

FAITH AND THOUGHT

*A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the
Christian Revelation and modern research.*

1974

VOLUME 101

NUMBER 2

T. C. MITCHELL

Old Testament Archaeology: Some Recent Work

**A paper, read to the VICTORIA
INSTITUTE on 2nd February, 1974
by Mr. Terence Mitchell, Assistant
Keeper, Department of Western Asiatic
Antiquities, British Museum.**

My aim in this paper is not to make an original contribution, nor to give a comprehensive survey, but simply to draw attention to some recent discoveries and areas of study, and not to seek to answer all the questions that may arise, but to indicate where research and discussion may continue. I interpret 'archæology' broadly to include anything, document or artifact, that may bear on the world of the OT, and by 'recent' I mean, in general, anything since the second World War (WW2), which marks a convenient pause in the development of the subject.

I have selected four main areas of the field, those concerned with Genesis, with prophecy, with excavations, and with Hebrew Inscriptions.

Atrahasis

In considering the early chapters of Genesis, it is usual to cite cuneiform documents which deal with comparable topics. The Creation Epic (*enuma elish*) describes the creation of the universe and man in crude terms of conflict between the Babylonian gods,¹ and the XIth tablet of the Gilgamesh epic (*Sha naqba imuru*) discovered by George Smith in 1872, gives an account of how the hero Utanapishtim built a boat and escaped the Flood.² The major MSS of both of these epics are in the neo-Assyrian dialect of Akkadian and date from about the 7th century BC, but an earlier Sumerian tablet of about the 17 – 16th century BC containing

some creation material, as well as a Flood story in which the hero is named Ziusudra, was published by A. Poebel in 1914.³ Among the known fragments of related texts were a number which were known, or have since been recognised, to have been parts of a Babylonian composition in three Tablets (or Chapters) known as the Atrahasis Epic and in the early 1960s two further substantial Old Babylonian fragments were recognised in the British Museum by A. R. Millard, and as a result, in 1969 he and W. G. Lambert produced a new edition of the known MSS.⁴ The known fragments mostly date from the Old Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian periods, the most complete version being the Old Babylonian one, copied by a scribe in about the 17th century BC, and of which over 1,200 lines are preserved. The epic begins by outlining the structure of the universe in which the heavens are ruled by the god Anu, the earth by Enlil, and the subterranean sweet water ocean by Enki. Enlil puts the minor gods to work on earth, digging canals, farming the land and so forth, but after 40 years they rebel at this, and refuse to work. In response Enki, who appears as a wise conciliator suggests that man be created to take over the world, and this proposal is accepted by the gods. Man is made by the goddess Mami, with the help of Enki, by modelling him from clay mixed with spittle, and with the blood of a god We or Weila, otherwise unknown, who is killed for the purpose. The human race is put to work and it multiplies, until the noise disturbs Enlil's sleep. He therefore decides to destroy man, and sends first a plague, then a famine, then a drought, and finally a flood, but each time Enki instructs the hero Atrahasis, who now appears in the story, on how to mitigate the effects of these disasters. He gives him seven days warning of the flood, and tells him to build a boat. Atrahasis builds the boat, loads it with his possessions and animals and birds, and after a banquet embarks and is preserved while all the rest of mankind is wiped out. When the gods see the result of the flood they see that there are no more men to produce food for offerings to them, and come to regret it. Here there is a gap in the MS, so no details of the landing of the boat survive, but the epic ends with Atrahasis making an offering to the gods, and Enlil finally accepting the existence of man.

