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HEBREW TRADE AND TRADE TERMS IN O. T. TIMES

By Herbert H. Gowen, University of Washington, Seattle

The present article is the by-product of an effort in the direction of studying the loan words of the Hebrew vocabulary. I looked naturally for a fair proportion of these among terms dealing with trade and commerce. Moreover, since the impression has been generally conveyed that the Hebrews only passed from the agricultural to the commercial stage after the exile, it seemed likely that most of the articles imported from foreign lands must necessarily bear foreign names. I found, on the contrary, a very considerable number of trade terms which are so naturally Semitic as even to have passed from the Hebrew into Greek, Latin and other European languages. Even some of the terms which may originally have been Egyptian or Indian have apparently passed to the west through a Semitic channel and in a Semitic form.

This result has tempted me to a brief review of the whole question as to the attitude of the Jew towards trade, before the exile as well as after.

First of all let me recur to the impression ordinarily given as to the late entrance of the Hebrew into the lists of commerce. I find, for example, the Jewish Encyclopaedia quoting Josephus (Cont. Apion I) as follows: "We do not dwell in a land by the sea and do not therefore indulge in commerce either by sea or otherwise", a passage which seems strangely oblivious of the Jew of the Dispersion, not to speak of the significance of facts directly in the path of the historian such as the acquisition of Joppa by
Simon Maccabaeus and the building of Caesarea by Herod the Great. The Encyclopaedia adds (speaking of course of post-Biblical times): "Hitherto there had been no signs of any special predilection or capacity for commerce shown by Jews", and accounts for the sudden enthusiasm displayed for the same by the rise of Islam which forced Christians to depend upon the Jews for the luxuries to which they had become accustomed.

Again, in Kent and Bailey's recent 'History of the Hebrew Commonwealth', I read: "The exile therefore was for the Jews a period of radical transformation. It wrought a fundamental change in their point of view . . . a change in their dominant activities from agricultural to commercial". Once again, in the recently republished articles from the 'Dearborn Independent' on the 'International Jew', we find: "A race whose entire period of national history saw them peasants on the land, whose ancient genius was spiritual rather than material, bucolic rather than commercial".

Some admissions will presently be made and for the requisite qualification of statement certain reasons given, but, before venturing upon a detailed criticism of the view just illustrated, I would like to put forward a generalization which I consider of very great importance. This is that from the earliest times the Hebrew carried within himself two opposite tendencies warring continually for supremacy. Samuel Taylor Coleridge declared that the possibilities of Judaism were equally expressed in the old clo' man and in the Evangelical prophet. We see these warring ideals at every point in the narrative. Even Abraham, 'father of the faithful', was one of the most materially prosperous of sheikhs and had in him the driving of a good bargain. The best illustration is of course Jacob who in his early exploits furnishes us with a fine exhibition of shiftiness, trickiness, and meanness, even though at the same time he is so sensitive of spiritual values. After his exile, during the 'Lehrjahre' with Laban, we have a striking case of 'diamond cut diamond' and the incident which has given us that amusingly misused word 'Mizpah' is a good example of the temper which prevailed to the very eve of his attaining to the new name of Israel.

If then the story of Jacob so plainly reveals a man of immense
commercial proclivity fighting desperately to retain his instinctive appreciation of the spiritual, may we not say that the whole of the O. T. is but a resumé of the like struggle continued in the race? A Hebrew poet, Mr. Zangwill, puts the matter clearly in the poem from which I quote the following lines:

"I saw a people rise before the sun,  
A noble people scattered through the lands,  
To be a blessing to the nations . . . .  
And wheresoe'er a Jew dwelt, there dwelt Truth,  
And wheresoe'er a Jew was, there was Light,  
And wheresoe'er a Jew went, there went Love.

Hear, O Israel, Jehovah, the Lord our God, is One,  
But we, Jehovah His people are dual and so undone.  
Slaves in eternal Egypt, baking their strawless bricks,  
At ease in successive Zions, prating their politics . . . ."

May we not recognize that if, in the O. T., the emphasis has been laid upon the victories of idealism, it is not thereby denied that for the mass the temptation to a materialistic choice was throughout alive and writhing, not to say at times overmastering? Sharpened by genuine reaction away from the ideals of Egypt, quickened in spiritual insight by the air and associations of the Sinaitic desert, the descendants of Israel re-entered Canaan in the set determination to exhibit the loftiest Puritanic disdain for the corrupt civilization of the people they displaced. In this resolve they were, of course, supported by the prophets of Jahvism who appeared ever and anon to revive and sustain the spiritual sense of the nation. Yet, nevertheless, the old Adam in the race made alliance with the older inhabitants of the land to frustrate the teachings of the prophets and the detachment from business which is reflected in the language of the prophets is after all the achievement of the few rather than the natural character of the many.

Thus it happens that when we penetrate beyond the spirituality of the elect minority, — the Remnant, as it is so frequently called — and get at the life of rulers and people as it was lived
in the light of common day, we discover that the same mercantile instincts which mark the Jew to-day were present all along and playing an important role in the national life. Perhaps it may even be said that the agricultural proclivities, which I believe to have been unduly stressed (cf. Gen. iii 17, 18) were never so strong as to supersede the earlier penchant for business. As a nomad the Hebrew could bargain with the best, and a trader he continued to be, at least, potentially, through all the vicissitudes of his career. He could well afford to consign agriculture to the accursed family of Canaan (cf. Gen. iv 2).

Let us now go more into historic detail, recognizing at the outset the almost inevitableness of a land such as Palestine being the habitat of peoples concerned with international trade.

Almost every writer on the Holy Land has drawn attention to its character as a natural bridge connecting Egypt with the Empires of the Euphrates Valley. Two great highways of traffic passed through the land, the one along the coast through Tyre and Gaza to Egypt, the other, east of Jordan, through Petra from S. Arabia to Damascus. Along these roads trade flowed uninterruptedly from the earliest times to the days of Islâm and the inhabitants of Palestine were kept in touch with the products and markets of India and of Rome, of Libya and Arabia, of Egypt and Babylon, even of China and the Malay peninsula. Herzfeld estimates that 133 different materials were brought to Palestine from these outside lands in addition to the 87 commodities produced at home.

So all along Palestinian history is one of trade association. In the earliest period of all it is stimulating to the imagination to think of the Egyptian Snefru, B. C. 3,000, finding things to interest him in the southern desert, of the exile Sinuhit becoming rich and wearing fine linen among the sand dwellers of southern Palestine, of Thothmes III obtaining from the siege of Megiddo thousands of horses, chariots, vessels of gold and silver, 'flat dishes of costly stone and gold', 'a large two-handed vase of the work of Kharu', gold in rings, silver statues, slaves adorned with gold and precious stones, lapis lazuli, and the like. Again, in the Amarna letters we are able to contemplate the enormous
variety of things imported for the commisariat of the Egyptian garrisons, the gold and silver exacted from the inhabitants of the land as tribute, not to speak of the chariots, vessels, ornaments, and precious stones which passed through from Naharina or Babylonia to Egypt.

It was more or less inevitable that such a land as this must breed merchants and there is no concealment of the fact that all the Semitic tribes of Canaan were keen for profiting by the situation. The same thing is true of the non-Semitic peoples in Palestine such as the Hittites and Philistines. The trading capacity of the former is reflected in the story of Abraham's purchase of Machpelalah (Gen. xxiii), and the latter, 'rovers' from Kefto (probably on the south coast of Asia Minor) brought with them some of the culture of the Aegean or Minoan world. Such names as Ashkelon in all probability witness to the commercial character of the Philistine cities.

The fact that much of the trading was carried on by itinerant merchants is unmistakably evident from the use of the Hebrew root רדס, 'to wander about' as the source of such words as: רדס, merchant; רדס, mart; רדס, traffic. (Cf. Gen. xxiii 16; I Kings x 28; Is. xxiii 3, 18; xlv 14; Prov. iii 14; Ez. xxvii 15). These wandering traders were no doubt for a long time after the entrance of the Israelites drawn largely from the older inhabitants of the land. For example, the traffickers in gums and spices who purchased Joseph from his brethren are called in the J. narrative of Gen. xxxvii 'Ishmaelites' and in the E. narrative 'Midianites'. In Isaiah xxiii and Ez xxvii the typical traders of the land are Phoenicians and in Prov. xxxi 24 the goodwife is represented as selling her wool to a merchant who is literally a 'Canaanite'.

Semitic archaeology and philology are continually adding to the evidence that Palestine was for long centuries marked out to be the highway for international trade. Dr. Naville has in a recent book drawn attention to the discoveries of Reisner which have added a fourth to the three previously known specimens of 'old Israelite' writing. It is in the form of 75 inscribed pieces of potsherd found in the ruins of Omri's palace in Samaria which
are nothing more or less than 'les étiquettes des marchands de vin'. An Aramaic inscription, dating probably from 400 B.C., has been also discovered at Taxila in India upon which appear words like און, ivory; און, cedar; possibly even the much debated מַעַל, of I Kings x.22. (See J. R. A. S. 1915, p. 340.) In course of time the Semitic scripts became the usual means of communication from India to Greece and Aramaean became a kind of lingua franca. This is illustrated by the story of Kadmos (i.e. the Oriental) who brought the Καδμηία γραμματα into Greece.

Is there any reason then to believe that the Hebrews were so different from other branches of the Semitic family that they were indifferent to commerce for the greater part of their national history and content to leave the monopoly to 'Ishmaelites' and 'Canaanites'?

One admission may readily be made. In common with the Romans the Hebrews had no liking for the sea and were well content to leave to foreigners the perils and risks of navigation. Both Solomon and Jehoshaphat used foreign ships (Tarshish ships) for their commercial ventures, and Jonah also made his one voyage in a 'Tarshish ship'. This, however, is not difficult to understand when we realise the absence of harbors on the Syrian coast as compared, for instance, with the coast of Greece. The very word for 'haven' (Pss. cvii 30), so far from suggesting a 'port', i.e. a gate to the open sea) suggests only a 'refuge' — מים. Also it should be remembered that the Jews were for the greater part of their history cut off from the strip of sea-coast acquired by the Philistines. As mentioned above, it was left to Simon Maccabaeus to obtain possession of Joppa and for Herod to make a port of Caesarea. We may add that the reference in the epinikial ode of Deborah (Jud. v), translated in A.V. 'Why did Dan remain in his ships?' should almost certainly be rendered, as in Dr. Moore's paraphrase, 'Why does he live as a dependent, under the protection of the Phoenician sea-farer?'

Let us appeal, however, to the actual record of the trade history revealed in O.T. narrative. Even in patriarchal times a certain acquaintance with trade is taken for granted and we note the employment of shekels and pieces of silver. The prosperity
of the cities of the plain is due to their position on the line of traffic. Corn is purchased with silver from Egypt. In the ‘borrowing’ transaction of the Israelites at the Exodus a distinct aptitude for business is evident. The entry into Canaan brings us such evidences of international trade as the ‘Babylonian garment’ and the gold ingot, while Gideon's victories over Midian bring with them the acquisition of gold ear-rings, purple(?), and possibly pearls (תַּחַם). But it is naturally the monarchy which most tends to make the Hebrew people personal participants in the traffic which flowed through the land. Saul’s victories over the Philistines naturally lead to increased ability to trade and, in the Davidic eulogy, the fact that the first monarch clothed the daughters of Israel with garments adorned with gold constitutes a special claim to gratitude. The reign of David is in itself a chapter in the story of trade development, and no one may reflect upon his triumph over the Philistines, his capture of towns and cities, his creation of a capital dependent upon commerce for its very existence, his regulation of trade (cf. II Sam. xiv 26), his relations with surrounding peoples, his employment of foreign mercenaries, his preparations for building on a splendid scale, alliance with Hiram, king of Tyre, without recognizing the immense impetus given to commerce which the foundation of the new dynasty gave. It would be superfluous to do more than direct attention to the trade ventures of Solomon. At every turn we see evidence of his grandiose designs to turn the geographical situation of the kingdom to commercial account. The visit of the Queen of Sheba illustrates the contact established with S. Arabia; the conquest of Edom by David had cleared the road to Elath; this in turn assisted the use of the Gulf of Akaba by the Phoenician sailors in the service of himself and Hiram; horses were purchased in Musri, wherever that much discussed region may have been; ships went periodically as far as the west coast of India, if not further; taxes and tolls were levied and exacted by ‘the king’s merchants’; fortified posts were established along the trade routes; and even guilds of foreign merchantmen were permitted to reside (and, consequently, to erect shrines) in Jerusalem. After the death of Solomon two causes led to a diminution of
trade. One was, of course, the loss of the northern province and the subsequent interposition of a hostile Aramaean world between Judah and the Euphrates. The other was the growth of prophetic influence which detected in the new international relations a menace to Jahvism. With Ahab connected by marriage with Tyre and furthermore permitted by Benhadad to have huzoth —ִהּעֹזוֹת— in the city of Damascus (see I Kings xx 35) the danger of foreign idolatry was more than imaginary. Jehoshaphat, it is true, attempted to revive the old commercial schemes, but 'his ships were broken at Ezion-geber' (I Kings xxii 41, 48) and after this the influence of prophetism combined with the growing pressure of Assyria to restrict the trade possibilities of the Jewish monarchs. Nevertheless, the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham were not without attempts at revival, and the earlier prophets corroborate what we might otherwise learn from the tribute lists of the Assyrian invaders that both Israel and Judah possessed much wealth which only had been acquired by rather extensive commerce. "Israel" says Sir G. A. Smith, "during those forty years of Jeroboam and Uzziah must have become a busy and a wealthy commercial power. Hosea calls the Northern Kingdom a very Canaan—Canaanite being the Hebrew term for trader—as we should say a very Jew; and Amos exposes all the restlessness, the greed, and the indifference to the poor of a community hasting to be rich". Amos, prophet as he was, was also a wool trader, and it was through his periodical visits to the great markets, including probably Damascus, that he became convinced of the Assyrian menace. Again, the list of articles of luxury, given in Isaiah iii 18, to 24, could only have been compiled in a land where commerce had attained considerable proportions. A generation later provision for trade is included in the Deuteronomic Code (see En. Bib. p. 5175, col. 1) in which respect a striking comparison may be made with the earlier Book of the Covenant.

After the Captivity there is so little question as to the activity of the Jews in international commerce that nothing need be said, but it may be observed that Ezekiel's wonderful description of the merchandise of Tyre of course reflects pre-exilic conditions.
In any case it provides for us a clear window opening out upon the commercial world of the 6th Century B.C.

The Jews who returned to Palestine after the edict of Cyrus may well have seemed for a while 'a starveling community' and were so indeed by comparison with their brethren of the Dispersion. The reforms of Nehemiah deliberately limited intercourse with foreigners as leading to religious contamination. Nevertheless, the Persian period was on the whole an epoch of great trade expansion, partly through the splendid administrative system of the Achaemenians and the liberal attitude adopted towards the subject peoples. This is reflected admirably in the book of Proverbs and the other Wisdom books.

Beyond this point there is no need to continue the historical sketch, and I desire for the remainder of this paper to draw attention to the light shed in instances not a few upon trade conditions by the Hebrew nomenclature used for the principal articles of commerce. It is to this task I now address myself.

By far the larger number of commercial terms of this sort are the names of spices, gums, and aromatic woods. The mere reference to such a list as Aloes, Almug, Balsam, Bdellium, Calamus, Cane, Cassia, Cinnamon, Frankincense, Galbanum, Ladanum, Myrrh, Saffron, Spikenard, Stacte, Storax, furnishes the proof of this, if proof be necessary. The list furnishes, moreover, the proof of the very general use of the Semitic tongues to denote the commodities.

Let us, however, to begin with, consider some which have foreign names significant of a non-Semitic provenance. Among these are:

אַלֹּת, תֹּלוֹלָא (once מִלְיָלַא); Num. xxiv 6; Ps. xlv 9; Prov. vii 17; Cant. iv 14. This is translated as 'Aloes' or 'Lignum aloes'; Gk. ἀγάλλωχος, ἐν-ἀγή. Both the Hebrew and Greek words are derived from some Indian word. Cf. Skt. agaru; Pali Agaru, agalu; Malayalam agil. Hence the Portuguese aguila, which gave rise to the French bois d'aigle, and our eagle-wood. The substance meant is a certain wood diseased through malnutrition and infiltrated with oil and resin. It was largely used for embalming and in the compounding of incense; also as a talisman,
from the belief that Adam snatched it for its perfume from the garden of Eden. Probably it was brought to Palestine from S. E. Asia. It is proper, however, to add that the expression of Num. xxiv 6 — “Lign aloes which the Lord hath planted”, presents the difficulty of implying a Palestinian habitat, and has suggested the emendation דָּלָּן, or ‘Terebinths’.

translated ‘saffron’ in Cant. iv 14. This is another foreign word, ultimately from the Skt. kankum, or kunkuma, which has come into Arabic as Kurkum, and thence obtained entrance into Gk. as κροκός. In this case the Semitic has been not the source but the channel.

Cant. i 12; iv 13, 14; and translated ‘nard’. This is a word borrowed from the Skt. narada, a word evidently related to nas, the nose (cf. our ‘nose-gay’). It passed into the Gk. from the Hebrew as נָרָדָא and so into other European languages. What is represented is undoubtedly the Indian Nardostachys Jatamansae.

D)D")3, I Kings x 11; לַדָּן (by transposition) II Chr ii 8; ix 10. This is also in all probability a foreign word, connected with the Skt. mocha, the יָן being a form of the definite article. It represents probably the Red Sandal wood which might very fitly be used by Solomon for the pillars of the Temple.

Gen. xxxvii 25, Ladanum, the Gk. ληθόν. This word is of more doubtful origin. In the Arabic it appears as ladhan and might very well be derived from the root לַח, to be sticky. It has also been derived from the Persian and appears to represent a fragrant and sticky resin gathered from the leaves of the Cistus ladanifera Schroff (J. A. O. S. Oct. 1920) calls it the Rock rose, Cistus villosus. The Semitic derivation of the name is favored by the fact that the Cistus is produced in Canaan, at least in the region of Gilead.

Balsam, is clearly a Semitic word, from which the Gk. βάλσαμον has been derived. It comes from the root בָּלָשׁ, ‘to smell sweet’, and has generally been identified with Mecca Balsam.

translated ‘balm’ in Gen. xxxvii 25, is another word of the same kind. It is mentioned also in Gen. xliii 11 and was regarded as so precious a product of Palestine that the tree was borne in
the triumphal procession of Vespasian. It is given in the LXX as ἰηρίνα, but is generally identified as Balsamodendron Gileadense. The root νερος means ‘to ooze or flow forth’.

חניה, translated in Gen. ii 12 as ‘bdellium’, is probably the same as the Babylonian ‘bidlu’ and so a Semitic word. It was apparently a resinous substance whose provenance has been variously given as the Somali coast, Persia, India, and even China.

כסי, Cassia, occurs only in Ps. xlv 9, except as a proper noun in Job. xlii 14,—the name of one of the daughters of Job. With a fair approach to certainty it may be derived from the root כבש, ‘to strip’, and so be translateable as ‘peelings’. It is in all probability the same aromatic bark as the צף, translated ‘cassia’ in Ex. xxx 24,—one of the ingredients of the holy anointing oil, and in Ez. xxvii 19. The root is the kindred word כף, ‘to cut’.

גא ונ, the calamus of Ez. xxvii 19 has given us our word ‘cane’ and has been identified with the sweet flag or lemon grass. Schoff observes, however: “We must guard against too specific an interpretation of these early trading terms”.

כרס, the Cinnamon of Ex. xxx 23, Prov. vii 17, Cant. iv 14, Rev. xviii 13, seems to me plainly a Semitic word, derivable from כריס, though Enc. Bib. thinks this extremely unlikely. It may possibly be that the term travelled from the further East, but Herodotus says distinctly that the Greeks learned the word from the Phoenicians. Consequently, even if the word be not of Semitic origin, it was transmitted by Semitic sailors. Schoff supposes that things ‘bundled’ were called by the merchants generally כספ, and ‘things cut’, i. e. packed in bags, כספ.

בום, the Cummin of Is. xxviii 25, is almost certainly derived from the root בום, ‘to season or preserve’ (cf. also בם). Enc. Bib., however gives it ‘of unknown origin’. Yet the word is the same in Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Carthaginian, and the Gk. κυμνον is evidently a derivative from the Semitic. The word represents the seed of an umbelliferous herbaceous plant.

צלב, the Galbanum of Ex. xxx 34, Gk. καλβανή, is without doubt of Hebrew origin, derived from the root צל, ‘to be sticky’. Galbanum is, however, not a Palestinian product, but is identified
by Birdwood as *Galbanum officinale*, a resinous substance grown in Persia. As an ingredient of the holy oil, it probably became known to the Jews no earlier than the Persian period.

The myrrh of Ex. xxx 23, Esth. ii 12, Ps. xliv 8, Cant. iii 6, iv 6, 14, v 1, 5, 13 (Gk. μυρρα, σμύρνα), is possibly the same as the Mecca Balsam elsewhere rendered שֵׁב. Schoff, however, speaks of that as Balsamodendron gileadense and describes it as 'a poorer cousin of the myrrh'. It is fairly certain that the word 'myrrh' is of Hebrew origin, from the root רַבָּן, 'to be bitter'.

Among commercial terms from outside the lists of the spices and aromatic woods we have the following:

דַּבָּן, the nitre or natron (Gk. νιτρον) of Prov. xxi 20, Jer. ii 22. This word too is almost certainly Semitic and derivable from דַּבָּן, 'to loosen', applied as it is to a mineral alkali, a kind of carbonate of soda, used for washing clothes. It was found in Egypt and India as well as in certain parts of Europe.

תִּירַב, on the other hand, was a vegetable alkali, or salt of lye, obtained by mixing water with wood ashes. It is mentioned in Job. ix 30, Is. i 25, Jer. ii 22, Mal. iii 2, and represents undoubtedly a derivative from דִּבְּר, 'to cleanse'. The word 'borax', which, however, represents something entirely different probably comes from the Semitic root דַּבָּן, 'to shine'. Among plant names we have:

בֲּוָאָס, the Hyssop (Gk. ύσσωπος) of Ex. xii 22, Lev. xiv 46, 49, 51, Num. xix 6—18, I Kings iv 33, Ps. li 7. This is derived from the root בָּוָא, 'to bloom' and is a genuine Semitic word. It was probably introduced to the Greeks by the Phoenicians. But it should be noted that the plant intended is probably not our Hyssop, H. officinalis, but possibly Capparis spinosa, known in Arabia as 'asaf'.

נוֹקְסֵן, the Sycamore (Gk. συκόμορος, συκαμίνος) of I Kings x 27, Ps. lxviii 47, Amos vii 14. It is probably derived from the root נַיְס, 'to be hard', in allusion to the fruit being of such poor quality as to require pinching.—Amos, it will be remembered, was a 'pincher' of figs, or sycamore fruit. In any case it is a genuine Semitic word which, transmitted into Greece, becomes συκόμορος, the fig mulberry, and συκαμίνος, the mulberry.
the cucumbers of Num. xi 5. It is derived from the root אָסֵר, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became אָסָה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as σίκους, σικύη. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.

The name, which appears commonly in O. T. as ‘shirt’ or ‘tunic’, is really our word ‘cotton’. It is a genuine Semitic word, though our ‘cotton’ probably comes to us through the Arabic قطن. It is derived from the root כָּחָה, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became כָּחַה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as αἰκυοῦς, αἰκυρός. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.

Kfc$?, the cucumbers of Num. xi 5. It is derived from the root אָסֵר, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became אָסָה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as σίκους, σικύη. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.

The name, which appears commonly in O. T. as ‘shirt’ or ‘tunic’, is really our word ‘cotton’. It is a genuine Semitic word, though our ‘cotton’ probably comes to us through the Arabic قطن. It is derived from the root כָּחָה, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became כָּחַה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as αἰκυοῦς, αἰκυρός. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.

Kfc$?, the cucumbers of Num. xi 5. It is derived from the root אָסֵר, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became אָסָה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as σίκους, σικύη. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.

The name, which appears commonly in O. T. as ‘shirt’ or ‘tunic’, is really our word ‘cotton’. It is a genuine Semitic word, though our ‘cotton’ probably comes to us through the Arabic قطن. It is derived from the root כָּחָה, ‘to hold or contain’, but by transposition of consonants the word became כָּחַה, a form which in all probability passed into Greece as αἰκυοῦς, αἰκυρός. The identification is usual with Cucumis Chate.
of an Egyptian word. See also Prov. xxxi 22, Gen. xli 42, Ex. xxv 4, Esth. i 6, Cant. v 15 (R. V. 'marble').

This, is a more probable Hebrew equivalent for silk. It is used in Ez. xvi 10—13 and is very possibly a foreign word, though offering a possible derivation from הָשָׁל, 'to draw out or spin'.

דַּרְכָּם, translated 'purple', is generally derived from the Skt. rdgām, but I see no difficulty in its connection with the root דַּרְכָּן, 'to spin', especially as it is certain the word implies material rather than color.

Passing to other commodities we find the word פַּנִּים which occurs in Cant. vi 11 and is translated 'nuts'. It is probably foreign, akin to the Pers. aglhus, but some are willing to connect it with the Hebrew root פַּנִים, 'to bind', i. e. to form a bunch. The word refers in all probability to the walnut (Juglans regia) which the Greeks and Romans always regarded of Persian origin.

דַּנְיָם, translated as 'ivory', has given rise to considerable discussion. It occurs only in I Kings x 22 and II Chron. ix 21. In the LXX it is represented by δόντες ἄλεφαντινοι. The Hebrew דַּנְיָם is regarded as equivalent to סֵרוֹם, but whether the דַּנְיָם, elephant, comes from the Skt. ibhas, or from the Egyptian ebu must be left doubtful. The Indian origin of the word is most favored, though it should be remembered that Thothmes III killed elephants in the Euphrates Valley. From Ez. xxvii 15 we learn that the Tyrians obtained ivory from the Rhodian merchants (Dodanim), and Amos mentions among the luxuries of the reign of Jeroboam II 'beds of ivory' (Amos vi 4). In Cant. vii 4 we read of a 'tower of ivory', though the meaning is doubtful.

יְפַּנִּים, which occurs only in Ez. xxvii 15, is translated ebony. It is generally regarded as a loan word, probably from the Egyptian heben, but may possibly have been confused with the Hebrew יְפַּנִּים, stone-wood. By emendation Cheyne finds the word in four other O. T. passages, including the passage mentioned in the last note, I Kings x 22. The wood referred to is in all probability the 'heart-wood' of S. India and Ceylon.

ירז, Iron, has all the appearance of a Semitic word akin to the roots יֶרֶשׁ, to cut, לְבָד, to be hard. The word appears in Assyrian as parzillu, and Hommel finds even a Sumerian barjāl which he
affirms to be the parent of the Semitic term. In any case the Hebrews seem to have acquired the use of iron from the older inhabitants of the land. This is implied in the Cainite tradition of Gen. iv 22 and confirmed by the use of iron for chariots by Jabin king of Hazor (Jud. iv). Goliath the Philistine had an iron spear, and the city of Zarephat may have been a smelter. That no iron was employed in the shaping of the altars or in the construction of the Temple is generally accepted as evidence that iron did not supersede the use of bronze before 800 B.C.

In the animal world three or four words connected with the history of Hebrew trade remain to be noticed.

Much debate has arisen from the references, in I Kings x 22 and II Chr. ix 21, to the פง and חניא which Solomon's 'Tarshish ships' brought back in addition to the gold, silver and ivory. The common interpretation has been 'apes' and 'peacocks' and the words have been identified respectively with the Skt. kapi and the Tamil togai, or tokei (now used only for the peacock's tail). In spite of the fact that this translation is favored 'by most moderns', the philological evidence is extremely weak and there is something to be said for Halévy's identification with the 'tuki' and 'kukupi' (Gk. κυφι) mentioned in the Amarna tablets. Here the words evidently denote certain costly vessels of oil. The LXX, it should be observed knew nothing of the 'apes and peacocks'.

A word may be said, in conclusion, of the animal most important of all to the travelling marchant, and it is not without significance that וה, the camel, is a real Semitic word which has found a place in many lands. It means 'the bearer' or 'carrier' and it is worth noticing that the word was in general use throughout the Semitic world before the separation of any of its branches.

One word to bring this paper, already grown too long, to a close. It is plain that the faculty for trade is for the Hebrew no acquisition of recent times but something which belongs to the very bone and blood of the race. Jacob and Esau were not so far apart at the starting point of their careers. The slope on the one hand towards materialism and on the other hands towards the spiritual was determined by a very nice choice at critical
moments. In like manner, the spiritual altitude of the great Hebrew prophets was not attained easily or in one splendid rush; nor was the materialism of the trader without its bearings upon that necessary process of universalization which meant so much for the theological, religious and social conceptions of the future. The old struggle of Jacob and Esau in the womb was destined to continue through the whole history of the Semitic peoples, with many a fluctuation of victory and defeat.

The international contacts developed by the language of trade afforded the Jew a marvellous opportunity for becoming the great missionary of monotheism. If he left this privilege to a 'remnant' we must not forget that it was a remnant trained, largely through commerce, to a world outlook. Nor need we allow that the battle for things spiritual was altogether lost, in spite of the fateful choice of nineteen centuries ago at Jerusalem. It is at least something to say that the history and writings of 'une petite peuplade sans culture' have had so spiritual an appeal for mankind as in large part to make us forget its ancient aptitude for commerce.
THE ASSYRIAN LAW CODE

(Recueil de Lois Assyriennes, By V. Scheil, Paris, Geuthner, 1921, pp.VI, 125. Francs 24)

By John A. Maynard, University of Chicago

The portions of an Assyrian law code published by Schroeder are nearly as important as the Code of Hammurabi. The have already been studied by Meissner in Babylonien und Assyrien, p. 175—179. Dr. Julius Lewy contributed a thorough study of the grammar of that code in the Berliner Beiträge zur Keilschriftforschung. The two first tablets were studied by Jastrow in the last issue of the Journal of the American Oriental Society. Professor Scheil's transliteration and translation of the code cover the first three tablets published by Schroeder, the three others being too small to be of much use at present. Scheil's work is of course entirely independent of Jastrow. We hope that it will be in the hands of any non-assyriologist who will study the code, since Jastrow's translation is faulty in many places. It is no pleasant task to call attention to errors of a scholar as universally regretted as Professor Jastrow but the importance of the text so well studied and presented by Scheil warrants such a departure.

Scheil's translation is excellent. We differ from him only in a very few places, where the text itself is doubtful. In Col. I, last line, we would rather restore (mim-im-ma-šu-nu). No question mark is necessary on p. 15, l. 16, as far as the meaning of the verb naku is concerned. Equally clear is the meaning of naikanu on p. 8, l. 6, l. 35, 39. Cf. Scheil's index, p. 123a. On p. 29, l. 55, we would add (s'il veut), translating (ha-di-ma) which is also to be restored. On p. 51, l. 58, translate esirtu by captive. On p. 57, we suggest banquet for šakulte. On p. 61, l. 43, 44, we would

1 Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedener Inhalts, 1920.
2 Das Verbum in den Altassyrischen Gesetzen, Berlin. 1921.
3 An Assyrian Law Code. JAOS, 1921.
translate, *et si (celui-ci) le prix total ayant été pris, est satisfait, il complétera l'affaire.*

There are a few errors in the transliteration. P. 2, l. 14, p. 4, l. 29, read aššat(at); p. 4, l. 22, read -ri-i-bu; p. 20, l. 78, read 40 (instead of 50); p. 24, l. 11, read aššat-su; p. 48, l. 38, the traces favor only -[ma]-a; p. 54, l. 90, read -ta-aš-ši; p. 76, l. 99, read mi-ta-a-at; p. 92, l. 44, read -nu-u-ni; p. 94, l. 8; p. 94, l. 8, read 50 instead of 5; p. 116, read šu-tu instead of šu-u. The copy which came into our hands had other errors of transliteration but they had been corrected by hand and so we presume that all other copies passing through the trade will have these corrections.

The Assyrian code shows a state of ethical development in Assyria far below that of Babylonia. A comparison imposes itself with the Hebrew Mosaic code and with the laws of the Himyarites attributed to Gregentius, Bishop of Taphar. It becomes evident now that there was no smooth and universal evolution of legalistic attitude in the Semitic world. Indeed the hypothesis of evolution in history of ethics and religion does not fit in with the facts. The Himyarite laws are no doubt partly the work of some jealous ecclesiastical writer of an age later than that of Gregentius, but it is rather striking that the punishments for some sexual irregularities are the same as in the Old Assyrian Code. Many critics are not able to understand why the Holiness Code witnessed to a legal conscience less developed than in Babylonia, but here we see a nation far closer to Babylonia, speaking a dialect of the same language, and yet far less developed from a ethical and legal point of view, than the more civilized South.

The first paragraph of the Code was not understood by Jastrow (*op. cit.* p. 13); it refers to a woman entering a temple for the purpose of robbery. "If in the temple she steals whatever belongs to the sanctuary, they shall prove it against her, they shall establish her guilt." There is no reference to restitution. The punishment consists partly in a shaving of the head, but that was evidently only a part of it.

The second paragraph is to be rendered as follows: "If a woman, be she the wife of a man (or freeman) or a man's daughter
utters impudent sayings or is given to vilifying of mouth, this woman bears her own fault. She will keep away from her husband, her sons, and her daughters.” The punishment of the common scold was therefore less severe than in the olden days of Massachusetts.

Nr. 6, read (instead of Jastrow). “If the wife of a man establishes a (concealed) store in the country, one buying (from her) will bear the penalty for robbery.” This makes evident that buying and selling were in Assyria matters conducted with the utmost carefulness of documentation.

Nr. 8, read after the word fingers: “and if the physician makes a ligature” (instead of Jastrow’s translation which is faulty).

Nr. 9. The penalty applies apparently to one finger only.

Nr. 12, (= Jastrow Nr. 11) read “the witnesses prove his guilt, and they (used indefinitely) put the man to death”. It does not follow that the witnesses put him to death, still less summarily without a judgment.

Nr. 13 (= Nr. 12 of Jastrow). The law does not assume (Jastrow p. 17, note 54) that the man is put to death but says clearly “they shall kill both man and woman.”

Nr. 14 (= 13) reads as follows: “If with the wife of a man, either in an assignation house or on the high way, a man has intercourse, knowing that she is the wife of a man, they shall treat the fornicator just as the husband shall command to treat his wife. If not knowing that she is the wife of a man, the fornicator has had intercourse with her, he shall be freed. The husband shall argue the point with his wife and will do to her as he pleases.”

Nr. 15 (14). The end of the paragraph says: “If he [declares his wife justified] he shall also declare the man [justified].

Nr. 16 (15). The beginning reads: “If [with] a man the wife of [a man makes] an intrigue, there is no guilt for the man.

Col III, 1—13 is not a continuation of the preceding paragraph (Jastrow p. 21) but deals with another case, namely that of a man lending to a married woman.” [Because] the lender has lent [to the wife of] a man, he shall go to the river, without bonds. If he returns from the river, as the husband of the woman shall do to his wife, they shall do to him.”
Nr. 24 (22) reads: "If a man's wife takes into her house the wife of a man and gives her to a man for intercourse and the man knows that she is a man's wife, they will do to him as to him who defiles a man's wife; and as the husband of the woman shall deal with his defiled wife they shall deal with the procuress. And if the woman's husband does nothing to his defiled wife, they will do nothing to the fornicator or to the procuress; they shall release them." The remainder of the paragraph was well understood by Jastrow.

Nr. 41 (Jastrow 39). Jastrow's translation (p. 36) "the unclean woman" was due to a wrong division of the syllables in the text where the word la-a is the negation and tu the first syllable of the following verb.

The first paragraph in the second tablet (Jastrow p. 50—51) reads: "... on the fields ... of land the [elder] receives and takes [two thirds] and his men receive and take the grass together. In the field of all ... and of all expenses, the younger son is free(?). The elder receives and takes two thirds as for the other third he throws the lot with his brother.

These notes show clearly that until further work is done on the subject, students will have to depend on Scheil's work and unfortunately not on Jastrow's. More definite work on the Code can be done only by one familiar with the Assyrian contracts and business documents which most scholars have neglected or the Babylonian documents. The portions of the Code published by Schroeder are of course only a portion of the great Code which may yet be found in the unexcavated mounds of Assyria.
THE ANAPHORA OF THE HOLY AND BLESSED JOHN¹
Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago
Anaphora of the Holy and Blessed, Treasury of Wisdom, John Son of Thunder

<THE INTRODUCTION>

*He shall say*

To thee, O Lord, we raise our eyes, we lift up our hearts, and exalt our thoughts, thou who art the existing one. He who existed from the beginning created the world, and he will endure forever. Thou hast no limit nor end. There is none who perceives thee; none who will perceive thee; there is none who knows thee, and none who is able to see thee. Thou alone knowest thyself. Thy kingdom will not be destroyed, thy power will not be annihilated, thy might will not be controlled, and thy glory will not be hidden. Thou art hidden from all, yet all is manifest in thee; thou hast no beginning, yet thou hast appointed an end to all; thou hast no end, yet thou hast appointed an end to all; all is from thee, and all is in thee, and all is for thee; thou art in all; thou art mightier than the mighty, and their rule is subjected to us by the coming of thy Son; yet thou art so much more mighty than thy seed, that thou hast subjected them to our power by thy mercy; thou art he who is a mediator to all; thou art he who transcends all; there is a refuge in thy might; and protection in thy strength; in thyself art thou concealed, for thou art in thyself. We beseech thee that thy Son may bless us. Thy Word is in thee, he who was born of thee, glorious even as thou art, for ever, thy Son and thyself.

For his sake, thou hast spoken to us, and his witness is thy voice; for thou art in truth and righteousness his Father. Thee

¹ Mercer, *Ms. Eth. 3*, 132a—147b.
they adore, with thy Son; but to him belongs the glory of sonship.

There was never a day that he was not with thee, and there was never an hour that the Son was not thy Son. The Father did not proceed from the Son, neither was the Son conceived by the Father; but the wisdom of the heart cannot fathom it. Let them rejoice that they may deliver themselves from fear, and exalt themselves above their watchers, for he works in secret and comes in secret; he enters and they tremble; he investigates and plans and examines even to the very limits that he may perceive any moment or hour whether thou makest a sign with the eye of unbelief, if such should believe not on thy only-begotten Son and his Father, and the Holy Spirit of life, even he who knows the hidden things of thy godhead, who has revealed to us thy essence, and made known to us thy unity, and hast taught us thy trinity, and has communicated to us thy unity. Therefore, thy equality which is irreproachable, thy unity which is blameless, and thy immanence which is universal, is the Father of heaven with the Son and the Holy Ghost. The Son blesses the Father and the Spirit, and the Holy Ghost informs the Father and the Son, for they are one in three. They control the unseen and miraculous. Thy praise, thou makest known to men, and thou hast manifested thyself in pity because of thy grace to those who praise thee; superiors according to their origin; kingdoms according to their tribes; watchers according to their orders; Cherubim according to their magnificance; Seraphim according to their holiness; all of them shall adore in fear and dread as is due; they shall fear God far and near.

THE THANKSGIVING

The deacon shall say

Let us give heed.

The priest shall say

Thus they veil their face with lightning that the consuming fire may not consume them; they cover their feet that the flame of power may not burn them; they fly to the four quarters of the world and to all places before him, that they may be in all
borders of the world; they shout that they may sanctify him who is above all in greatness of word and splendour and admiration. By their tribes and by their families, in their congregations and in their gatherings, they praise thee; thy Father they adore, and thy only-begotten Son they praise, and thy Holy Spirit they invoke, and all of them at thy holy eucharist mount up to give praise to thee. Show us that we may be together with them in thy mercy. O Lord, remember them. We praise thee, and we believe, and we say,

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Sabaoth,
the heaven and the earth are wholly full of the
holiness of thy glory.

_The deacon shall say_

Respond.

_The priest shall say_

Diverse art thou, and thou art the holy Father; diverse art thou, and thou art the holy Son; diverse art thou, and thou art the Holy Spirit; one name, one Lord; and in all of them we sanctify thee for thy goodness. And thou hast given them that we may be sanctified, and thou hast done all things. Thou hast created all, for thou wast not in subjection; thou hast subdued all for thou wast not weak; thou hast nourished all, yet thou wast not nourished; thou hast spoken for all, for thou wast not silent; thou hast given to all, yet thou didst not receive; thou hast added to all, yet thou wast not reduced; thou hast remembered all, for thou dost not forget; thou hast preserved all, for thou didst not sleep; thou wast forgotten by all, yet thou wast not obscured; thou hast given to all, yet thou didst not take.

Blessed is he—not the creator—who does not command the king, yet who does not constitute him Lord, who does not blame God, who does not barter him for riches, who does not give to him and then take away; for we all speak on behalf of thee, we magnify the creator of heaven. And thou hast sent forth the Son to us. He came forth, yet he did not leave thee; he went forth, yet he did not separate himself from thee; thou didst entrust all to him, and sent him to us, yet he was not separated from thee; where he was, there thou wast; he remained in heaven
with his Father, yet the earth was full of his Son; he descended, yet he did not proceed from above and he did not join himself to this world; he was conceived in the womb, yet he was not confined there; he was surrounded in the belly, yet he was not known; he, the creator of all flesh, dwelt in the womb; he who was above the Cherubim dwelt in flesh; he was clothed in flesh; fire consumed and concealed his subtle, spiritual body; he was brought forth from the hidden place into the open, and was nurtured by those appointed to nurture him in the body, and they developed him in the upper chamber to be our mantle of light. As he was clothed and dwelt in the house of the poor, so also, being poor, he sent forth the apostles. As a king they brought him gifts from afar; he was unruffled in his strength when he spoke to them. O Lord, thou wast nourished as an infant, yet they adored thee as Lord of all. He came forth as a man, yet acted as Lord. According to his own will he hungered as man yet he satisfied our hunger, and he multiplied little bread into that which was sufficient for the people. He thirsted when he was dying, and they gave him vinegar for water. As the Saviour of all he slept; as the Son of man be awoke and admonished their souls; as creator he established and sustained; being lowly he passed through the water; being exalted he lifted up his head; as our maker and Lord he is the remitter of sins; as Lord of all he was innocent of all, yet he endured the spitting of our profanation. He who made them live by his spital, made us see and gave us the Holy Spirit. They polluted him who forgave sins, and they condemned him who is the judge of judges. He was crucified on a tree that he might bear our sins; he was numbered with the malefactors that he might unite us with the just; he died of his own will and was buried by his good pleasure—he died that he might overcome death; he died that he might raise the dead; he was buried that he might raise those who were in their graves; he preserved them among the living that he might justify them of their sins; he cleansed them from their impurity; he received them to himself from their dispersion; and he established them in safety according to their occupation. Glory be to thee; praise and glory and blessing for ever and ever.
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The deacon shall say

Ye who sit, stand up.

The priest shall say

Because of those whom thou hast received back from death and caused to live and hast preserved, and whom thou hast cleansed from their iniquity, whom thou hast washed from their sins, whom thou hast brought back from their dispersion, whom thou hast delivered from their error, blessed art thou. Amen and Amen. We adore thee and we bless thee, O word of Wisdom and word of council, perfection of judgment and worthy of praise, fountain of happiness and prophetic source of prophecy, torrent of blessing on the Apostles, source of honour and establisher of kingdoms, pure crown of the priesthood, holy king, whose crown the sacred East shall adore, and he shall cover us with the sacred garment which had no joint and the tunic which was not torn. He is the way to the Father, the open doors—the work of the Son—the treasure which was opened, the true essence which was born, the mite which was found, the talent which increased, the leaven which was perfected for the leavening, the juice which gives taste to the insipid, the light which drives away darkness, the lamp which illuminates eternity, the saw which acts, the structure which is not destroyed, the ship which is not annihilated, and the habitation which is not moved, a sound friend but a swift punisher is Jesus Christ; and he is strength and wisdom to all. He has satisfied all and he has given to them eyes that they may see men as trees through a window, and that they may hear in secret. He will enlarge the sane ear, and he will expand the soul. With secret garments he will clothe their sublime body. His hand will erect a veil, his foot will broaden the way for those who limp. His soul will depart at night, and he will make his spirit to inhabit its abode. He will drive legions of demons into the herd of swine. He will cast sorrow from the weak soul, and he will cause the sun of righteousness to arise from its border, and it will shine forth to thy profit. Salvation and glory and praise for ever and ever.
<The Intercession>

The deacon shall say

Look to the east.

The priest shall say

Let us approach thee, the immaculate eucharist, full of penitence of soul, that it may sanctify our flesh. Let us not approach thee full of gold and silver, nor of precious gems which is injustice and sin, nor clothing which is a burden, nor a flock which is devoured by death, nor a herd which are in death. He will save his flock and preserve us, but he will not save those who deny him. We, who are saved, and are with those who are saved by thee do not approach thy human nature, but we approach thy majesty; we approach the fire of thy face, before the sacrifice of thy body and blood; we approach thy essence.

For the sake of thy holy Church which is saved by thee and for which thou hast died and for which thou wast smitten, for which thou didst shed thy blood and was crucified. But thou wast preserved by thy cross from danger that thou mayest enter into thy solemn heavenly marriage.

For the sake of all thy prophets who denied themselves to make thy place holy among all dark peoples.

For the sake of all thy apostles who sowed the earth with thy people in the place of thy cross, and carried the contents of thy word into all parts of the world.

For the sake of all thy martyrs, who rest in the orthodox faith, who for thy flock drove the wolf from the sheep.

For the sake of all the popes who cleansed their administration by purity and accepted their authority that they may receive the reward of their righteousness.

For the sake of all presbyters who preserve their sacred deposit that they may receive their portion in joy.

For the sake of all deacons, who were crowned with their portion of the Holy Spirit, that they may communicate to them the Holy Ghost.

For the sake of all thy saints, who have remained true, who teach thy people, and sanctify thy word.

For the sake of all kings and judges who rest in the orthodox faith.
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For the sake of the virgins and youths, who sinned in this world but who contracted a heavenly marriage.

For the sake of all the saints, who gave their souls to thee, who have braved martyrdom, and returned home with a good name, that they may ask for their prayers with a loud voice.

For the sake of all our fathers and brothers, who have left this changing world, though it was made for them; remember (when they appear) before thee.

For the sake of all those whom thou hast brought up in the baptism of the holy Church, that thou mayest be pleased with their martyrdom, and grant that thou mayest share with them that which is thine.

For the sake of all those who were killed with the spear and those who were taken.

For the sake of the poor and needy.

For the sake of the barren and orphans.

For the sake of thy work for us here below for which thou hast called us by thy grace, for it is not befitting that thou shouldst exalt us and lift us up—whom I cannot comprehend. But lead me to thee by thy pity, that I may draw near to thy sacrifice, O Lord; that thou mayest save my soul and all thy flock.

For the sake of this our congregation, that thou mayest bless them with the abundance of thy grace, that thou mayest strengthen our weakness, and justify defects, that thou mayest mollify our calamity, and quiet our consolation; that thou mayest enliven our sadness and cheer our minds; that thou mayest free our desperation, and give life to our morbidity; that thou mayest establish those who are penitent, and give power to the weak; that thou mayest strengthen the distant, and preserve those who are near.

For the sake of all those who are respectful, reward them; remember them in thy presence, for thou knowest all and thou art aware of all.

For the sake of the flowers of the earth, that thou mayest bless them, the crown of death; in multiplying thy long suffering, mayest thou give the crown of thy long-suffering.
For the sake of all those who receive this, remember the eucharist, that thou mayest receive for them their vows, and accept for them their eucharist.

For the sake of those who bear thy sign and came forth from the sad world and enter the joyful earth, that they may share in thy feast; that they may receive thy crown and rest in their habitation, which is for this world, in this thine own country of Canaan.

For the sake of all those who have sinned and erred, that this man—the Lord—may have pity upon them, and forgive them their sins, and take away their misdeeds and their errors.

For the sake of all those whom we call by name and those whom we do not know—for to thee their names are known—that thou mayest remember them in thy presence, O Lord Jesus Christ.

*The deacon shall say*

For the sake of those who sleep.

*The priest shall say*

Remember us, O Lord, and all those who rest their soul in thy bosom, in quiet waters in paradise, and in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the enlightened leaders of thy kingdom, and in the sanctity of thy houses.

*The people shall say*

Remember us, O Lord.

<The Institution>

*The priest shall say*

He stretched out his hands—our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son whom thou lovest, in the same night in which they took him, in the night in which it was decided to kill him; he was well-pleased that they afflict him; and that they crown him, afflicting him with spears; that the Church should come forth from his blood; that he should save his people by his cross; that he should build an altar, and that he should constitute images for them, and choose them priests and send them forth. He took bread into his holy and blessed hands, dowry of thy bride and the bill of
divorce of the synagogue which thou hast repudiated; giving thanks he blessed and brake, and gave to his disciples, and he said to them: "This bread is my body, whosoever eats of it shall not die, and whosoever receives it shall not perish. Take, eat of it all of you." Likewise, giving thanks over the cup he said: "This is the chalice of my blood of the new testament; take, drink of it all of you, a wonderful token for all who adore it at the cross, which was marked with his blood and signed with the cross and stamped with the sign which is for eternal life and for the remission of sins. So ye will show forth my memorial when ye come together.

<THE INVOCATION>

And we, O Lord, whom thou hast united that we may show forth thy passion, and that we may partake in thy resurrection from the dead, we beseech thee, O Lord, our God, that thou wouldst unite this bread scattered abroad in the midst of the mountains and hills, and in the valleys, and assemble and collect it that it may be one complete bread. So let us be gathered from all evil thought of sin in the full faith. So mix this wine with water that the one may not be separated from the other. So let thy divinity be mixed with our humanity, and our humanity with thy divinity; thy greatness with our smallness, and our smallness with thy greatness. Receive from us, O Lord, this oblation, on thy behalf, that thou mayest remember our righteousness, and that we may draw near to thee with pure bodies, and with all those who are not evil, but who are well pleased with thy greatness and with their eternal oblation for thee. Remember those who were with prudent Noah, and all those our sincere fathers upon whom thy kingdom shall come; let them magnify thy greatness that they may receive a good part and may be heirs of eternity in the kingdom of heaven, with all those who are satisfied with thee, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, our sincere fathers, whose work is good, and who shall come forth in purity, and who shall reign in righteousness with Moses thy servant and all the prophets who preached to us without fear and trembling, and who announced thee without ceasing; let them
receive their pay accurately; with Simon Peter and all thy disciples; with Paul and all thy apostles, who proclaimed thy gospel with patience, who deserve a blessing in thy mercy; with Stephen and all thy martyrs who poured out their blood for thy blood, that they may acquire glory from thy glory; let the names be written in the book of life in Jerusalem, the book which shall be for ever and ever, in it and the holy Church. We beseech thee, O Lord, let thy holy Church praise thee, and let thy flock exalt thee, and let thy people supplicate thee in their prayers for our purification, and by their submission to absolve us; and by their supplication to watch us; and by their praise to rule; and by their power to be chiefs of thy kingdom; by the holiness of the Seraphim and by the blessedness of the Cherubim; and by the excellence of our sublimity; a door of light will be revealed; the blessed gates will be opened; and thy spirit of life and holiness will come; it will descend, dwell, remain, rest, and pour out a benediction upon the oblation of bread and wine, which it will sanctify, that this bread may be a partaking of thy living body and the chalice a partaking of thy propitiating blood, that all who believe in the living Father and in the only Son, who proceeds from him, and in the Spirit of life who is inscrutable. Amen.

And he raised thy body and thy blood that they may be for redemption and for salvation and for remission of sins, for the taking away of death, for our light in the kingdom of heaven, and for eternal life. Amen.

He breaks it.

The deacon shall say

Let us give heed.

The priest shall say

And again we pray for all whom God the Father of our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ has taken away, for we praise him for all things and for all people, because a second time he has appointed us that we may fulfill this his holy mystery. We pray that thou wilt bless us this day, us and all whom the Lord our God has taken away.
THE INCLINATION

The deacon shall say

Pray ye.

The priest shall say

Lord God, Almighty, the Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, we pray and beseech thee by all and in all; for thou hast assigned us another opportunity that we may perform the holy elevation of this mystery; be pleased to bless us, and depart not from us; let not thy body be polluted nor desecrated by any; grant us to elevate this holy mystery of our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom to thee with him and with the Holy Ghost be glory and power, both now and ever and world without end. Amen.

The priest shall say

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world, and come before the face of the Saviour of the world, and encompass the Saviour of the world, even the body and blood of the Saviour of the world, in the faith of him the martyrs shed their blood.

THE COMMUNION

The deacon shall say

Stand up.

The priest shall say

Behold the blessing, behold the word which is proclaimed, behold the voice, behold the thanksgiving, behold the oblation, behold the name which was invoked upon those for whom this bread was given, who were without the adorable name of Jesus Christ, who is the Saviour, the giver of this living bread which came down from heaven to save the world. We bless thee, for thou art to us the way of life; we thank thee for thy word whom thou didst beget, and for this deliverance, and for this gift of flesh, and for this succour, and for this holy and mighty work of sacred life and lasting strength and quiet refuge and help, the
Saviour of those who wait upon thee. We thank thee that thou art called by this name for the love of man, that they may be saved and delivered from all evil, and from the former work which was placed upon them by their sins. And do thou sanctify them for ever and ever. Amen.

*After placing the oblation, he goes around breathing*

And again we beseech thee, Lord Almighty, Father of the Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ, we give thee thanks, by all and in all, for that thou hast granted to us to take of thy holy mystery. We beseech thee that thou wouldst bless us to day and be gracious to all whom the Lord our God receives.

*〈The Thanksgiving〉*

*The deacon shall say*

Pray.

*The priest shall say*

O Lord God, Jesus Christ, Lord Almighty, Father of our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ, we pray and beseech thee, by all and in all, for that thou hast revealed to those who are with thee our wisdom, that they may be helpful to us, and do thou reveal thyself to us and be merciful to us. O Father, because of thy name, be thou well pleased that we may partake of the holy mystery in thy presence. Let it not be pollution for any of us, who have abstained from sin, but for eternal life. Let true knowledge guide us while we are in this world. Receive this holy mystery, as it is received by us. Receive our dead into thy kingdom, that their lot may be with our Lord and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, through whom to thee with him and with the Holy Ghost be glory and dominion, both now and ever and world without end.

*〈The Benediction〉*

*Imposition of hands*

Before the holiness of thy sanctity, the work of thy hands and thy creature, submit himself to thee in soul, body, and spirit. Let thine ear incline to thy people; bless them and let them be among
those who are inscribed in the blessedness of thy mighty kingdom. Support their hands, and let them support them in all good works. Receive this sacred mystery; establish it in the hearts, minds and souls of all; may it be for strengthening of their soul, body, and spirit, in our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, to whom with thee and him and with the Holy Ghost be glory, both now and ever and world without end. Amen.
REVIEWS

*L'évolution de la langue égyptienne et les langues sémitiques.*

Professor Naville's new book gives us the scientific foundation of his theory of an "Aramaic Old Testament" anterior to the Hebrew Bible as we know it. It is scarcely convincing but it is logical, well written and most interesting a showing the growth of the fallacy which vitiates Naville's hypothesis. He starts with an attack on what he calls the German school of Egyptologists, which includes all the American, and many of the French and English Egyptologists. He tells us—which is not nearly correct—that the "German" school overlooks the African characteristics of the Egyptian language and civilization. The old school which Naville upholds reminds us of a curious conception of the Hebrew language which was frequently found among Christians in the 19th century the so-called *unpointed system.* Naville claims that vowels disappeared in writing because they had probably already disappeared in pronunciation. There—as almost everywhere else, he contradicts the bare facts. Indeed we know when the vowels came in in other Semitic languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic. There we can show that consonants remained although they were no longer pronounced. From the fact that modern Egyptians easily read unpointed Arabic the argues that a vowelless writing could not have been original. We do not know how Naville comes to such a conclusion with such premises, but it is certain that he contradicts the testimony of Arabic paleography. He rejects Sethe's monumental work on the Egyptian verb but that is rather an easy way of dealing with a scholar when you cannot prove his error. If the "Non. German" school is as numerous as Naville infers why does it not give us something equal to Sethe's work from the other point of view?
The author then takes up the growth of demotic which he compares to Aramaic. He tells us that cuneiform was not adapted to every day life, thus ignoring the silent testimony of myriads of business documents containing the most trivial information. He claims that cuneiform was only an official language, ignoring the testimony of the letters published by Harper which use a colloquial language, as letters do in the Orient to day. Thus do we know (facts versus Naville), that the spoken language was not Aramaic, not even in the time of the Sargonids. Besides that we also know that the Assyro-Babylonians had a stately and liturgical language namely the Sumerian. The author tells us that there had to be a passage from cuneiform to Aramaic language because it was not possible to simplify that cumbrous system (p. 166). He forgets that it was done in the case of Old Persian. He compares the birth of Coptic—under the influence of Christian missionaries adapting the Greek alphabet to an hypothetic transformation in Palestine in the first century A. D. when the Aramaic Bible (written in the language of the people) was translated into a dead language (Hebrew). This theory so flatly contradicts archeology, history and philology, that in spite of the winning personality of Naville, no Semitic scholar so far has dared to confess it—and yet we know how many of them would welcome any kind of a weapon against Bible critics.

Professor Naville has given us as good an apology for the Old School as could be given. His able protestations against a certain dogmatism found in the New School of Egyptologists will be very useful—but there is some dogmatism in the Old School too.

JOHN A. MAYNARD.


This book is the first volume of a work on Babylonia and Assyria by Professor Meissner. It forms the third volume of the first series of Foy’s Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek. No one could have been chosen better able to deal with the broad problem of the civilization of Babylonia and Assyria than Meissner, whose knowledge extends to every phase of cuneiform literature. Accordingly,
we have in this book a picture of Babylonian and Assyrian life which is well proportioned and masterfully done. The first chapter deals with land and people, the second gives a résumé of history, and then there follow ten chapters on the king and palace, army and war, officers and ministers, law, agriculture, industry, art, commerce, society and the family and daily life. A second volume will deal with literature, morals, religion, and probably other subjects.

Meissner planned his work primarily for the general cultured reader, but it will appeal to the student and scholar as well, for it has full references, and, although most of the material is old, there are some new things, such, for example, as Abb. 10, a statue of Lugal-kisalsi.

In a young science like Assyriology there are bound to be many unsolved problems. Meissner wisely avoids most of these. There are some things, however, in which he appears less cautious. For example, he speaks as if there was no question about the identification of Alašia with Cyprus. He also makes the bold statement that horned caps were the peculiar property of gods. This is not at all certain. See, for example, Naram-Sin, not as a deity, with a horned cap (Abb. 20). It is also not at all certain that priests did not dress like a god, wearing a horned cap, see, for example, many scenes on seal cylinders, where the suppliant is led before a deity by what is usually called another deity. This other deity is most likely a priest, who wears a horned cap. Nor is Meissner always careful to use what most Assyriologists consider to be a better form of transliteration. For example, he uses Erimuš for Rimuš. However, all these are minor considerations. The work is a masterly one, and we await volume two with eagerness. There is an excellent index, as well as 361 illustrations and a fine map.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


This new volume of the Biblical and Oriental Series takes up the life and growth of biblical Israel. The first chapter is "on
the rock whence they were hewn", namely the Semitic race, a rock found in the most ancient corner of God's great workshop. Dr. Mercer shows many nuggets in that rock and thus helps us to understand to some extent, why this Semitic race was predestined to give monotheism to the world. In that chapter, he connects Abraham's migration from Ur with the beginning of a monotheistic movement in that city, in the twenty-first century, a very plausible theory, since we know that there was at that time a most important transformation of religious ideals in Babylonia. Next, the author takes up the life of Israel, and most interestingly compares it throughout to the growth of a person. Israel was first an infant in arms (Egypt and the Wilderness), then a child (period of the Judges), then a youth (David's time). We have then Israel's coming of age, Israel's maturity (Amos to Ezekiel), Israel's ripened maturity (Judaism). Finally the author tells us of Israel's residuary gifts. There he shows the importance of the Zadokite movement, making clear that Christianity was a Pharisaiic or Zadokite Church, with a greater vision and with a tremendous message for the world at large. We have not found one single statement in this book that is not in accordance with the surest scholarship. The proof reading was as accurate as the work itself. There is only one misprint, due to metathesis, in the name of the city Berytus, in the map facing p. 164. We hope that this valuable outline of the religion of Israel will be made a textbook for Sunday School teachers, to whom books written by incompetent men have too often been recommended. Even scholars familiar with the modern science of the Old Testament will find Dr. Mercer's book inspiring. It is not a digest of dry facts but the outcome of deep thought, honest study, and good teaching. As a study of the collective life and growth of Israel, it is unsurpassed in the Old Testament literature of to day. We are sure that it will help much in the revival of Old Testament studies which will take place as soon as it is more commonly realized that we have in the Old Testament the most wonderful document of the quest of man after the living God—a book indispensable to the Christian Church, not only because of its proper value, but also as a safeguard against a wrong interpretation of the New Testament.
Let us hope that the Biblical and Oriental Series will give us a similar volume dealing with New Testament Times.

**John A. Maynard**


Goldziher's *Vorlesungen über den Islam* were published in 1910. In 1917, Mrs K. C. Seelye published under the title *Mohammed and Islam*, with an introduction by M. Jastrow, what was supposed to be a translation of Goldziher's Lectures. Dr. Arin's translation into French is entirely different in that it is a translation of what Goldziher actually wrote, without misunderstandings. The new translator is familiar with the subject. It appears that the translator had at first chosen Golziher's own title but changed it afterwards to a more explicit title borrowed from one of the chapter headings. Since the author himself made a number of changes in the first edition, Dr. Arin's translation is practically a new edition of the *Vorlesungen*. Goldziher's treatment of the Hadith is radical. He sees in them artificial sayings of Mohammed, made up for the purpose of giving a authoritative pronouncement on problems which arose after the death of the prophet, or for the purpose of sanctioning opinions of his followers. He then takes up the development of law and dogma, the growth of asceticism and sufism, the sects of Islam and the later developments, including Bahaism, the Ahmadiyya movement, and the attempt to unite sunnites and shiites in Russia. Goldziher is so evidently the best authority on Islam among European writers that his work deserves only praise. Here and there one may disagree with him about minor details. For instance, on p. 9, he takes a verse of the 22nd sura as illustrating Mohammed's tolerance towards Christians and Jews during the first period of his ministry. On the contrary it seems that this sura belongs to the third Meccan group and is therefore too late to illustrate a psychological evolution of Mohammed. One can easily be too dogmatic in such matters. The section of the book dealing with the modern movements should also have been brought to date, at least in a note. With these minor reservations, Dr. Arin's book will be a welcome
addition to the growing literature on Islam written in the French language.

JOHN A. MAYNARD


This fine series of articles by a few of the many friends, colleagues and former pupils of Professor Hommel is quite worthy of the veteran Semitic scholar who has inspired so many younger men to begin research work in the field of Semitic studies. The first volume contains 17 articles on Babylonian and Assyrian subjects, an article by E. Hommel on Etruscan, one by Nielsen on the North Arabian gods, three anthropological articles (by Bork, Röck and Schutz) and two Egyptological (by Sethe and Erman). The second volume contains six articles on the Old Testament, two on comparative religion, six on Islam, one on Ethiopic, one on Armenian, two on Turkish, and seven miscellaneous articles. By the variety of subjects it covers, this Festschrift is quite in keeping with the extensive range of subjects in which Professor Hommel has been a tireless pioneer, a versatile guide and true scientific prophet. However we miss in that Festschrift a bibliography of Hommel's work. That in itself would be quite a monument.

JOHN A. MAYNARD


Captain Ward is a well known explorer of Yunnan and Upper Burma. He gives us in this volume the story of a trip in the borderland of Burma at the headwaters of the Irrawaddy. This work will be mainly of interest to the botanist, but it will captivate the average reader. It supplies much information on the Kachins of Upper Burma of great value to the ethnologist and student of primitive religion.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Part I, Classical, Oriental, and Primitive Language and Literature, contains 1112 entries obtained from 137 periodicals. The list is excellent and indispensable to students.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a companion volume to the author's The Orient in Bible Times, and is an enlarged edition of The Peasantry of Palestine, Life, Manners and Customs of the Village, which appeared in 1907. The book has been revised, and an additional chapter seeks to sum up present conditions. Anyone, specialist or general reader, who desires a vivid picture of Palestine life, written by an eye-witness and a scholar thoroughly versed in Biblical literature, can do no better than to read this well-illustrated and well-written book.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Professor Marouzeau's book is meant for French readers, who may be unable to use books written in other languages; it therefore quotes only French authorities. He takes in turn phonetics, morphology, semantics, syntax, stylistic, descriptive grammar, historic grammar, comparative grammar, general grammar, the auxiliary sciences (philology, epigraph, etc.) and the history of linguistics. Dr. Marouzeau's book is most interesting, and written in a clear and racy language. As it stands it could not be translated into English, but it makes us desire that we also had in our own language, a textbook as valuable to all those who are interested in philology. It might help those who are trying so hard to clean our American schoolbooks and grammars from many of the errors of the old philology.

John A. Maynard
DIVINE SERVICE IN THE OLD KINGDOM

By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

An attempt is hereby made to sketch in outline the chief elements of Divine Service as it was in Egypt during the period of the Old Kingdom. Our knowledge of the religion of Egypt is yet very fragmentary, particularly of the earlier periods. There are many allusions to rites and ceremonies which we do not yet comprehend. Our picture of Divine Service during the Old Kingdom will, therefore, be fragmentary in places, but it will, it is hoped, serve as an outline in which to fit new fragments of religious knowledge according as they come to us.

Divine Service is taken to mean public forms of worship as distinct from private worship, if such ever existed in ancient Egypt. If our information about early Egypt were more complete, it probably would be found that what we are describing as public or official service was the only kind of service known. In fact the "Church" and state were so intimately connected — so much

an unit — that the need of an organized private service was never felt. The only form of private worship that has ever developed among any people may be called "Family Prayer", and as such, it never became very regular or rigid in its form. If Egyptians of the Old Kingdom ever developed a form of "Family Prayer" it has left no impression upon their civilization as we have been able to reconstruct it. The chances are that the mortuary worship of the Old Kingdom is the only form of worship with which early Egyptians were acquainted, and this they considered entirely sufficient for their religious life.

The chief elements that went to make up the official or public Divine Service in the Old Kingdom were gods, temples, altars, cult objects, hierarchy, offerings, lustrations, libations, and ritual acts. The nearest approach to a private service is to be seen in the mortuary offices. The material for the reconstruction of Divine Service in the Old Kingdom seems to fall naturally into two parts, that which has to do with mortuary offerings and that which has to do with acts of lustration. But, I think it will become clearer according as we proceed that these mortuary offices were likewise official and public.

There is no need of going into a discussion of the idea of god in the Old Kingdom, nor of outlining the growth of the pantheon. That has been done elsewhere. Suffice it to say that there were many gods, that the pharaohs were worshipped as gods, and that some gods were considered greater than others. From the Fifth Dynasty on, however, the kings began to call themselves "Son of Rē", because at Heliopolis Rē had established himself as head of the pantheon, and to serve him there developed a line of priestly attendants. Osiris had already established himself as the head of a pantheon, with his residence at Abydos, and we shall see that the two systems of ritual which grew up at these two centres gradually combined into the official Divine Service of the Old King-

dom. There were other minor pantheons, with their own rituals, at other centres, but it was primarily the ritual of the services at Heliopolis and Abydos that finally developed into the elaborate services as we know them in the later part of the Old Kingdom.

Divine Service in the Old Kingdom centred in the tomb and temple. There were the altars, the cult objects; there the priests officiated; there offerings were made; there lustrations were performed and libations offered; and there the various other acts of Divine Service were performed.

Every Egyptian deity had his house, Great gods possessed several temples (Erman, Life, 285). Some temples were named, for example, "The Goddess Abides" (BAR I 134), and some were erected or decorated for specific purposes, thus, Sistrum pillars were found only in the temples of goddesses, and tent-pole pillars only in temples which were erected for the celebration of the Thirtieth-year Jubilees. Naville thinks the earliest form of the temple in the Old Kingdom consisted of a single stone chamber, without ornamental sculptures, containing the false door (probably opposite the entrance) on which were the names of the king and the dedication. There may also have been a vestibule with square pillars. However this may be, the temple was considered the earthly abode of the god, and its interior was supposed to represent a picture of the world. The side of a temple represented the supports of heaven, being composed of the sign for staff, in the Old Kingdom, But before the end of the Old Kingdom the temple had developed into a very elaborate affair. Up till 1891, only one temple of the Old Kingdom was found, namely, that of the Sphinx, but since that time several good examples have been laid bare, copied, and published. Of course, these are mortuary temples. None others, such, for example, as that at Karnak, have been found to represent the Old Kingdom.

3 Mace, Tomb of Senetisti, New York, 1916, 84; compare the sign for temple in Petrie History, I, 8; and Bissing, Gem-ni-kai, I, 22.
4 Naville, Bubastis, 8.
But the general plan of these temples may be taken as typical of the ordinary temple of the Old Kingdom. One of the best of these plans is to be seen in Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Nefir-ir-ke³-re³* (WDOG 11), Leipzig, 1909, map at the end, or in Hölscher, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Chephren*, Leipzig, 1912. Such a temple consisted of a large hall, like the nave of a cathedral, and beyond that the hypostyle hall, corresponding to that part of a cathedral between the nave and choir, but of the same width of the main hall or nave. Then beyond that were the chapels. The whole was in the shape of a parallelogram. In the temple compound were residences of the priests and other officers of the temple, besides store-rooms for the materials of offerings. In these details, temples differed among themselves. Such establishments were primarily religious, and were immune from taxation. The earliest sun-temples were obelisk in form. In them Rē³ was the chief object of worship, although other gods, such as Hathor, Rē³-Harmachis, and Horus were worshipped. Rē³ had many temples, for example, Sep-Rē³, Šepu-ab-Rē³, Ast-ab-Rē³, and some of them were built by the pharaohs and called by their names. All temples were richly decorated with figures of gods and religious scenes, and in the innermost chapel, or holy of holies, was a shrine, the naos, inside of which was a richly decorated boat containing the figure of the god. These boats occur on the earliest inscriptions, and seem to have been carried in procession on festive occasions. A title borne by a man in the Old Kingdom was “Chief of the Two Holy Boats”, and these ships are usually decorated with the emblem or cult object at the top of the mast. Such cult signs are: a harpoon, a hill, a double axe, crossed arrows, a tree,
a thunder-bolt, a falcon, an elephant, etc. (AAA V 132). In fact, the boat served as the god's chariot, and he himself or his symbol was always represented in it. These cult objects represented different gods; thus, the thunderbolt, \(\text{\textbullet}\), represented Min (Amon?); the hill, \(\text{\textbullet}\), represented Ha; the \(\text{\textbullet}\) represented any god; the tail \(\text{\textbullet}\), represented any god or divine king. In a similar way the obelisk represented Re\(\text{e}\). These objects were not worshipped except in so far as they represented a god. Of course, there would be the tendency to mistake the object for the person represented, but, strictly speaking, it is not correct to speak of the cult of the obelisk (Petrie, History, I, 70—71), or of fire (Bib. Egy. 35, 385—422), or of the staff (RT 25, 184—190). There were other symbols or external manifestations of the deity, such as, the sacred bull (Petrie, Memphis, 1, 2; de Rogué, Six Dyn. 22, 60); the hawk (Quibbel, Hierakonpolis, II, 33); the crocodile (Schaefer, Kunst, Abb. 27); the ram of Mendes (de Rogué, Six Dyn. 22); the \(\text{\textbullet}\)-bird (AAA II 49 ff.); as well as the lion, the scorpion, and the beetle. But, in reality, these were all merely representations of the deity. The only approach to the real worship of anything than a deity or a deified king was the honour paid to the Apis bull. The time came when he really seemed to have received divine worship. But, at first, at any rate, he was merely the external manifestation of the deity.

