlier Halafians, the Ubaidans, or the later Sumerians, although the Ubaidans seem the most likely:

About 4500 BC the region was settled by people who came to be called Ubaidans. They in fact settled most of the sites where the great cities of Sumeria [Sumer] were to grow - ncluding Ur (where Wooley found their remains under the silt of the flood). Later they spread up the valley, succeeding the Halafians and becoming the first people to dominate the whole of Mesopotamia.<sup>21</sup>

The harsh, arid conditions might have caused the Halafians to make only brief appearances in the south, or maybe they never got there at all. The first inhabitants of the Tigris and Euphrates basin that can be readily identified are the Ubaidans, succeeded by the Sumerians.

Flood deposits have been found at key Southern Mesopotamian city sites; Kish, Shuruppak, Erech, and Lagash that center around a 2900 BC time frame.<sup>22</sup> However, both Ubaidan and Sumerian artifacts have been found at levels dated earlier than that. The Sumerians re-established their civilization after the flood, and rebuilt or resettled previously established city sites.

Conceivably Halafians could have been living in the vicinity of Eden when Adam was placed in the garden. But Ubaidan pottery has been found at the lowest levels of excavated cities in Southern Mesopotamia, and the Ubaidans best fit the most likely time

frame. Adam and his generations likely were surrounded from the beginning, or became surrounded by first Ubaidan, and then Sumerian culture.

## Irrigating the Garden

And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. (Genesis 2:5-6)

Genesis 2:5-6 is a useful passage to use in demonstrating that Bible interpretations which exclude pertinent extra-biblical data can produce dubious opinions and perplexing conclusions. From this verse, Henry Morris argues for a "vapor canopy" over the early earth, and reasons:

In the original world, however, there was no rainfall on the earth. As originally created, the earth's daily water supply came primarily from local evaporation and condensation.<sup>23</sup>

Morris reaches this conclusion solely on his reading of the biblical text, deducing that rain doesn't come until the flood, notwithstanding the fact that no one has discovered any place in the world where mist or fog naturally oozes out of the ground in sufficient volume to water humans, livestock, and crops. We would also be left to wonder what furnished the rivers in Genesis 2:10-14 with water. Were the Tigris and Euphrates not supplied by snow melt and rainfall as they are today"

In their well known *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Keil and Delitzsch explain Genesis 2:5 as follows:

The creation of the plants is not alluded to here at all, but simply the planting of the garden in Eden.

They too slide down the slippery slope to a woeful opinion. This was "dependent upon rain," they decide, and conclude that the mist or vapor in Genesis 2:6 was the "creative beginning of the rain itself"<sup>24</sup> So even though the Bible states in the previous verse "for the Lord God had not caused it to rain," nevertheless, rain it was, according to this respected Bible commentary.

So which is it, rain or no rain" The answer can be sought in the *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Archaeology* pertaining to ancient Mesopotamia:

The culmination of these prehistoric advances is to be found in the `Ubaid period of the sixth and fifth millennia, when the earliest settlements are known from Sumer. This area was characterized by the very great fertility of its alluvial soil and - outside local areas of marsh and lagoon, where a specialized fishing, hunting and collecting economy could have been practiced - an extremely arid environment that necessitated the use of irrigation for successful agriculture.<sup>25</sup>

Could "an extremely arid environment" be described as a place where the "Lord God had not caused it to rain"" Could a "mist from the earth" that "watered the whole face of the ground" refer to a land "that necessitated the use of irrigation for successful agriculture""

---

**It seems "there was not a man to till the ground" for an uncomplicated reason. No one had irrigated the desert soil; thus no plowing had been done, so no crops could be grown.**

---

Driver suggests irrigation:

Provision [is] made for the irrigation of the garden. The reference is implicitly to a system of canals, such as existed in Babylonia...<sup>26</sup>

The Septuagint offers further assistance. In the Greek text the word is not "mist," but "fountain." The RSV uses "stream." Certainly the words "fountain" and "stream" better describe an irrigation canal than a vapor canopy. It seems "there was not a man to till the ground" for an uncomplicated reason. No one had irrigated the desert soil; thus no plowing had been done, so no crops could be grown.

Even before the first cities began to appear on the Mesopotamian plain, sizeable settlements such as Jericho were being supplied by irrigation.

The biblical city of Jericho, a center for salt trade, flourished during the seventh millennium BC in the desert near the north end of the Dead Sea. Water diverted from a spring nourished its fields.<sup>27</sup>

In Genesis 2:8, "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there He put the man whom He had formed." "And a river went out of Eden to water the garden - " (Gen. 2:10).

It is unlikely that a river, synonymous with "brook" or "creek," is intended. Water falls on the ground, trickles into streams, and flows to rivers, which empty in the sea - the exact opposite of what the verse states. The purpose of irrigation canals is to carry water from the rivers to the ground - precisely what the verse states. There were no "rivers" in Babylon (Psa. 137:1), only canals. In other words, there was a place called Eden, out of which a canal ran eastward to irrigate the garden, where God placed Adam.

---

**What cries out for attention, though, is this:  
How could Eden be identified and named as a place  
distinct from the garden if there was no citizenry?**

---

We know that Southern Mesopotamia was laced with a canal network, the remains of which can still be seen today as lines in the desert. Canals obviously required people to dig and maintain them. What cries out for attention, though, is this: How could Eden be identified and named as a place distinct from the garden if there was no citizenry"

Take any place - London, England, for example. Was there ever a time when London was unoccupied" Well, yes, but no one could have called it "London" then. The principle is the same concerning Eden. Isaiah speaks of the Lord making the wilderness of Zion "like Eden" (Isa. 51:3). Eden was apparently a place for people, and had to have people before it could be called "Eden."

Who lived in Havilah (Gen. 2:11,12), and who mined the gold there" Driver places Havilah "most probably" in the northeast of Arabia on the west coast of the Persian Gulf, south of Egypt, and adds, "The gold of Arabia was famed in antiquity."<sup>28</sup> Also, the remains of mines have been found in the Egyptian Nile Valley that were active over 30,000 years ago.<sup>29</sup> There may be other ways to explain this verse, but the implications are that gold mining preceded even Adam's Fall!

We may not know who was living in "the whole land of Ethiopia" (Gen. 2:13), but sewing needles and stone vessels for grinding grain into meal were found at el-Badari along the Nile dating to slightly earlier than 5000 BC.<sup>30</sup> This was about the same time that Hassuna and Nineveh were established beside the Tigris (biblical Hiddekel) in the region later known as Assyria.

### **Enuma Elish - An Early Creation Epic**

The first people who can be clearly identified as likely descendants of Adam are the post-flood Semitic Accadians. Most authors believe that an influx of Semites<sup>31</sup> from the early third millennium BC were known by the Sumerians as "Martu."<sup>32</sup> The Accadians apparently learned their writing skills from the Sumerians, and began to record their own versions of history in their own language using the same cuneiform technique.

One of the early creation epics was written in Accadian or Babylonian cuneiform and is called Enuma Elish. It has been compiled from tablets found at Ninevah, Ashur, and Kish. According to legend, father Ea (second in the early Accadian Trinity) begat the heroic Marduk who slays the rebellious Tiamat. Thereupon:

*He split her like a shellfish into two parts:  
Half of her he set up and cield it as sky...<sup>33</sup>*

(For a shadow of this see Psa. 89:9,10 and Isa. 51:9. ) The one who "contrived the uprising" was the evil Tiamat's commander-in-chief, Kingu:

*They bound him, holding him before Ea.  
They imposed on him his guilt and severed his blood (vessels).  
Out of his blood they fashioned mankind.<sup>34</sup>*

In this account, the blood of Kingu was used, but in another legend the blood is mixed with clay.<sup>36</sup> Although somewhat gory in describing the mode of their creation, the Accadians also seemed to be aware they were not alone in the world. Frequent references are made to the "black-headed" people.<sup>37</sup>

The "black-headed" was a reference to the Sumerians who supplanted the Ubaidans, or conceivably, it could be a reference to some other race of people. But regardless of who they were, they were not Semites (or Adamites) judging from Accadian poetry.

*May he shepherd the black-headed ones, his creatures.  
To the end of days, without forgetting, let them acclaim his ways.  
May he establish for his fathers the great food-offerings;  
Their support they shall furnish, shall tend their sanctuaries.  
May he cause incense to be smelled...their spells,  
A likeness on earth of what he has wrought in heaven.  
May he order the black-headed to re[vere him],  
May the subjects ever bear in mind their god,  
And may they at his word pay heed to the goddess.  
May food-offerings be borne for their gods and goddesses.  
Without fail let them support their gods!  
Their lands let them improve, build their shrines,  
Let the black-headed wait on their gods.  
As for us, by however many names we pronounce, He is our God!<sup>38</sup>*

Evidently the Semitic Accadians thought of the "black-headed" as a separate people, racially distinct, and polytheistic as regards to religion. The light-skinned, dark-haired Sumerians best fit this description, and they spoke an unrelated language long before the Tower of Babel incident.

Early Adamite populations must have lived in relative isolation at the beginning since they developed a language entirely unlike the Sumerian language. But by the time the Sumerians learned to write, some of the earliest names recorded were Semite (or Adamite), demonstrating the close contact between these two cultures very early on.

### **Adam's Bride**

After naming the animals of the garden, there was still something missing, "but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:20).

A search can easily be implied by the words, "was not found." A search for a helpmate to be both wife and companion would be ridiculous if the world at that time contained only birds, beasts, cattle, and creeping things - but what if one or more settlements of humans were already in the vicinity"

Available females must have been nearby, one of which Adam could have chosen for his wife. We can deduce that from archaeological history. From the Bible we can conclude that none was suitable, so Adam had an operation resulting in Eve. As confirmation of an act of special creation for the first covenant couple, Genesis 2:21-23 gives us a graphic description. Paul confirms this mode of origination. "For Adam was first formed (*plasso* in the Greek), then Eve" (1 Tim. 2:13).

Apparently Adam was created biologically compatible with the neighbors outside the garden. But God's desire was for Adam's wife to be distinctive, just as Adam was. By fashioning Eve out of Adam, this allowed them both to enjoy 900 or more years of wedded bliss. We are free to speculate about the origins of Cain's wife, or Noah's wife, but not about Eve.

## The Bread of Life

Adam was banished from the garden after the Fall. "In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread..." and, "...the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken" (Gen. 3:19,23).

Could we believe the first man on earth already knew how to use fire, construct an oven, plant and harvest grain, mill it, and prepare the flour for baking? If not, then we may conclude that Adam was not the first man in the biological sense.

Prehistoric men were hunters of wild game and gatherers of fruits and berries. Farming and domesticated livestock were later developments. Paleontologists have uncovered evidence that ancient peoples harvested wild wheat as far back as 9000 BC. It took a genetic crossing of goat grass and "emmer" to produce bread wheat. The earliest evidence of wheat cultivation was found in the ancient oasis of Jericho and is dated at 8000 BC.<sup>39</sup>

Wheat, and therefore bread, appears to have been in use 3,000 years before Adam. So we have two choices. We can either deny the anthropological data; or allow that these agricultural developments predate Adam. If we choose the second option, at his inception, therefore, Adam must have been surrounded by people already familiar with growing grain when he was inserted into human history.

In the second article of this two-part series, we'll examine the culture that surrounded the early Adamites in Southern Mesopotamia at around 5000 to 4000 BC and discuss early cuneiform writings and inscriptions that speak about an historical figure that could have been Adam of Genesis. In addition, we'll look at the Sumerian king lists of early pre-flood rulers, which begin with "Alulim," the probable equivalent of Adam. Eridu, the oldest city in Southern Mesopotamia, dating to about 4800 BC, is the most likely place to have been Eden, the original home for Adam and his kin. Even the word "Eden" apparently was derived from the Sumerian "edin," meaning "plain," "prairie," or "desert." "Enoch," the city Cain built in the pre-flood period corresponds with "E-anna(k)," a Sumerian and Semite post-flood site.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Ann Gibbons, "Mitochondrial Eve: Wounded But Not Dead Yet," *Science* (14 August, 1992), 873.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 875.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 875.

<sup>4</sup>James Shreeve, "Argument Over A Woman," *Discover* (August 1990), 52-59.

<sup>5</sup>Robert C. Newman and Herman J. Eckelmann, *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 111.

<sup>6</sup>Lloyd R. Bailey, *Genesis, Creation, and Creationism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 130.

<sup>7</sup>Paul H. Seely, *Inerrant Wisdom: Science & Inerrancy In Biblical Perspective* (Portland: Evangelical Reform, Inc. , 1989), 17.

<sup>8</sup>Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 203.

<sup>9</sup>Gerald L. Schroeder, *Genesis and the Big Bang* (New York: Bantam Books, 1990), 175.

<sup>10</sup>John E. Pfeiffer, *The Creative Explosion* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1982), 121.

<sup>11</sup>From an exhibit in the Smithsonian Institute in Washington D. C., July 25, 1993.

<sup>12</sup>Jacquetta Hawkes, *The Atlas of Early Man* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), 63.

<sup>13</sup>John Gowlett, *Ascent to Civilization* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1984), 180.

<sup>14</sup>Dick Fischer, "The Bible Proves Creationism is Wrong," *The Washington Post* (August 17, 1986), C4.

<sup>15</sup>Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* ( New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958), 167.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 167.

<sup>17</sup>Hawkes, *The Atlas Of Early Man*, 64.

<sup>18</sup>Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 36.

<sup>19</sup>C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, and Jeremy A. Sabloff, *Ancient Civilizations: The Near East and Mesoamerica* (Menlo Park: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc. , 1979), 79.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 99.

<sup>21</sup>Hawkes, *The Atlas of Early Man*, 63.

<sup>22</sup>Lloyd R. Bailey, *Noah: The Person and the Story in History and Tradition* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 36.

<sup>23</sup>Henry Morris, *The Genesis Record* (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1976), 84.

<sup>24</sup>C. F. Keil, and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary On The Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 77-78.

<sup>25</sup>Andrew Sherratt, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Archaeology* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1980), 113.

