ERIDU, DUNNU, AND BABEL:
A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY

by

PATRICK D. MILLER, JR.

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, NJ 08542

This essay focuses on some themes in two quite different myths from ancient Mesopotamia, one known commonly as the Sumerian Deluge or Flood story, discovered at Nippur and published around the turn of the century by Poebel (1914a and b), the other published much more recently by Lambert and Walcot (1966) and dubbed by Jacobsen (1984) "The Harab Myth." The former myth was the subject of some attention at the time of its publication and extensive analysis by Poebel, particularly in King's Schweich Lectures (1918). As Jacobsen notes, it has not been the subject of much further work except for Kramer's translation (Pritchard, 1955, pp. 42–44) and Civil's translation and notes in Lambert and Millard (1969, pp. 138–147). More recently, Kramer has given a new translation of the text together with notes (Kramer, 1983).

Both texts have now been the subject of major new treatments in the last three or four years by Jacobsen (1978 and 1984), and that is in a large sense the impetus for my turning to them. Indeed, I first became interested in the two texts when Jacobsen delivered a paper on them entitled "Two Mesopotamian Myths of Beginnings" at a symposium on mythology given at Sweetbriar College several years ago. His rationale for dealing with the two of them at that time was that each "in its own way stands apart and it seems to me, raises interesting questions of a more general nature—about composition, interpretation, and what happens when a myth is borrowed from one people to another" (1978, p. 1). Neither in his original presentation nor in the separate publications has Jacobsen made any association between the two myths other than that they both—like numerous myths—deal with beginnings. His original treatment of them together caught my attention so that I am in part interested in their thematic interrelationship, to the extent that such may be discerned, as well as how these Mesopotamian myths of beginnings compare with the biblical tradition about similar subjects. My primary attention will be devoted to the older text, now dubbed by Jacobsen "The Eridu Genesis"; secondarily I want to address the Harab Myth in

its relation to the Eridu Genesis. In both cases Jacobsen's reconstruction and translation and his analysis provide the basis for my discussion. For the Eridu Genesis I have examined and used the translation of Civil and Kramer as well as Poebel. There are, naturally, some significant differences in these translations. For the most part they do not affect the analysis given here. I am also indebted to Jo Ann Hackett for bibliographical references and for her detailed notes on the Sumerian text.

I

Jacobsen's reconstruction and translation (1981) of the Sumerian flood story, or the "Eridu Genesis," is based upon three texts (CBS 10675 = PBS V/1 [ca. 1600 B.C.E.]; UET VI 61 [ca. 1600 B.C.E.]; and CT 46.5, a bilingual fragment from Ashurbanipal's library [ca. 600 B.C.E.][1]) all of which are given according to his restorations in the notes to his publication. Elsewhere, he gives the following brief summary of the myth (1976, p. 114):

> This myth, the beginning of which is missing, described the creation of man by the four great gods: An, Enlil, Ninhursaga (here called Nintur), and Enki. After Nintur has decided to turn man from his primitive nomadic camping grounds toward city life the period began when animals flourished on earth and kingship came down from heaven. The earliest cities were built, were named, had the measuring cups, emblems of a redistributional economic system, allotted to them, and were divided between the gods. Irrigation culture was developed and man thrived and multiplied. However, the noise made by man in his teeming settlements began to vex Enlil sorely, and, driven beyond endurance, he persuaded the other gods to wipe out man in a great flood. Enki, thinking quickly, found a way to build a boat in which to survive the flood with his family and representatives of the animals. Ziusudra wisely followed Enki's instructions and after the flood had abated Enki was able to persuade the other

---

Special abbreviations used are: ARM = *Archives royales de Mari* (texts in transliteration); CAD = *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*; CT = *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*; PBS = *Publications of the Babylonian Section, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania*; TCL = *Musee de Louvre, Departement des antiquites orientales, Textes cuneiforms*; TRS = *Textes religieux sumeriens du Louvre*; UET = *Ur Excavation Texts*.

1. This text was first published by Jacobsen (1939, pp. 59–60, n. 113). More recently Lambert (1973, pp. 271–275) has published a copy and translation of this text with additional joins, and further sources have been published by I. Finkel (1980). The text is part of the Dynastic Chronicle (or Chronicle 18; Grayson, 1975) and, therefore, may not have belonged originally to the Eridu Genesis. Jacobsen is still probably correct, however, when he says that what originally was told in the lacuna at the beginning of col. iii or PBS V 1 "is suggested" by this bilingual fragment (1981, p. 519). For that reason it is included in the appended reproduction of Jacobsen's translation of the Eridu Genesis.

gods not only to spare Ziusudra but to give him eternal life as a reward for
having saved all living things from destruction.

Jacobsen's proposal to call this text "The Eridu Genesis" is appro-
priate and important. For while it was early recognized that the myth
indicated some relationship between creation and deluge (so Poebel and
King), the focus of attention was placed largely on the flood story.
Partly on the basis of his recognition of the connection of the Ur
fragment and the Ashurbanipal bilingual to the Nippur text, and partly
on the basis of his analysis and interpretation of the whole, Jacobsen has
gone much further in signalling the character of this myth in its full form
as being not simply a flood story, but a myth of beginnings on a scope
comparable to that of the Primeval History in Genesis 1–11. Indeed,
Jacobsen's study should serve the purpose of placing this myth on a par
with *Enuma eliš*, Atra-Ḫasīs, and the Gilgamesh Epic among Mesopo-
tamian literary remains that lie behind the biblical tradition. (There is
still further reason for insisting on the appropriateness of the label
"Eridu Genesis" over the more usual ones, but that will be discussed
below.) In addition to the change of name, Jacobsen has underscored
the significance of this text in recognizing that its various sources point
to a time span for the myth from about 1800 to 600 B.C.E., indicating not
only the range of its continuity in the literary tradition of Mesopotamia,
but also that it was a living myth or epic throughout the whole course of
Israel's history and the history of its literature.

With regard to Jacobsen's interpretation of "The Eridu Genesis" as a
whole, a question can be raised about the division of the text into "three
distinct parts, each apparently with its own theme and purport" (1981, p.
526). Particularly with large segments uncertain, that division into
nature versus culture (col. i and UET VI 61), the founding of the first
cities and their rulers (col. ii and the first part of col. iii, as suggested by
CT 46.5 or its like), and the story of the flood (the remainder of col. iii
through col. iv) must be held fairly tentative. I wonder if the first part
ought to be reduced so easily to the familiar polarity of nature versus
culture, particularly when Jacobsen acknowledges that there is no
tension here between two ways of life. More appropriate, I think, is his
suggestion that this section functions as a charter for the city state. But
if that is the case, then the line between the first part and the second part
is significantly blurred, and one must ask if they do not serve somewhat
the same purpose. The focus of cols. iv, v, and vi is clearly the story of
the flood, yet even here there are some important thematic connections
to the prior columns in the several references to kingship and the
description of the flood sweeping over the kab-du$_{11}$-ga (economic centers
or capitals). To this line of continuity I shall return below.

