

message to man's existence. The reader soon gathers from the book that classic Protestant orthodoxy with its metaphysical system cannot leave the conflict with existentialism unscathed. If orthodoxy has erred, it has done so in overstressing the *content* of the Christian tradition as universally valid truth or dogma at the expense of ignoring man's need to encounter "here" and "now" in his own existence the message of this content.

After revealing the weak and strong points of existential theology and orthodoxy, Kuitert steers a clear course between and beyond the two. In his chapter, "Revelation Within the Mold of History," he shows how the reality of faith exists in the memory of the past and the anticipation of the future by saying, "In memory, one celebrates the past in its significance for the present and future, . . . and insinuates the past into his own life as the fuel for his hope" (p. 181). Thus, in one sweep he masterfully pulls the rug out from under existential theology's persistent concern for the all-inclusive "here and now." But he wishes us to remember that orthodoxy has received a favor by being reminded of the need to stress the application of the *heerigma* to man's existence in the present.

With skill Kuitert weds the objective and subjective in theology: He shows how NT content is handed down in the diversity of witnesses as the text becomes a transmission of *events* which were about human *beings*. This approach is one of his ways to steer between and beyond both existential theology and orthodoxy.

Kuitert does orthodoxy a favor by pointing out that "the fierce fidelity to the Christian tradition that orthodoxy exemplifies can be twisted into a legalism . . ." (p. 171). The reviewer disagrees with the author when he says that Christian truth cannot exist as unchangeable, eternal formulations (p. 171). Here he falls into the trap of existentialism itself with its relativism and subjectivism, which snare he has endeavored to deny in his study.

A very commendable service that Kuitert has performed has been to show that the dialogue between antimetaphysical and metaphysical theology involves real pragmatics. Thankfully he has translated this dialogue into understandable language. Kuitert's book deserves attentive consideration from every serious theologian and Bible student since he does not pursue a one-track theology but one which extracts the best of the two systems under discussion and formulates a new and significant theological dynamic.

Orlando, Florida

H. ELISON ADAMS, JR.

Lambert, W. G. and A. R. Millard, *Atra-hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1969. xii + 198 pp. 70sh.

This edition of the oldest preserved Old Babylonian epic with

all the available materials of the Babylonian and Sumerian story of the flood would have been impossible even half a decade ago. Until 1965 only about one-fifth of the Epic of Atra-ḫasis was known, while now over four-fifths of the whole can be restored.

The story of the recovery of the Epic of Atra-ḫasis begins with George Smith's volume, *The Chaldean Account of Genesis* (1876) in which he gave a general account of all the Babylonian literary texts he had discovered with excerpts in translation. The "Story of Atarpi," which is now known as the Epic of Atra-ḫasis, was among them. Only in 1956 did the Danish scholar Jørgen Laessøe finally remove the complicated problem of sequence, and thereby produce a story (J. Laessøe, "The Atraḫasis Epic: A Babylonian History of Mankind," *BiOr*, XIII [1956], 89-105; already Sidney Smith [*RA*, XXII (1925), 63-68] had recognized that col. ii should be v and col. iii should be reckoned as col. iv).

Those who have no access to the present edition and must still rely on the translations of E. A. Speiser in *ANET*, pp. 104-106, should note the following corrections: (1) The "Creation of Man by the Mother Goddess" which Speiser gives on pp. 99-100 is to be included in the Atra-ḫasis Epic. Of the two versions of this episode, part of that of the Old Babylonian has been re-edited with many improvements by Wolfram von Soden, "Erste Tafel des altbabylonischen Atramḫasis-Epos," *Or*, XXVI (1957), 306-315. (2) The late Assyrian version is part of the same tablet as Speiser's "Atrahasis D." (3) The column numberings of Speiser's D have been altered: The previous (i), (ii), and (iii) should now be read in the sequence of (iii), (ii), and (i), which correspond to (iv), (v), and (vi) in Lambert's and Millard's book under review, pp. 107 ff.

Once Laessøe had succeeded in establishing the correct sequence of the story, more text material was needed to fill out the details. This came forth by the same writers in volume 46 of *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* (London, 1965), consisting of two large tablets and many small pieces both Old Babylonian and Late Assyrian. To these are added in this edition still more new pieces, both Old and Late Babylonian, so that four-fifths (so A. R. Millard, "A New Babylonian 'Genesis' Story," *Tyndale Bulletin*, XVIII [1967], 4) is now available. The main edition used by the authors is the Old Babylonian Recension, since it is the most complete available to date. It was copied out in the reign of Ammi-saduqa (1646-1626), great-great-grandson of the famous Hammurabi, by Ku-Aya (former spelling was Ellet-Aya or Mullil-Aya), and consists of three tablets with eight columns each and a total of 1,245 lines. The text in transliteration and translation, each on opposite pages, of this main recension, is given on pp. 42-105. The Assyrian Recension, so called "because it shows Assyrian dialectal forms" (p. 6), comes largely from the library of Ashurbanipal. It was written on two tablets, not three, and is presented in the same manner as the Old Babylonian Recension on pp. 106-125. The authors suggest on internal evidence

"that the Assyrian Recension goes back to a Middle Assyrian original" (p. 37), but it cannot be ascertained whether it had a longer history in Assyria. However, there is hardly any question that it ultimately derives from the Old Babylonian Recension, not necessarily from Ku-Aya's edition, because there are fragments of Old Babylonian texts "which attest the presence of at least three widely different recensions" (p. 84) in the town of Sippar alone.

This volume contains furthermore the texts in transliteration and translation of two Middle Babylonian pieces, one from Nippur (pp. 126, 127, and one from Ras Shamra, *i.e.*, ancient Ugarit (pp. 131, 132). The former fragment (CBS 13532), is dated to the Old Babylonian period by the majority of scholars (for instance, H. V. Hilprecht, A. T. Clay, E. Ebeling, A. Heidel, etc.), in contrast to the Middle Babylonian date of the present authors. The latter represents the first English transliteration and translation of the small fragment of the Flood Story from Ugarit (RS 22.421), the cuneiform text of which was published by J. Nougayrol in *Ugaritica V* (1968). It was written on a single tablet of which only the beginning and end survive and which dates from the fourteenth century B.C. Unlike Atra-ḥasīs, it covered only the flood itself, much like Tablet XI of the Gilgamesh Epic, and represents to date the only version of the Babylonian flood story found outside Mesopotamia. The flood account of Berossus' *Babyloniaka* quoted by Polyhistor and Abydenus (pp. 134-137) concludes the section of the Akkadian Recension of the Epic of Atra-ḥasīs with related Akkadian stories of the flood. The only Akkadian flood accounts not included in this volume are the ones in Tablet XI of the Gilgamesh Epic and in Tablets I and IV of the Erra Epic. The reason for this is that the former Epic will soon appear in a new critical edition, while with regard to the Erra Epic it is briefly stated that "every detail referred to is either lacking from, or cannot be reconciled with the various versions of the story of the great flood. Presumably, then, this is another flood" (p. 27). This short note—the only information of the flood accounts in the Erra Epic in this volume—is hardly sufficient to justify the entire dismissal of the flood narratives in the Middle Babylonian Erra Epic. The author of the most recent critical edition of the Erra Epic maintains that there is no reason to suppose that the flood account of Tablet I of this epic does not belong to the Babylonian tradition of the flood (see Felix Gössmann, *Das Eva-Epos* [Würzburg, 1956], p. 65.). Even if a contrary position should be maintained, the inclusion of this material would have enhanced the usefulness of this important volume by making available for critical perusal material of a tradition that would or would not go back to the same origin.

On the other hand, this volume is enriched with "The Sumerian Flood Story" (pp. 138-145), edited by M. Civil of the Oriental Institute of Chicago. As is well known, the Sumerian flood account is preserved on a single tablet (CBS 10673), of which only about a third of the original text remains. Although there is a similarity of content, the

size of the Sumerian epic is quite different, namely some 300 Sumerian as opposed to 1,245 Akkadian lines. Civil dates CBS 10673 "not earlier than Late Old Babylonian" (p. 138), while Lambert seems more specific: "In its present form the Sumerian text is hardly much older than the tablet on which it is written (c. 1600 B.C.) . . ." (p. 14). This is the very time when the Epic of Atra-ḥasis was written down in its Old Babylonian Recension of Ku-Aya. Civil makes the following observation: "The theme of a flood which destroys mankind does not seem to belong to the main body of Sumerian traditions . . . [but] it became popular during the Isin dynasty" (p. 139). Regarding the generally held opinion that the Babylonian flood story "is of Sumerian origin" (S. N. Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology* [New York, 1961²], p. 98; cf. A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* [Chicago, 1963²], p. 102; L. Matouš, "Zur neueren epischen Literatur im alten Mesopotamien," *ArOr*, XXXV [1967], 4; Millard, *op. cit.* 5, 6, "it is now evident that this Sumerian narrative belongs to the same tradition as the Atrahasis Epic"; T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* [New York, 1969], p. 82); Lambert is now maintaining that the Akkadian author could possibly have known the Sumerian text, but that he "did not need to know the Sumerian text to write as he did" (p. 14). Lambert formerly spoke of the Sumerian text as "the Sumerian prototype of the Epic of Atrahasis" and "the Sumerian recension" of the Mesopotamian flood story, dating it to ca. 1700 B.C. (W. G. Lambert, "New Light on the Babylonian Flood," *JSS*, V [1960], 114, 115). The present position of Lambert indicates a more cautious stance toward the problem of the relation of the various Mesopotamian flood stories without offering an explanation. Why did the author of the Ku-Aya recension "not need to know the Sumerian text to write as he did"? Although the wording between the two agrees nowhere, it is obvious that there is a "similarity of content" (p. 14), to use Lambert's own words. This "similarity of content" between the Sumerian flood story and the Epic of Atrahasis must be accounted for. Would it not be likely that both accounts belong to the same Mesopotamian tradition and are related to each other? May not the tradition contained in the Sumerian text belong to an older Sumerian archetype which was reworked into a long epic by the Babylonian poet? To consider the "similarity of content" as merely accidental and unrelated is a position for which hardly anyone would opt.

A comparison of Civil's translation of the Sumerian flood story with that of S. N. Kramer in *ANET*, pp. 42-44, read along with the former's "Philological Notes" (pp. 167-172), represents a vast improvement over Kramer's attempt to up-date Arno Poebel's initial study of the Sumerian text from the year 1914. Civil's translation with his philological notes must from henceforth be considered the standard treatment of this difficult text which is filled with grammatical and lexical irregularities compared to standard Sumerian.

The structure of Atrahasis outlined briefly is the following: I.

The insurrection of the Igi-gods (Tablet I, cols. i-iii); II. The solving of the problem by the creation of man (Tablet I, cols. iv-vi); III. The multiplying of mankind; the curse of Enlil with its result, the plague (Tablet I, cols. vii-viii); IV. Further punishments of mankind: (a) second judgment of mankind by famine (Tablet II, cols. i-ii), (b) third judgment of mankind by renewal of famine and drought (Tablet VI, cols. iii-vii); V. Fourth judgment: The decree to destroy mankind, the flood, the rescue of Atra-ḥasis and thus the survival of mankind (Tablet III, cols. i-viii). This outline indicates that there are definite parallels to Gn 1-11, the so-called primeval history. It corresponds in the over-all scheme of events: Creation-Rebellion-Man's Achievements-Flood. Thus we have here a not insignificant parallel account—the only one in fact from Mesopotamia—covering the same sequence of events as the first eleven chapters of Gn. However, any critical reader of the two accounts will readily recognize that while the over-all scheme is identical, most of the details are so divergent as to discourage belief in literary borrowing or dependence of one upon the other. All those who would suspect or even suggest borrowing by the Hebrews would be compelled to admit large-scale revisions, alterations, and reinterpretations in a fashion that cannot be substantiated for any other composition of the ancient Near East or in any other Hebrew writing. The relationship between the two accounts seems possibly to indicate that both go back to a common tradition which the Babylonians and Hebrews appropriated each in his own particular way.

The Old Babylonian Recension of the Atra-ḥasis Epic begins with the words *inūma ilū awilum* which in the present edition are translated as follows: "When the gods like men" (p. 43). This translation of the opening line is not without its problems. Before the full cuneiform text of Tablet I was published, scholars supposed that the clause in line 1 was incomplete. The following translations were offered (none of which regrettably were referred to in the authors' discussion of the translation in the philological notes on p. 146): A.T. Clay, *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform* ("YOS," V/3; New Haven, Conn., 1922), p. 14: "When God, man . . ."; Laessøe, *op. cit.*, 98, reads *enūma ilū awilam* translating "When the gods . . . man"; A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1968²), p. 166: "When the gods (and ?) man . . ." ? C. Westermann, *Genesis* ("BKAT," I/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967), p. 97 quotes the translation which was produced in the last Seminar of the late Assyriologist A. Falkenstein of Heidelberg, which was based, in contrast to the other translations, on the full cuneiform text of CT, XLVI (1965): "Als die Götter noch Menschen waren." The authors of the present volume support their translation with the crucial argument that "*a-wi-lum* has the locative *-um* with the meaning of the comparative *-iṣ . . .*" (p. 146). It is true that in the later stages of the Akkadian language (1300 B.C. and later) the adverbial ending *-iṣ* is often the semantic equivalent of *kima* and *gen*. The authors argue that the first examples of the "com-

parative"-um in Old Babylonian are found in Tablet II. ii. 19 and again in the reconstructed line II. ii. 33 which reads: *ki-ma ša-ar-ra-qi-tu*. This is clearly an adverbial phrase to be translated "like a thieving one." *ki-ma* can here hardly be considered as pleonastic. It does, however, not correspond to the first line of this epic, where the preposition *ki-ma* is lacking. Furthermore, in the later stages of Akkadian -um and -iš interchange freely before suffixes, but this is not the case without suffixes. Since *a-wi-lum* does not contain a suffix and is not preceded by *ki-ma*, the argument that already in this Old Babylonian text the ending -um has the semantic meaning of -iš, and should therefore be translated with "like," is philologically not well founded. W. von Soden (*ZA*, XLI [1933], 128, 129) denied the occurrence of comparative -iš in the Old Babylonian period. This means that the doubtful character of the translation of the incipit should at least be indicated by italicizing if not bracketing the preposition "like" (so Matouš, *op. cit.*, p. 5).

In the present reviewer's opinion the translation, which on the whole is smooth, is doing more than merely "modifying some metaphors and putting the words in English order" (p. 7) as is claimed by the authors. The authors should therefore have provided in the translation some means—such as the use of italics—to assist the reader who is not versed in the intricate science of Assyriology to know where doubtful or problematical translations exist. The helpful "Philological Notes" (pp. 146-167) are, of course, not designed to do that, but to treat certain difficult points.

Now a word regarding the transliterated text. The Ku-Aya text is taken by the authors as the main recension while the other available Old Babylonian tablets serve to restore the text where the Ku-Aya edition is deficient. Thus the reader is presented with a "reconstructed text based on Ku-Aya's tablets where they are preserved, but the text is arranged metrically" (p. 39). The critical reader must always be aware of the fact that this "reconstructed text" does not now exist and likely never had existed in its present form.

The apparatus falls short in at least two significant respects: (1) There is no indication just exactly where the various tablets begin and end; and (2) only a limited number of variants are listed, as for instance a comparison with E = BM 92608 or other tablets shows. This means that the careful scholar cannot recognize at just which word a given tablet begins and ends (though a general idea can be gained from the margin), and he cannot be sure about the number and quality of the variants in a given tablet without going to the publication of the original cuneiform texts.

This volume opens with a valuable 25-page "Introduction" with an excursus on "Early Human History" (pp. 25-27) and one on "A Quotation of Atra-ḫasis for an Assyrian King" (pp. 27, 28). This is followed by "Notes on Orthography and Grammar" (pp. 29, 30), "The Manuscripts" (pp. 31-39), and a "List of Manuscripts" (pp. 40, 41). The closing part of this volume consists of a "Bibliography" (pp. 173,

174) which lacks the following items under "(i) Editions of Whole or Part": F. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke* (3. Aufl.; Leipzig, 1885); P. Haupt, *Das babylonische Nimrodepos* (Leipzig, 1891); K. D. Macmillan, *Some Cuneiform Tablets Bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (Leipzig, 1906); and under "(iii) General Discussions, Particular Notes, Etc.": D. Hämmerly-Dupuy, "Some Observations on Assyro-Babylonian and Sumerian Flood Stories," *AUSS*, VI (1968), 1-18. Then follows a "Glossary" (pp. 175-197), prepared by Millard, that contains all words found in the "reconstructed text" of Atra-ḫasis. It not only helps to find words and passages, but also indicates the source of restorations and serves as a concordance of all its texts. A "List of Names in the Akkadian Texts" (p. 198) serves as a handy concordance of all proper nouns found in the texts. This volume concludes with eleven plates of cuneiform texts. In this connection, attention should be drawn to "Addenda" (pp. xi, xii and 172), which contains the cuneiform text of K 10097, its transliteration, translation, and philological notes. K 10097 is recognized as a join of cols. ii and iii of S.

Throughout the volume the spelling of Atra-ḫasis instead of Atram-ḫasis is adopted. No explanation is given why the former is preferred to the latter. As a matter of fact, all Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian tablets consistently read *ʿat-ra-am-ḫa-si-is*. In Late Assyrian tablets the name appears five times, as *ma-tar-ḫasīs(geštu)*, and only in Late Babylonian the spelling is twice *mat-ra-ḫa-si-is* (and possibly once in DT 42 l. 11). This evidence indicates that this name should properly be spelled "Atram-ḫasis." There is no lexical or philological basis for any other spelling. It is more than misleading to adopt against the overwhelming and clear Old and Middle Babylonian evidence a Late Babylonian spelling for a work reconstructing the oldest Old Babylonian epic.

These and the foregoing remarks are not intended to diminish the value of this well-done edition of all available materials of the Babylonian and Sumerian stories of the flood, but it is hoped that they will contribute toward a better understanding of it.

The following errata were noted: "text" for "texts" (p. 5, l. 10); "li-bi-il" for "li-bi-il₆" (p. 56, l. 196); "k-ma" for "ki-ma" (p. 146. n. 1).

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

Lampe, G. W. H., ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. II: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1969. ix + 566 pp. \$ 12.50.

This is the second in a three-volume set which is appearing in reverse order. Volume III, including the period from the Reformation to the present day, was published in 1963. A further volume which