<sup>26</sup>S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938), 39.

<sup>27</sup>George, Constable, Ed., *The Age of God Kings: TimeFrame 3000-1500 BC* (Alexandria: Time-Life Books, 1987), 10.

<sup>28</sup>Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 39.

<sup>29</sup>Pierre M. Vermeersch, Etienne Paulissen, and Philip Van Peer, "Palaeolithic chert exploitation in the limestone stretch of the Egyptian Nile Valley," *African Archaeological Review* (1990) 8: 77-102.

<sup>30</sup>Hawkes, *The Atlas of Early Man*, 47.

<sup>31</sup>"Semites" is the term archaeologists and historians use to denote not only descendants of Shem, but also descendants of Japheth, Ham, or any of Adam's line in the pre-flood period (if a person such as Adam ever existed, or there was ever an event such as the Flood.) Thus, Canaanites spoke a "west semitic" language, notwithstanding Canaan was the son of Ham, according to the Bible. One might think "Hamites" would have communicated in a "hamitic" tongue. But the secular world does not recognize the Bible as being historically accurate. Therefore, "Semites" are universally recognized. "Adamites," "Hamites," and "Japhethites" are not, shall we say, "politically correct."

<sup>32</sup>Samuel Noah Kramer, "Sumero-Akkadian Interconnections," *Genava*, n. s., 8 (1960), 272-273.

<sup>33</sup>James B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 60-72.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, 68

<sup>36</sup>Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), 56.

<sup>37</sup>Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 70.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, 69.

<sup>39</sup>John Wiester, *The Genesis Connection* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983), 187.

---

**~~In Search of Historical Adam: Part 2~~**

## In Search of the Historical Adam: Part 2

Dick Fischer

P. O. Box 50111,  
Arlington, VA 22205

From *PSCF* 46 (March 1994): 47.

*In this article, the second in a series of two, the culture that surrounded the early Adamites in Southern Mesopotamia starting about 5000 to 4000 BC is examined. Early cuneiform writings and inscriptions speak about an historical figure that could have been Adam of Genesis. The Sumerian king lists of early pre-flood rulers begin with "Alulim," the probable equivalent of Adam. Eridu, the oldest city in Southern Mesopotamia, dating to about 4800 BC, is the most likely place to have been Eden, the original home for Adam and his kin. Even the word "Eden" apparently was derived from the Sumerian "edin," meaning "plain," "prairie," or "desert." "Enoch," the city Cain built in the pre-flood period corresponds with "Eanna(k)," a Sumerian and Semite post-flood site. Thus the early passages of Genesis are seen as factually relevant, and an integral part of secular pre-history.*

Cuneiform inscribed clay tablets discovered in Mesopotamian excavations have given archaeologists a picture of a civilization almost totally unknown only one hundred years ago.<sup>1</sup> These have given us valuable insights into the history, religion, and racial diversity in the region. And some of these tablets contain references that may appear to pertain to Adam of the Bible.

### The Legend of Adapa Related to Adam

Several fragments of the "Legend of Adapa" were taken from the Library of Ashurbanipal (668-626 BC) at Ninevah. One was also found in the Egyptian archives of Amenophis III and IV of the fourteenth century BC.<sup>2</sup>

The first people largely recognized as Semites (or Adamites)<sup>3</sup> were the Accadians, dating to possibly as early as 4000 BC. The early Accadians had a triune God. From the beginning, the Accadian "trinity" consisted of El, the father god; Ea, god of the earth and creator of man; and Enlil, the god of the air. Also dating to about 4000 BC, the polytheistic Sumerians were distinct from the Semitic Accadians and spoke an unrelated language.

As contact developed between these two cultures, things began to rub off. The Accadian father-god El was corrupted to "Anu" under pressure from the Sumerian "An." Enlil moved into second place, and Ea, known by the Sumerians as Enki, dropped to third.<sup>4</sup>

According to Accadian legend, Adapa was created an exemplary man by Ea, endowed with "superhuman wisdom,"<sup>5</sup> but not eternal life. A fishing accident angered Adapa, who broke the wing of the south wind, and was summoned to heaven to appear before the god Anu. Adapa was warned by his father, Ea, not to eat a certain food or drink any water that would be offered to him. A cautious Adapa shunned the food and water of life, through which he would have acquired eternal life.<sup>6</sup>

A fragment of one record of the Adapa legend inscribed in Amorite rests in the Pierpont Morgan Library. This is part of the translation:

*In those days, in those years, the sage, the man of Eridu,  
Ea, made him like a (riddi) among men;  
A sage, whose command no one could oppose;  
The mighty one, the Atra-hasis of the Anunaki, is he;  
Blameless, clean of hands, anointer, observer of laws.  
With the bakers, he does the baking;  
With the bakers of Eridu, he does the baking.*<sup>7</sup>

Adam of the Bible and Adapa of Amorite legend were both human sons of God, or a god. According to the legend, Adapa was a sage in Eridu.

Could it be only coincidental that Adam was told "by the sweat of his face" he would eat "bread," and Adapa was a baker by trade; or that Adapa was deprived of eternal life by not eating or drinking the "food or water of life" while Adam was cut off from eating the fruit of the "tree of life"?

Adapa was regarded as a prophet or seer, and had been priest of the temple of Ea at Eridu. Adapa is also described as "blameless," "clean of hands," "anointer and observer of laws." Could that be descriptive of Adam, the first type of Christ? Also, Adam was taken from the ground; in the Hebrew: 'adam from 'adamah. How close phonetically is 'adamah to Adapa?

Did Adam's Fall have an effect on later generations? These two lines are part of one Adapa fragment:

*... what ill he has brought upon mankind,  
[And] the disease that he brought upon the bodies of men...*<sup>8</sup>

This Jewish tradition of the Fall is also reflected in the fourth (second) book of Esdras (7.118):

*O Adam, what have you done  
For though it was you who sinned,  
the fall was not yours alone,  
but ours also who are your descendants.*<sup>9</sup>

Westermann concludes that in this text Adam is not understood as a "representative of mankind created by God, but as an historical individual whose 'Fall' was passed on through him to his descendants."<sup>10</sup>

## **Eridu, the Home of Adapa**

In 1940-41, the Iraqi government undertook the excavation of Eridu, home of Adapa.

Here at last it was possible to trace a full and uninterrupted sequence of occupations back through the whole duration of the Al 'Ubaid period to an earliest settlement with some features so distinctive that doubts arose as to whether the name Al 'Ubaid could still appropriately be applied to it.<sup>11</sup>

Some of the pottery found at the lowest of nineteen levels of occupation was so distinctive that the excavators called it "Eridu ware." It was described as an "extremely fine quality monochrome-painted ware, often with a buff or cream slip."<sup>12</sup> There was also at the lowest level a high percentage of coarse green pottery typical of Ubaid ceramics. Remember, the Ubaidans, dating to between 4500 BC to 3500 BC, were precursors to the Sumerians. Enough similarities were noted between the coarse Ubaid pottery at Eridu with that of the earlier Hassuna and Samarra cultures to denote that at least some of those early settlers had been migrants from the north.

If the two different pottery styles found at the lowest level of the site are indicative of two separate cultures living side by side, one Adamite the other Ubaid, then these pottery shards are of some importance. Quite possibly some of these remnants are from early Adamite populations.

Whatever culture was responsible for Eridu ware, Adamite or otherwise, it was evidently supplanted by Ubaid culture, because only Ubaid pottery could be found at higher levels. And just as the pottery disappeared, so perhaps, did the Adamites, by moving north, probably to Erech, also called by its Sumerian equivalent, "Uruk."

## **Is Eridu Synonymous with Eden?**

It was pointed out in the first part of this article (Part 1, December 1993 *Perspectives*, pp. 241-251) that the Bible implies irrigation for Adam's garden, probably via canal from Eden (Gen. 2:8,10). In 1948-1949, Fuad Safer examined several mounds just outside of Eridu, and reported:

The mounds were found to lie on the banks of the bed of a wide canal which, in ancient times, was undoubtedly connected with the River Euphrates. The recognition of this canal and the tracing of its course are now extremely difficult, as it has been filled with sand and soil drifted in from the surrounding plain.

The course of the canal crosses the flat depression of Eridu from north-west to south-east and its nearest point to Eridu is about 3 kilometers from the south-west of that site.

In other words, a branch canal from the main canal west of the city to water a garden located east of the city would have flowed through that city, exactly as stated in Genesis 2:8,10.

The Sumerian word, "edin" means "plain," "prairie," or "desert."<sup>14</sup> "Eden" probably was derived from this Sumerian word. Eridu is the earliest known settlement in Southern Mesopotamia, at about 4800 BC.<sup>15</sup> The Sumerians also regarded Eridu as a sacred city. Could Eridu be synonymous with Eden? The time and place are an excellent fit.

## Traveling On

Eridu is identified as the home of Adapa. However, he is also called "the Erechian."<sup>16</sup> This, coupled with the disappearance of Eridu ware, may indicate a relocation from Eridu to Erech (Uruk). Eridu is older by some 600 years than Erech, which has been dated to around 4200 BC. Adapa's reason for moving 50 miles north may have been that Eridu was sacked. According to the Sumerian king list, the kingship was overthrown and a new king came to power at Badtabira.

Uruk was first settled around 4200 B. C. by the Ubaid people, and at the lower levels it seems to be a characteristically Ubaid site. But beginning around 3500 B. C. , there is evidence of major changes which some archaeologists believe were characteristic of a new culture and others believe represented an indigenous evolution of the "Ubaidans."<sup>17</sup>

Erech was clearly established in the pre-flood period according to Sumerian accounts, and re-established after the flood. Erech and the city of Ubaid were located only 30 miles apart, and were contemporary cities situated about 140 miles southeast of Babylon.<sup>18</sup>

## Alias Adam

In addition to the Bible, possible variations of the name Adam appear elsewhere. On a Sumerian list of ten pre-flood kings ending in Ziusudra (the Sumerian Noah), first on the list is a king named "Alulim."

*When the kingship was lowered from heaven  
the kingship was in Eridu.  
In Eridu Alulim became king...*<sup>19</sup>

Adapa (created by the god Ea) and Alulim (king by heavenly decree) are both placed at Eridu. If Eridu is Eden, then Adapa, Alulim, and Adam could all be the same man. Conversely, if Adapa, Alulim, and Adam are the same person, Eridu should be Eden, since the Sumerian, Accadian, and Assyrian texts place him at Eridu.

A clay tablet was recovered in excavations at Khorsabad in 1933-34. It contains a list of Assyrian kings beginning with "seventeen kings who lived in tents"<sup>20</sup> " probably nomads.

"Tudia" tops the list of kings, followed by "Adamu," probably a namesake of his famous forefather. Farther down the list we find the 38th king, "Puzar-Assur." He was one of many Assyrian kings named in honor of a more immediate forefather, Asshur of Genesis 10:11. This same naming pattern is seen in regards to a descendant of Cain in Genesis 4:22 - Tubal-cain.

Another list of pre-flood kings is attributed to the Babylonian priest, Berossus. He lists "Alorus" first on the list of ten pre-flood kings. According to Berossus, Alorus was "appointed by God as Shepherd of men."

The title, "the Son of God," reserved for Sumerian royalty, is also used for "Adamu."<sup>21</sup> This title is identical to that used of Adam in Luke 3:38, where the genealogy of Christ culminates in "Adam, the son of God."

In Egypt, the pyramids of kings Mer-ne-Re and Nefer-ka-Re were inscribed with a dedication dating to about 2400 BC (many centuries before Moses). The text speaks of a first creation and a deified "Atum" who was on a primeval hill arising "out of the waters of chaos." Among those "whom Atum begot," according to the inscription, is one named "Seth."<sup>22</sup>

Could Alorus, Adapa, Alulim, Adamu, Atum, and Adam be all the same person? Perhaps a better question would be, what rationale could be employed to explain away the commonalities? At least some of these secular references must pertain to the first man in biblical history. If these Egyptian, Sumerian, Accadian, Amorite, and Hebrew variations all refer to one man "the most obvious conclusion" then this not only establishes an historical Adam, a.k.a. Adamu, Atum, etc. , but the time and the place is also confirmed, and in complete harmony with the Genesis text!

It should come as no surprise that Egyptian inscriptions, Sumerian legends, and Amorite epics would be based upon historical persons and events. The Sumerians could have learned about Adamic history from two sources; from their own forefathers, who may have lived side by side with Adamites, and from their Semite neighbors, direct descendants of Adam. Many times the Sumerians were subjects of Semitic kings; the great Sargon, for example, began his reign over the entire region in 2371 BC. Adam and his successors also may have ruled over the Ubaidans, who may have been ancestral to the Sumerians.

The Amorites (Gen. 10:16) were descendants of Canaan, Noah's grandson. They must have passed the history of their forefathers down through their generations just as the Israelites did, but distortions and embellishments resulted from centuries of retelling. There was a special purpose in protecting the accuracy of the creation narrative handed down through the line of promise from Shem to Abraham, and through to Moses. Parallel accounts, similar but contorted, can only increase our confidence in the historical value of the Genesis narrative.

## **Enoch City**

If Cain's wife did not come from Adam's line (a question we examined in Part 1), then she must have resided in a nearby settlement of people, probably Ubaidan, whom Cain had originally feared, and for whom Cain was given his mark.

And Cain knew his wife and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he built a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch. (Genesis 4:17)

Perhaps partly because Cain was long lived, he was recognized as a special or unique person, as evidenced by his overseeing the building of a city. A city would have been quite inappropriate for only three people, but a city might have been necessary to accommodate a growing community that included his wife's relatives.

Naming the city "Enoch" may seem like Bible trivia, but it is not without significance. According to the Sumerians, kingship resumed at Kish after the flood. Twenty-three kings ruled there until, "Kish was smitten with weapons; its kingship to E-Anna(k) was carried."<sup>23</sup> In *The Makers of Civilization*, Waddell translated E-Anna(k) directly as "Enoch," reckoning it as the Sumerian equivalent for Enoch, the city Cain built.<sup>24</sup>

Although the flood erased the early inhabitants, the Sumerians re-established Enoch and other pre-flood cities. It was here Mes-kiag-gasher became high priest and king and reigned 324 years.<sup>25</sup> His son, Enmerkar, built or continued building Uruk, the biblical Erech, part of Nimrod's kingdom (Gen. 10:10).

E-Anna(k), "the House of Heaven," is the oldest preserved temple at Uruk, and was supposedly the dwelling place of the goddess Inanna, the Accadian "Ishtar."<sup>26</sup>

If at the destruction of Eridu, Adam and his kin journeyed to Erech, then this placed the children of Seth at Erech as near to the Cainites at the city of Enoch as Brooklyn is to the Bronx. Driver took note of the remarkable similarity of the names in both lines of descent.<sup>27</sup> Compare Sethites: Enosh, Mahalalel, Methuselah, and Lamech with Cainites: Enoch, Mehujael, Methushael, and Lamech. The similarities in names are understandable if they lived in close proximity.

E-Anna(k), now called "Eanna" by archaeologists, has been excavated. A deep sounding was made in the Eanna precinct at Warka in 1931-32. The pottery was identified as Ubaid from level eighteen up to level fourteen. It transitioned to the Uruk period by level ten. Woolley's analysis was that the pottery from the earliest period he found at Ur (which he called "Al 'Ubaid I") was unrepresented at Warka,<sup>28</sup> demonstrating that both Ur and Eridu were established before E-Anna(k). And, of course, Adam's Eden would have been older than Enoch, the city Cain built.

The important point is that some of the details omitted from the biblical text are filled in by the Sumerians, confirming not only the existence of the cities of Enoch and Erech, but also pinning down the time and the location.

### **Pre-Flood Cities Are Also Post-Flood Cities**

It is especially noteworthy when we find a city such as Enoch, which the Sumerians clearly identified as existing after the flood, and which the Bible also ties to the pre-flood period. For one thing, it indicates the limited scope and breadth of the flood itself. Conversely, Erech, mentioned by the Bible in the post-flood period, has been excavated to reveal a culture dating to 4200 BC, over a thousand years before the flood. Likewise, Ur, the home of Abraham's youth, had pre-flood beginnings, and was contemporary with Eridu. Furthermore, Asshur built Nineveh after the flood (Gen. 10:11) on an existing city that dates to the pre-flood era, and had been called "Ninua" before the Semites arrived.<sup>29</sup>

This illustrates that at least four biblical cities that began before the flood were resettled by Sumerians and Semites after the flood. Thus we have confirmation that the entirety of Genesis 2-11 is confined to the Mesopotamian environs, both the pre-flood and the post-flood periods; and that none of the human history contained in the Bible predates 5000 BC.

Sumerian king lists also demonstrate the longevity of their sovereigns. In the pre-flood period, they reigned for legendary thousands of years.<sup>30</sup> After the flood, kings reigned for hundreds of years tapering off to mere mortal proportions in later periods.<sup>31</sup> The trend jibes with the records in Genesis.

Although the tablets are recorded in Sumerian, some of these kings bear Semetic (Adamic) names. Cain is the only explicit pre-flood example given by the Bible, but he fits the motif of long-lived, non-Sumerian rulers who reigned over Ubaidan and Sumerian subjects. Nimrod and Asshur are biblical post-flood examples.

## Of Patriarchs and Kings

When the Sumerian king lists began to surface, there was a rush to show that these were the source of the biblical patriarchs in Genesis 5. The close companion to the Sumerian versions, the Berossus list, was analyzed by the Assyriologist Zimmern, who concluded:

It can hardly be doubted that the Biblical tradition of Gen. 5 (P) concerning the antediluvian patriarchs is basically identical with the Babylonian tradition about ten antediluvian primeval kings.<sup>32</sup>

At the other extreme, G. F. Hasel made a comparative study and found, "a complete lack of agreement and relationship"<sup>33</sup> between Genesis 5 and 11 and the Sumerian kings. As is often the case, the truth may be found somewhere in between. The patriarchs and kings cannot be "basically identical" for reasons we shall see. On the other hand, there is sufficient agreement between the Sumerian kings and the Genesis 5 patriarchs that to say there is "a complete lack of agreement" is equally erroneous

## Deriving a Revised King List

In order to use just one list of kings for comparison purposes, we will revise the king list known as W-B 62 in four steps, taking into account another primary list (W-B 444), and five other lists of pre-flood kings (not shown). **Table 1** (below) shows the results.

*Step 1.* Misplacing names was a common scribal error. Using the other lists as a corrective measure, the fragmented "-kidunnu" is replaced with Enmenluanna, moving him from seventh on the list to third. This squares with WB-444.

*Step 2.* As a result of step 1, the kings at positions 8 and 9 are moved up one notch to take positions 7 and 8.

*Step 3.* The fragmented "-alimma" is replaced with Enmengalanna from W-B 444.

*Step 4.* Suruppak is inserted at position 9 to reflect his status as an intermediate generation. Ubartutu was the reigning king immediately preceding Ziusudra, but Ubartutu was Ziusudra's grandfather, according to Sumerian texts. Ziusudra's father was Suruppak.<sup>34</sup>

With these four corrective measures, we have a revised king list.

## Observations

**Table 2** is a "spreadsheet" of the pre-flood patriarchs, the revised list of pre-flood kings with the cities in which they reigned, the Berossus list, and two other king lists (for comparison purposes).

One transposition has been performed on the Berossus list. Both Amempsinos and Ensibzianna are identified as king of Larak. Since Larak was "clearly the third city" according to Langdon,<sup>35</sup> this suggests the Berossus list has Amempsinos out of order with Edoranchus.

Let us start with some preliminary observations. First, the genealogies in Genesis are just that: the early fathers of the Semites. The Sumerian king lists represent Semite (Adamite) and Sumerian kings, although there is some disagreement among experts as to which is which. At any rate, as the king lists represent rulers, no purely ancestral relationships are implied, even though royal offspring often ascend the throne.

Second, the thousands of years the pre-flood kings reigned looks to be an error in interpretation rather than a recording error. This can be deduced from the post-flood kings at Kish. After "the flood swept thereover," and the kingship was restored, 23 kings reigned a total of 24,510 years - plus, if you can believe it, 3 months and 3 1/2 days! (Archbishop Ussher<sup>36</sup> must have had a Sumerologist counterpart.)

Using the archaeological date of 2900 BC for the flood, that would mean the kings of Kish are still ruling today, and have another 19,000 years to go! Where is the error? The years the post-flood Sumerian kings reigned appear to be off by a factor of about 60. The Sumerians used a sexagesimal system of numbers, and that offers a clue as to how astronomical figures may be brought into the realm of believability. Dividing by 60 puts the total years reigned at Kish at a little over 400, a reasonable figure. It can get more

complex than that (they may have relied on moon phases rather than sun cycles, etc.), but it's not something we need to dwell on here.

To assert that the Bible genealogies are unrelated to the Sumerian kings because of a discrepancy in the hundreds of years of life for the patriarchs, versus the thousands of years reigned for the pre-flood kings, misrepresents the case. It should not be surprising that Sumerologists have been every bit as prone to error as Bible translators, and similarly reluctant to make corrections.<sup>37</sup>

Third, confusion can arise when more than one name pertains to a single individual. Among the difficulties is that titles or occupations have been used at times, rather than proper names, and will look dissimilar, especially when recorded in different languages. There are many instances where the Bible itself uses more than one name for one person, for example: Abram = Abraham, Jacob = Israel, Saul = Paul, Peter = Simon = Cephas, and even: Jesus = Emmanuel (corresponding, perhaps, to the Accadian "Ea").

Fourth, Adam is a virtual shoo-in as Alulim at Eridu. Seth, or conceivably Enosh, could be the second king, Alalgar. But the fourth patriarch, Cainan, does not and should not appear on the king lists. Eridu was overthrown. Kingship passed to the victorious city - a Sumerian city - Badtabira. A Sumerian city at that early date was probably devoid of foreigners speaking strange languages. The three kings of Badtabira should *not* be in the Adamic line.

So a dissimilarity is what we should expect concerning those three kings, and that is the case. Also, no connection can be seen between any of the kings and Jared, or with Mahalalel outside of Berossus. This sets apart at least three or four out of the ten patriarchs as absent from the Sumerian king lists, and that is about as far as dissimilarity can be extended.

Finally, there are complicating factors. The genealogies are in Hebrew, while the king lists are in Sumerian, an unrelated language, and Berossus wrote in Greek. Still, these are not insurmountable obstacles. In **Table 3** we will see that the list of patriarchs and the lists of kings are not completely independent: there is a relationship.

### **Line-by-line Explanation**

*Line 1.* Isn't there as much similarity between Adam and Alulim as there is between Richard and Ricardo? Parallels between the Sumerian Alulim, the Accadian Adapa, and the Hebrew Adam point toward a commonality. Clay proposed that Alorus from the Berossus list was "El-Or" found in early Aramaic inscriptions<sup>38</sup> and therefore, a Semitic (Adamic) name. Who would have been the first father or king of the forerunners to the Semites if not Adam? And if Adam, special in many respects, was in residence at Eridu from the start, who better to serve as king?

*Line 2.* Some scholars make the connection: Alaparos = Adapa = Adam, making Adam the *second* king. This raises a question. If Adam was the second king, who was the first?

It seems equally reasonable to suggest that Seth, or one of Adam's other sons, or even Enosh, could have been this monarch.

Alalgar may have been one of Adam's offspring. There is no way of knowing, but Poebel credits Berossus's Alaparas as the "son of" Alorus.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, if the first king at Eridu was Adam, a non-Sumerian, the next king, if directly related, would also have been non-Sumerian. Keep in mind, the first two names, Alulim and Alalgar, are Semitic (or Adamic), not Sumerian names.

The Semitic (Adamic) name Alalgar is entirely appropriate as applied to the covenant family. Among the meanings offered for Alaparas are "Ox of the god Uru," and "Lamb of El."<sup>40</sup> "El," Assyrian for God, (and seen in Hebrew as "Elohim," "El Shadai") was the father god, first in the early Accadian trinity. Thus, the name could be literally rendered "Lamb of God." This description of profound theological significance used of Jesus (John 1:29,36) might have been applied to Seth, or even Enosh, when men began "to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. 4:26). Seth, one of his brothers, or his son may have been this second pre-flood king.

*Line 3.* Alalgar's rule was closed out when Eridu was overthrown and kingship passed to the victorious Enmenluanna, king of Badtabira, a Sumerian city. It would be shocking to think that one of Adam's immediate generations (for example, Enosh) would have made war on his own father or grandfather. Also, Enmenluanna is a Sumerian name, making him the first genuine Sumerian on the Sumerian king list. It follows that a non-Adamic ancestry would be implied for this Badtabiran king and his successors.

Considering Adam's longevity (930 years), he and at least some of his kin must have escaped the bloodshed at Eridu. A move north of about 50 miles to Erech, adjacent to Enoch (the city Cain built), would have brought Adam to a location where he and his family could find refuge and safety among family members.

*Line 4.* From the name Enmengalanna, we might suspect he was son and successor to the throne of Enmenluanna. Adamic ancestry is therefore equally unlikely, and is reflected by a dissimilarity between his name and that of the fourth patriarch, Cainan.

*Line 5.* Clay allowed, "It seems that Mahalal-El may be represented by Megalaros..."<sup>41</sup> A link between Mahalalel and the fifth king on the Berossus list looks credible, but he is probably not the fabled Dumuzi, who corresponds to Daonus, sixth on the Berossus list. Also, Dumuzi and Daonus are identified as "a shepherd" and "the shepherd."<sup>42</sup> Dumuzi was consort to Inanna "queen of heaven and earth." W-B 444 offers no additional data on any of its kings with a single exception, declaring Dumuzi "divine," and his vocation as "the shepherd."<sup>43</sup> "Tammuz," the Semitic name for Dumuzi,<sup>44</sup> was famous in Accadian literature, with a cult following to rival that of Elvis today.

In the Accadian legend, Adapa gained entrance to heaven by flattering Tammuz. "At the gate of Anu," Adapa told Tammuz how much he was missed on earth.<sup>45</sup> A thirty-eight line

liturgical hymn to the departed Tammuz "represents the people wailing for the lord of life who now sleeps in the lower world."<sup>46</sup>

The prophet Ezekiel had a vision where he was "brought to the door of the gate of the Lord's house," and "there sat women weeping for Tammuz" (Eze. 8:14). Thus the prophet Ezekiel bestowed biblical recognition on the celebrated Dumuzi, the fifth Sumerian king.

*Line 6.* Demonstrating that kingships were temporary and easily terminated in the land of Sumer, "kingship passed to Larak" when Badtabira was overthrown, and Ensipazianna became king.<sup>47</sup> It is doubtful that Jared, sixth in the line of patriarchs, could have been king of Larak, almost assuredly an entirely Sumerian city at that early date.

*Line 7.* "Sevens" often indicate that something may be unusual or important. Here may be another example. In Clay's words, "This king (Enmenduranna) is generally regarded as the original of the biblical Enoch."<sup>48</sup> We might argue what he meant by the word, "original," but commonality seems apparent. Berossus has "Edoranchus," so all of these lists show a commonality.

Enmenduranna is deemed identical with Enmeduranki, sage and king of Sippar.<sup>49</sup> Zimmern, who first made the identification, said the name was pronounced "Evvedoranki." "Evved or Eved suggests the Hebrew 'Ebhed," Clay contends.<sup>50</sup> If so, this would dictate Adamic ancestry for the king of Sippar who according to Sumerian legend was taken by the gods and taught divine mysteries.<sup>51</sup> And, "By faith Enoch was translated (taken up) that he should not see death" (Heb. 11:5).

Another consideration is that Sippar was the cult center of the sun god. The sun completes a cycle every 365 days, which corresponds to Enoch's 365 years.<sup>52</sup> If Enoch was the king of Sippar who wrested power from Larak's control, and then was taken by God, a void would have been left in the kingship. Or perhaps someone not of good standing took his place. Either way, "Sippar was overthrown, its kingdom passed to Shuruppak."<sup>53</sup>

*Line 8.* The next three men on the revised list lived at Shuruppak until the flood, after which kingship was re-established at Kish. The Sumerian records show a direct line of descent from the king of Shuruppak, Ubartutu, through his son Suruppak to the last pre-flood king, Ziusudra. Ubartutu was Ziusudra's grandfather, while Noah's grandfather was Methuselah. Are Methuselah and Ubartutu one and the same?

W-B 62 ends in Ziusudra, although from W-B 444, only "one king reigned" at Shuruppak.<sup>54</sup> This was Ubartutu. If Ubartutu is Methuselah, who died near the time of the flood, this could explain the discrepancies in the two king lists. One list (W-B 62) recognizes Ziusudra, who, if he ruled at all, reigned for less than a year, or at most only a few years before the flood. The other list (W-B 444) gives him no credit for an abbreviated rule at Shuruppak.

*Line 9.* "With a brilliant name, let me make you famous," Suruppak told his son Ziusudra.<sup>55</sup> If Noah and Ziusudra are the same person, then unless he had two fathers, Lamech, the ninth patriarch, should be synonymous with Suruppak. One reason Suruppak never reigned could have been because his father outlived him. And Methuselah outlived Lamech.

*Line 10.* There is no need to recite the accomplishments of Noah. Legends about him are contained in ancient texts. The names may not look alike, gift-wrapped in different languages, and touching on different facets of the man: "he who laid hold on life of distant days" (Ziusudra); "he saw or found life" (Utnapishtim); "the exceeding wise" (Atrahasis); and "rest or comforter" (Noah).<sup>56</sup> But corresponding flood stories using these names, recorded in Sumerian, Accadian, and Assyrian, all parallel the biblical deluge. These remarkably similar accounts would be impossible to attribute to other than one man. Unequivocally, Ziusudra equates to Atrahasis, Xisuthros, Utnapishtim, and Noah.

### What Does It All Mean?

After a detailed analysis of Berossus, Delitzsch agreed with Zimmern and concluded:

The ten Babylonian kings who reigned before the Flood have been accepted in the Bible as the ten antediluvian patriarchs, and the agreement is perfect in all details.<sup>57</sup>

What Delitzsch failed to recognize is that agreement could be expected only in instances where patriarchs were rulers, or conversely, when the kings were also in the covenant line from Adam. Evidently, some of the patriarchs did reign over small kingdoms. Yet, concurrent kingdoms were also established in Southern Mesopotamia ruled by non-biblical monarchs. Clearly, it was the intent of Berossus and the king lists to record a sequence of kings without regard to ancestry, just as it was the Bible's intention to record a certain line of ancestry whether or not they were kings.

In Sumerian, the first two letters "en-" of a ruler's name denotes kingship in a way similar to the way "lord" does in English. The god "Enki" combines "en" for "lord" and "ki" for "earth" to mean literally, "Lord of the Earth." The Sumerian word "lil" can mean "air," "breath," or "spirit."<sup>58</sup> Enlil was second in the Sumerian pantheon after the father god, An. The possible interpretations of this name should be obvious. A parallel could exist between this Sumerian and Accadian god and our Holy Spirit.

If we survey the list of pre-flood fathers, in both the line of Seth and the line of Cain we see "En-" as the first two letters more often than any other combination (Enosh once, and Enoch twice). It is quite possible, then, that both Cain's son and Seth's son were rulers over Sumerian subjects. This offers another clue that the seventh patriarch, Enoch, was also a ruler.

One final thought. The Bible submits no data whatsoever on seven of the ten pre-flood patriarchs beyond their age when the first son was born, age at death, and that they had "other sons and daughters." Details beyond that are given for only three: Adam, Enoch,

and Noah. And the supplementary biblical information provided for each of them correlates directly to Sumerian and Accadian narratives.

Likewise, in all the Sumerian king lists pertaining to the pre-flood era, additional particulars are given on only one man, "divine Dumuzi, a shepherd." And he is the only Sumerian king, outside of the line of Adam, corroborated in the Bible by his Semitic equivalent, "Tammuz." All coincidence, do you suppose?

## **Giants in the Earth**

And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them; that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took wives, of all which they chose. (Genesis 6:1-2)

In light of all we now know this clearly describes the mixing of the Adamite populations with the Ubaidans and Sumerians. Has archeological discovery confirmed the mixing of covenant generations with non-covenant generations? Hawkes says:

Another break in cultural tradition and an acceleration in civic advance began around 4000 BC. Some historians believe that these changes were due to the arrival of the Sumerians on the plain, perhaps again coming from the north. Others do not accept a distinct immigrant group but see the Sumerians as an amalgam of all the prehistoric peoples of the region. The language, however, when it came to be recorded, does suggest a Sumerian tongue overlaying a more primitive one that might well have been that of the Ubaidans. It also contains some Semitic elements and it is likely that Semites were already drifting into the valley from the north.<sup>59</sup>

"Semites" technically refers to the descendants of Shem, because historians do not universally recognize Adam or Noah. Is it possible, though, that the Sumerian language contained not "Semitic elements," but Adamic or pre-flood Accadian language elements? If so, then the presence of those loan words in the Sumerian language supports Genesis 6:1-3.

We do know that after the flood, Semites spread out and encountered peculiar populations in their path (Gen. 15:20, Deut. 2:10,11, and Josh. 13:12, for example), but 4000 BC is pre-flood history.

There were giants ("Nephilim" in the Hebrew) in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. (Genesis 6:4)

The term "Nephilim" means no more to us today than does "the land of Nod" or "gopher wood." These are words of antiquity and will always remain obscure. And yet, the term "Nephilim," or "giants," seems to pertain to some kind of men who were different, were of ancient origin, and were well known at the time.

## **Noah's Wife Is the Key to the Ancestors Question**

For those who may wonder how all of us today could be related to a primordial ancestor who lived 100,000 years or so ago, and yet Adam, father to the Semites among others, could have been specially created, the Bible offers clues previously mentioned. Noah is the key to this seeming puzzle - or rather, Noah's wife is.

Genesis 5:23: "Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth." We have no way of knowing how old Noah's wife would have been, but she could have been in her teens at the birth of Shem. The flood took place in Noah's 600th year. His wife was still alive after the flood (Gen. 8:16,18), although there were no more children.

If Noah's wife was short-lived, she would have been past her childbearing years when the flood ended. This is the last passage about her. We do not know when she died, but Noah's drunkenness and lying naked in his tent (Gen. 9:21) might have resulted partly from his despondence after her death.

It is entirely possible that Noah's wife came from the indigenous populations (or she had mixed Cainite ancestry), and died before reaching her 120th birthday, although she could have lived a little longer.

Significant differences stand out between Noah's family life and that of the preceding patriarchs. First of all, starting with Adam, every one of the first nine patriarchs was less than 200 years old when he became a father, whereas Noah did not have children until he was 500 years old! This is too great a difference to be without significance. In all likelihood, Noah married late in life, very late.

All of Noah's predecessors had sons and daughters. Even post-flood patriarchs for seven generations after Noah "begat sons and daughters" (Gen. 11:11-25), but Noah had no other children after the three sons. Noah was unique in parenthood for some reason. The most obvious answer is that Noah's wife must have been unique. Noah married outside the covenant line.

Noah's wife and the wives of Noah's three sons must have had ancient ancestry. Their mitochondrial DNA extends back to ancient "Eve," preserving the links to the distant past.



Adam was specially created, responsible to God, and yet biologically compatible with other human beings who were already living in the region at the time of Adam's introduction. Adam could not possibly have started all the Near East peoples, let alone the human race, due to his late entry. Instead, he was placed in a locale which was already sparsely populated by that time.

Cain entered the world of flesh and took a wife. Sons from Seth's line, including perhaps male descendants from other sons and daughters of Adam, took wives from one or more

of the local farming communities, and possibly from the mixed line from Cain. This caused their subsequent generations to be mixed, being both of "spirit" and of "flesh."

The flood destroyed a multitude of men, and, of course, all of Adam's descendants except for Noah and his family. The judgment of the flood was brought down upon the Adamites, those who were accountable for sin. Other unfortunates in the vicinity were swept up in the tide.

Although Noah was a direct descendant of Adam, and "perfect in his generations" (Gen. 6:9), we are not told from where his wife or his son's wives originated. Someone had to be the source of the narrative of Cain and his line. The most probable source is Noah's wife, or maybe, the wife of Shem. Noah's wife, and the wives of his sons, must have had mixed Cainite ancestry, or simply came from the local populace.

Adamic ancestry accrues to only a small percentage of people scattered around the globe today. Traces of Adam's genes might be found in present-day Arabs, Jews, and their offshoots, and should have been present in early populations such as Amorites, Hittites, Canaanites, and others. But even among modern peoples who might have Adamic blood ties, there is still no escaping ancient history, and with it, ancient ancestry.

Some may claim Adam as a forefather, others may doubt it, and most just don't know. But, because of the intermarriages, even those who feel they can boast of biblical ancestors can also be assured that their roots may reach back 100,000 years or even beyond.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Noah Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), xx.

<sup>2</sup>Albert T. Clay, *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922), 39-41.

<sup>3</sup>"Semite" is the term archeologists and historians use to denote not only descendants of Shem, but also descendants of Japheth, Ham, or any of Adam's line in the pre-flood period (if such a person as Adam ever existed, or if there was such an event as the Flood). Thus, Canaanites spoke a "west semitic" language, notwithstanding Canaan was the son of Ham, according to the Bible. One might think "Hamites" would have communicated in a "hamitic" tongue. But the secular world does not recognize the Bible as being historically accurate. Therefore, "Semites" are universally recognized, but "Adamites," "Hamites," and "Japhethites" are not, shall we say, "politically correct."

<sup>4</sup>Gwendolyn Leick, *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Mythology* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 37.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>6</sup>Clay, *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*, 40.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>8</sup>James B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), 103.

<sup>9</sup>Claus Westermann, *Creation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 108.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>11</sup>Seton Lloyd, "Ur-Al `Ubaid, Uquair and Eridu," *Iraq*, n. s., 22 (1960), 25.

<sup>12</sup>John Oates, "Ur and Eridu, The Prehistory," *Iraq*, n. s. 22 (1960), 33.

<sup>13</sup>Fuad Safer, *Sumer* 6 (1950), 28.

<sup>14</sup>S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen & Co, Ltd., 1938), 38.

<sup>15</sup>C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky and Jeremy A. Sarloff, *Ancient Civilizations: The Near East and Mesoamerica* (Menlo Park: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc., 1979), 110.

<sup>16</sup>Clay, *A Hebrew Story in Cuneiform*, 41.

<sup>17</sup>Lamberg-Karlovsky and Sarloff, *Ancient Civilizations: The Near East and Mesoamerica*, 145.

<sup>18</sup>Yohanan Aharoni and Michael Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1977), 20.

<sup>19</sup>Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 71.

<sup>20</sup>Arno Poebel, "The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, (1942) Vol. 1, No. 3, 252.

<sup>21</sup>L. A. Waddell, *The Phoenician Origin of the Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons* (London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1924), 239, 253.

<sup>22</sup>Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3.

<sup>23</sup>Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 85.

<sup>24</sup>L. A. Waddell, *The Makers of Civilization* (New Delhi: S. Chand, 1968), 62.

- <sup>25</sup>Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 85.
- <sup>26</sup>Samuel Noah Kramer, *From the Poetry of Sumer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 174.
- <sup>27</sup>Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 80.
- <sup>28</sup>Lloyd, "Ur-Al `Ubaid, Uquair and Eridu," 24.
- <sup>29</sup>I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd and N. G. L. Hammond, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. I, Part 2*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 730.
- <sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, 107.
- <sup>31</sup>Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 77-91.
- <sup>32</sup>H. Zimmern, *Urknige und Uroffenbarung* (Gttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902), 539.
- <sup>33</sup>G. F. Hasel, "The Genealogies of Gen 5 and 11 and their Alleged Babylonian Background." *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, n. s. 16 (Autumn 1978), 361-74.
- <sup>34</sup>Bendt Alster, *The Instructions of Suruppak* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1974), 43-49.
- <sup>35</sup>Stephen Langdon, *Oxford Edition of Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. II (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), 2-3.
- <sup>36</sup>Archbishop Ussher calculated the year of creation at 4004 BC from his analysis of the Genesis chronologies.
- <sup>37</sup>One method of reconciling ages of Sumerian kings is outlined in an article by Hildegard Wiencke-Lotz, "On the Length of Reigns of the Sumerian Kings," *Chronology and Catastrophism Review, Journal of the Society for Interdisciplinary Studies* (vol. XIV, August 1992), 20.
- <sup>38</sup>Albert T. Clay, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923), 131.
- <sup>39</sup>Arno Poebel, *Historical Texts* (Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1914), 85.
- <sup>40</sup>Clay, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*, 132.
- <sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, 135.
- <sup>42</sup>Langdon, *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. II, 3.

- <sup>43</sup>George A. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), 347.
- <sup>44</sup>Samuel Noah Kramer, *Myths of Enki The Crafty God* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 7.
- <sup>45</sup>Stephen Langdon, *Sumerian Liturgical Texts* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1917), 42.
- <sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*, 285.
- <sup>47</sup>Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, 347.
- <sup>48</sup>Clay, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions*, 135.
- <sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 135.
- <sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, 136.
- <sup>51</sup>Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), 141.
- <sup>52</sup>Lloyd R. Bailey, *Noah: The Person and the Story in History and Tradition* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 125.
- <sup>53</sup>Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, 347.
- <sup>54</sup>Weincke-Lotz, "On the Length of Reigns of the Sumerian Kings," 22.
- <sup>55</sup>Alster, *The Instructions of Suruppak*, 43.
- <sup>56</sup>Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, 227.
- <sup>57</sup>Frederich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906), 41.
- <sup>58</sup>Samuel Noah Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981) 76.
- <sup>59</sup>Jacquetta Hawkes, *The Atlas of Early Man* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), 63-64.
-