II

Before turning to the main line of discussion, I want to identify a point of comparison with the biblical tradition that is not central to Jacobsen's treatment of the "Eridu Genesis," but has to do with a subject that has been of much interest in the investigation of relationships between Mesopotamian and Hebrew literature and religion. In what takes place in the existing portions of cols. iii and iv, we are very close to some of the basic notions and conceptuality underlying Hebrew prophecy, that is, its mythic background in the conceptions of a heavenly assembly. Jacobsen has frequently called attention to the significance of the assembly of the gods as a factor in Mesopotamian mythology and religion. Here we have another instance. The fundamental authority undergirding the prophetic message in ancient Israel is the fact that the prophet has stood in the council of Yahweh, has listened in on the decisions of the heavenly assembly (for example, 1 Kings 22; Jer 23:18–22). The divine government is effected by the decisions of Yahweh in the divine assembly. The prophet has access to the council and is sent to declare the divine decisions. In col. iii the "Eridu Genesis" may provide us with a fairly close conceptual background to this mythopoeic phenomenon.

Dreams as a means of communication from the deity, either as a message or by symbolism, are, of course, common in ancient Near Eastern texts (Oppenheim, 1956a). We know that they were frequently a part of the "machinery" of prophetic revelations at Mari. In the Gilgamesh Epic, there is a dream sequence that forms something of an analogue to our text and is regarded by Oppenheim in his survey of ancient Near Eastern dream phenomena as atypical (1956, p. 196). Enkidu has a dream in which he "sees and hears the great gods deliberate in their heavenly assembly and decide that he is to die" (Oppenheim, 1956, p. 196; cf. ANET, p. 85–86). The appropriate section of the Eridu Genesis goes even further, however. Ziusudra, king and priest, is also a seer (*ensi*; cf. Oppenheim, 1956, pp. 221–25), a prophetic type of figure who fashions a statue of *Ṣidanu*, the god of giddiness, according to Jacobsen,[2] and regularly stands by it to induce ecstasy. In

2. Jacobsen (1981, p. 522, n. 14) gives a brief explanation of his reading of Ṣidanu on the basis of the Akkadian rendering of sag nigin in Šurpu VII.15–16. The word *ṣidanu* refers to a disease, either vertigo (so *CAD* Ṣ, pp. 171–72) or epilepsy (so E. Reiner, *Šurpu*, p. 36, ll. 15–16). Jacobsen refers to the appearance of Ṣidanu as one of the companions given to Nergal by Ea in the Amarna version of "Nergal and Ereshkigal" (EA 357.49). There *Ṣidanu* appears in a list of demons of disease. One notes that in the Egyptian story of Wen-Amon where a young man is seized with a divine ecstasy or prophetic frenzy, "the

the course of doing this, he has an experience that is at least auditory and may be visionary. It is specifically said to be "something that was not a dream appearing." As Jacobsen describes it, Zuisudra's "senses open up to the supernatural and he becomes aware of what is happening in the world of the gods: their arrival to assembly in Ki-ur in Nippur where the divine place of assembly, Ubshukkina, was located, their conversation and swearing of the traditional introductory oath to abide loyally by what the assembly may decide" (1981, p. 523). That it is not a dream is a way of underscoring the special ecstatic experience that is not like any typical dream experience.[3]

In all of this we are not far conceptually from the phenomena associated with much of Hebrew prophecy. Ziusudra does not stand in the divine council, as did the prophets, but he is given access to the divine assembly on an occasion when it is making decisions, and the decision is communicated to him, albeit privately, by one of the gods, Enki.

There are obvious differences between the phenomena of this text and those of Israelite prophecy, for example, the dual role of king and seer that Ziusudra plays; but the basic experience described here lies close to that which is at the center of the prophetic experience in ancient Israel.

It is also not unlike what one finds in one of the "prophetic" texts from Mari (ARM X9) where the *apilum* Qishti-Diritim reports to Shibtu a vision of the divine assembly where the gods and goddesses under the direction of Ea swear oaths not to go against Mari.[4]

III

In his treatment of the "spread" of the Eridu Genesis, Jacobsen takes up some larger relationships between this work and the traditions of Genesis 1–11. He has suggested that in both the Eridu Genesis and the Priestly source of Genesis 1–11 we have "a new and separate genre" (1981, p. 528) that he calls mytho-historical. While one needs to be

---

determinative of the word '(prophetically) possessed' shows a human figure in violent motion or epileptic convulsion" (Wilson, ANET, p. 26, n. 13). It should be noted, by the way, that the si of *en-si* is restored by Jacobsen (1981, n. 4, l. 21).

3. Against the reading of Jacobsen and Civil, who see the text referring to something that was not a dream, Kramer (1983, p. 119) translates line 149: "bringing forth all kinds of dreams, con[versing]." He also does not see any reference to ki ur in line 151. It should be noted that in the small fragment of the flood story found at Ugarit, Atra-hasis says that he knew the oath of the great gods "though they did not reveal it to me" (Lambert and Millard, 1969, p. 133).

4. I am indebted to my colleague, J. J. M. Roberts, for his citation and his translation of the text (cf. Moran, 1969, pp. 50–51).

chary of proposing a new literary genre and in such a case must define the proposed genre, mark it off from related types, and give sufficient examples to demonstrate its typicality, Jacobsen has gone a long way toward making his case. On the one hand, both texts deal with matters of beginnings or origins in primeval times and share substantial content with typical myths of the ancient Near East, for example, description of pre-creation state, creation of human beings, and the activity of the gods in creating and shaping the destiny of the human creatures. On the other hand, the two texts also share features that remind one more of historical chronicles. Among them are the continuous chain of cause and effect,[5] the large interest in chronology including precise figures for lengths or reigns and life spans, and stylistic features more characteristic of dynastic chronicles than myths and folk tales. As one such stylistic feature, Jacobsen mentions the way the decision to destroy mankind is expressed: "their kingship, their term, has been uprooted." This is terminology more appropriate to the end of a term of office of a king and his capital city than to the destruction of all mankind. Another stylistic feature that seems to reflect the historical style of the Eridu Genesis was first pointed out by Poebel. This is the comparatively frequent use of *ud-ba* (or *ud-bi-a*), "that day" or "at that time" (UET VI.61, ll. 3', 11'; PBS V/1, iii:15'; iii:20'; vi:10). According to Poebel, the phrase "directs the attention to bygone days in contradistinction to the present . . . to make historical facts pass in review before the listener" (1914, p. 66). He indicates this use of *ud-ba* is "a very common feature of historical poetry" and sees an exact parallel in the use of *ʾāz* five times in Judges 5 "to introduce some striking incident" (1914, p. 66). One could add to those examples the use of *ʾāz* in Exod 15:1 and 15.

---

5. Jacobsen summarizes this chain of cause and effect as follows:

> In the "Eridu Genesis" moreover the progression is clearly a logical one of cause and effect: the wretched state of natural man touches the motherly heart of Nintur, who has him improve his lot by settling down in cities and building temples; and she gives him a king to lead and organize. As this chain of cause and effect leads from nature to civilization, so a following such chain carries from the early cities and kings over into the story of the flood. The well-organized irrigation works carried out by the cities under the leadership of their kings lead to a greatly increased food supply and that in turn makes man multiply on the earth. The volume of noise these people make keeps Enlil from sleeping and makes him decide to get peace and quiet by sending the flood. Now, this arrangement along a line of time as cause and effect is striking, for it is very much the way a historian arranges his data. . . . (Jacobsen, 1981, pp. 527–28).

One notes that Atra-hasis seems to have a similar chain of cause and effect from creation through the flood, so this is not peculiar to the Eridu Genesis. But the latter narrative includes elements, such as the settling down in cities and the sequence of cities and kings, that are not a part of Atra-hasis. The scope of the narrative as it is reconstructed seems to be somewhat more comprehensive in its sweep of cosmic and world history.

What Jacobsen proposes about the genre of the Eridu Genesis is quite significant for the background of the Genesis materials and sets them more clearly in the context of myth and story-telling in the ancient Near East. One of the ways the early narratives of Genesis have been distinguished from ancient Near Eastern myth is that primeval time in those narratives is not really that. It is simply the beginning of history that continues in a sequence clearly connected and running in an unbroken stream down to the present. But that sequential "historical" character that is basic to the Genesis stories is exactly what Jacobsen discerns in the Eridu Genesis. Thus the divide between the biblical presentation and the Mesopotamian may not be so sharp as we have thought or at least that divide is to be located at another point (i.e., the nature of the divine world).

The particular strand of Genesis 1–11 with which Jacobsen compares the Eridu Genesis is the P source because of its tripartite division into creation of human beings and animals, its list of leading figures after creation, and then the flood, as well as its heavy interest in dates and chronology. One might add to those affinities with P the pious portrait of the flood hero.

When, however, one compares the Eridu and biblical Genesis material closely, there are several places where the affinities with the Yahwistic stratum are as striking as, if not more so than, those with P:

a) Insofar as one can reconstruct the creation section of the Eridu Genesis, it is more truly a narrative and less the formalized, almost theogonic stages of Gen 1:1–2:4a(P). The Priestly material as a whole reveals a paucity of independent literary narrative in contrast to the Eridu Genesis, which has a very strong narrative line.

b) The reconstructed creation section of the Eridu Genesis (UET VI.61), which describes the initial situation in "not yet" terms (that is, no canal, no ditches, no plow, no wool) is much closer in style and formulation to the opening part of the Yahwistic Genesis account. This is particularly true, of course, of the motif of the original nakedness of humankind.

c) The Eridu Genesis has a clear interest in cities. The material in P reflects no sign of this interest whereas at three points in J—Gen 4:17; 10:8–12; and 11:1–9—there is a word about cities (see below).

Now all of this does not take us in another direction from Jacobsen's analysis, but it perhaps needs to be put in another way, that is, in terms of the Priestly tradent building on the J narrative in the light of a Mesopotamian model. This would tend to confirm the direction suggested by F. M. Cross and others toward viewing P not as a separate narrative source but as a framing, systematizing, and supplementing of

the JE epic tradition. In any event, one must look at the full shape of Genesis 1–11 against the background of the Eridu Genesis rather than just the strictly P material or supplementation, whether P is source or tradent. What is clear and important is that there were Mesopotamian models that anticipate the structure of Genesis 1–11 as a whole and not simply one or the other of the possible strata or sources.

A further important outcome to this comparison of the Eridu Genesis and the Primeval History of the biblical Genesis is that it tends to reinforce the conclusion reached by others, to wit that the primary structural unity in the opening chapters of Genesis is from the creation through the flood, i.e., Genesis 1–9 rather than Genesis 1–11 (cf. Clark, 1971, pp. 205ff., n. 89 and the bibliography cited there). The Babel story in Gen 11:1–9 is not reflected in this Mesopotamian model and is clearly set in its place as a backdrop to the Abraham story (see below). It is a specifically Yahwistic addition that is indebted to themes and motifs of the Mesopotamian accounts of origins but is not reflected there as such.

At the same time, one should note Poebel's analysis of the authorship of the Nippur text of the Eridu Genesis:

> ... our tablet shows a remarkable affinity to the list of kings which is published as No. 5 of this volume ... It seems to me, therefore, sufficie:•tly certain that the two tablets were written by the same hand and probably were intended to form, together with one or two others, a series of tablets on which the scribe wrote an outline of the history of Babylonia from its earliest beginnings down to his own time. As each column of the king list contained the name of about thirty-nine or forty kings, the missing portion of the last column cannot have given the names of more than nineteen kings, but in all likelihood much less, as there must have been left some space for the summary and probably a colophon. On a rough estimate the list will thus be carried down to approximately the latter half of the dynasty of Babylon, and this then would likewise be the time when the list as well as the deluge and creation tablet were written (Poebel, 1914a, p. 69).

If Poebel is correct, then the Eridu Genesis would provide an even more extensive analogue to the biblical narrative which, via genealogies (Genesis 10) plus additional stories (i.e, Gen 11:1–9 and beyond) continues from the stories of origins on down into later times, that is, to the present, the time when the narrative came into being. The sense of a single story from the creation to the present may have existed in Mesopotamia as well as Israel.

IV

The other mythological text that has been the focus of a recent major study by Jacobsen is the Harab myth. Neither in his earlier presentation

of these two myths (1978) nor in his later separate publication of them did he attempt to relate the two myths to each other. In some very basic ways, of course, they are quite different. There are, however, features of the myths that merit examination and comparison in relation to the biblical tradition.

Both the Eridu Genesis and the Harab myth have to do with beginnings, the former more with the origin of the world and humankind, the latter more with the origin of the world and the gods. They both clearly reflect and are concerned with a movement in time. They depart from each other in that in one case the movement is from the beginning through history down to and past the flood (Eridu Genesis), while in the other case it is a movement through the year (Harab myth). But both start from the beginning and progress from there in one way or another, and the fertility cycle Jacobsen sees in the Harab myth is set within a linear or sequential movement, one that begins with Earth and Sea, ploughing god and herding god, and moves through a theogony from the olden gods until it reaches young gods who are now in charge. The Harab myth is in one sense a succession document, particularly in that it locates all this in the city of Dunnu, and the deities here are also rulers of Dunnu. The figures in the theogony are gods and rulers at one and the same time. Other theogonies (e.g., Sanchunyaton who has Kronos founding the first city Byblos) have some relationship to a city but few, I think, quite as insistently as this one.

In the Harab myth, in typical mythic form where those things that happened at the beginning are repeated at regular intervals, the linear and sequential (i.e., the level of the myth whose components consist of beginning, succession, the rulership of Dunnu, the movement from olden gods to young gods, and the possible moral growth) interacts with the repetitive and cyclical (i.e., the level whose components consist of the god representing dimensions of fertility and agriculture, and the sequence of months, which unlike years indicates repetitive rather than linear movement). But whether one understands the dates as referring to the monthly progress of the agricultural process (Jacobsen, 1984) or the days on which offerings were made to the deposed dynast (Lambert and Walcot, 1966), one must not be so impressed with the seasonal or festival character of the myth that one misses the origin and succession, i.e., the progressive and linear dimension, a feature that Jacobsen has lifted up more in his published discussion than in his earlier and briefer oral presentation.