There were many orders of priests. The pharaoh was the chief priest, but with the multiplication of his duties and the growing complexity of Divine Service throughout the length and breadth of the land, most priestly duties were delegated to others, and there developed a complicated priesthood. In the temples of Re\(\text{e}\) there were five grades of priests: 1) the \(\text{\textbullet}\), or “prophet”, nine varieties of which occur; 2) the \(\text{\textbullet}\), or chief “prophet”; 3) the \(\text{\textbullet}\) or “prophet’s” deputy; 4) the \(\text{\textbullet}\), or priest; and 5) the \(\text{\textbullet}\), or priest’s deputy\(^1\). A similar hierarchy

\(^1\) Sethe, „Die Heiligtümer des Re\(\text{e}\) im alten Reich“, ZAeg. 27, 111 ff.
served the pyramids of the kings, in fact, there were separate priesthoods for separate kings. The head of a definite priesthood was called the \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textregistered}}} \) or \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textregistered}}} \), and each city and god had their own chief or high priest (Urk. I 84, 20; WO 289). The \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textregistered}}} \), or \textit{sem}-priest, was originally the high priest of Upuat, but later it was restricted to the high priest of Memphis. This priesthood was sometimes held by important personages, for example, Aba, a \textit{sem}-priest of the Menankh pyramid of Neferkara, bore the title "First after the King" (\( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textregistered}}} \)). But the \textit{hery-heb}-priesthood was held by some of the most famous men of the Old Kingdom. Thus, the Sheikh el Beled, and Pepi-Nakht of the reign of Pepi II were both Lector-priests (JEA 6, 231; Urk. I, 131). Priests bore high civil titles as well as their religious ones. One was called "The Great Chief of Works" (de Rogué, \textit{Six Dyn.} 71). Others were judges, royal secretaries, magistrates, etc. Most noblemen of the Old Kingdom bore priestly titles as well as others. Thus Zau bore no less than seven priestly titles, and his son bore six; Rēc-hetep, son of Sneferu, bore the title of high priest. In fact, the monarch was \textit{ex officio} superintendent of the prophets. Priestly titles were numerous. There was the \( \text{\textcircled{\text{\textregistered}}} \)-\textit{Rē} (Petrie RT I 37), the \textit{Uty} (Garstang, \textit{Mehāsua}, 19), the \textit{Imy-hnt}, the \textit{Wr-m3}, the \textit{Wnwt \textit{nt} \textit{ht}-ntr}, etc. The professions of priest and prophet were often combined. But among all these different orders of priests the two most prominent were the "prophets" (\textit{hmw-ntr}) and the priests (\textit{we}eb). The former were the more important.

High priests were appointed to their office by the king, and it is probable that all candidates for the priesthood had to be circumcised. The ceremony of ordination consisted of ordination, crowning, being conducted to the sanctuary, being embraced and fed by divine attendants. Priests were immune from forced labour, and derived their income from temple estates and from daily and incidental offerings. While the children of a priest usually succeed him (BAR I 219), there is no evidence to show that the priesthood became hereditary until Ptolemaic times.

Priestesses were of two classes: 1) Musicians, who danced, sang, and rattled the sistra, and 2) "Prophetesses", who nearly always
served Hathor or Neith. Priestesses also were often highly placed. For example, the wife of a nome-governor was a priestess of Hathor (Petrie, Denderah 47). The mrt, or musician-priestess, was especially connected with the Sed-festival and appears in company with another musician-priestess called the sût (JEAI 7, 8). Besides Hathor and Neith, these priestesses served Thoth (JEAI 7, 9), the king (Mariette, Mastabas, 90), or the sacred bull (de Rouge, Six Dyn. 61). The priest's wife was often a priestess (Petrie, Athribis, p. 2, col. 2). These priestesses were considered the concubine or wife of the god, in which case they were usually identified with Hathor (JEAI 7, 14, 16; Weill, Déc. 13). Priestesses were paid a stipend and received donations (JEAI 7, 29).

The central act in Egypt's Divine Service took place in the tomb-chamber. When it took place in a temple, it was because the temple represented the tomb-chamber of a god. Egypt's religious interest lay primarily in the power to live again. All Divine Service seemed to have been mortuary. Their conception of the gods was a mortuary one. The gods lived in this world at one time, they died, they were revivified, and finally took up their abode in heaven. Likewise the kings, the offspring of the gods, were destined to die, to be revivified, and to live in heaven. This was true of every individual. The sun-god, Rê, once lived upon this earth, he died, was revivified and went to heaven. His place was taken on earth by the pharaoh, his son. Osiris was killed, revived, and went to heaven. In like manner would not only every pharaoh but also every individual die and be again revivified? At a very early time in the development of Egyptian religious thought these ideas gave rise to what became the typical Egyptian Divine Service — mortuary offerings and lustrations.

Egyptian Divine Service begins with death. Immediately at death preparations are made for the funeral. The corpse, hût, is first embalmed. This is a religious ceremony of great detail, the ritual being supposed to represent those rites performed at the funeral of Osiris. The officiating priests and assistants impersonated the gods, Anubis, the four Sons of Horus, the Sons of Khentikheti, and Isis and Nephtys. The corpse is taken to the House of Purification, over a stretch of water, a sumptuous repast
is served, then an ox is offered, and finally the embalming process and ceremonies occupy seventy days. One of the most important of the ceremonies was the lustration, when the body was placed in a large jar or pan and two men poured water over it.

Next came the funeral, and that was also a religious ceremony. Accompanied by weeping men and women the coffin, covered with flowers, is placed on a boat-like bier, preceeded by three priests with papyrus-rolls, out of which are recited the laments. Then follow the officials and a female lamentator. Behind the bier is another female mourner, together with officers and priests. The corpse is carried over a stretch of water and then placed on a bier with runners, like a sled. On the sled before the bier is a box with the canopic jars and jars of incense, and over all is a baldachini. Behind all is a man robed in the jubilee-garments of the king. Some funerals are still more elaborate. Usually the bier is accompanied by an offering-sledge on which are numerous materials for offerings. On arriving at the grave, preparations are made for the greatest of all Egyptian services — the mortuary offering and the service of lustration. Officials are there with their staffs of office, female dancers and singers are there, for it is a joyous occasion. The mourning of the funeral procession gives place to the joy which anticipates the great new birth which is awaited. Loads of material for offerings are brought. A statue of the deceased is ready to be put in its place, and priests are ready to slay the beasts and birds for the offering.

The earliest tombs were usually brick-lined pits, and on a mat laid on the ground on the east side of the tomb was a vase containing the offering. From such a group the ḫtp — hieroglyph for offering arose. In these tombs also were deposited certain food offerings for the benefit of the deceased. At a later time stone sarchophagi in the form of a house became common. These were considerably roomy, and contained a niche, before which was placed the ḫtp-table. In the niche stood a statue of the deceased. The niche developed into a false-door through which the ka or spirit of the deceased came to receive nourish-
ment. When it became customary to paint the interior of these tombs, the deceased was often represented seated before a table (ḥtp) containing food and drink. With the passage of time these tombs became more and more elaborate until we come to the period of the great pyramids, which are tombs of the pharaohs. In fact, the great temples of later periods are nothing more than the tombs of the gods and the sacrifices offered therein are merely the mortuary offerings to the gods. Early in the Old Kingdom we meet with royal tombs which have two great stelae placed on the east side and between them was the table of offerings. Such tombs had a serdāb (cellar) where the statue of the deceased was kept, and a hole connected the cellar with the tomb so that the incense offered in the tomb-chamber may pass through to the ka which inhabited the statue. Soon the tomb-chamber was not considered large enough for the numerous offerings brought, when brick chambers were added around the tomb for that purpose. When the tomb was the burial place of a great man, it was surrounded by the more modest graves of his retainers. But every tomb was built on the same model.

These tombs were called the ♨️, or “everlasting house” or the ka-temple, ♨️, because there the ka of the deceased lived. The grave was known by other names, such as, the “house of the vital fluid” (WO 150), “the divine hall” (Capert Chambre fun. 13), etc. Now, the oldest mortuary rite of which we have any record was in the form of a banquet (Murray, Saqqara Mastabas, Pt. I, pl. XVIII, p. 36), and these offerings are not, therefore, sacrifices in the generally accepted meaning of that term. They were merely means of feeding the ka of the deceased in order to maintain and preserve life. Not only was food offered, but also utensils, and even servants were probably killed and buried (Petrie, RT I 14) in order that the deceased may experience no discomfort in his new life. And as time passed, the walls of the tomb-chamber were decorated with pictures of all kinds of food and utensils which the ka was supposed to be able to use and enjoy.

The daily mortuary service had its origin in the desire to keep the deceased continually supplied with all the necessities of life.
In these services food and drink were presented, libations were poured out, and incense was burned. At an early date royal decrees established mortuary offerings in perpetuity for the kings (Weill, Dēc. passim). Endowments were made, often by will, and priests were established to carry on the daily mortuary service. Some of these priesthoods were very powerful. Thus, princes of the Oryx Nome held priesthoods of the house of the ka of Pepi. The "prophet", was the usual mortuary priest. But these were organized into orders, and there were chiefs of the mortuary priests, as well as assistant mortuary priests. There were also mortuary priestesses (Urk. I, 1ff., 36).

Mortuary offerings were usually called the or "an offering which the king gives", because every mortuary gift was supposed to represent the eye of Horus which he sacrificed in his fight with Seth for his father Osiris, and every king was the personification of Horus. When, therefore, the priest presented offerings at the tomb of the deceased he impersonated Horus, and also the king, in his presentation. Therefore every mortuary offering was called a  di niśtw, or the "Eye of Horus" (PT, Ut. 54).

These mortuary offerings were numberless and consisted of almost everything that was good for food as well as of articles of clothing and utensils. The most common consisted of bread, beer, incense and linen. These numerous gifts at numerous tombs demanded the services of numerous priests and their assistants.

Originally the ritual in the tomb-chamber was very simple. After the offerings were brought and put in place the ka-priest offered incense, then the offerings were sprinkled with water containing natron to make them pure (PT 1112 c, d), and then began

2 For lists and literature bearing upon the subject see Wiedemann und Pörtner, Ägypt. Grabreliefs aus der großherzoglichen Altertüm.-Samml. zu Karlsruhe, Straßburg, 1906.
the ceremony of Opening the Mouth of the Deceased by means of proper implements (PT 30 a, b) and accompanied by the use of natron (PT 26 ff.), and the presentation of food and drink (PT 31—40). The mortuary priest then recites the formula "An offering which the king gives, an offering which Anubis gives, thousands of bread, beer, oxen, geese, for the ka of NN." Finally, comes the promulgation of immortality by the wot-priest (Third to Fourth Dynasty) or by the kry-lib-priest (Fourth to Sixth Dynasty). Then follows the censing and washing as preparation for the banquet, which consisted of many courses. The service is done by the priests and their attendants. After the banquet oils and cosmetics are presented for the guests and the ceremony comes to an end.

We have now followed in outline the mortuary service as it was usually performed in the tomb-chambers of the Old Kingdom. We have seen that is was not a sacrifice in the ordinary accepted sense of the term but a meal at which the ka of the deceased partook and was thereby strengthened and sustained. All offerings were thus for the revivification and sustenance of the ka of the deceased. When temples were built, as the mortuary homes of the gods, the same service, only on a much more elaborate scale, was performed. These took place occasionally and periodically. Everything was on a larger and more elaborate scale. The ḫtp-table became a great altar, and stood in the court before a great obelisk-shaped monument, and beside it was the area for the slaughter of animals. We are given in detail the different steps in the ritual of the seizure and slaying of the ox for Divine Service in such a temple, and the whole ceremony is performed under the direction of the "Chief of Sacrificers" assisted by the prophet and priest. The materials offered are numerous the chief being bread, cakes, beer, geese, wine, oxen, birds.

The question of human sacrifice in Egyptian religion has often been raised. Greek and Latin authors were the first to refer to it.

3 Klebs, *Reliefs*, 121; Capart, *Primitive Art*, fig. 165.
4 See for lists, Capart, *Chambre fun.*, 13 f. and literature noted there.
Modern students have referred to the representation of the pharaoh smiting a person whom he holds by the hair\(^1\), and to the assumption that servants were killed to serve their master in the future world. But beyond that there is no evidence in the inscriptions or pictures of the Old Kingdom. There is nothing to prove that the pharaoh is offering his captive for sacrifice, and, even if it could be proved that servants were put to death to accompany their master in the next world, that would not constitute a sacrifice. In fact, as we have had occasion to see, the whole nature of Egyptian ritual is opposed to any kind of real sacrifice. The offerings made to the \(ka\) of the deceased were not made as real sacrifices, but purely as food for his daily life. In like manner those made to the gods in their temples were not made with the idea of propitiating them or with the feeling that they were to serve as a means of strengthening the bond between man and his gods, but purely and solely for food to keep the gods alive. At any rate, this is all that can be said for the offering in tomb and temple in the Old Kingdom. There is, therefore, no such custom of human sacrifice to be found among the Egyptians of the Old Kingdom.

The most elaborate services took place periodically on great festivals, such as New Year’s Day, the \(Wag\) Festival, the Festival of Thoth, and especially the \(Sed\) Festival which occurred every thirty years (Petrie, RT I 22). The chief feature of the service on these occasions was a procession, and the service itself was connected with some legendary episode in the life of the gods. On such occasions special hymns were sung, the temple was decorated, illuminations were made, incense was offered, the statue of the god was exhibited and carried on a litter in the form of a boat. And on a particularly great occasion the king would appear and dance before the god\(^2\). This is perhaps the “divine dance” referred to in PT 1189\(a\).

Perhaps it was in connection with these mortuary offerings that the custom of pouring libations should be considered. At any rate, libations were supposed to produce the same effect, namely, to restore by sympathetic magic the vital fluids, and hence restore

---

2. Quibbel, *Hieran*, II 41; Petrie, RT I 22.
life (PT 22—23, 765—766, 868, 2007, 2031, etc.). The material of libations was usually water but milk could also be used and with the same result (PT 734 ff.).

The services so far considered, whether in tomb or temple, have been mortuary in character, their object being to do honour to the dead, whether god, king, or simple subject, by presenting him with an abundance of the necessities of daily life and thus enabling him to live. We now turn to another kind of religious service, but still mortuary in nature and designed to meet the same need, namely, to revivify and sustain the life of the deceased. This is the service of lustration. This service was originally based upon the ceremonial toilet of the Heliopolitan king which was performed daily at dawn in the so-called House of Morning, before he entered the Sun-temple to officiate as high priest. The ceremonial toilet of the king was in turn based upon the lustrations which the sun-god was supposed to make each day on rising. In its earliest form this service was comparatively simple. Every day the priest proceeded to the chapel of the deity worshipped, loosened the sealed cord that closed the door, broke the clay seal, drew the bolt, and opened the door revealing the statue of the god. He then offered incense and made prostrations, chanting and saying hymns. Then began the chief episode, namely, the daily toilet of the god. The priest first sprinkled the statue with water from four jugs, clothed it with linen bandages, white, green and red. Then he anointed it with oil, smeared it with green and black rouge, fed it, presented it with its insignia, and the ceremony was over. At each juncture the priest recited a liturgical phrase. By the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty the service became very elaborate (Mariette, Abydos i 34—76; Ber. Mus. No. 3055). This service is extant in two editions, one representing the service as it was performed at Abydos and the other the service of Karnak. These two liturgies Blackman has thoroughly studied, and placed them side by side in an article published in the Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society for 1918—1919, pp. 27—53. It will be realized how elaborate this service was if it be remembered that Blackman shows that
in the Abydos service there were as many as twenty-seven distinct episodes and in the Karnak service twenty-three.

This service which represented the deity or king as being daily reborn and revivified seems to have been applied imitatively by the individual worshipper to himself. Just as the king was washed every day, so the deceased would be, and just as the king was incensed and clad and fed, so the deceased would be. The individual's interest in such a service was, it seems, the fact that he expected the same benefits for himself as were conferred upon the deity or pharaoh by these ceremonial lustrations.

In another article, entitled "Egyptian Foretaste of Baptismal Regeneration", which appeared in the first volume of Theology, pp. 134—142, Blackman seems to interpret this service as a kind of Baptism. He does this because of the large part which washing with water plays in the ceremony and likewise because of the fact that such lustrations were thought, as he says, by the Egyptians to bring about a state of righteousness. But, of course, a moment's thought will show that "Baptism" would be a misnomer for such a service. Various reasons may be given. First, Baptism is performed only once for the same person. But the pharaoh, as prospective pharaoh was washed in infancy, he was again washed during his coronation ceremony, and again every time before he officiated in a temple he was washed by two priests impersonating Horus and Thoth or Horus and Seth. Furthermore, Baptism is designed to be applicable to all. In this case it is only the pharaoh who is thus washed. Of course, similar lustrations were performed over any deceased person, but they were designed to revivify him, and not necessarily to render him righteous, although all washings, according to the Egyptian way of thinking, were connected with the idea of purity, material and moral. The pharaoh was washed by divine beings before he ascended to heaven, who recited a spell asserting his righteousness (PT 921 a—c, 1141 a—1142 b), but that could hardly be called "Baptism". Lustrations were performed on all religious occasions. Nor can it be said that lustrations in themselves had any ethical significance, for it was not the lustration that produced righteousness, although it might have been a symbol thereof. That which produced righteousness
was the performance of the will of the gods. The living pharaoh was believed to be reborn each day like the sun-god through the medium of water, but not necessarily reborn from sin to righteousness. The pharaoh was simply a counterpart of the sun-god, and the ceremony was merely symbolical or imitative.

The ceremony of circumcision was common in the Old Kingdom, but we do not know what the ritualistic details were, nor do we know whether it was a religious ceremony or no. Elliot Smith is of the opinion that it was regarded by the Egyptians as a preliminary to marriage.

In all religious ceremonies of the Old Kingdom prayers in some form or other were common. The charms of the Pyramid Texts are really prayers; so are the many salutations in mortuary texts. Prayers are numerous for the comfort of the dead, and are addressed to deities or to the deified king. The numerous models of ears and stelae sculptured with ears, as well as the frequent representation on monuments of the attitude of adoration all attest to the prevalence of prayer. But little is known of the form of prayer other than that it usually took the form of a charm or salutation.

From the earliest times music was used in the religious ceremonies of Ancient Egypt. Hathor seems to have been the patron of religious music and sacred dancing, and music and dancing were a notable feature in her cult (JEA 7,14). The instrument usually used was the sistrum — the religious musical instrument par excellence. A priest of the Old Kingdom was called or chief singer (de Robu, Six. Dyn. 90), and one of the titles of the high priestess of Amon was "the Greatest of the Musicians".

Many musical instruments are mentioned in the sources of this period, such as the harp, flute lyre, pipe, drum, cymbals, castanets, tambourine, but it is not certain that, with the exception of the

---

1 Mercer, "Early Egyptian Morals", JSOR II 3—27.
2 PT 698a, 1688b, 1835a.
3 Already in the Old Kingdom Osirian and Solar theories of illustration are found side by side in the same formulæ, e. g., PT 1978c, d, 1979a, b, 1980a, b.
4 Klebs, Reliefs, S. 21, Abb. 10; Bib. Eg. 10, 115—118; ZÄEG. 52, 59.
5 Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society, 1912—1913, p. 75.
6 Capart, Primitive Art, 278f.
tambourine or timbrel, they were used very much in religious ceremonies. But on all great religious occasions, when there were processions and an abundance of ritual, music was common, the singers often marking the rhythm by clapping their hands.

Very little is known about the posture of the deity in a religious ceremony. As a rule, however, he sits upon a throne. The posture of a priest, however, is better known. As a rule he stood with left foot advanced, right arm at the side, and left arm bent at the elbow with a staff grasped in the hand. The worshipper usually stands with both hands raised as high as his face, palms outward. This is, however not the only posture, although it is the most common. Sometimes the suppliant prays with both hands crossed over the breast, or sits with both hands raised before he face. Sometimes he kneels and makes his offerings.

The characteristic garment of a deity was the folded kilt with a middle piece hanging downward. He wears an artificial beard, or is distinguished by certain animal heads, crowns, and attributes. When the dead king becomes an Osiris he is furnished with various ceremonial garments and royal insignia like the gods (PT 41–49). Some of the priestly orders were distinguished by the special vestments they wore, although, originally, the priest did not dress differently from the ordinary person. The distinguishing garments were ceremonial. The Lector-priest wore long hair and beard, a scarf over the left shoulder, and short skirt. Most other priests were beardless, short-haired, or clean shaven, with simple skirt, although the Sem-priest wore a skin fastened round the body by means of a waist-band and sash, the ka-priest wore a simple short skirt, and others wore a long wig with clinging tunic. High priests usually wore a long garment and a wig, sometimes the

1 Petrie, Dendereh, 48; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 194.
3 Quibbel, Sagg. 1907, Pl. XIII.
4 Fechheimer, Die Plastik der Ägypter, Berlin, 1920, Pl. 49.
5 Schaefer, Kunst, Abb. 36.
7 Bissing, Gem-ni-kai, II, 34ff.
8 Bissing, op. cit. II, 34ff.
skirt is short. Sometimes the high priests wore a badge as a symbol of their office (Mariette, *Mast.* 74, 75). But the most common indication of the priestly office in the earliest period was the leopard-skin and tail. Whenever the priest impersonated a deity, which he often did, he robed as a deity (RT 39, 57).

Ceremonial played a large part in a early Egyptian Divine Service, but the purpose of the service was never lost sight of, because it was so evident. The Service of Mortuary Sacrifice or Mortuary Offering was intended, whether in tomb or in temple, to feed and serve the deceased. The deceased must be kept alive and comfortable. In the case of the deceased individual, he must be kept in good condition in order to undergo successfully his trial before the divine judges, and, in the case of the gods, they must be kept comfortable because of the help expected from them as well as because of a real religious affection for them. The service of lustration was performed for the individual as well as for the king because of the belief that it was necessary to an admittance to the companionship of the gods. It was a sign and symbol of the condition necessary to an association with the gods. Thus, the pharaoh after death had to be purified in order to enter the abode of Re (PT 1359) or to sail in the boat of Osiris (PT 1201). After the Sixth Dynasty every dead person, in order to attain future happiness, must be identified with Osiris, and the symbol of that identification was purification or lustration (PT 733; 1411 a, b.)

In summing up what we have learned about Divine Service in the Old Kingdom it must be admitted that its details cannot as yet be followed very minutely. But, on the other hand, its character is doubtless. All Egyptian religious ceremonies of the Old Kingdom were mortuary in character. They were unlike the sacrificial services of Sumeria and Babylonia. The Sumerians and Babylonians, as well as other Semites, lived in this world. Their interests were centred in mundane things. They sacrificed to their gods in order

1 JEA 6, 226 ff.; PT 1349 b; Petrie, *Medium*, Pl. XII.
3 Compare Blackman, "Righteousness", ERE, 7.
4 Mercer, *Divine Service in Ur*, JSOR, V 1—17.
to please them, to propitiate them, to enjoy their company, and to receive their help. The Egyptians ever kept their eyes centred on the future. Their services began with death. As soon as an individual died, elaborate provision was made, by means of mortuary gifts, to keep his ka alive, and to furnish it with every means of happiness. That desire expressed itself in the most popular form of Egyptian Divine Service, namely, the Mortuary Sacrifice or Mortuary Offering. In the earlier periods this service took place in tombs, later, to some extent, in temples. In such a service prayer and music, at first, played a small part. The chief acts consisted in the presentation of the numerous gifts. As time went on, however, this service in the temple became very elaborate, and we can easily imagine the pomp and grandeur attending the processions which took place and the elaborate ceremony of killing animals and offering them for the benefit of the deceased. This Mortuary Sacrifice began in simplicity with a few gifts to the departed in his simple grave and reached its grandeur in the numberless offerings brought in procession to the god in his mighty temple. The other service of the Old Kingdom, the Service of Lustration, began with the king in the temple of Rā, and only gradually became an universal thing, a service of the masses. This was brought about chiefly by the entrance of the people's god Osiris, into the theology of the Heliopolitan priests.

Thus we have seen that Divine Service in the Old Kingdom expressed itself in two forms, first, that of Mortuary Sacrifices or Mortuary Offerings, and secondly, that of a Service of Lustration. Both lived side by side, the one arising out of popular need, the other having its origin in the palace, and being gradually appropriated by the common people. The Egyptians worshipped the gods primarily because of their hope to be united with them in the future, and not because of any great sense of present need. It is because of this, that their services are so mortuary and other-worldly in nature and character, and it is because of this that it is so hard for us to understand and appreciate the ceremonial detail of these services. Perhaps, when more material of this early period has been brought to light, and when we have learned more of the deeper meanings of ceremonial allusions in
the literature of the Old Kingdom, we shall be in a better position to understand the details and meaning of Divine Service as celebrated among the ancient Egyptians. But, meanwhile, it is hoped that this study will serve to arouse further interest, and to furnish some clue to a possible complete classification of the chief elements of Divine Service in the Old Kingdom.
A PENITENTIAL LITANY FROM ASHUR

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago

The text VAT 9939 (No. 161 in Ebelings Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts) is a bilingual text written in the late Assyrian period, which recalls in two or three places the second of Zimmerns Bußpsalmen. (ASKT 116ff.) The text is fragmentary.

TRANSLITERATION

1) ... aš]-ra-ak is-te-ni-[^3]
2) ... kin-kin-e
3) ...-ti-šu aš-[ra]-ak is-te-ni-[^3]
4) ki-zu ... [tab(?)-ba(?)]-ra kin-kin-e
5) aš-ru-ka ...[^3] a-ha-ti iš-te-ni-[^3]
6) šāb-mer-a-zu ki-[bi-šu] dē-[ra-a]b-gē-gē
7) lib-ka iz-zu a-na aš-ri-šu li-tu-ra
8) šāb- š-š-š-šu ki-b[i-šu] dē-[ra-ab-gē-gē]’e
9) lib-ka ag-gu a-na aš-ri-šu li-tu-ra
10) šāb-ib-s[i(?)]-ga-a-zu ki-bi-šu dē-ra-ab-gē-[gē]
12) [šāb ...] a-zu [ki]-bi-šu dē-ra-ab-gē-gē
13) ... [lib]-bi ...-li-ti ana aš-[ri-šu li-tu-ra]
14) šāb ... ki]-bi-šu dē-ra-ab-[gē-gē]
15) [lib-ka ...] a-na [aš]-ri-šu [li-tu-ra]
16) ... [bi]-bi-šu dē-ra-ab-[gē-gē]
17) ... [lib-k]a ... a-na aš-[ri-šu li-tu-ra]

Rev. 1) ^d... imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-[ni tug-ga]
2) [^d... sibit(it)] a-di sibit(it) a-r[a-an-šu pu-šu-ru]
3) [^d... imin-á imin-á] nam-tag-ga-a-ni tug-ga
4) [^d... sibit(it) a-]di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-šu-ru
5) [en] ^denbi-lu-lu imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-ni tug-ga
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6) belu d'en-bi-lu-lu sibit(it) a-di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ru
7) uku-gal d'kur-nun-na-an-ki imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-ni tuğ-ğa
8) šar-ra-tum d'zar-pa-ni-tum sibit(it) a-di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ru
9) u d'mu-ze-eb-ba-sà-a imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-ni tuğ-ğa
10) belu d'nabu sibit(it) a-di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ru
11) nin d'nin-ka-ur-si-si-ki imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-ni tuğ-ğa
12) be-el-tu d'taš-me-tum sibit(it) a-di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ru
13) u dimer di-mağ imin-á imin-á nam-tag-ga-a-ni tuğ-ğa
14) be-lu ilu-ma da-nu ši-ru sibit(it) a-di sibit(it) a-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ru
15) nam-tag-ga-a-ni tuğ keš-da-ni bur-da
16) [a]-ra-an-šu pu-ту-ur i-ru-su pu-uš-ru
17) [nam-tag-ga-a-ni] tuğ ka-tar-zu sil-sil(īl)
18) [a-ra-an-šu pu]-тu-ur dá-lí-lí-ka lud-lul
19) [šàb-zu šàb ama tu]-ud-da-dim ki-bi-šù dè-ra-ab-gé-gé
20) [lib-ka kima libbi] um-me a-lit-te a-na aš-ri-šu li-tu-ra
21/22) [ama tu-ud-da a-a] tu-ud-da-dim [ki-bi-šù dè-ra-ab]-gé-gé
23/24) [kima um-me a-li]t-ti a-bi a-lit-tu [ana aš-ri-šu] li-tu-ra

TRANSLATION

1) ...seeks thy place
2/3) ...his ...seeks thy place
4/5) thy place ...side, he seeks
6/7) may thy angry heart return to its place
8/9) may thy irritated heart return to its place
10/11) may thy heart dark (?) from anger return to its place
12/13) may thy ...heart return to its place
14/15) may thy ...heart return to its place
16/17) may thy ...heart return to its place

Rev. 1/2) O god..., seven times seven, let his sin be forgiven
3/4) O god..., seven times seven, let his sin be forgiven
5/6) O Lord Enbilulu, seven times seven, let his sin be forgiven
7/8) O Queen Kurnunanki (Zarpanitum), seven times etc.
9/10) O Lord Muzebbas (Nabu), seven times etc.
11/12) O Lady Ninkau-sisiki (Tashmetum), seven times etc.
13/14) O Thou Lord and God, august Judge, seven times etc.
15/16) Forgive his sin, loosen his curse
17/18) Forgive his sin that he may worship in thy service
19/20) May thy heart like a birthgiving mother’s heart return to its place
21/24) Like a birthgiving mother’s, like a begetting father’s heart, may it return to its place

NOTES
Rev. 7) uku to be restored. Cf. Br. 5918.
12) note the use of imin-á and sibit(it) adi...
14) pušuru (tu-ga) is a permansive. This use of the overhanging syllable in the Sumerian verb is common in the late period.
19 ff.) Zimmerm, Bußpsalmen, p. 35.
22) li-tu-ra. The text has tu-tu-ra, a scribal error.
DAS HETHITISCHE KÖNIGSPAAR
TLABARNAŠ UND TAVANNANNAŠ

Von FRIEDRICH HROZNY, Prague


1 Auch das Lüische hält Sommer mit mir für eine indoeuropäische Sprache (ib. Sp. IV).
2 Der Vorschlag Sommers, das indoeuropäische „Hethitisch“ trotz des Chattischen auch weiterhin aus praktischen Gründen Hethitisch zu nennen, wird wohl allgemeine Zustimmung finden.
wiederholt versichert worden, daß ihnen mein Buch große Dienste geleistet hat. 


ist, so daß somit nur die zuletzt angeführte Erklärung Sommers (tabarna Eigennamen und Titel) zu Recht bestehen wird, und weiter, daß in ähnlicher Weise, wie der Name Labarnaš, auch der seiner Gemahlin später verwendet wurde.

Über alle Zweifel ist der Name und die Existenz des Königs Labarnaš erhaben. Siehe Bo 2043, Obv. II. 4 f.: ha-an-tide-iz-si-ia-āš-ma-āš-ka-n "La-ba-ar-na-āš "Ha-[a]t-ti-ši-li-ši NebiY Ku-me-iš-na-ha-an pa-ri-an Ü.UL tar-ni-eš-kir „(als) die ersten aber die (Akk.) "Labarnaš (und) "Ḫatušiliš (über?) den FLUSS Kūmešmaḫaš hinaus" NICHT haben gehen (?) lassen". In dieser Inschrift Ḥattušilis III. wird Labarnaš vor Ḩattušiliš I. genannt. Die ersten Zeilen (Obv. I. 1—3, richtiger jetzt 1—4) der bekannten von mir HKT S. 9 usf. zum erstenmal übersetzten Telipinuš-Inschrift sind jetzt mit Hilfe des Duplikats (Bo. 2620, Obv. 1—4 folgendermaßen zu ergänzen:

\[UM.MA\] ta-ba-ar-na "Te-li-b[p](-j)nu L[UG]AL(?) G[A]L(?)

\[ha(?)-r]u(?)-ū "La-ba-ar-na-āš. LUGAL GAL e-eš-ta na-pa [MA\*RE(?) L]-ŠŪ


d. h. [ES FOLGT (DIE REDE)] des tabarna "Telip[u]š, DES G[ROSS]KEN(?) K[ÖNIGS(?) (....)]:

\[Ein]st(?) "Labarnaš GROSSKÖNIG war. Alsdann SEINE [SÖHNE(?)]

SEINE [BRÜD]ER(?) und seine LEUTE Verwandten(?), die LEUTE Würdenträger(?)

UND SEINE KRIEGER versammel[ten s[i]ch.

Auch die folgenden Zeilen (Obv. I. 5—12 = HKT S. 96ff., 4—11) beziehen sich auf Labarnaš, auf den (EGIRŠŪ-ma) nach Z. 13 Ḥattušiliš folgte.

\[Für die Präposition pa-ri-iš(-an) wahrsch. „hinaus“ siehe z. B. KBo. IV. Nr. 3, Obv. I. 19, KBo. V. Nr. 13, Obv. I. 31 und vergleiche auch HKT S. 47, Anm. 6.\]
Auch in dem Fragment des Muvattalliš-Alakšanduš-Vertrages KBo. IV Nr. 5, Obv. I 3 wird m. E. 

\[ \text{m} \text{La-ba[r(?)-]na[?](-)ás[?]) } \]

erwähnt. Muvattalliš gibt diesem Vertrag in herkömmlicher Weise eine historische Einleitung, in der er mit Labarnaš zu beginnen scheint; er bezeichnet vielleicht nach dem leider hier ebenfalls schlecht erhaltenen Duplikat Bo. 2079 Labarnaš sogar als seinen Vorfahr! Muvattalliš bespricht hier die Beziehungen des Labarnaš zu den von diesem anscheinend unterjochten Ländern Arzava und Viliša, worauf er dann auf Dudduḫalijaš I. und später auf Ṣuppi-luliumaš zu sprechen kommt.

Die Gemahlin des Königs Labarnaš hieß m. E. Tavann(a)n. Beachte vor allem die Inschrift Bo. 706, von der ich mir, da sie noch völlig ungereinigt ist, leider nur die folgende Zeile notierte habe: 

\[ \text{a-ú la-bar-na-an LUGAL-un } \text{SAL} \text{Ta-va-na-na-an } \text{SAL. } \text{LUGAL } \ldots \text{den Labarnaš (ohne Personendeterminativ!), den } \text{KÖNIG, (und) SAL Tavananaš, DIE KÖNIGIN}.“ Siehe weiter das kleine, anscheinend Opfer für verstorbene Könige und Königinnen behandelnde Fragment Bo. 499, 3 ff.: 

\[ \text{A.NA } \text{SAL Ta-va-na-na-a[n?] } \ldots \]

\[ \text{A.NA } \text{mLa-ba-ar-n[a?] } \ldots \]

\[ \text{5 A.NA } \text{SAL Kad-du-si-i } \ldots \]

\[ \text{A.NA } \text{mMur-ši-il-l} \text{ i UDÚ } \ldots \]

usw.

d. h. FÜR \text{FA} \text{U Tavanna[nnaš?] } \ldots 

\[ \text{FÜR } \text{mLabarn[aš?] } \ldots \]

\[ \text{5 FÜR } \text{FA} \text{U Kadduši } \ldots \]

\[ \text{FÜR } \text{mMurši-liš } \text{i SCHAF } \ldots \]

usw.

Auch hier wird die Tavanannaš wohl die Gemahlin des Labarnaš und andererseits die Kadduši... vermutlich die Gemahlin Murši-liš I. sein. Vgl. auch z. B. KBO. II. Nr. 15, Obv. II. 6, rev. IV. U.

Wie verhält es sich nun mit dem König Tabarnaš? Einen hethitischen König dieses Namens habe ich vor allem auf Grund der VSHL S. 49f. erwähnten akkadisch-hethitischen Bilinguis VAT 13.064 aufgestellt, in deren l. c. S. 50 zitierten akkadischen Unter- 

schrift ta-ba-ar-na LUGAL GAL und LUGAL GAL ta-ba-ar-na
(in beiden Fällen ohne Personendeterminativ) zur Zeit, als wir in tabarna sonst nur ein Wort für „Erläß“ sahen, unmöglich diese Bedeutung haben konnte, sondern viel eher als der Name des Großkönigs (LUGAL GAL), des Autors dieser Inschrift aufzufassen war. Wenn nun Sommer jetzt die Möglichkeit erwägt, daß das tabarna dieser Stelle kein Eigennname, sondern bloß ein Titel ist, so ist dem entgegenzuhalten, daß hier — was S. allerdings nicht wissen konnte — dann die auch von Sommer selbst postulierte Voraussetzung für seine Deutung fehlt, nämlich ein von tabarna verschiedener Name des Königs in der Einleitung der Inschrift.

Die erste akkadische Zeit der Inschrift (Obv. I. 1) lautet:¹

\[\text{[um(?)-ma(?)] t}a-ba-ar-na a-na sa'be}^1 ti na-ak-pa-ti u a-na kap-t(a)-ti\]
d. h.: „[Folgendermaßen?] (sprach) tabarna zu den Kriegern von Gewicht (d. h. Offizieren?) und zu den Würdenträgern.“

Die entsprechende hethitische Zeile (Obv. II. 1) bietet jetzt nur:

\[U[M(?).M]A(?)] ta-ba-ar-na pa-r[a(?)-a] \ldots\]
d. h.: „E[S FOLG]T(?)(DIE REDE) des tabarnaš [zu(?)] den(?) Vo[r?]-\ldots\]

Es ist nun gewiß nicht wahrscheinlich, daß diese inhaltlich so bedeutsame und auch so ausführliche Inschrift es — entgegen der sonstigen Übung — verabsäumt hätte den Namen ihres großköniglichen Autors wenigstens in der Einleitung zu nennen.

Hierzu kommt weiter, daß, wo wir im Kontext dieser Inschrift wohl den Namen des Königs erwarten würden, das Wort la-ba-ar-na-aš o. ä. (ohne Personendeterminativ) steht, das uns bereits als der Name eines uralten hethitischen Königs bekannt ist (s. oben). Und da der akkadische Text unserer Inschrift an einer Stelle das hethitische la-ba-ar-na-aš vielleicht durch \[t]a(?)-ba-ar-na wieder-gibt, das ja anscheinend als Name des Königs auch in der Einleitung und in der Unterschrift der Tafel genannt wird, und da ich auch z. B. aus der hethitisch-protochattischen Bilinguis Bo. 2030 wußte, daß auch sonst die Wörter labarnaš und tabarna miteinander abwechseln können, so lag für mich der Gedanke nahe, daß

¹ Das Original dieser Inschrift ist sehr schlecht erhalten und ist außerdem noch nicht gereinigt; ich gebe daher die folgenden Lesungen nur unter Vorbehalt.

² Etwa den „Vo[rgesetzten des Heeres]“ o. ä. ?
unsere Inschrift eben von einem König Tabarnaš oder Labarnaš stammt, dessen Name in Wirklichkeit dann etwa Tabarnaš lauten mußte; das Fehlen des Personendeterminativs bei dem Namen eines so alten Königs brauchte nicht unbedingt aufzufallen (siehe hierzu auch weiter unten). Ich lasse nun die betreffenden Stellen unserer Inschrift folgen.

L. c. Rev. III. und IV. bs.: Heth.: LUGAL GAL la-ba-ar-na-aš A.NASAL Ḥa-āš-ta-ia-ar me-mi-iš-[i(?)-i]zi(?)-zi(?)

Akkad.: [LUGAL(?)] GAL(?)[t]a(?)-ba-ar-na a-na SAL Ḥa-āš-ta-ia-ar i-₃[a?-bi?]¹

d. h.: „Der Großkönig Labarnaš (akk. [T?]abarna) zu der Frau Ḥaš-tajar spricht“:

Hier scheint also für das hethitische labarnaš im akkadischen Text [t]a(?)-ba-ar-na zu stehen; von [t]a(?) scheint noch sichtbar.

¹ Die Stelle bestätigt meine bereits MDOG 56, S. 37, Anm. 2 gegebene Gleichung heth. memai „er spricht“.

Ähnlich ergibt sich aus unserer Bilinguis z. B. (in Auswahl):
heth. -an (II. 8) = akkad. -šu (I. 8) „ihm“ (siehe SA S. 141 ff.)

-e-ip-pu-un (II. 8) = akkad. as-bat (I. 8) „ich nahm“ (siehe SH S. 170 ff.)

-na-an-qa-ka[n] (II. 8) = akkad. ma ... -šu (I. 8) „und ... ihm“ (s. SH S. 134)

do-a-₃ (II. 10) = akkad. il-ki (I. 9) „er nahm“ (s HKT S. 210 f., 71).

nu (II. 10) = akkad. ₃ (I. 10),

un (II. 11) = akkad. ṣi (I. 11) „und,“

nu-ra (III. 64) = akkad. ₃ (IV. 64),

-an-na-āš-ši-di (II. 10) = akkad. umni-šu (I. 10) „seiner Mutter“ (s. SH S. 31, 132)

ud-da-ar (I. 12) = akkad. a-va-a-ti (I. 12) „Worte“ (s. SH S. 66 ff.),

bi-pi-iḫ-lu-un (II. 31) = akkad. ad-din (I. 31) „ich gab“ (s. HKT S 114 f., 30),

az-zi-ib-ki-id-du (II. 32) = akkad. bi-₃u-al (I. 32) „er möge essen“ (s. SH S. 170),

pa-an-ku-un (III. 62) Akk.

= akkad. [na(?)-a]k(?)-pa-tam (?) (IV. 62) wahrschein. „Gewicht, Würde,

pa(?)-an-ga-u-i (III. 63) Dat. Adel, Honoraryen“ u. ä.

= [a-na] na-ak-pa-a-[i?] (IV. 63)

kar di Dat. (III. 64) = viell. akkad. SA(G) (IV. 64) „Herz“ (vgl. l. cor, gr. καρδιὰ usw.),

a-pa-a-t (III. 64) = akkad. šu-va-a-ti (IV. 64) „jenes“ (s. SH S. 137 f.),

-sum (III. 66) = akkad. an-ni (IV. 66) „mich“ (s. SH S. 121 ff.),

li (III. 66) = akkad. li (IV. 66) „nicht“ (s. SH S. 184),

ki-ša-an (III. 67) = akkad. ki-e-a-am (IV. 66), „so, also“ (s. SH S. 140, Anm. 3),

tle-za-si (III. 69) = akkad. i-₃a-ab-bi (IV. 68) „spricht“ (s. SH S. 2, Anm. 3),

dar-ra-an-si (III. 67) = akkad. i-₃a-ab-bu-₃ (IV. 67) „sie sprechen“,

-[a (III. 68)] = akkad. ši (IV. 68) „und“ (s. SH S. 185),

ša-₃-ag-ga-₃-ti (III. 70) = akkad. i-di (IV. 69) wohl „ich weiß“ usw.
Siehe weiter Rev. III. 50 f. (die akkadische Kolumne IV ist abgebrochen):

\[ {\text{[LAGAL]} } {\text{[?]}} \text{ la-ba-ar-na A.NA } "{\text{Muur-ši-il li MAR.ŠÚ}} \]

\[ {\text{[?]-mi(?)-i?]} } {\text{ši-nu-an da-ša-š usw.}} \]

d. h.: "[DER GROSSKÖNIG?] Labarna zu "Mursiliš, SEINEM SOHNE, hat [gesprochen(?) usw.

Ähnlich heißt es ibid. 47 (Kol. IV ist abgebrochen):

\[ {\text{[ŠA(?)] } la(?)-[ba?]-ar(?)-na-š LUGAL GAL ud-da-ar-me-it}} \]

\[ {\text{pa-aš-ša-š-nu-ut-te-en}} \]

d. h.: "Meine (-met), [DES?] La[bjarnaš(?), DES GROSSKÖNIGS, Worte bewahret!]"

Eine andere wichtige Stelle, die m. E. zeigt, daß es auch einen König, namens Tabarnaš gab und daß dieser wohl mit Labarnaš identisch war, finde ich Bo. 253 g, Rev. (3) I. 14 (eine leider unvollständig erhaltene liši-Stelle):..... ta-ba-ar-na-an SALT[a]-a-an-na-an ...

Der Vergleich mit der oben S. 67 zitierten Stelle aus Bo. 706 legt wohl die Identität der Könige Labarnaš und Tabarnaš, die anscheinend beide eine Frau, namens Tavannahnaš, zur Gemahlin hatten, nahe.

Endlich möchte ich noch eine Stelle erwähnen, die ebenfalls in dieser Richtung weist und uns zugleich meines Erachtens die Lösung


"sein", gr. Sg. des z.B. VAT 13062 öfters vorkommenden Demonstrativpronomens šaš, šan, šiš (Akk. Pl.), ar-ta-ta-taš (II. 64) "deines Vaters" usw. Endlich sei hier auch der 16. Rev. III. 49, bezw. 35 vorkommende Satz notiert:

\[ \text{NINDA(?)-an as-ša-ši-te-ni va-a-dor-ra e-ku-ut-te-ni, bezw.} \]

\[ \text{nu NINDA-an as-ša-ši-te-ni va-a-dor-ra e-ku-ut-te-ni, den man mit dem Satze} \]

\[ \text{nu NINDA-an e-is-ša-ši-te-ni va-a-dor-ra e-ku-ut-te-ni} \]

(SH S. 61)

"Nur BROT werdet ihr essen, Wasser ferner werdet ihr trinken" vergleichbare.

2 Vgl. auch Obv. II. 30 (heth.): TUR.TUR (Oder Rasur?) la-ba-ar-ni ..... - Ist vielleicht der Obv. I. 2, bezw. II. 3 (akad. marṣam am la-ba-ar-na; hatte ..... la-ba-ar-na-an) erwähnte Labarnaš ein anderer Sohn des Königs Tlabarnaš, der zuerst als dessen Nachfolger anzusehen war?? Der von Tlabarnaš zu seinem Nachfolger designierte Mursiliš wird übrigens vielleicht nie geherrscht haben; auf Tlabarnaš folgte ḫattiššušš I. und auf diesen Mursiliš I., der nach K Bo. I. Nr. 6, Obv. 13 wohl ein Enkel ḫattiššušš I. war.
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des ganzen Problems an die Hand gibt. Es ist dies die keilschriftliche Legende des Sigelabdrucks von K Bo. V. Nr. 7, Obv. Mitte:1

\( DUB \) \( ta-ba-ar-na \) "Ar-nu-an-ta LUGAL GAL TUR "Du-u[d?]

\( DUB \) \( SAL \) Ta-va-an-na \( SAL.Aš-mu-ni-kal \) \( SAL \) LUGAL GAL T[UR(?)]. \( SAL(?) \) ...

\( \overline{U(?)} \) TUR. \( SAL \) "Du-ud-ša-li-[a]..."

d. h.: (..)² TAFEL des \( \text{Tarbarnaš \,} \) "Arnuantas, DES GROSS-KÖNIGS, SOHNES VON "Du[ḍhaliya(?)] DES GROSS-KÖNIGS(?)" TAFEL der \( \text{FRAU} \) Tavannanna \( \text{FRAU} \) \( \text{Ašmunikal,} \) DER GROSS-KÖNIGIN, DER [TOCHTER(?)] VON...

UND(?) TOCHTER³ "Du[ḍhaliya[aj]'s...".

Aus dieser Legende möchte ich schließen, daß ähnlich, wie \( \text{Ašmunikal} \) die Gemahlin des \( \text{Armantaš} \) (vgl. dieselbe Inschrift Obv. I., Rev. 46 und 49), auch Tavannannaš die Gemahlin des Tabarnaš (hier wiederum ohne Personendeterminativ; ähnlich auch ibid. Rev. 49) war, und weiter, daß sich nach diesem berühmten Königspaar der alten Zeit, das das kleine hethitische Land so bedeutend vergrößert hatte, die späteren hethitischen Könige als \( \text{Tabarnaš} \) oder \( \text{Labarnaš} \), die späteren hethitischen Königinnen als Tavannannaš bezeichneten. Diese ursprünglichen Namen sind später zu Ehrentiteln und zugleich sozusagen zu einem Programm der hethitischen König und Königin geworden; jede spätere König fühlte sich wie ein \( \text{Tlabarnaš} \), jede Königin wie eine \( \text{Tavannannaš} \). Es kann daher nicht auffallen, daß das besonders häufig vorkommende \( \text{tabarnaš-labarnaš} \) schließlich ohne Personendeterminativ, und zwar auch dann, wenn es als Eigennamen den alten König selbst bezeichnete, verwendet wurde.

1 Vgl. Winckler in MDOG 35, 29.
2 Vor \( \text{DUB} \) ist noch der Kopf eines vertikalen Keils sichtbar. Kann dieser Keil eventuell an den Schluß der Zeile gehören?
3 Dieses \( \text{TUR-SAL} \) "Tochter" ist hier sehr auffällig; man würde hier gemäß ibid. Rev. 46 und 49 vielleicht das Ideogramm \( \text{DUB} \) "Tafel (\text{mDu[ḍhaliya[aj]}, DES KÖNIGSSOHNES)" erwarten. Allerdings ist ein Irrtum des Schreibers auf einem Königssiegel sehr unwahrscheinlich. Und so scheint die Annahme unvermeidlich, daß Ašmunikal, die Frau Armantaš II., zugleich auch seine Schwester war (E. Winckler l.c.). Der Name Ašmunikal ist mit dem Namen der Mondgöttin Ningal, 522, zusammengesetzt; beachte die Bo. 2068, Obv. 1 gegebene Schreibung dieses Namens: \( \text{UM.MA SAL.Aš-mu-LU NIN. GAL SAL LUGAL GAL} \) usw.
In der Verwendung als Ehrentitel der hethitischen Könige kommt Tabarna in allen jenen Fällen vor, in denen wir es bisher unrichtig als ein Wort für „Erlaß“ aufgefaßt haben; einzelne Belege siehe bei Sommer l. c. Sp.IV. Ich möchte hier besonders die Stelle K Bo. III. Nr. 6, Obv. I. i. hervorheben: UM.MA m Ta-ba-ar-na mHa-at-tu-si-li LUGAL GAL usw. „ES FOLGT (DIE REDE) des mTabarna mHhattušiliš, DES GROSSKÖNIGS“ usw. Hier hat mTabarna noch das Personendeterminativ! Sehr wichtig ist die Stelle Bo. 2471, Rev. IV. 14 ff. (Muvattališ-Alaksanduš-Vertrag), die uns zeigt, daß nicht nur mTabarna, sondern auch mLabarna—und zwar auch hier mit Personendeterminativ —als Ehrentitel der hethitischen Könige vorkommt, und weiter auch, daß labarna nicht etwa die Lesung des bekannten Titels der hethitischen Könige ILU $AM$I (MEINE) GOTT SONNE“ (vgl. Sommer l. c. Sp.IV) sein kann, wogegen übrigens auch die Nichtverwendung des Gottedeterminativs bei tabarna-labarna spräche:

...ku-i-e-(m)eš LI.IM ILANIPL. ILU $AMŠI$ ši
m"La-ba-ar-na mNIR.GAL LUGAL GAL tu-u(?)-li(?)-ia šal-zi-ily-ğu-un usw.
d. h. „...welche TAUSEND GÖTTER ich, (MEINE) GOTT SONNE,
m"Labarna mMuvattališ, DER GROSSKÖNIG, insgesamt(?) 1 an-
gerufen habe“ usw.

Muvattališ bezeichnet sich hier in absteigender Linie als die göttliche Sonne, als der altberühmte König Labarnaš und zuletzt als Groβkönig.

Mitunter ist es naturgemäß schwer zu entscheiden, ob t[labarnaš Eigennname oder Titel ist. So z. B. in der protochaltisch-hethitischen Bilinguis Bo. 2030, Obv. II. 37 ff., wo indes die letztere Auffassung doch vielleicht etwas wahrscheinlicher sein wird als die erstere. Siehe z. B. die Litanei ibid. Obv. II. 40—44:

Protochattisch:

40 va a-dš-ḥa-ab-na eš-vu ur aš-ka-ḥi-ir šu-u-va a
41 "Ha-at-tu-š ti-it-ta-ḥi-zi-la-at šu-u-va a
42 ta-ba-ar-na ka-a-at-ti ta-ni-va a-aš

Hethitisch (unmittelbar darauffolgend):
43 \textit{ILANI}^{PL.} \textit{KÜR}^{PL.} \textit{ma-ni-ia-ah-\textit{hi}-ir da-a-ir-ma-at} \textit{ALU}\textit{Ha-at-tu-\textit{si}}
44 \textit{\textit{ša\textit{l-li}}}^{\textit{IS}} \textit{\textit{ŠU.\textit{it}}} \textit{da-a-ir-ma-at} \textit{nu-za la-ba-ar-na-d\textit{š} LUGAL-u\textit{š}}...

Das heißt:
43 DIE GÖTTER LÄNDER unterwarfen (übergaben?), gaben ferner sie der STADT \textit{Hattušaš} (protochattisch: \textit{Hattuš})
44 dem großen GERÄT THRONE(?) gaben ferner sie (d. h. Länder); von \textit{labarnaš} der KÖNIG...

Dem protochattischen \textit{tabarna kâtti} entspricht hier das hethitische \textit{labarnaš LUGAL-uš} (vgl. auch den Dativ ibid. Rev. III.9: \textit{la-ba-ar-na-i LUGAL-i}). Im Folgenden ist dann die Rede davon, daß „wir sie (d. h. die Länder) beherrschen(?) und wir ferner des \textit{l[abarnaš]} (so hethitisch; protochattisch: \textit{labarna}) des KÖNIGs HAus ihnen machen“. In Fällen wie VSHL S. 32 f., Z. 6, 11, 12, 21, 23 usw. wird \textit{tabarna(š)} (protochattisch) wohl eher Titel als Eigennamen sein. Was das Vorkommen der Schreibungen des Wortes \textit{t[labarnaš} mit \textit{t} oder \textit{l} in den einzelnen Sprachen von Boghazköi betrifft, so sei hierfür auf VSHL S. 49 hingewiesen. Hier mag noch hinzugefügt werden (so eigentümlich es auch klingt) daß es fast den Anschein hat, als ob die Schreiber in den hethitisch geschriebenen Texten in der Einleitung und in der Unterschrift die Schreibung \textit{tabarna}, inmitten des Textes hingegen die Schreibung \textit{labarna} vorzügen. So kommt nach dem einleitenden \textit{UM.MA} bis-her — soweit ich sehe — nur die Schreibung \textit{tabarna} vor, während in der Mitte des Textes \textit{labarna} wenigstens bedeutend häufiger zu belegen ist als \textit{tabarna}; in dem hethitischen Teil der Bilinguis des Königs \textit{Tlabarnaš} kommt \textit{tabarna} nur in der Einleitung vor, während im Kontext selbst, soweit der Text erhalten ist, nur \textit{la-barna} nachzuweisen ist.
FOURTH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF ASSYRIOLOGY (YEAR 1921)

By John A. Maynard, University of Chicago

This article is mainly a survey of books and periodicals dealing with Assyriology, published in 1921, so far as they have come to our knowledge. But since, on account of post-war conditions, a number of European publications reached us too late to be included in the former bibliographical surveys published in this journal, we shall for the sake of completeness include them here. This article should be used in connection with our previous surveys. Numbers 1—364 refer to articles in JSOR 28—46, 365—555 to articles in JSOR 46—28, 556—788 to articles in JSOR 58—35; 789—951 (in broad type) refer to works mentioned here. Reviews are not numbered. Our classification takes up the following topics: Excavations and history of Assyriology (789—795), Texts (796—803), Related Languages (804—808), Writing and signs (809—810), Sylabaries (811—817), Lexicography (818—824), Sumerian Grammar, (825—826), Akkadian Grammar (827), Geography (828—832), Chronology (833—848), History (849—873), Business Documents (874—878), Law (879—880), Letters (881—884), Civilization (885—890), Names, Myths (891—900), Religion (901—931), Astronomy (932—934), Weights and measures (935—937), Boundary stones (938), Art (939—945), Seals (946), Costume (947), Medicine, Babel and Bible (948—950), Babel and Greece (951).

EXCAVATIONS AND HISTORY OF ASSYRIOLOGY

The fourth volume of F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, was issued in 1920. This volume does not deal with Assyriology itself, except as containing an index to the preceding volumes. (789). Herzfeld, Am Tor von Asien, 1920, has a similar purpose. It reproduces on p. 3—6,
the reliefs of Sarpul (Die Felsbildnisse der Lullukönige) (790) Cruveilhier gave an interesting account of the excavations at Susa in Les principaux résultats des fouilles de Suse, 1921 (791). In the University Record (of the University of Chicago), VII (1920) 215-235, Breasted gave under the title of The New Past an account of the preliminary work of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in Egypt and Babylonia (792). J. A. Montgomery wrote a panegyric of Morris Jastrow Jr. in AJSL 38, 1-11 (793), G. Bergsträsser described the life and work of F. Peiser in OLZ, 24, 1921 97-102 (794). A note relatively too short in comparison with these was written on J. P. Peters in AJSL 38 150 by I. M. Price (795). See also 893.

TEXTS

Schroeder published in 1920 Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschie- denen Inhalts containing the Assyrian law code, lists of gods, letters, business documents, astronomical and geographical tablets. (796). One of these texts had already been published with a slight scribal error by Schroeder himself in Eine Götterliste für den Schulgebrauch, MVAG 21 175-181 (797) and another by Ebeling, in KAR 149. S. Smith published Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum, part I, 1921. (798) Contenau published Tablettes Cappadoiciennes, 1920 (799), which was reviewed by Ehelol, OLZ 24, 1921 119-121. A former volume of similar texts by Contenau (Trente Tablettes Cappadoiciennes, Cf. 654) was reviewed by Weidner, OLZ 24 31-37. Schroeder's Altbabylonische Briefe (VAS 16) published in 1917 (800) was reviewed by Landsberger, OLZ 24 312-314. Weidner and Figulla edited the first volume of Keilschrifttexte aus Boghaskoi (801) which was reviewed by Meissner, OLZ 21 18ff. R. P. Dougherty published for the Yale Babylonian series a volume of Records from Erech, 1920 (802) which was reviewed by Mercer, (JSOR 5 61-62) Lutz had edited in 1919 Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts (803) which were reviewed by Ball, Journal of Theol. Stud. 22, 1921 405-406, and by Dhorne RA 18 40. Cf. also Scheil RA 17 35ff. Other texts which were edited by Clay (853), Edgerton (859), Försch (876), Gadd (834), Langdon (811), Leeper (813), Lutz (836), Scheil (814, 815, 6*
872, 877), Schmidtke (866), S. Smith (870), Schroeder (835), and Weidner (842), will be noticed in their proper place in the course of this bibliography.

RELATED LANGUAGES

The Hittite literature has now grown to such an extent that a special bibliography will be necessary. We shall only note here the note on the Sumero-Hittite Vocabulary VAT 7478 Kol. III 30 ff. by C. Marstrander, OLZ 21 128 (804). W. F. Albrecht studied Ein Agypto-semitisches Wort für Schlangenhaut, OLZ 24 58-59, connecting the Egyptian word sbi or sbsbi with the Assyrian sabsabu, (805). W. F. Albright also accepted Luckenbill's etymology and form of the name of Hammurabi (AJSL, 37 350-353) in a philological note on the Amorite form of name of Hammurabi, AJSL 38 140-141 (806). F. Perles wrote some remarks on Zimmern's book as Ergänzungen zu den akkadischen Fremdwörtern, OLZ 21 65-67 (807). Schroeder described Reste der Sprache von Hanganbalat, OLZ 21 174-175, (808) showing that they were found in 5 R 20 and 27.

WRITING AND SIGNS

E. Unger wrote on Babylonisches Schrifttum in a publication of the Deutsches Museum für Buch und Schrift, 1921 (809). G. Hüsing studied a value of the sign LA as HIR, OLZ 21 76-78 (810).

SYLLABARIES

Langdon continued his studies on Assyrian Grammatical Texts, XIV, RA 18 37-42 (811). The Syllabary edited by Clay in 1915 was studied by Ungnad, Das Vokabular C, ZDMG 71, 1917 121-136 (812). A related syllabary in London was edited by Leeper in the first part of the 35th volume of Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum, 1918 (813). The Sumero-Hittite Vocabularies which had already been partly studied by Delitzsch and Holma (Cf 34) were at last published in the first volume of the KBo already noticed (Cf 801). In an article on the Catalogue de la Collection Eugene Tisserant, RA 18 1-33, (814) Scheil published lists of plants and drugs. He also edited a Vocabulaire pratique RA
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1848-78, which is a Sumerian list of common objects (815). Schollmeyer wrote Zur Serie ḫarra ḥubullu, OLZ 21 171 (816) and Ungnad on Die fünfte Tafel der Serie HAR-RA, correcting some errors of Meissner, OLZ 21 224 (817).

LEXICOGRAPHY

On the topic of Akkadian Lexicography we had an article by P. M. Witzel on Was bedeutet parsu, MVAG 21 199-212 (818), a note showing that in the Assyrian code we find the meaning ḫurûppti, betrothal gifts, by Jastrow, JAOS 41 314-316 (819), four notes by Meissner on Lexigraphisches, OLZ 21 171-174, 272-273 (820), a note by Schroeder on Ṭebetai oder Kanunai, OLZ 21 75-76, showing that the month AB was apparently called Kanunu in Assyria and Ṭebetu in Babylonia (821). P. Haupt wrote on Assy. birku, knee, and karabu, bless, JBL 39 163-165 and abundant data on lexicographical science in JBL 39 152-163 (822). His disciple Albright derived the name Rebecca from riqibtu to cultivate, made her into an earth-goddess JBL 39 165-166 (823) and added much to philology as enriched by metathesis in other Brief Communications JBL 39 166-168. Cf also Nr. 805. We may also mention here an article by Deimel, Zur ältesten Geschichte der sumerischen Schultexte, Orientalia, 1920 51-53 (824).

SUMERIAN GRAMMAR

Poebel's Historical and Grammatical Texts were reviewed by Foertsch, extensively, in OLZ 21 236-242. Poebel wrote Sumerische Studien, MVAG, 26, I, 1921 (825) and Zur zweiten Person Pluralis des Imperativs im Sumerischen, OLZ 24 78-79 (826).

AKKADIAN GRAMMAR

The only item is Das Verbum in den altassyrischen Gesetzen mit Berücksichtigung von Schrift, Lautlehre und Syntax, by J. Levy, being the fourth (although the first one published so far) of Berliner Beiträge zur Keilschriftforschung (827). Boson's Assyriologia (Cf 403) was reviewed by Contenau, RA 18 45.
JOHN A. MAYNARD

GEOGRAPHY

We have already noted the geographical tablets edited by Schroeder (Cf. 796) and that have been thoroughly studied by him in the index to that volume, Meissner wrote on Umma, OLZ 21 219–220, (828) without solving the question of the reading of its supposed ideogram. Peters accepted Kraeling's identification of the tower of Babel with Birs Nimrud, JAOS, 41 157–159 (828 a). Lehmann-Haupt wrote on Ḍūṣašir und der achte Feldzug Sargons II, MVAG 21 119–151 (829), an article continued in Zu Sargons II Feldzug gegen Urartu 714 v. Chr., Klio, 1918, 15 439–440 (830). In Kaspisches IV, OLZ 21 43–48, Husing treated also of geographical matters (831), Sir William Willcocks book From the garden of Eden to the crossing Jordan (Cf. 601) was reviewed by S. Reinach, Rev. Archéol. 1921 197–198. The geographical section of the naval intelligence division of the British Admiralty published a Geology of Mesopotamia and its borderlands, with maps, bibliography, and index (831 a). Lehmann-Haupt wrote Zur Lage von Magan, Klio, 17 112–113 (832). See also Nr. 946.

CHRONOLOGY

The list published by Poebel was studied by Ungnad, Zur altbabylonischen Chronologie, ZDMG, 71 162–166 (833). The same scholar took up Clay's data as published in Misc. Inscr. 32, 33 and Thureau-Dangin's chronology in Die Dynastien von Isin, Larsa und Babylon, ZDMG 74 433–438 (833 a). New material was contributed by C. J. Gadd. The early dynasties of Sumer and Akkad, in the first volume of the Eothen series, 1921, where three plates of texts are given (834). From OS IO, a contract in his possession, Schroeder gave Ein neues Datum aus altbabylonischer Zeit, OLZ 21 75 (835). In the Museum Journal (of the University of Pennsylvania) Lutz studied the chronology of the Dynasty of Agade, giving another fragment of a text published in the preceding number (836). In OLZ 21 31, Foertsch wrote Zu OLZ 1917 59 taking up the question of a date wrongly transcribed by Barton in UMBS 19, 25 (837). In one of his Miscellen, Orientalia, 1920 57–58, Deimel took up points of Sumerian chronology (838). The Patesis of the Ur Dynasty, by Keiser (623) were reviewed by Contenau,
RA 1845. In *La première dynastie araméenne de Berose et les documents contemporains*, RA 79–81, E. Cavaignac showed that Berosus' point of view was that of a Southern Chaldean city. His Arab kings reigned in Southern Babylonia, then hostile to the Cassites. As for the northern region, it knows only Amorite invaders, and only later, the Arameans (839). Lehmann-Haupt studied *Berossos*’ Chronologie und die keilinschriftlichen Neufunde in Klio, 16, 242–270 (840). He retranslates the Synchronitic History. In an appendix, Klio, 16, 270–301, W. del Negro takes up the Kurgalzu problem and gives a comparative table of the Cassite and Assyrian kings (841). A valuable list of eponyms from Ashur was published by Schroeder in KAV. (Cf. 796). It formed the subject of a far-reaching study by Weidner on *Die Könige von Assyrien*, MVAG 26, 1921, 2 (842) which should be supplemented by Schroeder Zu den Königslisten aus Assur, OLZ 21, 37–43 (843) and *Über die Limu-Liste KAV 21–24*, OLZ 24, 19–21 (844). Weidner’s conclusions were attacked by Lehmann-Haupt in *Berossos*’ Chronologie und die keilinschriftlichen Neufunde, Klio 16, 178–186 (845) and by Albright, *A revision of early Assyrian and middle Babylonian Chronology*, RA 18, 83–94 (846), where Kugler’s and Thureau-Dangin’s dates are preferred. It was more favorably received by Ungnad, Zu den assyrischen Königen, OLZ 24, 18 (847). In Klio 17, 113–120, Lehmann-Haupt took up *Der Tod of Gyges* as a chronological problem (848).

**HISTORY**

On prehistoric times, we had *Das babylonische Neolithikum und sein Verhältnis zur historischen Zeit*, by S. Geller, OLZ 21, 209–219 (849). The society of Antiquaries of London published an article by Langdon on *Sumerian Origins and Racial Characteristics*, 1920, which presents the view that Sumerian civilization began circa 5000 BC on the Euphrates above the region called later Sumer (850). From Langdon, we also had a most remarkable article on *The early Chronology of Sumer and Egypt and the similarities in their culture*, J. of Egypt. Arch. 7, 1921. It shows that the real beginning of history is 5000 B.C., although the first real historical dynasties are only in 4200 B.C. The Semites, who became the
Akkadians, were South Arabians, who arrived in Akkad before 5000 B.C. and invaded Egypt later (851). These two articles cause us to expect much from Langdon's History of Sumer which is shortly to appear. Deimel wrote on Die Reformtexte Uruk-ginás, Orientalia, 1920 3-31 (852). Clay told us of A new king of Babylonia, named Marduk-bel-Zer in a business document which he published in JAOS 41 331 (853). In a masterly article on The antiquity of Babylonian civilization, JAOS 41 241-253, he outlined the latest development of the Amurru (or Mari) theory, argued against Breasted for a lengthening of the dates now commonly accepted, and proposed new arrangements of dynasties (854). Clay's Empire of the Amorites was reviewed by Poebel, OLZ 21 270-272. W. F. Albrecht wrote in OLZ 24 18 on Der zweite babylonische Herrscher von Amurru, who was Ammiditan (855). In a Note on Dr Peters' notes and suggestions on the early Sumerian Religion and its expression, JAOS, 41 150-151, Barton remained doubtful on the identification of Kesh with Kish made by Peters (856). We had from Peiser Einige Bemerkungen zur altbabylonischen Geschichte, MVAG 21 160-174 (857). Jeremias studied again Der sogenannte Kedorlaomer Text, MVAG 21 69-97 (858). King's History of Babylon (89) was reviewed by Meissner, OLZ 21 86-89. Edgerton published a document showing that we have a Lishanum patesi of Marad, AJS 38 141 (859). In the fourth year of Bur-Sin. Meissner transliterated VAS 16, 155 in Eine Inschrift Samsuilunas, OLZ 24 18-19 (860). Luckenbill translated the Hittite Treaties and letters of KBo I in AJS 37 161-211 (861). Lehmann-Haupt wrote on Semirâmis und Samuramat, Klio 15 243-255 showing that she really was the consort of Samsi-Adad IV, who on her husband's death became regent during the minority of her son Adadnirari (862). He also wrote Zum Tode Sargons von Assyrien giving a new translation of K. 4730, already given by Winckler, AF I 414; Klio 16 340-342 (863). Ungnad's view of the location of Sennacherib's murder (662a) was criticised by Schmidtke, Der Ort der Ermordung Sanheribs, OLZ 21 160-171 who maintained that the place was Babylon (864). In his turn Lehmann-Haupt declared Schmidtke's theory not proved in Zur Ermordung Sanheribs, OLZ 21 273 (865). Schmidtke had already expressed his view at length in Asarhaddons
Statthalterschaft in Babylonien und seine Thronbesteigung in Assyrien, in altorientalische Texte und Untersuchungen, pp. 78—138 (866). He gave us there an improved edition of Scheil’s prism, a study of 4 R 61, and of several of Harper’s letters. B. Meissner took up Harper’s letter 336 and others in his study on the history of the Aramean state of Bit-Dakkuri in Šamaš-ibni von Bit-Dākūri, OLZ 21 220—223 (867). Olmstead continued his studies on Assyro-Babylonian History (Cf. 95, 429, 630) in Babylonia as an Assyrian dependency AJSL 37 212—219 (868) and Fall and Rise of Babylon, AJSL 38 73—96 (869). A new prism of Sennacherib most important for the Aramean nomenclature was edited by S. A. Smith as The first campaign of Sennacherib, in the Eothen Series, 1921 (870).

The Sennacherib prism formerly edited by King in CT 26 was touched upon by E. Madeja, Das Ninlil-Tor zu Ninive, OLZ 21 165—167 (871). In RA 18 1—3 (Cf. 814) Scheil published an inscription which is probably from Ašir-bel-niše-šu. Texts on Ashurbanipal were published or republished in CT 35 (Cf. 813). A text much studied before was reedited by Scheil, as L’inscription votive d’Assurbanipal à Nabu, sur table de pierre calcaire, RA 18 95—97 (872). Cf. Streck, Assurb. II, 272—275. Meissner studied the meaning of the expression šabatu pan maške in Sennach., prism 5, 47 in OLZ 21 121 (873).

BUSINESS DOCUMENTS

Deimel studied Die Listen über den Ahnenkult aus der Zeit Lugalandas und Urukaginas, Orientalia 1920 32—51 (874) and touched on other business documents in Missellen, Orientalia, 1920 54—64 (875). Foertsch edited Zwei altbabylonische Opferlisten, MVAG 21 22—34 (876). Scheil edited as his Notule 62, a Sumerian document, RA 18 98—99 (877). As his Notule 61, in RA 18 97 he translated Nr. 162 of Keiser’s Letters and Contracts, which gives the name of a new spice (?) qunnaphu, oil of hemp or haschich (878), Hussey’s Sumerian Tablets in the Harvard Museum, published in 1912 and 1915 (Cf. 159) were reviewed by Foertsch, OLZ 1918, 21 180—185 and Nies’ Ur dynasty Tablets by Mercer, JSOR, 5 38—95 See also Nrs. 859, 853, 937.
The Assyrian law code edited by Schroeder in the KAV was studied by Scheil, *Recueil de lois Assyriennes*, 1921, (879) which was reviewed by P. Humbert *Rev. de theol. et de Phil*. 1921335; it was also the subject of an article by Jastrow, JAOS 41^1−59 (880). We have already noticed Levy's contribution to the grammar of the code (827). See also 950.

**LETTERS**

Various Assyrian letters were published by Schroeder in the KAV. Clay's *Babylonian letters from Erech* (678) were reviewed by Ball, Journ. of Theol. Studies, 22^495 and by Mercer, JSOR 5^52. Schroeder wrote *Über die Glossen ši-ir(-ma) und mar-ia-nu(-ma), OLZ 21^125−127 (881).* In *Ein mündlich zu bestellender altbabylonischer Brief, OLZ 21^5−6,* he showed that VAS 16, 7 was a memorandum of three different short messages (882). Ungnad found *Ein merkwürdiges sumerisches Lohnwort* (in a letter from Bismiya edited by Luckenbill, AJSL 32^281), OLZ 21^115−116 (883). This word is unneduku, u-ne-dug. Ungnad translated also Nr. 140 of Lutz' *Early Babylonian letters from Larsa as Eine altbabylonische Kriegsdepesche, OLZ 24^71−72 (884).* See also Nrs. 866 and 867 for articles on Harper's letters and 861 for the Hittite letters.

**CIVILIZATION** (See also under ART)

The outstanding work is Meissner, *Babyloni en und Assyrien, 1920,* which is the third volume of the Kulturgeschichte Bibliothek (885). It is well illustrated and complete. Review by Langdon, *Man, 1921^93−96.* A. Schneider wrote a book on *Die sumerische Tempelstadt, 1920* (886). Review by Luckenbill, AJSL 38^151. Schwenzner's articles on the prices of commodities in Babylonia (462, 653, 658, 691) were continued in the fifth and sixth of his *Beiträge zur babylonischen Wirtschafts-Geschichte, namely Zur Entwicklung der Getreide- und Dattelpreise, OLZ 24^21−25 (887) and Eine Lohnaufbesserung unter den ersten Perserkönigen, OLZ 24^79−88 (888)* which also deals with the price of dates and wheat. Christian wrote on *Über einige babylonische Ackerbau- und Bewässerungsgeräte,*
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OLZ 24.§4–77 (889). Schroeder's article Über die ältesten Münzen, OLZ 21 276–279 (890) takes up CT 26, VII, 16–19 and other cases (Cf. 684).

NAMES

Chiera's List of Sumerian personal names was reviewed by Ball, Journ. of Theol. Studies, 22 406–407 and by Dhorme, RA 1848.

MYTHS

Langdon's Sumerian Epic of Paradise (242) was sharply criticised by Ungnad, ZDMG 71 252–256 and was also made the subject of a rather impossible article by W. W. Martin, Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the flood, and the fall of Man, Methodist Review 1916 610–653 (891). The later edition — or Poème Sumérien (472) — was reviewed by Sayce, JRAS 1921 295–298. Witzel's Drachenkämpfer Ninib (694) was reviewed by Pancritius, OLZ 24 88–92 and Deimel Biblica, 2 464–472. Deimel also touched on it in his interpretation of a seal in Missellen Orientalia, 1920 53 (892). A popular account of The Babylonian story of the deluge and the Epic of Gilgamish with an account of the Royal Libraries of Nineveh was written by Budge for the use of visitors to the British Museum, 1920 (893). Geller's pamphlet on the epic Lugal-e (Cf. 241) was reviewed by Schroeder, OLZ 21 185–188. Ungnad showed how Rm 272 (Meek, BA 10, 1) belongs to the first tablet of Lugal-e, in his article on Nabu und Ninurta, OLZ 21 167–168 (894). Luckenbill studied The Ashur version of the seven tablets of Creation, AJSL 38 32–35 (895). He translated the first and sixth tablets as their text has been made more complete by Ebeling's KAR. He also gave a new translation of Barton's Creation Text which had also been reedited by Langdon in Le poème Sumérien. Zimmern improved also the rendering of a passage of the Creation poem in Marduks (Ellils Assurs) Geburt im babylonischen Weltschöpfungsepos, MVAG 21 213–225 (896). Langdon's new fragment of the Epic of Gilgamesh (Cf. 231) was emended and enlarged by Jastrow and Clay, An old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, Yale Or. Ser. Research. IV, 3, 1920 (897) with a publication of the new text by Clay. Cf. a review by Jensen, OLZ 21 268–270, where corrections

**RELIGION**

Peter’s article entitled _Notes and suggestions on the early Sumerian Religion and its expression_, JAOS 41131–149 (9, 10) offers some interesting suggestions but its value is very much curtailed by the author’s dependence on faulty translations. Ungnad wrote a popular book, _Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer_, 1921 (902). _Der Gottesberg_ by J. Jeremias (Cf. 723) was reviewed by Pancritius, OLZ 24,77–32. Landersdorfer studied in a Syriac poem of Jacob, Bishop of Batna, _Das assyrisch-babylonische Pantheon im vierten Jahrh. n. Chr._, MVAG 21,109–118 (904). Schroeder wrote on 

\[ \text{daga-šu-ul, dme-šu-ul, dme-iz-su-ul-la-aš,} \]

OLZ 24, 70 ff. (905). Cf. also his article listed under 797. In one of his _Miszellen_, Orientalia 1920,52, Deimel wrote on Nin-Urra of Umma (906). Plessis made a complete study of the worship of Ishtar in his _Etude sur les textes concernants Ištar-Astarte_, 1921 (907). In JBL 39,143–151, Albright took up _The supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos_ (908). It rejects Langdon’s theory but brings in another on a kind of double called giš-zar. Paffrath studied _Der Titel Sohn der Gottheit_, MVAG 21,157–159 (909) and the rite of adoption of kings by goddesses. Deimel wrote on _Die Rangordnung unter den Tempelverwaltern in Lagash zur Zeit der Könige von Ur_, MVAG 21,226–232 (910). In _Notule 63_, RA 18,100, on the text published by Legrain, Mus. Journ. Dec. 1920, March 1921, he showed that Sargon was kašudu of the defunct king Ur-Zamama and described that office (911). We had a brief note by Price in JAOS 41,192–193 (912) on _The functions of the officers in the temple of Ningirsu_. Meissner wrote on _Beamte als Stifter von Götterstatuen_, MVAG 21,152–156 (913).

Boissier’s article on _Esabad_, RA 18,43 dealt with the sanctuary of Gula in the light of the new KAV texts (914). Albright in
The Babylonian Temple tower and the altar of burnt offering, JBL 39 137–142 (915) shows how the mountain of the gods and the mountain of the shades, being both in the North became confused, and so were the temple tower and the altar. In Altorientalische Kultgeräte, MVAG 1918 370–392, O. Weber studied the religious significance of reliefs, boundary stones and seals (916).

Mercer studied Divine Service in Ur, JSOR 5 1–17 (917). In Der Gottesbrief als Form assyrischer Kriegsberichterstattung, Ungnad treated of Langdon's Babylonian Liturgies Nr. 169, OLZ 21 72–76 (918). In Festlied zum Einszug des Königs in Eanna, MVAG 21 98ff., Kinscherf translated the Sumerian Liturgy VAS 10, 200–208 (919). In Sumerische Handelungsgebete, OLZ 21 72–76 (920) as a catalogue of hymns. Langdon's Sumerian Liturgies and Psalms, 1919 (Cf. 703) were reviewed by Dhorme RA 18–48 and Ball JTS 22 107.

In Zu den Übersetzungen Ebeling ZDMG 74, 175 ff. (Cf. 715) in ZDMG 74, 139–145 Landsberger rectified Ebeling's translations of KAR 71, 74, 73, 56 (921). Ebeling translated KAR 64 in Babylonische Beschworung gegen Belästigung durch Hunde, MVAG 21 17–21 (922). In Magische Hunde, ZDMG 73 176–182 Meissner worked out KAR 54, 26, 64, 62 (923). In his article on Korset och Labarum, Le Monde Oriental, 9 145–151 (outline in French on p. 149–151). Sven Lönborg studied several scenes in Babylonian reliefs to support his theory that the cross goes back to a wheel (924). In Nazoräer (Nazarener), ZDMG 74 129–138, Zimmern dealt with Babylonian gnosis (925). Thureau-Dangin's Rituels akkadiens, 1621, takes up the ritual of the kalu (Cf. 454), the daily ritual of Anu in Uruk, and new-year rituals (926). There are references to religion in the article Salutations, by Barton, ERE II 104–108 (927). Langdon wrote on Sin, ERE II 53–533 (928) and Pinches on Salvation, ERE II 109–110 (929). Rogers treated of the State of the dead, ERE II 828–829 (930). In Spiritism and the cult of the dead in antiquity, 1921, Paton wrote on Spiritism in Babylonia and Assyria (p. 211–231) and on Babylonian influence on the Hebrew conception of the dead (p. 240–247). Although the writer brought up nothing new, his very careful treatment of the activity, abode, deification of the dead, offerings to the dead, exorcism, necromancy,
and drugs is most valuable (931). See also on Religion Nrs. 852, 874, 876.

ASTRONOMY

Ungnad wrote Bemerkungen zur babylonischen Himmelskunde, ZDMG 73 159-175 (932). In Zur babylonischen Astronomie, MVAG 1918 346-356, Lindl took up the “Astrolabe” studied by Pinches, Kugler, and Weidner (933). Ginzel studied Die Wassermessungen der Babylonier und das Sexagesimalsystem, Klio 16 231-242 (934).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

In Die babylonische Zeiteinheit von 216 Minuten, Zeitsch. f. Ethnologie 51 101-111, Lehmann-Haupt translated a new CT 24, 45, 46-47 and showed that the little uddazalu was 216 minutes and the larger 14 hours 24 minutes (935). Unger’s Catalogue of weights from the Ottoman Museum (Cf. 761) was the subject of an article by Lehmann-Haupt, Zur Metrologie, Klio 15 441-445 (936). The same wrote on Die Mine des Königs und die Mine (des Landes), Klio 14 370-376 (937) a study of the business document K 816.

BOUNDARY STONES

On King’s Boundary stone 37, Meissner wrote Eine babylonische Stele Assurbanipals(?), OLZ 21 119-123 (938). See also 916.

ART


Dombart’s book Der Sakralturm, 1920, (942) was reviewed by Wreszinski, OLZ 24 174-175. In Der Turmbau zu Babel OLZ 21 161-165,
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Dombart dealt with Koldewey’s study in MDOG 59 (943). Gersbach’s *Geschichte des Treppenbaues der Babylonier und Assyrier, Ägypter, Perser und Griechen*, 1917, was reviewed by Dombart, OLZ 24 209–212 (944). Weidner wrote *Zur babylonischen Eingeweideschau*, MVAG 21 191–198 (945) giving illustrations of spirals.

SEALS

Pinches and Newberry described *A cylinder seal inscribed in hieroglyphic and cuneiform in the collection of the Earl of Carnarvon, Journ. of Egypt. Arch. 7* 196–199 to be dated 2000 BC or earlier. Pinches adding an important contribution to geography (946).

COSTUME

Mary G. Houston and Florence S. Hornblower wrote on *Ancient Egyptian, Assyrian, and Persian Costumes and Decorations*, 1920 (947). Pp. 43–75 are devoted to Assyria; while they offer nothing new, are however interesting.

MEDICINE Cf. 814, 931

BABEL AND BIBLE

Delitzsch issued a new edition of his famous *Babel und Bibel*. N. D. Van Leeuwen wrote *Het bijbelsch-akkadisch Schumerisch*, 1920 (948) Jirku showed that in KAV 42 12u Ha-bi-ru der Stammesgott der Habiru-Hebräer, OLZ 24 246–247 (949). C. Edwards issued a third edition of *The Hammurabi Code and the Sinaitic Legislation*, 1921 (950). Other items especially important under this heading are found already listed as 865, 823, 858, 864, 865, 866, 925, 931.

BABEL AND GREÈCE

H. Wirth reopened the question in *Homer und Babylon* (951) (n. s.).
REVIEWS


The latest attempt to synthesize the results of the discoveries of the past ten years made at Nippur chiefly by the University of Pennsylvania is this little book of forty-three pages recently published by Mr. C. J. Gadd of the British Museum. The principal sources upon which it is based, are three: Poebel's "Historical Texts"; B. M. Tablet 108857 first published by Scheil and later reedited by him and by Thureau-Dangin and now reproduced here with minor changes by Gadd; and the new Philadelphia Fragment (L) published in 1920 by Leon Legrain.

Although the source material available is still too meager to justify the author's claim that he can "attempt to... furnish... an entirely connected scheme of chronology which rests, not upon conjecture, but upon the evidence of written records that are, in comparison, almost as old as the events which they commemorate", a comparison of his tables with previous dynastic lists shows a very considerable advance in knowledge of the period. Dr. Poebel's provisional reconstruction of Babylonian chronology from the First Dynasty (Kish) after the flood through the Dynasty of Nisin contains two gaps — a great gap between the Dynasties of Awan and Akshak, and a lesser gap between those of Gutium and Ur. These lacunae Mr. Gadd, by the aid of the new texts, sets himself to fill. For the gap between Awan and Akshak the L fragment gives the names of four new Dynasties, Kish — Hamazi — Adab — Mari, which, with other known data permits him to conjecture the arrangement of the early Dynasties to have been: Kish I — Uruk I — Ur I — Awan — Ur II — Kish II — Hamazi — Kish III Uruk III. The present uncertainties as to the number of years covered by the Mari Dynasty and of kings in the Dynasties of
Kish II and Uruk II, together with obvious discrepancies in the chronology given to the kings of Akshak and Kish IV by the scribes, which the author points out, will subject these conclusions to reinterpretations as more source material becomes available.

For the smaller gap between Gutium and Ur Mr. Gadd finds that Utu-ñegal, king of Uruk fits into the summaries as a probable king of the Fifth Dynasty of Uruk, which all evidence seems to agree in indicating as being short, and concludes that no very considerable gap intervened between the defeat of Gutium and the formation of Ur-Engur's kingdom.

Besides filling in these two gaps in the dynastic list, Mr. Gadd indicates several other new discoveries: a probably complete king list for the Agade Dynasty, the names of the first four kings of Gutium, the completion of Dr. Poebel's list of the "eleven cities of royalty" by the addition of Hamazi, Adab and Mari, and new material on Sargon. A transliteration and translation of a new British Museum text of Libit-Ishtar is interpolated at Chapter X, as the author states, "not because it has any historical value, but because of its interest as being only the second inscription of this king as yet recovered".

This monograph is short and subject to revision but it is an invaluable starting point for further research on the subject. The tables on pages thirty-six to thirty-nine are clear and are particularly valuable for synchronizing contemporary dynasties. Until these uncertainties are done away with the author very sensibly avoids attempting to fix absolute chronology, though in the Appendix he provides a method for so doing.

GEORGE TYLER MOLYNEUX.


This is one of the latest volumes of the excellent "Collection Payot". After an appropriate introduction, Dr. Contenau discusses in a very simple and clear fashion the geography, races, language, and script of the Tigris-Euphrates valley, and then continues with a chapter on the archaeology of the country and the development of the inscriptions. Then there are three excellent chapters on
religion, art, and general institutions, and at the end comes a brief but well-selected bibliography. It would be asking too much to demand details in such a small book, but now and then one searches in vain for points which ought to appear, even in such a résumé as this. For example, no mention is made of the part Dr. J. P. Peters played in the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania; nor is the nature of Langdon’s *Epic of Paradise* clearly set forth. Nevertheless, this little book is an excellent thing of its kind.

**Samuel A. B. Mercer**


The value and importance of this famous book, now appearing with additions and notes, can hardly be overestimated. In spite of the fact that Delitzsch, in his enthusiasm for the culture and civilization of Babylonia, has greatly exaggerated the influence of Babylonia upon the Bible, yet whatever he has to say deserves careful consideration. In this new edition he has changed none of his fundamental contentions of earlier editions, even retaining his earlier interpretation of the so called “temptation scene”. The little book, however, although in its sixty-third thousand deserves further circulation.

**Samuel A. B. Mercer**


M. Speleers is to be congratulated upon this magnificent publication. In a special study devoted to liturgical elements in the Seal Cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria, the reviewer had an occasion to test the value and accuracy of this fine piece of work. After a very detailed and informing introduction, which occupies 82 pages of well-arranged material, the author arranges the Seals of the Royal Museum at Brussels in the following order: Elamite, Sumero-Akkadian, Early Babylonian, Assyro-Babylonian, Hittite, Syro-Hittite, Persian, and Miscellaneous. The excellent
indices of names, etc., that follow renders this mine of information about Seal Cylinders and their contents indispensable.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Students of Babylonian history will be thankful to M. Speleers for the publication in facsimile, text, and translation, of this fine monument of the reign of Nebuchadrezzar II.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is an extract from the *Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles,* XXIX, pp. 145–180, and serves as an addition to the *Catalogue* published in 1917.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


In his publication of this fine papyrus, containing a copy of the Book of the Dead of the XVIII dynasty, preserved at the Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire à Bruxelles, M. Speleers has brought the time when it will be possible to publish a *textus receptus* of the Book of the Dead a long step nearer. This great Egyptian work — the Book of the Dead — reaching back through the Coffin Texts to the Pyramid Texts, deserve the greatest attention and the most unrelenting study, until its great mass of important religious material is analysed and digested. In the work before us we have, after the introduction, a description of the XXIX magnificent plates, after which follows an important list of variants in the Ms. from the Naville text. Then comes a special study of the important thirty-second chapter, and then, a most important study of the principal deities whose names
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occur in the Papyrus of Nefer Renpet. M. Speleers has made excellent use of the Pyramid Texts in this study, and his work will be highly appreciated by all Egyptologists.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

M. Speleers has presented an excellent discussion and publication of a fine stela of the reign of Seti I. He has shown that several versions of the same hymn are extant, and after a detailed comparison of these versions and a translation of the text, has made an excellent study of the religious elements of the inscription.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


There is a considerable literature in French on the Malekite rite, but far less on the Hanefite. Abu Yusuf Ya’kub whose book on the landtax is now translated by M. Fagnan, is the work of a disciple of the great imam Abu Hanifah, but not altogether of a blind follower. For instance he does not accept the latter’s decision on the relative share of a horseman and a foot soldier in the division of booty (p. 26 of the translation). Abu Yusuf’s work is of course a collection of hadith and of stories about the immediate followers of Mohammed. It covers the question of the division of booty, from which the landtax is only a derivative, at least in a medieval society. The author then takes up the question of fiefs, showing how the Moslem conquerors wisely avoided the confiscation of the lands of their subjects. The problem of irrigated lands is taken at length, and also that of the property of renegades and Christians. He then takes up the various penalties for crimes and finally the rules of warfare. M. Fagnan is an ideal translator, first because he is thoroughly at home in the Arabic language, secondly because he has little use for pseudoscholarly darkness and like Renan, believes that the translator’s
task is fulfilled only when he has been able to present his thought in a perfectly correct sentence. There is a very comprehensive index. The *Service des Antiquités et des Beaux-Arts* of the French Syrian Administration is to be highly commended for this first volume of the *Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique*, which will supplement the magnificent journal *Syria*.

**JOHN A. MAYNARD**


This is the first volume of the *collection Payot*, a series which will be similar in its scope to the *Home University Library*. Prof. Montet's book is a splendid beginning for that series. There is not, in any language, a better outline of Islam. The author is a liberal Christian; he has a better knowledge of Islam than any other French writer on the subject, because he has not only the scholarship of books, but the experience of travel in Moslem lands. He knows how to read and to observe with sympathy and open-mindedness. The little book before us is not only full of, but rich in information, written in a clear and interesting manner, without even one dull place. We were especially interested in his treatment of the present and future of Islam, and of the expert opinion on Turkish affairs at present. It has been very hard for us in America to have real information on the subject on account of the strong anti-Turkish propaganda conducted in certain quarters. Prof. Montet tells us what will take months and even years to filter through our ordinary channels of information. It is quite evident that the author could not tell us all we need to know about Islam: the space given to him was too limited. We only wish he had said a word about South Arabian religion, when describing the "times of ignorance" before the coming of Mohammed. Another word on the Ahmadiyya movement would have been welcome, even if it had meant less space given to the Bahai. However, the author had a right to his own judgement and with the small number of pages at his disposal he has done wonderfully well.

**JOHN A. MAYNARD**

The author of this little book is a biblical scholar who has written at length on the connection between Babylon and Israel. He gives us now in a masterly manner an outline of the French excavations at Susa and of their results from the religious, legal, economic, and philological point of view. It will interest even those who have been able to delve into the bulky tomes edited by La délégation en Perse. The author does not differ in any way from Scheil, either in his translations, or in the interpretation of the data. For his attitude, we would be the last to criticise him. The most interesting part of his study is that dealing with the religion of Elam, where he gives a thorough study of the "high place" of Susa. Fr. Cruveilhier points here and there the value of the results of these excavations for an enlightened and even for an apologetical study of the Bible.

J. A. Maynard


The author of this charming little book is a great naturalist but it is quite evident that he knows how to write for the general public. He describes a Philippine village near Manila, Manila itself, a village in Palawan, the Philippine leper colony, Canton, Honolulu, and Singapore. The aim of the book is to call the attention of prospective visitors to the Philippine Islands to the relatively short but most interesting excursions that they could arrange from there. One wishes that Mr. Reese had given us more than these samples of observations. The book is abundantly illustrated from photographs by the author.

J. A. Maynard


This volume of the Payot Collection is the work of one of the best known historians of China. The first part is geographical, the second historical. A following volume will treat of the literature and fine arts. Prof. Cordier's book is packed full of information,
perhaps too packed; it reminds one of an article in an Encyclo- 
pedia. There is a misprint on p. 109, where the name of the 
leader of the Formosans should be Koxinga. On p. 76, the fall 
of Assyria is wrongly placed in the reign of Sardanapalos. These 
are minor blemishes, and they will in no wise take anything from 
the value of the vade-mecum on Chinese history and geography 
that Mr. Cordier has written for us.

J. A. MAYNARD


The present is the first part of this collection of documents to 
be published since before the beginning of the war; in the mean-
time Fr. Rabbath who began the collection has died, but we are 
assured in the present publication that the work will be continued 
until the entire series of 2000 documents has been issued. We 
welcome this assurance for the documents are valuable from 
various points of view, some of which we indicate below. Mostly 
the documents have to do with the activities of the various religious 
orders in the Orient, the Jesuits especially. Each letter is preceded 
by a summary of the contents and accompanied by brief notes, 
mainly biographical. Interesting light is thrown upon the missio-
nary needs, money and men, (see especially the Latin letters, 
pp. 476—485). Persecution is not wholly absent, some of the 
Fathers are imprisoned and ransom demanded; others are urged 
to apostasize to Mahommedanism: “Vis Maurus fieri?” “Absit hoc 
a me”, respondet Pater (p. 486). Sometimes they are beaten and 
put to forced service. On the unpleasant side we find the con-
troversies between the Franciscans and Jesuits, but the present 
Jesuit authors give full credit to the Franciscans for their work. 
In opposition to the religious standpoint of most of the writers 
we have the letter of the Marquis de Villeneuve, dated 1740, 
(pp. 561—577), which would have to be taken into account in recon-
structing the conditions of the place and time. The Nestorians
of the time held the view regarding the teaching of Nestorius which has been revived in recent days, especially since the publication of the Bazaar of Heraclides: "che gli errori che a lui si attribuivano non erano suoi, ma si ben d’altri impostigli falsamente" (p. 443). The cause of their rejection of the Catholic teaching is seen to be a misapprehension of its nature: "Altri poi negavano doversi semplicemente concedere che la Vergine Santissima fosse Dei Genitrix, ma necessariamente doversi aggiungere Dei Genitrix Verbi, pensando che nella prima proposizione si conceda che sia madre di tutta la divinissima Trinità" (p. 443). Nestorian errors were sometimes tenaciously held even after a verbal retraction had been made, this fact brings forth a valuable letter of Paul V on the subject (pp. 427—430); Fr. Adam a Nestorian who had made profession of faith to Rome defends his renunciation of Nestorianism thus: "io non negai Nestorio, ma dissi se Santo Nestorio ha detto le cose le quali gli sono imputate, io lo male-dico; ma non è vero che egli dicesse quelle cose" (p. 455). Some of these Nestorian envoys who came to the West in the early seventeenth century played a part very like that of more recent adventurers. One letter expresses an interesting opinion of other Eastern Christians: "Le sieur Mailllet m’a écrit que si on s’attachait à l’instruction des Coptes, qui n’ont plus que le nom de chrétiens on y ferait un fruit bien plus certain qu’en allant en Ethiopie, où il luy paraist qu’il y a peu de chose à espérer" (p. 542). This last letter shows, incidentally, what appears throughout, how much more modern the Italian spelling of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was than the French. Towards the end of the present fasciculus we have a series of letters (pp. 580—612) dealing with the dissolution of the Company of Jesus. The variety of interests touched upon in this series of letters makes their continuance well worth while.

FRANK H. HALLOCK


Our author has the first great qualification for writing a book, but one so often left out of consideration. He knows his subject.
The literature is familiar to him, for he quotes freely the Platonic-Philonic scholars: Allixius, Miss Mathilda Apelt, Bentwich, Brehier, Burnet, Bywater, Drummond, Heinze, Horowitz, Jonsius, Le Clerc, Montefiore, Mosheim, Neander, Shorey, Zeller, and others.

He starts off with the current Greek proverb: "If Philo is not a Platonist, Plato is a Philonist". The reviewer does not pretend to discuss fully, or even fairly satisfactorily this book, for he is not a Philonic scholar, still less a scholar of Plato. The purpose of the review is to call attention to the book. No effort is made to suggest corrections of a typographical nature, for so careful a reading has not been possible.

The table of contents will tell the story to those interested:


II. Philo's Conception of the Ultimate Reality.

III. The Intermediary Powers.

IV. Man's Soul and Its Powers.

V. Ethics.

VI. The Influence of Plato on the Phraseology of Philo.

The most useful chapter of the book for the author's purpose is the VI, "The Influence of Plato on the Phraseology of Philo". It carries the author's argument further and more fully than any other portion of the book. The Introduction is far more interesting and for most readers the best part of the work.

The lack of a bibliography is noticeable, but in the circumstances, the rather full discussion of authorities in the Introduction, this may be passed rather lightly, yet no book of this nature ought to be published without a good bibliography.

D. Roy Mathews


This is an excellent list of words based on the smaller Oxford edition of the Vulgate New Testament, which was published in 1911. It will be found handy and useful to students of the New Testament.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
RECENT HISTORICAL MATERIAL ON ASHURBANIPAL

By John A. Maynard, University of Chicago

Since Streck studied the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal and his successors in the Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, additional material has been published — or republished — in vol. 34 and 35 of the Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum. We shall in this article take up some of this new material.

1. CT 35, 48 (K 1364) (Streck, II, 174–175) was partly known to us through G. Smith's History of Assurbanipal, 243–244, where a good deal of the reverse was given. The whole text reads now as follows,

Obv. 1... 2... he caused to take... 3... their glorious emblems... filled... 4... grandson of Sennacherib, I am indeed... 5... their... I conquered my enemies. I was satisfied in the plenitude of my heart. 6... the place of the feet... he cut off the head of Teumman their king in the presence of his soldiers. 7... on his throne. Ummanigash son of Urtaki, king of Elam who had fled and taken hold of my feet. 8 Tammaritu, third brother of Ummanigash, I established as king in Hidalu. 9 Ummanigash, the creature of my hands [forgot] the good... 10... before Shamash-shum-ukin... 11... he accepted a bribe and sent [to help him]. 12... my troops which marched through Karduniash... 13... their... they went up and 14... -tu-la, brother of Ummanigash against Um-[manigash(?)] 15...

Rev. 1 Tammaritu who after Ummanigash had sat upon [the throne of Elam]... 2 did [not] enquire after [my royal] welfare... 3 I prayed...
orisons to Bel and Nabu... 4Indabigash his servant rebelled against him and accomplished his defeat... 5Tammaritu, his brothers, his family, his father's kin and the princes walking [at his sides] 6fled before Indabigash his servant and seized my royal feet. My messenger 7concerning the going of Nana from the midst of Susa to Uruk I sent to [Elam] 8to Ummanaldasi king of Elam and he did not [hearken to me(?)] 9For the third time, by the command of Nabu, son of the king of the gods, the glorious one, who is clothed with brilliancy, [I went] to [Elam] 10Fourteen fortified cities, royal seats with numberless smaller cities 11and twelve districts in the midst of the whole of Elam, I conquered, ravaged, destroyed, [burned with fire] 12their gods, their goddesses, their goods and possessions, people, male and female, horses, mules 13asses, cattle and sheep, more numerous than locusts 14...Nana Lady of Eanna...

2. CT 35, 36 (K 2637, Cf. 3 Rawl. 37a 67–78 and G. Smith, Assurbanipal, p. 148). There is nothing to add to the text as given by Streck, II, 320–323.

3. CT 35, 13–15 is a very difficult text. Bezold, Catalog. IV, 1644, had given five lines of it and they had been translated and transliterated by Streck, II, p. 342–343. In his Tamus and Ishtar, p. 146–147, Langdon translated a few sections. We give first a transliteration of the text.

RECENT HISTORICAL MATERIAL ON ASHURBANIPAL

pi-i an-nim-ma a-na šu—-(perh. ūati-ka) a-man-nu šd dup-pi bu-us-su-rat ḫa-di-e [su]-lum-me-e štu-še-bi-la [ina(?)] pani(?;) iluj-ti-ia št-u-rad(?)—di ib-bi-šu(?)...

Rev. šina tukulti-ia rabu-ti ša u-tak-kil—... ša it-ti-ka īš-ša-an-na—... šu-ut īp-še-e-te an-na-a-te lim-ni-a-te—...na e-pu-šu eli-ka īš-di īš kussi šarru-šu as-suḫ pali-šu...sa-šaḫ maṭ·ak-kadī ki epuša ššuk-lul eš-ri-e-ti īlāniš pl rabūtiš pl ut(?)... na-ki-e īmer·niḵeš pl pa-liḫ ilu-ti-ia palū damīktu bušu(?)...a-ši-im ši·mat-ka šm.d.iš šamaš-šu·m·uk-im ša adī-ia la is-su-ru-u-ma šiḫ-tu-u ina ūabiši m.d. assur-ba-an·a pliš šarri na-[a-am] lib-bi-ia šina me-si-ri dan-ni e-si-ir-šu-ma ar-ku-us ZI (napšat)...št.pl...ti șm...am rabuṭiš pl šu šir-ri-e-ti āš-ka·nu ma-na [šepa-du-ka u-ša-āš-ki-nu-šu-nu-]ti ši-a-na kit-ri šarrāniš pl sa-ka·p maṭnakīrē-šu šu·bil(?)...žiršu-šu ti miša-ri ba·nā ir ša mat ṣen-liš ap(?)...ši ši ṣamaš-šu·m·uk-im ni-si-ir-te belu-ti-ia ša a-ru-ru-uš-[šu]...št...damku(?) ša balat napištī-šu ul iš-du-du(?)...šši-ulamiš pl ši mat-su a-na limūtum (tim) ša la(?) ta-ba-at(?) šmuššuš pl ta·bil maṭnakīrē-šu šu·bil(?)...šši·mat-su a-na limūttum (tim) št...e-te-ne-šu ši [ušu] šina ga-tu-u-a ilāniš pl šu it-ti-šu iz-nu-u u-maš-ši-ru-šu [iš]-ba-tu a-ḫa-a-ti št [ina] ki-bit ilu-ti-ia rabī-šu alāniš pl šu-nu tak-šu-ud ša [šal]-lat-su-nu ka-bit-tu ta-aš-lu-la a-na ki·rib maṭaššur ki ština tukulti-(ti)-ia rabī-ši ša mun-taḫ-ši-e-šu abikta-šu-nu taš-kun [si·i]t-tu-ti bal-tu-su-un ina kātē du.ia...ši·rib ni·nu ka al belu-u-ti-ka ina[kakkēš] pl ta-nir-šu-nu ti ština kakkēš pl·ia iz-zu-u-ti a-na ka·šaṭ amnakīrēš pl·ka [panu]-uk-ka un-da-šir šina zi·kiri šumi-ka ša u-šar-bu-u ummanāte-ka a-na(?) [mit]-ḫu-ši kakkī it-tal-lu-ka ša-ša·niš ština su·up-pi-e ut-nin-ni·ka da(?)...al·lu-ru rabī-šu ilu-ti št i-da-a ka az-zi·iz·ma i(?)...[ga·ri-e·ka št...mārēš pl maṭaššur ki št...su·ma št šarru-ti-šu.

Translation. ši thy favor...ši... to do my will I imposed... the Anunnaki are intent upon executing his purpose šthe kings who dwell in the sacred places shall prostrate themselves [before] thee and kiss thy feet šI shall break [the bows] of Elam, I shall strengthen thy bow[6] upon the totality of [thy] enemies I shall make thy weapons great šši-du-du (or -kin) king of Babylon, his predecessor, I have declared for him ššIn] his time, his people because of famine and sickness gnawed(?) bones(?) I caused hun[ger and want] to take hold of the people of Akkad[10]...they
ate each other as meat...........\textsuperscript{19}...my divinity... \textsuperscript{20}[may he(?)] pacify the heart of my [divinity(?)] \textsuperscript{21}I caused to stand at his gate...my hands  \textsuperscript{22}By the order of my divinity I command to thee and thou shalt perform it \textsuperscript{23}to renovate these gods ...their sanctuaries I have appointed thee (lit. in thy hands)  \textsuperscript{24}In their assemblies they heard they blessed thy kingdom; \textsuperscript{25}in thy days, they have uttered much in my presence \textsuperscript{26}...the enemies of the great gods shall fear \textsuperscript{27}According to this utterance, I myself will deliver them into thy hand(?).  \textsuperscript{28}A tablet of good news of joy thou shalt carry away  \textsuperscript{29}thou shalt bring before my divine face \textsuperscript{30}......

Rev.\textsuperscript{1} 1) By my great help, whereby I encouraged... \textsuperscript{2}that are with thee, he shall report... \textsuperscript{3}because of these evil deeds...he has done to thee\textsuperscript{4} I shall tear off the foundation of his royal throne ...his reign...the destruction of Akkad he(?). has made\textsuperscript{5} 2) The completion of the sanctuaries of the great gods...offering the sacrifices \textsuperscript{6}(thou) who fearest my divinity, a pleasant reign, riches... I appoint as thy fate\textsuperscript{7} 3) Shamashshumikin who kept not my covenant\textsuperscript{8} and sinned against the grace of Ashurbanipal, the king beloved of my heart\textsuperscript{9} I shall enclose him with a mighty blockade, I will tie up the life(?)... \textsuperscript{10}...of his nobles I shall place cords and I shall make them do obeisance at thy feet \textsuperscript{11} To the rescue of the kings, overthrow of his enemies bring(?)... \textsuperscript{12}a shepherding of righteousness they are seeking, the land of Enlil....\textsuperscript{13}...his life and the overthrow of Akkad...\textsuperscript{14} Shamashshumukin the treasures of my lordship about which I cursed [him]...\textsuperscript{15}...the favor of saving the life of his soul he did not draw...\textsuperscript{16}...the gods...all of them he mustered \textsuperscript{17}...he did these evil deeds which are not good\textsuperscript{18} removing the treasures of the gods\textsuperscript{19}...his fate for evil\textsuperscript{20}...they did \textsuperscript{21}By my hands his gods were angry with him, they abandoned him, they seized distant parts. \textsuperscript{22}[By] the command of my great divinity, thou shalt conquer his cities, thou shalt take away a heavy booty from him into Assyria. \textsuperscript{24}By my great help thou shalt perform the defeat of his warriors. The rest alive, in my hands... \textsuperscript{25}In the midst of Nineveh, the city of my dominion, thou shalt kill them with [weapons].  \textsuperscript{26}12) With my mighty weapons I sent before thee to conquer thy enemies [before] thee. \textsuperscript{27}13) At
the mention of thy name which I have made great, thy warriors shall march triumphantly to the conflict of arms. 28) By the orisons that thou hast prayed... great divinity 29) I shall stand at thy side... thy enemies... the sons of Ashur... kingdom.

This new text made quite clear that in the mind of the priest who inspired these oracles, Shamashshumukin had committed an unforgivable sin, when, in order to buy foreign support, he had spoiled the treasures of the Babylonian temples. He is now abandoned by the gods, largely through the influence of Ishtar, always faithful to the pious Ashurbanipal. His fate is quite certain, as the oracles make clear by using, as Langdon had already remarked, the prophetic perfect.


22 a-na-ku Ashurbanaplu šar Assur ki-rib 21mil-ki-a 23niñe²² pl taš-r[i-ih-ti] ak-ki epuš(uš) i-sin-ni ḏše-ri

22 I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria in the city of Milkia

23 I offered great sacrifices and performed the festival of Sheri.

5. CT 35, 15 (Rm 2, 305) is a new text. We understand it as follows,

1...his lord, his king 3...and the oath of the people of his land

5...in the midst of a mountain 6...his head, his hands, his feet.

7...Tammaritu they brought and 8...my generals 9...Tammaritu...

10...they made an alliance(?) 11...

Rev. 1Urtaki, king of Elam 2...Teumman, king of Elam, 3...

Teumman perished(?) 4E... Elam 5...governor 6...seraglio

6. CT 35, 16 is also a new text, which we translate as follows,

1Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, suppliant... 2...their cities... 3...my lord... 4...king... 5...caused to dwell... 6... 7...divine judge of the gods... 8Esagilia at they love... 9lordship of Assyria, Sumer and Akkad... 10...received their heavy gifts... 11...Adad. The people of Assyria, Sumer and Akkad 12...since Ummanmenana had made his weapons rage 13...they(?) conquered and carried away their booty. 14...Esarhaddon(?) king of Assyria, king of the four quarters

......all the kings that are not equalled... 16...upper and lower
to have dominion in the Orient \(^7\)... of his sceptre like... upon the people... \(^8\)... all the totality, charging all the people... \(^9\)... his gods, their tribute...

7. CT 35, 17—18 (Rm 40) is a new text with the exception of two lines.

\(^{1}\) I am Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, who by the command of the great gods attained \(^2\) the desire of his heart. The clothes, treasures, all the symbols of royalty of Shamashshumukin, \(^3\) the faithless brother (read PAP instead of U), his concubines, his generals, the soldiers of his host, \(^4\) chariots, wagons, his royal vehicles, horses \(^5\) to make up the teams of his yoke, all kinds of desirable things for his palace, as many as they were, \(^6\) people, male and female, small and great, I caused to bring before me.

\(^7\) Nabushallimshunu, chief driver, Manu-ki-Babili, son of Nabushalimshunu.

\(^8\) The sons of Eazerikisha, of Bit-Amukkani.

\(^9\) I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria. \(^{10}\) By the command of Ashur and Beltis, the great lords \(^11\) the kings dwelling in sacred places bowed to my yoke \(^12\) The bows of Tammaritu, king of Elam \(^13\) in their midst, he made strong to encounter my troops... \(^14\) the festival by the might of Ashur and Ishtar \(^15\) the gods my helpers, the bows of the son of... \(^16\)... month Nisan with...

The reverse of the text (Rm 40) was partly known since from Bezold's *Catalogue* p. 1575, Streck had translated two lines (Vol. II, p. 339) The text of the reverse is as follows,

\(^2\) ... ilu-su \(^3\) ... ku-nu ... ellu(? \(^4\) ... ina ki-bit-ku-nu šir-ti \(^5\) ... nu ki-nu ša la ittakkaru(u) \(^6\) ... ka \(^d\)e-a u \(^d\)marduk \(^7\) ... [šu-n]u-ti-ša li-me-du pu-uz-ra-a-ti \(^8\) ... ni-ku-nu niš \(^d\)marduk apli reš-ti-ša \(^9\) ša aššur niš \(^d\)ninib aššur ... sa \(^d\)en-lil niš \(^d\)nergal idlu dan-nu-ti \(^10\) še-šũ-nu-ti-ša ma-ruš-[tu] li-is-su-u li-ri-šu \(^11\) li-tap-pi-ru li-tal-ku šiptu \(^12\) ina pan šalmani\(^{13}\) abkallê\(^{14}\)

Translation. \(^2\)... his god \(^3\)... your pure(? \(^4\)... by your noble command \(^5\)... your faithful... which is not altered \(^6\)... thy... Ea and Marduk \(^7\)... their... may they establish the mysteries \(^8\)... your... by the oath of Marduk the first son \(^9\)[of] Ashur by the oath of Ninib, the first born of Enlil, by the oath of Nergal the mighty hero \(^10\) he heard them. The calamity let them remove, let them
put away ¹¹let them go away, let them depart. Incantation.
¹²Before the images of the wise.

8. C T 35, 18, K 6049 is a new text.

¹...Tammaritu ²Parû, son of Ummanaldasi ³...without number
the soldiers of...⁴...Teumman, king of Elam, his father's brother
...⁵...son of his sister that Tirhaka, king of Cush...

9. C T 35, 18 K 6384 is too fragmentary to be translated at
present. We read on the edge: ⁴...Birishadri, governor of Matai,
Sharati...⁵...75 cities...

(To be continued.)
LITURGICAL ELEMENTS
IN BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN SEAL CYLINDERS

By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

The term Liturgical Elements has been taken in this article to include all elements on the seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria which may be interpreted as belonging to any part of the ritual of divine service as it was known among the Babylonians and Assyrians. These elements are: The posture of the deities worshipped and of the worshippers, priests and attendants; ritual acts or gestures of the same personages; and their vestments. Almost always the service depicted on these seals is a sacrificial one, and the liturgical elements of this particular kind of service have been noted. The purpose of this investigation, therefore has been to canvass these seal cylinders for any light their inscriptions may have to throw upon the form and nature of divine service among the Babylonians and Assyrians. The results have not been disappointing, although inconclusive in some respects.

The term early Babylonian has been used to include Sumerian down to and including the Hammurabi Dynasty; Assyrian is selfevident; but late Babylonian has been made to include the Cassite Dynasty.

These seals, as a rule, were dedicated by a servant or handmaid to his or her deity. As a rule, they bear no literary inscriptions. Exceptional are a few on which the name of the worshipper and his deity are given, as well as those of the Cassite period which are mostly occupied with long prayers of invocation, and some late Babylonian seals, which have imprecations.

Most of the literature dealing with the subject of Babylonian and Assyrian seals is to be found in the Verzeichnis der Abkürzungen to Weber, Altorientalische Siegelbilder (Der alte Orient, 17. und 18. Jahrgang), Leipzig, 1920.  

1 The less obvious abbreviations used in this article are: AO = Der alte Orient,
LITURGICAL ELEMENTS

In liturgical services some of the most important elements are posture, gesture, and vestments. The seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria testify to this. Whenever a liturgical scene is represented, the deities and priests and attendants are always represented in definite postures with definite gestures, and clad in definite liturgical garments. Deities — gods and goddesses — are represented usually in a standing or a sitting posture. The deity often stands near the altar (De Clercq, Cy. Or., No. 86). He is sometimes represented with his left foot on a mountain (AO 383), or with his right foot on a animal (Delaporte, Mus. Guim. Vol. XXXI, p. 211, fig. 11). Ištar stands on dogs (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 101), with her right foot on a lion (Ward PM 91), or with her foot on a stool (Delaporte, Mus. Guim., Vol. XXXI, p. 216, fig. 13). This last posture is also assumed by Šamaš (Qb 8). A male and female deity are found standing on steps (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 52), Marduk stands on a composite creature (Ward PM 92). Nergal stands with his left hand at his waist (Pinches, BA Cyl. Seals, pl. 1, No. 4), and a deity stands by the side of a sacred tree (Ward WA 663).

More often deities are represented in a sitting posture. Thus, the deity is found sitting on a square throne in a kiosque (Speleers, Catalogue No. 590). The throne may have steps (De Clercq Cy. Or., 83), or may be placed beneath a crescent (Qa 29). The goddess Ištar is represented sitting on a bench in the shade of a large tree (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 104), often with a child, representing the protection which she will give to her worshippers (Ward WA, p. 154). Again, she sits on a throne with her feet on a lion (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 100; Ward WA 407). Nisaba is enthroned upon a mountain (Qa 22), and another goddess sits on a highbacked throne.
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(Ward PM 177). In one case a deity sits in a wagon to which is harnessed a dragon (Ward WA 127), and in another a deity is seated in an enclosure (Ward WA 341). The enclosure in Ward WA 399 takes the form of a tent, made by a bent tree. In the tent is found a kneeling goddess, beside whom is a kneeling god. The deity's throne often takes the form of a boat (Ward PM 7), a seamonster in the form of a boat (Ward PM 8), or a swan (Ward PM 145).

Those deities most commonly found standing are: Šamaš, Ai, Ištar, Adad, Marduk, Ramman, Shala, Enlil; and those most usually represented in sitting posture are: Šamaš, Sin, Bau and Ištar.

In Assyrian and late Babylonian times, the presence of a deity at divine service was not considered necessary. His place could be taken by his symbol (Jr. of the British Arch. Ass., Vol. 41, pl. 3, No. 4; Qβ 37), and he was often replaced by a mythological divine figure, such as the man-fish (Ward Wa 658), or the sacred tree (Ward WA 670, 695; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 142). The transition period is represented by a scene where both the deity and the sacred tree are present (Speleers, Catalogue, No. 592). But in early Babylonian art the sacred tree is unknown, except in one instance, where Ai stands on one side and a suppliant on the other of a sacred tree (Ward WA 663).

Before detailing the posture of the priest as represented on the seal cylinders of Babylonia and Assyria, an attempt must be made to determine whether the personage who leads the suppliant into the presence of the deity is a deity or a priest. Because this personage is very often represented as wearing a horned-head-dress, it has been thought that he is a deity. In fact, it is usually assumed, without argument, that he is a deity (RA 16, 57). Now, aside from the fact that, in all ancient religions, such an office is always performed by a priest, it should be borne in mind that this personage, on the seal cylinders, is never named a god. Nor does such a phrase as ılam u šēdam li-ir-ši, "a god and a protective genius may he have", ever refer to the personage under consideration. On the contrary, this personage is a priest, or priestess (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 73; Ward WA 304). The priest, as a rule, dresses as much like the god as possible, and usually holds his hands in a similar position (Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N. 50;
Qa. 35). The priest very often wears a dress over the left shoulder, but leaving the right shoulder free, just as the Egyptian priest (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 73, 74). When this personage is a female, she is a priestess, dressed, as a rule, like a goddess (Ward PM 102; Ward WA 319). That is, both the priest and priestess, by wearing the dress of a deity, impersonate the deity (Ward WA 32). It is, therefore, a priest, probably the high priest, impersonating Ningishzida, who introduces Gudea into the presence of his god, Ningirsu (Meyer, *Sumerier und Semiten*, pl. VII). The horns of the headdress, worn by the priest, do not prove that the wearer is divine. And, not only the priest, but also the suppliant himself, as well as the priestly attendant, often wears a horned headdress (cf. Speleers, *La Collection des Intailles*, 1920, pl. III, No. 590). In fact, the horned headdress indicates not only deity, but also greatness. This is seen by an examination of lugal, 𒆜, the word for king, which shows a man, wearing a horned headdress, the horns, 𒆜, indicating greatness. It is safe to say, therefore, that the personage who appears on our seal cylinders in the rôle of conductor, of the suppliant before his god, is not a deity but a priest, often clad like the deity.

The posture of the priest is always a standing one. He usually leads, with his right hand, the suppliant by his left hand, and has his left hand raised in adoration before the deity (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73). Sometimes, however, he stands with both hands raised in adoration, while the suppliant stands between him and the deity with both hands folded below his breast (Ward WA 51 a). Sometimes there are two priests with their hands raised in adoration (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 337). When the scene represents a sacrifice, the priest usually stands, with the left hand in the posture of adoration and the right hand on the altar (Ward WA 405). Sometimes the priest is represented as if he had two faces (Ward PM 60). This is a device to show his dutifulness in keeping

---

1 It should also be observed that the deity does not always wear a horned headdress, see, for example, Ward WA 315.

2 If the second seated figure, in Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.* 53, 56, be a priest, this would furnish an exception, but this is questionable.
his gaze concentrated on the deity and worshipper at the same time. Sometimes the priest stands before the deity with folded arms (Qp 9, 29), and sometimes, in late Babylonian times, he raises only the left hand in adoration (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 142). The priestess, especially, in the presence of a goddess, plays the same part as a priest (e.g., Ward PM 52; Ward WA 225, 315).

Almost every liturgical seal cylinder has its worshipper. The worshipper is usually represented in a standing posture, with the right hand raised as high as the face, and the left hand grasped by the priest (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 73). Very often a worshipper has his own special god or goddess (RA 16, 49—50), and sometimes two gods (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 119, 120; cf. RA 16, 51, n. 2). As a rule a female worshipped a female deity (Ward WA 221), although there are many exceptions. Kings and even semi-divine beings were represented as a pâlîšu, or devotee of a deity (Dungi, Pinches, *Bab. and Assy. Seals of the Br. Mus.*, No. 5, pl. 1; Gilgamesh, Ward WA 418 a). Sometimes the suppliant appeared before his god with both hands folded at his waist and sometimes with one hand raised and the other at the waist or at the side, and often with both hands raised (Ward PM 177; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 118; *ib.* La Haye, pl. II, No. 9; Ward PM 65; Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B.N.* 51, 110; Qp 23). Very often the worshipper brings a kid (Speleers, *Catalogue*, 610) in his left hand, while his right hand is stretched out holding a vessel (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B.N.*, 61), or raised in adoration (*ib.* 62). In one instance a suppliant presents a tree as a dedication to his deity (Ward WA 94); in another case a vase (Ward WA 399), and still another, a vase and vessel (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 101). Now and then two worshippers appear in the same scene (Delaporte, 79), sometimes a man and his wife (Ward WA 218). The usual offering is a goat or kid, but in one instance the worshipper appears driving a ram (Ward PM 14), and in another instance the offering seem to be berries (Delaporte 241). The suppliant also offers libations which are poured in a vase (Delaporte, 155), or on an altar (Ward WA 215). As a rule the worshipper is represented in a standing posture, but sometimes he appears kneeling (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 52; Qp 41; Speleers, *Catalogue*, No. 422).
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A figure which has been called "warrior god" is probably the representation of a warrior in the act of adoration (see, for example, Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, 225). The warrior-suppliant appears preferably before the warrior-goddess, Ištar (Delaporte, 225, &c. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 85, 99).

In these liturgical scenes the priest was attended by another priest or server. There is no reason to believe that this attendant is a deity (Ward WA 51a; Speleers, *Catalogue*, 562). The attendant is usually dressed like the priest, and had both hands raised in adoration (Ward WA 51a; Qa 33). Sometimes there are two attendant priests, both with objects of offerings or dedication (Ward PM 60, 382). The attendant sometimes presents flowers, with left hand at the waist (Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 100), sometimes he pours a libation on the altar (De Clercq, *Cy. Or.*, No. 86), or presents cakes (Ward WA 215), or carries a pail in the right hand and the left at the waist (Ward WA 403), or has both hands at the waist (Delaporte, *Cy. Or. B. N.*, No. 62). Sometimes the attendant is a female (Ware WA 214). The attendant priest or priestess acted as a server and brought the necessary *res sacrifici* (e.g. Ward WA 307, 374; Menant, *Gly. Or.*, fig. 104). Sometimes he was followed by a dog (Ward WA 407).

Gesture, or ritual acts, ever accompanied liturgical services. In the liturgical scenes under consideration the deity usually has his left hand at his waist, and his right hand extended toward the worshippers as if to welcome them (Menant, *Gly. Or.* fig. 73). Sometimes he is represented as holding a vase in the extended hand as if to receive a libation (Ward PM 86; Ward WA 51a). The god of agriculture holds in his hand ears of corn (Ward WA 374), and the goddess Bau sometimes held flowers in her left hand, while her right hand was raised (Ward WA 214). Marduk often wields a scimitar (Ward PM 92). Another deity holds a staff in his right hand and a rod over his left shoulder (*Fr. of the British Arch. Assoc.*, Vol. 41, pp. 396ff., pl. 1, No. 3), and still another seems to be blowing a trumpet (Delaporte, 51). Sometimes the deity raises his left hand when he has something in his right hand (Ward WA 399). Šamaš often holds his saw (Speleers, *Catalogue*, 592), and sometimes his ring and staff (Qβ 8). Another deity seems to
be partaking of a libation by means of a long tube (Delaporte, 58). Adad often carries his thunderbolt and leads a bull (Ward WA 457); Nergal carries a weapon in his right hand (Jr. of British Arch. Assoc., Vol. 41, pp. 396 ff., pl. 1, No. 4), and Ištar has her caduceus, arrows and scimitar (Ward PM 91).

The most common gesture of the priest is the raised left hand with thumb and fingers extended (Qβ 37; Qa 32). Sometimes he has both hands raised (Ward PM 62); but occasionally he stands with hands folded at the waist (Ward WA 51 a; Ward PM 51). The ritual of genuflection was quite common in all periods of Babylonian and Assyrian liturgical worship. The priest often genuflected before the deity whom he served (Delaporte, 73), his right hand being raised and left stretched out (Legrain, Catal. Cugnin, No. 16; cf. Delaporte, 77; Menant, Gly. Or., figs. 94, 95, 96, and pl. IV, No. 5; Ward PM 58; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 23). The gesture of the priestess is the same as that of the priest (e.g., Ward WA 407).

The attendant priest ordinarily stood with both hands raised in adoration (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 73), although very often he was engaged in bringing in some res sacrifici or object for use in the service of adoration (e.g. Ward WA 374, 407, 307, 214; Ward PM 72), or in pouring libations (De Clercq, Cy. Or. 86).

Special vestments played an important part in liturgical services in Babylonia and Assyria. Normally the deity wore a horned headdress (Speleers, Catalogue, 610, 592; Qa 22), except especially in the age of Gudea when he wore a very plain, low turban (Ward WA 303 a; cf. Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 73; Qa 23). Goddesses, ordinarily, also wore the headdress (Ward PM 52, 90). The robe of the deity was usually long and flounced (Qa 22) or pleated (Speleers, Catalogue, No. 592). The material of the robe may have been linen (Speleers, Catalogue, No. 610), or goat-skin (Qa 16). The warrior god, Ramman, wore a round turban and short garment (Ward WA pp. 176 ff.). His garment was sometimes a lion’s skin with paws (Ward WA 387). In one case, the deity seems to be clothed in a fish-skin (Ward WA 687). The deity is represented with long hair and beard (Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 381) and shaven upper lip (Qa 16).
The priest was ordinarily vested like the deity, with horned headdress (De Clercq, Cy. Or., No. 86; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 100; Ward PM 51, 52; Qa 22) and long founced (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 73) or pleated robe (Qa 22). His robe was sometimes of a plain variety (Qβ 37). The robe usually goes over the left shoulder and under the right arm (Menant, Gly. Or., figs. 73, 100). This robe has been described as the Greek καυνάκης, a garment of thick cloth. The priest, like the deity, is sometimes represented clad in a fishskin (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 37) or in an animal's skin (ib. 42). Priestesses were similarly clad (e.g., Ward WA 315). The priest was often clean-shaven, head and face (e.g., Qβ 18), sometimes with a long pig-tail of hair (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 100), but frequently we find him bearded (Qa 22; Ward WA 374).

As a rule the worshipper appeared bare-headed (Ward PM 51, 62; Qa 22), although there seems to have been exceptions, for example, in the case of Ward WA 307, where the suppliant wore a horned headdress. But the so-called suppliant here might have been a priest or priest's attendant. In one case a nude worshipper seems to have been represented (Ward WA 419), otherwise the suppliant wore a long tightly-fitting robe (Qa 26) with long fringes (Qa 23). Ordinarily the worshipper was represented with his head clean shaven and beardless (Speleers, Catalogue, No. 573; Qa 23; Ward WA 303a, 407; Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 381; Pinches, Berens Collection, No. 31). He, however, sometimes appears with long hair (Qa 22; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 100) and bearded (Qa 22).

The priest's attendant or server usually appeared with horned headdress and robe like the priest (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 100), but sometimes he wore a simple round cap (De Clercq, Cy. Or., No. 86; Lajard, XII, No. 17).

The central service in Babylonia and Assyria was the sacrifice and the central object in sacrificial service was the altar. The earliest altar may have been a light construction of reeds or palm-leaf stems. But before long a more substantial erection must have been used where burning could have taken place (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 117). The earliest form of the altar is that of a square, with or without a step or rear-table, at the top where cakes and other res sacrifici were placed (Ward WA 302; Ward PM 53;
Ward WA 376). It was probably made of brick (Ward in Curtiss, No. 4; Ward WA 368). It gradually began to vary from straight upright sides to those of concave (Ward in Curtiss, No. 4), until a regular hourglass altar was used (Ward in Curtiss, No. 5; Ward WA 365). This remained the regular form of the altar down to Assyrian times. In Ward in Curtiss, Nos. 6—15 we see a series of these altars represented with the flame of sacrifice or libation rising from them. The deity usually stands on one side and the priest in horned headdress on the other (see, for example, No. 9). These altars are chiefly for libations, but although the slaying of an animal for sacrifice is never represented, it perhaps should be assumed that the offering of animals was for sacrificial purposes. In one instance the altar appears in the form of a tripod (Ward WA 399), but the altar is to be differentiated from the credence table on which the res sacrifici are usually placed (Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 52; Ward WA 219; Ward PM 117). The Assyrian altar seems to have been much more substantially built than the early Babylonian altar (e. g. Ward WA 1253; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 73; Jeremias, Altb. Geistk. Abb. 206), although the small vase-like altar was very common (e. g. Ward WA 1260, 1261, 1259, 745, 746, 753; Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 339; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 65) as well as a tall peculiarly shaped altar (Ward PM 148, Ward WA 738). Very often what is called an altar by students of these scenes is merely a credence table (e. g. Ward, WA 1254, 1255, 1256, 721, 741; Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 340, 342—346; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 66).

In Assyrian as well as in Late Babylonian times it became customary to place on or near the altar the symbol of the deity worshipped (e. g. Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 118; Qβ 37; Qγ 5; Delaporte, Cy. Or. B. N., 544 ff.). An interesting example comes from the Assyrian period. An altar is represented with a fish upon it. The fish appears to be worshipped, of course, as the symbol of Dagon (Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 40), and on another seal Dagon is again worshipped, and the priest impersonates him, that is, he appears in the form of Dagon with a high mitre (Menant, n. fig. 36). This is interesting in view of what has been said above about the priest being robed like the god whom he serves.
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The central service was the sacrifice. Sacrificial scenes, as a rule, have an altar, and around the altar group the deity or his symbol, the priests, worshippers and attendants. The priest is always the sacrificer. The res sacrifici varied considerably, although the most popular article of sacrifice was the goat or kid, and next to that the bull. The goat or kid occurs as a sacrificial animal in all periods of Babylonian and Assyrian religious life (e.g. Qa 26; Ward PM 78; Qβ 36, 18; Menant, Gly. Or., fig. 62; Ward WA 136). The same is true of the bull (e.g. Ward WA p. 364; Ward WA 734). Other res sacrifici were: A lamb (Keiser, Patesi of the Ur Dynasty, p. 13), a ram (Ward WA 407, 1233), fish (Ward WA 740, 1255), a swan (Menant, Gly. Or., pl. VII, fig. 3), a deer (Ward WA 733), cakes (Ward WA 718, 726), and in early Babylonia a gazelle is found as material of sacrifice (Ward WA 1269).

Menant in his Gly. Or. made the claim that the Babylonian and Assyrian seals give evidence of the practice of human sacrifice. He instances (fig. 94) the scene where there is depicted a man with a vessel in his right hand and a worshipper genuflecting with both arms tied. An attendant stands behind the man. In fig. 95, he sees the same man with hand raised, grasping a weapon to kill the suppliant. And in fig. 96, he sees the same man in the act of killing the suppliant. Compare also figures 92 and 93. But Ward (American Journal of Archaeology, 5, 34—43) disputes Menant's claim. As there are no inscriptions dealing with this subject on the seals, and as other Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions do not furnish definite material, the question must be left open for the present. Although it must be said that the practice is not inherently impossible, but rather somewhat probable.

Besides the sacrifice of materials, such as have been noted above, liquids were offered as libations. These were very common (e.g. Speleers, Catalogue, p. 33; Delaporte, Mus. Guim., Vol. XXXI, p. 216, fig. 13), the usual liquid being water, although wine and oil were also probably used.

Other forms of divine service were common, such as liver divination, dedications of objects, and consecrations of persons and things, but the seal cylinders give very little evidence of them (Qβ 38, 37). But prayer always played a prominent part in divine
service. In fact, wherever the altar is not represented on these seals, it may be taken for granted that the scene depicts not a sacrifice, but a simple service of invocation or adoration (e.g. Menant, *Gly. Or.*, figs. 61, 122—127), and on the Cassite seals some of these prayers are recorded (cf. RA 16; Ward PM 121). Nor was music absent at both sacrificial and devotional services, as such a seal cylinder as Ward WA 539 would indicate, although our seals are very reticent on this subject.
ZUR ASSYRISCH-BABYLONISCHEN GESCHICHTE

Von Ernst F. Weidner

I

Ein Bruchstück der Annalen Nabonids


Im Jahre 1892 veröffentlichte J. N. Straßmaier in \textit{Hebraica} IX, p. 5 den Text Sp. II, 407. Da es sich nur um ein verhältnismäßiges kleines Bruchstück handelt, so wußte er bei dem Mangel an jeglichem Vergleichsmaterial natürlich nicht viel damit anzufangen, erkannte aber bereits damals mit klarem Blick, daß mit Nebukadnezar, dem Sohne Ninurta-nâdin-šumis, der in Vs. 6 genannt wird, Nebukadnezar I. (1146—1123 v. Chr.) gemeint ist. Der einzige, der sich später eingehender mit dem Texte befaßt hat, war Hugo Winckler.\(^3\) Er meinte, daß die Vorderseite eine


\(\text{\footnotesize \(^2\) Vgl. Dhorme, RA XI, 3, p. 106 f.; Landsberger, ZA XXX, S. 71—73.}

\(\text{\footnotesize \(^3\) KAT\(^3\), S. 107; OLZ 1906, Sp. 334 f.; KT\(^3\), S. 56 f.}
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5. [ .................................................. \( \text{aban narû} \)
6. [ ] \( m \, d \text{Nabû-kudurri-usur šar Bâbîlî\text{"}ki} \, m\text{ar } m \, d \text{Nin-urta-nâdin-šumi} \)
7. [ ] \( ša-lam enti \, \text{par-ši-šu al-ka-ka-ti-šu} \)
8. [ ] .................................. \( \text{-di-e-šu šat-ru} \)

Clay, YOS I, pl. XXXIII f., Kolumne I.

9. . . . \( \text{aban narû la-bi-ri ša } d \text{Na-bi-um-kur-dur-ri-û-sur} \)
30. \( \text{mär } m \, d \text{Nin-urta-na-din-šu-mi šar pa-na ma-ak-ra-a} \)
31. \( ša \text{ša-lam enti ba-âš-mu ši-ru-uš-šu} \)
32. \( si-ma-a-ti-šu lu-bu-uš-ta-šu } ū \text{ti-ik-ni-šu} \)
33. \( \text{it-ti-i iš-tu-ru} \)


\(^1\) Dazu stimmt auch die weitere Tatsache, daß der Text in neubabylonischer Schrift geschrieben ist.

1 S. Delitzsch, Paradies, S. 269—273.


1 Vorderseite, Kol. I, 9 a—c (Winckler, UAOG, S. 154; Schrader, KB III, 2, S. 128 f.; Hagen, BA II, S. 216 f.).
2 Rost, Keilschrifttexte Tiglatpileser III., S. 74, Z. 26; Winckler, AOF II, S. 3, Rs. 8.
3 Meißner-Rost, Bauinschriften Sanheribs, S. 12, Z. 45.
6 Das Land Ammanu, als dessen König sich Singâšid und Šamaš-šum-ukīn bezeichnen, hat mit unserer Stadt Ammananu gewiß nichts zu tun. Es wird sich um eine babylonisch-aramische Grenzlandschaft handeln (s. Streck, VAB VII, S. CCLIX, Anm. 1).
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II

Die babylonischen Könige der Amarnazeit

Das Königslisten-Fragment VAT II 262 aus Assur behandelt die Amarnazeit. Leider ist aber nur die assyrische Spalte erhalten, und so blieben bisher, wenn auch die Reihe der assyrischen Könige nunmehr endgültig feststeht, doch immer noch erhebliche Zweifel, wie die Reihe der babylonischen Könige für diese so überaus wichtige Periode der vorderasiatischen Geschichte zu rekonstruieren sei. Ich habe in MVAG 1915, 4, S. 62 f. und 1921, 2, S. 54—57 zwei Rekonstruktionsversuche veröffentlicht, doch dürften sie beide kaum restlose Befriedigung ausgelöst haben. Das veranlaßt mich,

1 Wahrscheinlich sind Vorder- und Rückseite bei Straßmaier zu vertauschen. Der Text wird mit einer ausführlichen historisch-politischen Einleitung begonnen haben und zum Schluß in eine Bau- und Weihinschrift ausgelaufen sein.
2 S. Weidner, MVAG 1915, 4, S. 3; Schroeder, KAV, Nr. 11.
3 W. F. Albright hat es im Journal of Egyptian Archaeology VII, 1921, p. 85 und in RA XVIII, 1921, p. 83—94 für nötig befunden, wegen meiner chronologischen Aufstellungen in MVAG 1915, 4 schwere persönliche Ausfälle gegen mich zu richten. Da er in RA XVIII, p. 83 selbst erklärt, daß die meisten seiner Ausstellungen durch MVAG 1921, 2 gegenstandslos geworden seien, so wundert es mich um so mehr, daß er seine Arbeit gleichwohl in dieser Form erscheinen ließ. Im übrigen weiß er sachlich anscheinend wenig vorzubringen und läßt mich dafür Dinge behaupten, die mir selbst gänzlich unbekannt sind. So habe ich keineswegs Semiramis mitgezählt, um die Zahl 82 für die assyrischen Könige zu erhalten, wie sie mir ohne den Schatten eines Beweises nachsagt. Wenn er daher den Mangel an tatsächlichem Material durch eine gereizte persönliche Form ersetzt, für die mir jedes Verständnis fehlt, so darf ich wohl im Hinblick auf das Urteil eines wirklichen Kenners der altorientalischen Geschichte (AJSL XXXVIII, p. 225 ff.) darauf verzichten, mich näher mit seinen Ausführungen zu beschäftigen.
das Problem hier noch einmal aufzurollen, auch mit Rücksicht auf neues Material, das inzwischen zu meiner Kenntnis gelangt ist. Das folgende Material liegt für die babylonischen Herrscher der Amarnazeit vor:


2 Kadašman-Ḥarbe, der Sohn und Nachfolger des Königs Kara-indaš, wurde bei einem Aufstand erschlagen. Darauf bestieg sein Sohn Kurigalzu den babylonischen Thron.3

3 Nach einem von King veröffentlichten Tonkegel ist Kurigalzu, der Sohn des Kadašman-Ḥarbe, ein Vorgänger eines Königs Kadašman-Enlil.


5 Kadašman-Enlil I. war ein Zeitgenosse Amenhoteps III. (1415—1381).6

6 Burnaburiaš II. war der Sohn Kadašman-Enlils und Zeitgenosse Amenhoteps IV. (1380—1364) und Ašur-uballits. Nach den Urkunden aus Nippur hat er mindestens 25 Jahre regiert.9

7 Kurigalzu III. war ein Sohn Burnaburiaš II.10

1 Vs. I, 1—4 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).
2 Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 10, 8.
5 Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 9, 19.
6 Knudtzon, a. a. O., Nr. 1—4.
7 Hilprecht, BEUP I, pl. 25, Nr. 68; Thureau-Dangin, JA 1908, Janv., p. 122 ff.
8 Knudtzon, VAB II, Nr. 7—11, 15—16.
9 S. Schnabel, MVAG 1908, 1, S. 5.
10 Synchr. Gesch. I, 16 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38); Nies and Keiser, Historical, Religious and Economic Texts, p. 20 ff., pl. VIII (Nr. 15; dort ist in Z. 2 natürlich sar ḫillati zu lesen). In der Reihe der Nippurtexte liegt jedenfalls gegen MVAG 1921, 2, S. 55 keine Lücke vor.
Aus 2, 3, 6 und 7 lassen sich die folgenden Reihen babylonischer Könige aufstellen:

2 Kara-indaš,
   Kadasman-Ḫarbe,
   Kurigalzu
3 Kadasman-Ḫarbe,
   Kurigalzu
   Kadasman-Enlil
6 Kadasman-Enlil,
   Burnaburiaš
7 Burnaburiaš,
   Kurigalzu

Aus diesen vier Einzelreihen kann man nun die folgende fortlaufende Reihe babylonischer Könige gewinnen:

Kara-indaš I,
Kadasman-Ḫarbe I,
Kurigalzu II,
Kadasman-Enlil I,
Burnaburiaš II,
Kurigalzu III.


1 Ein Komma hinter dem Namen bedeutet, daß der betreffende König der Vater seines Nachfolgers war.
2 S. Schnabel, MVAG 1908, I, S. 5, 11.
sich dann etwa folgendermaßen rekonstruieren:

Abirattaš¹ 1678—1659  
Tazzigurmaš 1658—1639  
Ḫarbašipak 1638—1619  
*Achter König* 1618—1599  
Agum II. 1598—1579  
Kurigalzu I. 1578—1560  
Melišipak I. 1559—1541  
Nazimaruttaš I. 1540—1522  
Burnaburiaš I. 1521—1503  
Kaštiliaš II. (III.) 1502—1484  
Agum III. 1483—1465  
*Sechzehnter König* 1464—1446  
Kara-indaš 1445—1427  
Kadašman-Ḫarbe I. 1426—1408  
Kurigalzu II. 1407—1389  
Kadašman-Enlil I. 1388—1370  
Burnaburiaš II. 1369—1345  
Kurigalzu III. 1344—1320  
Nazimaruttaš II. 1319—1294

Wenn wir nun hierzu die Reihe der assyrischen Könige in *MVAG* 1921, 2, S. 65 vergleichen, so lassen sich eine ganze Reihe wichtiger Feststellungen machen. Burnaburiaš I. (1521—1503) war der Zeitgenosse des assyrischen Königs Puzur-ᾲsir IV. (1530—1511). Das wird durch die Synchronistische Geschichte bestätigt.³ Allerdings ist dort der Abschnitt über Puzur-ᾲsir—Burnaburiaš an eine falsche Stelle geraten, da der Verfasser Burnaburiaš I. und II. verwechselt hat.⁴ Ebenso wird der Synchronismus Kara-indaš (1445—1427)—ᾲsir-bēl-nišēšu (1450—1431) durch die Synchronistische Geschichte bestätigt.⁵ Völlige Verwirrung scheint aber sowohl in der assyrischen (Synchronistische Geschichte) wie in der babylonischen Überlieferung (Chronik P) über die Geschichte

¹ Danach ist die Tabelle in *MVAG* 1921, 2, S. 63 zu verbessern.  
² Oder Kaštiliaš II.  
³ Synchr. Gesch. I, 5—7 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).  
⁵ Synchr. Gesch. I, 1—4 (CT XXXIV, pl. 38).

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Enlil-nāšir II., Aš[ir-râbi I., Ašir-nîrâri II.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>[Kara-indaš]</td>
<td>Ašir-bêl-nîšē-[šu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>[ǁ]</td>
<td>Ašir-rîm-nîšē-[šu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>[Kurigalzu II.]</td>
<td>Enlil-nîr[ârî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>[.............]</td>
<td>um-ma-an-[šu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>[Kadašman-Enlil I.]</td>
<td>Arik-dên-ilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>[Burnaburias II.]</td>
<td>ǁ [³¿]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>[Kurigalzu III.]</td>
<td>ǁ [³¿]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>[Nazimaruttaš II.]</td>
<td>[Adad-nîrâri I.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bei dieser Liste fällt zunächst auf, daß Ašur-uballiṭ, einer der bedeutendsten Könige des mittelassyrischen Reiches, der zweifellos längere Zeit regiert hat, mit seinen beiden Vorgängern Ašur-nâdin-âḫê und Eriba-Adad in eine Zeile gepreßt ist, während seinem

¹ Dieser ist wohl Ašir-bêl-nišēšu, Ašir-rîm-nišēšu oder Ašur-nâdin-âḫê gewesen.


1 S. MVAG 1921, 2, S. 14 und Tafel II.
Die Dynastie von Akkad

Die Dynastie von Akkad, deren Begründer Šarrukin war, ist uns dank der neuesten Funde Legrains im Museum der University of Pennsylvania nunmehr sowohl in der Reihenfolge der Herrscher wie in der Zahl ihrer Regierungsjahre lückenlos bekannt. Die

---

Dynastie umfaßt danach folgende Herrscher:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herrscher</th>
<th>Jahre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šarrukin</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimiš</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maništusu</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narâm-Sin</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarkališarri</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igigi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudu</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimal-Dur-ul²</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Es sind also im Ganzen elf Herrscher, die zusammen 197 Jahre regierten. Eine Schwierigkeit bietet aber noch die Königsliste Scheil,³ die Rs. 8 in der Unterschrift der Dynastie von Akkad liest: „zwölf Könige, die 197 Jahre regierten“. Diese Angabe hat Clay⁴ veranlaßt, zwischen Šarkališarri und Igigi eine Lücke anzunehmen. Dieser Annahme stehen nun aber die beiden Tatsachen gegenüber, daß für einen zwölften Herrscher kein Jahr mehr übrig ist und daß die Königsliste Scheil, Rs. 1 direkt vor den vier gleichzeitig regierenden Königen Igigi, Imi, Nanum und Ilulu bietet: Šar-g[a-šašar-ri].⁵ Wir werden also ohne Zweifel annehmen dürfen, daß die Angabe „zwölf Könige“ der Liste Scheil auf einem Irrtum des Schreibers beruht und daß dafür „elf Könige“ einzusetzen ist.⁶ Wir kennen nunmehr mithin die gesamte Dynastie von Akkad, für deren Herrscher etwa die folgenden Regierungszeiten zu gelten haben:⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herrscher</th>
<th>Jahre (Regierungsjahr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šarrukin</td>
<td>2684–2630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimiš</td>
<td>2629–2615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Vgl. Clay, JAOS XLI, 1921, p. 248.
² Für die Lesung vgl. Scheil, RA XVIII, 2, p. 99.
³ Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Insr. 1911, p. 608; Thureau-Dangin, Chronologie, p. 60; Gadd, The early Dynasties of Sumer and Akkad, pl. 2.
⁴ JAOS XLI, 1921, p. 248.
⁵ RA IX, 1912, p. 69.
⁷ Darnach ist MVAG 1921, 2, S. 62 richtig zu stellen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>König</th>
<th>Jahr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maništusu</td>
<td>2614—2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narām-Sin</td>
<td>2607—2552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarkališarri</td>
<td>2551—2527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igigi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanum</td>
<td>2526—2524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudu</td>
<td>2523—2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimil-Dur-ul</td>
<td>2502—2488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOME NEW BOOKS ON ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago


Dinet’s and Sliman ben Ibrahim’s book will probably be given a haughty side glance with a caustic remark in some quarters where a monopoly of scientific knowledge is advertised among friends. We however take it as a book well worthy of notice. The authors’ point of view is that the study of Islam — like any other study — should not be divorced from life. Their attitude is like that of the famous French entomologist Fabre, who said to scholastic entomologists, better provided with University honors, You investigate death, I investigate life. For this reason our generation is richer by the work of Fabre. For a similar cause our generation will be richer by the work of Dinet. Dinet says that many of the works of learned European Orientalists are monuments of artificial scholarship built without foundation: these painstaking scholars do not know the Eastern soul — a soul which can scarcely be studied in a library, but rather in living the life of the Arab people at least for a while, in having a share of their sorrows and their joys, in forgetting ourselves, our education, our way of thinking — in becoming a little like them. This is not exactly what Dinet says but we think that it gives the substance of his argument as it echoes in our own mind. The author shows how the leading orientalists Dozy, Lammens, Noeldeke, Sprenger, Hurgronje, Grimme, Margoliouth, Huart, contradict each other in their estimate of the character of the founder of Islam. Dinet criticises more especially the work of Lammens — which is very
SOME NEW BOOKS ON ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

clever but is not exactly history. The method of the learned Jesuit is very simple: he takes a statement in the Sira, declares that the contrary is true and sets to prove his contention by a similar treatment of texts, whenever these do not strengthen his point. Dinet shows that Lammens' method applied to the gospels would lead to the canonization of Herod and Judas. In another chapter, he takes up Casanova's theory that Mohammed expected to see the end of the world. This theory has not been accepted in scientific circles, as it is really too fanciful, and Dinet disproves it very easily. In the same chapter he shows that Roches' account of a journey to Mecca (Dix ans à travers l'Islam) is a mere plagiarism of Burckhardt. Dinet's work is of the greatest value: we hope that it is only a beginning, and that either he or his friends will present their views in a more pretentious form. We shall only remind them that the entomologist Fabre did write quite a little and thereby justified the value of his point of view. As a Christian, we have long felt that in certain academic circles, much learned nonsense has been written on Christ as it has been written on Mohammed. Arm chair investigators are not proper students of Eastern religions — and Christianity is one of these. Unbelievers and men who have no sense of the wonderful and the miraculous are, in their study of religion, as inefficient as a guild of blind men criticising great painters — even though they may loudly proclaim their infallibility. No one can study a great living religion without a willingness to hear through it, the still small voice of a God, who sends down his rain on the just and the unjust and whose light lighteneth every man that cometh into the world. It is the heart that makes the theologian, it is the heart that makes also the student of comparative religion. Dinet's protest came from his heart this is why we judge him right and hope for more from his pen and from his brush.

Guidi's little book is not a cry from the heart — but no such thing as the heart is necessary perhaps when dealing with pre-Islamic Arabia and those brilliant times of cunning warfare and

1 Dinet has already published a Life of Mohammed, which is very artistically presented, and purposely conservative and uncritical.
gorgeous poetry, altogether barren of a living God. It gives us four popular lectures delivered by him before the Egyptian University of Cairo. The first takes up the northern and central kingdoms of Hira, Ghassan, and Kinda. The lecturer shows that the form of the Thamudic characters proves that at the beginning of our era Yemen was still the main civilizing center in Arabia. In the light of this admission the fourth lecture which deals with South Arabia and Abyssinia is a little disappointing as it limits itself to Himyaritic History and attempts no reconstruction of the earlier Minean and Sabean period. As a matter of fact, any study of preislamic Arabia should begin from the South, for we find as early as Gudea a mention of Magan, Meluhha, and Gubi, namely the region of Main, Amalek and Juf. The identification of Amalek with Meluhha may be doubtful but its location in Oman is certainly proved by cuneiform sources. Guidi has a perfect right to think that what has been written so far on ancient South Arabia is of little value from a scientific point of view, but we think that the students of the University of Cairo who probably know very little about the South Arabian Inscriptions could very well have been told a little about these still mysterious chapters of Ancient History. The second lecture is on intellectual progress among the Arabs, namely on their poetry and the third on their material progress which was mainly due to Aramaic influence. This influence is established by the use of Aramaic terms in agriculture and the arts, words like lamp, wine, leaven, and those denoting fine clothing and jewels, being borrowed from the same language. The author shows how some of the words came into our own Western vocabulary later through the Arabic. Here again we think that a study of South Arabian antiquities and reliefs would allow us to make less absolute some of Guidi’s statements. For instance it is far from certain that lamps were introduced from Aram; Bent found an antique, lamp, inscribed with Himyaritic characters in Hadhramaut. Wine was made in South Arabia. We are perfectly willing to admit that extravagant claims were made for South Arabian culture ten or twenty years ago and Arabists have a right to take a skeptic attitude — but since they choose to say nothing on the subject, we also have a right to remind them that a study of Arabian
civilization which ignores South Arabia before its decadence, is like a survey of the civilization of Palestine which would tell us nothing of the Canaanite civilization before the Egyptian conquest. We may also add to strengthen our argument that Professor Langdon claims that the Semites of Akkad came from South Arabia, a theory which makes preislamic Arabia one of the greatest factors in the development of the world’s civilization. He has not yet made public all his arguments in support of his thesis: we can only suppose that it will be partly based on the striking similarity between some verbal forms in South Arabic, Ethiopic, Egyptian and Assyrian. With this qualification, Guidi’s popular lectures are an excellent outline of preislamic Arabia — and without qualification, they are the best ever written on the subject.

Baron Carra de Vaux presents to us the two first volume of what is going to be a standard work on Islamic civilization in five volumes. The first volume treats of the sovereigns of Islam who were learned or famous patrons of learning, of Arabian, Persian, and Turkish historians, of political philosophers, proverb-makers and storytellers. The second volume takes up the geographers and travellers, mathematicians, astronomers, physicians, agriculturists, and alchemists. The third volume will take up law, the fourth, theology, the fifth, the new liberalism in Islam. This work is unpedantic but thoroughly scientific; it is comprehensive, without being as dry as an Encyclopedia; it has been slowly written, and yet it reads like a popular book. We do not know whether any orientalist could have done as well; certainly none ever did. In the present chaotic state of Arabic bibliography many will turn to this work for references of uncommon editions and translations. It is therefore to be regretted that the author does did not make mention (on p. 112 of the first volume) of Amar’s translation of the Fakhri. The author is very accurate, but we wish that he had not satisfied himself with Arabic sources concerning the foundation of Baghdad, a very ancient city indeed, which is mentioned in cuneiform sources.

The publisher Geuthner is to be congratulated for these distinctive contributions to our knowledge of Islam, each written from a different point of view, but all the works of experts and masters.
AN OLD TESTAMENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL
BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1918 TO 1921 INCLUSIVE.

By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio

The results of the great war are still with us. Consequently, there will perhaps be some books and articles which should appear in this bibliography but which have not as yet come to my attention. However, there will always be a few books which will not be considered suitable for a scientific bibliography, and there are many brief notes and even articles, which cannot find a place here. But it is my aim to include every book, article, and note of scientific value in this Archaeological Bibliography. This bibliography continues that published in this JOURNAL in 1919, pp. 19—35.

I. GENERAL


BALDENSPERGER, P. J., "The immovable East", PEF 1918, 20—24, 116—121; 1919, 118—122, 159—166; 1920, 161—166.


BRITISH MUSEUM, How to observe in Archaeology. London, 1920, pp. 103.


* This is the archaeological section of the Old Testament bibliography which appears in the Anglican Theological Review.


MÖLLER, W., "Ein fünftägiger Ausflug nach dem Jordantale im Februar 1914", Palästinajahrbuch 16, 36—46.


PETRIE, W. M. F., "Thirty Years in Egyptology", Exp. T. 33, 110—114.


SCHCHECHTER, A., Palästina, seine Geschichte und Kultur im Lichte der neuesten Ausgrabungen und Forschungen. Berlin: Lamm, 1918, pp. 106.


SPRENGLING, M., "The Aramaic Papyri of Elephantine in English" (Continued), AJTh 22, 349—375.


WEILL, R., "La Cité de David", R. Études Juives 69, 1—85; 70, 1—36, 149—179; 71, 1—45.

In his inaugural lecture before the University of Amsterdam, Aalders emphasizes the fact that we have arrived at a new turning-point in Old Testament studies. Baldensperger continues his important cultural studies in the "Immovable East", and Bentwich reviews the history and culture of the Jews. The British Museum has issued helpful suggestions for travellers in the Near and Middle East, including Palestine. Clark discusses the relation between India and the West, including Palestine, in the tenth century B.C. Dalman continues his valuable archaeological notes. A good review of the literature on Babylonian traditions about the origin of things is given by Dhorme. Dussaud calls attention to the necessity of excavations on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem, emphasizing the superiority of the reliability of the dimensions in I Kgs. over those in Ezekiel. Frazer's great work in three volumes is a mine of valuable exegetical material. Grant writes for the layman, and so does Hölsher, in the Göschen Sammlung. The prehistoric culture of Palestine and Phoenicia, the fruit of many years of research in Palestine, is given by Karge. The material is indispensable to all students of the culture and religion of these two lands. King presents the newest material up to 1918 on Creation and Deluge matters. He is at his best on the Semitic side of his work. An immense amount of material dealing with the archaeology and historical relations between Egypt and Canaan from the earliest times until 70 A.D. is presented by Knight. He, however, uses very little discrimination in his use of valuable and inferior material. Krealing gives an excellent account of the rôle played by the Aramaens in the world's history. Kyle conservatively deals with the light which archaeology sheds upon the period of the patriarchs. Luckenbill reminds us of the necessity of keeping before us the history of whole Nearer Orient, when we try to visualize the earliest steps in the political and religious evolution of the Israelites. Mercer gives an Old Testament archaeological bibliography for the years 1914—1917. Moulton's
article covers the late period only. Offord, who died in 1920, again has placed us in his debt by his interesting archaeological notes. Petrie is always interesting whenever he writes on archaeology, especially, as in this case, when he applies its results to the reconstruction of history. Sayce reviews a few recent works on archaeology. Schwartz treats of the walls of Jerusalem in the times of the Maccabees and Agrippa. Weill gives a detailed account of his excavations in the soil of the primitive city of Jerusalem in his search for the tombs of the kings of Judah.

2. ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY
CASPARI, W., "Die Personalsfrage als Kern der ältesten israelitischen Staatsgründungspläne", OLZ 1920, 49—51, 97—105.
DALMAN, G., "Die Stammeszugehörigkeit der Stadt Jerusalem und des Tempels", von Baudissin-Festschrift 107—120.
HUMBERT, P., "Der Deltafürst So' in Hosea 5", OLZ 21, 224-226.
TORREY, C. C., “A Phoenician Necropolis at Sidon”, Annual Amer. School i, 1—27.
The article by Barton contains a good classification of Semitic peoples Blanckenhorn studies early Palestine and Syria in the light of prehistoric Europe and North Africa. Clay believes that Amurru takes the place of Arabia as the cradle of the Semitic race. Jerusalem according to Dalman belonged to the tribe of Benjamin. Dieulafoy points out that the time between the capture of Jerusalem and the edict of Cyrus, freeing the Jews, in 538 was 60 or 49 years, and not 70, as stated in II Chr. 36:31. Humbert shows that 13 MT and אֵשׁ LXX אֵשׁ of II Kgs. 17:4. Only part of the Hebrews were ever in Egypt is what Jirku holds, and in his second article he shows that Abdi-Ḫabi was a Hittite and was born in Jerusalem, and he concludes that the population of Jerusalem was mostly Hittite. Killermann finds many gaps in the early chronology of the Bible. Kleber uses Assyrian data in his attempt to bring into accord the statements of Kings and Chronicles. The Ḥabiru are identified by Langdon in a wider sense with the children of Eber. Langendorfer's article is popular but good, relating it to Bible phenomena. Maynard sees in the Phoenicians a people from the North; while Meinhold finds evidence of Indo-Germanic influence in Canaan. A useful study of the Jews in Egypt in the Greek and Roman period is furnished by Modona. Möller looks upon Sib’u — שבע as a mistake for Shabaka. In his article on the Samaritans in HERE, Moulton strangely omits Thomson’s fine work. Peiser thinks that the oldest name of Canaan, though later found as F-n-h, was originally Ki-na-aḫ-ḫi; whence the two names Canaan and Phoenicia. The name Araunah, thinks Sayce was a title. Schmidtke believes that Sennacherib was murdered in Babylon, as against Ungnad. Schollmeyer agrees with Witzel’s interpretation of the so-called “Epic of Paradise”. Sidersky makes a fresh and detailed study of the Stela of Mesha and defends its genuineness, while Storr takes the opposite view, on the basis of a critical study of the text, and Cowley seeks to show that in l. 18 of the text the name Yahweh does not occur. He thinks that the pre-exilic form of the name of Yahweh was Yāw. Thomson has written the best account of the Samaritans that exists in English. Weiner is polemical but well worth reading.
3. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY

CHRISTIE, W. M., Tell Ḥum the Site of Capernaum, Studia Semitica et Orientalia 13—34.


GUTHE, H., Die griechisch-römischen Städte des Ostjordanlandes. Leipzig: Hinrichs 1918, pp. 44.


HORWITZ, J. W., النقد העתיק ירושלים 11 and 12, 51—73.


LUNCZ, A. M., התווך יenario כבלי, Jerusalem 11 and 12, 233—310.

LUNCZ, A. M., הנקודות וIALIZ רופטימי, Jerusalem 11 and 12, 325—335.


WILLCOCKS, W., From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan. London: Spoon, 1919, pp. 100.

The old Jewish sanctuary, 'Ain Duk, was discovered in 1918. The discovery was discussed in R. Bibl. 1919, 532—563, in JAOS 1920, 141—142, and finally by Cook in PEF 1920, 82—87 and 142. Dussaud shows the importance of Sidon as a centre of glass manufacture. von Gall deduces, in this article, 952 as the date of the first year of Salomon’s reign. Gardiner thinks the desert road from El-Kantareh to Rafa was the ancient military road from Egypt to Palestine. Horwitz studies the name Abel in the Bible as well as in the Talmud and in Josephus. In his first article Luncz discusses the limits of Palestine in the time of the 'Return, and in his second article investigates several topographical problems. Offord writes on Heliopolis, as found in a Semitic inscription, and on the Gilgals and Massebas of Palestine. Peters finds the home of the Semites in Asia Minor and the regions eastward and in Armenia. Cf. Clay’s position. In his book Schoff studies the commerce of the Bible and attempts to show, that the Tyre of Ezekiel’s vision is Babylon. Stähelin sums up in neat fashion all we know at present about the Philistines, while Stearns traces the history of Gezer back as far as 3000 B.C. Sutton discourses on cities both east and west of the Jordan, and Vernes believes that Moses received the law and gave it to Israel at the Moabite Sanctuary of Beth-Peor. Wiegand records many valuable observations on the identification of Old Testament geographical names. To Willcocks we are indebted for an original and suggestive study.

4. ARCHAEOLOGY AND LITERATURE
ALBRIGHT, W. F., "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph", JBL 37, 111—143.
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CASPARI, W., "Tohuwabohu", Hommel-Festschrift 1—20.
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EBELING, E., "A Specimen of Babylonian Wisdom Literature", MVAG 1918, 50—70.
HAUPP, P., “Zerubbabel and Melchizedek”, JSOR 2, 76—82.
MELAMED, R. H., “The Targum to Canticles according to Six Yemen MSS, compared with the Textus Receptus”, JQR, 10, 377—410; 11, 1—20; 12, 57—109.
MORGENSTERN, J., “The Sources of the Creation Story”, AJSL 36, 169—212.


Aalders collects and discusses some Palestinian tales. The various elements in the Story of Joseph, thinks Albright, are the product of long evolution. In his second article he contributes many fresh ideas to our knowledge of the Flood and lustration practices. Astley discusses Ezek. 8:5–14; Deut. 4:14ff.; and Is. 65:2–7; 66:3, 17. In his second article he emphasizes the teaching value of the Mythology in the Psalms. Ball finds the name Daniel under the form Danya as early as the Hammurabi dynasty. Bergmann discusses the religious Haggadah of the Jews. In his article, Bewer compares the prophecy of Haggai with the contents of Gudea A and B. Budde finds Adapa in Joel 2:20. Clermont-Ganneau describes the mosaic pavement of an old fourth century synagogue at Noeros. Cowley published 38 texts from Elephantine papyri, with brief notes and an historical introduction. An unsuccessful attack upon the modern interpretation of the Bible is made by a man, who does not know his subject — Doumergue. Ebeling discusses what he considers a parallel to Ecclesiastes, giving a new transliteration and translation of the text. Edwards’ book is a new edition, with no improvement on the quality of the first edition. Ewing thinks he finds certain results in Thomson’s “The Samaritans” which are in conflict with the Higher Critical School. Fischer points out the numerical value of the letters of certain important words. Fullerton shows the important bearing which Neh. 12:31–39 has upon the probable course of Nehemiah’s wall. Gray discusses Ebeling’s text, and shows the great difference between its contents and the Book of Job. In his article, Gunkel argues for the genuineness of the Book of Esther. Haupt makes Ps. 110 refer to Zerubbabal. Hausrath compares the relationship between Oriental and Greek fables. Hommel equates Arioch of Ellasar with Rim-Sin of Larsa. James
has published a most stimulating book upon his subject. **M. R. James** gives a list of titles and fragments of lost Apocrypha. **Jeremias'** book is a study in the symbolical language of the Bible. The Tower of Babel, according to **Krealing**, is to be identified with the temple-tower of Borsippa (Birs Nimrud). **Langdon** shows that the Biblical Ellasar = Sumerian Ilasar (= Larsa). **Luckenbill** gives a good rendering of a part of the new version of the Babylonian Creation story. **Mann** treats the Responsa as a source of Jewish History. **Maynard** publishes under this title and "Hebrew and Aramaic" a penetrating criticism of Naville's hypothesis of a cuneiform text of the Old Testament. **Mercer's** article seeks to show the independence of the Biblical story of Creation of Babylonian influence, while **Morgenstern** says that the question of the antiquity of the Babylonian myth in Israel is not settled. **Ranston** treats Theognis as a possible source for ideas in Koheleth. **Reisner** gives an account of his excavations of the pyramids of Nuri, the largest of which proved to be the tomb of Tirhaqa (II Kgs. 19). **Sayce** finds a scapegoat among the Hittites, and in his second article shows that Salem stood on the Temple-hill. **Schmidt and Kahle** publish a series of stories and legends about Palestine, collected by peasants. **Stieglecker** places the Hindu flood-stories midway between the Babylonian and Hebrew in point of worth. Megillat Taanit is treated by **Zeitlin** as a source of Jewish chronology and history in the Hellenic and Roman periods.

5. **ARCHAEOLOGY AND RELIGION**


**ALT, A.**, "Ein Grabstein aus Beerseba", ZDPV 1919, 177—188.

**BARTON, G. A.**, "Possession" (Semitic and Christian), "Soul" (Semitic and Egyptian), "Stones" (Semitic), "Suicide" (Semitic and Egyptian), HERE 10, 133-139; 11, 749—753; 11, 876—877; 12, 38—40.
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MACALISTER, R. A. S., "Sacrifice" (Semitic), HERE 11, 31—38.


MERCER, S. A. B., "Was Ikhnaton a Monotheist", JSOR 3, 70-85.


VAN HOONACKER, A., “Is the Narrative of the Fall a Myth?” Exp. 1918, 373—400.


VAN RAVESTEYN, T. L. W., “God en Mensch”, ThSt. 35, 197—224, 249—270; BZ 14, 278.


WENSINCK, A. J., *Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia*. Amsterdam: Müller, 1921, pp. 56.


The Assyrian etymology of Ariel is upheld by Albright in his first article. In his second he discusses the Serpent and the Fall; and in his third he is against a Babylonian derivation of the Logos. This is in contrast to Langdon’s position. **Barton’s** articles are excellent, with one exception, namely, that on "Soul". In his article **Buttenwieser** denies the existence in Israel of the notion that violent death called for vengeance only as long as the blood remained uncovered. **Clermont-Ganneau** publishes a Greek inscription discovered on the Hill of Ophel in 1914. It records the erection of a Synagogue of the time of Herod, possibly the Synagogue of the Libertines (Acts 6:9). **Dussaud**’s book is full and thorough. His position is opposed to Wellhausen. **Fiebig**’s book is a rather unscientific polemic against Fritsch, *Handbuch der Judenfrage*. **Gressmann**’s article is a study of Amarna Letters Egyptian texts. The Ark, according to Gressmann came from Canaan. **Heinisch** discusses, among other things, the Spirit of God and the Angel of Jahweh in the Old Testament. **Jirku** agrees with Langdon on the problem of the Ḥabiru. **Langdon**’s first article throws much light upon titles in the Hebrew Psalter, e.g., āl šōshannîm = “on the three-toned instrument”; shigu = penitential psalm = shiggāyôn. His second article contains much that is questionable, but his article in the Museum Journal is excellent. **Meek** thinks that Yaweh was the tribal god of Judah only. **Mercer** fails to find a real monotheism in Egypt. His two books on Egypt and Babylon throw much light upon problems in Old Testament religion. His articles in Hasting’s *ERE* collect all the available material. **Meyer** says that the Zadokites were a religious society in Damascus, and arose during the first half of the second century B.C. **Morgenstern** emphasizes the value of archaeology. **Paton** finds similar psychical manifestations in antiquity to those so popular to-day, but most of his deductions are false. In his second article **Pilcher** describes an amulet in Greek and Samaritan — the oldest of its
kind. It must have been an oversight that Pinches did not discuss Tammuz in his relation to the Old Testament. Scheftelowitz discusses some interesting OT sections, such as, Is. 45:6 f.; 50:10 f. 

Smith holds that ethical Yahwism and its prophets came into Canaan from the south, where Israel came into touch with the sages and seers of Egypt. Van Leeuwen’s book is a very thorough discussion of the subject, making full use of all new material. Van Ravesteijn’s book is a Babel en Bijbel contribution. Vernes in his first article thinks that the Hebrews adopted megalithic cromlechs by making the twelve stones symbolize the twelve tribes of Israel. In his second article, he advances the theory that the scene of the elevation of the brazen serpent was at or near Obot in eastern Arabia. Weber discusses the origin of the Ark of Jehovah. Welsford’s article is very disappointing from a Semitic and Egyptian point of view. Worrell interprets the Demon of Noonday as a sickness demon.

6. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GENERAL CULTURE


HERRMANN, J., "Der Ursprung des Alphabets", OLZ 40, 27—32; 51—57.
KITTEL, R., Kriege in biblischen Landen. Gotha: Perthes, pp. 82.
NEUBAUER, J., "Beiträge zur Geschichte des biblisch-talmudischen Eheschließungsrechts", MVAG 1919—1920, 1—249.
OLMSTEAD, A. T., "Wearing the Hat", AJTh 24, 94—111.
RICHTER, G., "Die Kesselwagen des salomonischen Tempels", ZDPV 41, 1—34.

ZAPLETAL, V., "Der Wein in der Bibel", BS 20, 1—66.

Aptowitzer discusses the relationship between Ḥammurabi § 110 and the Hebrew law. Bauer opposes the theory held by Sethe and Gardiner about the Phoenician alphabet. Woman is assigned a very high place by Beer, but Boehl holds that that was true only of the period before the Captivity. A special quality was attributed to the number 40 by the pyramid builders in Egypt, and Dieulafoy thinks that it was adopted by the Hebrews. Eisler thinks that the Sinai inscriptions contain Semitic writing, influenced by the hieroglyphic. The language is a Canaanitish dialect, of the Hyksos period. Gressmann describes the ancient Hebrews as wearing long head-hair, pointed beard and short moustache. Jastrow translates the new Assyrian law code, but makes numerous grammatical blunders; compare Scheil’s translation of the same. Lehmann-Haupt discusses the Sinai inscriptions, deriving them from Egypt. Luckenbill believes that the author of the Sinai inscriptions drew upon both Babylonian and Egyptian systems. A definite relationship is found between Babylonian and Hebrew law by Lunfield. Masterman’s article treats of modern and Bible times. Mercer studies the new Assyrian Code, and finds that while it is closely related to previous Babylonian and Assyrian law, it adds to evidence which militates against any close relationship between Babylonian and Hebrew law. Olmstead writes of the limitations of Hellenization and the inevitableness of Oriental reaction. Petrie adds his weight to the theory that the alphabet owes much to Egyptian sources. Roscher presents a servicable collection of material — including OT material — on the navel of the earth. He, however, frequently falls into error, for example, when he says, that the Samaritan temple originated in the time of Alexander. Sayce adds his word to the problem of the alphabet, saying that the characters are Egyptian but their values are Semitic. Scheil discusses what seems to be a part of the source of the Ḥammurabi code. Soutzo presents some interesting material. He thinks, for example, that the kernel of wheat was used as a standard of weight in Babylonia, and he estimates that the Hebrew talent weighed 864,000 kernels.
REVIEWS

*Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu den altassyrischen Gesetzen.* (MVAG 1921, 3.) Von Paul Koschaker. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921, pp. 84. $ 0.50.

This book contains full scientific apparatus for the study of the Assyrian Code which was given in translation and introduction by Ehelolf and Koschaker in *Ein altassyrisches Rechtsbuch.* After some introductory remarks about the publication of the text by Schroeder in 1920, and a description of the text, Koschaker takes up the importance of the Code from a legal point of view. He then describes the technique of the laws, their contents, and their similarity to the Hammurabi laws. Then follows a discussion of some of the more important of the new laws, in which it is seen that they are composite, and contain many glosses, or later additions. This is the most valuable part of Koschaker's work, and will give rise to much speculation as to the origin of these glosses. After a series of paragraphs on special topics, such as the question of the levirate, etc., the writer gives an excellent outline of the Code, and an able discussion of its probable sources. No student of Semitic law can be without this fine piece of work.

*SAMUEL A. B. MERCER*


This monograph makes the first part of a series of studies edited by Otto Weber, and published by the Vorderasiatischen Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, which will treat in a semi-popular fashion some of the archaeological and literary monuments preserved in the Berlin Museum. This book gives a German translation of the new Assyrian Code, rendered into English by Jastrow and into French by Scheil. The translation is
well made, and is accompanied by numerous critical notes. Koschaker has contributed a very valuable Introduction in which he discusses the nature and contents of the Code, and throws welcome light upon many difficult problems of interpretation. He contrasts the structure of this Code with the Hammurabi Code, showing that the Assyrian Code is largely a compilation of earlier laws, and the laws in this Code are more discursive than those in the older Code. The work both of translator and commentator is well done.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This forms the 2. Heft of the 23. Jahrgang of Der Alte Orient, Professor Zimmern has herein presented us with an excellent translation of the Hittite Code as found at Boghazkøi, and dating from about 1300 B.C. This translation is a most important contribution to the study of ancient law, especially as it is made at a time when fresh interest is aroused in this particular field of research by the recent publication and translation of the Assyrian Code. Zimmern's translation leaves very little to be desired. This is preceded by a brief introduction referring to the possible relationship between these Hittite laws and those of the Hammurabi Code of the Assyrian Code and of the Old Testament. He also shows that these particular laws represent a period of reform among the Hittites. The translation, which is the first to be made in any language, is furnished with excellent notes.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


In this interesting study, the author seeks to show how the skygoddess, Nut, became a goddess of the dead. In chapter one, he assembles the pyramid texts that have to do with the goddess, Nut. Chapter two is devoted to a study of the meaning of these texts, and here he shows how the grave and coffin were
identified with Nut, and how the dead became a star-god. The following chapter shows the development of these ideas during the later periods. Chapter four records an exception, and chapter five discusses the relationship between Nut and other mortuary deities. The whole work has been excellently done, and much light has been thrown upon many hieroglyphic texts.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a second edition of Gressmann's great work. As the author says, it is almost entirely re-written, and has a wealth of folk-lore material illustrative of the text. The work extends, as before, from the time of Samuel to that of Hosea inclusive, but has, in addition, fifteen long critical and historical notes on such important subjects as: Die Lade Yahves, Seher und Propheten, Der Ephod, Riesensagen, Das Bündel des Lebens, Das Totenorakel, Heilige Tänze, Die Blutrache, etc. Of great importance is an appendix of fourteen pages of Textkritische Anmerkungen, and of first-class value is the fine index. Dr. Gressmann has placed all students of the Old Testament under a great debt of gratitude for this excellent commentary.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Spiritism is in the air. It has been for the last few years. Professor Paton has realized this, and has thought it interesting and timely to present a study of similar psychical manifestations in antiquity. Paton is well known for his able work on the origins of Semitic religious thought. His scientific method is well known and approved. But, it seems to the present reviewer, that there is a wide gulf between what the author is pleased to call spiritism in antiquity and modern spiritism. For example, in describing the way in which, as the Egyptians believed, spirits of the dead occupied statues, just as gods occupied images, the author thinks
it probable, without the slightest shred of evidence, that spirits possessed in Egypt “all the powers of levitation and of control that they manifested elsewhere”. This is all pure imagination. Again, when he says that “spirits of the dead” in Egypt, “controlled mediums”, he is simply romancing. The book is packed full of such unfounded assumptions. Then there are many matters of fact which are contradicted by what the author has to say. For example, he speaks of the cult of living kings in Babylonia as being an imitation of the Egyptian model. Now, assuming that Babylonian kings were worshipped during their life-time, which is not at all certain, there is still no proof that such was an imitation of Egyptian customs. Again, there is not a particle of evidence to show that ordinary mortals were ever worshipped in Egypt, even by their own descendants. He discusses the subject of prayer to the dead. He, accordingly, interprets wailing as such. According to such a method of interpretation, prayers to the dead, as divine beings, would be found among all peoples modern as well as ancient. Furthermore, in discussing spiritism in Babylonia he says that spirits of the dead were entirely maleficent. He confuses spirits of the dead with demons. He evidently takes the presence of *ilu* as a sign of deification. If that were so, we would be forced to conclude that Babylonians deified and worshipped bridges, canals, etc. An example of his method of forcing suitable meanings out of words is seen in the way in which he makes *Kigal* mean “Great Beneath”. Now *ki* does not mean “beneath” at all. It simply means “place”, “location”.

It is with regret that the reviewer has been forced to record the above observations because he has always had the highest regard for the work and scholarship of Dr. Paton. Nor is this volume, in one respect, unworthy of Professor Paton. It is packed with interesting material, culled from numerous sources, on Chinese, Indo-European, Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Hebrew spiritism. But Paton started out with the will to show the similarity between spiritism in antiquity and modern spiritism and he has done so without much respect for what the ancient sources really teach.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
JOURNAL OF THE
SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH
Journal of the Society of Oriental Research

EDITED BY
SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME VII

THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO, CANADA
1923
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Epic of the King of Battle: Sargon of Akkad in Cappadocia</td>
<td>W. F. Albright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Historical Material on Ashurbanipal</td>
<td>John A. Maynard</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anaphora of St. Gregory (Ethiopic)</td>
<td>Samuel A. B. Mercer</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice in Ancient Egypt</td>
<td>Samuel A. B. Mercer</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyriological Notes</td>
<td>Stephen Langdon</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New Interpretation of the Gudea Cylinder A and Some Observations</td>
<td>Samuel A. B. Mercer</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Fifth Survey of Assyriology (Year 1922)</td>
<td>John A. Maynard</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errata et Corrections</td>
<td>Frederick Hrozny</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sumerian Conception of Giš-Xar</td>
<td>W. F. Albright</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphraates and the Jews</td>
<td>Frank Gavin</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>35, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obituary</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE EPIC OF THE KING OF BATTLE: SARGON OF AKKAD IN CAPPADOCIA

By W. F. Albright, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem

Year after year our historical horizon extends gradually, taking in epochs and countries hitherto enshrouded in the mists of oblivion. True to its reputation, the romance of archaeology does not fade with the development of a scientific method and the increase of specialization; on the contrary, it becomes more intense than ever. For every new problem solved a dozen new and more fascinating ones claim our attention; for every gate unlocked a new vista presents itself. One might think that the decipherment of so many forgotten scripts and languages would leave the future scholar little pioneer work to do, but, strange to say, two new languages seem to rise from their sepulchre at every one revived from its sleep of millennia. In our science, as in so many others, the day of diminishing returns has happily not yet come, and we may still expect to be thrilled by startling discoveries.

Beyond doubt the center of interest for the world of Orientalists is now Asia Minor, from whose soil the magic wand of Boghazköi has conjured such unexpected visions of the past. Beginning with the discovery of the Hittite civilization by Sayce and Wright, Anatolian research sought and received an ever increasing share of attention, nor were there lacking men like Ramsay, who devoted his life to the recovery of ancient Asia Minor. But the Hittite hieroglyphs remained an enigma, and many sober scholars laughed
at the visionary Hittite Empire, as they deemed it to be, just as others now doubt the existence of another great empire — that of the Amorites. The mystery might have remained as great as ever, but for the fact that cuneiform tablets by the myriads lay concealed under the mounds of Cappadocia, once a focus of Mesopotamian culture. These tablets were partly written in a dialect of Akkadian (Semitic Babylonian), but so little was this expected that Pinches and Sayce first considered them as non-Semitic. In 1894 Delitzsch read them correctly, thus laying the foundations of what is now a distinct and important branch of Assyriology. Presently genuine non-Semitic tablets began to appear in Europe, coming mostly from the ruins of the Cappadocian city of Ḫattušaš, now called Boghaz-köi. While these texts could not be read, their very existence aroused the imagination of far-sighted men to the fever-pitch, and it was not long before Hugo Winckler, that brilliant dreamer of somber destiny, succeeded in interesting men of influence in the possibilities of Boghaz-köi. The ensuing excavations conducted by Winckler and Puchstein were successful beyond the wildest dreams of even Winckler, whose occasional reports in OLZ¹ became the center of scholarly interest.

Winckler’s prolonged sickness prevented Orientalists from gaining access to the rich documentary treasures of the old Hittite capital. When Winckler’s death removed the ban, the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft immediately took steps to have the tablets copied and published. Then the Great War interrupted the work, which was rapidly gaining in momentum, and for years the outside world knew little or nothing of the progress of the new science of the Hittites — not to use the cacophonous term “Hittitology.” We knew that Delitzsch had published his trilingual vocabularies, that Hrozný had partially deciphered the Hittite tongue, and that a controversy had arisen over his claim that Hittite was an Indo-
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European language of the centum group. When the restoration of the postal relations gave access to this new literature, there was much to surprise and interest the student, but there was an unmistakable feeling of disappointment at the apparent meagerness of the results.

Yet there was no room for disillusionment. Soon after the Armistice, Forrer published his remarkable brochure, *Die acht Sprachen der Boghasköi-Inschriften*, which has been followed by a flood of publications, in which a large part has been taken by Forrer himself and Hrozný. Not least among the finds, which include new languages, royal chronicles, and public documents of every sort, are the Hittite laws, recently published by Hrozný, and translated successfully by Zimmern and Friedichs. The texts already available for students form only a fraction of the total material, which will afford a vast storehouse of information on the history and civilization of Asia Minor in the second millennium B.C.

Historically we are enlightened by Forrer’s recent paper in MDOG. It is known that there were at least fifty kings of the Hittite Empire, fully half of whose names are already recovered, reigning at Ḫattušaš and Kuššar in Cappadocia between 2000 and 1200 B.C., when the empire was overthrown by the Phrygian irruption. The first apogee of the Hittite Empire fell about 1925, with the capture of Babylon by Muršiliš I. The second seems

2 Until Forrer’s paper in MDOG 61, 20—39, it was thought by most scholars that this Muršiliš lived about the fifteenth century or a little earlier, and that his capture of Babylon had nothing to do with the famous conquest of Babylonia by the Hittites which put an end to the First Dynasty of Babylon; but cf. already RA 18, 94, n. 1. There can be no doubt now that we have in this statement of the Hittite chronicle a most valuable synchronism between Babylon and Ḫatte. Unfortunately, however, Babylonian chronology is not yet certain before the Cossae period. The debate between Weidner and his followers and the supporters of the chronology of Kugler is still going on. Forrer supports the latter (in his paper just mentioned), as has also the writer, in a paper in Ra 18, 83—94. The same view is maintained by Olmstead, in a discussion of Weidner’s latest brochure, AJSL 38, 225—8, and to a certain extent by Condamin, in a criticism of Hommel’s short chronology (*Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 1922, p. 126—7). On the other hand, it would seem that Kugler has given up his own position, swayed by calendric considerations. Here is a good chance for the chronologist to exercise the well-known policy of watchful waiting! If Weidner is right, we must reduce all dates before the Cossae Dynasty by about 165 years.
to have come about 1600, when Tudḫalíaš I conquered Ḫalab (Aleppo). Then the Hittite confederation weakened, unable to measure swords with the triumphant Pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty. For about two hundred years we learn little of the march of events in Cappadocia, until the rise of Ṣubbiluliuma, who established a new empire that endured about two centuries, through seven generations.

No less interesting than the direct historical results are the philological and ethnographic. As many as eight separate tongues are represented on the tablets, five of which are Anatolian, if we exclude the two culture—languages of Mesopotamia, as well as the Indo-Iranian speech of the Mitannian aristocracy. First in importance among the Anatolian languages come Naši and Luyya or Luğğa. Naši was the native tongue of Cappadocia, already spoken before the invasion of the Ḫatte in the last century of the third millennium, as we may deduce from the Naši proper names in the Cappadocian tablets. It soon became the literary language of the Hittite invaders, who probably lost their own language at an early date. The vast majority of the texts found at Boghazköy is written in Naši.

Luyya is closely related to Naši, though the differences appear to be more than dialectic. As the name indicates, it is an older form of the language later spoken by the Lydians; both grammar and vocabulary of Naši, Luyya, and Lydian present many identities and similarities even in the present limited state of our knowledge. The place-names of Anatolia and the Greek Isles prove that they were occupied at the beginning of the bronze age, when cities were founded, by peoples of this race. Forrer is almost certainly correct in regarding Naši and Luyya as belonging to a group related to Proto-Indo-European (and Ugro-Finnic). The view of Hroyny that Naši is an Indo-European language of the centum group is given up by nearly all other scholars.

Ḥatte is the language of the Hittite invaders from Central Asia. Their language is connected by Forrer with certain tongues of the northeastern Caucasus; with its far-reaching system of prefixes it is wholly different from the other known ancient languages of
Western Asia, and is clearly an intruder. The proper names of the Hittite kings are certainly in part, and perhaps all of Ḫatte origin, and are not Cappadocian, like those of their subjects.

Ḫurri forms the connecting link between Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, since Ḫurrian is practically identical with “Mitannian.” The civilization of the Ḫurrians, like their religion, was almost wholly Mesopotamian. Ḫurri was the tongue of Northern Syria, Northern Mesopotamia, part, at least of Armenia, and some of the contiguous sections of Asia Minor. We may safely identify it with the biblical “Horite,” which has been gradually replaced in the Hebrew Bible by “Hivite,” as shown by the evidence of the LXX.3 Since the proper names of the Guti are Mitannian in character, it would seem that the Ḫurrians replaced the Sumerians in northern Mesopotamia at a very early date.

Bala, finally, is justly connected by Forrer with Paphlagonia; its linguistic affinities are still uncertain.

These discoveries are sufficiently extraordinary in themselves to stir the pulses of the most phlegmatic scholar, but even more sensational ones have been made, though not altogether in Cappadocia itself. The Hittite civilization presupposes the existence of Mesopotamian civilization on Anatolian soil. The correctness of this inference is shown by the Cappadocian tablets alluded to above, which belong to the period 2400—2100 B. C., as is proved by the seals of Ibi-Šin and Sargon I of Assyria, found impressed on two of them. They are all business documents emanating from the two Cappadocian trade-centers of Ganiš or Kaniš (Küll-tepe) and Burušğatim or Buršaḫanda.4 It is not accidental that they come to a close just before the Hittite Empire first emerges in

3 In JPOS II, 128—9, I have taken the opposite opinion, but I am now convinced that Eduard Meyer is right in accepting the evidence of the LXX, against the Hebrew text. I believe now that the Hivites were a Semitic people occupying the district south of the Dead Sea, as in Gen. 36:2 (“Horite” should be replaced elsewhere in this chapter by “Hivite”), and that the LXX is correct in finding Horites in Shechem (Gen. 34:2) and Gibeon (Jos. 9:7). In the lists of Canaanite tribes, which are late, “Hivite” has crept in erroneously instead of “Horite,” which we should have. The Horites are the same people as those we find in the Amarna Tablets bearing Ḫurrian (“Mitannian”) names.

4 See especially Ehelolf, OLZ 24, 121.
history, under Labarna. Though we know the date of the fall of these colonies, the date of their foundation is obscure. Under what auspices were they established? In the Dynasty of Ur, the date-lists give us an idea of the extent and character of the conquests of the Babylonian monarchs, but not a word points to Asia Minor. It is clearly to an earlier date that we must go—before Gudea, before the Gutian conquest, to the Empire of Akkad, at least.

In 1914 Schroeder published an account of a tablet that had been discovered in the excavations of the Germans at Tell el-Amarna, the site of the ancient capital of Amenophis IV. This tablet proved to be literary in character, and Schroeder, who worked from photographs, first supposed it to contain the account of the campaign of an Egyptian king, called "the warlord" (šar tamḫārī) against the Syrian town of Bor'-Anath (Buḫanda or Buršaḫanda). The following year Schroeder published the tablet in transcription, and its importance speedily became evident to a number of scholars. Sayce was the first to publish a translation, entitled "Adam and Sargon in the Land of the Hittites." The title alone shows that Sayce's interpretation was more fanciful than serious; every line contains misunderstandings. What strange mythological conceptions Sayce found in this juxtaposition of "Adam" and Sargon may be read in his article; strange to say "Eve" did not occur in the text. Perhaps these alarming results frightened others away; at all events no further translation appeared for six years, until Weidner brought out his brochure Der Zug Sargons von Akkad nach Kleinasien (Leipzig, 1922). Meanwhile the text had become even more interesting from the fact that Schroeder had published an Assur fragment from the middle of the same tablet as that found in Egypt. While the latter, however, was written in the most unmistakable Anatolian (Hittite) orthography, the former was Assyrian. Moreover, the spelling of Sargon's name removed all doubt

6 PSBA 37, 227—245. Weidner should have referred to this article.
7 Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedener Inhalts, No. 138.
that the hero was really the famous Sargon of Akkad, the Charlemagne of Babylonia.

Weidner’s study constitutes a most important contribution to the subject. In parts of the difficult text he has proposed the most brilliant interpretations. In many places, however, he has misunderstood the meaning, and his analysis is certainly incorrect in the main. Since the writer had prepared an independent translation of the tablet and had come to radically different conclusions in many respects, he feels it incumbent upon him to lay these results before scholars. To some extent he rests on Weidner’s shoulders, since the latter explained certain passages which baffled him, though misunderstanding many others. Weidner has also attempted to combine a text of an entirely different character with the šar tamḫari epic, while failing, on the other hand, to connect with the latter an important fragment belonging to it which had previously been found at Tell el-Amarna. As a result Weidner’s historical deductions are partly wrong—in some important details.

The following translation of the šar tamḫari epic, so far as it is at present known, differs considerably in places from Weidner’s. All divergences of importance, both in translation and transliteration, are indicated in the footnotes. Since the latter, however, are very few, it has not been thought necessary to lengthen the paper by adding the transcription.

Obverse

[ ] Ištar, the rampart \(^8\) of Ak[kad . . . ]
[ ] battle, the king in the midst of Akkad . . . \(^9\)
[ ] speaking, war may Sarg[on . . . .
[ ] of his dread weapon, the palace. Sa[rgon opened his mouth]

5 [speaking, ad]ressing [his warriors]: “My warriors, the land of Ga[niš?]\(^10\)

[ ] has planned war, has subdued [ ]

---

\(^8\) Weidner (p. 70) is inclined to regard Ištar a-šú-ri as “eine zweitergestaltige Gottheit” (Ištar-Aššur). This is very unlikely. If the reading is correct, we may combine a-šú-ri with ašurrû, “boundary wall, rampart.”

\(^9\) Reading ki-ri-[ib al Ag-ga-ti] in place of Weidners ki-ri-[e], which he renders “Feinde” (=girā).

\(^10\) Or mú-tu gu, “thy land,” in which case one warrior is addressed, which is improbable. It is to be noticed that the Anatolian scribe, following his own linguistic peculiarities, does not distinguish between voiced and voiceless stops (mediae and tenues). Weidner’s mút Galasu is impossible; see note to Obv, 28.
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[ ... ch]aff he has brought, despising Sarg[on...].
[ ...] of every throne-room, the road, my lord, which thou wouldst go
[ ...] the roads are difficult, the way is hard, the road to Bursa-handan
[ ...] which thou wouldst go, the road of which I speak, is never traversed.
[ ...] we will set on the throne, we will quickly pacify
[ ...] our sides, our thighs will be wearied by traversing the roads,
[ ...] opened his mouth and spoke, the chief of the merchants said:
[ ...] traversing the roads, making straight the way, visiting the (four) quarters,
[ ...] of every throne-room is from the rising of the sun to its setting.
[ ...] the heart of the merchants is bitterly incensed — may a hurricane
[ ...] in the midst of Akkad sweep Kisshu away!
[Sargon, king of the world, is called by name; let him come down to
us and we shall receive strength — for we are no warriors —
[ ...] roads may the king impose. We will pay the king his interest,
and the king shall pay those who help him in battle
[ ...] let the warriors divide the gold; let them give Sargon an īnu of silver.

11 Read perhaps [... hi-im-ma-tam i-it-ra-a fa-is Sarru-ki-][en...]. Weidner offers no translation, though the transliteration is clear. The form i-road is derived from taru (syn. naṣu, “carry, bring”), a secondary formation from waru, “lead, bring,” like tabanksu from wabansu, takalku from wakīl, and tasabu from watsabu. For himmatu, “straw, chaff,” which seems to be the only possible word here, cf. Thureau-Dangin, Huitième campagne de Sargon, line 267, and AJSL 34, 246, s. v. ihm. The verb šapu (syn. of nāsu) “despise” is well-known.
12 We must naturally read [... ʃa ka]-li-iš pa-ra-ab-ki. Weidner’s “möge Dich senden” is impossible; the person addressed is a man. Moreover, the word harrāna belongs with the following.
13 Read harran ša ad-dinu ɪbīr tim im-ma-ti = haran ša adîinu (ul) mušbirat immati, “the road of which I speak never lets (one) cross”; harānu is feminine. Weidner’s harran ša adimunu šibir immati, „einen Weg, über den ich mich beklage, die Sendung wir jemals“ is quite impossible. Erroneous doubling of consonants is very frequent in our text; cf. the note on obv. 27.
14 Weidner is undoubtedly right in recognizing a dual, burka, in bur-ga, but the word means “thighs” burku = lap, public region) not “Kniee”, which would be birkā.
15 As in obv. 8, above.
16 Text: [...] mārē tamkarē šibbu-šu-mi i-ra-a mar-ta bu-ul-ul-ul. Weidner is wrong in supplying sukkatu, “chief,” at the beginning, as well as in separating šibbušumu from the preceding. I suspect that in i-road we have at last the Hebrew hrād, “burn,” used only with pabu as “his wrath was kindled.” The phrase mar-ta bullul means “(their heart) was flooded with bitterness”.
17 Weidner has correctly interpreted this passage, but he reads har-bi phonetically and renders doubtfully “Das Getreide bezahlen wir dem Könige.” It would read the group ideographically—ifAR.BI = hibullušu.
18 Read [...] i-i-su šu-aša garradu (coll); Sarru-gi-en li-it-ti-mu šu u-ru kaspi. Zuzu, izū means “divide.” The word šu means “vulva,” among other things; perhaps we should read i-i-ru “bull.” Weidner offers for this line: “... aus Gold der Krieger. Sargon möge ihm geben einen... aus Silber.”
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[ ] let us go—fighting is going on in the... of thy god Ilbaba.
[ ] the merchants gathered and entered the palace. After they had entered, [the merchants] did not encounter the warriors. 19 Sargon opened his mouth and spoke, the king of battle [said]: "Buršaḫanda, of which thou speakest (?), 20 let me see its valor (?) 21

25 [ ] where is its place (?), 22 what is its mountain, where is its road, that I may go." 23

[..The road, my lord, which thou wouldst go, the roads are difficult, the way is hard; the road of which I speak, is seven double-hours in length. 24 [The road to Buršaḫanda, which thou wouldst go,

[ ] dense mountains 25 in whose interior 26 is antimony, lapis-lazuli, and gold; [ ] apples, figs, pears, box-wood, cedars (?) 27! — seven apšé deep is its well. 28

30 [ ]where they fought... its summit is seven double-hours—lotus (?) 29

( Remainder of obverse so mutilated as to be unintelligible.)

19 Text [mārē] tamkarē u-ul im-šu-ru qarradē, which Weidner translates: "die Kaufleute ließen nicht vor die Krieger," i.e., the warriors did not allow the merchants to pass.

20 The text here is doubtful. Schroeder’s copy offers da-bu-ru, which Weidner corrects on collation to it-šu-su. Since this is meaningless, we may perhaps assume an error in taking dictation, as in mū-te-te-ru harrāna (obv. 14) for muštēr harrānī. The orthography proves that our text was copied at some time in its history by dictation to an uneducated Anatolian scribe. I would like to propose da-da-mu(l)-š[u] here.

21 The word kiri-it-ta is explained by Weidner as giritu, "Feindschaft. So far as I know, this word is yet unknown, so I prefer to assume another unknown word giritu — qarradētu, "valor".

22 Weidner has erroneously combined minū with the following word instead of with šadū (cf. next note), so we must surely read a(l)-ša(l)-ar-šu a-išu at the beginning.

23 Combine harrānu with a-idu (harrānu is fem.), and read kisili-il-li-ik-ma

24 Literally: "causes one to cross seven bērē". Contrast Weidner.

25 Read huršān ga-ab-šu. Weidner offers here his impossible ṣar-sag Ga-la-šu.

26 Text i-na GAM-šu. GAM has the value kippatu, which is also the equivalent of BURU (U), "shaft." I suspect a confusion of ideograms, since there are three different words kippatu—"basin (?)", horizon,' and "shaft." Whether it means here "basin" or "shaft, mine" is doubtful, but the general import is clear.

27 See Weidner’s note on line 29, with his references.

28 Read um-miq (!) šīḥa ZU-AB (apšē) bi-ra-šu, "deep seven apšē is its bīru." Bīru is evidently equivalent to bīru, Heb. bēr, and is then the long-lost cognate of Ar. bīr, Heb. bēr (bēr) "well." It is very interesting to learn that the Assyrians had seven apšē, as well as seven nages, seven divisions of the underworld, and seven heavens. Naturally, this highly stereotyped cosmological system was theoretical, and not actually in vogue among the people, for whom it was too complex.

29 The writer will defend this meaning for amurinnu in a special paper.
Reverse

[ ] gave utterance, Nūr-daggal opened his mouth and spoke, to his warriors;
[he said]: "Up to now Sargon has not come to us—may the flooded bank pre-
vent him; 30

5 may the dense [mount]ains produce reeds, forests ... thickeths, may vines be
eiwed (?)." 31

[His war]riors answered him, to Nūr-daggal they spoke: "What kings, recent
[or] ancient, what king? 32 ever came and saw our lands?" Before Nūr-daggal
had finished (uttering) a word, Sargon had spied out his city (?). 33 ...  

[ ... he] cut through his wall, he smeote all whose courage wine had created. 34

10 [Sargon before the city-gate approached his throne. Sargon opened his mouth
[and s]poke, to his warriors he said: "Now, as for Nūr-daggal, favorite of Ellil,
[let him] overthrown, let him subdue it, that I may see!"

[ ] antimony, 35 on top of which was a qirṣappu of lapis-lazuli, and

below which were fifty-five officers.

[ ] sits before him, who like him (the king) sits on a golden throne.

The king sits there like a god.

15 Who is exalted like the king! They made Nūr-daggal sit down in the presence
of Sargon. Sargon opened his mouth and spoke to Nūr-daggal: "Come, Nūr-daggal, favorite of Ellil, how

couldst thou say,

'Up to now Sargon has not come to us—may the flooded bank prevent him,

may the dense mountains 36

30 The words ḫlāšu kibru mišu can only have the meaning given. Weidner
offers: "Mag er es auslassen. Ein gefülltes Gebiet"—a rendering which is quite
meaningless. A somewhat similar is found in Maqlû 1,50: akīšu nāštumu ḫlāšu,
"I have barred access to the ferry, I have barred access to the quay."

31 Weidner's rendering is here entirely wrong. Ḫu is "reeds", not "Vater";
kiša is kiša, "forest", not "Sünde"; qalla is the synonym of kišu; ġisari is
derived from qūṣuru "bind" (cf. in Enuma elīš I, 6, the phrase ġisāra lä qūṣuru);
ittāmillu comes from aššu, "bind, hang".

32 The Assur fragment shows that the word kiššatī has fallen out in line 21;
here also we must render: "What kings, recent or ancient, what king of the world
(i. e. Babylonian emperor)"

33 Text ḫ-ta-ap(?)-ga-ra ḫa-šu. The word can hardly be ḫapāru, "collect"
(not "versammeln") assemble, but may be the cognate of Hebrew ḫāṣar, Arab.
ẖtābar, "spy out." The rest of the line is unintelligible to me; cf. Weidner's
attempt at a translation.

34 This translation is rather a desperate effort. Weidner reads im-tar-ga-at ša
karāni ṣu-pu-šu it-lu-lu-šu, "durch einen Krug Weines (ist) glänzend seine Mann-
haftigkeit," a rendering which neither affords sense nor has any connection with
the preceding. I would suggest im-ḥas ga-la ša karānu ṣu-pu-šu it-lu-lu-šu. The
Anatolians were notable drunks—a notoriety which they still possessed in the
classical age.

35 For daggašu = antimony cf. Haupt, OLZ 16, 492ff.

36 See note on obv. 28, above.
produce reeds, forests, may they cause to grow... thickets, vines!" Núr-daggall opened his mouth and spoke to Sargon: "However, my lord, can they have informed thee! — the soldiers of thy god have brought thee. 37 —

20 I have crossed the river—What lands can rival Akkad! [What] king 32 can vie with thee!—thy rival 39 there is not; their mighty foe art thou. 10 Thy foes are faint-hearted, they fear and are panic-stricken; show mercy to them!" 41

Before we proceed to the analysis of our text, let us consider the remaining fragments. The Assur bit is of special interest, since it is a part of the same tablet, and the divergences, though slight, are sufficient to prove that we have here another recension. The ten lines of this fragment correspond roughly to the Amarna tablet. rev. 17—21, with the first part of the second tablet, now lost. The Assyrian recension was considerably shorter than the Cappadocian one; much of lines 18 and 19 was omitted, as well

37 Text: mi-in-ti be-li u-ša-du-ka. For ušadu (=ušēdû) cf. līšēšû, rev. 18 (=līšēšû) and nušētab, obv. 11 (=nušētab). Weidner strangely leaves it untranslated. 38 Preterite instead of future, with Weidner. 39 Text ki-ru-ga, in which Weidner has recognized girûka. His rendering "Feind," is not exactly right; Sargon had many foes. The word girû, from garû "run," means properly "rival." 40 Text na-kiš-ir-šu nu gar-ru at-tu (Assur fragment at-ta). Weidner reads kašru for garû, and renders: "Ihre Feindschaft ist gehemmt." 41 Text te-ir-šu-nu-ti, literally "restore them," tarryaru, ta'aru is "merciful one." The preceding word is uš-ša-ra-ra-ma; the ma is clear in Schroeder's copy, and Weidner offers no defense of his impossible du-te-ir-šu-nu-ti. 42 This translation is likely to prove wrong, since the connection is very bad. The word rendered "garment" is uš-ša-nu. Weidner's translation is syntactically out of the question. 43 Text lu-ut-ra-a fa-a-bi, followed by i-na a-la-ak [u-ur-ke u] a-la-bi. For tarû, "brings" cf. note on obv. 7. Weidner's rendering is impossible—"I will schirmen den Wohlstand beim gehen [ ] beim sitzen." 44 Unnamisu is certainly a proper name, not "die Stadt seines Erbarmens" (Weidner).
as, apparently, 23—9. Weidner may be right in thinking that lines 9—10 of the Assur text, which are not found in the Amarna tablet, belong between rev. 22 and 24 of the latter, where the connection is now very obscure, but, in view of the systematic tendency of the former to terseness, our view is at present safer. In this case we obtain two additional lines, perhaps from the beginning of the second tablet:

[ ] Šamaš [ ] of Nûr-Dagân [ ]

[Sar]gon opened his mouth [and spoke, saying]
Perhaps the most interesting thing about the Assyrian fragment is the correct orthography of the proper names. Sargon (Šarru-kin) appears as LUGAL-GI-NA instead of LUGAL-GI-EN; Nûr-daggal turns out to be Nûr-Dagân.45

This brings us to another text which Weidner has tried to connect with the šar tamḫari cycle—the explanatory text attached to the so-called Babylonian map of the world.46 Obv. reads [3]Ut-napištim Šarru-kin u Nûr-[d] Dagân, Lugal-[marda(?)]. Weidner (op. laud. p. 87, n. 13) says that there is certainly no mention of the flood-hero in our text, and in his translation he offers “Šamaš the life of Sargon.” He is wrong, however; our document does mention Ut-napištim, along with the pair Sargon and Nûr-Dagân, as well as, apparently, Lugal-marda, as having something to do with the mysterious lands beyond the sea, where the great red dragon and the lion-headed eagle of the storm dwell (1. 5.). The following line says that “no one (else) knows their interior,” a statement which solves the riddle. The four demigods are the only persons known to Babylonian tradition who were able to cross the perilous mountains and seas of the far northwest, and behold the marvels with their own eyes. But the text in question is merely a late Babylonian copy of an older cosmography, and has nothing to do with the epic of šar tamḫari. It

45 The differences of orthography are numerous, but otherwise not of any special importance. There are a few minor divergences. Thus the Assur bit offers a kēšati after šar(ru) which certainly belonged also in the Cappadocian recension (see note on rev. 7), at the beginning of rev. 21. Weidner erroneously reads a-i-tu ma-a-ta-a-ti in line 5. Amarna recension, rev. 20 has a-i-u-du Kûr-Kûr[ ] instead of a-i-tu ma-a-ti; aitu is fem. sing. and matu is fem.

46 CT XXII, plate 48.
does, however, indicate that Nûr-Dagân was transformed from a foe of Sargon to a friend, who accompanied him in later tablets of the šar tamḫari on still more venturesome excursions into the west.

On the other hand, Weidner has overlooked a fragment from the earlier finds at Tell el-Amarna,47 which proves, at least, that Kišši (Obv. 17 of the first tablet) is really the name of a prominent figure in the šar tamḫari epic, and is not a common noun, as Weidner supposes. This fragment reads in translation as follows (it will be noted that Schroeder’s copy enables us to make a decided advance over Knudtzon’s edition):

\[
\begin{align*}
[ & ] \text{to the god Šam[āš]} \\
[ & ] \text{N[ergal}^{48} \text{and al[l the] gods} \\
[ & ] \text{Kišši in this way} \\
5 [ & ] \text{they entrusted}^{49} \text{them to the hands of the gods} \\
[ & ] \text{the hands of man, he opened the city-gates}^{50} \\
50 [ & ] \text{the gods... protect Kišši in} \\
[ & ] \text{Šamaš, they make a report} \\
\end{align*}
\]

It is too bad that the text is so fragmentary, but the phraseology, as well as the script and orthography, prove conclusively that it belongs to the šar tamḫari epic, probably to a later tablet, since there is no clear place for it in the lacuna in the middle of the middle of the first tablet.

Owing to a number of misunderstandings, natural enough in so difficult a text, Weidner's analysis is unsatisfactory. The land “Galašu” does not exist, and his elaborate attempt to identify it with Ganiš is gratuitous. The “King of Battle” (šar tamḫari) is not, as Weidner thinks, (p. 78), the ruler of the hostile Buršaḫanda, but is naturally Sargon himself, the hero of the entire epic. The title šar tamḫari is frequently applied to Nergal and Ninurta, the gods of war, and doubtless belonged to Ilbaba, as well as to his servant, King Sargon. The latter receives the appellative in virtue

48 So Schroeder; Knudtzon has Šin.
49 Read [isp-zi]-du.
50 Read i-ipti (GAB) abullê (KA-GAL-ZUN). Contrast Knudtzon.
of his later apotheosis; he is no longer a mere earthly monarch in our epic, but a demigod.

As a result of these errors, or misinterpretations of passages, and rash attempts to supply words in gaps, Weidner has given us a wholly misleading version of the plot. According to him, the king of Buršaḫanda has attacked the neighboring Babylonian colony of Ganiš ("Galašu"), which sends a delegation to Sargon, pleading for aid. Sargon then discusses the matter with his "warrior," who describes the difficulties of the undertaking, but inclines to favor it. The chief of the merchant-delegation, whom Weidner identifies (erroneously) with Nūr-Dağān, now tries to move Sargon to the expedition, and the merchants themselves proceed to attack Sargon in his very palace, in order to bring the king to take action. They are opposed by the guard, and Sargon comes out and speaks to them, though without making a definite promise. The merchants go on to picture the riches of their country, and Nūr-Dağān finally says to his "warrior" that Sargon, being unwilling to exert himself, may now rest quietly at home. Finally Sargon gathers the men of Akkad, and holds a council, in which Nūr-Dağān is called to account for his insulting words about the king, and is forced to save himself by chanting a panegyric in honor of Sargon. The assembly ends apparently (according to Weidner) with the decision of Sargon to make the expedition.

If we analyze the text on the basis of the above translation, our results will be very different. At the beginning of the epic, we find the name of the goddess Ištar, Sargon's patron-deity, who is apparently planning a warlike career for her favorite, in her quality of war goddess. Sargon then tells his warriors (plural, not singular, with Weidner) that a certain land, perhaps Ganiš, has declared war against him, and has sent him an insulting message, apparently with chaff substituted for the usual gifts of one prince to another, or a weaker state to a stronger.

One of Sargon's warriors, it would seem, replies, picturing the great difficulty of the road to Asia Minor, and even denying the practicability of such an expedition. The chief of the merchants, whose name is unfortunately lost, takes a different view of the
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situation, and in the next paragraph urges the king strongly to go on this campaign. The king is a mighty prince, who makes distant journeys and conquers foreign lands. The merchants, whose profits depend largely upon the military activity of the king, are vexed by the present inactivity, and call down imprecations on Kišši, who is residing in Akkad. The name Kišši is interesting, since it is probably identical with the Ḫurrian name Keššē. Kišši may have been Sargon’s general, who was partly responsible for the idleness of the army. The chief merchant goes on to appeal to Sargon personally, begging him to take up arms for his country’s prosperity, “for we (merchants) are no warriors.” The merchants are ready to advance funds for the payment of the troops, which was presumably in arrears, and suggest golden prospects of spoil.

In the next paragraph we find that the merchants have penetrated into the royal palace, without finding the soldiers, who are evidently not burdened with valor. The king comes out and asks them further details about the way to Buršaḫanda. The answer of the merchants is very different from that of the soldiers. While the latter stress the difficulty of the campaign, the former slur this phase over, and dwell fondly on the enormous of the country, with its immense mineral and forest wealth. In the remaining lines of the obverse, and the beginning of the reverse, now missing, the preparations for the campaign, and its commencement were presumably described. There must have been plenty of room—at least a third of the entire text.

The first preserved lines of the reverse carry us to Asia Minor, where Nûr-Dagān, the king of Buršaḫanda, is shown boasting to his warriors that Sargon will not be able to reach their land. Between Akkad and Buršaḫanda flow deep and wide rivers, swollen by floods. High mountains, inaccessible because of the dense growth of forests and thickets, bar the way. No foreign, i.e. Mesopotamian, king ever invaded Asia Minor, not even one of the redoubtable world monarchs. But Nûr-Dagān reckoned without

51 Keššē was the name of a distinguished Ḫurrian author; see Forrer, Die Acht Sprachen von Boghazkoi, p. 1032.
52 Cf. the notes on the text, rev. 7, 21, šar(kiššat).
his host. At the very moment he uttered his boast, Sargon was in his land, spying out (?) his city. Without loss of time Sargon stormed the city through a breach in the wall, and put the drunken Anatolians to the sword—if the translation is correct. Then, like Sennacherib at Lachish, Sargon set up his throne before the city-gate, and proceeded to mete out justice, in the rough and ready manner of the ancient Orient. Sargon is represented as speaking ironically of the vain braggadocio of his fallen foe, whom he orders to be brought before him, as he sits in state like a god. He quotes Nûr-Dagân's own words, and demands an explanation. The latter admits that he had no conception of the power of Sargon, who was aided by his god Ilbaba, and prudently launches into a panegyric of the Akkadian king. At the end he pleads for mercy to his conquered subjects, which Sargon presumably grants. The remaining lines are very obscure.

From the way in which Nûr-Dagân is alluded to as the "favorite of Ellil," it is evident that he was a personage of note, who was included among the heroes of the epic. As already observed, he is mentioned in a Neo-Babylonian cosmogony with Sargon as among the very few heroes who had seen the marvels of the distant west. That a brave foe should become a friend and participate with his friend in deeds of valor and high emprise is not a new motive in Babylonian literature; we find it well developed in the Gilgames Epic, where Gilgames and Engidu, after fighting furiously, are reconciled and become the best of comrades. It is a pity that we do not possess the remainder of the epic, which may well have been a Babylonian Odyssey or Argonautica. However, we may safely expect new fragments to come to light; a composition which was read and copied in places so far removed as Assur, Cappadocia, and Egypt was known elsewhere. Again we are brought face to face with the fact of our own ignorance; only an insignificant fraction of the vast mass of cuneiform literature has been recovered, and we dare not dogmatize on negative evidence.

What historical conclusions may we draw from this extraordinary romance?—for a romance it most obviously is. Weidner maintains, on the basis of his interpretation, that the Babylonian mer
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cantile post of Ganiš was already in existence at the time of Sargon, and that it was founded by the kings of Kiš (p. 97 f.). Our analysis shows clearly that the merchants of the text are the merchants of Akkad, who were not the pioneers of the sword, but the camp-followers, who profited by the military victories of their suzerain, just as the Assyrian merchants did in later times. There is no indication whatever that Sargon found a Babylonian merchant colony in Cappadocia, nor that he founded one there himself.

The solution of the problem is furnished by the name Nur-Dagān, belonging to the king of Buršaḫanda. Cappadocia was then controlled by an Akkadian aristocracy. The Akkadian conquerors of Cappadocia came, however, from northern Mesopotamia, a fact which is established by the close similarities in language and customs between Cappadocian Semites and Assyrians. In the closing centuries of the fourth millennium there was a wide-spread Sumero-Akkadian culture, covering not only Mesopotamia and Elam, but also Syria and Cappadocia. The vast domain of this civilization was welded for a time into a kind of empire, thanks to the energy of Sargon an Naram-Šin, but after Šar-gâli-šarrī it fell hopelessly to pieces, under the onslaughts of the Hurrian peoples from the north, whom the Babylonian called Guti. The defeat of the Guti king Šarlak by Šar-gâli-šarrī meant only a little respite; two generations after his death a Guti dynasty was on the Babylonian throne, and the glory of Akkad was a memory.

There is no good reason to doubt that our romance has a historical nucleus. The main events and persons described in the extant fragments are probably historical. We have an excellent parallel in the Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes, where the persons and campaigns are essentially historical, but the legendary trappings are a tissue of mythical motives, partly from such Babylonian sources as the epics of Gilgames and Etana. So in our text Nur-Dagān, Kišši, Buršaḫanda, Unnamušu, etc., are either demonstrably or probably historical, as is also the campaign of Sargon in Asia Minor. The latter is closely paralleled by the campaign of Naram-Šin, mentioned in the text CT XIII, 44, and now discovered also in an old Naši translation of the annals of Naram-Šin. According to these sources, Naram-Šin defeated a
calition of seventeen kings of Asia Minor, among them the rulers of Ḥatte (i.e., Buršašanda, according to Weidner’s plausible conjecture) Kaniš (Ganiš) and Kursaura (Garsaura). The number of ninety thousand troops assigned to the confederation is naturally exaggerated.

With our present knowledge it is more difficult to determine the character and the sources of the mythical material. The journey of Sargon and Nûr-Dagân to the mysterious west is closely related to the Gilgames Epic. Some years ago the writer suggested “that the iter ad ostia fluminum has been modified by attraction into the Sargon cycle, just as the iter ad paradisum, transferred from Gilgames to Alexander, made a volte-face from west to east carrying Eden with it.” Now we are in a position to show that a similar shift actually occurred in the Gilgames Epic, probably during the Sargonic period, or soon after, when the Sargon Romance was in process of formation. The expedition of Gilgames and Engidu to the “cedar forest” in charge of the giant Humbaba and the subsequent battle with that redoubtable monster as recounted in the Gilgames Epic bear an unmistakable likeness to the little we can infer regarding the expedition of Sargon and Nûr-Dagân to the far west. Now, the cedar forest points to Syria, as observed recently by Clay, and the equation given by Schroeder, šad erini = mât Ḥatti, i.e., Syria, proves the correctness of the inference, indicated also by the fact that Humbaba was reverenced as Combabus at Hierapolis in Syria. But these combinations are not original, since Humbaba is found on Susian tablets as an Elamite personal

53 In the Akkadian version of the annals of Naram-Šin, CT XIII, 44, obv. col. II, 6, Buršašanda appears as Burušanda, a form which connects Buršašanda with the Burušatim of the Cappadocian Tablets. For Ḥatte = Buršašanda see Weidner, op. laud., p. 94, n. 5.
54 See AJSL 35, 192; 36, 280–4, and an article to appear in AJSL on the “Location of the Garden of Eden.”
55 The battle with Humbaba is now available in part for the student, thanks to the Old Babylonian fragment of the Gilgames Epic recently published by Clay and Jastrow, as well as the Naši text published by Hrozný, Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi, 6, Nos. 30, 32.
56 Empire of the Amorites, p. 87f.
57 Schroeder, Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts, No. 183, 10.
58 Cf. JBL 37, 127, n. 13.
name. The campaign against Humbaba was originally, therefore, a historical conflict on the part of the semi-mythical Gilgames against a prehistoric king of Elam; under the influence of the Sargon Romance—probably—it was shifted from the east to the west, and Humbaba is transformed from an Elamite into the Amorite Huwawa.

59 Written in the same way—H hu-u m-ba-ba; see Délégation en Perse, Vol. IV, p.177.

60 For a full discussion of Gilgames see JAOS 40, 307—19. The writer now believes that Gilgames was a historical figure, who has assumed the mythical trappings of Lugal-marda, mentioned once in the Epic as “his god”, a fact which shows that the original tradition was still alive, even after the deification of Gilgames. His name seems to mean “Torch of the god Games”, like Gizzil-Šin, “Torch of Šin”, and Nūr-Dagan, “light of Dagān”. His association with the solar deity Lugal-marda explains how Gilgames came to be a solar deity himself; he has in large part replaced the former. Engidu, however, remains a god, as has been shown in detail in the second part of the paper mentioned (pp. 319—33). It must not be supposed that the demigods whose names are included among the kings of Kiš and Erech were all real heroes. Probably the majority of them are strictly mythical in origin. We must not forget that both in Egypt and Babylonia the rule of the gods preceded that of mortals—as also in Hellenic cosmogony. The basic historicity of Gilgames is established rather by the large number of traditions associating him with building operations of a very concrete nature. The historical Gilgames probably lived in the first half of the fourth millennium. According to the Babylonian king-lists there were over thirty kings between Gilgames and the Dynasty of Akšak. Since the latter began between 3200 and 2900 (maximum and minimum dates), Gilgames may have lived between 3800 and 3500. Unfortunately, however, we cannot depend upon our lists for accurate chronological estimates, since many names may have been omitted, and some of the dynasties may have been contemporaneous. A date of five hundred years before Ur-Ninā for Gilgames is very reasonable, however; writing was already practised centuries before Ur-Ninā, as shown by such archaic documents as the Blau Monuments, so it is not even necessary to ascribe the preservation of the hero’s name wholly to oral tradition.

61 For Huwawa as an Amorite name see Clay, Empire of the Amorites, p. 87. The name may have been included in the list of Amorite names published by Chiera because the tradition of Humbaba-Combabus had already been localized in northern Syria. Since the name is decidedly non-Semitic, this explanation seems to me very likely. We must remember that Humbaba-Combabus, though attracted into the Gilgames Epic, had an existence outside, as is proved by the Hurrian fragment of an independent myth of Huwawa, published by Hrozný, op. laud., No. 33. He was the guardian of Irmini-Stratonice as well as the foe of Gilgames. While a mythical origin is possible, a historical source is rendered likely by the fact that his name is found as an Elamite personal name (see above). Another giant of legend, who was also once a monarch, was the Parthian king Sanatruck, celebrated in the tales of the Mesopotamian Arab. Recently Aramaean inscriptions from Ḥatra, mentioning him, have been deciphered and published by Jensen.
In connection with the writer’s views regarding the localization of paradise in Anatolia, according to Babylonian conceptions, it is very interesting to note the glowing descriptions of the mountain-paradise of Cappadocia, founded on the deepest apsû, like the Sumerian temple-tower, and reaching far into the clouds which veil the face of heaven from mortal gaze.

To conclude, our text furnishes us with a startling glimpse of the antiquity and diffusion of the Babylonian historical saga or romance. The discovery is not without bearing on the Old Testament, explaining as it does how the legend of Nimrod may have reached Canaan, which was long a province of Babylonian culture just as it was politically a province of the Egyptian Empire. The Akkadian tradition was faithfully handed on by the Amorites to the Hurrians and Hittites, who in their turn took up the torch of Mesopotamian civilization, and carried it on.

62 See AJSL 36, 280f.
63 See JAOS 40; 314, n. 14, and Kraeling. AJSL 38, 214—20.
NEW HISTORICAL MATERIAL ON ASHURBANIPAL
(continued)

By John A. Maynard, Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

10. The text K 4530 (CT 35, 19) is new. We translate it as follows, 2...in order to set at rest [the heart of the great gods(?)]
3...these Elamites (NIM1-MA-KL-a-a) 4...they killed, his head
they cut...5 I went, [his] defeat (text IG1, LAH) 6...Ashur. The
horsemen in order to serve (?) 7...8...they (?) magnified his
weapons. 9...the mules, the weapons of war 10...for ever (?)
...without (?) 11...the city in which he trusted...12...I burned (?)
his dwelling; [his] son (?)...13...by order of Ashur my lord I
conquered 14...the heads of Bel-ikisha 15 with Aplai 17...gave
with...

11. The text K 5234, (CT 35, 19) is apparently not a collection
of epigraphs as Bezold described it in Catal. p. 700. It is a diffi-
cult text but we think it is clearly a prayer or oracle.
3...into their hands 4...the king son of the king (?) thou didst
cause to go (?)...5...their mighty...6...the splendor of...
7...Ashur and Ishtar like...8...battle like [bows?] (kiš-kat-šte])
a heavy wind storm, lightnings...10...the darts that do not
spare...11...the brilliancy (?) of the conquering weapons of Ashur
12 the bows of Ishtar lady of...13...thy unconquered...
14 thundered like lightning...15...the land of the Elamite whose...
16...were numerous (?) and in the Month Teshrit upon them...
17)...the corpse of Teumman king of [Elam] 18...thus, whoever...
19...the life of...20...alive (?)...

12. The text K 2651 (CT 35, 20) is clearly a series of epi-
graphs. 2...Teumman...3[the sons of] Urtaki, Kudurru, ...4 they
with sixty princes of the blood in...5) upon these troopers, officers,
...6 He Teumman to...7 I looked up to Ashur and Ishtar...
8 Against me the river [Idide] 9 in the midst of [Tulliz]...10...his
troops I cut up...11...chariots, mules...12...his son, Bel-ikisha the Gambulite...13 I overthrew his land like a mighty storm. The city Shapi-Bel...14...himself, his brothers, his family...15 the people of...I carried away.

13 The reverse of K 3096 (CT 35, 21) had been studied by Streck (p. 332-335) on the basis of that part of the text which Smith had edited in 3 R 36, 5 and Hist. of Assurbanipal p. 295—296 with the help of Ashur and Ishtar...2 Tammaritu king of Elam, image of the devil...3...[Shamash-shumukin] the inimical brother, they came...4...by order of Ashur and Ishtar the gods my helpers 5...against him he rose and...6...his family, the seed of his father's house and the nobles who go 7...they crawled on their bellies...8...before me they glorified the might of the great gods who go by my side. 9 I am Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria. With the help of Ashur and Ishtar who do not...10 the symbol of royalty. Shamash-shum-ukin...11 a chariot for driving his lordship; troopers to do rebellion, he...12 on the land they became reconciled (?) before me the rest of...13...of the mountains for a lesson to men upon asses...14 I caused to abide and Nineveh with joy I entered. 15 The people of Haiala that Shamash-shum-ukin...16 as booty of the field with the help of Ashur and Ishtar [my hands] conquered 17 The sons of Borsippa who wrought rebellion who with [Shamash-shum-ukin] 18 made common cause, with the help of Ashur and Ishtar I conquered 19 [The sons of Babylon] who wrought rebellion, who with Shamash-shum-ukin...

20 The sons of...who with] Shamash-shum-ukin wrought rebellion...21...led (?)...22...great...

The new edition of the reverse does not differ from Smith.

14. K 2642 (CT 35, 22)

Col. I 2...[Tammaritu] king of Elam 3...dominion 4...Shamash-shum-ukin the inimical brother 5...before my troops 6[with the help of] Ashur and Ishtar 7...Indabigash his servant 8[I caused to sit] on his throne 9...the seed of his father's house 10...[princes walking] at his side 11...they crawled [on their bellies] 12...they went Col. II of the obverse and Col. I of the reverse are too fragmentary to give any sense.

Rev. Col. II 1... Tammaritu king [of Elam] 2...the chief [of
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his chariots) 3...of the horse 4...son of Urtaki king of Elam 5...Teumman king of Elam 6...son of Ummannappi son of Urtaki 7 king of Elam 8... nagiru 9...of the seraglio

15 CT 35, 23 is a document of the same character.

I am Ashurbanipal... 2 who by order of the great gods a kingdom... 3 attained the desire of his heart with... 4 that my hands conquered to... 5 the city of my dominion that... 6 E-im-kur-ra... the walls 7 I am Ashurbanipal, king of the world, king of Assyria 8 [to whom] Ashur and Ishtar appointed a favorable fate 9...Tammaritu, king of Elam 10... his family, the posterity of his father's house 11...princes who go at his side, my enemies 12 they...and took hold of my royal feet 13...my gods gave me confidence 14...into Nineveh my lordly city 15 [joyfully] I entered

Rev.... 2 rebellion (si-ḫi-u-maš-ti) 3...my hands captured 4... in order to [show] the power of Ashur and Ninlil 5...[wild asses], camels I caused to dwell therein 6...with the sons of Ashur 7 who before me, performed music. 8 I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria 9 Ammuladi king of Kedar 10 whom my hands conquered with the help of Ashur and Ishtar 11 they (or I) brought forward [in... 1 perhaps before me]

16. K 4453 obv. (CT 35, 28)

[they delivered ] in my hands 2...their hearts I pulled out 3 their...I...their [tongue] I cut 5 their [skins ] I flayed their flesh I caused the birds to eat. 6 Nabuzerukin son of Nabushum... 7[a servant] attentive to my countenance, who... 8[with] Shamashshumukin he had made common cause 9...the bow...my...my troops 10...I conquered afterwards I...and his skin I flayed. 11...Shamashshumukin 12...Bit-Dakuri 13...my [troops] 14...I flayed his [skin]

15 [I am Ashurbanipal king of] Assyria who, by order of the great [gods] 16...in (?) his heart, [precious] garments 17... (to) Shamashshum-ukin faithless brother 18... his prefects, the soldiers, his battle array 19 [the chariots] for driving his lordship 20...his harnessed teams, whatever is desirable 21...as much as there was, people male and [female] 22...I caused to bring forth before me. 23... their defeat. The Overseer of the Sheep Mannukibabili 24 son of Nabushallim 25 the sons of Ea-zer-ikisha of the tribe Bit-Amukkanu
... I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria who by order of ... 27 ... the kings dwelling in sanctuaries...

The reverse of this text is found in CT 36, 27 and reads as follows, 1 [I am Ashurbanipal king of] Assyria whom Ashur and Ishtar 2 ...[as] head caused to stand 3 ...his heart, Tammaritu, king of Elam 4 ...[to] Shamash-shum-ukin the inimical brother they came 5 ...my troops. Before Indabigash his servant 6 ...he caused to be and he, together with his brothers, 7 ...the posterity of his father's house, his nobles, to Nineveh 8 [they fled] and kissed my royal feet 9 [he dedicated himself to] my service and besought my lordship 10 ...he forgot the good of Ashurbanipal king of Assyria 11 ...he did not keep his sworn treaty 12 ...the people of his land 13 ...and before the people of his land 14 ...in the midst of his land

17. K 13652 (CT 35, 29)
2 conquered ... 3 the sons of ... 4 who ... Rev. 2 the battle-line of Ummanigash [king of Elam] 3 of whom Ashurbanipal king of Assyria 4 accomplished [the defeat] 5 Tammaritu with him ... 6 I thrust through ... 6 the beheading of [Teumman] 7 who ... me ... 18. K 13741 (CT 35, 29)
1 ... and ... 2 ... the bow ... 3 ... people of ... 4 ... this 5 ... who in the midst of Elam 6 ... the working of the might of [Ashur] ... 19. Sm 1950 (CT 35, 29)
1 ... the Elamite 2 ... to his neck they hanged and 3 ... Nineveh] his royal city 4 [he joyfully entered with] music 5 ...[the favor (?)] 1 of Ashurbanipal mighty king 6 ... they returned to him 7 ... [he broke (?)] their bows

20. Bu. 89-4-26, 116 (CT 35, 29)
1 ... Ishtar ... 2 ... doing what is proper for royalty 3 with Shamash-shum-ukin they made common cause 4 [with the help of Ashur] and Ishtar my hands captured [them] 5 ... [who with] Shamash-shum-ukin wrought rebellion 6 [with the help of Ashur] and Ishtar my hands captured 7 ... I slaughtered with weapons. 8 I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria to whom the great gods 9 [appointed] a favorable fate 10 ... his brothers, his family 11 ... [for] help 12 [to] Shamash-shum-ukin they came 13 ... his lord

Col. II 1 ... the faithless brother 2 ... his hands which ... 3 fire I burned ... 4 I am Ashurbanipal ... 5 [my hands] conquered 6 all the
trappings [of royalty ... the palace girls ... the chariots ... the horses ... the palace (?)

21. K 2623 (CT 35, 30)

1 Tammaritu king of Elam ... Elam ... [chariots] horsemen, bowmen 4 [all] the army as much as there was 5 mules, asses, oxen, and sheep 6 I carried to Assyria 7 I did not leave a resting place for birds ([man]-za-az iṣṣurē ul e-zib) 8 ... former and latter among the kings ... these (cities) as many as I conquered 10 ... all (?) the charioteers, the horsemen 11 of the whole army as many as there were 12 males and asses 13 ... I carried away to Assyria 14 I covered Elam with fear 1 Rev. 1 ... with the strongholds ... Assyria ... 15

22. Rm. 2, 236 (CT 35, 30) is evidently not a series of epigraphs but of oracles of Ishtar addressed probably to Ashurbanipal. 1 ... my great divinity which [is not thwarted] 2 ... the kings thy fathers ... 3 ... in order to conquer the lands of those who disobey me ... 4 ... my great divinity which is not [thwarted] 5 ... of the Quarters 6 by their own counsel ... 7 in Eḫarsagkurkurra before ... 8 I longed for thee, I called thee before [thy (?)] face (?) ... 9 the mighty weapons, the darts of the enemy 10 ... I shall destroy the staffs (or weapons) in the cutting down of the enemy 11 [I shall strengthen] thy [staff] ... 12 ... my divinity ...

23. The first nine lines of the obverse of Sm. 1350 are accurately translated by Streck from Bezold, Cat. 1481. We shall translate only the remainder.

10 I am Ashurbanipal king of the world, king of Assyria. 11 Nabudamik, Umbadara, the nobles 12 ... remaining (?) The first line of the reverse is now broken off but we may restore ina tar-ši kaḫkad on the basis of a translation made by G. Smith (Assyrian Discoveries p. 412) when the tablet was perhaps in a better state of preservation.

Rev. 1 In front of the head 1 of Teumman king of Elam 2 whom Ishtar my lady had entrusted into my hands 3 I made with joy an entry into Arbela. 4 Dunanu, Samgunu, Aplai (or Shumai) 5 at the gates of the East and West 6 for the astonishment of the people, I chained with wild animals 7 with the decapitated head of Teumman king of Elam 8 I joyfully took the road of Arbela.
I am Ashurbanipal king of Assyria. The nobles of Ursa, king of Armenia which he had sent to enquire about my welfare, Nabudamik Umbadara the nobles of Elam (so read by Smith, who probably saw it-ti) letters or their insolence I caused to stand before them. Before them (reading ina tar-ši-šu-un, as Smith probably did) of Mannukiahê, the second of Dunanu and of Ninib-usalli the man appointed over his city I tore out their tongues. I flayed their skins.
THE ANAPHORA OF ST. GREGORY
Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio

THE ANAPHORA OF SAINT GREGORY THE BROTHER OF BASIL

<THE INTRODUCTION>
May his prayer and his benediction be with his chosen one Walda George, for ever and ever. Amen.

<THE THANKSGIVING>
Let us praise him for his goodness towards us. O Lord have mercy; O Father of our Lord, and our God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ! Let us praise thee, holy God, merciful God, long-suffering God, far from anger and great in pity and righteousness. Thou art our God, who art without sin, and our Saviour who art without end. His right hand is fire; and mighty is his voice, which was not lifted up. He is without limitation in extent of time; without limitation in extent of being; without self-seeking. He did not exalt himself to proclaim his word; he did not blush to be rich for our sake. They magnified him, yet he did not cast off his visible humility. Thou art his image, hidden from eternity; his contemplated word, which he breathed and it came forth.

The deacon shall say
Let us attend.

The priest shall say
He who made the heavens, and he who established the earth is not more profound than his God; nor is he higher nor is he deeper; nor is he wider nor is he more right-handed. He is not second in order, nor is he partly hidden from the knowledge of all his angels, who manifest him in his essence. He cannot be destroyed by that which his hand created. He came from above; he tabernacled, he became incarnate for us; and he became man

1 Mercer, Mt. Eth. 3, 157b—167b.
before creation; he descended, yet he did not empty himself of the dignity of his godhead, but he raised us from death by his death.

_The deacon shall say_

Towards the east.

_The priest shall say_

We lift our eyes, our hearts, and our thoughts to thee; to thee is the fervour of our humble hearts; to thee is the praise, and to thy kingdom we will come; to thee is the sweet incense of thy angelic host, to thee we approach, and we are veiled by this sacrifice. He suffered willingly and was crucified of his own good pleasure; he died according to the will of his Father; and rose again the third day.

_The deacon shall say_

Respond.

_The priest shall say_

Let us ascend with praise to heaven, for heaven is open to us, and the earth is wholly full of the holiness of his glory. Holy Lord, etc., softly, O Lord, chief companion, thou art the bread of life, which came down from heaven. Pour the grace of thy Holy Spirit upon us that it may sanctify our soul and body.

_The priest shall say in a low voice_

O God, who art everlasting, before the last day was decreed and before the heavens were consumated, before day and night were established; thou who didst take our flesh and blood and didst come forth from the womb, and didst descend into the water and wast baptized in water, thou who didst become the food of all creatures, which was freely given, and who didst fulfil all expectation; three persons were with us; they took all the world as one assembly, as one communion, and as one power, and connected it with the heavenly father. He was made, but not as thou; he suffered, but not as thou. By the power of his word, terror is established. He is, indeed, our terror from above; his terror thundereth from the tops of the mountains. Precious is he who dwells above the highest heavens; profound is he who descends into the depths of the abyss where storm and hunger reign, accompanied by fire in the midst of much smoke. No one shall enter,
and none shall go out, except we who are his chosen flock, even those whose two ears and eyes are attentive.

The deacon shall say

Lift up.

The priest shall say

He took bread in his hands, which were pierced with nails, and with which our Father Adam was moulded, immaculate, without sin, pure without fault. Giving thanks, he blessed, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said to them: "Take, eat, this bread is my body, bread of righteousness, in truth, my body which is given for the remission of all the world; whosoever eats of it shall live for ever and ever." Likewise he looked upon the cup, the water of life with wine, giving thanks, he blessed, and sanctified it, and gave it to his disciples, and said to them: "Take, drink, this cup is my blood, drink of true life. Whoever drinks of it shall live for ever. Take, drink of it all of you, that it may be to you for life and for redemption."

Ye who return to this house of prayer, remain all of you holy and faithful before him. The word is the word; the word of the Lord is the word. The body was made and it dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, and the covering hid his body from us, which was not violated. He was scourged in this body God did not scourge. Come, behold this scourging which he bore patiently out of love for us. It was hard for those who saw him with the eye, and it was stupendous to those who heard with the ear. Come, see how his face was smitten, and how his head was broken with a stick in the hand of the chief priest. Come, let us receive the crown of thorns with which he was crowned as Saviour of all the world. Come, let us, each and all, worship the heavenly host who fly above the firmament, and who ascend to the sun and the moon and the stars, and who descend to the waters and to the depths of the sea. Behold, the waters of the deep flee when they see the greatness of his presence. To our God belong sun, darkness, and moon. The stars became blood when the greatness of his magnificence was revealed; death was defeated when Satan fell. Who will not go with him to meet the august God?
Come, see the difficulty of the deed which was done in the house of prayer when the chief priest answered in the midst of the assembly, and said to all of them, "Trust in God who sustains all, think of him and come to him, the Lord of spirits, for he will bring all powers under his kingdom. Behold all the children who say, "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord, and blessed is the Lord our God, the God and Lord of hosts. Hosanna, Blessed is he who cometh."

And they shall say "Blessed, etc., in a loud voice. Hosanna in the highest; Hosanna in the highest; Hosanna in the highest.

The priest shall say turning around three times,
Hosanna of hosannas, he is manifest, he is made known, he is the wonder which did not hitherto appear, and which will not henceforth be seen. Hosanna of hosannas, he is manifest in grace and power and magnitude above the thrones and principalities and powers of his own house. Hosanna of hosannas, he gushed forth as a fountain, without sin, to justify us and to cleanse us from all impurity, and to lead us to safety. Hosanna of hosannas, he vouchsafed light to us, that we may be born again, that our light may not be extinguished, that it may endure for ever. He who is the truth was accused by our wisdom, even by our wisdom which is false, but he was not overwhelmed. May he rest the souls of us and of all, of their fathers and of our holy fathers.

〈The Intercession〉

The deacon shall say

Pray on behalf of our fathers, the popes, and our fathers, the bishops, and our brothers, the priests, and our disciples, the assistant priests; pray for the sake of the Christian Church; for the sake of the faithful, Again, pray for the sake of the virgins and widows; for the sake of the boys and girls; for the sake of the barren, the sterile, and the fruitful. Arise and the peace of God be with you.

The deacon shall say

On behalf of the happy and blessed and honoured Abba Matthew, the happy and holy pope, Abba Christian, Abba Tito and Abba
Fabian and Abba Andronicos and Abba Basilides; on behalf of these thy servants, our fathers, popes and Abunas, bishops, and our fathers, the assistant priests, and our brothers, the deacons, our faithful, and all these thy servants; have compassion upon them all, give rest to their souls, and be long-suffering towards them. O, our God, remit their sins, and let not the commission of their sin become habitual to those who know the resurrection of thy holy body, and to those who know that their works approach the command of thy word of salvation. Cleanse us and all those whose souls are at rest, and be long-suffering to them in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. On behalf of those who are blessed in the Christian Church, teach all of us and be long-suffering towards us for ever and ever.

The priest shall say

Our father Paul and our father Peter and abba James, the pope, and Abuna Kēbūr, pope, abba Christolū, John, and Simeon, and James, the son of Alphaeus, and James, the apostle, the brother of our Lord, bishop of Jerusalem, for the sake of these thy disciples, Mark, Luke, Titus, Philemon, and Calymtos, Basil, and Athanasius, Epiphanius and bishop, abba Driakos, and abuna Kēbūr, pope, abba Matthew, strengthen their life and uphold them and hear their prayer of incense, and teach me that I may pray for them for ever and ever. Further, may he rest the souls of our fathers, the popes, and our fathers, the bishops who rest in this Christian Church; the assistant priests and deacons, anagnosts, and singers, attendants and doorkeepers. Bless them, for thou art the Lord; hear them; forgive them; raise them up by thy holy resurrection; and to us who bear the marks of thy holy body and the sign of thy precious blood, raise us up by thy right hand with those who do thy will. Feed us and sustain us all our days that we may forget our suffering; disperse our weakness; heal our sickness; inspire our lives; be long-suffering in our death; have compassion upon those who live; vouchsafe blessings upon my head, holiness in my soul, and purity in my body to receive thy body for life, and to drink thy precious blood, the divine mystery which thou hast mingled. Grant that, to those who receive, it may be for eternal life.
<THE Invocation>
The deacon shall say
With all hearts, etc.

The priest shall say
Grant that we may be united in communion with the Holy Ghost; grant that we may receive the communion of the Holy Ghost in peace, that he may vouchsafe to us the way.

The deacon shall say

<THE Communion>
Stand up for prayer.

The people shall say
Lord have mercy upon us.

The priest shall say
Peace be to you all.

The people shall say
With thy spirit.

Prayer
O Lord, our God, who didst speak from above with our father Abraham, from thy throne on high, saying, "Abraham, Abraham, Abraham, Abraham, I am the God of thy fathers and besides me there is no God, be thou a custodian of my command, of the word, which I have spoken to thee. I have prepared the earth for thy family and I have multiplied it for thy seed which shall be as the stars of heaven and as the sand of the sea-shore in number." And Abraham arose and took bread, and a paten and wine and set forth food and left his family, and came up to Tabor; and he brought it forth to a priest whose name was Melchizedek and he cried three times, "Come, O Lord; Come, O Lord, Come, O Lord" and then there came a man, terrible, near to him and when he looked, behold, he was not terrible, and Abraham was taken up while the Lord spake, and he took with him the bread
and paten and wine and mingled them and he made food and he came up to mount Tabor and he cried saying, "Come, O Lord; Come, O Lord; Come, O Lord". Then the terrible man went forth satisfied; and when Abraham had looked he prostrated himself on his face, and became like one dead, and Melchizedek stretched forth his hand and lifted him up and said to him, "Arise, Abraham, and fear not. The Lord who has sent thee to me is he who speaketh to me and he has come to thee", and Abraham arose and there was spoken to him the knowledge of the greatness of God. And Abraham was lifted up, and he arose, cleansed and he cut the nails of his hand, and of his feet, and he shaved the hair of his head; and Melchizedek lifted him up, and he arose and came up with the bread and the paten and the wine, and Melchizedek lifted his eyes to heaven and he blessed and brake and sanctified and gave to them, blessing Abraham, the child of God, our king, whose sacrifice and oblation thou hast received. Thou hast turned, by thy mercy, to our prayers, and thou hast inclined to thy people by the grace of thy only begotten Son, our Lord, and our God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and by faith in his passion, the forerunner and messenger of his death; and by faith in his resurrection, and in the fulness of his mystery.

_The priest shall say_

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world and encompass the Saviour of the world, even the body and blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world, in the faith of Christ we follow his steps.

_<The Inclination>_  

_The deacon shall say_  

Stand.

_The priest shall say_  

We beseech thee, O Lord our God, Almighty, that thou wouldest multiply thy mercy upon us, that thou wouldest prepare us for what is proper — to see him as angels. We pray and beseech thee, believing in thy goodness, thou lover of man, that thou
wouldst cleanse us all, and bring us near to thee because thou hast turned us from this divine mystery, and hast filled us with the Holy Ghost, and hast confirmed us in the orthodox faith, and hast filled us with a portion of thy love, in truth; and we render praise to thee at all times, through Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom to thee with him and with the Holy Ghost be glory and dominion, both now and ever world without end. Amen.

<The Thanksgiving>

The priest shall say, directing

Our soul and our body — pointing — O God, long-suffering, the Father of our Lord, and our God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, thou didst mix water with wine, spirit with humanity, and water with the dust of the earth, so that it may be mingled, even as we are, in the power of thy divinity. And mix again thy passion with thy crucifixion, we pray thee, we beseech thee, we adjure thee, for ever and ever.

<The Benediction>

After placing the oblation, he touches it with his hand

O Lord, our God, Almighty, eternal, bless east and west, the Great Bear and the Little Bear; bless the sun and the moon and all the seven stars; bless the winds of heaven and the rain of the earth, the fountains of water and all wells of water; bless the mountains and hills; bless the fruit of the earth; bless the things beneath the heavens, and the things beneath the earth. Christ our God, recognize them in thy heavenly kingdom, for ever and ever.
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There are many ways of writing a grammar or a dictionary. Quite a few Assyriologists have done one or the other, just to show off their deep knowledge of the subject and to impress beginners with the remarkable science of the author. Dr. Mercer has written a grammar which is quite different in that its aim is to help the student, and there is indeed need of such a help. The reviewer is not quite convinced that it is wise to study at the same time the Assyrian language and the cuneiform script. Lyon's attempt to teach the grammar and the vocabulary from transliterated texts met with no success, because he has had very little influence on the development of Assyriology, but that is a personal reason, and the value of the method is not disproved thereby. Whether the teacher of Assyrian wants to lay first a good foundation of vocabulary and grammar by the study of transliterated texts, or whether he wants to follow the common method of beginning with simple cuneiform signs, in the late Assyrian script, we think that Mercer's Method is the best for a beginner. The author takes up first simple syllables, then the study of ideograms, and that of determinatives. The sign list at the back of the book should then be studied, some practice being given by reading a list of Assyrian words similar to Hebrew. Then follows a chapter on the syllabaries, one on phonology, and then the study of pronouns, verb, noun, etc. Each chapter, having a vocabulary and an Assyrian text for translation. This is followed by a short syntax and Chrestomathy. In the opinion of the reviewer the course could be studied in 30 to 40 hours by a pupil having some knowledge of another Semitic language.
Dr. Mercer's grammar will be of use even to advanced students of Assyrian on account of its good tables of verbal forms. A teacher using Dr. Mercer's grammar may disagree with a few of the statements there made. On p. 18 we would rather say sibilants may change to 1 before a dental. On p. 12 the vertical wedge is of course employed before male proper nouns, but there are exceptions, where it is used before the name of a female. On p. 8, the meaning “beer” for šikaru would be probably as good as “strong drink”. On p. 12, we would say that the plural ZUN has apparently a collective value. The index is very helpful and nearly complete but on p. 117 we would rather have read pithallu for bitḥallu the translation “doer” for mušarkis is not certain. On p. 121 read šut-šaku, which however is not proved to be better than šuparšaku. But all these are minor matters that the teacher will easily correct for his pupils. The typographical work is excellent, there are very few errata and these are given at the end of the book. We would suggest that a short synopsis be made to precede every section of the Chrestomathy. As it is, the proper names, not being given in the lexicon, may be puzzling for a student working without assistance.

JOHN A. MAYNARD


This book forms the thirteenth volume of the Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum at Pennsylvania, and gives to the world another selection of the many fine tablets in the Museum's splendid collection. Eighty-five texts are autographed and many of them are given in transliteration and translation. There is an excellent photograph of number five and of number one, and at the end of the book is a useful map of the Lands of Sumer and Akkad. In accordance with the fine work always done by the University Museum, this volume leaves nothing to be desired in the matter of its printing.

The translation and commentary are preceded by an introduction which is followed by a Nippurian chronology, many points in which await further light. On page fourteen is a useful list
of the cities of Sumer and Akkad. In the introduction, attention should be called to the questionable interpretation of bal, palu. It should most likely be translated post, marker, or paling (the Latin palus). In the same place the word Tiger for Tigris is queer, to say the least. The English of the introduction, and more especially of the rest of the book is atrocious. Why should such rank English be allowed to appear in any publication? The author's native tongue is French but that is no reason why such abominations in English grammar should be permitted to appear in public. Every page is disfigured by them. But in the matter of transliteration and interpretation the author has done good work.

Numbers one and two are very important. They contain lists of kings of unusual importance in reconstructing the history of Sumer and Akkad before 3000 B.C. They give us a new list of kings and dynasties, and they fix for the first time the length of reign and the succession of the kings of Akkad, besides adding to our information about Guti and the kings of Kiš. Number five is a seal which preserves to us a portrait of king Ibi-Sin, other portraits of ancient Babylonian kings being those of Hammurabi, Gudea and Naram-Sin. The king is clad like a god, as was often the case. In number sixteen, rev. II 1.7, dalḫ-ḫu should probably be read tukḫ-ḫu and translated "openings" (cf. Del. Sum. Gloss. tug.) Number fourteen is CBS 14226 and not 14225. The last line in number nineteen should be translated "an oracle from Enlil" and not, as Legrain has, "by the oracle of Enlil". "Nonsuit" in number thirty-two, as well as "comptability", p. 60, "lecture", p. 23, etc. etc. is an example of the author's Gallic-English. In this same tablet, the last line should be translated, "in the name of the king they swore" (ni-pad). In thirty-three, the last line contains no negative, (mu-ta-gin), and in thirty-four "ditchers" should be diggers. One of the most interesting of these texts is number eighty which reminds one of the lists of presents in the Tell el-Amarna Tablets. In spite of these and many other imperfections, Assyriologists are thankful to M. Legrain and the University Museum for the publication of these texts.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
**Textes économiques d'Oumma.** Par Henri de Genouillac. Paris: Geuthner, 1922, pls. XLVII. 45 Fr.

This is tome V of the *Textes cunéiformes*, which the Musée du Louvre began to publish in 1910 and it contains fifty texts representing the Ur Dynasty. The texts are excellently copied, and are conveniently printed on forty-seven plates in a fashion most convenient to the student. They were excavated by Arabs at Djoňa or Umma, the Assyrian Keš and represent the reigns of Dungi, Bur-Sin and Gimil-Sin. They are all contract tablets and are useful primarily in the reconstruction of the economic life of ancient Babylonia. There are a few legal texts and some of the texts furnish instructive geographical, chronological and religious material. All students of Cuneiform will be particularly grateful to M. de Genouillac and to his publisher, M. Geuthner, for this fine collection of texts. The attention of students of Sumerian religion is particularly called to nos. 5664, 5672, 6053, 5667, 5671, 6040 and 6055.


The sexagesimal system which is the basis of our measurements of the circle, of trigonometry, and of time, is of Sumerian origin. The cubit of Gudea as given on two of his statues is 49.5 cm which is equal to the cubit of Babylon, from the measurements of the great stage tower by Koldewey. The value of the ka is not yet quite certain but it seems from a text recently published that it is the \( \frac{1}{144} \) of the cube cubit and that the mina is the \( \frac{1}{240} \) of the cube cubit. The author gives a list of the many measures of Assyria and Babylonia, with their equivalents in the metrical system, thus providing us with a most useful compendium of all that has been found on the subject.

**Une Figurine de Bronze Sumeró-babylonienne.** By Louis Speleers. Beyrouth, Imprimerie Catholique, 1922.

This reprint from the *Melanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, pp. 59—69, with one plate, presents a thorough study of a fine
bronze figure, which is rare in its detail. The statue is that of a devout worshipper of the Ur-Isin period or of that of the First Babylonian Dynasty.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


M. Boissier publishes a fragment of a tablet which is interesting because it contains paragraph seven of the Code of Hammurabi and also because it mentions five kings of the Dynasty of Isin. A transliteration and translation are given with copious notes.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Any one who wants to know — and it is the duty of every person interested in the ancient Orient to know — about the splendid programme inaugurated by the University of Chicago under the efficient direction of Professor Breasted, for Oriental Research, must not fail to read this reprint from volume 38 of the AJSL, pages 233—328. The account is arranged under the following heads:

I. The First Field Expedition of the Oriental Institute.
II. Purchases, Installations and Diagrams.
III. The Assyrian-Babylonian Dictionary.
IV. The Coffin Texts and Early Stages of Egyptian Religion in the Forerunners of the Book of the Dead.
V. The Tales of Kalila and Dimna and the Ancestry of Animal Fables
VI. The Archives
VII. Co-operation with other Institutions
VIII. Publications.

The pamphlet is packed full of interesting ideas about Oriental research. This is true especially of sections three, four and eight.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

In this book there lies before us the first volume of an ambitious work planned by one of Denmark’s greatest Orientalists. For twenty years Dr. Nielsen has been studying the problem of the “dreieinige Gott”, and has now begun to give to the world the results of his investigations. Nielsen’s point of view reminds one of that of Jeremias, but is larger and more comprehensive. Jeremias saw in Babylonia the source of practically all of Christianity’s dogmas, but Nielsen prefers to find in Syria the home, or at least the medium, whence came much of the teaching of the Church. After a well-arranged preface, he divides his work into three large sections: first, an introduction, in which he discusses Semitic religion and the method of its study in general; then comes a study and comparison of the Semitic and Christian cult; and, thirdly, he studies in detail the Semitic trinity of divine beings and the idea of a triune God.

Nielsen presents practically no new material; but he uses his material in an interesting way, and has assembled in convenient form a great number of references to the ideas of father, son, and spirit as found in Semitic religious thought. He seems to find no difficulty in demonstrating the fact that the Semites possessed the idea of a real trinity of divine beings. But it is strange that he denies this idea to the Jews. This latter phenomenon leads him to conclude that the bulk of New Testament mythology is foreign to the Old Testament. This, I think, is a mistake, for a careful reading of the so-called inter-testamental Jewish literature, compared with the Old-Testament, will show that the Jews, before the rise of Christianity, in spite of their conscious monotheism, were tending more and more to express themselves in terms of a trinity of personalities or at any rate of a triune God. And after Christianity arose, and its antagonism to Judaism forced the Jews to revert to a stronger emphasis upon monotheism, the Jews even then found it difficult to resist the temptation of personifying attributes of Yahweh, which amounted to an expression of trinitarian, or at least polytheistic, ideas. With this exception, I believe that much which Nielsen has to say can
be well substantiated. However, the same material and the same observations may with greater probability be used, not merely to show the origin of many Christian ideas, but also to show how the world of religious thought was naturally prepared for the "fulness of time". This book is indispensable to the serious student of religion and we look forward to the other volumes with keen anticipation.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This volume like several others already noticed in this Journal is a sign of the growing place taken by French scholarship in the field of Islamic studies. The author is a professor at the Institute des Hautes-Études marocaines of Rabat, in Morocco, a school for Islamic studies, where a first class faculty directs the publication of Moroccan and Berber archives, and of the review Hesperis. This Institute bids fair to rival the School of Algiers, of which it is we suppose an offshoot.

The subject taken up by Professor Levi-Provençal is one in which a few errors have crept in among scholars through Brockelman and Kampffmeyer as the author tells us with delicate scientific wit (p. 6 and p. 23). The author in his Introduction describes the status of a Moslem scholar in Morocco, and the courses he takes. The first part takes up the Moorish conception of History. History is taught nowhere in schools. It is not primarily a science of recording events but a literary means of attacking a ruler or flattering him (with the hope of receiving a favor). Writers on historical subjects do therefore defend their task on religious grounds by quotations of the hadith, for instance, which of course are historical collections. There are different kinds of histories, dynastic (with a strong apologetic bias), and biographical, a very important branch of learning in Morocco, because of the development of the veneration of the shorfa, authentic or not. The author then studies the method of procedure of historians, showing their constant endeavor to imitate slavishly the methods of Moslem historiographers in other parts of Islam.

Moslem historians were not able to consult all the sources, even
REVIEWS

local, for there was no printing press in Morocco until the end of the 19th century and only one or two lithographical shops in Fez, which issued mostly didactic and religious works. Most of the historical literature was only copied by hand, and to this day, Moorish schoolars are singularly jealous of the manuscripts they have inherited. The would-be historian gathers therefore a few documents, takes notes that he will reproduce slavishly in his compilation, or more usually trusts to his memory, more especially when he is quoting poetry. Having done with an author, the historian turns to another. He is quite ready to wait a long time before having access to other sources. If he thinks he is sufficiently informed he begins to write his own book. He explains his aim in a preface, finds a well sounding title and, with his notes before him, writes his rough copy. When there are contradictory versions of an event he first quotes the most ancient authority, just as his notes have it, then the others, and sometimes his own opinion. The writer will have several copies made of his book as time goes on, and will change the contents of his work whenever he has in the course of further study come upon another point of view. On a manuscript already written, such changes are made in the margin. It is quite evident that we have in Morocco, even in this century, methods of histography which can be made to shed abundant light on the problem of the composition of the Bible stories. Professor Levi-Provençal shows how the style of all writers is uniform. The second part of this work takes up the historians serially, their life, and their works, illustrated by quotations. Five of these historians (one of whom is still living) are of more than local value. The appendices give lists of sources, of government officials and cadis of Fez and Marrakesh, six pages of bibliography and three very complete indices. Very few of the Arabic sources are accessible to us in this country, but anyone can tell easily that the author has thoroughly mastered his subject, and that his method of research is strictly scientific. This volume does great honor to the School of Rabat.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The science of polity is mentioned in the great Hindu epics. It was a special study of the Kshatriya caste. Mr. Law has studied more especially here the Arthashastra of Kautilya, a work which enters into very fine distinctions and elaborate classifications in the field it covers, as Sanskrit books usually do. Monarchy was not the only form of government in India, but at the momentous period which saw the birth of Buddhism there were several self-governing clans with local and general assemblies and an official corresponding to the Roman Consul. Even the kings were kept in check by the heads of the self-governing communities or guilds. There are even traces of the elective principle in Vedic times, when however, monarchy was the ordinary form of government. Mr. Law studies the composition and function of the state council, the status of the royal priest, regal succession, education of the prince, the king’s daily routine of work, the state officials. He then subjects Frazer’s theory of the origin of kingship, and with a surety of method, which Frazer certainly lacks, shows that is does not fit in with the data we have in India. Another exhaustive chapter on the Religious Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity brings the book to a close. There is a very good index. Both from the point of view of erudition and method the author is evidently well qualified. Let us hope that his masterful criticism of Frazer will be known as widely as it deserves to be. The reviewer is still waiting to hear whether there is any part of the wide field of Comparative religion where Frazer’s most interesting and romantic views have stood the test.

John A. Maynard


This is a sympathetic, conservative, and thorough study of the Book of Job in the light of history and literature. It is, without exception, the best general and popular book on the subject which has appeared in a long time. The author favours the integrity of the Prologue, the Epilogue, the Speeches of the Almighty, and
even of Elihu. This is, of course, more than any modern scholar is willing to admit. He, however, does appreciate the difficulty in accepting the Elihu speeches, as well as a certain portion of the Epilogue. In this last respect he approximates the conclusion arrived at by Buttenwieser in his recent book on Job. The work is divided into eighteen chapters which are full of sympathy, high thoughts, and beautiful illustrations of almost every phase of the great problem. The author's treatment of 19:25—27 illustrates his conservatism, a conservatism which is often in positive error. In an Appendix there are six sections which are really fine. There is no book on Job which the reviewer can with more confidence recommend to the general reader than this one.

Samuel A. B. Mercer.


Dr. Scott's contribution to the study of this difficult prophecy consists in his many illuminating comments upon the difficulties of the Massoretic text, but more especially in his clever readjustment of the first three chapters. What this readjustment is the student must read for himself, for the argument is detailed and cannot be reproduced in a short review. It should, however, be said that the author while avoiding the recklessness of modern commentators, has so arranged the text of Hosea that the great message of the book can be fully appreciated. I believe that Dr. Scott's treatment of Hosea is the best that has ever appeared, and I look forward with pleasure to incorporating much that he has to say in my lectures on this book to my students.

Samuel A. B. Mercer.


This monograph was printed in Germany, but did not arrive in the United States until 1921, and was not distributed until 1922 when a supplement on the Pythagorean number philosophy was added. The thesis itself appeared in the Jewish Quarterly Review in 1912—1913. It is a discussion of the origin of Letters and
Numerals according to the Sefer Yetzirah. The author holds that the Sefer Yetzirah contains an account of the origin of letters and he proceeds to demonstrate his thesis. He then gives the text and a translation of the Sefer. The monograph is most interesting, but the argument is sometimes rather obscure, and misprints abound. It is, however, a convenience to have this unusual work in its original form.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
SACRIFICE IN ANCIENT EGYPT

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto, Canada

In an article published by me in this Journal, entitled "Divine Service in the Old Kingdom", I said, on page 51, "We have seen that it (the Offering in Egypt) was not a sacrifice in the ordinary accepted sense of the term, but a meal at which the Ka of the deceased partook and was thereby strengthened and sustained". I should like to see further investigation on this point made by other Egyptologists. Meanwhile, since I wrote the above I have had the problem continually in mind, and it is the purpose of this brief paper to record some further observations which I consider pertinent to the subject. I still doubt the sacrificial character of Egyptian offerings, that is, in the Semitic sense of the term, but I am not sure that I have yet penetrated into the real meaning of the rite.

There seems to be no doubt but that banquets were prepared for the Ka of the deceased. These banquets consisted of elaborate gifts of food and drink and were accompanied by the presentation of ointment (Pyr. Ut. 637) and clothing (Pyr. Ut. 453). They were intended to sustain the Ka of the deceased and to make him comfortable. Precisely the same gifts of food, drink and clothing were presented to the deity, who was thus fed and clothed by his children. Very often the statue of the deceased

1 Petrie, RT I, 14; cf. PT, Ut. 26—212, 338—349, 401—426.
or of the god was clothed, in order, by the power of magic, to clothe the deceased or the god himself.2

These gifts were not intended to transform the dead into a living soul, for that function was performed through lustrations, which by sympathetic magic restored the vital fluids.3 The dead Pharaoh was thus revivified (PT 1359b, 1201c), as well as the dead individual (PT 733c, 1411a, b). Such lustrations were based upon the lustrations which the sun-god was supposed to have made each day on rising.4 But banquets were intended to sustain the Ka of the deceased after revivification of the deceased.5

Now, these banquets were mortuary rites, whether celebrated at the tomb or in the temple,6 and consisted in creature comforts brought and presented by the priest to the deceased. By magic this comfort could be administered in the form of a carved representation which was supposed to bring the necessary comfort to the deceased, but usually, whenever possible, even at the expense of tomb and temple endowments, actual food and clothing were presented as mortuary gifts.

So far as I have been able to discover, these mortuary offerings are just what students of Egyptian religion have been calling "sacrifices", and yet these mortuary gifts do not seem to bear any resemblances to the sacrifices of Semitic peoples. Apparently the worshipper presented them to his god, or the individual presented them to his deceased relative for the sole purpose of furnishing the Ka with the means of life. They were offered daily, and were the exact counterpart of the daily meal. There seemed to have been no element of propitiation in the rite, nor did it seem to have had any relationship with the sense of sin, with contrition or with repentence. No idea of religious thanksgiving, atonement, or conciliation seems to enter into the ceremony. Even if "sacrifice" be interpreted as "a gift to a god",

3 PT 22—23; 765—766; 868; etc.
4 PT 1688b, 1835c, (cf. 689b), 275b, 519, 525ff., 1180, 1247, 1408, 1421b, 1430.
5 PT 1002—1003, 1046—1047, 1877c—1881, 1747—1748.
6 Murray. Saqqara Mastabas, l. c. I, pl. XVIII, p. 36; cf. PT 30a, b.
the Egyptian mortuary gift would not entirely satisfy this definition, for there is no difference between the gift made to a god and that made to the Ka of an ordinary individual. Moreover, the universal Egyptian belief that the life beyond the grave was an exact counterpart of life here in this world, and equally material, demands only that these mortuary rites be interpreted as an ordinary means of feeding and caring for the deceased, just as they were fed and cared for in this life.

Nor do the words used by the Egyptians themselves seem to demand any other interpretation. The most important of these words are ﮐ ﮏ ﮌ, which, judging by a variant form, namely, ﮐ ﮏ, means merely food, bread and drink; ﮗ, which means that which is daily placed; ﮐ, which really means to do a thing; ﮗ, which denotes a hostile beast; ﮗ, which means merely to split; ﮐ, which means to burn or cook an animal; and its variant ﮐ, which mean a slain animal; ﮐ, which merely means to give, or present; and its variant ﮐ, which refer to the act of killing; ﮐ, which means to slay an animal; ﮐ, which means to slay; ﮐ, which refers to a slain bull or cow; ﮐ, which also refers to something slain; and ﮐ, which indicates a slain person. Not one of these words is so constructed as to lead to the conclusion that these gifts and presents placed in tomb or temple constituted a sacrifice in the Semitic sense of the word. We can judge of these so-called sacrifices only on the basis of the services themselves, and these, as has been shown in the above named article, leave no place for a service of sacrifice in the generally accepted sense of that
term. The slain animal, the gifts of food and drink and raiment were clearly brought and presented for the sustenance and benefit of the Ka of the deceased, much as an Irish peasant insists upon clothes and food being placed in the coffin of the deceased friend or relative, to sustain him in purgatory.

It is a natural conclusion, and in full keeping with all we know of Egyptian mortuaty services, to believe that gifts brought to the tomb were merely for the benefit of the Ka of the deceased. It seems logical to arrive at the same conclusion in respect to gifts brought to the temple, for in reality the temple was the tomb of a god, and the service there partook of the same nature as that at the tomb, except that it was more elaborate. In fact both tomb and temple were referred to by the same words, e.g., \( \text{\textcircled{1}} \), \( \text{\textcircled{2}} \), \( \text{\textcircled{3}} \) and \( \text{\textcircled{4}} \), etc. and the different chambers in the tomb bore the same names as the different rooms in the temple, e.g. \( \text{\textcircled{5}} \), \( \text{\textcircled{6}} \), \( \text{\textcircled{7}} \), etc. For full proof of this point, see Moret, *Du Caractère religieux de la Royauté pharaonique*, pp. 122ff. This would seem to demand that we assume that the service held in the temple possessed the same character as that in the tomb, and especially so, since the extant descriptions of these services are the same for temple as for tomb.

It would seem, therefore, that what we have been accustomed to call “sacrifice” in the study of Egyptian religion was not a sacrifice in the Semitic and ordinarily accepted sense of the term, but was rather a presentation of various gifts at the tomb or temple for the benefit and sustenance of the Ka of the deceased king or individual, or for the benefit and sustenance of the deity in question.
ASSYRILOGICAL NOTES
By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

1) The Semitic Word for “hermaphrodite”

In the tablet of teratoscopy, CT 27, 4, 7 = 6, 2, edited by FOSSEY in Babyloniaca V No. 1, l. 72, occurs the following sentence: šumma sinnistu mu-ut-ta-at' amelûtî ulid bitu šuatu issappaly. The commentary on this passage, K. 4171, Obv. 26 (see RA 17, 136), has muttatu (l. 26), but the explanation is broken away. Fortunately a Berlin text, VAT 9718 preserves the explanation, muttatu-mis[4u, see EHELOF in ZA 34, 26. If in this passage the synonym be substituted for muttatu, it would read mišil amelûtî, “a half man”, mišlu “half” as a word for hermaphrodite is unintelligible when amelûtî is omitted but it passed into Syriac as muslā (by metathesis); muslā “hermaphrodite” is a loan-word from Assyrian and can have no relation to the Greek μυλλᾶς, harlot. It is obvious that mut(t)atu also means “half” and, by omission of the defining genitive amelûtî, “hermaphrodite”. This word can hardly be identical with muttatu, “forehead”, of unknown etymology. It occurs in the sense of “half” in the Code of Hammurabi, § 137. If a man divorced a woman who had borne him children, he was required to restore her dowry and to give her muttatu išlim kirim u bišim, “half of (his) field, garden and property”. This word has been invariably rendered by “portion” in this law, which leaves the legislation on such an important point altogether too vague. For muttatu išlim, “half of the field”, see also VS VIII 74, 7 muttatu lišani-šu ša immi in CT 27, 41, 22, clearly means “the right half of his tongue”. It is, of course, possible that mut(t)atu, fore-head, and mut(t)atu “half” are derived from the same root whose form and meaning have not been discovered.

1 Var. mutat.
2) Zahānnu, a vessel

The signs $\equiv$ and $\equiv$ are variants of an old Sumerian sign ($U + GA$, Thureau-Dangin, REC 276) is not this sign but ši-ga, see the same author's *Alt-sumerische und akkadische Königinschriften*, p. 136 XVI 11) which is apparently identical with $\equiv$ in Barton's *Sumerian Business Documents*, PBS IX No. 6 III 1, where a vessel *bur-zahān* is mentioned. This ancient sign was reduced to $\equiv$ in Assyria and further shortened to $U + GA$. By comparing the variants of Syl. B' II 7 it is evident that the two signs are identical. The value *za-ga-an* belongs to both and the *Chicago Syllabary*, AJS 33, 173, 34—38 assigns the values *za-gan*, *utu* and *u-tag* to $U + GA$ as restored from Syl. B' II 5—7. Now the vessel *bur-za-gan* of the ancient texts occurs as *bur-sakan* in IV R 20, No. 2, R. 3 and *šakan* ($\equiv$) also belongs to the most ancient epigraphy, REC 274. An unpublished text from Nippur (Ni. 4560 III 13) of the Isin period has also *bur-sakan*, or *ša-šan*, and *Shurpu* VII 89 has the same signs. The sign $\equiv$ (šagan, šakan, šagan šaman) is rendered by šappatu, bowl, box, jar, and šikšatu (same sense). Obviously $\equiv$ (za-gan) is only a variant form of $\equiv$ and it is difficult to understand why the early Sumerian had two signs for za-gan which is clearly the same word as za-gan, bowl, ointment box, the Semitic za-hannu, Syl. B' II 7, za-han, AJS 33, 173, 34, za-hannu is listed among the names of jars, bowls, in K. 4239, Obv. 17 (ZA IV 157), kam-[za-gan] = [ȘU-nu, i. e. za-han-nu], restored by Rm. II 556, Obv. 11 (RA 17, 187); Meissner in ZA 34, 35 misread the passage; za-hannu is clearly the word in question here.

The sign $\equiv$ when read *u-tu* (or Var. *u*) is explained by diktu, tiktu, certainly a vessel, and probably derived from *tiku*, root takū, pour out, as Muss-Arnolt has already classified the word in his Lexicon. It is not likely that diktu? (diktu? digtu?) in Kühler, *Medizin*, 4, 35 is the word diktu, tiktu, a jar, $\equiv$ (u-tag) for which a Berlin Assur text gives the reading *udda-g*, is rendered by šamū, clearly the name of a vessel. Note *giš-ū-tag* *apin*, part of an irrigating machine, rendered *ingu* and *rittu* part of the *rikbu* of the *epinnu*, Meissner, ATV I 62, 60 + 62; (*u-tag* = *ingu*), a plant??, K. 4369 R. 14, Babylonica VI Pl. IV
The two signs $U + GA$ and $U + GAN$, despite their similarity in the original texts seem to have been distinct signs and, although both were read zaˈɡan or šaˈɡan, they were distinguished by the careful epigraphists who composed Syl. B in the Isin period. See Syl. B 366 for šaˈɡan. All Semitic words which explain these signs indicate a vessel or jar.

3) KA-KA-SI-GA, "The meaning is the same"

In *Babylonica* VII, 87—92, I defined the meaning of the obscure Sumerian grammatical term ka-ka-si-ga or enim-enim-si-ga and came to the conclusion that it has practically the same sense as Ki-MIN or MIN, equivalent to the Latin *idem* or English *ditto*. The term ka-ka-si-ga has a larger sense than ki-min, which simply indicates the repetition of one word or phrase; it indicates the repetition of a series of synonyms. In giving what, I supposed, was a complete list of the known examples, one of the most interesting passages was overlooked. In the *Chicago Syllabary* 106—107 there is an entry which furnishes convincing proof of this thesis. We find there ґa-a: ḤA = lu-u, followed by a-a: ḤA = ka-ka-si-ga. This would mean that ḤA when pronounced a means lū just as ḤA when pronounced ґa has the precative force of lū. But one of the rules of Sumerian grammar is that ґa and a both indicate the precative, ґa being usually employed for the 3rd person and a for the 1st person. See *Sumerian Grammar* § 219.
A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE GUDEA CYLINDER A AND SOME OBSERVATIONS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto, Canada

In July of 1922, P. Maurus Witzel published, as Heft 3 of his Keilinschriftliche Studien, a study of this famous text, entitled, "Der Gudea-Zylinder A in neuer Übersetzung mit Kommentar", and, in the form of an appendix, he gave in translation and transliteration a text which was formerly published by Nies and Keiser in Historical, Religious and Economic Texts, under the title "A Hymn of Eridu", and which Langdon treated in this Journal, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 63—69. It this the purpose of this brief paper to call attention to this work of Witzel and to study some of the religious aspects of the text.

Witzel's new translation in the volume under consideration was prepared for by a study in his Keilinschriftliche Studien, Heft 1, pp. 96—128, where he gave a translation and discussion of Gudea-Zylinder A, sections 11—413. His continuation of this study in this new publication calls for close consideration. Witzel's translation is so different from that of Thureau-Dangin in SAK that it is deemed necessary here to give an outline of it. The text may be divided into three sections, namely, an introduction, the history of the building of the temple, and a description of the temple. The Introduction tells of the determination of the destiny of Lagash and its temple, of the destruction of the storied-tower and of the patesi, who is about to restore the temple. The temple of Lagash had been destroyed by a flood, and after an offering of oxen and of kids, the patesi determined to restore the temple (11—16). Then follows the history of the building of the temple (17—20). Gudea has a dream which he relates to the goddess Nina for interpretation (17—510). On his way to Nina Gudea

makes various offerings and libations and finally reaches the abode of the goddess. Nina interprets the dream and there follow her advice to Gudea, and a prayer to Ningirsu (§15—94). The second dream gives more detailed information about the building of the temple, and refers to Ningirsu as the "Drachenkämpfer" (95—1211). Witzel was prepared for this part of his clever interpretation by Heft 2 of his Studien, namely, Der Drachenkämpfer Ninib. After further discussion of the dream, there ensues an account of the establishment of peace in Lagash and the purification of the site of the contemplated temple (1212—144). This is followed by various acts of preparation, such as the imposing of the tax, the procuring of building material, the preparation of the material, and the preparation of the "stone of destiny" (145—199). The laying of the "corner stone" next takes place (1910—1919), and that is followed by an account of the actual building of the temple and of Gudea's care for it (1920—2011). The last portion of the text gives a description of the temple, including the zikkurat, the terraced tower, the symbolism of it, and its comparison with the Ekur of Enlil (2024—2918). Finally there is a conclusion in which an expression is given to the wish that in this temple Ningirsu be ever praised (3015—16).

The whole text reminds one of Solomon's dream and Jehovah's appearance to him in reference to the building of the temple in Jerusalem (I Kings 3ff.). In fact the relationship between Gudea and his god Ningirsu reminds one of Solomon and Jehovah. Like Samuel, Gudea was brought up in close association with the temple and was born therein (35). Just as the Old Testament of a later period represented Moses as receiving the plan of the tabernacle from Jehovah, so Gudea received from Ningirsu the plan of the temple (815ff.). But the most striking similarity between this text and Old Testament religious usage is that to be found in 115, where Gudea is represented as bearing the "stone of destiny" (sig nam-tar-ra) upon his head (cf. 1914). This should be compared with II Kings 1112, where it is said that Jehoiada, the priest, brought forth the king's son, Joash, and put upon his head the נָרִי or "testimony". The exact meaning of this passage is perhaps doubtful (cf. II Chr. 2311 and II Sam. 110, and the
LXX on this passage) but it may be that it refers to an inscribed stone which was used in the coronation ceremony. If this be so, we have an interesting parallel in the passage in the Gudea inscription. Another interesting passage is to be found in 3 8 where "my seed" (a-mu) is used by Gudea in the sense of his father's seed, just as in Job 19 17 the phrase "children of my body" (נֵבָבָב) most likely means children of my mother. There is also a passage in this text, namely 11 10ff., which describes the fertility of Sumer in a truly Messianic sense.

Some interesting views of the pantheon may be deduced from this text. For example, we know that Eridu was the original home of the cult of Ea. Then it moved to Nippur. In Nippur it amalgamated with the cult of Enlil. Now, the cult of Ninib-Ningirsu was an offshoot of the cult of Enlil, with motives from the Ea cult. It was, therefore, from Nippur that the Ninib-Ningirsu cult came to Lagash. It is interesting to note that Ninib-Ningirsu may be considered a modified Enlil-Ea, both Enlil and Ea, as well as Ninib and Ningirsu being wind, rain and storm deities. The storm-god which adorned the upper part of the gate of Eninnu (299) was perhaps Enlil, and it was Ningirsu who was the bringer of floods (815ff.) and ruler of the Absu in Nippur. Now Ningirsu was Ninib and Ninib was the son of Enlil, who was perhaps at one time identified with Ea. That is Ningirsu of Lagash was the son of Ea of Eridu, and the storm cult of Lagash was a descendant, through Nippur, of the water cult of Ea. Just so was Nina, the sister of Ningirsu, the daughter of Eridu, that is of Ea (2016), and the giver of oracles, for oracles were associated with the water-cult. Being the sister of Ningirsu it is easy to recognize in Nina, the mother of Gudea. But so was Gatumdug represented as the mother of Gudea (3 6), as well as of Lagash (2019) therefore Nina and Gatumdug are to be identified (Cf. II R 59, 27 d where Gatumdug = Bau, and Bau is universally identified with Nina). Ningirsu was the spiritual lord (en, 2 22) as Gatumdug was the spiritual lady (asag) of Lagash.

The temple of Lagash is represented as having been created at the very beginning (1 1-2), a device to indicate its sanctity. The temple had seven stories, the seventh being Eninnu, and gave
light to the world (21\textsuperscript{12}). It was decorated on the exterior with statues of heroes, dragons, lions, emblems of deities, etc. The central service of the temple consisted in offerings of oxen and kids (1\textsuperscript{14}), bread offerings (2\textsuperscript{8}), water offerings (2\textsuperscript{8}), sheep and calves (8\textsuperscript{8}), fish? (27\textsuperscript{12}), and cypress and cedar (8\textsuperscript{10}f.). In this text (18\textsuperscript{3}ff.), a service of sacrifice is described. At daybreak a libation of water was offered, and then an ox and a goat were sacrificed. The procession then entered the temple and the cushion on which the "stone of destiny" rested, and emblems of deities were carried in procession. The pouring and sprinkling of water filled a large place, and music was common. The "stone of destiny" seemed to play an important rôle, being anointed and set in position.

In this translation of Gudea Cylinder A, Witzel has done a great service to Sumerology and has gone a step forward in the direction of a fuller understanding of this difficult but interesting text. It should be noted, in passing, that his "Uschu-Holz" of 127, should be rendered "ebony". As an appendix, Witzel's study of the Hymn of Eridu has made it possible to follow the course of ideas in this important text.
A FIFTH SURVEY OF ASSYRIOLOGY (YEAR 1922)

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, University of Chicago

This bibliography continues our Fourth survey JSOR 6, 74—87 and should be used in connection with it and our former bibliographies published in this Journal (JSOR 2, 28-46, where Nrs. 1—364 are found; JSOR 4, 16—28, where Nrs. 365 to 555 are given; JSOR 5, 18—35 where Nrs. 556 to 788 are given). All items which came to our knowledge before 15. Dec. 1922 have been included. Our classification takes up the following topics: Bibliography (952—953), Excavations and History of Assyriology (954 to 967), Texts (968—974), Related languages (975—981), Signs (982), Syllabaries (983—988), Lexicography (989—1003), Grammar, Geography (1004—1011) Chronology (1012—1013), History (1014 to 1022a), Business Documents (1023—1027), Boundary-Stones (1028 to 1029), Laws (1030—1041), Letters (1042—1043), Civilization (1044—1052), Metrology (1053—1054), Art (1055—1063), Seals (1064—1067), Myths (1068—1076), Religion, including Divination (1077—1114), Astronomy (1115—1118), Babel and Bible (1119 to 1124), Babel and Hellas.

Bibliography

The publication of a bibliography by E. F. Weidner, Die Assyriologie, 1914—1922, has been announced by Hinrichs (952). It will cover what was published from Aug. 1, 1914 to July 31, 1922. A short Bibliographie über die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer was written by C. Clemen, Religionsgeschichtliche Bibliographie V und VI, 1920 p. 8—9, 26 (953).

Excavations and History of Assyriology

M. Pillet told the sad story of the expedition of Fresnel and Oppert in L'Expédition scientifique et artistique de Mésopotamie et de Médie, 1851—1855, Paris, Champion, 1922 (954) Venderburgh wrote on Excavations in the Orient and Bible Study, The Jewish
Forum, 1922, 73—80, 151—153, 216—217 (955), a popular article. P. Cruvelhier told of *Les principaux resultats des nouvelles fouilles de Suse*, 1921, being an excellent survey of the Delegation en Perse memoirs (956) Reviews by J. Marty, Rev. d' Hist. et de Philos. Rel. 2, 286—288; Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 129 to 130; Schroeder, OLZ 25, 319; Maynard, JSOR 6, 94. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge wrote a very witty account of the early days of Assyriology and of his own activities in Egypt and Mesopotamia on behalf of the British Museum, in *By Nile and Tigris*, 2 vol., 1920 (957). Comte Aymar de Liedekerte-Beaufort wrote an *Excursion archéologique en Mesopotamie*, Babyl. VII, 1922, 105—116, with illustrations (958). Important results were achieved by the soundings of R. C. Thompson on the site of Eridu, which he described in *The British Museum Excavations at Abu-Shahrein in Mesopotamia in 1918*, in Archaeologia vol. 70, pp. 101—144, Oxford, 1920 (959). A few Sumerian texts were found and some bricks of Nabonidus. Reviews by Mercer JSOR 5, 106—107; by Thureau. Dangin, RA 18, 151—152, and by Langdon JRAS, 1922, 621—625; the latter maintained that Thompson's hypothesis of a pre-Sumerian civilization similar to that of Susa is not proved. J. H. Breasted wrote on the *Oriental Institute, a beginning and a program*, AJSL 38, 233—328, telling of the work accomplished and planned by the University of Chicago (960).

Sayce wrote on The name by which the Assyrian language was known in the Ancient World JRAS, 1921, 583 (961) and showed that it was called Babylonian by the Hittites in the 14th. century, a fact of great importance from the point of view of the history of culture. cf. also Nr. 1050 G. Contenau wrote on L'Assyriologie in Le Livre du Centenaire of the Société Asiatique, 1922 p. 91 to 103, telling of the place of French assyriologists in the development of that science (962). A survey of more general scope was written by C. J. Gadd, Thirty years progress in Assyriology, Expos. Times, 1922, 392—397; 439—444 (963). Among obituaries we note A. T. Clay, Professor Jastrow as an Assyriologist JAOS 41, 333—344, with a Bibliography of Morris Jastrow Jr. (964); E. Pottier on L. Heuzey, Rev. archéol. 1922, 324—331 (965). Clay, In memoriam J. B. Nies, Bull. of the Am. Sch. of Or. Res. 1922,
Meissner wrote on *Die gegenwärtigen Hauptprobleme der assyriologischen Forschung* ZDMG 76, 85—100 showing that they are chronology, Law, interpretation of Religious Texts, archeological research and the Hittite problem (967).

**TEXTS**

A. de la Fuye edited *Documents présargoniennes, fascicule supplémentaire*, 1920, 48 plates (968). H. de Genouillac edited the fifth volume of *Inventaire des tablettes de Tello*, 1921 which covers the presargon period of Agade and Ur, with a volume of plates (969) and also a volume of *Textes économiques d'Oumma de l'époque d'Our*, 1922, with a short preface. These texts are of the utmost importance (970). L. Legrain edited *Historical fragments*, PBS, XIII, 1922, 108 p. 33 plates, a more miscellaneous collection than the title would indicate, and certainly very important for Sumerian chronology (971). The 36th. volume of the *Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum* was edited in 1921 by C. J. Gadd (962). It includes texts from Eannadu to Nabonidus and Sumerian Hymns. Langdon edited some texts from the Museum at Toledo, Ohio, *Miscellanea Assyriaca*, Babyl. 7, 1922, 67—80 (973). Weidner edited duplicates and complementary texts of Hittite letters and treaties and of Hittite vocabularies in *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi*, 3, 1922 (974).

We noted reviews of Barton, Miscellaneous *Babylonian Inscriptions, Sumerian Religions Texts* by Ungnad OLZ, 25, 256—257; of Clay's *Miscel. Inscr.* by Ungnad, OLZ 25, 1—5 with many corrections; of Contenau's *Tablettes Cappadociennes* by Luckenbill, AJSL 38, 229—230; of Ebeling, KAR vol. 3—6 by Meissner, OLZ 25, 448—452, with many improved readings; of Nies and Keiser *Historical Religious and Economic Texts and Antiquities*, by Ungnad OLZ 25, 69—71; of Sydney Smith's *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum*, by Luckenbill AJSL 38, 229—230 and by Thureau-Dangin, RA 18, 152—153. To this section belong also texts edited by Clay (1072), Chiera (1023, 1024), Gadd (1017), Langdon (983, 1025, 1101), Pinches (1026), Scheil (1031), and Thureau-Dangin (1114) which will be noticed in their proper place because of their special character.
RELATED LANGUAGES

The relationship of Sumerian to other languages was taken up by some who are qualified to do so and by others who are not. F. Hommel compared it to old Turkish in Zweihundert sumerotürkische Wortvergleichungen als Grundlage zu einem neuen Kapitel der Sprachwissenschaft (975). C. J. Ball who had already set forth a relationship with old Chinese compared Sumerian with Egyptian in a review of Mercer-Roeder, Egyptian Grammar, under the title Egyptian, Semitic, and Proto-Semitic Journ. of Theol. St. 1922, 439—444 (976). See also Hommel's article Nr. 1048. A deeper comparison reaching into grammatical similarities, which are, of course, of more value than vocabulary was made by T. Kluge, Versuch einer Beantwortung der Frage: welcher Sprachengruppe ist das Sumerische anzugehören, 1921, pp. 96; this excellent monograph finds some similarities with Sudanese languages (977). He was not apparently aware that a comparative study of Sumerian and Bantu had already been made. A work of quite different nature was written by H. de Barenton, Le Temple de Sil Zid Goudea patesi de Lagash (2100—2080 av. J. C.) et les premiers empires de Chaldée, 1921, pp. 116. This is supposed to be a translation of Cyl. A and B, which are taken as monuments of Etruscan culture, the Etruscan language being Egyptian, according to the author! (978). Pinches apparently favors a Mongolian relationship (cf. (1016).

Concerning the relationship of Assyrian to other Semitic languages we had an excellent article by M. Lambert, Le groupement des languages sémitiques, Cinquantenaire de l’Ecole pratique des Hautes Études, 1921, p. 51—60, where the similarity between Assyrian and Ethiopic is shown very clearly (979). We had also a work by Naville, L’évolution de la langue égyptienne et les langues sémitiques, 1920, where it was seriously declared that Aramaic is really identical with Akkadian, the former being the colloquial of the latter (980). This thesis has little value.

A post-mortem blow was delivered with all due courtesy to Halévy’s theory by S. Langdon, Intensive compound verbs a critique of the Précis d’Allographie de M. Halevy, Babyl. VII, 1922, 81 to 86 (981).
John A. Maynard

Signs

Howardy gave us the third part of his Clavis Cuneorum, 1918. It was very favorably reviewed by Sayce JRAS, 1921, 439–440 (989). See also Nr. 990.

Syllabaries

Langdon edited Tablet I of Har-ra = hubullu, Babyl. 7, 1922, 93–98, one of the texts being a commentary on Shurpu (983). Meek's Some explanatory lists and grammatical texts, RA 17, 177 ff. were studied by Ehelolf and Meissner, Bemerkungen zu Meeks Som. expl. l. a. gr. texts, ZA, 34, 24–38 with various emendations (984). More thorough work was done independently by Weidner, Vokabular-Studien, AJSL 38, 153–213, where Meek's texts were classified in Vocabularies, Grammatical, Astrological texts, Omens, Medical, Religious texts, Lists of Gods (985). P. B. Zimolong studied Das Sumerisch-assyrische Vokabular Ass. 523 (n. s.) (986). Zimmern compared SIL 122 which he had already studied with Langdon's Text Nr. 7 in Gram. Texts from Nippur, Zu den Körperteilnahmen SIL 122, ZA 34, 92–94 (987). Landon showed that The Grammatical term KA. Ka. Si. Ga. is to be read enim-si-ga, and means "the words or meanings are the same", Babyl. 7, 1922, 87–92 (988) See also Nr. 974 and 990.

Lexicography

Langdon studied Sumerian ugan, straightway, quickly, JSOR, 5, 101–192 (989) and AMAR. ŠE (siskur), to sacrifice, JRAS, 1921, 574–575 after a new collation of CT. The word means to give to eat by fire (990). Cf. also Nr. 1092. In the field of Assyrian lexicography we note the second instalment of Dhorme. L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien, RB, 31, 489–517 (991); Driver, Three Assyrian roots (kantum, šimetan and simkurru) JRAS 1921, 389–393. On the latter F. Krenkow remarked in JRAS 1922, 91 that the cognate word in Arabic is really Turkish (922). C. Frank wrote on akukūtū, burning sandstorm OLZ 25, 438 (993); Holma on Weitere Beiträge zum assyrischen Lexikon in Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, 1921 (994); Langdon, Assyrian Lexicographical notes,
šarapu to burn, Hebrew rašaph, JRAS 1921, 573 (995). Luckenbill wrote Assyriological Notes, AJSL, 39, 56—60 (996); Lutz on The meaning of Babylonian bittu (as girdle), JAOS 42, 206—207 (997); and on The root edelu, JAOS 42, 202—203 (998). Meissner wrote Lexicographische Studien, OLZ 25, 241—247 (999); A. H. Pruessner on Abi Ummani, AJSL 39, 52—55 (1000); Zimmern, Zur Etymologie von ša reši. Valuable comparative material can be found in Lidzbarski, Altaramäische Urukunden aus Assur, 1921 (1002). See reviews by Stummer, OLZ 25, 414—415 and Guidi, RSO 9, 416. Bezold gave a sample of his Assyrian Dictionary in Babylonisch-assyrisch alaku gehen (1003). See note by Mercer, JSOR 5, 110 to 111. In his article already mentioned (cf. 960) Breasted gave an outline of the work done for the Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago (AJSL, 38, 288—305) More than 250000 cards have been filed to date.

**Grammar**

Mercer has written an Assyrian Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary which is intended for the beginner (1003a). A Sumerian grammar by Poebel is announced.

**Geography**

Langdon studied The location of Isin, JRAS, 1922, 430 and placed it at Bahriyat, north of Fara or Shuruppak, refuting Meissner’s article in OLZ, 1917, 141 (1004). F. Schachermeyr wrote Zur Geographischen Lage von Mitanni und Hanigalbat, Lehmann-Festschrift 188—193 (1005); Sayce on Kas and Kusa, JRAS 1921, 54, a land in North Syria out of which Cusan-Rishtaim may have come (1006). Luckenbill wrote Assyriological Notes AJSL 39, 63 to 65 (107) and A messenger from Ibla. AJSL 39, 65—66 (1008). E. Forrer wrote Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches, 1920, 2 maps, pp. 149 (1009). A. Mingana showed our Arabists that there is evidence of a pre-islamic Bagdad in Syriac sources JRAS 1922, 429—430 (1010). R. P. Dougherty identified Te-ma-a in YBT, 134, 6 with Teima in Ancient Teima and Babylonia, JAOS, 41, 458 to 459 (1011). See also Nrs. 1019, 1020, 1025.
A. Poebel studied *Ein neues Fragment der altbabylonischen Königslisten*, ZA 34, 39—53 (1012) on the basis of Legrain's text in MJ 1920, 175 ff. Ungnad took up the same text in *Zur Rekonstruktion der altbabylonischen Königlisten*, ZA 34, 1—14 (1013). The same scholar dealt with chronological data in his review of Grice, *Records from Ur and Larsa dated in the larsa Dynasty*, 1919, OLZ 25, 9—12. Keiser, *Patesis of the Ur Dynasty* (Cf. 623) was reviewed by Mercer JSOR 5, 111—112 and Ungnad, OLZ 25, 67—68; Grice, *Chronology of the Larsa Dynasty* (Cf. 625) was reviewed by Mercer, JSOR, 5, 112 and Ungnad OLZ 25, 14 to 16; Gadd, *Early dynasties* (Cf. 834) was reviewed by Molyneux JSOR 6, 88—89; Mercer, Angl. Theol. Rev. 5, 151—152; Thureau-Dangin, RA 18, 153—154, the latter offering several emendations. Weidner, *Könige von Assyrien* (Cf. 842) was reviewed by Olmstead, AJSL 38, 225—228. Condamin rejected Weidner's scheme, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 126—128 and announced that a coming book by Kugler will dispose of it effectually. See also Nr. 1115.

**History**

E. G. H. Krealing writing on *The origin and real name of Nimrod* AJSL, 38, 214—220 (1014) showed the connection of the culture of Israel with Arabia. This is contrary to the Amurru-hypothesis which Clay presented anew in his book on the Flood story which will be noticed further among the myths. In his *Histoire de l'Asie*, vol. I, p. 5—10, 20—29, 303—305, R. Grousset placed Babylonian history in its proper background though without the certainty of an expert (1015). In his article on Sumero-Akkadians, ERE 12, 40—44 (1016) Pinches apparently favored a Mongolian origin for the Sumerians. C. J. Gadd wrote *Notes on some Babylonian Rulers*, JRAS 1922, 389—396 (1017). He proposed to read Ur nammu for Ur-engur (p. 389—391); he studied a Sumerian text of Ur-Ningirsu which sheds light on the history of Lagash (p. 391—394), and finally the H dynasty of Babylon (p. 394—396). P. M. Witzel gave a new translation *Der Gudea-Zylinder A*, 1920 (1018). H. O. Lock wrote on *The conquerors of Palestine through forty centuries*, 1920. The fifth chapter p. 35—43 deals with the Assyro-Babylonians. It
is not very strong (1018a). Olmstead wrote on *Shalmaneser III and the Establishment of the Assyrian Power*, JAOS 41, 345—382 giving a map of the North East frontier (1019). Lutz studied the question of *Sanduarru King of Kundi and Sizu* JAOS 42, 201 to 202 (1020). *The First campaign* of Sennacherib by S. Smith (Cf. Nr. 870) was reviewed by Meissner OLZ 25, 402—406 and Thureau-Dangin RA 18, 154—155 who both offered emendations. Deb supposed that a prince of Elam reigned in India during the days of Sennacherib and that India supported Elam against the latter, *India and Elam*, JAOS 42, 194—197 (1021). Clay criticized Scheil’s hypothesis in *Gobryas, governor of Babylonia* JAOS 41, 466—467 (1022) showing that there is no proof that Gobryas was governor before Cyrus’ days. In one of his *Etudes assyriennes* JA 1922, 1—18 Fossey took up the new text of Nabonidus (Cf. Nr. 128) (1022a). See also Nrs. 971, 972, 974, 1062, 1066. Olmstead announces a *History of Assyria*.

**BUSINESS DOCUMENTS**

E. Chiera edited *Selected Temple Accounts from Telloh, Yokha and Drehem in the Library of Princeton University* pp. 40 and 35 plates, 1922 (1023). He also edited as PBS VIII, 2 *Old Babylonian Contracts* 1922, Sumerian and Akkadian documents from Babylon, Larsa and Isin dealing with marriage, adoption, leases, loans, etc. pp. 115, 110 plates (1024). Langdon edited *A Sumerian tablet from Ellasar* JRAS 1921, 577—582 of importance for the lower course of the Euphrates in the days of Rim-Sin (1052). T. G. Pinches edited *A loan tablet dated in the seventh year of Saracos*, with some remarks on Sin-šar-škun (1026). Fossey studied the deed of a slave sale in Clay, *Bab. Records* in Library of J. P. Morgan 1913, II Nr. 2 in JA 1922 p. 40—48 (1027). Barton’s *Sum. bus. and administ. doc.* (Cf. 154) was severely reviewed by Genouillac, Babyl. VII, 126—127. Dougherty, *Records from Erech* (Cf. 802) was reviewed by Pinches JRAS 1921, 658—661 and Ungnad OLZ 25, 12—14. Grant’s *Bab. Doc. of the Classical period* (C. 656) was reviewed by Landsberger OLZ 25, 407—410. Keiser, *Cuneiform bullae of the third millennium* was reviewed by Genouillac, Bab. VII, 125
to 126 and Ungnad OLZ 25, 254—256. Keiser's *Letters and Contracts* (Cf. 437) was reviewed by Ungnad, OLZ 25, 68—69 and Keiser's *Selected Documents of the Ur Dynasty* (Cf. 438) were reviewed by Genouillac Bab. VII, 117—125 (a perfect review) and Ungnad OLZ 25, 8—9. Nies, Ur dynasty tablets (Cf. 650) were reviewed by Schroeder OLZ 25, 257—259 and Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 124—129. The latter vindicates Nies' readings against Hommel's in the appendix written by the latter and particularly attacks Hommel's new date for Hammurabi which is like that of Weidner. See also Nrs. 968, 969, 970, 973, 1025, 1026, 1092.

**Boundary Stones**


**Laws**
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LETTERS

Ungnad wrote Briefe König Hammurapis, 1919 (1042) which was reviewed by Poebel, OLZ 25, 279—281 and Ebeling LZB, 1021, Nr. 40, Sp. 762. E. Taubler, Zur Deutung des El-Amarna-Briefes Knudtzon Nr. 9, Lehmann-Festschrift 111—114 (1043). A very important review of Lutz, Early Bab. Let. f. Larsa (Cf. 456) was written by Ungnad OLZ 25, 5—6. Ungnad also reviewed Clay’s New Babyl. Let. f. Erech (Cf. 678) OLZ 25, 6—8.

CIVILIZATION

A remarkable little book on La civilisation assyro-babylonienne was written by G. Contenau (1044). Rev. by Mercer, JSOR 6, 89 to 90 and Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 130—131. Meissner’s book Babyl. u. Ass. (Cf. 885) was reviewed by Mercer JSOR 6, 35—36 and Ungnad DLZ, 43 Nr. 11. Die Sumerische Tempelstadt by Schneider (Cf. 886) was rev. by Mercer JSOR 5, 110 and Schwenzner, OLZ 25, 176—182. Sayce located The lead mines of Early Asia Minor mentioned in the Cappadocian tablets at Kara Eyuk 10 miles NE of Kaisarieh. JRAS 1921, 54—55 (1045) W. Reimpeill wrote Geschichte der babylonischen und assyrischen Kleidung, 1921, pp. XII, 82, profusely illustrated. Mercer wrote on War, ERE 12,
One important feature of Babylonian agriculture will be better known through the study of V. H. W. Dowson, *Dates and Date cultivation of the Iraq*, in 3 parts (1047). The relation of Sumerian and Egyptian culture was taken up by F. Hommel, *Die beiden ältesten babylonischen und ägyptischen Heiligtümer* (1048), noticed by Mercer JSOR 5, 109. The spread of Babylonian influence was studied by E. Assmann, *Babylonische Kolonisation in dem vorgeschichtlichen Spanien*, Lehmann-Haupt-Festschrift, 1—7 (1049). Its abiding influence was taken up by Holzhey, *Assur und Bibel in der Kenntnis der griech. röm. Welt*, 1921 (1050). (Rev. by Weißbach OLZ 25, 410—411 and Philipp, LZE 1921, Nr. 43) as well as by Lehmann-Haupt, *Zum Nachleben der Assyrischen Sprache, Religion und Dynastie*, Klio 17, 206—207 (1051) confirming an article by Jensen, Berliner Sitzber. 1919, p. 1042ff. (n. s.) B. A. Brooks wrote on *the Babylonian practice of marking slaves*, JAOS 42, 80—90 (1052). Cf. also Nr. 1000.

**METROLOGY**

Langdon described *A Mana stone weight of the period of Entemena*, JRAS, 1921, 575 (1053) which weighed 680.5 grams and showed that it was probably a great mana, while the ordinary mana varied from 477 to 520 grams. Thureau-Dangin in his *Numération et métrologie sumériennes*, RA 18, 123—142 (1054) gave a complete treatment of the subject.

**ART**

xerxes, RA, 18, 143-145 which was used to carry despatches in the royal mail (1062). In the beautiful History of Art by E. Faure, 1921, p. 78-104 a very clear and racy description of Assyro-Babylonian art is given with well-chosen illustrations (1063).

SEALS

Weber wrote Altorientalische Siegelbilder, Alte Orient, 1920, 17 and 18 (1064). Rev. by Müller, OLZ 25, 173-176 and Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. 13, 131-132. K. Speleers described Un cylindre Neo-Babylonien of the time of Nebuchadnezzar II (1065). Cf. note by Mercer, JSAR 6, 91. Legrain wrote on Five royal seal cylinders Mus. Jour. 1922, 60-78. (1066) The first is a seal of King Basha-Enzu of Ur (circa 2900) who is called the neverfailing husbandman of Ur. In his treatment of a seal of Dagania (of the first dynasty of Babylon) he shows that Adad is still dressed in old Sumero-Akkadian style and concludes that the Amorite conquerors adopted an older and superior civilization their own being of a rather poor quality. One of the seals here given is a Sumerian seal of the Cassite period. Langdon in A new Cassite seal JRAS 1921, 573 to 574, 577 describes a seal also in Sumerian, with Egyptian artistic influence (1067).

MYTHS

Chiera studied in A new creation story JAOS 41, 459-460 (1068) and more fully in A Sumerian Tablet relating to the Fall of Man, AJSL, 39, 40-51, a text which Lutz had edited but not understood (1069). Ebeling wrote Das babylonische Weltschöpfungs- lied umschrieben und übersetzt, Altorient. Texts und Unters. II, 4, 104 p. (1070) namely the texts edited by himself in KAR. In some of his Etudes assyriennes JA 1922, 18-30, C. Fossey gave a new rendering of several passages in Enuma eliš, Gilgamesh and the Atrahasis myth. On p. 23-24 he showed that the name of Gilgamesh's mother was Nin-sumenlil. On p. 27-29 he explained šut-abni in Gilgamesh's epic (1071). About an omen text in Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, Clay writing on The early Amorite King Humbaba, ET 34, 38-42, taking up again a thesis already defended by him, compares that name to that of Hobab, shows
that the heroes of Babylonian myths were deified men and not, as was erroneously said before, gods who became men. No doubt Clay is on solid ground there, but he must, of course, spoil it by an exaggerated place given to Amurru. The little pamphlet published by the British Museum on The Babylonian story of the Deluge and the Epic of Gilgamish (Cf. Nr. 893) was sharply reviewed by Ehelolf. OLZ 25, 406—407. Jastrow's and Clay's Old Bab. Vers. o. t. Gilg. Epic (Cf. Nr. 897) was rev. by Mercer JSOR 5, 108. Clay reedited an Atrahasis myth in A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform, with a long preface setting forth the Amurru theory (1072) Rev. by Kyle, Biblioth. Sacra 79, 515—517 and by Sayce ET 34, 76—77. Zimmern wrote Zum Ura-Mythos ZA 34, 89—90 (1073) on KAR 168, 169 showing how it witnesses to some kind of belief in mechanical inspiration. A. H. Edelkoort wrote on the myth of Tiamat, Nieuwe Theol. St. 3, 1920, 249—256, with quotations of Enuma eliš (1074) and also Kritische Opmerkingen over de Mythe van Istar, N. Theol. Tijdsch. 1922, 142—168, with a translation and commentary of both versions of the Descent into Hades (1075). Hommel, in an article Zu Semiramis = Ištar, Klio 17, 286, showed that besides the equation Semiramis = Sammuramat, restated by Lehmann-Haupt (Cf. 862) we have also in Semiramis an element from the mythical personality of Ishtar (1076). See also Nr. 1119.

RELIGION

As religious texts proper we already noted Nrs. 983 and 985. Ungnad's Religion d. Bab. u. Ass. (Cf. 902) was rev. by Schroeder, OLZ 25, 447—448. Jeremias wrote an excellent outline of Bab. Religion in Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte, 1918, p. 19—58 with a good bibliography (1077). Edelkoort wrote on Monotheisme in Assyrie in N. Th. Tijd. 1921, 36—45, treating MAR 25 (which Ebeling has studied in his Quellen I, 11—12) compared with texts of a similar character (1078). A thorough treatment of the Theology of the Word was contributed by Langdon to ERE 12, 749 to 752 (1079). It shows its influence on Greek philosophy and calls attentions to some similarity in Hebrew theology. C. Fichter-Jeremias studied Der Schicksalsglaube bei den Babyloniern, MVAG, 1922, 2, with a good treatment of fate among gods and men
Mercer's *Rel. a. moral ideas in Bab. a. Ass.* (Cf. Nr. 518) was rev. by Herrmann OLZ 25, 59, Mercer wrote on *Late Babylonian Morals* JSOR, 5, 84—95 (1081). A general survey, coming down to modern times was written by J. T. Parfit, *Religion in Mesopotamia*, Jour. o. t. Trans. o. t. Victoria Instit., 1921, 177—184 (1082).


view on The incantation E. NU-ŠUB, ISOR 5, 81—83 (1098) in answer to Jastrow's article in AJSL, 37, 51—61 (Cf. 581). He studied also The liturgical series d barbar-e-ta, JSOR, 5, 102—104 (1099) and The meaning of Bar-n after the titles of liturgies, JSOR, 5, 104—105 (1100) In The Assyrian Catalogue of Liturgical texts, a restoration of the tablet, in RA 68, 157—159, Langdon reedited 4 R. 53 (K 2529) now joined to K. 3276 (1101). He also translated KAR 158 in his paper on Babylonian and Hebrew Musical Terms, JRAS, 1921, 169—191 (1102). Zimmern criticized his arrangement of columns there in Zum Liederkatalog aus Assur, ZA 34, 90—91 (1103). Landersdorfer wrote Eine Sumerische Parallele zu Psalm 2 in Biblische Zeitschrift, 16, 1922, 34—44, being a translation with notes on SKL 199 (1104) on the basis of Zimmern's article König Lipit-Ishtars Vergötterung, ein Altsumerisches Lied, Leipzig, Phil. hist. kl. 68, V, 1916. Much discussion was aroused by KAR 96 (=Reissner 6) already studied by Ebeling, Quellen, II, 50 ff. Bohl wrote on it as Minimus en drama op het Babylonische Nieuwjaarsfeest, Stemmen des Tijds, 10, 1920—1921, 42—55 (n. s.) (1105). Zimmern, Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest (ZA 34, 87—89, 1106), reviewed by Sayce JRAS, 1921, 440—442, where the veteran assyriologist calls attention to a similar text edited by Pinches in PSBA, 1908. The same subject was discussed with a very level head by Loisy, La passion de Marduk Rev. d'hist. e. d. Litt. relig. 8, 289—302 where Zimmern's comparison with the passion of Christ was shown to be unfounded (1107). Another article was written by G. R. S. Mead on the same subject in The Quest, XIII, 1922, 166—190 (n. s. 1108). Zimmern wrote on Babylonische Vorstufen der vorderasiatischen Mysterienreligionen, ZDMG, 76, 36—54 (1109). In his review of Dougherty's Records from Erech (Cf. 802), OLZ, 25, 12—13 Ungnad translated Nr. 154 which shows how a widow in time of famine dedicated her two sons to Belit of Uruk by marking them with a little star (1110). In JA. 1922, 32—34 Fossey wrote a note on Maklu 8, 62, 84 (1111) and on p. 38—39 a note on hittite ou mitanni dans les incantations assyriennes (1112). L. Dennefeld studied Die babylonische Wahrsagekunst, 1919 (1113). Rev. by Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 135—136. Thureau-Dangin published Rituel et Amulettes contre Labartu RA 18, 161—198 a com-
plete discussion with several new texts (iii4). See also Nrs. 983, 990 and 1029, 1073.

Astronomy

E. Mahler wrote Zur Astronomie und Chronologie der Babylonier ZA 34, 54—78 (iii5) dealing with Bezold and Weidner's work. Weidner gave us Studien zur babylonischen Himmelskunde RSO, 9, 287—300 (iii6). H. Osthoff took up Die Farbenangaben in den altbabylonischen Sternverzeichnissen und die Farbe des Sirius, Die Himmelwelt, 1920, 78—87 (iii7). Virolleaud in Les origines de l'astrologie Babyl. 7, 1922, 99—104 (iii8) showed the growth of the idea of determinism from the correspondence between heaven and earth making "history a servant of divination". See also Nr. 985.

Babel and Bible

For Biblical comparisons cf. Nrs. 956, 1006, 1014, 1018, 1036, 1079, 1096, 1104—1108.

Babel and Hellas

Wirth's *Homer and Babylon* (cf. Nr. 951) was reviewed by Condamin Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 13, 135 and Geyer LZB 1922, Nr. 6. See also Nr. 1050.
DRUCKFEHLERBERICHTIGUNG ZU DEM AUFSATZE:
DAS HETHITISCHE KÖNIGSPAAR TLABARNAŠ UND
TAVANNANNAŠ (JSOR, VOL. VI S. 63—73)

Von FRIEDRICH HRÖZNY, Prag

S. 64, Z. 3, den Hauptvorwurf; Z. 24, Hethiter.
S. 65, Z. 22, sicher einreihbar; Z. 23, 1580 (7).
S. 65, Z. 27, Tlabarnaš; Z. 28, erscheinen.
Z. 66, Z. 3, Tabarnaš; Z. 7, -kän; Z. 9, m Ḫattušiliš; Z. 10, hinaus
NICHT; Z. 13, HKT S. 94ff.; Z. 14, Obv. I, 1—4; Z. 18, [ka(?)-r][u(?)]-ú
m La-ba-ar-na-āš LUGAL; Z. 19, [MĀRÊ (?) ]-][ ŞŪ; Z. 20, [AHHE]È
(?) PL. ŞU AMELUTI. PL. ga-e-na-āš.še-eš-šā AMELUTI. PL.; Z. 22, ZAB PL.
ŞU ta-ru-up-pa-an-[?]+e-eš; Z. 24, (… .?); Z. 31, (EGIR. ŞŪ-ma).
S. 67, Z. 16, SAL Tavananāš; Z. 22, m Mur-ši-il-li; Z. 26 u. 30,
Kadduši . . .; Z. 27, m Muršiliš; Z. 31, Muršiliš; Z. 32, IV, 4.
S. 68, Z. 11, Zeile; Z. 12, šābē PL; ū; Z. 17, pa-[a?]—a(?)] . . . .
Z. 22, hätte, den; Z. 25f. und 29, la-ba-ar-na-āš; Z. 29, [t]a(?)—ba-
ar-na.
S. 69, Z. 7, IV, 65.
S. 69, Z. 10f., SAL Ḫa-āš-ta-ia-ar; Z. 15, noch ||| sichtbar zu sein.
Meine Abschrift dieser Stelle wurde im Jahre 1919 angefertigt;
die Ausgabe dieser Inschrift vom Jahre 1922 (KUB I. 42, 6u) gibt
hier bloß ||||
S. 69, Z. 16, MDOG; Z. 18, SH; Z. 20, na-an-za-kän; -ma; Z. 21,
da-āš; Z. 22 u. 24, akhod.; Z. 23, nu; Z. 28, li-ku-ul; Z. 33, ŠA(G);
Z. 36, -mu.
S. 70, Z. 1, 56f.; Z. 3, MĀR. ŞŪ; Z. 4, [me(?)-mi(?)-i]š-ki-u-an;
Z. 14, Bo. 2539, Rev. (?) I, 14; Z. 22, pa-ḫa-āš-du(?)—ma; Z. 24,
maz-dazdūm; Z. 26, KÜR-e-šē-me-it: Z. 27, e-id; Z. 28, Gen. Sg.;
Z. 29, at-ta-aît-ta-āš; Z. 30, der ibid. Rev.; Z. 31, va-a-dār-ra; Z. 34,
Nun; Z. 35, TUR. TUR (? oder Rasur ?). KUB, I, 37, 31 bietet
jetzt TUR-mi.
DRUCKFEHLERBERICHTIGUNG ZU DEM AUFSATZE etc.

S. 70, Z. 36, akkad. màrama\textsuperscript{m} la-ba-ar-na; heth . . . ; Z. 40, Ḫattušiliš.
S. 71, Z. 5, \textit{SAL}Ta-va-na-an-na \textit{SAL}Āš-mu-ni-kal; Z. 8, Tabarnaš; Z. 9f. DEM GROSSKÖNIG (?); Z. 15, Arnuantaš; Z. 33, vielleicht eher; Z. 36, Arnuanta's, E. Winckler; Z. 37, ḫēš; Z. 39, \textit{SAL}Āš-mu-il\textit{NIN}-GAL.

S. 72, Z. 4, l. c. Sp. 316; Z. 14, İLU ŠAMŠIši; l. c. Sp. 317; Z. 17, ILÂNI\textsuperscript{pl.} ŠAMŠIši; Z. 18, \textit{m}NIR. GĂL; Z. 27, protochattisch-hethitischen; Z. 33, \textit{ALU} Ḫa-at-tu-uš.
S. 73, Z. 2, ILÂNI\textsuperscript{pl.}; Z. 4, İŞU.A; Z. 9; nun labarnaš; Z. 13, tabarna.

Diese vielen Druckfehler sind durch den Umstand verursacht worden, dass ich irrtümlicherweise von diesem Aufsatz keine Korrektur erhalten habe.
THE SUMERIAN CONCEPTION OF GIŠ-XAR—A CORRECTION

By W. F. ALBRIGHT, Jerusalem

Typographical errors are the bète noire of the conscientious scholar, since they are often ominous in their consequences. Thus the final paragraph of my paper, “The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos”, JBL 1920, 143—151, is rendered virtually unintelligible by the corruption of giš-xar, i.e., giš-har or giš-gar, into giš-zar, which is nonsense. In his valuable bibliographic survey of Assyrian research (Journal, VI, p. 84) Maynard has naturally called attention to so vulnerable a point, observing that the paper “rejects Langdon’s theory but brings in another on a kind of double called giš-zar.” The “theory” vanishes, however, with the correction of this enigmatic word to giš-xar, since every Assyriologist knows, or will learn if he examines the passages where giš-xar, giš-xar-xar, or usurtu, usurâti occur, that my explanation of the latter as “prefigured outline, destined plan”, whence “prototype” and “destiny”, is quite correct.
REVIEWS


Volume VIII, part 2, of the Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum at Philadelphia completes the publication of the legal documents from Nippur which belong to the dynasties of Babylon, Larsa and Sin. These documents belong to what is known as Babylonian contract literature. The language is Sumerian. In addition to the legal documents of the dynasties, already mentioned, the author has included in this volume one purchase document of the Ur Dynasty and six contracts of the Cassite period.

Some of the texts herein published are of unusual interest. Number 173 (Ni. 7178) is a legal decision concerning murder, which might be called the oldest record in existence of a penal judgment. Number 160 (CBS 14162) contains the name of a hitherto unknown Cassite ruler, namely Enlil-á-mağ. Numbers 130 (Ni. 7024) and 107 (Ni. 7195) contain two new date formulae of the Isin Dynasty, namely, mu i-ra-i-mi-ti ki-šur-ra ba-ğul and mu en-lil-ba-ni [bad?] mu-gur-[-en-ki-ra [mu-d]ú. Number 120 (Ni 7405) contains a date formula for the 29th year of Hammurabi, thus showing that that king held sway in Nippur two years longer than was formerly supposed.

After a transliteration, translation and discussion of several of the more important of the tablets, Dr. Chiera, furnishes a list of personal names from the Nippur texts as well as a list of personal names in the appendix of this work. After that comes a description of the documents here presented, with a concordance of texts. The autographing has been exceedingly well done, and scholars are much indebted to Chiera for his fine piece of work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

This is a highly interesting and detailed study of wine and beer in the Ancient Orient and of the way in which they were made. In chapter one, it is shown that the vine is a prehistoric plant. In Egypt, in the pre-dynastic period, vineyards were common; in Palestine, long before the Hebrews arrived, the country was rich in vineyards; but Babylonian soil and climate were not such as to make an extensive culture of the vine possible. Chapter two deals with the making of wine, and excellent illustrations of reproduction of the work in Egypt, while full accounts are given for other countries. Chapter three is devoted to a study of beer in the Ancient Orient; and chapter four discusses wine and beer in the daily life and religion of these ancient peoples. Wine and beer were used in the light of a harmless pleasure, to gladden the heart, and intoxication was never considered a moral offence. Both wine and beer played a considerable rôle in ancient religion, both being used in libations, and in ancient Sumer the vinegoddess, Geštin, was very popular. However, with the passage of time, as we learn from the Book of Proverbs and Islam, intoxication became a grave moral sin among oriental peoples.

Lutz has published an interesting study. It is, however, strange that in his quotation of the Pyramid Texts, he does not seem to have used Sethe's edition. He quotes from the old and antiquated Maspero text. This makes verification of his texts very complicated. One wonders whether he went further than to copy references from Brugsch without reference to the text and context. I have not noticed many misprints, but "Rescription" for "Description" (p. 6, n. 6) and for (p. 15) demand attention. The author's translation of Gudea Cyl. A 2810-11 is questionable. It possibly should read: "The ne-sag (place of offering) was a wine-mountain." But these are small matters in comparison with the general excellency and reliability of this study.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

This is a dissertation presented to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It is written in the regular thesis fashion with vita of the author and a list of abbreviations. The authoress does not claim to have presented an exhaustive treatment of the subject of moral practices in Ancient Mesopotamia, but yet it is strange that without any explanation of it, she seems to have omitted the evidence of religious and poetical material. Having for many years made a study of the morals of the people of Mesopotamia, I have been always alive to the importance of the evidence to be derived from poetical literature, but I have never yet felt sufficient confidence in the date of the origin of such literature to use it in any fundamental way in the chronological discussion of Mesopotamian morals. I had hoped that Dr. Brooks had done that. However, she has presented us with a very interesting study. There is very little to be criticized in the thesis, except that her results have not been presented as systematically as one would desire. In fact, she does not seem to have arrived at anything very definite at all. On page 32 Mrs. Brooks has misrepresented the facts when she assumes that in my article on "Sumerian Morals" I used the Ḫammurabi Code as a source. The fact is that I used only the older elements in that Code (see JSOR I, 49). Again on page 82 she says that the sabe were the lowest class of society, and were men from whom labourers for the public works were recruited. This is not an accurate statement, as reference to the sabe of the Tell el-Amarna letters will show. There it is clear that the sabe were people of various classes of society, who offered their services, or were called upon to do so, in time of peril.

It is to be hoped that Mrs. Brooks may continue her work in Cuneiform so well begun.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

Another considerable collection of cuneiform tablets has been located in America, namely, in the Library of Princeton University. The bulk of these tablets were presented by the late Professor Brünnow, and came originally from Telloh, Yokha, and Drehem, representing the period of the Ur Dynasty. In the collection there is also a number of unopened case tablets from Umma, which are perfectly preserved and covered with splendid seal impressions, and likewise a group of about sixty seal cylinders. Of this fine collection Dr. Chiera has been preparing a catalogue, which will soon be published. Meanwhile, in the work before us he has gathered all of the largest Telloh tablets and some of the best Yokha texts. He purposes also to publish other volumes until all the texts of any importance shall have been published.

The texts before us are temple documents, many of which are specimens of old Babylonian ledgers, and others are receipts and small accounts. Dr. Chiera has translated (with transliteration) the first and last column of eight of these tablets, and has supplied us with full annotations, grammatical and exegetical. None of the texts are of unusual importance, but they furnish us with a considerable list of personal names, which Chiera has carefully collected. After a description of the tablets, Dr. Chiera presents us with autographs of thirty-six of these tablets. The Autographing has been well done, and the work is a considerable contribution to our wealth of cuneiform contract literature. We await the future volumes with keen interest.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The Assyrian Grammar of Samuel A. B. Mercer comes to meet a long felt need. As Prof. Mercer points out, Assyrian is a difficult language and compilers of Assyrian Grammars have not done
much to make it attractive to the student. Delitzsch's Assyrische Lesestücke, no doubt a very valuable book, is not well adapted for the use of beginners.

Its chief source of difficulty is offered by the etymological glossary at the end of the book. An intelligent use of it presupposes a good acquaintance with other semitic languages and this most beginners do not possess. This objectionable feature of the glossary could have been corrected by the use of a large number of cross references, but of these we find very few. Moreover, the sign list is both defective and incomplete. Some special forms of well known signs are not listed where they should rightly be, but only as variants and are thrown together with the "regular" sign. How is the student going to discover them, except by going through the whole list? Some of the ideograms either are not listed in their proper place or are altogether omitted. I could never understand why these defects have not been corrected in later editions, but the fact remains that the teacher, if he wants to avoid a useless waste of time on the part of the students, must elucidate in advance such words or passages which are likely to prove stumbling blocks.

In Mercer's book we have a means of guiding the student through the first steps in Assyrian until he has acquired sufficient knowledge to be able to use the more difficult works. For this reason I believe that the name "Assyrian Grammar" is somewhat misleading. We find there only an outline of the grammar, most of the place being taken by the exercises. It is really a "Primer", and the student in his first year should cover considerably more ground than that embraced by the book. It goes without saying that Mercer's work will not take the place of the larger grammars and that it is simply intended to be an introduction to them.

The weak point of the book will be found in the glossary, which is inadequate. How is the student going to translate the expression *zikir shumšhu*, when both words are translated "name"?

But these are minor faults. We must be thankful to Prof. Mercer for having given us a book which will contribute towards making Assyrian more popular among the students.

Edward Chiera

In this Inaugural-Dissertation presented to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Breslau, Dr. Zimolong has given in transliteration with full commentary the important Sumero-Assyrian vocabulary, Ass. 523, which is the second tablet of the series ea-A-nāku, of which Clay's vocabulary published in 1915 is the first part. A splendid photograph of the tablet is included in the book, as well as an excellent register. No student of Cuneiform should be without this fine thesis, for the commentary is full of useful material, and stimulating suggestions. It is curious that the author does not seem to know of the Chicago Syllabar published by Luckenbill. Nevertheless, there is hardly a page without some valuable comment.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This extract from the Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles, t. XXX, 1921, pp. 149—179, gives further evidence of the care and scholarship with which Mr. Speleers is so indefatigably carrying on his fine work in Oriental archaeology. In this brochure, the author's aim has been to study an example of each of the minor arts of the ancient Orient. His work is both philological and also archaeological, and brings together, in a systematic manner practically all that is known about ancient Oriental furniture. The study is of first importance as a work of reference.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


A very interesting book by an author who apparently has no prejudices and no pet theories. The chapter on the Times of ignorance is excellent. Everything is said so simply that one wonders why it has never before been said by others, in this clear and well balanced way. The treatment of Judaism and
Christianity in Arabia is just as good. The author takes up then
the institution of Islam (perhaps a chapter less good than the
others), the political activity of the prophet, the Caliphate, the
Alid Legitimist opposition, the Abbasids, the Sherifates, and tells
of the Turkish domination and its disappearance, which has left
Arabia a political riddle and a country divided under as many
rulers as in the 18th century. There is a very complete index
(seven pages) a good map of Arabia, but no bibliography.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

_Thoth the Hermes of Egypt._ By Patrick Boylan. London, Ox-

As the title-page reads, this is a study of some aspects of
theological thought in ancient Egypt. Professor Boylan has here
presented us with a really first-class piece of work. The god
Thoth is studied in great detail, first of all in his name of Thoth,
then as he appears in the legends of Osiris and Horus and
among the Enneads of Heliopolis and in connection with Re and
then as a luna deity. His symbols come in for a fine treatment,
as well as his functions and attributes. Finally, his chief temples
and shrines are enumerated, and three appendices give a list of
proper names in which the name of Thoth appears, a list of his
epithets, and some divine associates of Thoth. The whole work
ends with additional notes on important points in the text.

It would take much more space than we have at our disposal
to catalogue the interesting points in the theology of Egypt which
the author has discussed. But is should be said, that his findings
rest on the most reliable handling of the original texts. In every
case the author has gone to the hieroglyphic text itself and
quotes it. The name Thoth he finds to be a _nisbe-form._ One of
the most important sections of this book is the chapter wherein
Thoth is treated as a lunar deity, and where the author shows
that Thoth was not only the moon-god himself, but also the
protector of the moon. Another fascinating chapter deals with
Thoth’s symbols, the most familiar of which are the ibis and
the ape.
Professor Boylan has placed all students of Egyptiology in his debt and has made an excellent collection of a great deal of the material which bears on the god Thoth. The Pyramid Texts, however, do not seem to have been used as frequently as they might have been. Many misprints show rather careless proof-reading, e. g., p. 78, l. 12; p. 82, l. 19; p. 133, l. 2; p. 136, l. 11; etc. Particular attention should be called to the mass of philological material in this fine book.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is an important work of five parts. In the first part the author gives in full an account of the organization of the great expedition, headed by Fresnel, and the details of the trip from Paris to Bagdad, together with an account of the Sultan's firman. Part two begins the account of actual digging and discovery of inscriptions. The work done by Fresnel and Oppert is given in detail. In the third part, comes an account of the transportation of "finds" to Bagdad and their loss in the Chatt-el-Arab, and finally the death of Fresnel. The fourth part has to do with the details of Fresnel's relations with the French government and the English explorers, and at the end the author relates Oppert's experiences at Paris, and describes the publications of the expedition. Part five is occupied with decrees and financial tables.

Pillet has given a full and detailed account of one of the greatest expeditions ever sent to Mesopotamia. It is a model of what such a work should always be.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is volume four of the Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, and is a publication of the text of the Grammar of Gregory Barhebraeus. The Syriac text
is edited on the basis of many manuscripts. The work was begun in 1907 and brought to a conclusion in June 1922. Dr. Moberg gives a full account of the manuscripts used in his introduction, as well as an account of his restoration of the text, and of the critical apparatus employed therein. Then follows an index of the more important Syriac words treated in the Grammar, and a grammatical index in French. The grammar itself occupies 256 large pages, and is beautifully printed. No student of the Syriac language, who aims at a really first-hand knowledge of the structure of the grammar, can be without this book. The author is to be congratulated upon the completion of this important work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


These two parts of the *Boghazkoi-Studien*, herausgegeben von Otto Weber, in Berlin, follow Hrozný’s important work, *Die Sprache der Hethiter*, published in two parts in 1916 and 1917. The two former parts deal with the problem of the Hittite language, and will form the basis of an article to appear soon in this *Journal*. Meanwhile this review calls attention to Hrozný’s work in the second two parts. The first of these two parts, called *Boghazkoi-Studien II*, after a preface, in which the Indo-Germanic character of Hittite is emphasized, is made up of a detailed transliteration and translation of ten large inscriptions from Boghazkői. The first is a report on a temple of Tešup, the second is an Ominatext, and the third has to do with religious ceremonies. If the renderings of these inscriptions are reliable, they give us some interesting glimpses into the religious life of the ancient Hittites. The Hittites had many gods, Ḫepe, Lelwaniš, Mezzulaš, Telibinuš, Inar, etc., the chief of whom were Tarḫu and Tešup. Like the Egyptian king, the Hittite monarch was called a sun-god. The Hittite had their feasts and religious ceremonies, the most important of which was the daily sacrifice. Oxen, sheep, beer and meal were the chief *res sacrifici*, and priests were the officiants.
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(EN SIGISSE), who also furnished oracles (IR. TUM) and were called oracle-priests (AMELHAL). There were also priestesses (SALŠŪ-GI) and temples were supplied with statues of men and women.

Heft 3 contains a discussion of the people and language of the old Chatti-country, where Hrozný thinks two peoples united, an indigenous and an Indo-European, and a new arrangement of the list of Hittite kings. This will be discussed in full in an article to appear in a later number of this Journal. No student of Hittite or of Oriental civilization can be without these splendid pieces of work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


This forms the first fascicule of detailed linguistic and historical study of the famous Boss of Tarkondemos. The introduction is devoted to a general consideration of the problem, and the first part of the whole work, namely this volume, is concerned with a study of the god Tark and the hieroglyphic sign of his name. The greatest detail is to be found in this book on the phonology of the name Tarku-Tarkon, a most elaborate investigation being instituted, the result being that the name should be rendered Targwu. The last part of this fascicule treats of the diffusion of the name in Egypt, and in other places, a study to be continued in the next fascicule. An estimation of the whole work cannot be made until it is finished. But the present number is well worth scholars' most careful consideration.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


From _Syria_, 1922, comes this interesting article. The two figures described are from the collection of Dr. Jousset de Bellesme, and were found at Ḫomš. They are an excellent example of Syro-Hittite art, and the description of them contained in this extract will be most welcome to students of Oriental art. There
are two excellent plates, the second of which should be numbered XXVIII. In comparing one of the figures with Syro-Hittite statuary, it is clear that it is that of a war-god. But the war-god cannot be identified.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This study by the professor of Egyptology in the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, forms the third volume of Orientalia, and gathers together in convenient form all that we know, from an Egyptian point of view, of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt. He seems to have got his inspiration from Gardiner’s fine article in the JEA and from Weill’s work La fin du Moyen Empire égyptien. After a brief introduction Father Mallon gives in great detail what is known of Egypt and Palestine previous to the crossing of the Jordan by the Hebrews. Then he treats of the penetration and establishment of Asiatics in Egypt, and of the period of the Hyksos. Then follows an account of Joseph and of the land of Goshen. This leads up to a study of the period of Hebrew oppression in Egypt, of the ten plagues and of the exodus. A series of valuable appendices is added, together with a series of useful indices. Professor Mallon has treated his subject from a conservative point of view, and withal with a fine thoroughness. He speaks of “ten” plagues of the Sinaitic route of the Hebrews, just as if no serious problems were involved. He rightly, I think, identified Rameses II as the pharaoh of the oppression and Merneptah as the pharaoh of the exodus, but he does not to my mind satisfactorily explain the reference to Israel in the stela of Victory, (cf. my article “Merneptah’s Israel and the Exodus”, in the Anglican Theological Review, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 96—108), but he does realize the difficulty. This monograph will be found to be of great use, for it brings together in one place, most of the material pertinent to the subject. It is well illustrated with pictures of modern as well as ancient material.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

This is a study in origins, and contains in expanded form, with the addition of appendices, the three Schweich Lectures for 1920. These lectures are a combination of new and old, as the author himself says. The nucleus of I and II appeared before in the Journal of Theological Studies. But lecture three is new. In lecture I, a study is made of the translators of the prophetic books of the Old Testament, which he believes were the work of different persons, and in his second lecture the author has tried to show that the use of the Old Testament in Jewish worship is an important factor in the interpretation of select passages. In his third lecture he makes a study of the Book of Baruch, the whole structure and framework of which seem to have been governed by liturgical considerations. The whole work is followed by a series of useful appendices. Many brilliant emendations of the text makes the book very valuable to the exegete as well as to the student of Old Testament religion.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Dr. Margolis gives herein an interesting and informing account of the origin and growth of Hebrew scriptures. At many points, he makes use of unusual Talmudic material, which gives the book an aspect of unusualness. A good chronological table and index make the little volume very useful.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is really an unusually remarkable book. The famous professor of English at Yale has humanized Biblical characters and made them live. He uses the Authorized Version, of which he
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says all other versions are inferior, and, with a lightness of touch and keenness of psychological insight, so represents characters and scenes that they seem to speak to us. He does not write for the specialist, to whom his derivations, such as, Abram "father of height", and Moses, "Drawer out", would seem ridiculous, but there is not a page in this book which does not freshen and vivify some Biblical character or scene, for my part, I read the book through at two sittings, so fascinating and interesting it is. The titles of the chapters, "The Creation and the Flood", "Moses and the Ten Commandments", etc. do not give the slightest inkling of the mass of splendid material to be found in this incomparable book. The book ought to be read from cover to cover by every student of the Bible.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


Mr. Andrews has made his readers thrill and long to take a trip to Old Morocco. With colour, beauty and charm the author conducts us over a pass of the Atlas Mountains, traversing a region of Africa little known to Europeans and Americans. After a beautiful preface, the author describes the Oasis City, Marrakesh, with all its wonder and enchantment, and then follows his description of Atlas scenery, interspersed with humorous episodes and vivid pictures. The book will find many enthusiastic readers.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER
OBITUARY

The Rev. J. B. Nies, Ph. D., a member of the Society of Oriental Research, died in Jerusalem last year. He was the author of several articles and published two volumes of texts. He was a generous supporter of archeological research in the Near East.

J.-A. M.
APHRAATES AND THE JEWS

By FRANK GAVIN, General Theological Seminary, New York

I. OF THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE HOMILIES.

The "Persian Sage", Ῥᾳάρατ, now known to be Aphraates, wrote in the years 336—345 A. D. twenty-three homilies in Syriac, which have been carefully edited and are available for use in two editions. Their peculiar interest lies not only in the fact that they are almost unique in the purity of their diction and are in fact the standard texts of classical Syriac, but, as well, in the intrinsic interest of their thought. Aphraates is the sole surviving representative of a type of Christian thought which was essentially Semitic, and utterly independent of both Latin and Greek philosophy. The medium of his thinking, classical Syriac, was far closer to the contemporary Jewish Aramaic of Babylon, than was the Syriac of the later Christian writers. Even in St. Ephraim Syrus can be discerned a transition type toward the later Syriac, bristling with Greek and Latin philosophical and theological terms, with

---

1 Bibliography, Nos. 1 and 2. For discussion of his name, life, works, chronology, etc., cf. introduction to Parisot’s work, pp. ix—xI; Forget, De vita et scriptis Aphraatis, pp. 1—223; A. Bert, Aphraat’s des persischen Weisen Homilien, ... pp. vii—xxxvi; Saase’s, Prolegomena, etc.


3 On him and a comparison of his theology with that of Aph. cf. F. C. Burkitt Early Eastern Christianity, New York, 1904, especially pp. 103—110, etc.
its syntax broken down and its character completely debased by an enforced conformance to an only half understood Greek idiom. This subservience of thought and servility of style issued in a double calamity. (a) In the centuries in which Syriac literature flourished there emerges almost no thinker or writer half so prolific in thought as in literary output. (b) In these centuries the artificiality and imitative character of Syriac writers destroyed the structure of their medium. Under them Syriac was twisted into false and unnatural shapes in imitation of an alien Greek thought and idiom. As Renan observes in „De Philosophia Peripatetica apud Syros,“ (1852, p. 3) „the characteristic of the Syrians is a certain mediocrity.‘ In Aphraates, however, the classical language is at its best, and his homilies are worthy of philological study as fine examples of the linguistic excellence of pure and idiomatic Syriac.  

The language of Aph. is free from any borrowing of technical philosophical terms. Any peculiarly alien properties of borrowed words had been strained off by successive filtrations, or assimilated and their identity lost in the mass of the language as a whole. The process whereby such words as ἰδιομα or ἰδιομα ἔστι had been added to the vocabulary of Syriac had antedated Aphraates. It is only by reference to subsequent theological development that a fixed theological or philosophical content can be read into these words in the Homilies. There is no philosophical system discernible in any part of the whole text. Later Syriac writers worked

1 Quoted by Wright, Syriac Literature, pp. 1—2.
2 Any good Syriac grammar draws heavily on the homilies, — e. g., Nöldeke's and Duval's. For an intensive study of Aph.'s syntax, of which only the treatment of the relative is available, cf. E. Hartwig, Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Aphraates . . . Leipzig, 1893.
3 E. g., ἵππος ; 161: 16; 284: 19; 285: 10; 332: 4; 11: 21: 12; 11: 125: 7; 11: 144: 8; in each case means simply “self”, though it may be from ἐπικεφαλεύον, and have had originally a definite philosophical content. Cf. κενομο and the word itself in later uses, in Payne Smith Thesaurus. Thus too, ἰππος : 36: 14; 156: 2; 225: 22—23; 261: 1; 277: 21—23, etc., never has a technical meaning, and = only “nature” or “character.” So also with ἰππος or ἰππος : 100: 18—19; 11: 117: 11 = ὠός, but in no technical or philosophical sense. Cf. Bethune-Baker Nestorius and his Teaching, appendix, pp. 212—232, (ed. of 1908) on the Syriac use of this term.
from the basis of a philosophy with which they harmonized the Sacred Literature, in much the same way as Philo adjusted his interpretation of the Torah to his philosophy. Earlier Greek and Latin writers had pursued this method — particularly is this the case with the Apologists. The apologetic of Aphraates was not at all of this character.

While the case for Christianity must of necessity have been put into the terms in which any given controversy was conducted, it is perhaps unique in Christian literature that in his apologetic Aphraates did not seek to accommodate his belief to an alien medium. As he worked from his theology outward to as near an approach as he ever made to a philosophy, (and not as did most of his contemporaries, who reversed the process,) so in his apologetic there is practically no difference in method from that which might as fitly be called a dogmatic. Christian literature may be divided into the two general types, on the basis of the relation between theology and philosophy. If philosophy be the starting point, and the object of the writer be to harmonize, adjust, and interpret theological belief in relation to it, it is obvious that the content of what is held to be revealed truth, that is, dogma, would sustain vastly different treatment than if the process of thinking and presentation were conditioned by the aim of presenting and expounding the received content of belief independently of the dominant philosophical necessity. Presenting the case of Christianity, defending it from attack, explaining, and interpreting it, in short, the task of the apologist, has usually been held to involve a certain translation of traditional belief into current philosophical language. A body of doctrine may remain the same and its defence and method of propagation differ in different periods, as the accent of interest and point of contact or attack shift. It is, however, of singular interest that no \textit{a priori} philosophy determines the thought of Aphraates. No current idiom of philosophy conditions the presentation of his thought.

Of the twenty-three Homilies, the first ten were written in the years 336—337.\footnote{cf. Hom. V, paragraph 5, particularly, 193:17—25; Hom. X, paragraph 9, and 1044:10—15.} They were written upon the request of a friend,
also a monk, and probably the head of another community of monks. He had asked for an "explanation concerning matters necessary to the faith" that by such an exposition his mind might be "set at rest" (فس增长率). It is possible that this is a literary fiction. The form is very reminiscent of the "dedication" of St. Luke's Gospel and the opening words of the Acts. In any case, the first ten homilies were written for a larger audience than one person, for they were to be read and discussed with his brother monks. There is in them no explicit dogmatic teaching, and no attempt made, as Dom Connolly has pointed out, to give an ordered exposition of the content and meaning of the Christian Faith. It is the "works of the Faith" which he is to discuss, that is, the implications of it in their practical bearing; for example, the titles of some of these homilies are, "On Faith" (Hom. I), "On Love" (Hom II), "On Fasting" (III), "On Prayer" (IV), "Concerning Monks" (VI), "On Penitents" (VII), "On Humility" (IX). That Aphraates writes as he does in Homilies VI, VII, and X, shows at once his own authority and, one may justly infer, the condition and circumstances of those for whom he wrote. They were monks, and his friend was probably the head of a monastery. (cf. Hom. X "On Pastors"). Laxity and the domestic problems of the monastery are reflected in the conditions presupposed in homilies VI ("On monks") and VII ("On Penitents").

Of more interest to the study I am about to present is the homily "On Wars" (V) which contains scarcely veiled references

---

1 4:20—22.
3 465:1—6.
4 Dom R. H. Connolly, O. S. B. The Creed of Aphraates, in ZNTW, Vol. 7 (1906), pp. 204, ff. and cf. the controversy with Burkitt,—F. C. Burkitt, Early Eastern Christianity, pp. 81—95; 120—141; Connolly in J. Th. S., Vol. 6, (1904—5), Vol. 6, pp. 522—539; Burkitt, ibid, pp. 286—290; Connolly, ibid. in Vol. 8, pp. 10—15; ibid., pp. 41—48, etc.
to the war between Persia and Rome. The progress of this war caused much anxiety and distress to the Christian communities. It was for the reason that he wished to hearten them, discuss the situation, and make a prophecy of a happy outcome of the then untoward circumstances that led him to disguise it all "in figures" (hūs). He uses the prophecy as a veil beneath which lies his real meaning. Its significance will be hidden from the possibly hostile glance of a casual reader and apparent to one who has the key to the secret. Rome is the great power. It is the iron legs and feet of the image of Dan. 239-41.2 After quoting Ezek. 154-5, he goes on to say that the vine of Is. 53-6 is Christ, and that "He at His coming gave (the power to) rule to the Romans, called the 'sons of Esau,' who hold the rule for Him who had committed it to them." It is owing to the obstinate pride of Persia that its fall is assured.4 The armies of Rome will not be defeated by the forces gathered together against them, for they will hold the kingdom for Him who had committed it to their trust, who Himself is its Keeper and Preserver.5 The cause of Rome is the cause of Jesus, and it will not fail to conquer.6 This is the essence of the homily, though the conclusion7 is in a homiletic and devotional strain.

This homily throws some light on the conditions in the Christian communities of Persia which led to the persecution. The Persian Empire was "the beast about to be slain".8 Although he disclaims any special revelation, yet Aphraates means his words to be taken as a prophecy. He bases his prediction on the text of St. Luke 1411 and the analogy of God's method of dealing with mankind in the past.9 This is not the first prophecy which has been proven false in the event. From other sources we are enabled to

1 184:1—4; 185:3—5.
3 229:26—27; 232:1—2.
4 cf. homily V, sec. 3, 5, 7, etc.
5 233:12—15.
6 233:16—21.
7 sec. 25.
8 237:18.
9 237:10—20.
reconstruct much of the background of his times. The preference for Rome and Roman rule was not due solely to the profession of Christianity by its rulers. In the Persian Empire the Christians were regarded as a slave class, treated constantly without consideration, and subject without the recourse of appeal to the whims and fancies of merciless overlords. Furthermore, there was the glamor of ancient Rome and the strength and power of its organization. Above all, however, the outstanding fact was that this empire was now under a king of their own faith. If the letter of Constantine to Sapur\(^1\) of about the year 330 be authentic, it shows an extensive familiarity with conditions in the Persian Empire. It is written in the tone of one who feels himself constituted the Protector and Advocate of all Christians in all places. Sapur began to reign in the year 309 on September fifth,\(^2\) and in the year 337—338 attacked Nisibis, the first act of his successful war against Rome.\(^3\) To maintain the war Sapur had to exact heavier taxes and to conscript troops. It was in the course of the campaign that the persecutions of the Christians became violent. While there had been before this time occasional acts of persecution, the great necessity to which the Persian Empire was put made an undoubted loyalty to the royal policy imperative.

This support the Christians had not formerly given; note the rebellion in Adiabene, through which Mar Kardagh at death attained a martyr's fame.\(^4\) In the year 318 had occurred the martyrdoms of three Christians in Karka de Beit S'lokh,\(^5\) and in 327 there are

\(^1\) De vita Constantini, Eusebius, IV: 9—14, in Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller, Leipzig, 1902, Eusebius, I. Band, pp. 121, ff.
\(^2\) Tabari, ed. Th. Nöldeke, p. 411.
\(^3\) Though Nisibis did not fall till 363, when it was ceded to the Romans after the defeat of Julian the Apostate. It had been by the treaty of Narses and Galerian surrendered to the Romans in 297. St. James of Nisibis succeeded in driving off Sapur in his three unsuccessful attempts upon the city.
recorded eleven martyrdoms in the province of Arzanene.¹ When Sapur sent out instructions ordering the drafting of recruits and collection of taxes to prosecute the war against Rome, (which had begun so inauspiciously in his repulse at Nisibis in 337—338) he was met by reluctance, passivity, and even opposition, on the part of the Christians.

For the facts concerning this period we have the Passion of St. Simeon bar Sabba’e, the Homilies of Aphraates, Tabari, and Byzantine hagiographic material as authorities. The fifth homily of Aph. gave a forecast of the storm impending.

The second series of Aphraates’ Homilies give us more definite and important information as to the events which occurred after the outbreak of the war with Rome. As we have seen, the state of mind reflected in homily V is one of as open and frank hostility to Persia as of outspoken advocacy of the cause of Rome. It had become a religious war in the minds of those who came within range of Aphraates’ teaching. In the fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-second homilies he gives us other indications of the progress of events. In homily fourteen the calamities of which he writes later could not have occurred, for therein he complains of the ambition and worldliness of the clergy, which, as Kmosko notes, is a characteristic of times of peace, not of persecution.² It is dated the thirty-fifth year of Sapur, that is, 344.³ This encyclical was inserted into the second group of homilies, the “controversial homilies”,⁴ which are dated 343—4.⁵ The twenty-third homily (“On the Cluster”, — cf. Isaiah 65, 2 Esd. 9¹) while it is primarily a theodicy and not an apologetic, yet this

¹ At his time under Roman rule, hence their death was not during an organized Persian persecution, but probably in a raid by hostile anti-Christian Persians. cf. Acta Sanctorum Martyrum, ed. Steph. Evodius Assemanni, Rome, 1748, pars I, pp. 215—224. cf. J. Labourt Le christianisme dans l’empire perse, pp. 50 (note), and 78. ² cf. S. Simeon bar Sabba’e, ed. M. Kmosko, in Pat. Syr. pars prima, T. II, pp. 699—701; Aphraates, 577: 1—5: 625: 16—18. Still a dark cloud was hanging over the Church, as can be inferred from the whole tone of the encyclical, (cf. 573: 15—19; 709: 12—16,) though the church’s chief difficulties were internal friction, pride, and worldliness. ³ 725: I—2. ⁴ i.e., nos. XI—XIII, XV—XXI. ⁵ 1044: 15—20.
characteristic, though incidental, is sufficient to constitute its claim to be included in the "controversial" group. It is designed to stabilize and hearten the Christians who were now in the midst of persecution. Aphraates speaks of a "persecution which came in the fifth year after the destruction of the churches, in the year of the great slaughter of confessors in the Eastern country." It is dated in the next year after the twenty-second homily — (namely, 345), which closes this (second) series.

In the year 344 occurred the martyrdom of St. Simeon bar Sabba'e, of whom we have an authentic Passion, and another later work concerning him. Kmosko dates the first recension (MS₁) in the year 474, and says that it contains an account written before 407. The second recension (MS₂) was written toward the end of the fifth century. The first he finds to bear good evidences, internal and external, of authenticity, and reference to it confirms the inference already drawn as to the cause of the persecution and to the condition of the Christians reflected in the Homilies.

In the royal command purporting to have been issued for the arrest of St. Simeon (given in the second recension of his martyrdom), there is the following statement: "Wars and tribulations which are grievous to us and the gods, to them (the Christians) are life and delights, for while they live in our land, they cleave in mind to Caesar our enemy." Thus, too, the Jews tell Sapur (according to the first recension) that were he to send gifts and presents to the Roman Emperor they would be spurned, but if Simeon were to write him but a mean letter it would be received with reverence, and his wishes immediately carried out. When St. Simeon came as prisoner, he refused to reverence the King, which before, as

1 II:149:1—11. On the dates cf. Parisot, pp. XV—XVII. It may be that Aph. himself fell in the persecution of Christians which lasted throughout Sapur's reign, i. e. till 379. W. Wright in An Ancient Syriac Martyrology, J. S. L., Vol. VIII (old series — 1866) p. 431, gives the name of a martyr Aphraates. The text is authentic, and is of 412 or earlier.

2 Ed. by M. Kmosko, with Latin translation and excellent introductions. On the chronology of the persecution cf. pp. 690—713.

3 cf. discussion. op. cit., 678—690.

4 St. Sim. b. Sabba'e, op. cit., 791:12—16.

5 ibid., 739:4—12.
a free man, he had not refused to do. In both recensions the purpose is patent: the writer wishes to show that the persecution was directly due to the hatred of Sapur for Christianity. Just so far is this true as the national cause of Persia was identified with the forces against Christian Rome. As we have seen, if to Aphraates the cause of Rome were the cause of Jesus, it is not unlikely that the Persians recognized that the cause of Persia was the cause of the forces against Christianity. In this sense the contention of the two martyrdoms that it was a religious persecution, is true.

From other sources we are confirmed in this view of the conditions. A large Christian community existed in the midst of a non-Christian state, which, while it was in peace, did not greatly disturb itself over religious matters. In times of danger, however, profession of Christianity was tantamount to treason and disloyalty, and the persecution viewed politically as a part of the struggle of Persia against Rome, might be regarded religiously as a persecution directed against Christianity. Persecution was usually sporadic, and localized in towns and centres of government or religious control. A Christian was accused and denounced, then arrested, imprisoned, "questioned," and upon failure to recant, executed.

It would seem at first sight rather unexpected that of the homilies written during this period the bulk should deal with anti-Jewish controversy. But in both recensions of the passion of St. Simeon, the redactor shows great anti-Jewish feeling. It was the Jews who calumniated St. Simeon before Sapur, and made the very telling point noted above, concerning the status of the Bishop Simeon in the eyes of the Roman Emperor. Simeon prophesies another slaughter of the Jews, of which an account is given in the second

1 ibid., 742:11—26.
2 Labourt, Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse, pp. 56–63.
4 cf. S. Sim. b. Sub., op. cit., Sec. 13. This is embodied also in the second recension — cf. 807:5–14, ibid.
recension.¹ This account is to the effect that during the time of Julian, who had proclaimed to the Jews his readiness to assist and further the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem,² a number of Jews left Machuza "in the hope of this return and had gone three parasangs' distance from the city. When news of this was brought to Sapur he sent his troops and slew many thousands of them . . . ."³ If the account of his massacre be authentic, the Jews suffered a persecution of much the same quality as the Christians, and for the same reasons.

According to Labourt, the Jews were thought to have informed upon St. Simeon's sister, Tarbo, and her sister-nuns.⁴ Just how much truth there is in the assertion that the Jews urged Sapur on in persecuting the Christians, it is difficult to determine. Nöldeke thinks it very likely,⁵ but Duval is by no means convinced on the basis of the evidence of the Acta.⁶ The relation between Jews and Christians in Mesopotamia was always delicate, and the situation that lay back of the controversial homilies, was one which, under the stress of persecution, made the Christian less sparing than ever of recrimination. The causes of the friction were many. Before proceeding to a study of the evidence offered as to the relation of Christians and Jews by the Homilies, it will be well to consider first, the history of Persian Christianity, with especial reference to its probable relation to Judaism, and, second, to investigate the position of the Jews under the Sassanids.

¹ Sections 14, 15.
³ Patrol. Syr., pars prima, t. II, 811:4—6. There seems to be no record of this event in Jewish literature, so far as I have been able to discover. Cf. M. Adler, J. Q. R., Vol. 5, 1899, "The Emperor Julian and the Jews."
⁵ Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, (of Tabari), ed. Theodore Nöldeke, p. 68, note i.
⁶ La littérature Syriaque, R. Duval, p. 134.
APHRAATES AND THE JEWS

II. OF THE ORIGIN AND CONSTITUENCY OF THE CHURCH OF APHRAATES.

It is not until the Persian Church, by a process of reflection and under the stimulus of a kind of national self-consciousness, began to construct for itself a past as honorable as her position in the 5th century warranted, that any well defined and carefully articulated written tradition appears. Three main traditions are recorded. The first is that of Timothy I, a Nestorian patriarch, who in a letter to the Maronite monks says that the Magi on their return brought the Gospel to Persia “five years before Nestorius, and twenty after the Ascension of our Lord.” The gap of some four centuries in the legend disposes of any value in it as history. The second legend makes the Apostle St. Thomas the founder of the see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and the earliest list of bishops is in the works of Elias of Damascus (circ. 890). Together with various lists of former occupants of the see, a letter of the “Fathers of the West” (that is, the Bishops subject to Antioch) guarantees the autonomy of the see of Seleucia, certifies its patriarchal character, and assumes its independence of Antioch. The value of this is easily tested by noticing that the reputed bearer of the “letter” was Agapetus, bishop of Beit Lapat, who was one of the orators at the synod of Dadisho held in 424. The third legend binds up the history of the origin of Persian Christianity with Edessa. Addai, according to this third tradition, evangelized the valley of the Tigris. This legend is shown by Duval to be useless historically, since the document is of the sixth century or later. The work was composed merely to advance the reputation of an obscure town, Dar Qoni.

1 From an unedited MS., (Borgia, K. VI, 4, p. 653,) quoted by Labourt, op. cit., p. 10.
5 Synodicon orientale, Chabot, p. 581.
6 Ed. Abbeloos, Louvain, 1885.
7 La littérature Syriaque, p. 118.
After a careful examination of the evidence regarding the origins of Christianity in Edessa, it would seem highly probable that it was due to the missionary activity of Palestinian Jewish Christians. According to Burkitt, the original Judeo-Christian character of the Edessene Church was later reinforced and substantially altered to align it with the general western type of the Great Church. The glory of Rome (where Serapion of Antioch was consecrated early in the third century), influenced even the obscure community of Christians in the eastern outpost of Edessa, who could thus boast of communion with the see of Peter. But the overlay of the more developed type of Christianity never succeeded in effacing entirely the original character of primitive Edessene Christianity. Edessene Christianity was due originally to missionary enterprise, and sustained its character in the years to come. The case made by Burkitt is strengthened, if the various indications of alliance between Edessa and Mesopotamian Christianity of the early type be kept in mind. It would seem probable that the Church of northern Mesopotamia, which reproduces the same characteristics as are indicated in the early type of Edessene Christianity, owed its evangelization to the activity of missionaries from Edessa.

From Edessa a great road led across to Mardin, Nisibis, and thence to Mosul. It would have been the obvious route by which the early Edessene converts, on fire with the Christian evangel, would propagate their faith, and convey to others what had been brought them through like missionary activity. Such intercourse would have been difficult, if not impossible, after the rise of the Sassanids. The tradition above referred to from the Acta Maris may really embody a germ of truth when it claims the apostle of Edessa as the founder of Persian Christianity, if the obvious course of missionary activity had been from Edessa eastward and then perhaps towards the south. Armenian Christianity traces its

1 The whole argument may be found in Early Eastern Christianity, by F. C. Burkitt, London, 1904, pp. 1—79, particularly, pp. 34, 76; Tixeront, Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse, Paris, 1888; R. Duval, L'histoire d'Edesse, Paris, 1892.

2 s. v. "Mesopotamia," by Albrecht Socin, in Encycl. Brit., Vol. XVI, Ninth ed., (American issue), Chicago, 1892, p. 53, and cf. bibliography, p. 56; according to Socin, the early Persian roads were as excellent as those of Rome; cf. on this also Graetz, op. and vol. cit.
origin to Edessa,\(^1\) and, according to Sozomen, shared with Edessa in evangelizing Persia.\(^2\) Armenia, as Labourt points out,\(^3\) was too new in the faith thus early to establish missions abroad, even if its foundation had been laid by the time of the first decades of the third century.\(^4\) Yet Edessa from the beginning of this century was a centre of great missionary activity.\(^5\) The alliance,—probably via Edessa— with Antioch is suggested in the History of Beit S'lokh,\(^6\) in which a Greek is recorded as the first bishop of that city.

If Burkitt's contention that the original Christian community of Edessa was composed of Jewish converts be true; and if northern Mesopotamia was evangelized from Edessa before the primitive character of its Christianity had been made to align itself with contemporaneous Greek or Roman Christianity, we should expect to find strong Jewish affinities of thought, expression, and general viewpoint, in the Semitic Christianity of Northern Mesopotamia. If Aphraates represent a type of Christian thought which disappeared even from Edessa within a few years after the close of the second century? we should expect to find traces in him of both a primitive and undeveloped theology, containing strong Jewish elements and, as well, traces of the thought current in the second century. As a matter of fact, we do find a strong alliance in his general Christology with that of the so-called "Asianic" school, particularly with St. Irenaeus of Lyons.\(^8\) We

---

3 op. cit., p. 18.
4 cf. Ter Minassiantz, *op. cit.*
7 On the relation of Aph.' thought to the primitive stratum of Edessene Christianity, *i. e.*, that of the original Judeo-Christians, cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, p. 61, where he compares Bardesan and Aph., illustrating this relationship.
8 cf. Excursus VI in my dissertation, *The Christology of Aphraates*. His Christology had not developed beyond the type of St. Irenaeus.
find also interesting affiliations, first suggested by G. Bert, with the type represented in the Didache. This I shall hope to discuss below, after I have treated of the Homilies.

There are not a few indications that the Christians of northern Mesopotamia were Jewish converts. The version of the O. T. which they used was the Peshitta. This version, as Nestlé notes, follows both the Hebrew text and Jewish exegesis. While Isaiah and the Twelve Minor Prophets contain much from the LXX, Ezekiel and Proverbs are much more like the Targumim. The book of Chronicles has midrashic affiliations. It has been conjectured that the Peshitta translation, almost certainly done by Jews — since there are many cross relations to the Targumim, the “Pasuka,” Psalm 68, chapter superscriptions, the translation of “Selah,” according to the Targumic code — was used in the synagogue worship in Palestine, and was completely supplanted later on by the Targumim. The evidence for this, with Talmudic references, would seem to furnish a very high degree of probability for the thesis. Yet the question of its authorship is still unsettled. “The origin of the Peshitta is still as obscure as when Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote: ἡμῶν ἐν τούτῳ εἰς μὲν τὸν τῶν Σύρων παρ᾽ ὅτου διήγησε, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγνωσταὶ μέχρι τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς ὑπάτης ὅστις ποτὲ οὐτὸς ἔστιν.”

Of great interest is the fact that the terms for “salvation,” the verb “to save,” the noun “Saviour,” for which the O. T. Peshitta uses the equivalents לֶאָה, לֶאָה, and לֶאָה, are in the early Syriac Gospels translated לֶאָה for לֶאָה, and לֶאָה for לֶאָה. Aphraates,
who used the Diatessaron with its early form of text, always makes “to live,” — “to be saved.” Thus, “only believe and thy daughter shall be saved,” where σωθήσεται of St. Lk. 8:50 = Μα. “Salvation is identified in the Syriac usage with ‘life’. Σωτήρ is μωσ, “Life-Giver,” and ‘to be saved’ is ‘to live . . . ’ This is the more remarkable as Syriac has several words meaning ‘to deliver,’ ‘to protect,’ ‘to be safe and sound.’ May we not therefore believe that this identification of ‘salvation’ and ‘life’ is the genuine Aramaic usage, and that the Greek Gospels have in this instance introduced a distinction which was not made by Christ and His Aramaic-speaking disciples?” Subsequent Syriac versions aligned the older version used in the Diatessaron to the standard of theological thought and feeling of a later date, but in Aphraates as a typical, and perhaps unique, example of early northern Mesopotamian Christianity, no such alterations appear as were made later in the N. T. “Peshitta” of the fifth century.

It has been conjectured that this original O. S. version was the work of Jewish Christians, by whose efforts it was given to the Gentiles whom they in turn evangelized. It would seem highly likely that the community of Christians in northern Mesopotamia, to whom the Edessene converts brought Christianity, were themselves Jews, — at least in the earliest years of that mission. The earliest name for “Christian” in northern Mesopotamia was “Nazarenes” (L bénéficetur). This is the common title at even so late a period as that

---

2 St. Mk. 16:16 — Aph. 41:3—4.
3 Aph. 40:21—22.
5 cf. Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 88—99, on the “Holy Spirit” in Aphraates. The conclusions he draws from these facts I believe unjustified in their entirety, but he draws attention to the undoubted character of the evidence. The N. T. “Peshitto” is dated cir. 412.
of the *Acta Martyrum.* The Jews at the indictment of St. Simeon bar Sabba'e used the word as the common designation of Christians, by which time (*circ. V saec.*) it must long have lost its original meaning of Judeo-Christian. It is a characteristically Jewish usage that אֲבֵלוֹת = שֵׁם. The Christian adoption of this use may be found in the earlier recension of the Martyrdom of St. Simeon, (MS, — 4th cent.) Thus a martyred bishop of the name of נטשא of the town Ḥnaitha has the same name as תטשא of Karka-d'Beit-S'lokh. Kmosko gives examples of other conspicuously Jewish uses and ideas adopted by Christians, recorded in the *Acta* of the Persian martyrs, such as the reckoning of time, the prostration towards the East, chiliasm, etc. It is hardly possible that such considerable common elements and Christian-Jewish affiliations should have been the result merely of "friendly intercourse" of the Christians with the Jews, between whom at this time, because of the lack of evidence in Talmud and Midrash, Funk finds no reason to suspect any hostility or unfriendliness. The evidence from both *Acta* and the *Homil es* interprets this silence in Jewish sources for us. The Christian communities, especially in the north, were in such a numerical minority that in normal times it was essential to keep on good terms with their Jewish neighbors. The organization of the Christian communities near Mosul, for example, was such that in towns the Christian lay folk were few in number

1 Thus: "in the thirtieth year of Sapur... there came Magi slandering the לתי," *Acta Martyrum,* Bedjan, t. ii, Leipzig, 1891, p. 55. For a criticism, summary, and analysis of these acta, cf. Labourt, *op. cit.,* pp. 51—82.
3 *ibid.,* 747:22.
5 *ibid.*
and not particularly powerful, either socially or intellectually. Even the well established communities of monks were in danger from the cogency of the reasoning of the Jews; and one can read between the lines in Aphraates, — particularly in the later homilies — a solicititude and anxiety not unmixed with fear. It is obvious that the Jews had nothing to fear from the Christians. It is abundantly clear that the Christians feared the Jews.

Both the attitude of the Jews, as reflected in the Acta and Homilies, and also the curious cross-relations in thought and expression in these sources can be accounted for, if it were true that the early Christians in northern Mesopotamia had been converts from Judaism. Aphraates himself was a gentile convert, but his type of theology, the methods and content of his exegesis, the general characteristics of even his Christology, are all typical of a stage of development which had no representative in his day, either in the place of its origin, Edessa, or even in other parts of his own country. His theology is widely different in thought from that of the Narratio of St. Simeon bar Sabba‘e. The simple Christology, the absence of Nicene terminology, the total lack of any considerable theological reflection, all point to a primitive type, beyond which the thought of, for example, the great southern see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon had developed to some considerable degree. The Homilies represent a much simpler theology, while the Christian community to the south is of a type more in line with the thinking and reflection of Catholic Christendom. While the north was chiefly Semitic in its general term of thought and expression, Seleucia was more nearly in these respects like Hellenic Christendom. The Acta S. Maris record that before St. Maris’ coming there had been no Christians at Seleucia.¹ Seleucia was a city of Greeks, too, and this may well account for the non-Semitic cast of its theology as shown in the Acta and in the Passion of St. Simeon.² It is not reasonable to suppose that the evangelization of the northern regions had proceeded from Seleucia-Ctesiphon.

² There is a manifest difference in the theology reflected in the Martyrium and that of the Narratio. The former is much nearer to the thought and feeling of Aph.’ Homilies.
To summarize the evidence above, it may be said that the Christianity of Mesopotamia came probably from Edessa, and that the original missionaries and their northern converts as well, were of the Jewish people. The introduction of Christianity took place not far from the beginning of the third century at the latest, as is indicated both by the Asianic Christology of Aphraates and the presence of so many Jewish elements in the form and substance of his thought. That the constituency of the Persian Church in the north was Judeo-Christian originally, and that it never quite lost the character given to it at the beginning, seems to be shown by the relations between it and Judaism. Aphraates understood the Jews, while he would have had considerable difficulty in understanding the point of view of his co-religionists of Rome or Antioch. This intimacy in thought had its dangers, for the Christians of the north were few in number; and while they were no menace to the Jews, the latter were, especially in times of persecution, a cause of much anxiety to the Christians. Aphraates' solicitude for his co-religionists and his fear of the effect on them of Jewish polemics, is not of the same sort as the bitterness against the Jews shown in the Acta recording contemporaneous events, for this was inspired by the attitude of the Jews toward the persecuted Christians.¹

III. THE JEWS UNDER THE SASSANIDS.

The position of the Jews at this time was on the whole not unfavorable. There were settlements of Jews in northern Mesopotamia at a very early date. R. Jehuda ben Batera, the account of whose journey to Nisibis is told in the Midrash Echa Rabbati,² took up his abode there, after studying under R. Eli'ezer ben Hyrkanos in Palestine.³ He belonged to the second generation of Tannaim,

¹ 992:1—18, and 993:1—7, give Aphraates' interview with a "man called and is typical of the relation between Jews and Christians. The quotes St. Mt. 17:19, 21 to Aph. apropos of the powerlessness of the Christians in the face of persecution.
and is reckoned the eighth of the second group. This "generation," according to Mielziner, extends over the year 80—120. According to Talmudic references, Berliner dates R. Jehuda ben Batera "shortly after the destruction of the second Temple."2 There are many allusions to R. Jehuda, which suggest that his work in establishing the school at Nisibis was not in vain.3 Before R. Simlai went south to Nehardea he had first taught at Nisibis.4 He had come to Nisibis from Lydda and was "reputed less for his teachings as a teacher of the Halacha than for his ingenious and lucid method of treating the Agada."5 He was really of the first generation of Palestinian Amoraim (219—279) and was one of the links between Palestine and Babylonia.6 His association at Nisibis was with the school begun there by R. Jehuda ben Batera, which was still flourishing.6 Other notes on the city of Nisibis in Jewish history make it highly probable that it was from the earliest time a centre of scholarly education and instruction, and that its school endured at least into the time of the greatest of the Sassanids.7 The city of Nisibis had been Roman territory since Trajan Parthicus had recaptured it in 115, till in 194 the Osrhoenians took it. The Roman colony, established unser Septimius Severus, held it for Rome and it was well fortified. Nisibis was the subject of constant disputes between Rome and Persia, until under the weakest of the Sassanids, Narses I, it was acquired by Rome again (297). After this for a period of twelve years beginning in 350, Sapur II three times besieged it in vain, till in 363 it was finally ceded to the

1 Thus Mielziner, (Intro. to Talmud) pp. 25—27; Strack, (Einleitung in den Talmud), p. 92, who refers to W. Bacher, Agada der Tannaiten, Straßburg, 1903, pp. 378—385, Fränkel, Brüll, etc.
4 Aboda Zara, 36a, with which cf. Talmud Jer. Aboda Zara, II, 8.
5 Mielziner, op. cit., p. 43.
7 Hirschensohn, Sefer Sheva Hochmoth, (London, 1912) s. v. יבצלא page 364 and especially the note (יוגע).
Persians on the defeat by them of the forces of Julian. It was on the trade route from the West to Mosul, by which both Jew and Christian could travel easily from Syria to northern Mesopotamia.

Besides the indigenous population of Jews, who had through good and evil days maintained their identity and national life since the exile, and, from the second Christian century onward, had at their head a “Resh G'lutha,” the Jewish population of “Babylon” had been augmented by the coming in of exiles from Palestine. The outcome of the rebellion of Simeon bar Chozeba (called „Bar Cocheba” — 132—134) had sent still more Jews into “Babylon,” who came from the Roman domains into the country of the Parthians and Sassanids in ever increasing numbers with every new act of hostility launched against them. Gradually “Babylonia became for the Jewish nation a second mother.” The Jews had their own political chief, the Resh G'lutha, and their obligations to the Persian government were satisfied by the payment of taxes and imposts. In other respects they had in Persia that which they were denied by Rome, — autonomy and religious liberty. Conditions under the early Christian emperors were peculiarly

1 ibid., LXXV, 23. When it was ceded to the Persians it was an important Christian centre. The see of Nisibis was founded by Babu (ob. 309). cf. J. B. Chabot, L’ecole de Nisibe: son histoire, ses Status, (Paris, 1896). Guidi, Gli Statuti della Scuola di Nisibi, (in Giornale della Società asiatica italiana, IV, pp. 165—195).


4 According to Graetz, op. cit., et vol. cit., p. 133, he ranked the fourth in the Persian kingdom. This Nöldeke (Tabari, p. 68,) thinks very doubtful.

5 Graetz, op. et vol. cit., p. 133. It was on account of his refusal to pay this sort of tribute, or perhaps rather the double tribute that Sapar exacted of all in order to furnish means to carry on his war against Rome, that Simeon b. Sabba'e was indicted and his arrest ordered. cf. Martyrium, St. Sim. b. Sab., sec. 10, and Narratio ibid., secs. 9, 10, (Patrol. Syr., pars prima, t. II, cols. 731—734 and 802—803, 806). If Sapar had tried to make him equal to the נחלו ישו and Simeon had until this time enjoyed Sapur’s favor, it would seem that this account in both MS1 and MS2 cannot be true to the facts; for discussion, cf. Kmosko, Patrol. Syr., pars prima, vol. II, pp. 705—709 (sec. 8 of Praefatio III). St. Simeon bar Sabba’e is called ליזא, ליא; cf. ibid. 799:14; 818:13; 867:23.
unhappy for the Jews. “Judaism would have rejoiced in the victory of the Spirit over the power of arms had victorious Christianity really carried out in practice the meekness of its Founder.”\(^1\) Constantine's edict of toleration (312–313) soon proved a dead letter, for any proselytism of Christians was forbidden. Jews were not allowed in Jerusalem, except on the day of the commemoration of its loss. Under Constantius, persecution was very bitter, and many Jews went to Babylonia. Marriage between Jew and Christian had been forbidden under pain of death (339). Roman legislation had prohibited the holding of Christian slaves by Jews.\(^2\) The argument employed by way of trying to win Jews from their faith ran somewhat as follows: “Why do you kill yourselves for your God? See how many punishments are inflicted upon you, how much you suffer in the way of confiscation of your goods! Come to us, and we will make you counts, nobles and peers.” It is instructive to compare with this\(^3\) the argument of the Jew which Aphraates reports in his twenty-first homily.\(^4\) In both cases the opponent reasons that that religious allegiance must be defective which involves persecution and suffering on the part of those most devoted to it. In the whole of the twenty-first homily Aphraates attempts to refute this argument, and to comfort and strengthen his brothers in the Christian Faith.\(^5\)

The great school cities of Babylonia were now flourishing. Abba Arikha,\(^6\) (“Rab”) a noble Babylonian, went to study with his uncle, R. Chiya, in Palestine, and completed his studies under R. Jehuda Hannasi. After the latter's death? he returned to his homeland, and founded the academy at Sura. (219 A. D.) As the sayings of over a hundred of his disciples\(^8\) are recorded in

1 Graetz, op. cit. vol. cit., p. 159.
2 ibid., pp. 161–166.
3 from Graetz, op. et vol. cit., p. 162.
4 932:8–18.
5 vide homily XXI, especially sec. 21.
6 Nidda 24b — quoted in Bacher, Agada d. babyl. Amor. He was of lofty stature, — a noble in appearance as well as in lineage and character.
7 As to the time of his return, — whether some years before the foundation of the academy at Sura, or just before that event, cf. Strack, Einleitung, pp. 100–101.
8 Mielziner, op. cit., p. 44.
the Talmud he can well be said to have obeyed the command of the men of the "Great Synagogue" — 

He gave a great impetus to the development of haggada, though it is doubtful whether a collection of haggadic material was really made in his day. As a bridge between the Tannaim and Amoraim he is held to have had the right to dispute precepts of the Mishnah. He died in 247 (A. D.).

There are two towns named Sura mentioned in Rabbinic literature. The Sura where Rab founded his academy lay on the west shore of the Euphrates, on an estuary, a good day's journey from Nehardea, and on lower ground than the latter. It was west from Pumbeditha. Neither in Nehardea nor in Sura were there any Christians. The work of Rab, besides being conspicuous for the large number of disciples he had gathered, made him eminent as a haggadist, who created and discovered new methods, while the content of his haggada may have been handed down by tradition. He employed the allegorical method very little. One of his methods was to compare the several possible meanings of a term, and another is that called "gematria." Bacher calls attention to the fact that the best developed and favorite element in haggada, the parable, was almost never used by Rab. His was a conspicuously original type of genius.

The city of Nehardea was in constant communication with Palestine until in 260 it was destroyed by Odenatus of Palmyra.

---

1 Pirke Aboth, i. ib.  
2 [Hebrew text]: Erub. 50b; Baba Bathra 42a, Sanh. 83b.  
3 Bacher, Agada d. babyl. Am., p. 45.  
4 Berliner, Beiträge zur Geographie, p. 55.  
5 Berliner, op. cit., p. 51.  
7 W. Bacher, op. cit.  
8 *ibid*, p. 30, note 199, where the few instances of the use of this method are given.  
9 Only two instances are ascertainable, — cf. op. cit., p. 31, and note 203.  
10 On his life, cf. M. J. Muhlfelder, Rabh; Ein Lebensbild zur Geschichte des Talmuds, Leipzig, 1871; and Strack op. cit., p. 101, where other references are given.  
11 Berliner, op. cit., pp. 50—56. Intercourse with Palestine via Nehardea was never so constant and so free as in the days of the first two generations of Amorain, cf. Bacher, op. cit., pp. 85ff.  
who in that year proclaimed himself king, and began a campaign against the Persian empire which brought him eventually into alliance with Rome. His real campaign against Sapur began in 265, when both in his own pretended right as an independent sovereign and also as subject of the Roman empire, he made inroads into the Persian state, which caused alarm and distress everywhere that his arms or his fame reached. To Odenatus the Jews applied the words of Dan. 7:8. Two Three years before the destruction of this city, of which the population of Jews must have opposed Odenatus as an expression of hostility against Rome and of that loyalty to Persia which Mar Samuel had engendered, Mar Samuel had died. He had succeeded R. Sheila as Resh Sidra in that city, after having studied in Palestine. R. Sheila had used the haggadic method of teaching, and his successor, Mar Samuel, continued to develop it. Examples of his haggada are found in the controversies between him and Rab, his friend. They used much the same method, but differed as to conclusions. With Rab he agreed in denouncing asceticism. Perhaps his conspicuous doctrine, with special relation to the subject matter of the present essay, is the principle which he enunciated that the civil law of the government is as valid for the Jews as their own law. He was superior to the great Rab in civil law. It was doubtless owing to his influence that certain conciliatory measures were adopted out of deference to the fanaticism of the Magi and their prescriptions regarding the use of fire, etc. This counsel allowed the Jews to bend gracefully beneath the storm of Zoroastrian

2 Graetz, op. cit. et vol. cit., p. 144. Graetz’s date for the destruction of Nehardea is 259.
6 Mielziner, op. cit., p. 44. The sentence דעתו של מבית העיר Baba Bathra 55a, is to be interpreted in the light of his teaching regarding the relation between the omnipotent power of the heavenly “Kingdom” (i.e., “Rule”) and the earthly power, which determined his whole attitude toward rule of the government under which he was, — cf. Baba Bathra, 3b; Arachin, 6a; Bacher, op. cit., p. 44–45, note 70.
7 Bechoroth 49b.
intolerance in the "New Persia" of the beginning of the Sassanid dynasty. The Christians, who evidently were incapable of such yielding and concessions, suffered extremely, especially in the cities of upper Mesopotamia,—the environs of Nisibis, and in Edessa, where they were by this time (226) firmly established, according to Graetz. The same loyalty to the new government, transition to which, however, was not always so easy, brought upon the Jews of Nehardea the wrath of Odenatus, as has been mentioned. This destruction of Nehardea is never mentioned in the Talmud, and Odenatus is there called רדנ ל苡מ. R. Nachunan, who followed R. Samuel, was the head of the academy at the time of this great calamity. Of the learned men associated with Nehardea, by far the most famous is R. Samuel, the impress of whose teaching was so widely extended and deep. The city itself lay on the N'har Malka, was the seat of the Resh G'lutha, and was one of the two loci on the circumference of Jewish "Babylonia," of which the second great seat of Jewish life at the other extreme on the East was Sura.

After the destruction of Nehardea the court moved to Machuza. Machuza was situated on the Tigris, not far from Nehardea, and on the N'har Malka. The Jews had there the protection of a large Persian garrison, which was, however, as much of an

1 op. et vol. cit., p. 142; on p. 143 Graetz asserts that Sapur I had been friendly with Mar S.
2 cf. the words of Rab upon the death of Artaban, p. 143, Graetz, op. cit.
3 Berliner, op. cit., p. 51.
4 cf. Eruvin 34b and Gittin 45a.
6 Baba Bathra 36a.
10 Sab. 147b; Taanith, 21a.
embarrassment as a benefit to them. Raba could not extend his customary invitation to all who were in need to come in and eat, lest he be swamped by the acceptance of his hospitality on the part of all of the soldiers of the garrison who might accept! There were many proselytes, whose morals were not of the best. The town suffered from its prosperity, in that temporal well-being induced spiritual laxity. It lay near to Seleucia, the capital of Sapur II, and was thus at the centre of the life of the Persian empire. While Rab Shesheth removed there from Nehardea after the destruction of that city, he left it shortly to found his school at Silhi. The great glory of Machuza, among the first three generations of Amoraim, was Raba (299—352). He had studied with R. Nachman and R. Hisda, and later under Rabba bar Nachmani. R. Abaye at Pumbaditha (see below) was his rival, but Raba's superior genius drew crowds of disciples to Machuza. Under these two, dialectics reached its greatest development. His public lectures and disputationes are more frequently related than those of any other Babylonian. A long midrash on Esther at the end of the tractate Megillah (10b—17a) is his work or that of his disciple, as is that on Lamentations in Sanhedrin 104b ff. By the time of Raba, wealth and prosperity had increased greatly. The poor were sharply divided from the rich. A similar separation between learned and unlearned, which distinction did not exist under the Tannaim, had also become a fact. Scholars had developed into a caste and had come to speak of the study of the Law as an end in itself. Thus the common people said of them: "What good are these scholars? They accumulate learning for themselves only!" Such, R. Joseph denounced as "heretics." Learned as Raba was, he had little

1 Berliner, op. cit., p. 40.
4 Mielziner, op. cit., p. 50.
5 Thus Bacher, op. cit., p. 119—121.
6 As did, e. g., R. Joseph; Meg. 16b, Sota a, Nidda 61b.
7 Sanhedrin 99b; and cf. Graetz, op. cit., p. 176.
patience with the people of Machuza, who were mostly proselytes. He was of pure Jewish strain and of a noble family. The virtues of humility, meekness, and unselfishness were not conspicuously displayed in his character. He had to maintain his standing with Sapur II by the payment of heavy tribute. When a man, convicted of a criminal offence according to the Jewish law (which Raba administered), was by his order flogged, and died, it was only the Queen Mother’s intercession with her son that stayed Sapur’s wrath. The Queen Mother, Ephra Hormiz, was throughout partial to the Jews, as is shown by her gifts of money to R. Joseph, and to Raba. Other gifts, as of sacrificial animals, were doubtless an embarrassment, save in so far as they assured the Jews of her goodwill. It is scarcely to be wondered at that Raba complains: “We have always been the servants of Ahasuerus.” On Lev. 13

1 1 instead of מֶלֶךְ וְאָוֶת, to give foundation for R. Isaac’s statement that “the Messiah would come when Rome became Christian.” It was probably not a mere interest in the fact which prompted him to say that Rome was more powerful than Persia, with his precarious tenure of the royal favor.

Next only to Nehardea and Sura in importance was the academy of Pumbeditha, where there was a community of Jews and a synagogue at the time of Rab. The town lay near Nehardea at the mouth of the canal named סור. Its inhabitants enjoyed no good reputation, but its renown was based upon the generations of great scholars who taught there. R. Jehuda bar Jecheskel, the

2 Taanith 24b. In spite of this, Raba did not escape the wrath of public opinion. Cf. Graetz, p. 177.
3 Baba Qama 8a.
4 Zebachim 116a, and cf. Nid. 20b.
5 The Acta Martyrum accuse her of conspiring with the Jews to incite her son to persecute them. This Duval (La lit. Syriaque, p. 134) rejects and Funk (Die haggadischen Elemente in den Homilien des Aphraates, p. 11) denies. For a discussion of her relations with Jews and Christians, cf. Pat. Syr., pars I, t. II, pp. 693—694, where Kmosko has collected all the evidence.
6 Megilla, 14a.
7 Sanhed. 97a.
8 Shevuoth 6a.
9 Sab. 110a.
“acute,” founded its academy, after studying under Rab at Sura and Mar Samuel at Nehardea. He was a contemporary of Rab Huna (212—297) who succeeded Mar Samuel at Sura in 257. At Rab Huna’s death he followed him as רבי מונרכא at Sura, dying two years later. Under Rabba bar Nachmani (270—330, called “Rabba”) who had studied under the Sura scholars, Rab Huna, Rab Juda, and Rab Hisda, the academy at Pumbeditha flourished. His authorship of the Palestinian Midrash to Genesis is denied by Bacher, on excellent grounds, since of recorded haggadic sayings attributed to him there are very few indeed.

Between Rabba and Rab Joseph (who succeeded him in 330, and only held office for three years), there was a deep friendship, based on mutual respect and the supremacy of each in his own field. Rabba was called the “uprooter of mountains,” and Rab Joseph “Sinai.” The former was eminent as a dialectician, the latter conspicuous for his knowledge about and exposition of the sources of the Law. R. Joseph worked on the Targum of the Bible, and translated and published the prophets in the vernacular. His primary devotion was to the text of the Bible rather than to deductions from it in the dialectic manner of Rabba. Very little haggadic material of either has come down to us... His employment of the parable — as, e.g., in Nidda 31a — is worthy of note especially because of the rarity of its use by the Babylonians. He valued the study of the Law more than works of piety.

Rabba had gathered a great number of students about him, and the flourishing academy of Pumbeditha with its more than one thousand students attracted the unfavorable attention of enemies of the Jews. It was said that many of his students attended his lectures in order to evade the poll tax, and, since he was charged

1 cf. Berach. 37a.
with conniving at this, Rabba fled, and died in solitude (330). This kind of hostility was, however, not altogether uncommon, in spite of the favor of the Queen Mother who sent a generous offering after Rabba's death to his successor, R. Joseph. The story is told of Rabba bar bar Chana, (who had studied under R. Jochanan bar Napacha at Tiberias, and had returned to his native land to propagate his teacher's methods and precepts) that during an illness R. Juda and his pupil Rabba visited him. It was on the festival of Ormuzd on which the Jews were not allowed lights, and a "geber" (= "fire priest") came in and extinguished the lamp while they were talking. Thereupon Rabba b. b. Chana cried out: "Either let us dwell under Thy protection, (= let us not live) — or at least under the protection of the children of Esau" (Rome).

This kind of petty inconvenience, however, did not disguise or alter the great fact that in the main the Jews under Sapur II were far better off than their fellow-countrymen under Roman rule. The Queen Mother's kind offices doubtless availed often to soften prejudice and remove the disabilities which the hostile priests of Zoroaster desired to place upon the practice of any religion but their own.

Under Rab Abaye Nachmani (280—338), who succeeded R.Joseph at Pumbeditha, the glory of the latter academy waned in the brilliance of Machuza, which attracted many pupils under Rabba's leadership. Contrary opinions of the two are almost always coupled together in the Talmud, but in practical matters Rabba's opinion almost always prevailed, only six instances to the contrary.

2 Baba Qama 8a.
3 Son of Abba bar Chana, not as Graetz makes him, R. b. Chana; cf. Bacher op. cit., p. 87, note 5.
5 Bacher, op. cit., p. 87, note 4.
6 Gittin 16:1.
8 Abba bar Abba said to his pupils: "Instead of gnawing at the bones served up to you in the academy of Abaye, go and eat meat at Rabba's school," (Baba bathra 22a); on the text and its emendation, cf. op. cit., Bacher, pp. 108—109, note 7.
being noted. His principles of interpretation are of considerable interest, being in many ways a reaction against the contemporary dialectic. Of the early fourth century Amoraim at Sura, Rab Chisda (219—309) and Rabba bar Huna his successor (died 322), were contemporaries of Rab Abaye and Raba. At the death of Rabba bar Huna the academy at Sura was deserted until the time of Rab Ashe. At the time Aphraates wrote his controversial homilies (344—345), the dominant Jewish school was that of Machuza under Raba, which had now supplanted both Pumbeditha and Sura, Sura, in its turn, having yielded the palm to Pumbeditha under the presidency of Rab Joseph and Abaye Nachmani. The great throngs of Jews from all over Babylonia which attended Raba’s lectures must have carried his teaching far and wide. To him, as has been said, are ascribed the two Midrashim on Esther and Lamentations. He was an eminent haggadist who employed the haggadic method very largely, though he did not reject the popular proverb. The Jews enjoyed a comparatively quiet and untroubled existence under the Sassanids from the time of Mar Samuel on. The difficulties they experienced from time to time were a sharp lesson. The moral to be drawn from each clash between the Jews and the government was merely the rediscovery of the truth of Mar Samuel’s dictum that the civil law of the government should be accepted as the civil law of the Jews. The conciliatory attitude which he adopted served as a modus vivendi. Every violation of his principle only proved its value both theoretically and practically.

IV. The Homilies of Aphraates in relation to Jewish thought

Conditions of Jews and Christians During the Persecution compared

For the Christian there was no such way out. Even under the loose government of the oriental dynasty of the Sassanids, the

1 Baba Mataia 21b; Sanhedrin 27a; Erubin 15a; Kidd 52a; Gittin 34a.
4 Baba Bathra 55a.
5 On its organization cf. Nöldeke’s Tabari, pp. 102, 436—458; and Labourt’s Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse, pp. 1—9.
measure of autonomy which the Christians enjoyed in the north and in Seleucia, only made them restive. A state under Christian rule, with the Church fully recognized and supreme in her own domain, was the only ideal worth living for. The condition of the Church under the Sassanids was tolerable only as an interim stage. When persecution broke out against them the real issue was revealed. Rome was the Christian state, and its ruler, who took counsel always with the Bishops whom he constantly had with him and held in high reverence, the means for delivering captive Christians, exiles in a foreign and hostile land. The prophecies of the exile were perhaps more luminous with meaning for Christians than for the Jews of their day.

If Raba thought Rome more powerful than Persia, and Rabba bar bar Chana fretfully wished for Roman domination as a relief from the petty inconveniences of Persian rule, Aphraates openly expressed his views in no uncertain terms. "That kingdom of the children of Esau will not be given over to the forces now gathered which are coming up against it, for it (now) guards the kingdom for Him who has given it, and He it is who protects it." The reason that Roman power had not yet conquered Persia is that Rome did not carry Him

1 In homily XXIII Aphraates had seemingly come to despair of this ideal being realized in his day, and his vision became entirely "otherworldly" (cf. II:144:19—25, and the whole of Sec. 67). This is not necessarily an inconsistency, since the failure of a concrete human hope would not alter the fundamentally supernatural cast of his ideals, but, rather, bring them into sharper prominence.

2 cf. the list of quotations from the prophets, references, and occasions, in Parisot's ed., vol. II, pp. 482-484.

3 cf. especially secs. 1, 3, 13, 23—25.

4 Shevuoth 6a.

5 Gittin 16b.

6 Aph. 233:12—15
in their midst by whom the victory was to be won. Now that Rome is Christian the designs of God are to be carried out. Rome is now a fit instrument for God to use in the fulfilment of his own prophecy. Aphraates claims to build this certain forecast on the words of St. Luke 14°, alleging that it is consistent with God's previous ways of working in mankind. Persia (he felt in 336—337) was certainly doomed to defeat at the hands of Rome.

Common Elements in Aphraates and Contemporary Judaism: the Same Envisagement of Religion.

Once persecution had broken out, many difficulties beset the Christians. In the districts where the persecutions were not organized, (for in the early years there were only local outbreaks, and it was but for a comparatively short time that there was a systematic persecution all over the Empire,) there were many things to fear: apostasy into a formal adherence to the government religion; despair and lapse into irreligion, and even a lapse into Judaism. Aphraates' "controversial" homilies show that the danger of lapsing into Judaism was the occasion and reason for their being written. They are written primarily for Christians, with a special view to providing Aphraates' fellow-believers with the necessary defence against Jewish attack. Their object was not to convert Jews, but to roll back the danger with which the Christians were being beset. The Jewish argument was cogent. Christian and Jew had the same one God. Christian and Jew recognized the same Old Testament and used the same text (the

1 cf. latter part of sec. 23 of the fifth homily.
2 cf. La Christianisme dans l'empire Persé, pp. 56—86; De persecutione Saporis, being chapter III of the Preface to St. Simeon bar Sabba'e, by M. Kmosko, in Pat. Syr., Pars I, t. II, pp. 690—713.
3 cf. Le Christianisme, p. 62.
5 That this was a real possibility is seen from sec. 22 of the Narratio de St. Simeon b. Sab., cf. Pat. Syr., pars I, t. II, col. 823.
6 cf. 489:19—20; 528:8—9; 532:19—24; 533:21—24; 540:2—4; 568:6—10; 572:20—23; homily 15, sec. 1, 744:15—20; 757:12—15, etc.
If some of the members of the church of Aphraates had been Jews, a return to their original faith would not be difficult, especially under the conditions of the time when Jews were comparatively free from the sort of persecution to which the Christians were exposed. If the condition of convert Jews in the Christian communities of Persia was so unhappy, because of the pressure of Persian persecutions and the none too friendly attitude of the Jews, exempt as they were from the official disfavor which had fallen upon the Christians,—the lot of Persian Gentile converts was still harder. Persian Christians felt the force of the demands of loyalty to the Persian emperor, since all were of the same blood. Furthermore, the Latin and the Persian were natural enemies. Judaism offered a compromise, for it would be a great advance over their former paganism. They could still be monotheists; they could retain their ethical standards, and their religion would be of the same general type as Christianity. By becoming proselytes of Judaism they could in a measure save their consciences and, at the same time, clear themselves of the stigma of disloyalty to their own government and declare themselves on the side of their fellow-countrymen against the hated foreigner.

The strong common bonds between Judaism and the Christianity of the Church of Aphraates made a reversion to Judaism not at all difficult. His Christianity was envisaged in the same terms as Judaism. One cannot but notice that the two religions were of the same quality. No alien philosophy was interlocked with his theology, so that the two could not be separated. Perhaps the greatest distinctively Christian element in his theology was Aphraates' doctrine of the Sacraments. But it was no such doctrine as could be aligned with the type of sacramental teaching of the heathen mystery religions; it was predominantly ethical.¹

¹ It was a contemporary of Aphraates who translated the prophets into the vernacular Aramaic — Rab Joseph (ob. 333). cf. Graetz, Gesch., op. et vol. cit., p. 171.

The Jews looked for a Messiah; Aphraates said that this Messiah had already come. The Jews held that the Messiah should be such as to fulfill all prophecies; Aphraates taught that all Christian teachings, practices, and dogmas had their type in the Old Testament. As Jesus was foreshadowed by many great worthies of the Old Testament, so the ordinances of the New Covenant were related as fulfilment, or antitype, to the "types" found in the Old. Thus Circumcision, the type, gave way to its fulfilment; Baptism; the Passover, to the Eucharist; the *הַנְּשָׁפָה* to the Church; the Law, to the Gospel. Christianity was essentially the flowering of the plant Judaism. He could not conceive of the New Testament without the Old,—the Gospel without the Law: Fulfilment without Prophecy. It is worthy of note that just those sides of Pauline teaching appeal to Aphraates' thought as had reference to the relation of Jesus to the prophecies, of the Church to Israel, of Christian ordinances to their types in the O.T.; only such elements of Pauline teaching were really assimilated and thoroughly digested. It is just where

1 Homily XVII, "That the Messiah is the Son of God," is "against the Jews" (785:1-2) and especially secs. 9-12.


3 813:6-25; Jacob's vision, a foreshadowing of Jesus the Messiah, cf. 148:1-4; XI sec. 12; Jacob, XXI, sec. 9; Moses, sec. 10, etc., all as prophetic types of Jesus.

4 The contrast in Aph. is between *יְסֵל* and *לִפְסָה*. *יְסֵל* = "mystery" (also in sense of "sacrament.")


6 "The mystery (אֶלִיפָל) of the Passover was given to the Former People, (i. e. the Jews) but its fulfilment (lit., "truth" = אֶלִיפָה) to-day is preached among the Gentiles." (516:4-5).

7 II:40:10-13; II:92:12-15; Hom. XXI, sec. 20, the *לָפְתִי* 765:4-5.

8 There are almost twice as many quotations from the Old, as from the New Testament: approximately 1056 to 564 instances of explicit quotation.

9 The "Diatessaron", which Aph. used with the addition of the genealogical passages, is based upon the first Gospel. It would not have been uncongenial to Aph. that the bulk of that Gospel, which aims at displaying the eminent character of Jesus as Fulfiller of prophecy, should be incorporated into the Diatessaron.

10 Cf. Rom. 9:6; I Cor. 10:18; Gal. 6:16.

11 Rom. 4:11, 12; Gal. 5:2, 5, 6; 6:12, 13, 15; Col. 2:11, 12 3:11; Eph. 2:11; Phil. 3:3; I Cor. 10, 12:13; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3, 4; Heb. 6:2, etc.

12 For example, there is no strong indication of any appreciation of the characteristic Pauline doctrine of "justification by faith", though Aph. does use the words-
St. Paul functioned as a Jew that Aphraates best understands his thought. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, supplied what Aphraates very greatly needed: the theory of the fulfilment of the High Priesthood in Jesus.\(^1\)

Aphraates regarded the Gospels as his *Torah*. The Epistles were an inspired commentary on and interpretation of them. It is not straining the facts to think of him as a kind of interpreter of this *Mishna*—the Epistles. The very words of the Gospel had both a literal as well as an allegorical or symbolic meaning; yet he did not base all of his teaching on the text of Scripture. Its interpretation was to be sought for in tradition, and any deduction of an individual were to be aligned with the consensus of living opinion in the Church. Of his doctrine about Jesus,\(^2\) His Person and work, it is sufficient here to say that he thought of Him at least as Messiah in the Jewish meaning of the word.\(^3\) The new Race which had Jesus at its Head stood in a peculiarly intimate relation with God.\(^4\) The bond between the Christian and God was initiated and sustained by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit,—the same Holy Spirit which had inspired the Old Testament prophets, and had spoken through them.\(^5\) The Sacraments were the means by which the Holy Spirit was given to the individual.\(^6\) Here he would seem to diverge radically from the Jewish conception of grace and of the gift of the Spirit. But this divergence is not so fundamental, if it be kept in mind that

---

\(^1\) E.g., cf. Hebs. 4:15, Aph. 645:21—22 (cf. whole of Hom. XIV, sec. 28); Heb. 9:11, 12, Aph. in Hom. II, sec. 6, 920:25—26; Heb. 9:16, 17 also in II:33:2—3; Heb. 10:3, 31 in II:5:2—3, etc.

\(^2\) Cf. Hom. XXII, sec. 26; V, sec. 25; II, sec. 14 (where he says he has been taught by *Rabbi Φθυδιοι*: 77:9) I, sec. 20; XII, sec. 12.

\(^3\) Cf. Hom. XVII.

\(^4\) Cf. I Cor. 15:44—49 and Aph., 308: I—II.


\(^6\) The gift of the Spirit was by Baptism (293:2—5, etc.).
in the Law sin was originally conceived of as a kind of infection which could be removed by material means. Similarly holiness might be communicated by these means. Ethical and religious notions were not clearly separated.  

While Aphraates says little explicitly about the excellence of the study of Holy Scripture, he everywhere gives evidence of the practice of that principle.  

Few Christians have shown such a wide and intimate acquaintance with the Bible. Nowhere does he spin a theory or any part of his doctrine out of thin air. One is forced to feel that he was sincerely convinced that every element of his teaching was based on and deduced from the words of Holy Writ. Tradition, as was suggested, had a great share in the development and interpretation of the meaning of Holy Scripture.  

The Church "of the Gentiles" stood in the same relation to God under the new Christian Dispensation as had Israel under the Old.  

He felt, in short, that his spiritual ancestors were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and the prophets.  

There is an excellent commentary in Seeley's *Natural Religion* on the relationship of race to religion. The author points out that the triumph of Christianity is not the victory of certain ideas, so much as "the idealization of the Jewish nationality. It is the extension of the Jewish citizenship to the Gentile. It is this so truly . . . . that the nations of Europe actually adopt as their own the entire history and literature of Israel, so that Jewish traditions, heroes, and poets everywhere supersede the native treasures of memory".  

Scarcely a more clear case illustrating the action of this principle can be found than that afforded by the *Homilies* of Aphraates. In fact his dependence goes still further than in

---

1 Cf. G. F. Moore, *History of Religions*, vol. II, *Judaism, Christianity, Moham-

2 edanism*, New York, Scribner's, 1919, pp. 42—43.  

3 Cf. *the wide range of his knowledge and the extraordinary number of quo-
tations used by Aph., in Parisot's ed., vol. II (pars I of Pat. Syr.) Syllabus locorum
Sacrae Scripturae*, pp. 481—486.  

4 Cf. 77:9; etc.  

5 404:12—13; Hom. XVI sec. 3; (765:4—5) sec. 5; 980:20—22; Hom. XXI,
sec. 20, etc.  

6 468:1—5.  

the case of other Gentile or non-Semitic Christian writers. Gentile though he was, Aphraates had adopted for himself all of the spiritual ancestry of Judaism. He did this so thoroughly, and so utterly effaced any traces of allegiance to the spiritual past of his own race, that despite the fact of his non-Jewish nationality 1 (based upon indubitable evidence), he was thoroughly conversant with, and dependent upon Jewish tradition. „Wie vollkommen noch im vierten Jahrhundert die syrische Kirche im Verständnisse des A. T. an die jüdische Tradition gebunden war, zeigen in auffallender Weise die Homilien des Afraats”. 2 The extent of this dependence was first suggested in detail by Funk, 3 who gives fifteen instances of haggadic interpretation and illustration of Genesis, eight of Exodus, two of Leviticus, three of Numbers, five of Deuteronomy, and six other instances,—with a doubtful seventh, 4—of dependence on Aphraates' part, on haggadic material. Parisot adds a number of illustrations of this affiliation with current Jewish tradition. 5

"No Church father was ever so strongly influenced by rabbinical Judaism as this defender of Christianity against the Jews... In certain very important questions concerning the soul, God, retribution, etc., he shows himself a docile pupil of the Jews... His doctrine of the two attributes of God—justice and mercy 6—is decidedly Jewish... The oldest rabbinical source is the Sifre

1 789; 19—21; 801:6—16; 804:1—2.
4 Cf. op. cit., pp. 53—59; on Aph.' doctrine of the "sleep of the soul" (e. g., Aph. 293:2—25; 296:1—26; 297:1—6; Hom. XXI, sec. 6, etc.) in which the identity of the Jewish elements has been completely lost, since Aph.' teaching is based upon his own peculiar reading of 1 Cor. 15:44. Cf. my article on The Sleep of the Soul in early Syriac Church in the JAOS, April, 1920, pp. 103—120, and Monatschrift f. Gescl. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth., 1899, pp. 64 ff.
5 In Pat. Syr., pars I, col I, s. v. Aphraates' Doctrina-præfatio, pp. xlix-xl. That Aph. calls Pharaoh Necho, "Pharaoh the Lame" (יַהֲנוֹם שְׁבָתֹן 972:6—7) does not involve any individual indebtedness to Jewish tradition since it had already thus interpreted the text in the Peshitto.
6 E. g., 268:18—19.
to Deuteronomy (ed. Friedmann, sec. 27) "... Only on the day of judgment is recompense dealt out (cf. Hom. VIII, sec. 10), since the soul sleeps till the Great Day. This peculiar conception of a soul slumber ... was widespread among the Jews in Aphraates' time."¹ It is not to be wondered at that so intimate a connection is discerned between Aphraates and Judaism,² if it be recalled that in language, geographical proximity, and in respect to a kind of imputed spiritual ancestry, he was at one with them. Furthermore the distinction suggested above, between apologetic and dogmatic, had no need to be drawn. There was a common appeal to a common authority—the Law and its traditional interpretation.

Concrete instances of Aphraates' dependence upon Jewish thought, and affiliation with it.

1. Aphraates' doctrine of (a) Creation, man, and the soul.

Aphraates' references to the Creation follow the text of Genesis, but much of what he says embodies elements of an undoubtedly Jewish origin. In Hom. XVII, commenting on Psalm 90¹⁻², he says: "Know, beloved, that all creatures above and below were first created, then after them all, man. For when God first considered creating the world and all its adornments, from the very first He conceived and shaped man in His Mind. After He had conceived man in His thought, He then conceived the creatures .... In conception man is, therefore, older than the creatures, and previous to them. In birth they are older than man and previous to him .... When God had completed the world and adorned it so that there was nothing lacking to it, then He begat Adam from His mind. He molded man with His own hands .... and God placed him over all His works, as a man who wishes to make a marriage feast for his son, procures a wife for him, builds

the house, and provides everything his son may need... Thus after He had conceived Adam, God begat him and gave Him rule over every creature." Of the several un biblical elements in this account, counterparts exist in contemporaneous Jewish literature. There is a distinction drawn, for example, between the six things which preceded the creation of the creatures. "Some of these were (actually) created and others God had in His mind to create... The Torah and the Throne of Glory were created... The Fathers, Israel, the Holy Sanctuary, and the Name of the Messiah arose in the mind of the Creator."2 "The Spirit hovering over the face of the waters", according to R. Simeon ben Lakish, was the "soul of the King Messiah",3 which thus evidently must have preexisted creation. The words of Ps. 1395 were taken to refer to the creation of man. Thus, R. Jochanan couples them with Gen. 126, and Rabbi Akiba says that "after" (תֵּאַל) refers to the first day, and "before" (ידָSegments not found), to the last day (of creation). He applies the words of Gen. 124 to the soul of Adam. R. Simeon b. Lakish, on the other hand, says: "'After', (that is, after) the work of the last day, and "before" the work of the first day".4 There seems to be a faint hint at the thought afterward developed by Aphraates in these words of R. Simeon.

Again, according to a Jewish tradition "Adam was created on Sabbath eve... that he might at once go to a meal. It is like a human king who has built a palace, and when he has it completed then spreads a feast, and afterwards invites the guests".5 Thus Adam was created last in order that all things might be ready for him.6 That God distinguished man from the rest of His Creation by molding him with His own hands, while the creatures were made by the word of His mouth is frequently alluded to.7 Adam had two conspicuous advantages over creaturedom: he

---

1 797: I—3; 3—10; 11—15; 17—19.
2 Mid. Ber. Rab. 15.
3 Ibid., 8a.
4 Ibid.
5 Sanh. 38a, cf. parallel in St. James of Edessa (who may be indebted also to Aph.) in L. Ginzberg, Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern, p. 24.
6 Tosefta Sanh. 8 7—9 upon which follows the above quotation of Sanh. 38a.
was made by the very hands of God, and was also the culmination of the process of creation. "Each successive thing in creation bears the rule over that which was created before it: thus the firmament over the heavens, the herb over the firmament, . . . . and (God said to man) ye are created after all to have the rule over all". The serpent tempted Eve by urging her to eat of the fruit of the tree "lest other worlds be created, and they rule over you", and thus man might forfeit the preeminence he now held. We may see from these examples how Aphraates combines several Jewish elements in the piecing together of his first creation story in the seventeenth homily. Even a superficial examination shows that its tenor and method are obviously quite in the style of the Rabbis.

Aphraates further says of the original endowment of Adam, that "after God begat man from His thought, and molded him and breathed His Spirit into him, He gave him the power of discrimination, of knowing good from evil, and the power of acknowledging His Creator as his Maker". This "breathing into man of His Spirit" is what Aphraates in another place calls the natural soul (אַנְשֵׁי לְאֹי), and it was given at the "first birth" (מִּשְׁתַּחֵז). This is created in man, and is immortal. The Pauline doctrine of "natural" and "spiritual" (cf. I Cor. 15) is of course back of his thought when he says: "At the day of Resurrection, those who have not been changed will remain in their natural state in the nature of the earth which Adam had, and will abide on the earth below". Even in this case, the "natural" soul is conceived of as being immortal, though it is of a different quality of immortality to the "spiritual" soul given by Baptism. What I wish to suggest here is that Aphraates was convinced of the immortal character of the life principle with which Adam—

1 Thus R. Jehuda bar Simon, in Mid. Ber. Rab. 196.  
2 R. Joshua in the name of R. Levi, ibid.  
3 800: 2—6.  
4 293: 5—9. Aphraates believed in a second birth, and a special gift of the Spirit through Baptism,—by compensation, through the work of Jesus, for the presence of the Spirit lost through sin, but this topic need not be entered upon here.  
and his descendants—were endowed, and to note that the gift of this immortal principle carried with it (a) the capacity for speech, and (b) the faculty for the recognition of God as man’s Lord and Creator.

The Targum Onkelos on Gen. 27 translates פֶּן חֲרָצִים by רַחֲמִי thus implying the association between the power of speech and the gift of the “living soul”. According to Aphraates when man recognized and acknowledged his Creator, then God took up His dwelling in man, “being formed and conceived in the mind of man, who (thereby) became the Temple of God”. On the other hand, failure thus to acknowledge God reduces the deniers to the level of the animals, and such men “were accounted as beasts before Him”. Aphraates is perfectly certain that the presence of God in the individual is determined by the free will of man, who can either accept or reject his proper allegiance. According to the Jewish tradition Adam, after naming the animals, being asked by God who He was, answered: “Thy Name is Adonai, for Thou art the Lord of all Thy Creation.” R. bar Chama said that when Adam refused to recognize His Creator he “became as a beast”.

b) The Fall, death, and the curse.

Aphraates believed that there was a loss of this presence of God at the Fall. Man’s sin brought the curse of death upon Adam and his posterity. His sin was disobedience, and the curse pronounced upon him was the penalty of labor, because of the curse upon the earth for Adam’s sake, and death. God gave Adam an opportunity to repent: “When Adam had sinned, God called him to repentance, when He said: ‘Adam, where art thou?’ But he concealed his sin from the Searcher of hearts, and brought

1 800: 6—9.
2 Ps. 73:32: 800: 15—16.
3 Aph. even distinguished a service of God undertaken freely and without command, a “work of supererogation”—as it were, cf. 845: 19—25.
4 Mid. Ber. Rab. 175.
5 In Sankh. 383, and cf. Pesikta R. 349 (at end).
6 324: 6—11; 992: 6—19 (cf. Rom. 5:12, 14); II: 9: 5—13, etc.
accusation against Eve that she had deceived him. For the reason that he had not acknowledged his sin, (God) decreed upon him death, and (also) upon all his posterity".  

"On the day thou eatest of it thou shalt surely die" is interpreted in the Targum Jonathan: "thou shalt become worthy of death".  

Aphraates says: "When God laid the injunction upon Adam... and afterwards Adam transgressed it, and ate, he lived nine hundred and thirty years, but because of his sin he was as dead before God". 

Part of the first quotation of Aphraates is almost word for word given in the Midrash R. to Numbers. "R. Tanchuma b. Aba said... when Adam had transgressed the command of the Holy One..... and had eaten of the tree, the Holy One looked for him to make an act of repentance, but he did not". 

The words מ名录 are taken to imply the curse of death on Adam's descendants, as well as on himself and Eve. God said of man: "If he sin, he shall die, and if he sin not, he shall live". Death followed man's sin, but Adam did not die immediately: "When I said, 'On the day thou eatest of it thou shalt surely die', ye knew not whether I meant one of my days, or one of yours. Behold I give one of my days of a thousand years', and Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years, and left the seventy years to his sons". (While Adam lost the term of his natural life, still God gave him life for one of His own days,—cf. Ps. 90 4). Aphraates said that Adam was "dead" because he was in sin, and speaks of those who, while still alive in the flesh, are really dead spiritually because of their sins. The lot of the righteous on whom the curse even of death rested in spite of their holiness, was a subject for rabbinical disputation. God answered the angels, who asked Him why Adam had died, by saying: "Because he did not carry
yet Moses and the great patriarchs had died, and Moses had not committed sin as had Adam. When Moses thus appealed to God, God yet decreed death upon him; “because of the sin of the First Man thou art to die, for he brought death into the world”. R. Levi illustrated this same doctrine by the parable of the child born during his mother’s imprisonment. “When he grew up it chanced that one day the King passed by the prison, and the youth appealed: ‘Why, my Lord King, am I bound in prison?’ The King answered: ‘This is due to thy mother’s sin’”. “There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked man, to the good and to the pure”. R. Ami said: “There is no death without sin... Upon Adam was decreed death because he transgressed a very light command of God... Why then did Moses and Aaron die? Because there is one event”, etc. The application of the text quoted to Moses and Aaron is made in the Mid. Koheleth, ad loc.

One Jewish tradition finds the same solution of the difficulty regarding the relative lots of the evil and good on earth, that death reigns over both alike, as is suggested by Aphraates. In commenting on the text of Eccl. 9 a midrash is given to the effect that “the living know that they will die,—this refers to the righteous who are called ‘living’ even though they die; the dead have no knowledge—this means the wicked, who though living are called ‘dead’. Thus in the text ‘about the land—which I sware unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, saying, etc.’ God spake not to the Fathers,—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,—but to Moses: ‘Go, and say to them that I have fulfilled my oath which I sware to them’, saying ‘to thy seed shall I give it’. But the wicked are called ‘dead’, as it is said, (Ezek. 11)... This refers to the wicked who in their lifetime are called ‘dead’.” But Aphraates meant more by his use of the thought than that the wicked are “called

1 Sifre 141a. 2 Mid R. Debarim 94
3 Ibid. 4 Eccl. 9. 5 Sab. 55b.
6 91: Moses is “the good”. Cf. Ex. 2 and Aaron “the pure” since he is concerned with the laws of purification.
8 Numbers 32 11.
9 Mid. Koheleth 94.
dead”. He understood that on their higher spiritual side they were actually without the indwelling Spirit of God. The wicked forfeit the Spirit's presence as he does who refuses to recognize and acknowledge His Creator—and are thereby reduced to the level of animals, saving only that they are immortal.

As we have seen, Aphraates believed that repentance on Adam's part would have restored him to God's favor. “The folly of Adam consisted in not saying 'I have sinned' but in maintaining his innocence.”¹ The contrast to “folly” is “wisdom”, the end of which is repentance and good works.² “Happy is he who sins not, and if he sin, repent, that it be well with him.”³ According to R. Simeon b. Lakish, Adam was not driven from the Garden of Eden until he had reviled and blasphemed God.⁴ Adam's sin lost him his place in the Garden, and he incurred the double curse of labor and death.

The curse laid upon the serpent is related by Aphraates as follows: "When the serpent was jealous of Adam in paradise he incurred upon himself a threefold curse: God deprived him of his feet, and he crawled upon his belly; he took away his food, and gave him dust (for food); he made him the enemy whom man should tread under foot,⁵—since on his feet he had come to commit sin, and had attacked Adam, and through food had seduced Eve.”⁶ So the serpent gained a certain power over mankind by the Fall, for “we are the food of the serpent.”⁷ The fact that dust was to be the serpent's food (Gen. 3:14) and was also that to which man, by the curse laid upon him, "was to return" (Gen. 3:20) establishes the inference which Aphraates drew that man was the food מָאָכָל of the serpent.⁸

According to Jewish tradition, God was willing to treat with Adam and Eve and would have forgiven them on their showing

---

² For parallels cf. Hershon, Homesh ... lephi Hattalmud, p. 141, etc.
³ Succ. 53a.
⁴ Mid. Ber. R. 1922.
⁵ 424: 25—26; 425: 1—4.
⁶ 600: 1—5.
⁷ 89: 19—20.
⁸ 676: 20—21; 732: 18—19; 241: 2—3; 6—7, etc.
signs of repentance, but He refused to deal with the serpent,—“an evil beast and a master at repartee.”¹ “As the First Man sat in the Garden and the ministering angels roasted flesh and chilled wine for him, the serpent taking note of these attentions, and observing his happy state, grew jealous,”² and then plotted his downfall. He was also jealous of Adam and wanted Eve for himself.³ “When the Holy One . . . said to the serpent, ‘upon thy belly shalt thou go,’ the ministering angels descended and cut off his hands and feet, and his cry was heard from one end of the world to the other . . . .”⁴ R. Asi and R. Hoshia explain it thus: “. . . God said ‘I made thee King over cattle and animals, and thou didst not seek it; I made thee to walk upright like a man, and thou didst not seek it;—‘upon thy belly shalt thou go’; I made thee to eat food like a man, but thou didst not desire it,—and ‘dust thou shall eat all the days of thy life’; thou didst desire to slay Adam and to take Eve to thyself,—and ‘I have set enmity between thee and the woman . . . .’ ”⁵

The sin on Adam’s part,—according to Aphraates—was his pride.⁶ “Because (through pride) he hearkened to the serpent the first man received as penalty that he should become his food.”⁷ Eve’s fall was occasioned by her weakness in yielding to temptation, and the appeal, in her case, was to the flesh.⁸ Thus the fall in Jewish tradition is attributed to Adam’s pride and disobedience, to Eve’s lust, to the wiles of the serpent, and to the deceit of Satan.⁹ Aphraates says in homily XII that the serpent was none other than Satan.¹⁰ The Devil foiled God’s plan for raising man even to a still higher state, should he have obeyed

¹ Mid. Ber. R. 203.
⁵ Ibid, 2011. Lust was the chief reason for the serpent’s deed, according to Sota 9a-b, where substantially the same account is repeated with a slightly different coloring.
⁷ II : 5 : 9—12.
⁸ Cf. Hom. XXIII, especially sec. 3.
¹⁰ 524 : 17—18.
God's command. In the last resort, R. Simeon B. Lakish says all evil is traceable to a single source, for "Satan, the evil yezer, and the angel of Death are all one."

2. (a) Sin and the yezer hara.

It is because of his evil yezer ("impulse"), according to the Rabbis, that a man sins. Man has properties in common with the animals below, and also qualities that are from above. Of the six works of creation, some were from above, and some from below. When it came time to create man, God said: "If I create him from that which is above, then such works will outnumber those from below, and if I create him from that which is below, they will outnumber the former . . . . I shall create him from that which is both above and below, as it is written, 'and God the Lord moulded Adam,' etc.,—of dust from the earth,—from below,—and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,—from above." The doctrine of the two yezers was attached to the text Gen. 27, in which the word יֵשֶׁר has two yods,—"this means the good yezer and the evil yezer." The word itself might mean (a) something which God has made, or (b) something which man works, according to F. C. Porter. The rabbis dealt with the practical method to escape sin and conquer it, rather than with any speculations regarding its origin. They were following the line of the teaching of the apocryphal and pseud-epigraphical literature in so doing. The sequence in history is noted, but it is regarded as rather a temporal than a causal

1 439:16—25.
2 Baba Bathra 97a.
3 Gen. 27.
5 Ibid., 144.
6 Cf. Deut. 3121.
sequence. It is in line with the Semitic way of thinking to conceive of events in a *temporal* sequence, while the Greek mind would be prone to find rather a *causal* sequence in the same facts. The theologians who followed the speculative philosophers of Greece found in Adam’s sin the cause of our own sinning. Hence was developed the theory of “original sin.” The Rabbis were not concerned with the speculative problems. “Original sin” is not a rabbinic doctrine. The “Fall of man... can mean only the original experience of the individual... It cannot refer to mankind as a whole, for the human race has never experienced a fall, nor is it affected by original or hereditary sin.”

The question in the rabbinic mind was rather how to deal with the ever present problem, than to speculate about its origin.

The doctrine of the ‘yeser hattob’ and the ‘yeser hara’ is the rabbinic method of meeting the problem. The evil impulse and the good impulse were both created in man by God. “It does not appear that its origin was traced to man’s sin. It must have explained his sin.” The philosophical difficulty involving an inherently evil disposition in man as God made him, is not grappled with by the Rabbis. The Rabbis speculated when it was given man, whether at birth or before, but in any case they conclude that the evil impulse does not make itself felt until a certain age has been reached. “God made man that he should become righteous. If you ask, ‘how is it possible for one to make good what God has made evil?’ God answers, ‘thou hast made it to be evil.’ A babe sins not, nor a five, six, seven, eight or nine year-old child, but at ten and from then on the evil impulse grows, and the Holy One says: ‘Thou hast made it evil.’ The soul comes pure from the hands of God and must be returned

---

3 Cf. treatment of the question in *Yoma 69b*.
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7 Cf. *Gen. 8 21b*.
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to Him in purity." Consecutively each man sins of himself; Adam was the cause of his own, and no one's else sin.²

Some of the other Rabbinic passages have been interpreted to involve a real dualism between spirit and matter. Thus Weber³ says that the evil yeṣer inheres in pre-existent matter, which always manifests a certain character of rebellion against God. He adds that it is resident in the material part of man, while the good yeṣer inheres in his spiritual faculties. That Weber is quite wrong is shown conclusively by Porter.⁴ For example, Weber's translation of ἐνόμιμον as "body" is misleading, as is clear from such a passage as Aboth ⁴.¹⁰: "whosoever honors the law is himself (ἐνόμιμον) honored." There is no dualism in Rabbinic theology. Man is considered a unity of body and soul,⁵ and both are essential to the notion of man. There is no opposition between matter and spirit discernible in Judaism. "The Greek idea of the material body as the seat and source of sin gained difficult and limited access to the Jewish mind".⁶ "The Rabbis are never dualists after Plato's kind. It is man that sins, and man is neither body nor soul, but the union of the two."⁷

The evil and the good yeṣer both reside in the moral person, the inner self. They inhere in the same body and soul. "The heart of wisdom on the right hand,⁸ that is, the good impulse.... the heart of folly on the left, that is, the evil impulse."⁹ The evil yeṣer is conceived of not only as a resident passion or impulse but even as a foreign and alien element. While it is in man, it is not of him, as in the highest stratum of man's constitution. R. Jochanan b. Nuri said: "This is the way the evil yeṣer operates: to-day it may say to a man, 'do this' (to-morrow, 'do that') and

¹ Mid. Koheleth Rabba 12 7.
² As in Apoc. Bar. 54 15, 19.
³ Jüdische Theologie, pp. 201 ff.
⁸ Cf. Eccl. 10 2.
finally it tells him to commit idolatry and he does . . . R. Abin said: ‘from what text is this derived? (from the words)’ there shall not be in thee any strange God, thou shalt not worship any alien Divinity.’ What sort is this ‘strange God?’ It is the evil yeṣer.’ The evil yeṣer has led astray whole peoples. Occasionally it is conceived of as an almost personal alien power: “The evil yeṣer misleads men in this world, and in the world to come acts as διάβολος against them”. Raba says that it is at first called the “traveler”, the “guest”, and then after sojourning a time in man takes up its permanent abode in him, and acts as master.

It is an overwhelming outside force, a passion. Bacher interprets the controversy between R. Akiba and R. Meir about the evil yeṣer by saying that the point of their conclusions is that the greatest moral strength without divine protection is not sufficient to protect a man against its onslants. Only the special help of God given in answer to prayer avails to make man’s struggle against the evil impulse victorious. “God decrees all the events of man’s life, but whether he be righteous or wicked, He does not predetermine, but this matter is left in man’s own hand(s), as it is said: ‘behold I have put before thee to-day life, the good, death, and the evil’.” The great moral struggle is to give the allegiance of the will and deed to the rightful lord. The evil yeṣer is likened to a foolish old king, the good yeṣer to a young but poor king. The force of the comparison lies in the fact that the latter does not receive the full allegiance of all men, and is therefore “poor”, but yet wise, “since the good yeṣer incites to wise actions and the way of righteousness”. They only who obey the behests of the good yeṣer can be said really to possess life.

In the majority of men the evil yešer is the stronger, and the good yešer the weaker. The great moral struggle is to dethrone the evil yešer and set up the rightful king. "All the time the righteous live, they do battle with their (evil) impulse." He must so fight that source of sin which is in him, and yet is not identical with him. Man did not transgress the command laid on him save by the interior struggling and victory of this unclean spirit. As the impulse of this alien, but yet resident, power, is always to evil, yešer alone usually has the connotation of the "evil yešer". According to Porter, "it frequently stands unmodified and always . . . in the evil sense." The Rabbis usually employ it with its bad connotation. The Rabbinic use is in evidence in most of Ben Sirach, in the graminum seminis mali of 2 Esdras, and in Apoc. Baruch. The appearance of the Rabbinic use dates from the 2nd cent. B.C. The deduction from Biblical texts, such as Gen. 8, was not out of accord with general Rabbinic conclusions that "that leaven is truly unfortunate whose baker witnesses of it that it is evil from its youth." When the word is used without attributive or predicate adjective it is understood to mean the evil impulse.

God only can give the grace necessary to conquer it in this life, and He will publicly slay the evil yešer at the last day. God's might is necessary in this life to hold its power in check, and at the best to enable the individual not to be conquered by it. God will finally reveal it, slay it in the world to come, and forever destroy its power over men. Meanwhile the struggle goes on in this world. "Blessed is he that considereth the poor

1 Nedarim 32b. 2 Mid. Ber. R. 97.
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6 Cf. Levy, Wörterbuc: Jastrow's Dictionary s. v. י져 for confirmation of this use.
7 Mid. Ber. R. 34 12.
9 Cf. Succa 52a.
10 R. Jehuda said: "In the world to come the Holy One . . . will bring forth the evil impulse, (פז) and slay it before both the righteous and the wicked." Succa 52b.
and needy: the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble”1 according to Abba bar Yarmiah, speaking in the name of R. Meir, “is he who caused the good yeṣer to rule (יְשֵׁר) over the evil yeṣer”.2 Proverbs 2431 is another text which has reference to “king”, ‘he who should rule over him’,—this means the good yeṣer who is to rule over the evil yeṣer.3

b) “Original Sin”; Jewish teaching and Aphraates.

In Aphraates we find no doctrine of original sin. If St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans was thinking as a Greek and not as a Jew, then Aphraates has surely failed to grasp his meaning.4 Adam sinned, and all of his descendants as well, save only the “One innocent among all the children of men.” The sequence from Adam’s sin to that of his offspring was temporal, not causal. It is clear from what is shown above, that Aphraates believed Adam’s sin to have been the result of his own choice and pride, whereby he followed the temptation suggested by the Evil One and disobeyed God. While he does not say that his evil yeṣer caused Adam to sin, his view of sin is entirely consonant otherwise with Rabbinic thought. The Rabbis did not trace sin to Adam’s Fall, but rather explained his sin by the doctrine of the evil yeṣer. In Aphraates there is no dualism between spirit and matter. There is an opposition, which he shares with Judaism, between good and evil, but there is not the faintest connection between “evil” and matter as such, or “good” and spirit at such. Again he shares the Rabbinic point of view. A still stronger resemblance is found in Aphraates’ conviction,—so utterly taken for granted that it not only not defended or questioned, but not even explicitly stated,—that man is a unity. “Man” consists of the union of body and soul. A clear corollary from this principle

1 Ps. 41 1.
2 Mid. Vayyikra R. 34 1.
3 Mid. Tanchuma Behaalotecha 2.
4 E.g., on Rom. 5 19 cf. Bethune-Baker, History of Christian Doctrine, p. 17; St. P. may have had the “cor malignun” of Bar 1 22, and 2 Esd. 3 25 ("deliquerunt . . . facientes sicut Adam et omnes generationes ejus") in mind; Sanday and Headlam, ad loc.: "something else at work besides the guilt of individuals . . . the effect of Adam’s fall" (Commentary p. 134). S. & H. reject the idea of a dualism in St. P.; vide op. cit., pp. 174, 181.
can be seen in the doctrine of the "sleep of the soul." The soul of the believer is buried in the earth with his body, and there will sleep till the Day of Resurrection. The Spirit given at Baptism has returned at the believer's death to heaven. At the Resurrection the "Spirit" will return to its tenement, and body, soul, and spirit are again united, and the whole man stands before God for judgment. So keenly did he feel the implication of this eminently Jewish conception that he could not think of the punishing or rewarding of the body apart from the soul.

Again, Aphraates always uses אֲדֹנָי in the normal Rabbinic sense, when undefined, as the evil יֶֽסֶר, following the meaning of the word in such passages as Gen. 6:5, 8, Deut. 31. The equivalent of the יְרֵא דָּהָב is to be found, I believe, in combination with another eminently Jewish conception,—in Aphraates' doctrine of the indwelling Holy Spirit. As was said above, Aphraates taught that God was born in man when he by a free act of will acknowledged and recognized His Creator. This indwelling presence of God in the heart of man, His creature, is lost by sin. Aphraates intimates that the sinner loses the presence of God by his sin, in that sin, (disobedience), is a declaration of unbelief or a repudiation of God's primary relation to man as Creator and Lord. The text of Gen. 6:3 in the Peshitto reads: יְהֹוָה אֲדֹנֵי eu דָּהָב אָם, and while Aphraates never explicitly quotes it, I believe that in it lies the key to his doctrine of Sin, the Fall, and Redemption. If the effect of sin be the loss of God's Spirit, lost to each man by his own free will, and pre-eminently in the case of the typical Man, Adam, redemption is the restoration of that Spirit to mankind. As a matter of fact, this is precisely Aphraates' doctrine of Redemption: the importation into sinful humanity of the Spirit through the work and life of Jesus, by which all the consequences of the Fall were obliterated, and mankind raised to the position which God had predestined for it. The means of the 'injection', so to speak, of this lost

---

1 Cf. my article on the Sleep of the Soul in JAOS, April, 1920, pp. 103-120.
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principle into mankind, was the Incarnation. The fruits of the Incarnation were made available to believers through the Sacraments. The Spirit was in the waters of Baptism, and by the performance of the rite it entered the believer.

“The King”, and the “King’s Son”, to Aphraates, is the “Spirit” or “Spirit of Christ”.¹ “It is not fitting ... that from the portal by which entered the King should go forth refuse and filth; ... the mouth through which entered the Son of the King should be carefully guarded”.³ “Let us magnify the King’s son who is with us ... he who receives the King’s Son with honour has many gifts given him by the King ... What may we do in our poverty for the King’s Son?”⁴ The proper rules for the entertainment of this “humble anointed King”⁶ whom unbelievers and sinners reject, are the precepts of the spiritual life. As this “Spirit” (of Christ) is primarily the Spirit of life, so Death is conceived of as the Spirit of evil. As in the case of the evil yeqeq, destruction of death is the work of God,—but in Aphraates it is to be through Christ.⁷ The gift of immortality is pledged now, and is to be realized hereafter in the world to come.

According to Jewish tradition “the generation of the Flood shall have no portion in the world to come, nor shall they stand in the judgment” ... (then, quoting Gen. 6:3), “for theirs is no “judgment” and no “Spirit”⁸ A closer parallel to some of the elements of Aphraates’ thought is traceable in the Rabbinic doctrine of the Shechina. “When Adam sinned the Shechina was withdrawn to the first heaven; Cain sinned and it was withdrawn to the second heaven; at the time of the generation of Enosh it was withdrawn to the third heaven,”⁹ etc. By prayer, acts of virtue, and the merits of the great Patriarchs, it is restored to proximity to man, etc. Sufficient has been suggested to show

---

¹ 101:20—25.
² Alluding to the Eucharist, by which the Spirit of Christ entered the believer.
³ 280:14.
⁵ 272:5—6.
⁶ 428:14.
⁷ Cf. homily XXIII, sec. 4.
⁸ Sanhedrin 107b.
⁹ Mid. Bammidbar 134.
where Aphraates obtained the elements he pieced into the framework of his Christian theology, which was simply the N. T. interpreted from the standpoint of the "Asianic School," seen through the eyes of the Semite.

3. Eschatology and chiliasm.

A brief notice of Aphraates' affiliations in respect to eschatology and chiliasm will serve as a close to this section. Aphraates justifies the Resurrection in exactly the same way as does, e. g., R. Gebiha b. Pesisa. "If those who have not yet lived can come into existence, how much more shall they live (again) who have already died." His argument is of the same familiar type, the ḥaft ḫp, so frequently employed by the Rabbis. Of the general type of Aphraates' eschatology it may be said that it was in part influenced by such a point of view as that of Josephus: "Our bodies are mortal and made of perishable matter, but part of the Godhead, an immortal soul, dwells in mortal bodies." The Philonic doctrine of Josephus is rather more akin to Aphraates' thought than that of the Rabbis who, while they recognized the Divine principle in the soul, did not regard it as a "part of the Godhead," but rather viewed it as like the other creatures,—bearing the likeness of their Creator. "This world is the anteroom in which prepare thyself that thou mayest be able to enter into the palace." Hence the duty of preparation for the life to come is incumbent upon all. R. Pinchas ben Yair saw that the means of making ready for the future life consisted in "obedience to the law, hence . . . . purity, humility, sinlessness, sanctity, possession of the Holy Spirit, and immortality." The various texts used in proving from the Torah the doctrine of the immortality of the soul are those which Aphraates himself uses,—Deut. 22, 8

1 Sanh. 91a. 2 369:19—23. 3 De bello Jud. III. 8. 5. 4 Aug. Wünsche, Die Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode nach Apocrypha, Talmud und Kirchengütern, J. P. T. (vol. 6) 1880, pp. 355—83; 455—523. 5 Pirke Aboth 4. 21. 6 Moed Katan 9b. 7 Aboda Zara 20b. 8 Kt. 39b.
Deut. 31 \textsuperscript{16}, \textsuperscript{1} Deut. 32 \textsuperscript{39}, \textsuperscript{2} Deut. 33 \textsuperscript{6}, \textsuperscript{3} etc. There are few things more definite than the unanimity of conviction among the Rabbis concerning the resurrection of the body. "The soul is without its earthly integument for a time only, and is then to be reunited with it... The grave gives back the material composition of the body, which... passes in new power to an eternal immortality."

The three chief types of argument for the Resurrection are as valid for Aphraates as for the Rabbis. The first type is the "ontological," \textsuperscript{5} and the familiar illustration is derived from a comparison of pottery and blown glass. A blown glass vessel if destroyed can be remade, since it is made by breath (רוח), while pottery, made by hands, if once smashed is forever incapable of being restored. "Thus with men there is the possibility of rehabilitation, since they are made by the breath of the Holy One" (יהוה הרוח). The "moral argument," which is the contention of homilies XXI and XXIII of Aphraates, states that without the Resurrection there is no vindication of the righteousness of God, nor compensation for the suffering of the poor and innocent.\textsuperscript{7} The "analogical" argument of, for example, R. Tabi in the name of R. Josiah, shows the analogy of the grave to the womb of the pregnant mother.\textsuperscript{8} This figure frequently appears in Syriac literature\textsuperscript{9} though it does not, so far as I have been able to find, in Aphraates.

An examination of the component elements in Aphraates' doctrine of the "sleep of the soul" will disclose its strong Jewish affiliations. "In the second birth\textsuperscript{10} men receive the Holy Spirit, a particle of the Godhead, (סכל, רוח נפש) and it will never die. When these men die, the 'soulish' spirit is buried with the body

\textsuperscript{1} Sanh. 90\textsuperscript{b}.
\textsuperscript{2} Pesach. 68\textsuperscript{a}.
\textsuperscript{3} Sanh. 92\textsuperscript{a}.
\textsuperscript{4} Wünsche, op. cit., p. 365.
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Aph. 369: 19—23; Sanh. 92\textsuperscript{a}.
\textsuperscript{6} Sanhedrin 91\textsuperscript{a}.
\textsuperscript{7} Cf. Pirke Aboth. iv. 29.
\textsuperscript{8} Sanh. 92\textsuperscript{a}; Berach. 15\textsuperscript{b}.
\textsuperscript{9} Cf. O. Braun, Moses bar Kepha und sein Buch von der Seele, Freiburg i. B., 1891. cf. pp. 145—46; cf. St. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena... ed. G. Bickell, Leipzig, 1866; esp. LXXIII, LXV, LXXI, etc.
\textsuperscript{10} L. c., Baptism.
and all sensation is taken from it. The heavenly Spirit which they have received goes back to its nature, to the presence (תֵּחַם) of Christ. Both these facts the Apostle teaches, for he says: 'The body is buried (מַלְכַּח) 'soulish' and rises 'spiritual’... Christ's Spirit which the 'spiritual' (דְּתַנְמִי) have received goes back to the Lord's presence: the soulish spirit is buried in its own nature and is deprived of sensation". Just as the servant who awaits punishment on the morrow sleeps uneasily, so does the wicked man awaiting his condemnation; while the righteous sleep well in the grave and have pleasant dreams. The moral capacity is as entirely absent during the sleep of death, as it is in abeyance during natural sleep. The judgment at the last day will be of both soul and body together, since "no one has yet received his reward".

Aside from the very considerable influence of St. Paul in determining the character of Aphraates’ eschatology, there is undoubtedly the same conviction at work in Aphraates’ thought as in Rabbinic Judaism. "The whole man, body and soul, is judged," not the soul alone. "The body says, 'the soul has sinned';... the soul says, 'the body has sinned'.... It is like the case of a man who had a beautiful orchard yielding delicious figs. To guard them... he put into the orchard two men,—one blind, the other, lame and unable to use his legs. The lame man suggested to the blind man that he carry him on his back, as the only way to get at the figs... When the master missing his figs,... accused them, one pleaded: 'thou seest I have no feet

1 The Pesh. ad loc. has חֲבָלֵי and the difference between the two verbs “buried” and “sown” has a considerable bearing on Aphraates’ doctrine. It is probable that he ‘adapted’ his text to prove a position taken on other grounds.
2 1. Cor. 15:44: the “soul” (ψυχή) is λοι; the “spirit” (πνεῦμα) λοι.
3 293:2—24.
4 396:16—5; 397:1—14.
5 397:15—17.
6 401:14—15.
8 Wünsche, op. cit., p. 379.
to bring me to the figs*. The other: 'I have no eyes to see the way to them'. But the master placed the lame man on him who was blind and beat them together'. As in Rabbinic Judaism, so in the eschatology of the early Syriac Church, the doctrine of the bodily resurrection was necessary, since: "Der ganze Mensch ist es, der Verdienste oder Missverdienste erwirbt, darum erhält auch der ganze Mensch Lohn oder Strafe".

"The souls of the righteous go directly on high, but those of the ungodly wander about, finding no place to put their feet;... their souls go back and forth constantly about the grave for twelve months". This is, however, not the only speculation concerning the state of the souls of the dead. According to some Rabbis, they have no sensations at all, but there are indications that some of the Rabbis believed in much the same doctrine concerning the presence of the soul in the buried body, as did Aphraates. R. Nachman v. Jacob said that "a worm hurts the body of the dead as much as a needle the body of a living person". The departed hear everything spoken of them. Rab asks R. Simeon b. She'ila to deliver a good funeral oration over him that he may enjoy it! The judgment will be of all alike, regardless of whether "they be Gentile or Israelite, man or woman, mistress or maid, all will be judged according to deeds, by the Holy Spirit who will pronounce upon them". There will be those who are "sealed to eternal life" (the righteous), the evil who are "sealed" to hell, and the "middle grade" who have sinned, but repented, and will be punished for a while. Precisely this theory is discernible in Aphraates, for the righteous go immediately to heaven at the last judgment, the wicked to hell, and

---

1 Sanhedrin 91b.
4 Sab. 13b.
6 Sab. 152b; Ber. 51b.
7 Sankh. 90b.
10 Homily XXIII is in part a theodicy. He calls the righteous "the soul of
the sinners, who have repented, expiate their sins and then go to heaven.

The doctrine of the Spirit in Aphraates shows Jewish affiliations, but yet is not entirely under Jewish influence, inasmuch as the basis of his doctrine is Pauline. Aphraates agrees with the Rabbis, in holding that the Holy Spirit is the immortal principle in man, and the bond between God and man. By implication, at least, the Holy Spirit’s loss denotes a forlorn condition of man in Aphraates, from which he can only be rescued by aid from God direct. If the Jewish repudiation of the doctrine of original sin be on the basis that it makes the Presence of the Holy Spirit in every one of no effect,¹ then Aphraates’ doctrine may be considered a step forward toward a more clear grasp of the teachings of the Great Church on the subject. If however “the loss of the Spirit” in Aphraates be a combination of the ‘Shechinah’ doctrine and other Rabbinic speculations on Gen. 6 ³ then it is not necessary to see in Aphraates any violent divergence from the broad current of Jewish thought.

The chiliasm of Aphraates is strikingly Jewish. “Our wise teachers have said, in the same way as God assigned six days’ time to the (creation of the) world, this six thousand years’ time will see its consummation, and then will come the sabbath of God”.* R. Ketina said that the “world would last six thousand years: two thousand of emptiness, two thousand of the law, and two thousand of the messianic era”.*³ It was a belief which was widespread in Rabbinic Judaism that Aphraates reflects in the quotation above.⁴ This Rabbinic speculation came into the Church, and is especially noticeable in Papias, as quoted by Eusebius

the world". Cf. “The righteous an everlasting foundation” (Yoma 38b) and Aphraates 18:13; and Rabba b. b. Chana in Sank. 103.³

¹ Cf. H. Cohen, Der Heilige Geist in Festschrift zum 70ten Geburtstag J. Gutmanns, Leipzig, 1915, pp. 1—21 ... “Die Erbsünde ist unmöglich, ihr Gedanke überwunden, (weil) sie widerspricht dem heiligen Geiste, der dem Menschen mit Gott gemeinsam ist”. (P. 15. ibid.)

² 77 : 8—13, on which cf. Parisot in his Praefatio, sec. 17, ch. III. pp. lviii ff.


⁴ Cf. O. Braun, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie in den syrischen Kirchen, ZKTh. 1892 (col. 16) pp. 273—312.
(H. E. iii. 39) in the Epistle of Barnabas, and in many Christian Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings. "Die Anschauung, dass 1000 Jahre einem Tage vor Gott seien, war auf Grund der Psalmstelle schon in vorchristlicher Zeit bei den Juden verbreitet, und es wurden rabbinische Berechnungen angestellt". St. Irenaeus says that "in as many days as the world was made, in as many years will it be ended". He represents the early Christian theology which had "adopted the whole Jewish eschatology, the only difference being that he regards the Church as the seed of Abraham.... Wherever philosophical theology had not yet made its way, the chiliastic hopes were not only cherished.... but emphatically regarded as Christianity itself".

In innumerable concrete instances of exact parallels in thought, as well as in his general envisagement of theological problems, we find that Aphraates is a "docile pupil of the Jews". In his account of Creation, sin, and the Fall, the problems of salvation, and redemption, his eschatology and his chiliasm, Aphraates is peculiarly at one, in the idiom of his thought and the perspective of his field, with contemporary Rabbinic Judaism. Where he diverged, he only recombined elements taken from the Rabbis to reassemble them into the contour of a mosaic of a Christian character.

4. Aphraates and the Didache.

Schwen, and Bert both suggest the strong resemblance to be found between the words of Aphraates in the so-called "Creed"

1 xvi. 4 of the Epistle; cf. Barnabae epistola, graece et latine.... Gebhardt und Harnack, Leipzig, 1878, where (pp. 64—65 ff.) Harnack presents all the evidence, parallel passages, etc.
6 Afrahats, Seine Person und sein Verständniss des Christentums.—Berlin, 1907, p. 65.
7 Afrahats des persischen weisen Homilien... T.u.U. III, Heft 3 and 4, p. 18, n. 1; p. 19, n. 2.
at the beginning of the *Homilies*, and the *Didache*. Bert suggests
the comparison between Aph. 44:21—26, 45:1—6; Lev. 19:26, Deut. 18:18, and *Did. 3:4*. The words in the *Didache*, “thou shalt
not blaspheme, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt be
neither double-minded, nor double-tongued, for the double tongue
(is guilty) of death”,¹ are strikingly like those of Aphraates:
“Withhold thyself from blasphemy; thou shalt not bear false
witness, thou shalt not speak... with a double tongue”.² On
such passages Schwen comments that “they doubtless go back
to an original common Jewish source”.³ Instances of similar
dependence are well illustrated in certain other passages. In
*Homily IV. ‘On Prayer’* Aphraates comments on St. Matt. 18:20:⁴—
“Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there
am I in the midst of them.” He goes on to say:⁵ “How, beloved,
dost thou understand these words?... if thou art alone, is not
Christ with thee? It is written concerning believers in Him that
Christ dwells with them.⁶ By this (text) it is shown that when
two or three are gathered together Christ is with them. I shall
show thee that it is possible for not only two or three, but even
for a thousand to be gathered together in the name of Christ,
yet for Christ not to be with them, while even one only may
have Christ with him...”. Then, after quoting the text again,
he says,⁷—(in proof that a single individual may have Christ with
him)—“When a man gathers himself in Christ’s name, Christ
dwells in him; and God dwells in Christ,—thus the (single) man
becomes one from three,—himself and Christ Who dwells in him,
and God who is in Christ, as our Lord Himself said:⁸ ‘I am in
the Father, and the Father in Me’, and (He said) ‘I and the
Father are One’.⁹ Again He said:¹⁰ ‘Ye are in Me and I in
you’. And again He said by the prophet:¹¹ ‘I shall dwell in
them and walk amongst them’. By this train of thought canst
thou understand that word which our Saviour spake”.

¹  *Did. 23, 4.*  
²  44:21, 26; 45:1—2.  
⁵  *I St. John 3:1, etc.*  
⁶  St. John 14:10, 11.  
⁷  9 St. Jn. 10:30.  
"  *Lev. 26:12, etc.*
There is a very interesting text in the Oxyrhynchus Logia, no. 5, which reads as follows: λέγει Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅπου ἐὰν ὄσιν β' οὐκ εἰςιν άδειοι, καὶ ὅπου εἰς ἐστιν μόνος λέγω Ἐγώ εἰμι μετ' αὐτοῖν . . .".

"The meaning must be either, 'Wherever all are unbelievers and one alone is faithful, there am I with him', or, 'wherever there are two disciples I am with them, and wherever one is alone, I am with him . . .'. The two paralleled clauses . . . support the second alternative (Heinrici) and the passages from Clem. Alex., Strom. iii. 10, and Eph. Syr., Evang., cum. Exp. 14, decide almost certainly for the second view . . . We have provisionally adopted the brilliant conjecture of Blass . . . 'Wherever there are two, they are not without God's presence, and if anywhere one is alone, I say I am with him . . .'. It has been suggested that άδειοι may be an allusion to the pagan nickname, 'they are not, as men call them, άδειοι, godless, etc'.

This is Lock's interpretation of the text, and seems quite satisfactory. It is interesting that the commentary attributed to Eph. Syr. is extraordinarily like that which Aphraates says, though there is no literal agreement. According to the Latin translation of Mosinger from the Armenian recension, the text runs: "Christus . . . vitam solitariam agentes in hac tristi conditione consolatus est dicens: 'Ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum.' Ne quisquam ex solitariis contristaretur: . . . 'Et ubi duo sunt, ibi et ego ero',—quaia misericordia et gratia ejus nobis adumbrat. Et quando tres sumus, quasi in ecclesia coimus, quae est corpus Christi perfectum, . . ." etc. Taylor quotes several passages in Pirke Aboth, Tal. Babli, Berach 6, which show Jewish

1 C. Taylor, _The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus, found in 1903._—Oxford, pp. 26—27.
4 Quoted in Resch, _Agrapha._ T. u. U., Band 5, Heft 4, pp. 295—296. (Leipzig 1889). He refers to Ign. _ad Eph._ v, and _Ps. Ign._ v, etc.; numerous parallels between Aph. and Eph. Syr. are noted by Parisot,—intro. pp. L—LL.
affiliations with this notion. In Jewish tradition, the Shechinah abides over those who occupy themselves with the study of the Torah, one authority adducing the text Ex. 20:22-25 ("In every place where I record my name, I shall come to thee"). There is a pun on the meaning of י in Mid. Debarim Rab. (2:15) when 'God is said to be so near to him' (וילאש—Deut. 4:7); the text refers it to the people who were in such close proximity to God, the allusion here to the individual. Thus the meaning of Didache 4:1: ὅσεν γὰρ ἕκαστος λαλεῖ τω, ἐκεῖ κύριος ἐστιν 1 exactly agrees with a favorite principle of the Jewish Fathers that those who occupy themselves with words of the Torah . . . have the Shechinah among them. The resemblance can be seen from the words of Rabin b. R. Ada in the name of R. Isaac: . . . 'God is in the synagogue with the מני שוהק”'ה מתיי, since: 'God stands in the congregation of God.' 2 in the congregation of אדך סאמה נץ בכרה ולא מני ומשה שתחין שכרת עמה שעם אדך ומי מני אלناقش שווייבין ברי שכרת עמה שאמרא בכרה אדך ימשו מני שמי שווייבין זוכיןбудו שכרת עמה שאמרא שאמרא אדכ נבורי ריו מתי אל רוקה ויקשובה ומי יא (Mal. 3:16—cf. Ber. 6a) and so on, basing the reason of the abiding of the Shechinah in one single person on the text of Ex. 20:21. The handling of texts in Aphraates is conspicuously Jewish, and so are the ideas with which he deals, though the actual words of his text are from the N. T.

It seems rather extraordinary that one whole homily out of the 23 of Aphraates, should be devoted to the duty of almsgiving. Two facts, however, will make this appear not so strange. a) Our author is not concerned with abstract doctrines or teachings, but is devoting his energies to an exposition of the works which must accompany true faith and of the practical difficulties of the communities and Churches of his day. b) Our author is writing for monks, and one of the counsels which they had undertaken to follow as their life principle, was poverty. Consequently the duty of almsgiving assumed rather important proportions in his perspective. It was at once the practical exemplification of true

2 Ps. 82:1.
religion and an act of religion itself, in that its offices were wrought on the very person of Christ. I have no doubt that back of this double purpose lay a still more fundamental consideration in Aphraates’ convictions; (for his convictions were unconsciously or consciously the result of Jewish tradition and training in relation to the view-point from which he envisions religion, and the atmosphere with which he invests it). He begins his “homily on the sustaining of the poor” with the words: “It is a great and praiseworthy gift, when it happens that a prudent man is able to give to the poor of the toil of his hands ...” 1 He goes on to show the importance of the duty in the Torah, its place in the life of David, and finally cites the words of Christ,— St. Matt. 25 32—45,— where He identifies Himself with the poor to whom the ministration is offered. He then interprets the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, 2 allegorizing it in a thoroughgoing way: Christ is the poor man, the Gentiles the dogs who licked his sores, etc. Almsgiving, he shows from Dan. 4 27, does away with sin, among its other valuable properties, as well as “sows the seed of (eternal) life.” 3 Incidentally the state of poverty, being most like that of Christ, is to be preferred. 4

While Aphraates nowhere expressly refers to toil as the curse laid upon man, his emphasis upon almsgiving as man’s act in giving of the fruit of his toil,—which he obtains from the ground only at the price of his sweat and labor,—indicates in part that which may have been back of his thought. Almsgiving had a very large part to play in Jewish religious practice. “Whosoever ‘shears’ himself of his possessions and gives alms of them, escapes the condemnation of hell.” 5 “Alms (ננד) delivereth from death” (Prov. 11 4). This deliverance, according to Bab. Bath. 10a, “frees one from the judgment of Gehinnom”. According to Rabbi Eleazer, following Ps. 21 3: “He who does alms is greater than (he who offers) all sacrifices.” 6

---

1 893: 1—3.  
2 St. Lk. 16 19—31.  
3 913: 6—8; 929: 3—4.  
4 Homily XX §§ 5—4.  
5 Nah. 1 12.  
6 Succah 49 6.
things which annul the judicial sentence against man, puts almsgiving first.¹

While there are ten things created, each one stronger than, and prevailing over the preceding, death being stronger than all together, alms deliveth from death.² Aphraates states that almsgiving is one of those good acts which refresh God.³ "When a man gives of his substance to the poor he refreshes the will of God⁴ and of Christ, as it is said: 'this is my refreshment: give the weary rest.'" ⁵ It is more important than prayer to Aphraates: “Beware, beloved, when some opportunity present itself (to thee) to refresh the will of God, lest thou say: 'the time of prayer is at hand: I shall pray, and afterward do this.' Before thou shalt have finished, that opportunity will have passed.”⁶ Prayer is better than sacrifices, since, as Aphraates says, it has supplanted them,⁷ and prayer has become, together with fasting, the real sacrifice.⁸

The words in Aphraates:⁹ a prudent man: 

are much like those in Did:¹⁰ παντὶ τῷ άιτροῦντι σε δίδου καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει. πᾶσι γὰρ θέλει διδόσαι ο πατὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων χαρισμάτων. μακάριος ο δίδους κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν . . . . ἄλλα καὶ περὶ τοῦτον δὲ εἴρηται: ἱδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τᾶς χειρᾶς σου, μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τίνι διὰς . . . κ.τ.λ.

This passage in the Didache has a parallel in the Sibylline Books (ii. 77); and "the parallelism (of the Sibylline Books) with the language of the Teaching shows that in the latter the main idea is the connexion between personal charity and one's earnings."¹¹

There is an interesting parallel to the passages, among others

¹ Rosh Hash. 16⁶.
² Bab. Bath. 10⁶.
³ 920: 12—16.
⁴ Is. 28 ¹³.
⁵ 172: 6—14.
⁶ 181: 16—18.
⁷ 245: 19—20.
⁸ 893: 2—3.
quoted by Taylor: 1 καὶ ἄλλος πάλιν ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ γεωπόνου ἐξ ἱδίου ἱδρῶτος ποιούντος συμπάθειαν, καὶ ἔτερος ὁ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ ἀπὸ δώρων καὶ πρωσώδων παρέχοντος. The parallel passages in the 'Shepherd', the Apostolic Constitutions, etc., are given, loc. cit.

It is in his explanation 2 of the words of the Did. 16 5b: "σωθησονται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ καταθέματος" that Harris coins the phrase 'salvation by similars' to distinguish that type of 'popular canon of soteriology.' "The antidote", he says, 3 "grows on the same stem with the poison: that which damns turns into that which saves." To illustrate his point, he suggests that the meaning of the text of St. Jn. 3:14 ("as Moses lifted up" etc.) is clear when the change of the word ἡν into ἴση by "gematria" is kept in mind. "In this way man is saved by the very curse itself." 4 Harris adduces a number of references bearing out his contention,—Severianus of Gabala in Jewish controversy, Irenaeus, etc. In the N. T. this usage is not unfamiliar,—"as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." 5 Christ is the Second Adam, 6 and through Him life is restored, after the first Adam had brought death. That "through him He might destroy him that had the power of death, the devil," was the purpose of Christ's coming. 7 According to Aphraates, 8 the Incarnation was a necessity in order to give God a way to come at death. It was by the body man had sinned and incurred death: by the body must be made the conquest of death. Death, sin, the curse, 9 and the easy access of the devil to man came through Eve. 10 "Through the coming of the Son of Mary the thorns are uprooted, the sweat wiped away, .... dust becomes salt," 11 "the

1 Cf. Ps. Athan., J. R. Harris, Questiones ad Antiochum duc., in Traching of the Apostles, pp. 15—16 (Baltimore, 1887.)
2 Ibid., p. 62 (Text, p. 10).
3 p. 62; cf. Just. Trypho: ὁ Ναὸς ἐν ζύλῳ διεσώμη, but the Fall had come by the tree, etc., (E. Archambault, Textes et documents, p. 296, col. 2).
4 p. 63 ibid.
5 I Cor. 15 22—23.
7 Harris, op. cit., p. 66.
8 Il. 32:9—16. 9 265:3—11.
10 265:15—18.
11 Cf. the curse of Adam in Gen.; an antidote for the Devil is salt, since he cannot eat it; cf. Gen. 3 11 b, 20 b, Aphr. 256:5—6.
curse is affixed to the cross,” etc. For further parallels to this, cf. J. Rendel Harris, op. cit., pp. 66—67.

This, according to Harris, is the significance of almsgiving in Jewish tradition: it is ‘the pains God gives man for his salvation.’ It may be, too, that this lay in the background of Aphraates mind. It is quite clear that he conceived of there being a potential blessing in the act of the eating from the tree, though the act incurred a curse on man. Those who had eaten of the fruit of the tree had the principle of life preserved in themselves, and “they received in their bodies the abrogation of the curse.”

The sentence passed upon the serpent was, according to Rab. Eleazer, both a blessing and a curse, for a blessing was involved in the cursed.

The same notion of ‘salvation by similars’ appears in Aphraates: “The blood of Christ . . . . it is which stained them, and they were not able to be clean of it. But if they were washed in the water of baptism, and received the Body and Blood of Christ, blood would be expiated by the Blood, and body cleansed by the Body . . . .”

Harris suggests other conspicuously Jewish features in the Didache, to which we find parallels in Aphraates. Thus the careful precepts about fasting for the Neophyte and about his baptism, according to Harris indicates a Jewish original. Aphraates calls fasting and prayer, “desirable fruits,” “a (worthy) sacrifice to be offered to the King.” Rab. Shesheth, a little before the time of Aphraates, is quoted by Harris to show that fasting took the place of the sacrifice which had ceased to be offered. Aphraates devotes one homily to the subject of fasting, and places it between love and prayer. He considers it as an offering made to God, and adds that it must proceed from true religion, and one rightly ordered ethically: the fast of the Marcionites, Valentinians, and the like, is unacceptable to God. A sinner's fast

1 xxiii, section 3. 2 II. 8:15.
7 Cf. iii., section 9.
destroys its own value. Fasting of the true sort involves much more than a simple abstinence from food.

The method of interpretation of the O. T. in the Didache is expressed in these words: "πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δὲ δοκιμασμένος, ἀληθινός, ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικόν ἐκκλησίας, μὴ διδάσκειν δὲ ποιεῖν ὅσα αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, οὗ κριθήσεται ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. ἀν. τ. λ.

Taylor discusses this at length, and adduces very interesting illustrations and interpretations of his explanation of the passage. He finds that 'the Teaching' interprets the O. T. in the manner of Barnabas and Justin Martyr, seeing in it everywhere a πράξις εἰς μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This principle is applied incidentally in justification of unusual conduct in the Christian prophets, but it is not to be limited to acts which stand in need of apology. "This 'unusual conduct' must proceed however from an intention to perform such abnormal actions with symbolic reference to the Church and its affairs." Harris says that this sort of action, 'not to be imitated, was only done to expound some mystery.' This μυστήριον κοσμικόν is the Rabbinic בֵּנוּ יָש וּנַשָּׁה. Such actions were the making of the brazen serpent by Moses, (Num. 21:8—9) in flat contradiction to the Second Commandment, Jacob's marriage of four women, and in Irenaeus (IV. xx. 12) Hosea's fallen wife, and the like. Thus St. Paul speaks of a woman being sanctified by a faithful husband, and St. Irenaeus says: Id quod a propheta typice per operationem factum est, ostendit apostolus vere factum in ecclesia a Christo. So also the marriage of Moses is a type of that of the Church and Christ.

Aphraates in Homily xviii is presenting the subject of celibacy and the dedicated life to the Jews. After adducing as many scriptural illustrations as possible, (which, so far as his literal

---

1 113:13—14.
2 97:7—9.
3 In Theology of the Did., p. 156.
4 Taylor, op. cit., p. 150, ibid.
7 Cf. St. John Chrysostom's Synopsis; St. Athanasius, De virginitate, section 2, (Taylor, op. cit., p. 151).
proof of Divine sanction to a dedicated life of continence in the O. T. is concerned, do not apply), he concludes his homily with the words: "And this lot entails a great reward, since we accept it voluntarily and not in obedience to a command, nor by the necessity of (obeying) an injunction, nor are we bound to it under the Law. We may find the type and the likeness of it in the Scriptures, and may see in those who have conquered, the likeness of the Angels of heaven, (realized) by a special gift (of God) on earth..."¹ It may be noted incidentally that the reference here and in the passage quoted above, "who will recompense the fasting of Valentinus, will reward Marcion,"² is suggestive of the ideas associated with the doctrine of the "two ways" in the Didache. The passage is collated with the Targum by Harris,³ who points out several passages allied to the words of the Did. iv. 7: "γνώση γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης." He concludes: "Whatever may be thought of this parallelism it can hardly fail to be regarded as a striking Hebraism on the part of the Teaching."⁴

5. Aphraates' use of the Scriptures.

A still more interesting question with regard to the Homilies is Aphraates' use of the Bible, his method of quotation, style, and interpretation of biblical passages. His view of the Bible and of the necessity for a living tradition do not surprise us, in view of his remarkably Jewish affiliations in other respects. He usually quotes the writer of the passage by name, if possible, though he often uses the ordinary Jewish word הָמוֹר. Schwen⁵ notes that Bewer⁶ finds 86 occasions of the use of this word in Aphraates in connection with the O. T. and 19 with the N. T. He usually

¹ 841: 19—25.
² 116: 6—17.
⁴ Ibid. p. 79.
⁶ The History of the N. T. Canon in the Syriac Church, in A. J. T., 1900, pp. 64 ff; 345 ff.
calls it “the Scripture” (םדחה). At times he quotes the prophets as mouth-pieces of God, who speak His words in the first person. God speaks through the Holy Scriptures, and His Spirit was upon the prophets. For Aphraates the O. T. was an objective unity, and possessed Divine authority. Aphraates delights to find parallels and “types.” Thus Gideon’s act was the presentation in figure of something yet to come, for it was the great mystery of Baptism which he prefigured and foreshadowed as a “typos”. He frequently develops parallels in word, act, general configuration, and concrete detail, between Jesus Christ and the O. T. worthies. This method of presentation comprises the greater part of the content of his homily “on Persecution.” He employs the word יתל to express “foreshadowing,” together with לוה to denote “fulfilment.” As with type in prophecy and realization in fact, so with life, action, and word in symbolic meaning in the Old, and with completion in deed in the New Dispensation. “Thou hast heard,” he says in his homily on the Passover, “of that passover of which I told thee that it was given to the former people (לילות הנבואה) as a mystery (йтиל) and that its truth is today made known among the Gentiles.”

There is much that is Jewish in his method of approach to the Scriptures, yet the characteristic and fundamental Christocentric point of view of our author must not be obscured. All of the furniture of his illustrations and imagery, all of his sources and texts, are Biblical, and his manipulation of them is in the main in accord with Jewish methods; his conclusions only are different. His method of interpretation of the text,—to find a deeper and more significant meaning behind the words than is conveyed on their surface,—may well be compared to the process of interpretation in Jewish tradition. For example, Aphraates speaks of

---

1 749:3-4.
2 752:22 etc.
3 Cf. Schwen, op. cit., p. 35.
4 344:10-11.
5 344:22-23.
6 No. xxii. sections 8-20.
7 516:3-5.
8 508:22.
the “great and wondrous mysteries” brought forth by the account of the Passover in Ex. 12:4-45. The בְּשֵׁשֶׁת and רְאוֹן are nothing else than the “(followers of) the teachings of the Evil One who are not permitted to eat of the Passover.” So again, circumcision was only a type and symbol of the true circumcision, which is baptism. There is an occasional lapse into the allegorical method of interpretation, but it has developed nothing of the proportions to which, for example, Clem. of Alex. developed it. On the other hand, Aphraates was not tied down to the historico-grammatical method of the Antiochene School. He was strongly antiadoptionistic and his strong theological antipathy may account for his rejection of the characteristically Antiochene method of exegesis. The Bible was practically his sole authority and he knew the contents as few men have. While the idiom of his thought was Jewish, his combination of various elements and the resulting teaching were quite his own. The Bible was interpreted in accordance with a living tradition, and Aphraates claims that his own words were not written according to any single individual’s private opinion, nor necessarily for the purpose of any single person’s needs whom he might have had in mind, but in accord with the mind of the whole Church, and for the exposition of the faith in its general aspects.

Bacher translates the words מֵבִּין מֵבִּין, attributed to R. Karna, contemporary of Rab. (175–247): “Hierin ist ein Geheimnis verborgen.” With this may be compared the two methods of interpretation,—the one proceeding from the simple and obvious meaning of a word, phrase, or passage in its context, and according to the rules of grammar,—the מָשֵׁמ, and the more artificial interpretation,—the מַשְׁרָה. The result of this latter type

1 525:10–12.
2 Cf. XI section 11.
4 1045:13–14.
5 1044:25–27.
6 1045:1–2.
7 Mielziner, *Intro. to Talmud*, p. 43.
9 "אֲרֵךְ מָשֵׁמ", in *Hullin* 6 a; cf. R. Kahana, in *Sah.* 63 a.
of interpretation is termed Midrash, of which there came to be developed two kinds, "midrash halacha," legal, and "midrash (h)aggada," homiletic. Back of the plain meaning may lie, according to Rabbinic tradition, an esoteric signification, deep and hidden, the דִּבְשָׁם. Acquaintance with the elaboration and articulation of the rules of interpretation into a code (under Rabbi Išmael, who rejected much of the fanciful method evolved by R. Akiba) is nowhere apparent in the writings of Aphraates. He simply regarded the Bible as the Word of God, divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit speaking through the individual writers, beneath every word of which lay a hidden meaning, to be ascertained by reverent allegorization or mystical application.

It is not difficult to show that Aphraates' attitude towards the study of the Scriptures resembles that of the Jews of his day to the study of the Torah. Its study was the end for which man was created, and he ought not be proud of having done that for which he was brought into the world. He should be prepared to suffer anything for its sake. In such a one, according to R. Jose b. R. Hanina, the words of the Torah abide, and, according to R. Joḥanan, in a man who because of his great humility regards himself as naught. The necessity of this humility in the student of the Scriptures is emphasized by Aphraates in homily xxii, section 26. The "Holy Scriptures" (הַרְשָׁנָה הָלָכָה) in Aphraates חַלְשָׁנָה מְסֶמְרוּת were inspired by God, and His Spirit spake through patriarchs and prophets. The Spirit, according to Gen. 1:3 of the Targum Onkelos, is מְסֶמְרָה מִלַּה and was created on the first day, as one of the ten things then brought into existence. According to Jewish tradition it rested upon the Patriarchs, and this same Spirit was in the Scriptures,—the נֵאֲבָה הַנִּיהוּד which spake, inspired, and prophesied. As has been shown, the "Spirit,"—called

---

1 756:1, 12, etc.
2 328:8; 405 13.
3 From Abodh de R. Nathan, ed. Schechter p. 58, note 5, and cf. the words of R. Jose bar Chanina on Prov. 8:12, in Sota 21b.
4 1045:18.
5 292:14.
6 Hagiga 12b.
the “Holy Spirit”, “or Spirit of Christ”, or “the Spirit” in Aphraates,—has all of these same functions attributed to it, save that it is nowhere stated that it was created by God. The Spirit of God had inspired the Holy Scriptures and thus they became utterly different from ordinary human writings.

The individual could appropriate as much of their meaning as he could use—and stood in need of,—but could never exhaust them. The content of the Scriptures is infinite. “If thou hast received of the Spirit of Christ, Christ suffers no loss, and if Christ abide in thee, yet He is not confined to thee.” Then after illustrating his meaning with the figure of the sun, he says: “thereby know thou that the word of God no man has compassed, nor has he set a bound to it.” With the Jewish quotation noted above (that it is the duty of a man to study the Torah, since for that purpose he was created), it is interesting to compare the following words of Aphraates, at the end of his 22nd homily: “I have written these words . . . a man born of Adam, molded by the hands of God, a student (ילומ) of the Holy Scriptures.” His own characterization of himself was as a human being, in whose creating God had exercised his infinite care, and whose essential function lay in being a student of God’s word. A cursory glance at the text of Aphraates would convince anyone that his questioner did not err in attributing to him power of exposition of Holy Scripture.

Aphraates’ saying that so infinite was the depth of Holy Scripture that were a man to study constantly from the time of Adam till the end of the world, he could not exhaust or fathom the meaning of it, (since no one can comprehend the wisdom of God) is much like the words of R. Eleazar, quoted in Shir Rabba: “. . . . Were all the seas ink, and all the reeds pens, and heaven and earth books (מכתבים) and all men writers, yet were they unable to write down the knowledge of the Law which I have obtained,
and yet I have taken as little from it as a man who dips his pencil's point in the sea, from the water of the ocean." When Aphraates says "the Word of God is like a pearl which reveals new beauties with each new aspect of it," his thought is reminiscent of the words of the school of Rabbi Ismael on Jer. 23:29: "As a hammer breaks a rock, as (the stone by) the hammer is shattered to bits, thus one single text issues in to a number of interpretations." 1

In another place Aphraates compares the Holy Scriptures to the water which quenches the thirst of the Gentiles. Commenting on Is. 41:17-19, he says: 2 "Thus does God take care of the needy..... because their tongue was dried up for the lack of water: (he says) 'I shall open rivers in the mountains,' 3 . . . . . The poor and needy who seek the water and have it not, are the people of the Gentiles; the water is the teaching of the Holy Scriptures...." 4

In Mid. Shir. Hash: "The words of the Torah are likened to water..... (as) water is not delightful to a man except he thirst for it, (so) the Torah is not delightful to him except he crave it." 5

The Scriptures then objectively are universal and infinite in scope and content. Each must learn from tradition the interpretation of them, but is not limited thereto, according to Aphraates. There may be differences of opinion, yet "whoever reads the Holy Scriptures,—both the former and latter ones in both testaments,—and reads willing to be convinced, (לומד) he can both learn and teach." 6 Aphraates believes that the product of such studies should be submitted to the whole body of the Church, to be ratified and corrected there, and should gain acceptance because of their intrinsic value under these conditions, and not because of the person of the author. 7

A. M. D. G.

---

1 Sankh. 34:9. 2 913:15-16. 3 913:18, 25-26. 4 916:1-2. 5 Mid. Shir. R. 1:19, and ff. So "the Scripture is likened to water, the Mishna to wine, the Gemara to spiced wine." The idea is, that water is of the greatest necessity to the slaking of thirst,—wine is excellent, but the spiced appetizing drink a luxury and available to only a few; from Sopherin 96. 6 1045:17-20; 1044:25-27; 1045:1-2. 7 1048:26.
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We give here the translation of a number of historical inscriptions from the city of Ashur edited by Schroeder in the second section of Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Historischen Inhalts. It is our intention to complete these translations and to supplement them later by an historical discussion.

Nr 30
Palace of Adad-nirari, king of the world, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Enlil-nirari, king of Assyria.

Nr 31
Palace of Adad-nirari, king of the world, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Enlil-nirari, king of Assyria. The booty of Taidi (var. of Irridi).  

Nr 32
Belonging to the temple of Ashur. Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, for the third (var. fourth) time made his banquet. (takultu)

Nr 33
Adad-nirari, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Enlil-nirari, king of Assyria. 5) The quay facing the river which had been weakened

1 For this city Taidi cf. KAH 1, 3, 8 and 13, col. II, 2. In the Hittite treaties we have a Taita KBo I Nr 1 rev. 28 and Nr. 3, 13.
2 For Irridi cf. KAH 1, 13, col. II and 3, 8. Both cities were in the Kashiari region. It is perhaps the same as Irrite in the Hittite treaties KBo I, Nr 1 rev. 20, 28, 57; Nr. 3, 25, 36, 39, 42, 43, 45, 50.
3 For this kisirtu cf. KAH I 3 rev. 2 and 6; 7, 3; 24, 15 and rev. 5.
by the waters and whose limestone and burnt-brick had been carried away by the flood, this quay in its thickness and beyond 11) I walled up. (To a thickness of) four and a half bricks I strengthened it; with limestone and powdered bitumen I walled up its back. 15) (When in the days of) a succeeding prince, this quay falls in ruins and the flood carries it away may he restore its ruins and wall them up. Let him return to their place my inscription and my foundation inscription. 21) Ashur and Adad shall hearken to his prayer. Who alters my inscription and my name, 25) may Ashur my Lord overturn his kingdom. May Adad my Lord with an evil lightning flash thunder upon his land. May he cast famine upon his land. 30) May he slay him, his people and his posterity in the face of his enemies. May he not stand and may he make his land like a heap of ruins caused by a hurricane. 3 Month of Nin-egal, 13th day, Eponym of Ashur-eresh.

Nr 34

1) Adad-nirari viceroy, of Enlil, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ilu, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur, son of Enlil-nirari, viceroy of Enlil, 5) priest of Ashur. When the temple of Assyrian Ishtar my Lady which formerly Ilushumma priest of Ashur my father, son of Shalim-akhi, priest of Ashur had made and completed, 10) this temple had gone to ruin and Sargon priest (var. vicar) of Ashur, son of Ikuni, priest (var. vicar) of Ashur had renovated it. Again it had fallen in ruins. Puzur-Ashur my father, priest of Ashur, son of Ashur-nirari, 15) priest (var. vicar) of Ashur had renovated it. This temple, its namaru, the shukhuru of the open court and the khurushtu of the open court, that they call altammu of Ishtar (vad. adds and the Temple of Ishkharra which is in the open court) again 20) became ruined. Adad-nirari, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ilu, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Enlil, son of Enlil-nirari, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur (var. adds this temple) 25) its weak places I strengthened, I joined its tiratu, I strengthened its foundation. Of the beams of the shukhuru and of foundation and the nabdu and the beams of the khurushtu I removed the dilapidated parts, 30) I placed new beams, I put (the work) back

4 If ia in the text be correct we understand it as a short form of ianu.
5 Mat-su ki-ma til a-bu-bi lu-si-me. This is another instance where apparently abubu does not mean flood.
in its former state and I placed my tablet. In days to come (when there is) a succeeding ruler, when this temple shall have fallen to ruin and he shall renovate it, may he (var. he shall) return to their place my tablet and my written name. Ashur shall hear his prayer. Whoever alters my inscription and my name, may Ashur do away with his kingdom, may he destroy his name, his posterity in the land, may Ishtar my Lady cause to be an overthrowing of his land, may he not stand before his enemy, with an evil lightning flash, may Adad thunder upon his land. May he cast famine upon his land. Month of Nin-egallim 10th day, Eponym of Ashur-damik (var. Month Karratu eponym of ša-adad-ninu).

Nr 35

Adad-nirari, noble prince, adorned by the gods, exalted governor for the gods, founder of cities, who smote the wild hosts of the Cassites, Kuti, Lulumi and Shubari, destroyer of the totality of the enemies in the high lands and low lands, trampling their lands, from Lupdi and Rapiku to Elukhat, conquering all men, extending frontier and boundary, king at whose feet Anu, Ashur, Shamash, Adad, and Ishtar cast all kings and princes, noble priest of Enlil, son of Arikden-ilu, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur conqueror of the lands of Turuki and Nigimkhi and all their borders with all the kings, mountains and highlands of the vast border of the Kuti, conqueror of Kutmukhi and all its allies the regions of the Akhlamu, Suti, Iauri and their lands, who enlarges frontier and boundary, grandson of Enlil-nirari, priest of Ashur, who smote the Cassite hosts and whose hand conquered all his foes who enlarged frontier and boundary scion of Ashur-uballit mighty king, whose priesthood is exalted in the glorious temple and whose royal welfare is firmly established in distant places like a mountain, who subjects the land of Musri, who overthrows the forces of the wide spreading Shubaru, who broadens frontier and boundary. The quay facing the river from the limit (sipu) of the upper city namely the Gate of Ea-sharri to the limit (sipu) of the lower city which is the Gate of Nabu, which had been weakened by the water and whose limestone and burnt brick the flood had carried away, this quay with bitumen and

* husahhu really means want, but in the meaning of want of food.
burnt brick I walled up (to the depth), of four and a half burnt bricks I strengthened it, 30) with limestone and dust of the city Ubase, 7 I walled up its kutallu and I placed my memorial. In days to come, when the quay shall have become ancient and fallen in ruins, may a succeeding prince renovate its ruins. 35) May he return to its place my inscribed name. Ashur shall hearken to his prayer. Whoever shall obliterate my name written and inscribe his own name or who shall break my memorial, shall consign it to destruction, shall throw it in the flood, 40) shall cover it with dust, shall burn it in fire, shall throw it into water, shall put it into a dark place where it may not be seen and place it (there) or whoever because of these curses shall send an hostile enemy, 45) an evil foe, a man of foreign race, or anyone else, shall make him take it, or if he plan and carry out any other (plan), may Ashur the exalted god who dwells in Ekharsagkurkurra, Anu, Enlil, Ea, and Ninmakh the great gods, the Igigu 50) of the sky, the Anunnaku of the earth, in their totality, look upon him with malevolence, may they in wrath curse him with an evil curse, may they destroy his name, his posterity, his host, and his family; may the overthrowing of his land, the destruction of his people and of his boundary issue out of their steady mouth. 55) May Adad flood him with an evil flood, may he establish in his land hurricanes, tornadoes, storms, destruction, tempest, misery, famine, drought, and want. May he hunt down his land like a flood. May he turn it to heaps and waste. May Ishtar my Lady 60) bring to pass the overthrow of his land. Before his enemy may he not stand. May Adad thunder upon his land with an evil lightning, may he cast want upon his land. Month Sipputu, eponym of Andarisina.

Nr 37

Palace of Adad-nirari, king of the world, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Bel-nirari, king of Assyria; belonging to the open court of Nin-egal.

Nr 38

Palace of Adad-nirari, king of the world, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Bel-nirari, king of Assyria, belonging to the terrace.

7 Cf. 2 R. 53a 33; Harper AB 433, 5, 626, 7. The latter text shows that the material must have been brought by water.
Nr 39
Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ilu, priest of Ashur. He walled up the promenade of the passage (?) court of the temple of Ashur his lord.

Nr 40
Palace of Adad-nirari, king of the world, son of Arik-den-ilu, king of Assyria, son of Bel-nirari, king of Assyria, belonging to the bit sudutini sami.

Nr 41
Shalmanezer, viceroy of Enlil, (AB) priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ilu, priest of Ashur. 5) When the gate ša libur-šalhi next to the storeroom for statues (bit šalme) of (?) the gate of Ashur my Lord, and its works had formerly fallen in ruin 10) I renovated its ruins, I strengthened its weak places and what had fallen down from its basis to its coping 15) I built and I placed my memorial tablet, may a succeeding prince 20) restore its ruins, may he return my written name to its place, may Ashur hearken to its prayer. Whoever alters my inscription and my name, 25) may Ashur my Lord overthrow his kingdom, may he cast want upon his land. Month Hibur, eponym of Mushabshiu-Sibilti.

Nr 42
Shalmanezer, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ilu, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur 5) When the temple of the Assyrian Ishtar my lady, which formerly Ilušhumma, priest of Ashur, my father, son of Shalim-ahi, priest of Ashur, had made and completed, (when) this temple had fallen in ruins, Sargon, 10) priest of Ashur, son of Ikuni, priest of Ashur renovated it and again it fell in ruins, Puzur-Ashur, my father, priest of Ashur, son of Ashur-nirari, priest of Ashur renovated this temple; it fell in ruins and 15) Adad-nirari, my father, priest of Ashur, renovated it. In these days Shalmanezer, viceroy of Enlil, priest of Ashur, of this house I strengthened the weak places, 20) I joined its tiratu and I placed my tablet. Whoever alters my inscription and my name, may Ashur my lord do away with his kingdom, 25) may he destroy his name and posterity in the land, may Ishtar my Lady (cause) the overthrow of
his land and people (?), may he not stand before his enemies, may Adad thunder on his land with an evil thunderclap, on his land, may he cast famine.

Nr 43
Shalmanezer, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria, son of Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, son of Arik-den-ili, 5) king of Assyria. When the former Temple of Ninuaitti my Lady, which formerly 10) the king going before me had made, had fallen in ruins, I built from its basis 15) to its coping, I returned to its (former) state and I placed my tablet.

Nr 44
To Ashur his Lord, Shalmanezer, viceroy of Bel, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur, son of Arik-den-ili, 5) priest of Ashur, the Temple of Ashur my lord in its entirety from its basis to its doping I made. More than formerly I enlarged it, for my life the prosperity 10) of my posterity and the prosperity of Assyria to Ashur my lord I presented it.

Nr 45
Temple of Shalmanezer, king of the world, son of Adad-nirari, king of the world.

Nr 46
To Ashur my lord, Shalmanezer, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur, 6) son of Arik-den-ili, priest of Ashur presented it.

Nr 47
Palace of Shalmanezer, king of the world, son of Adad-nirari, king of ... 

Nr 48
Tulkulti-Urta, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria, favorite of Ashur, priest of Ashur, faithful shepherd, favored of Ishtar, 5) conqueror of the land of the Kuti in all its parts, son of Shalmanezer, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur. When the Temple of Ishtar 10) the Assyrian my Lady, which formerly Ilushumma my father, priest of Ashur, a king who went before me, had made 1120 years, 15) had gone and the temple
had fallen in ruins and had become ancient. In these days, 20) at
the opening of my reign I removed its ruins, I reached as far as
its foundation. Eme, the house of oracles, abode of her joy,
25) Eanna sanctuary of her splendor, a magnificent abode, whose
frontage exceeding the former one, I made. 30) Like a heavenly
mansion I caused it to shine. From its basis to its coping I com-
pleted it; I placed my tablet; may a later prince 35) on the day
when this temple becomes ancient and falls in ruin restore it; may
he see my tablet; may he anoint it with oil; may he offer sacrifice.
To its place 40) may he return it. Ishtar shall hearken to his
prayer. Whoever alters my inscription and my name, may Ishtar
my Lady break his weapon, may she lower him under the hand
of his enemies.

Nr 49

1) "Tukulti-din-ib 2) šar kiššati šarru dan-nu šar mat aššur
3) ni-šit aššur šangu aššur 4) re'u ki-nu na-šat dištar 5) mu-šik-
niš mat ku-ti-i 6) a-di pa-at gim-ri 7) apil dšulma(ma)-nu-ašaridu
šangu aššur 8) apil adad-nirāri šangu aššur-ma 9) inu-ma bit
d(v. adds ištar) di(or sulma)-ni-te 10) belti-ia ša i-na pa-na (v. pana)
11) šarrani a-lik pa-ni-ia 12) e-pušu bitu šu-u 13) iš-tu pale m(ad-
nirāri 14) šangu aššur a-bi-ia 15) e-na-aḫ-ma im-šut 16) iḥ(v. ik)-
da-bit i-na ume(me) šu-ma 17) i-na (v. i-na) šur-ru šarru (LUGAL
v. XX)-ti-ia 18) ip-ri-šu u-ni-kir 19) dan-na-su ak-šud 20) bit(E)
ella (v. ella) šu-bat ḫi-da-te(v. ti)-ša 21) e-an-na šuk-lu-la 22) parak
ta-ni-iḫ-ti-ša 23) ša (var. caret) maḫ-ri-ı 24) kuḫ-ši-ša šu-tu-ru
25) epuš-ma iš-tu uš-šē-šu 26) a-di gab-dib-bi-šu 27) u-šik-lil u na-
ri-ia 28) aš-ku-um rūbu arkū inu-ma 29) bitu šu-u u-šal-ba-ru-ma
30) e-na-ḫu lu-diš lu-ni-me-ir 31) na-ri-ia šamni 32) li-ip(v. lip)-
šu-uš 33) ni-ka-a li(liḫ)-ki 34) ana aš-ri-šu-nu 35) lu-te-ir 36) di-
ni-tu 37) ik-ri-be-šu i-še-me 38) mu-ni-kir šiť-ri-ia 39) u (v. u)
šumi-ia di-ni-tu 40) bēlti wakki-šu 41) liš-be-ir 42) ana (v. a-na)
ḫat nakirē-šu 43) lu-šip-li-šu.

Tukulti Urta, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria,
favorite of Ashur, priest of Ashur, faithful shepherd, favored of
Ishtar, 5) who subjected Kut-land in all its borders, son of Shul-
manu-asharidu, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirāri, priest of Ashur.
When the temple of Ishtar-Dinite (or Shulmanite) 10 my lady,
which formerly the kings going before me had built, this temple
from the reign of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur, my father, 15) had become ruined and fallen down and destroyed. In these days, at the beginning of my reign, I removed its dust, I reached its foundation. 20) Bit-ella abode of her joy, E-an-na was completed as sanctuary of her wailing; more than formerly its frontage I made greater, 25) I built it and completed it from its base to its coping and my memorial tablet I placed. When this temple will have become ancient and become ruined, 30) may a succeeding prince renew it. May he see my memorial, may he anoint it with oil, may he offer sacrifice. To its place 35) may he return it. May Dinitu hearken to his prayer. Who alters my inscription and my name, may Dinitu 40) my Lady break his weapon, may she lower him under the hand of his enemies.

Nr 50

Tukulti-Urta, viceroy of Bel, priest of Ashur, son of Shalmanezer, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur. 5) When the temple of Anunaita my Lady, which formerly the kings my predecessors had built, this temple fell in ruin and became ancient, 10) Shalmanezer, my father, priest of Ashur, removed its ruins, reached its foundation, cast its base. 15) He built the terrace; 72 tipki (var. tikpi)8 he raised it. In these days I, Tukulti-Urta, viceroy of Bel, priest of Ashur, added 20) twenty tipki above them. I placed beams and doors. I built the terrace and completed it. 25) I built the sanctuary. Anunaita my Lady with joy and gladness in her sanctuary I caused to dwell and I put my memorial in place. 30) May a succeeding prince renovate its ruins. May he return my inscribed name to its place. Anunaita shall hearken to his prayer.

Nr 51

Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria, 5) son of Shalmanezer, king of Assyria. When the Temple of the Assyrian Ishtar my Lady, which Ilu-shumma, 10) my sublime father had formerly built, this temple fell in ruin. Its ruins 15) I removed. Its site I changed. The Bit-shukhuri and the namaru 20) according to plan I built a big shrine for the dwelling of Ishtar my Lady, I cast, from its base 25) to its coping I built it.

8 The metathesis in the variant is interesting. Tikpu, a brick thickness is properly the Hebrew and Talmudic ţepaḥ, fistbreadth from the first knuckle to the last.
INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASHUR

Nr 52

Tukulti-Ninib, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Shalmanezer, king of Assyria. 5) When the temple of Shulmanitu (or Dinitu) my Lady, which Ilushumma, a king, my predecessor, had built (when) this temple 10) fell in ruin and became ancient, I removed its ruins, I reached its foundation. 15) From its base to its coping I built it. I placed my memorial. May a succeeding prince renovate its ruins. May he return to its place my inscribed name. Ashur shall hearken to his prayer.

Nr 53

Palace of Tukulti-Urta, king of the world.

Nr 54

To Ashur the great Lord, father of the gods, his Lord, Tukulti-Urta, viceroy for Bel, priest of Ashur, son of Shalmanezer, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur.

Nr 59

Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, mighty king, king of Assyria, 5) favorite (nišit) of Ashur, priest of Ashur, faithful shepherd, favored (našat) by Ishtar, conqueror of the land of the Guti 10) in all its borders, son of Shalmanezer, priest of Ashur, son of Adad-nirari, priest of Ashur. 15) When the temple of the Assyrian Ishtar my Lady, which 20) formerly Ilushumma, my father, priest of Ashur, a king, my predecessor, 25) had built, 1120 years having passed, this temple 30) fell in ruin and became ancient. In these days at the beginning of my reign 35) I removed its ruins, I reached its foundation. E-me the oracle-house, 40) abode of her joy, E-an-na sanctuary of her glory (la-li-ša) 45) as a magnificent dwelling, its frontwall being greater than formerly, I built (it). 50) Like a heavenly mansion I beautified it (u-be-ni); from its base to its coping, 55) I completed it. I placed my memorial. May a succeeding prince, when 60) this temple shall have become ancient and fallen in ruin, restore it. May he see 65) my memorial. With oil may he anoint it. May he offer sacrifices. To its place 70) may he return it. Ashur shall hearken to his prayer. Who alters 75) my inscription and my name, may Ishtar my Lady break his weapon. 80) At the hand of his enemies may she lower him. In these days at the beginning of my reign (to) Ishtar the Lady another temple
that she had requested me to raise above the former Eanna, 85) Etil, the abode of Ishtar, my Lady, which is before the bit-edinu, the northern wall was placed against (?) the abode of Ishtar and the bit-shakhruru before it was not made.

Nr 93
1) Palace of Ashurnasirpal, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of Assyria.

Nr 95
Palace of Ashurnasirpal, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Adad-nirari, king of the world, king of Assyria.

Nr 96
Shalmanezer, king of the world, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of the world, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, who established the wall of the city Ashur.

Nr 97
Shalmanezer, vicar of Ashur, son of Ashurnasirpal, do, son of Tukulti-Urta do, for his life and the welfare of his city 5) the walls of the gate which formerly kings going before me had built and which had fallen in ruin in (a for an) their entirety from (ušdu) its base do its summit 9 he built. In its foundation 10) I placed memorial cones. When the wall of his gate shall have fallen in ruin may a coming prince built it. Ashur and Adad shall hearken to his prayer. May he return the memorial cones to their place.

Nr 98
Palace of Shalmanezer, governor for Bel, priest of Ashur (var. king of the world), son of Ashurnasirpal, priest of Ashur (var. king of the world). When the temple of Belat-Nipha my Lady, which Tukulti-Urta, 5) my father, prince of Ashur, had built formerly, had fallen in ruin, Shalmanezer... anew...

Nr 100
Shalmanezer, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of Assyria, conqueror from the Great Sea of the Western Land which is of the Sunset to the Sea 5) of Chaldea

* Lit. to its lip. a se-ap-te-su, a for ad (or adi), such abbreviations, being Northern, are not found in genuine Babylonian.
which they call the Salt river I ruled. When the former wall of my city of Ashur which Tukulti-Urta, son of Shalmanezer, had built before me I removed its ruins, I strengthened its foundation (dannatu), I built it up, from its base (uššu) to its coping, I completed it. More than formerly I beautified, I made it bigger. I placed my memorial and my foundation record. May a forthcoming prince renovate its ruins, may he return my inscribed name to its place. Ashur shall hearken to his prayer. The name of the battlement is munirrit kibrati.

Nr 101
Shalmanezer, mighty king, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Ashurnasirpal, mighty king, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of Assyria, builder of the temple.

Nr 102
Shalmanezer, mighty king, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, king of Assyria, builder of the wall of the city of Ashur.

Nr 103
Shalmanezer, viceroy of Bel, priest of Ashur, son of Ashurnasirpal, priest of Ashur, son of Tukulti-Urta, priest of Ashur. Armada ša bit Ashur my lord, who formerly had not been made, with the wisdom of my heart I made of gold.

Nr 104
Palace of Shalmanezer, great king, mighty king, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of Assyria.

Nr 105
Palace of Shalmanezer, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Ashurnasirpal, king of the world, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Urta, king of the world, king of Assyria.

Nr 117
1) Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, maker of the statue of Ashur and of the great gods, raised like a mountain

10 Here as often enuma means this is the time when.
this bit-akiti 5) from its foundation to its coping with limestone and mountain stone.

Nr 118

1) I am Semnacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, maker of the statues of Ashur, Anu, Sin, Shamash, Adad, Nirgal, Ishtar (of) Bit-kidmuri, MAH, and the great gods. 5) The bit-akiti, abode of Ashur my lord (with) white limestone I lay its foundation

Nr 119

I am Sennacherib (king of the world), king of Assyria, maker of the images of Ashur, Sherua, Anu, Sin, Shamash, Adad, Ishtar of Bit-kidmuri, MAH, 5) Gaga, Hani, Kubu, DUB, Nergal, Ningalkimakh and the great gods. The foundation of the New Year's Temple for the festival and the banquet of Ashur with limestone and mountain stone I cast its base.

Nr 125

1) Esarhaddon, king of the world, king of Assyria, noble prince, beloved of Ashur and Ninlil 5) upon whom you put your protection and on whom you kept watch in view of his reigning. All his foes you slew. 10) You caused him to attain his desire. On his father's throne you made him sit at ease and the dominion over the lands you entrusted to him. 15) (He is) the son of Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria (v. adds maker of the images of Ashur and of the great gods), son of Sargon, king of the world, king of Assyria (v. adds, who looks after the sanctuary of Ashur and Ninlil). The former Temple of Ashur 20) which Shulmanu-asharidu, son of Adad-nirari, king of Assyria, a prince, my predecessor had made, had become weakened and 586 years 25) having passed it had fallen in ruin. Of this temple I did not alter the location. 30) On a foundation deposit of gold and silver, precious stones, fragrant herbs, oil, cedar-wood I cast its base and I placed its bricks. 35) I erected it and finished it. That people may wonder I made this thing a success. For my life, the lengthening of my days, 40) the establishing of my reign, the safety of my offspring, the protection of my throne and priesthood, the overwhelming of my enemies, 45) the prosperity of the harvests of Assyria, the safety of Assyria I made (it).
THE HITTITES, MITANNI AND BABYLONIA IN THE
TELL EL-AMARNA LETTERS

By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Hittites.

In way of introduction it is necessary to give in brief outline an
idea of the Hittites in general, their history, language, religion and
culture. We shall then be in a position to collect and to utilize
whatever references there are to the Hittites in the Tell el-Amarna
Letters.

Only forty-five years ago the Hittites were classed with the other
small Syrian tribes mentioned in the Old Testament, and what
was known of the Hittites was chiefly drawn from the Old Testa-
ment. In Gen. 9:15 we read that Canaan begat Zidon and Heth,
and we believed Heth to be the ancestor of the Hittites. In Gen. 23
we learned that Abraham bought the Cave of Machpelah from
Ephron the Hittite. In almost every one of the twenty-two passages¹
in the Old Testament where the early inhabitants of Canaan are
mentioned, the Hittites are given a conspicuous place. In Ezekiel
16:3, 45, the prophet is reported to have said of Jerusalem, "thy
father was an Amorite and thy mother a Hittite." There are a few
other references to the Hittites in the Old Testament, namely,
Gen. 25:9; 26:34; 36:2; I Sam. 26:6; II Sam. 8:9f.; 11:3f.;
23:39; I Kings 10:28f.; 1:1, and they teach us that the Hittites
were in Palestine in the time of David and Solomon. But there is
nothing in the Old Testament that would lead us to think of the
Hittites as a great people in accordance with the information about
them which has recently been brought to light.

In 1872 William Wright of Cambridge, England, made the first
serious study of the Hittites, but Hittitology did not really begin until
in 1886 when a second edition of his book appeared. The next
important step was made in this science when Hugo Winckler in

¹ Gen. 13:17; 15:18, 20; 34:30; Ex. 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23, 28; 33:2; Deut.7:1;
20:17; Josh. 3:10; 9:1; 11:13; 12:8; 24:11: Judg. 3:5; Ezra 9:1; Neh. 9:8; I Kings.
9:20; II Chr. 8:7.
1906-1907 found the great Hittite archive in Boghazkōi. Since then, especially immediately after the Great War, great interest has been displayed in the subject, and the names of Hrozný, Weidner, and Sommer have stood out preeminently as those of pioneers. In 1911 Messerschmidt made a corpus of all Hittite texts known up to that time. But since then many have been published. However, these latter are chiefly in Cuneiform, while Messerschmidt's corpus contains only hieroglyphic texts.

Besides these native texts—hieroglyphic and Cuneiform—which are in the process of being published and studied—although the hieroglyphic has not yet been finally deciphered—there are other sources of information about the Hittites. There are Egyptian reliefs, paintings, and royal inscriptions, in temples and tombs, which furnish material for the study of the Hittites. There are Hittite names in Babylonian texts, and there are Hittite names and glosses in the Tell el-Amarna Letters.

The term Hittite comes to us from the Old Testament where it appears as רֵית. It occurs in Cuneiform as Ḫatti and in Egyptian as Ḫi-ti, Ḫe-ta(ht'), or Ḫeta. The derivation of Ḫatti is not certain. Hommel in Grundriß, p. 42, Anm. 4, p. 44, has suggested that its origin is to be found in the divine name Ḫattu, found in combination in personal names, and to be seen in a later form in the name of the goddess Ᾱētē or Ᾱētēg. It has also been suggested that Ḫatti is equivalent to Ḫani, on the Euphrates, and that this latter is a shortened form of Hanigalbat (cf. MDOG 21, 50f.; Meyer GA 2, 592). If this be so the earliest centre of Hittite civilization is to be found on the Euphrates, which later was transferred to Boghazkōi. At any rate it is becoming very apparent that the Hittite empire consisted of many principalities or kingdoms stretching from Western Asia Minor to the plains east of the Tigris, and from the Black Sea to Damascus.

According to Egyptian representation, the Hittites were men with long, slightly bent nose, receding forehead, large jaw-bones, short, round double chin, and red skin. They were a mixed Aryan and Caucasian race, growing out of five groups, a Proto-Hittite people who inhabited the mountains of Cappadocia, a Luvian people who dwelt in Northern Asia Minor and Cilicia, a Bata people who inhabited Paphlagonia, a Harrian folk who dwelt in north-eastern

2 Cf. v. Lusch in Archiv für Anthropologie 19.
Mesopotamia, and a Kanisian people who came from the region of the sea of Marmora and founded what we know as the Empire of the Hittites, and in whose language is the bulk of the Boghazkøi inscriptions. The Kanisians established themselves as a kingdom as early as the second half of the fourth millenium B.C. Their capital was probably at Ḥanigalbat. There an empire was developed, but finally became two—the Harrian in Armenia and the Mitannian further south-west. About 2100 B.C. there differentiated from the Mitannian people an Empire which retained as its name an abbreviated form of the name of the capital city, namely, the Ḥani or Ḥatti empire, that is, the Empire of the Hittites. This empire was chiefly the creation of the great king Labarnaš who resided in Kuššar.

The first historical appearance, however, of the Hittites in military enterprise was in the reign of Samsuditana of Babylonia, about 1956-1926 (King, Chronicles II, p. 22). They over-ran Babylonia and paved the way for the fall of the Ḥammurabi dynasty and the coming of the Kassites, and from this time until 1300 B.C., the Hittites were very influential in the Oriental world. Three hundred years later there is a reference to this Hittite invasion of Babylonia, for Agumkakrine, about 1650, relates (V R 33; KB III, 1, 134 ff.; cf. King, Chronicles I, 149) that he took back the pictures of Marduk and Sarpanitum which had previously been carried off to the land of Ḥani. Furthermore, there seems to be evidence that previous to the reign of Samsuditana Hittites had come into contact with Assyria, for the builder of the wall of the city of Aššur in Assyria and the founder of the temple of Ashur, in the same city, bore Hittite names, namely, Ušpia and Kikia (BA VI, Hft. 5, p. 12).

The successor of Labarnaš is not known, but a king by the name of Hattušili I seems to have been the third king after his reign. The fifth king seems to have been Muršiliš I, who reigned about 1900, and made Boghazkøi his capital. He was in turn succeeded by Telibinus, who seems to have been the last of these powerful kings for the next three hundred and fifty years. About 1700 B.C. the Hittites again became powerful, and from the western portion of this empire went the Hyksos, about 1650, to conquer Egypt. For the next two hundred years very little is known of

3 Olmstead doubts that the Hittites destroyed Babylon, JEA 8, 224.
the Hittites. But in the reign of Thutmose III of Egypt tribute was received from them and they were finally conquered. Thutmose III later defeated the confederated states of Syria and gain the whole of Western Asia for Egypt. This brings us to the period of the Tell el-Amarna correspondence.

The Hittite dynasty of the Tell el-Amarna period began with Šubbiluliuma, who seems to have been the son of a small city-king who claimed the grandiose title "great king, king of Ḫatti." This city-king was probably Hattusili II, c. 1400. However that may be, Šibbiluliuma was a strong man. He conquered the Mitanni, under Tušratta, and put Mattiuza on the Mitannian throne. Aziru recognized his overlordship and he became so powerful that Rib-Addi was moved to warn Amenophis IV against him. He reigned about 1380—1350, overlapping the reigns of Amenophis III and Amenophis IV. One of the Tell el-Amarna letters is from his hand to Amenophis IV, namely No. 41.

Šubbiluliuma was succeeded by his son Arandas, c. 1350—1345, who died early, and was succeeded by his brother, Muršiliš II, c. 1345—1315. This king became powerful and made alliances with Arzawa, Gasga, Tibia, and Zihria. He fought against Rameses II at Kadeš and is referred to in the Boghazköl texts. He had four children, Ḥalpaššulubi, Muttallu, Hattušili, and a daughter, Ilānirinna. His reign extends beyond the Tell el-Amarna period.4

Muršiliš II was succeeded by two sons, in succession, Muttallu, c. 1315—1300, and Hattušili III, c. 1300—1270, both of whom are mentioned in the famous Rameses II treaty. The Boghazköl documents mention the former as conqueror of the Amurru and from the latter's reign come most of the Boghazköl texts. Two well-known kings follow this reign, namely, Duḏhalia,5 c. 1270—1250 and Arnuanta, c. 1250—1240, but before the reign of the former, Assyria, under Šalmaneser I, 1280, had slaughtered the Hittite armies. The Hittite empire was now losing ground and by the end of the eighth century B.C. the greater part of the Hittite possessions had passed out of their hands and the Hittite power came to an end in the reign of Sargon of Assyria who conquered


5 See OLZ 24, 36—70 for a thesis to the effect that Duḏhalia preceeded Hattušili III.
Carchemish in 717 B.C. Thus came to an end a mighty empire of at least forty-four kings of which we at present know very little, but of which we hope to know more after the Boghazköy and other inscriptions have yielded up their secrets.

The Hittites were a mixed people, and it is becoming clearer every day that the Hittite language was also a mixture. There are undoubtedly Aryan elements in the language, and besides that there is evidence of several other languages. Forrer believes that there are as many as eight languages to be found in the Boghazköy inscriptions, namely, Proto-Hittite, Luvian, Balâin, Harrian, Kanisian (or Azawan), Sumerian, