

case must therefore have been due to another cause, and that was, in fact, the opposition of St. Paul.

Nowhere in Paul's later Epistles do we find any mention of speaking with tongues; and the same is the case in the post-Pauline writings. We read, it is true, once more in Eph 5<sup>18</sup>, 'Be not drunken with wine, but be filled with the Spirit,' but this has reference more particularly to the prophets. After a short time the nature of speaking with tongues was so little remembered, that though it was indeed not confounded with speaking in foreign languages, yet both could be associated as if they were similar in kind. Thus arose that conception of the miracle at Pentecost which now lies before us in Ac 2, and which has really a deep and true meaning. Will it not be true, indeed, in the future, that all peoples—those also of whom nothing was known at that time—will hear in their own language the proclamation of the mighty works of God? The author of the

conclusion to Mark's Gospel, whether Aristion or some other, had also no definite conception of the speaking with tongues, and, as we have seen, Irenæus had just as little. Tertullian, on the other hand, knew of the phenomenon in its montanistic form, which we can now say resembled that of the early Christians. It was, perhaps, even superior to the latter, in that the montanistic oracles, although spoken in ecstasy, and in parts needing explanation, yet as far as the individual words were concerned, appear to have been intelligible. That could not always have been the case with the speaking with tongues. Nevertheless, the Church has rejected this reaction, and rightly, for this rejection is but the application of Paul's axiom: 'God is not a God of confusion, but of peace' (1 Co 14<sup>33</sup>).

In conclusion, if our preachers should wish to speak again with tongues in the old way, not only the uninitiated and unbelieving, but also the best Christians would certainly say, 'Ye are mad.'

---

## The Antediluvian Patriarchs.

BY A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

In the *Sunday School Times* for 31st December 1898, Professor Hommel has an interesting article on 'The Story of Cain and Abel,' in which he points out that, while Abel represents the Semitic nomad shepherds, Cain stands for the cultured population of the Sumerian cities of ancient Babylonia. Cain is, in fact, 'the smith,' and, as I pointed out many years ago, the Cainites, or Kenites, were the tribe, or caste, of wandering smiths, among whom the secrets of the craft were handed down from father to son. The Assyrian equivalent of Cain is *Ummannu*.

The tinkers are still a wandering caste in the East, as they were in Europe during the Middle Ages. This will explain how it is that though Cain represents the settled Sumerian people of Babylonia, he can yet be described as a 'fugitive and a vagabond.' Can the 'mark' that was set upon him be a tattoo-mark peculiar to the caste?

Seth, who took the place of Abel, is a duplicate of the latter. He is the *Sutu* of the cuneiform monuments, the *Satiu* of the Egyptian inscriptions, that is to say, the Semitic nomads of the deserts

between Egypt and Babylonia, and of the plateau of Mesopotamia. The name must go back to the period when the ancestors of the Babylonians and Egyptians had not yet separated from one another, and when the wheat of Babylonia was being introduced into the valley of the Nile.

I believe that the Egyptian god Set—or rather, *Sutu*, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets show the name should be read—is merely the 'Sutu' god. At all events, Set was the god of the desert in which the Semitic nomads lived, and the name of the goddess, *Satit*, at the First Cataract is written in the same way as that of the *Satiu*, while her consort, 'Anuqit, is the feminine of the Canaanite god Anak. That the *Sutu* worshipped an eponymous deity we know from Nu 24<sup>17</sup>, where they are called 'the children of Sheth,' (just as the Ammonites are called the children of Ammi), and the Assyrian king Samas-Hadad (or Samas-Rimmon) invokes 'the god *Sutu-sar*,' 'Sutu the king' (*W.A.I.* i. 29, 18.), who is coupled with the god *Nabu-rabe*, 'Nebo the great,' in a text published by Dr. Scheil (*Z.A.* viii. p. 206). The form '*Nabu-rabe*,' it may be added, belongs to

the period of West Semitic influence in Babylonia, in the age of Khammurabi.

The antediluvian patriarchs are ten in number, like the antediluvian kings of Babylonia. This has often been noted, but what has not been observed is that both the patriarchs and the kings fall into three groups, which exactly correspond with one another. The first two Babylonian kings, Aloros and his son Alaparos, came from Babylon; their six successors from 'Pantibibla'; while the two last kings, Opartes (Ubara-Tutu), and his son Xisuthros, the Chaldean Noah, were from 'Larankha,' the Surippak of the cuneiform texts. Similarly, in the Book of Genesis the third and fourth patriarchs are merely a dialectic variation of first and second; in other words, Adam and Cain, for whom Seth is substituted in the Sethite genealogy, belong to the list as it was handed down by one tribe, Enos and Cainan to the list as it was handed down by another tribe. Adam and Cain (or Seth) thus stand just as much outside the biblical list as Aloros and Alaparos do outside the Babylonian one. The latter were foisted into the Babylonian list at the time when under the dynasty of Khammurabi Babylon first became the capital of Chaldea, and began to claim that the right of sovereignty belonged to it from the first.

This, however, was far from being the case. Babylon was one of the younger cities of Babylonia, and was a colony of Eridu, the seaport on the Persian Gulf, through which the elements of culture first penetrated into the country. The fact was acknowledged even by those who made Aloros of Babylon the first antediluvian king. Berossos tells us that it was from the waters of the Persian Gulf, and not from the Euphrates at Babylon, that Oannes arose each morning, bringing with him a knowledge of the arts and sciences, and consequently it must have been at Eridu and not at Babylon that Babylonian civilization first established itself.

Beings similar to Oannes ascended out of the gulf during the reigns of the six successors of Alaparos. Hence we may infer that the 'Pantibibla' of Berossos must be the Eridu of the inscriptions, however difficult it may be to explain the name. Perhaps it is intended to signify 'the town of books.' At anyrate, while the first two antediluvian kings owe their existence to the vanity of the natives of Babylon, and the last two are derived from the legends of Surippak, the inter-

vening six represent the antediluvian history of Babylonia as it was conceived in the ancient traditions of Eridu.

Now between the six antediluvian kings who belong to the traditions of Eridu and the corresponding biblical patriarchs there is a close relationship in names. The following table will make this clear:—

BABYLONIA.	GENESIS.
3. Amelon (Amilum, 'man')	3. Enos, 'man.'
4. Ammenon (Ummanum, 'smith').	4. Cainan, 'smith.'
5. Megalaros (for Megalalos).	5. Mahalaleel or Mekhuyael (Gn 4 <sup>18</sup> ).
6. Daños, 'the shepherd' of Eridu ( <i>rëum Eridi</i> ).	6. Jared or Irad.
7. Euedor-ankhos.	7. Enoch.
8. Amempsinos (Amil-Sin, 'the man of the moon-god').	8. Methuselakh or Methusael (Mutu-sa-ili, 'the man of the god').

In the list of the Cainites (Gn 4<sup>18</sup>) Enoch and Mekhuyael (Mahalaleel) are transposed, but this is because Cain is stated to have built the city of Enoch, and it was therefore natural to suppose that Enoch was his son. The name, which is variously written Jared and Irad, seems certainly to be Eridû, 'the native of Eridu.' As for the eighth patriarch, the fact that his name is purely Babylonian (Mutu-sa-ili) and not West Semitic, is very remarkable. The form Methuselakh may be due to a confusion between Mutu-sa-ili and Mutu-sa-irkhu, 'the man of the moon-god' (cf. the name of the king of Hamath, Irkhulena, 'the moon-god is our god').

With the eighth patriarch the list of Eridu closes, and the correspondence between the genealogies of the Sethites and Cainites on the one hand, and the biblical patriarchs and the Babylonian kings on the other, comes to an end. Lamech, whatever the name may mean, bears no relationship to Ubara-Tutu, 'the minister of the god Tutu,' whom the traditions of Surippak made the father of the Chaldean Noah, ascribing to the latter the translation to heaven, which in the Book of Genesis (and probably also in the traditions of Eridu) was ascribed to Enoch.

The name of Noah, however, must go back to the age of Khammurabi, when, as we now learn from the cuneiform inscriptions, names of West Semitic origin terminated in the mimmation. In Gn 5<sup>29</sup> it is derived from נחם, 'to comfort,' implying that it terminated in -m, and was accordingly pronounced Nukhum.

A. H. SAYCE.

*Dahabia 'Istar,' Assuan.*