All of this suggests that the Eridu Genesis and the Harab myth are similar in type. Jacobsen summarizes his understanding of the Harab myth as follows:

> As it stands, the story with which we have been dealing may be described briefly as a *dynastic chronicle* [italics mine] telling how a certain Harab built a city Dunnu, assumed lordship there and founded a dynasty in which son followed father, coming to power in extraordinary patterns of patricide and incest with mother and sister.
>
> A special perspective for interpreting the meaning of this curious chronicle is given, however, with the fact that all the members of the dynasty are gods; we are dealing with a *myth* [italics mine], therefore; and that the line of successive ruling generations seems to lead down to Enlil and his son Ninurta. The lordship of which the story tells would thus seem to be that held by Enlil in the storyteller's own day, that is, lordship over the cosmos as a whole, and the gods and events told about would all antedate Enlil, reaching back into the dark and remote ages before the present generation of gods and the present world order came into being (Jacobsen, 1984, p. 15).

Such a summary, which accurately grasps the myth, leads one to ask if in some sense we do not have here also a kind of mytho-historical text like the Eridu Genesis, with the significant difference that the Harab myth—in what is preserved—does not involve an interaction between gods and human beings. It does, however, reflect a chronological interest and sets this "history" of the gods (i.e., theogony) in the midst of a human city.

V

The above comments point toward the way in which the Eridu Genesis and the Harab myth most clearly intersect and one of the points at which they may be most clearly distinguished from the mythic materials in Genesis 1–11.

In his discussion of the second part of the Eridu Genesis, Jacobsen expresses himself to be somewhat at a loss as to the import of the list of cities and their kings and suggests that this section is in the myth for "pure historical interest" (1981, p. 526). There is more going on than that, however; the establishment and rule of cities is fundamental to both of these texts. The antediluvian cities referred to in col. ii of the Eridu Genesis play a major role in Mesopotamian traditions, as Hallo (1970) has demonstrated. They appear in many contexts. In one of the oldest pieces of Sumerian mythology (AO 4153, NFT 80; see van Dijk, 1964–65, pp. 39–44) the pre-creation stage is described as being a time when daylight and moonlight did not shine, Enlil and Nilil did not exist, and Enki and Eridu had not yet appeared.

A later text highlights Eridu and other antediluvian cities (with some changes in the list reflecting the later period). It is a bilingual version of

the creation of the world by Marduk, which, according to Hallo, is a part of the mouth-washing ritual (Hallo, 1970, p. 63, n. 80; for a translation see Heidel, 1951[2], pp. 61–63). What is most interesting here is that the pre-creation state is described (in summary) as a time or state when there was no holy house, no reed, no tree, no brick, no brick-mold, no house, no city, no living creature, Nippur not made and Ekur not built, Uruk not made and Eanna not built, the Apsu not made and Eridu not built, a holy house of the gods not made. Then in lines 12ff., the first act of creation is the establishment of Eridu with its Esagila followed by the establishment of Babylon and the building of its Esagila temple.

Eridu is here explicitly seen in relation to the creation, as is also the case in the Eridu Genesis, so that its founding and indeed the founding of all the antediluvian cities is related both to creation (as in these two cases mentioned) and to the Flood (in the Sumerian King List as well as the Eridu Genesis where the Flood sweeps over the bushel baskets).[6] Further, the antediluvian cities and other cities provide a structure or framework for the Sumerian King List—from Eridu through the ante-diluvian and post-diluvian cities to Isin. Hallo, Wilson, and others make a strong case for seeing this as the primary function and rationale for the Sumerian King List: "Indeed that List should more properly be called the 'Sumerian City List' in terms of its own summary ('11 cities which exercised kingship'). In its fullest form, the List begins with (the building of) Eridu and ends with (the destruction of) Isin, that is, it records the entire history of 'The City'" (Hallo, 1970, p. 66). Or as Wilson puts it succinctly: ". . . SKL is primarily concerned with the succession of *cities* (author's italics) through which kingship passed . . ." (Wilson, 1977, p. 81).

According to Jacobsen—and this has been confirmed by more recent discoveries—the antediluvian tradition of the Sumerian King List is not original to that list but has been taken over from the Sumerian epic contained in the Eridu Genesis and put on as a Prologue (Jacobsen, 1939, pp. 55–68). If that is the case, two things follow: a) the ante-diluvian city and ruler tradition is an important one or it would not be taken over; and b) the Sumerian King List has to be viewed in terms of that framework, which affects and shifts its focus and intention, as Hallo and Wilson have noted.

In the Harab myth, the antediluvian cities do not appear, but once again the myth has much to do with and in some sense focuses on a city,

---

6. Or "capital cities" if that should be the correct understanding of kab-du$_{11}$-ga.

in this case the city of Dunnu. Jacobsen says with regard to the locale of the myth:

> These findings, that the myth is so closely tied to a provincial town in the Isin kingdom are *certainly surprising* (italics mine) in view of its pretense to universal significance as a story of bygone rulers of all of the cosmos; we can see no other reasonable explanation for this conflict of local and universal than to assume that the story in its origins represents a purely local tradition concerned with Dunnu and the story of the local gods of its tomb-sanctuary, a simple herdsman's cosmogony of limited geographical horizon (Jacobsen, 1984, p. 22).

Here again, as with the Eridu Genesis, Jacobsen does not seem to have taken full account of the centrality of the city both as a cosmogonic motif and as a social institution whose significance is etiologized in various literary traditions, such as the ones under study here. The city was in Mesopotamia a center of power, and, even though kingship and the city or city-state were closely tied together, cities could stand against the power of a king. They were, as Oppenheim has put it, "The institutionalization of the desire for continuity in Mesopotamia" (1964, p. 79).

A city is the point of continuity in the Harab myth. A particular city, Dunnu, becomes the meeting place of heaven and earth, but in a quite different way from Babylon/Babel with its tower, whether in *Enuma eliš* or in Genesis (see below). Dunnu, therefore, claims its place in the cosmos. The succession of the gods is a succession of the rulers of Dunnu. The olden, dead gods even have their abode in Dunnu, and the building of Dunnu, the "eternal city" (Hallo, 1970, p. 66), or the "city of yore" (so Jacobsen for *Du-un-nu ṣa-a-te* in l. 6: Jacobsen, 1984, pp. 6–7) is a primordial act. It is not only that a city is built, but that it is an act of the creation. It takes place "in the beginning" (l. 1). The god and the goddess Harab and Ersetu build the city as a part of their creative activity. Indeed it is the second (or third) and concluding creation (ll. 1–6).

One can hardly avoid comparison with Genesis 2–4 and the picture or activity of creation set forth there. In the Harab myth, the re-creation state is "wasteland" (*harab*), not unlike the picture in Genesis 2 of a time with no plant or herb, no rain, nor anyone to till the earth. Both stories give primacy to the need to work or till the earth, Harab by doing that as the first creative act, Genesis 2 by describing the re-creation state as the absence of one to till the earth and then the creation of *ʾādām* to do just that.

As in Genesis 2, the first thing that is done in the creation is the creation of water, though in Genesis 2 it is sweet water to water the

plants ($^{\jmath}\bar{e}d$) and in Harab it is sea (Tamtu). But in the Harab myth, river, i.e., Idu (=Heb. $^{\jmath}\bar{e}d$), comes in the next generation as daughter of sea (Tamtu). Sumuqan "the shepherd god", is also brought forth in the initial creation, though in Genesis the shepherd does not happen until chapter 4:2. Still, one notes that in Harab we have at the beginning the god of ploughing, the farmer, worker of the earth, and the god of shepherding. Perhaps what is most interesting is that these two human functions and vocations appear in the creation in a *genealogical sequence* in both the Harab myth and in Genesis 2–4. In the former it is a genealogy of the gods; in the latter a genealogy of *humanity* (Adam/Cain and Abel)—an accentuation, I think, again of a feature to which I have called attention before (Miller, 1978, pp. 9–26 and 35–36), that being the concern in the biblical primeval history for the distinction between the divine world and the human world, more specifically the guarding of that distinction (cf. Hanson, 1977, p. 214; and Oden, 1981, pp. 197–216). The responsibility for tilling the earth (Genesis 2–4) and ruling and shepherding the animals (Genesis 1–2 and 4) is clearly a human responsibility. In some sense it defines humanity. So it is set totally in the sphere of the human. In the Harab myth, however, it is as much a sphere of the gods.

Equally significant is the next step in the creative activity. In the Harab myth it is the building of Dunnu, "the city of yore" conceived as a "pristine, heavenly city", according to a lexical text (Hallo, 1970, p. 66), of which it is also said that Harab gave himself title to the lordship there, Sumuqan "loved" it (*irāmmu*), and the succession of gods was laid to rest there. In Genesis, the next step in the creative work of Yahweh is not, of course, building a city, but the creation of $^{\jmath}\bar{a}d\bar{a}m$, who will build the city (Gen 4:17; Gen 10:10–12; Gen 11:1–9). Here, we come to one of the most significant contrasts between the Mesopotamian and the biblical stories of beginnings. In the former, the building or providing of the cities is a divine or a divine and human enterprise, i.e., the responsibility of gods and rulers, if we may take our clues from the Eridu Genesis, the Harab myth, *Enuma eliš*, and the like. In the former, Nintur institutes kingship so that the king may build the cities, a primary desire on the part of the deity (col. i, ll. 40–43), cities which are then given by Nintur to other deities, presumably as cult centers for their worship and service. In the biblical stories of beginnings, the building of cities is a subject of interest three times: Gen 4:17; Gen 10:10–12 (Nimrod); and Gen 11:1–9. All of these references, of course, have to do with the Mesopotamian centers. In all of the cases the building of cities and the interest in cities is a purely human enterprise and, as such, subject to the ambiguity of all human enterprises.

The city, or the cities, of Mesopotamia, therefore, play a central role in its literary tradition and quite specifically in the two myths under consideration here. That role is set in a variety of contexts:

a)   in relation to *creation* (e.g., the early mythological text that describes pre-creation as a time when Eridu did not exist [van Dijk, 1964–65, pp. 39–44]; the Eridu Genesis, which puts the cities where Genesis 1–9 does—between creation and flood; the creation part of the mouth-washing ritual text; *Enuma eliš*, where the building of Babylon and Esagila is the climactic and creative act of the gods to confirm the rule of Marduk and Babylon; and the Harab myth, which has the building of a city, Dunnu, at the earliest creation stages in the beginning of the theogony).

b)   in relation to the *divine world* (e.g., the Old Babylonian list of gods in TCL XV 10, which, according to van Dijk's analysis [1964–65, pp. 12ff.] pictures the pre-existence of an embryonic universe in the heart of which live the numina, the chthonic deities; this universe is conceived of as city, the "uru-ul-la", the "city of yore"; from it rises the heaven, An, who becomes "the lord of the city of yore"; heaven unites itself to earth (Uras) in a cosmic hierogamy; at a given moment heaven separates itself from earth; and out of the union of heaven and earth the great gods appear by way of "emersion").[7]

c)   in relation to *theogony* (Harab myth and TCL XV 10=TRS 10 god list—both theogonies).[8]

d)   in relation to *economy* (the Eridu Genesis?).

e)   in relation to *flood* (the Eridu Genesis, the Sumerian King List and the Dynastic Chronicle).

f)   in relation to *kingship* (the Sumerian King List, the Eridu Genesis, *Enuma eliš*, the Dynastic Chronicle, and the Harab myth).

All of this fits quite well with what we know of Mesopotamian history and civilization and the central place of the cities and the city states in that history from the third millennium onward. The city and kingship were intimately related, as the Eridu Genesis and Harab myth both underscore. Kings did not exist without cities, nor did the cities have a history apart from kingship. Individual cities might exist in loose relationship to kings or in tension with them. They could effectively challenge the king in various ways. But the builders and rulers of the great cities were remembered in the tradition as either kings, or gods, or both.

7. For a somewhat different treatment of this text see Jacobsen, 1970, pp. 115–117.
8. For discussion and bibliography of TCL XV 10=TRS 10 see Cross, 1976.

VI

When we turn to the biblical Genesis with these data and conclusions in mind, we find both a consonance and a dissonance. The antediluvian cities tradition is probably there in Genesis 4, and where we would expect it to be in light of the Mesopotamian models, that is, between creation and flood. It appears, as we have noted, in the Yahwistic stratum and not the Priestly source or supplementation. The tradition of the first cities, however, is quite submerged in the biblical story and present only in the note in Gen 4:17 that tells of the first builder of a city. That builder seems to be Enoch, who named the city after his son, Irad, "a name that is strikingly similar to the name Eridu," as Wilson (1977, p. 139)—along with others—has noted. The tradition (or text) is so unstable, however, that it can only be discerned by recognizing, as I think one must do even without supporting textual witnesses, a gloss in the text that has made Cain the city builder (despite the clear Yahwistic understanding of him as ground tiller, like his father) and Enoch the city (cf. Hallo, 1970, p. 64; and Wilson, 1977, pp. 138–141).[9]

So in Genesis 1–11, theogonic and cosmogonic elements and structures were remembered and used, as well as the first city tradition,

9. The textual reconstruction and reading of Gen 4:17 and 18 is a complex matter. One needs to take account of the relation of the Cainite genealogy to the Sethite genealogy in Genesis 5 (where Yered=Irad is the father of Enoch and not his son) as well as the effects of oral tradition on both lists. A few things may be said in a preliminary fashion about 4:17–18 textually and linguistically:

a. One would expect the subject of *wayehî bōneh ʿîr* and *wayyiqrā* to be the immediately preceding personal antecedent, inasmuch as no separate subject is given for these verbs. For Cain to be the subject, the reader would be required to move back in the sentence past the reference to Enoch and past two feminine verbs.

b. Cain is regularly identified in 4:1–16 *vis à vis* his vocation as one who tills the earth (*ʿōbēd ʾādāmâ*).

c. Gen 4:17–18a is formulated on analogy with 4:1–2, not on analogy with the rest of the genealogical listings of the rest of v. 18. This has several implications:

1. *ḥănôk* at the end of v. 17 is a secondary insertion.

2. *wayehî bōneh ʿîr* does not simply say, "He built a city" (*wayyiben ʿîr*), as one would expect if Cain were the builder. The phrase is identical in form to the vocational notices of Gen 4:2 where the first notice, *wayehî hebel rōʿēh ṣōn*, follows immediately after the reference to Abel's birth (*hebel* is mentioned as the subject because the sentence is paired with the notice about Cain's vocation). On analogy with this, *wayehî bōneh ʿîr* in 4:17 clearly refers to *ḥănôk*, not *qayin*. Cain's vocation, *ʿōbēd ʾādāmâ*, has already been explicitly identified. It makes no sense in context and linguistically to see him as *bōneh ʿîr* here.

3. The only explanation of the clause *wayyiwālēd laḥănôk ʾet-ʿîrād* that makes sense *in this context* is to see it as an explanation of the name of the city, which

according to Mesopotamian models. But "the tradition of the ante-
diluvian cities remained embedded, and for practical purposes concealed
within the context of the primeval history of mankind" (Hallo, 1970,
p. 66). That is not the case, however, in Mesopotamian literary traditions
early and late where the antediluvian cities, especially Eridu, and other
cities were remembered and played a prominent role in both mythology
and king lists.

The beginning of the cities is mentioned as a datum of importance in
the history of culture described in Genesis 4 and also in the post-flood
Yahwistic account of the building of the great Mesopotamian cities,
such as Babylon, Erech, Akkad, Calah, and Nineveh, by the mighty
Nimrod (Gen 10:10–12). The prominence of the city in the biblical
primeval history comes, however, in a quite different way in the struc-
ture of the whole, and that is in the story of the building of the city and
tower of Babel. When the founding of the city or cities as the center of
culture does emerge as a significant element of the mytho-historical
account, it is after the flood and another moment of breakdown in the
human story. (Note that the city that is founded, Babel=Babylon, is one
of the few that carries the epithet "eternal city" in Mesopotamian
tradition and is also one that replaces some of the original antediluvian
cities in a variety of later systematizations.)

It is clear that the primary focus of the story in Gen 11:1–9 is the city
($^{c}\hat{\imath}r$) and the city as cult center (cf. the Eridu Genesis). While the
attention of readers early and later is naturally drawn to the great or
high *migdāl*, the story more properly should be captioned "The City of
Babel". The phrase $^{c}\hat{\imath}r$ *ûmigdāl* is a heniadys, "city with a tower" or "city
crowned by a tower" (cf. Speiser, 1964; and Westermann, 1984). *Migdāl*
appears twice in collocation with $^{c}\hat{\imath}r$ but never by itself. The conclusion
of the story focuses only on the city: "They stopped building the city.
Therefore, its [i.e., the city's] name is called Babel" (11:9).

So Gen 11:1–9 is about the human plan to build cities and cult places,
or, to use Jacobsen's term, "cult cities". But such a move is seen as

---

has been given before the birth notice. "[Enoch] named the city after his son, for
Irad had been born to him." One could even place the second clause in parenthesis.
4. That the first clause is explanatory to the preceding and not simply a standard
genealogical note is seen by comparison with the rest of the verse, which proceeds
for three generations with the same form: *wĕ-X yālad 'et* Y. If the reference to the
birth of Irad were not a part of the preceding discussion about the naming of a
city after a son, one would expect at the beginning of v. 18: *waḥănôk yālad
'et-ʿîrād.*

precisely the opposite of divine plan and divine instruction, in contrast
to the way the Eridu Genesis tells of the building of the first cities.
Rather than the building of a great city and cult center being seen as the
divine intention or plan, it is perceived by the deity as human ambition,
the usurpation of divine prerogatives (contrast Gen 11:4 with 12:2 as
well as 1 Sam 7:9), again a violation of the distinction or separation
between divine world and human world. So the human effort is thwarted
by the divine command.

Like the Eridu Genesis, the Babel story in Genesis 11 begins in the
movement of a people from their wandering about (*benosᶜām miq-
qedem*) to settlement in a great city. In the Eridu Genesis, that move-
ment is at the command of the ruler-creator goddess Nintu, or the god
Enki, if Kramer (1983, p. 116) is correct in his interpretation. The
building of the cities with bricks is also at the command of the deity
under the direction of the king. There the goddess (or god) will put
peace. In Genesis 1, such a move is a purely human plan, understood
not as a program for divinely created peace and harmony but human
unity created out of hubris and the desire for autonomy.

The Primeval History of Genesis 1–11 thus varies from the Eridu
Genesis in several ways:

a)   The foundation of cities is a purely human enterprise in Genesis 1–
     11. It is either neutral *vis à vis* the divine world (Gen 4:17; 10:10–12)
     or a negative act, a potential threat to the divine rule (Gen 11:1–9).
b)   Kingship is democratized, as indicated by the Priestly description of
     the human nature and purpose in royal terms in Gen 1:26–28. *ʾādām*
     is king in the biblical tradition, a feature that has an echo in the
     Eridu Genesis expression about humankind: "their kingship, their
     term, has been uprooted" (col. iv 10).
c)   The negative act of human effort to build a city is the explicit
     backdrop to the biblical story of Yahweh's intention to provide a
     name and blessing not through the creation of cities, but through the
     wandering movement of an obedient people. Abraham is sent out.

The theme of the city does not, of course, disappear from the biblical
tradition. With the monarchy the cities, and one particular city espe-
cially, rise to prominence, but the Primeval History of Genesis does not
project this back to the beginning. For Israel, in some sense the city was
as viable and as ambiguous as kingship, as capable of fulfilling the
destiny of God for the human community (Isa 1:26; Zech 8:3–5) as
kingship was (e.g., Isa 11:1–9), and as capable of subverting that divine
intention as was kingship (Isa 1:21–23; Mic 3:9–12).

APPENDIX[10]

The Eridu Genesis
Restored and translated by Thorkild Jacobsen (1981)

Thirty-six lines missing from beginning of col. 1 of Nippur text (PBS V). Jacobsen assumes the account of creation of the world and human beings and then the following:

UET VI.61.   (as restored and translated by Jacobsen):

Lines 1'–2'   Mankind's trails when forgotten by the gods were in the high (i.e., not subject to flooding) desert.

3'–4'   In those days no canals were opened, no dredging was done at dikes and ditches on dike tops.

5'   The seeder plough and ploughing had not yet been instituted for the knocked under and downed people.

6'   No (one of) all the countries was planting in furrows.

7'–10' Mankind of (those) distant days, since Shakan (the god of flocks) had not (yet) come out on the dry lands, did not know arraying themselves in prime cloth, mankind walked about naked.

11'–15' In those days, there being no snakes, being no scorpions, being no lions, being no hyenas, being no dogs, being no wolves, mankind had no opponent, fear and terror did not exist.

16'–17' [The people had as yet no] king.

PBS V/1

	Col. i	Jacobsen's numbering
37	Nintur was paying attention:	1'
38	Let me bethink myself of my humankind, (all) forgotten as they are;	2'
39	and mindful of mine, Nintur's, creatures let me bring them back,	3'
40	let me lead the people back from their trails.	4'
41	May they come and build cities and cult-places, that I may cool myself in their shade;	5'
42	may they lay the bricks for the cult-cities in pure spots, and	6'
43	may they found places for divination in pure spots!	7'

10. For the convenience of the reader and with the permission of the author and the appropriate editors, Jacobsen's reconstructed translations of the Eridu Genesis and the Harab myth are included as an appendix.

44	She gave directions for purification, and cries for quarter,	8'
	the things that cool (divine) wrath,	
45	perfected divine service and the august offices,	9'
46	said to the (surrounding) regions: "Let me institute peace there!"	10'
47	When An, Enlil, Enki, and Ninhursaga	11'
48	fashioned the darkheaded (people)	12'
49	they had made the small animals (that come up) from (out of) the	13'
	earth come from the earth in abundance	
50	and had let there be, as befits (it), gazelles,	14'
	(wild) donkeys, and fourfooted beasts in the desert.	

36   line lacuna at beginning of col ii
Col. ii

85	. . . and let me have *him* advise;	6'
86	let me have *him* oversee their labor,	7'
87	and let *him* teach the nation to follow	8'
	unerringly like cattle!	
88	When the royal scepter was coming down from heaven,	9'
89	the august crown and the royal throne being already down from	10'
	heaven,	
90	he (i.e., the king) regularly performed to perfection	11'
	the august divine services and offices,	
91	laid the bricks of those cities in pure spots.	12'
92	They were named by name and alloted half-bushel baskets.	13'
93	The firstling of those cities, Eridu,	14'
	she gave to the leader Nudimmud,	
94	the second, Badtibira, she gave to the Prince and Sacred One	15'
95	the third, Larak, she gave to Pabilsag,	16'
96	the fourth, Sippar, she gave to the gallant, Utu.	17'
97	the fifth Shuruppak, she gave to Sud.	18'
98	These cities, which had been named by names,	19'
	and been allotted half-bushel baskets.	
99	dredged the canals, which were blocked with purplish	20'
	(wind-born) clay, and they carried water.	
100	Their cleaning of the smaller canals	21'
	established abundant growth.	

36 line lacuna at the beginning of col. iii. What originally was told here is suggested by the fragment from Ashurbanipal's library (CT 46.5):

(1'–5) In Eridu Alulim reigned 36,000 years (1'–4) Alagar ruled 10,800 years (1'–3) 2 kings reigned 46,800 years, Eridu's term. (1'–2) Eridu's term was commuted (shifted) (1'–1) in Bad-tibira Enmenluanna reigned 46,800 years (1') Enmengalanna reigned 64,800 years (2') Dumuzi the shepherd reigned 36,000 years (3') 3 kings reigned 100,000 years, Bad-tibira's term. (4') Bad-tibira's term was commuted (5') In Sippar Enmeduranki reigned 64,800 years (6') one king reigned 64,800 years,

Sippar's term. (7') Sippar's term was commuted (8') In Larak Ensipandzianna
reigned 36,000 years (9') One king reigned 36,000 years, Larak's term. (10') Larak's
term was commuted (11'). In Shuruppak Ubara-Tutu reigned 28,800 years (12')
Ziusudra reigned 64,800 years (13') two kings reigned 93,600 years, Shuruppak's
term. (14') Five individual cities, nine kings reigned 352,800 years, their terms. (15')
Enlil took a dislike to mankind (17') the clamor of their shouting . . . kept him
sleepless.

Col. iii

140	That day Nintur wept over her creatures	15'
141	and holy Inanna was full of grief over their people;	16'
142	but Enki took counsel with his own heart.	17'
143	An, Enlil, Enki, and Ninhursaga	18'
144	had the gods of heaven and earth swear	19'
	by the names An and Enlil.	
145	At that time Ziusudra was king	20'
	and lustration priest.	
146	He fashioned, being a seer, (a statue of)	21'
	the god of giddiness (inducing ecstasy)	
147	and stood in awe beside it, wording (his	22'
	wishes) humbly.	
148	As he stood there regularly day after day he heard	23'
149	something that was not a dream appearing: conversation	24'
150	a swearing (of) oaths by heaven and earth, a (confirming)	25'
	touching of throats	
151	and the gods bringing their thwarts up to Ki-ur.	1
152	And as Ziusudra stood there beside it he want on hearing:	2
153	"Step up to the wall to my left and listen!	3
154	Let me speak a word to you at the wall	4
	and may you grasp what I say,	
155	May you heed my advice!	5
156	By our hand a flood will sweep over	6
	(the cities of) the half-bushel baskets, and the country,	
157	the decision, that mankind is to be destroyed,	7
	has been made,	
158	a verdict, a command by the assembly,	8
	cannot be revoked,	
159	an order of An and Enlil is not known	9
	ever to have been countermanded,	
160	their kingship, their term, has been uprooted	10
	they must bethink themselves (of that)	
161	Now	11
162	What I have to say to you . . . . . ."	12

Lacuna from here to bottom of column.

Col. v
201 All evil winds, all stormy winds gathered into one   1
202 and with them, the Flood was sweeping over (the cities of)   2
     the half-bushel baskets
203 for seven days and seven nights.   3
204 After the flood had swept over the country,   4
205 after the evil wind had tossed the big boat   5
     about on the great waters,
206 the sun came out spreading light   6
     over heaven and earth.
207 Ziusudra then drilled an opening in the big boat.   7
208 and the gallant Utu (the sun-god) sent   8
     his light into the interior of the big boat.
209 Ziusudra, being a king,   9
210 stepped up before Utu kissing the ground (before him).   10
211 The king was butchering oxen, was being lavish with the sheep   11
212 barley cakes, crescents together with . . .   12
213 . . . . . . he was crumbling for him   13
214   14
215 juniper, the pure plant of the   15
     mountains he filled on the fire
216 and with a . . . clasped to   16
     the breast he . . . . .
Lacuna from here to bottom of column.

Col. vi.
251 "You here have sworn by the life's breath of heaven,   1
     the life's breath of earth, that he verily is allied with you yourself;
252 you there, An and Enlil, have sworn by the life's breath   2
     of heaven, the life's breath of earth, that he is allied with all of you,
253 He will disembark the small animals   3
     that come up from earth!"

254 Ziusudra, being king, stepped up before An and Enlil   4
255 kissing the ground,   5
255a And An and Enlil did well by him,   6
256 were granting him life like a god's,   7
257 were making lasting breath of life, like a god's   8
     descend into him.
258 That day they made Ziusudra,   9
259 preserver as king of the name of the small   10
     animals and the seed of mankind,
260 live toward the east over the mountains   11
     in Mount Tilmun.
260   12
Text breaks off near the end.

The Harab Myth

(Restored and translated by Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Harab Myth*. Sources from
the Ancient Near East. 2/3. [Malibu: Undena Publications, 1984], pp. 7 and 9.

Obv. (1) [Harab,] in the first [beginnings, took Earth to wife,]
           [to (found) a f]amily and (exercise) lordship [his heart urged him:]
           "We will cut furrows in the wasteland of the country!"
           [By] ploughing with their soilbreaking plough they caused Sea to be
              created,
     (5) [the fur]rows by [the]mselves gave birth to Sumuqan.
           His stro[nghold,] Dunnu (the city) of yore they built, the two of
              them.
           [Har]ab gave himself clear title to the lordship in Dunnu, but
           [Earth] lifted (her) face to Sumuqan, his son,
           and said to him: "Come, let me love thee!"
    (10) Sumu[qan] took Earth, his mother, to wife, and
           Harab, [his father,] he killed, and
           in Dunnu, which he loved, he laid [him] to rest;
           also, Sumuqan [t]ook over the lordship of his father, and
           Sea, his older sister, [he to]ok to wife, but
    (15) Gaiu, the son of Sumuqan, came, and
           killed Sumuqan, and in Dunnu
           in the mausoleum of his father he laid him to rest.
           Sea, his mother, he took to wife;
           also, Sea murdered Earth, her mother.
    (20) In the month of December on the 16th day he took over the
                                              lordship and the kingship.
           [Gaiu], son of Gaiu took Idu (River), his own sister, to wife;
           [Gaiu] senior and Sea, his mother, he killed, and
           [in the m]ausoleum he laid them to rest together.
           [In the month of January] on the 1st day [he seiz]ed the kingship
                                              and the lordship for himself.
    (25) [Kush, son of G]aiu to[ok] Ua-ildak (Pasture and Poplar), his sister,
              to wife,
           he made [the verdure] of the earth plenti[ful,]
           put it at the [disposal of fold and] pen
           [as fo]od for the wildlife and mo[ving (creatures)];
           [also,] he p[ut] (all) neces[sities] at [the disposal] of the needs of the
              gods.
    (30) [Gaiu and] Idu (River), his mother, he killed, and
           [in the mausoleum] he made them dwell.
           [In the month of February on the . . . day] he took over the lordship
                                              and the kingship for himself.
           [Haharnum, son of Ku]sh, to[ok] Bêlit-ṣêri, his sister, to wife,

[Kush and] Ua-ildak (Pasture and Poplar), his mother, he [killed], and

(35) [in the mausoleum] he made them dwell.
[In the month of Ma]rch on the 16th (var. 29th) day [he took over]
the kingship (and) lordship.
[Hayashum], son of Haharnum
to[ok X,] his own [si]ster, to wife;

[at New Year] he took over the lordship of his father, but
(40) he did [not k]ill him; al[ive]
he seized him, and ordered his city to hold his father captive, and
he was put in cha[ins.]

(lacuna)

(lacuna)

Rev.

[Nus]ku to . . . . .
[he inf]ormed [them . . .
[say]ing: ["Ninurta will exercise the kingship and the lordship . .]
"Yes" [answered . . . .
5' and Sharrat-[Nippuri . . . .
saying: [". . . . .
Ninurta [will exercise] the kingship [and the lordship . . .]
and . . . [
10' Enlil . . . [
Nusku . . . [
in the mi[dst] of the house of . . . [
and Enlil and . . [
Enlil . . . . . . [
15' Ninurta the Head(?) of . . [

. . . . .

. . . .

[. . . .] the Akitu festival of the mon[th of April . . .]
The (ploughman's) [work-so]ng [let him sound] shrilly [in the country]
20' Written [according to] a tablet which is a copy from Babylon and Assur and collated.
[(Composition beginning:) "Ha]rab". Complete.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, W. M. 1971. "The Flood and the Structure of the Pre-Patriarchal History." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 83:184–211.

Cross, F. M. 1976. "The 'Olden Gods' in Ancient Near Eastern Creation Myths," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God*, eds. F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, and P. D. Miller, Jr. Garden City. Pp. 329–38.

Finkel, I. L. 1980. "Bilingual Chronicle Fragments." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 32:65–80.

Grayson, A. K. 1975. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles. Texts from Cuneiform Sources* V. Locust Valley, New York. Pp. 139–44.

Hallo, W. W. 1970. "Antediluvian Cities." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 23:57–67.

Hanson, P. D. 1977. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96:195–233.

Heidel, A. 1951. *The Babylonian Genesis*. Chicago.

Jacobsen, T. 1939. *The Sumerian King List*. Assyriological Studies 11. Chicago.

———. 1970. *Toward the Image of Tammuz*. Cambridge.

———. 1976. *The Treasures of Darkness*. New Haven.

———. 1978. "Two Mesopotamian Myths of Beginnings." Unpublished.

———. 1981. "The Eridu Genesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100:513–529.

———. 1984. *The Harab Myth*. Sources from the Ancient Near East 2/3. Malibu.

King, L. W. 1918. *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition*. London.

Kramer, S. N. 1983. "The Sumerian Deluge Myth Reviewed and Revised." *Anatolian Studies* 33:115–121.

Lambert, W. G. 1973. "A New Fragment from a List of Antediluvian Kings and Marduk's Chariot." *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro De Liaghre Bohl dedicatae*. Leiden.

Lambert, W. G. and A. R. Millard. 1969. *Atra-Ḥasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford.

Lambert, W. G. and P. Walcot. 1966. "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod." *Kadmos* 4:64–72.

Millard, A. R. and W. G. Lambert. 1969. *Atra-Ḥasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford.

Miller, P. D. 1978. *Genesis 1–11: Studies in Structure and Theme*. Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series 8. Sheffield.

Moran, W. L. 1969. "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy." *Biblica* 50:15–56.

Oden, R. A. 1981. "Divine Aspirations in Atrahasis and in Genesis 1–11." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93:197–216.

Oppenheim, A. L. 1956a. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*. Philadelphia.

———. 1964. *Ancient Mesopotamia*. Chicago.

Poebel, A. 1914a. *Historical Texts*. Publications of the Babylonian Section, the University Museum 4/1. Philadelphia.

———. 1914b. *Historical and Grammatical Texts*. Publications of the Babylonian Section, The University Museum 5. Philadelphia.

Pritchard, J. B., ed. 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton.

Speiser, E. A. 1964. *Genesis*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York.

van Dijk, J. 1964–65. "Le motif cosmique dans la pensée sumérienne." *Acta Orientalia* 28:1–59.

Westermann, C. 1984. *Genesis 1–11*. Minneapolis.

Walcot, P. and W. G. Lambert. 1966. "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod." *Kadmos* 4:64–72.

Wilson, R. A. 1977. *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*. New Haven.