There is clearly much in this epic which has interesting

similarities to Genesis, and Lambert⁵ and Millard⁶ have recently discussed these and related matters. The Atrahasis flood account may very likely, as both Lambert and Millard suggest, have been largely the source used for the XIth tablet of the Gilgamesh epic. Until recently few literary texts have turned up in Mesopotamia in copies earlier than the 2nd millennium BC, and though it was a fair assumption that many of them went back to compositions of earlier date, there was little evidence to substantiate this. Among the early tablets found at Fara, ancient Shuruppak, and published in the 1920s by A. Deimel, a number of literary texts have been recognised, but this material is now significantly augmented by the discovery of more texts of about the same date, c. 2500 BC, at Abu Salabikh in southern Iraq.⁷ Some of these can be seen to be precursors of later compositions and show the possibility that much of Sumerian literature originated at this time, known archaeologically as the Early Dynastic III period, most familiar, perhaps, from the 'royal' tombs at Ur. At present, nevertheless, Sumerian literature is mainly known from later MSS of the early 2nd millennium BC but this material, is sufficiently extensive, for M. Civil, in his recently published edition of the Sumerian Flood Legend, to put forward the opinion that the theme of a flood to destroy mankind was not part of the main Sumerian tradition. He also cites the fact that while some MSS of the Sumerian King List name the kings who ruled before the Flood, the earliest MSS do not include this pre-Flood section, which is presumably a later addition,⁸ and he thinks that the Flood theme began to become popular in the early 2nd millennium. It is possible, of course, that the Flood theme was native to Mesopotamia and was not adopted by the Sumerians when they arrived as new-comers, but on the other hand it is also possible, assuming Civil's impression to be correct, that it was only introduced by the new population groups who arrived at about the end of the 3rd millennium.⁹

From the 3rd until well into the 2nd millennium, BC, the Hurrians (biblical Horites) were infiltrating into Mesopotamia. These people spread throughout the Near East, forming for instance a large element in the population of Nuzi, where documents have revealed customs closely comparable to those reflected in the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis. Their main area of concentration,

and probable centre of emigration, was the region around Armenia, known in the first millennium BC from a people whose language had many parallels with Hurrian, as Urartu, biblical Ararat. It is tempting to bring into the discussion a literary fragment found at Boghaz-koy which seems to be part of a Hurrian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, and which contains the name Nahmazule. This was long ago compared with the name Noah, which in Genesis 5: 29 is associated with the verb *nhm*: "This one will provide us relief (*yenahamenu*) from our work . . ." ¹⁰ It seems more likely however that this fragment, which is paralleled by a Hittite fragment from Boghaz-koy where the name Nahmizulin has the feminine determinative, belongs to tablet X of the Gilgamesh Epic which has nothing to do with the Flood. All we can do at present therefore is to draw attention to this link of the Hurrians with the traditional area of the resting place of the ark, ¹¹ and perhaps speculate whether the forebears of Abraham came from the Hurrian area. The first indication that the Patriarchs were living in Mesopotamia comes in Genesis 11: 28, where it is stated that Abraham's brother Haran died "in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldees". Here "land of his birth" uses the word *moledet*, which though it came to mean "land of his kindred" or "native land", could quite well simply mean birth place. In other words the family need not have been in Mesopotamia for more than a generation or two before the time of Abraham. ¹²

Prophecy

The existence of seers in the ancient near East has been long known. In the *Zakir Stela*, for instance, an Old Aramaic inscription found in 1903 near Aleppo, the author, Zakir, king of Hamath in the 8th century BC, says, among other things, "Baalshamayn spoke to me through seers and diviners . . . (saying) 'Do not fear, I made you king' . . ." ¹³ The word used here for "seers" is *hzyn*, singular *hz*, which is clearly cognate with biblical Hebrew *hozeh*, 'seer', a word which is applied, for instance, to Amos (7: 12).

Since the War a new group of documents of much earlier

date, which have a bearing on prophecy, have come to light. These belong to the archives from Mari, of about the 18th century BC, which are already well known for their bearing on the Patriarchal narratives of Genesis. In 1948 G. Dossin published the first of this group,¹⁴ a letter, which A. L. Oppenheim describes as follows, it "was sent to the king of Mari by a high court official on account of a dream reported to him. A minor provincial functionary dreamed that he was on his way to the capital and visited the temple of the god Dagan, first thing upon arriving in Tirqa, an important city of the realm. In his dream he performed the customary prostrations before the image and heard in the same moment a voice addressing him (without introduction) with a question. He identified the voice immediately as that of the god Dagan, and answered. When he was about to leave the sanctuary — so the account of his dream continues — the same voice gave him a message for the king of the country. The message is quoted verbatim, addressing the king in the second person singular".¹⁵

Several other similar texts have since come to light, and in 1967, cuneiform copies of 14 more were published by Dossin¹⁶ and these with those already published, amounting in all to 28, have given rise to a considerable body of discussion.¹⁷

From these texts it appears that various people, some of them connected with the religious establishment, others not, claimed to communicate predictive messages from the gods. When those involved are private persons the messages seem to have been received by them in visionary dreams, and the administrative officials who report the dreams do not always seem quite to know what to do about them. This suggests that in some cases at least there was something more involved than simple mechanical oracles from which answers might be solicited.

It is not particularly surprising that such people should have existed among Israel's neighbours. In the period of the monarchy, Jeremiah, for instance, is told by God to send word to Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre and Sidon (27: 3) instructing them to serve Nebuchadnezzar, and he is told to say to them "... do not listen to your prophets, your diviners, your dreamers, your soothsayers,

or your sorcerers who are saying to you, 'You shall not serve the king of Babylon'" (27: 9). Here the term "prophet (*nabi*)" is the normal word applied elsewhere to the Israelite prophets, the implication being that such individuals existed outside Israel. This is also clear from the episode of Elisha and the prophets of Baal (*nebi'im ba'al*) in 1 Kings 18: 19–20.

The revelations to the Israelite prophets came from God but in that case how can the phenomena from Mari and related examples be understood? One possible explanation is to be found in demon activity, the existence of which is even today well attested.¹⁸ There is clearly much scope for further study in this field.

Excavations

There has been a great deal of excavation in Palestine since the end of WW2; some of it at sites previously unexcavated, notably Tell el-Jib el-Far'ah (Tirzah), Tell Qasile, el-Jib (Gibeon), Ramat-Rahel (Beth-hacherem), Tell el-Qedah (Hazor), Tell Deir 'Alla, Tell Mor (Ashdod), Arad and Khirbet Qumran; but also much of it at re-opened sites, previously excavated, notably Jerusalem, Jericho, Gezer, Ta'anach, Megiddo, Samaria, Shechem, Beth-shan, Shiloh, Tell Jemmeh, Bethel, Ai, and Lachish.¹⁹ Here there is only space to mention a few of these excavations.

An interesting example of an archaeological discovery leading the excavator to examine the Bible from which he received the clue to further excavation, is provided by the work of Y. Yadin at Hazor, and subsequently at Megiddo and Gezer. During his operations at Hazor in 1955–58 he found a six-chambered gate with two external towers associated with a casemate (or compartmented) wall which he was able to date to the time of Solomon. He noted that in 1 Kings 9: 15 the author writes of the "... forced labour which king Solomon levied to build the house of the Lord and his own house, and the Millo and the wall of Jerusalem and Hazor and Megiddo and Gezer", and therefore turned to the reports of the excavations at Megiddo and Gezer

to see if anything similar had been found at these sites. In the Megiddo report he found a description of a six chambered gate with square towers almost identical with that at Hazor, but associated with it was a quite different kind of wall divided into twenty foot lengths set alternately forward and back by about two feet. He went to Megiddo to examine this installation and during excavations in 1960 and 1965 – 67 he found that this wall which he called the “ insets-offsets wall ” was in fact not attached to the gate but that the latter joined a casemate wall just like the one at Hazor, which lay immediately below the insets-offsets wall. This was a satisfactory discovery but it had other repercussions since the insets-offsets wall was associated (correctly as he verified) with two complexes of pillared buildings which the excavators had identified as stables, and which have been quoted in practically every book on biblical archæology in the last 30 years as Solomon’s stables. This new discovery therefore meant that the stables were later than the time of Solomon and Yadin has plausibly suggested that they belong to the time of Ahab, the next dominant king who might have been expected to undertake major building projects.²⁰

P. L. O. Guy, one of the prewar excavators of Megiddo had supported the identification of the pillared buildings as stables by citing Solomon’s building activity at Megiddo (1 Kings 9: 15) and the reference later in the same passage (9: 19) to the “. . . store cities that Solomon had, and the cities for his chariots, and the cities for his horsemen . . .” and pointing out that the pillars in the buildings had holes pierced possibly for hitching, objects which might be stone mangers, and paved floors for the horses to stand on. Since the Solomonic attribution has had to be abandoned, J. B. Pritchard has now argued that perhaps these buildings were not stables at all.²¹ He points out that not all the pillars have pierced holes and argues that the ‘ mangers ’ were not particularly suitable for this purpose since the trough part was only about 6 inches deep, and that the paving stones which have a rough surface are not the most appropriate floor for horses to stand on. He concludes that the horses might well have been kept in open enclosures and that these buildings might have been “ storehouses or barracks ”. This is a slightly lame conclusion,

for storehouses or barracks do not seem any better as an identification, and there is no reason why Ahab should not have had stables since he certainly had horses (1 Kings 20: 20–25; 22: 4). This question remains a matter for debate.

The third site mentioned in 1 Kings 9: 15 is Gezer and after his discoveries at Hazor, Yadin examined the report published in 1912 by R. A. S. Macalister of his excavations at Gezer. There, on page 104 of volume 1, he found a plan of a 'Maccabean Castle' which incorporated a casemate wall and one side of a six chambered gate of almost the same dimensions as those at the other two sites. That this was in fact of Solomonic date was subsequently confirmed by excavation.

The fourth city mentioned in 1 Kings 9: 15 is Jerusalem. Excavation at this site presents exceptional difficulties since it is extensively built over, and religious susceptibilities attach to much of the area which the archæologist would perhaps be most interested to examine.

The site consists in general terms of two spurs, extending southwards from an area of high ground, separated from each other by a central valley known later as the Tyropoean Valley, which joins a valley, the Valley of Hinnom (Gehenna) running across the southern end. The eastern spur, the Hill of Ophel, was the site of earliest occupation. On its east side lies the Kidron Valley on the west side of which, that is the lower eastern slope of Ophel, is situated a natural water source, the Gihon Spring, the water from which was in the time of Hezekiah carried by a long tunnel to a pool at the south west end of Ophel, the predecessor of the Pool of Siloam. The Canaanite (Jebusite) city of Jerusalem was situated on Ophel Hill, and in the time of Solomon it was extended northwards by the construction of his Temple and Palace. The site of these structures lies below the present Haram ash-Sharif area, sacred to Muslims, but excavations on the part of the hill to the south of this, particularly those conducted from 1961–67 by Dr. (now Dame) Kathleen Kenyon, have thrown some interesting light on the history of the city. It had usually been assumed that the fortification walls of the

Israelite city stood near the top of the Ophel hill. It is now clear that from the Bronze Age and through the early Israelite period, the main eastern wall stood quite a long way down the slope. This helps to explain the operation of the Gihon Spring in the period before Hezekiah's tunnel, for this is now seen to have lain inside the newly identified fortification walls.

A feature of the area of the eastern hill now seen to have been included inside this wall was a number of retaining walls filled in with rubble in such a way as to form platforms on which houses could be built in a series of terraces on the steep slope between the summit and the outer wall. Dr. Kenyon found that these dated back to the Canaanite period, but were still in use in Israelite times, and she has plausibly suggested that they may have been the feature referred to as *Millo* in 1 Kings 9: 15. The name *millo* is probably derived from the root *ml'* which in its verbal form *mala'* means 'to fill' or 'to be full', and could therefore have reference to the filled-in retaining walls.

No trace of a casemate wall or a six-sided chambered gate has been found at Jerusalem, but another new discovery has led Dr. Kenyon to postulate a possible line for the Israelite walls in the area covered by the Haram ash-Sharif. The existing Haram area consists of a large paved terrace bounded on the west, south and east sides by walls of large well-dressed blocks which probably date back to Herodian times. These create a large enough flat area on top of the ridge to make building feasible. Dr. Kenyon has now discovered, by clearing some of the rubble which lay up against the eastern wall, that at a point about 100 feet from the SE corner, the Herodian masonry abuts upon a different kind of masonry which continues northwards in the same line. This masonry is markedly similar to that found in buildings of the Achæmenian period at Sidon and Byblos and also to that in the structure known as the Tal-i Takht at the early Achæmenian site of Pasargadæ. On this basis the Jerusalem masonry can reasonably be dated in the Achæmenian period, and therefore quite possibly be attributed to the rebuilding which took place under Zerubbabel.²²

There is no sign of this kind of masonry in the western Haram wall which is clear considerably further north than the point corresponding to the junction with the new masonry on the east wall, so it may be presumed that the Achæmenian period platform did not extend so far to the west as the later Herodian construction. Dr. Kenyon has suggested that the western wall in Achæmenian times may have lined up with a wall running south from the southern Haram wall and enclosing a salient of the present city. On this basis she has drawn a very tentative line to indicate the walls of the temple area in Achæmenian times. She has pointed out the likelihood that Zerubbabel would have tried to follow the line of Solomon's walls and has therefore put this reconstruction forward as a possible indication of the approximate position of the walls on the northern part of the site in the time of Solomon.²³

This section may be concluded with a brief reference to recent discoveries by B. Mazar on the west of the Haram area. It has long been known that the remains of the first springers of two arches are to be seen in the masonry of the west wall of the Haram. These are named, after those who first described them, as *Wilson's Arch* to the north, and *Robinson's arch* to the south near the SW corner. It has long been assumed that both of the arches marked the location of viaducts across the central valley to the SW hill which had been occupied now since at least the time of the Maccabees. Mazar's excavations have found no trace of the next stone pier which would have been necessary had a viaduct gone westwards from Robinson's Arch, so it is now quite clear that there was no viaduct in this position. In fact the arch appears simply to have led to a stairway giving access to the central valley.²⁴ At the southern end of the central valley lies the Pool of Siloam, so this staircase presumably provided one of the routes from the Temple enclosure to the Pool. This new discovery therefore provides a new side light on Jerusalem in NT times.

Hebrew Inscriptions

In 1903 G. A. Cooke published his *Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions* in which he included all the major ancient Hebrew

inscriptions then known. These were the Siloam Inscription, discovered in 1880, which described the process of cutting the tunnel leading from the Gihon Spring to the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem, a few inscribed seals, and the Mesha Stone, found in 1865 at Dhiban, and written in the language known as Moabite which is very closely related to Hebrew. These inscriptions provided 40 lines of text, and no subsequent discovery has equalled them in length, but in the period since 1903 a considerable number of Hebrew inscriptions have been found.

Two important groups of ostraca, of the 8th century BC from Samaria, and of the 6th century from Lachish, were found in the years before WW2, and these with a number of others provided a substantial body of material for D. Diringer's compendious work *Le iscrizione antico-ebraiche Palestinesi* published in Florence in 1934. Since WW2 there have been several new discoveries in this field, and it is now easy to obtain a quick survey of what this new material amounts to by reference to a recent work by J. C. L. Gibson.²⁵ Some of the new discoveries will be mentioned in chronological order.

The 9th century Mesha or Moabite Inscription was unfortunately smashed into fragments by Bedouin soon after its discovery, and though an impression ('squeeze') had been taken of it while it was still intact some parts are still uncertain. The discovery of a fragment of another stele at el-Kerak in Jordan in 1958 has made possible the restoration of one of the uncertain passages. This occurs at the beginning of the inscription which starts, "I am Mesha son of Chemosh . . . king of Moab the Dibonite". The two last characters of Mesha's father's name have been uncertain and many restorations have been proposed over the years. The el-Kerak fragment which includes part of the first line of the original inscription begins, after a small lacuna ". . . moshyat, king of Moab the Di . . ." which makes clear that the original name was Chemoshyat.

An interesting discovery of the 8th century BC was made in 1948-50 at Tell Qasile on the coast near Tel Aviv. It consisted of two ostraca, one of which read "Gold of Ophir for Beth-horon,

30 shekels". This refers to the famous place, familiar to many from John Masefield's lines —

Quinquireme of Nineveh from distant Ophir
Rowing home to haven in sunny Palestine,
With a cargo of ivory,
And apes and peacocks
Sandalwood, cedarwood and sweet white wine.

This of course shows some poetic licence but according to the Bible, most of these commodities were imported to Palestine in Solomon's time. The products of Ophir included gold, precious stones, and algum/almug wood, traditionally, though uncertainly, identified with sandal wood (1 Kings 10: 11; 1 Chron. 29: 4; 2 Chron. 8: 18; 9: 10), the ivory, apes and peacocks not being attributed to that area (1 Kings 10: 22). It is worth noting, incidentally, that the "apes and peacocks" of the AV and RSV versions, given as "apes and baboons" in the margin of the latter, now appears in NEB as "apes and monkeys". This follows a plausible suggestion made over 50 years ago by Albright²⁶ whose own explanation of them as two kinds of monkey is probably preferable to the ape and monkey. 2 Chronicles 8: 17-18 indicates that Ophir was reached by way of the Red Sea, but its location is unknown though various theories have been put forward.²⁷ The puzzling thing about this ostrakon is its discovery on the Mediterranean rather than the Red Sea coast.

Also from the 8th century is an interesting inscription from a tomb at Siloam, opposite Jerusalem. This was discovered in 1870 and has in fact been in the British Museum since then but was only satisfactorily deciphered in 1953 by N. Avigad. It reads, "This is . . . iah the royal steward. There is no silver or gold here, only . . . and the bones of his maidservant with him. Cursed be the man who opens this." The two destroyed sections can be reasonably restored as "this is the tomb of . . ." and "only his bones . . .", but the owner's name can only be guessed. The phrase "royal steward" represents the Hebrew *'sr 'l hbyr*, literally "who is over the house", and exactly reproduces

a title which occurs several times in the OT.²⁸ The passage to which Avigad draws attention is Isaiah 22: 15–25 where the prophet denounces “Shebna the royal steward (Shebna who is over the house)” for hewing himself “a tomb on the height”. The wording on the tomb and in Isaiah 22: 15 may be compared for clarity.

Tomb . . . yhw 'sr 'l hbyt
Isaiah . . . sbn' . . . 'sr 'l hbyt

The part of the name preserved in the tomb, *-yhw*, is the common ending, an abbreviation of the name Jehovah or Yahweh, which appears in the English versions in the form *-iah*. Shebna's name here spelled *sbn'* is elsewhere spelled *sbnh* (Isaiah 36: 3), and it is possible that it represents a shortened form of *sbnhyhw*, Shebaniah, which is attested elsewhere in the Bible (Nehemiah 9: 4, etc.). There is thus a possibility that this inscription comes from the tomb of the Shebna mentioned by Isaiah.

Almost all of the early Hebrew inscriptions which have survived are on hard materials, stone or pottery, but in 1952 a fragment of papyrus was discovered in a cave in the Wadi Murabba 'at on the west side of the Dead Sea. This dates from about the 7th century, and confirms, what might have been suspected, that this material was used for writing in ancient Israel. It does not unfortunately normally survive in the physical conditions of Palestine, and many ancient documents must have perished.²⁹ This document is a palimpsest, having a list of personal names, and quantities, superimposed on a letter.

The common use of writing is illustrated by a letter on an ostrakon of the 7th century found in 1960 at Yabneh-Yam on the coast. It records the appeal of a farm labourer to his district governor, against the confiscation of his garment as a punishment. Unfortunately the offence for which the man was being punished cannot be ascertained, but it is of great interest that at this period so unimportant a person as a labourer could find it possible to have a letter written, no doubt by a scribe, to state his grievance.

A considerable number of ostraca have been found since 1962 by Y. Aharoni at Tell Arad in the Negev. Many of these are in a bad state of preservation, and only a few have so far been published. One group belongs to the time just before the conquest of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in the early 6th century BC. It contains messages addressed to an official named Eliashib instructing him to issue provisions of bread, wine, and oil to certain individuals. An interesting example runs, "To Eliashib. And now give the kittiyim four baths of wine, and write the name of the day. And from what is left of the flour draw one ephah of flour to make bread for them. Give some of the wine in the bowls." Here, the bath is, of course, a measure, the liquid equivalent of the ephah. The actual value of the bath is uncertain but there is some reason to think that it may have been between four and five gallons. The interesting feature of this inscription is however the reference to kittiyim. This literally means the "people of Kt", Kt being the Phoenician name of Kition = Citium = Larnaca, an important port on the east coast of Cyprus. The "people of Kt" were therefore first of all the Cypriots, but with Greek expansion in the east Mediterranean the name came to refer to the Greek speaking inhabitants of Cyprus, and by extension the Greeks in general and this is probably the meaning here. There was a further development in the meaning of this term, which clearly refers to the Romans, in the sectarian literature from Qumran, and this is the most likely interpretation of the term in Daniel 11: 30, a fact reflected in some MSS of the LXX which read *Rhomaioi* instead of *Kitioi*.

These new texts make increasingly clear the widespread use of writing in ancient Israel.³⁰

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. For translations see E. A. Speiser and A. K. Grayson in J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed.; Princeton, 1969 (= *ANET*), pp. 60-72, 501-503; and A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 2nd ed.; Chicago, 1951, pp. 18-60; and of other Mesopotamian creation stories, *ANET*, pp. 42-44, 100-101; and Heidel, pp. 61-75.
2. Translations by Speiser in *ANET*, pp. 93-97; and Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic*, 2nd ed.; Chicago, 1949.

3. Recently retranslated by M. Civil in W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atrahasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 138–145.
4. See n. 3.
5. *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, 1965, 16, 287–300.
6. *Tyndale Bulletin*, 1967, 18, 3–18.
7. Biggs, R. D., *Jour. Cuneiform Stud.*, 1966, 20, 73–78.
8. See T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, Chicago, 1939, pp. 55–68.
9. Here it is worth noting that in Egyptian literature, though there exists the element of the destruction of mankind by the gods as a punishment, followed by deliverance (J. A. Wilson in *ANET*, pp. 10–11), there is no clear Flood story. I am indebted to Mr. E. P. Uphill for information and discussion on this point.
10. See Burrows, E., *Jour. Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, 1925, pp. 281–284; and E. A. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins*, Philadelphia, 1930, pp. 160–161, and *Genesis*, New York, 1964, p. 42. Here and subsequently, for typographical reasons, foreign words are quoted without diacritical marks.
11. “On the mountains of Urartu”, Gen. 8: 4, where “mountains (*hare*)” is plural, and has no particular reference to modern Mount Ararat.
12. See however Speiser, *Oriental and Biblical Studies*, Philadelphia, 1967, pp. 244–69, who suggests that the Flood Story was transmitted from Mesopotamia to the Israelites by the Hurrians.
13. *ANET*, pp. 501–2.
14. *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 1948, 42, 125; Translations in A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, Philadelphia, 1956, p. 195; W. L. Moran in *ANET*, p. 623; H. B. Huffmon, *Bibl. Archaeologist* (= *BA*), 1968, 31, 117.
15. Oppenheim, *Dreams*, p. 195.
16. *Archives royales de Mari* 10 (Textes cunéiformes du Louvre, 31), Paris, 1967.
17. See *ANET*, pp. 623–5, 629–632; *BA*, 1968, 31, 101–124.
18. M. F. Unger, *Demons in the World Today*, Wheaton, 1971.
19. For a useful bibliography of Palestinian excavations see E. K. Vogel, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Cincinnati, 1971, 42, 1–96.
20. See Y. Yadin, *Hazor* (Schweich Lectures 1970), London, 1972, pp. 147–164.
21. In J. A. Sanders (ed.), *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, New York, 1970, pp. 268–276.
22. Kenyon, K., *Palestine Explor. Qtl.*, 1968, 100, 104–4, pl. XXXVII. A–B; Dunand, M., *Vetus Testamentum*, Supplement 17 (1969), pp. 64–70; and for Pasargadaë, R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia*, London, 1962, pls. 21–22.
23. K. Kenyon, *Jerusalem*, London, 1967; and in Sanders (ed.), *Near Eastern Archaeology*, pp. 232–253.
24. B. Mazar, *The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Near the Temple Mount*, Jerusalem, 1971, pp. 13–22.
25. J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, I, *Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1971.

26. See W. F. Albright, *Archæology and the Religion of Israel*, 3rd ed., Baltimore, 1953, p. 212, n. 16.
27. Bibliography in L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, 3rd ed., Leiden, 1967, pp. 22-23.
28. See T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials*, Lund, 1971, pp. 70-110, who translates it as "house-minister".
29. On the ancient use of papyrus in the near east see D. J. Wiseman in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, I, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 30-32.
30. See A. R. Millard, *BA*, 1972, **35**, 98-111.

DISCUSSION

R. S. Luhman. In the light of recent comments concerning the Sumerian Flood stories can the Biblical account still be regarded as antedated by the Sumerian and Babylonian accounts?

Reply: The biblical account of the Flood is only preserved in late MSS, but one can speculate that it was available to Moses in written form, and could indeed have been part of a small library of cuneiform documents brought out of Babylonia by Abraham. If this was the case, and there is of course no evidence to support it, it would not be affected by the theory that the Flood theme did not become current in Babylonia until the early 2nd millenium, because the time of the Patriarchs was not earlier than this.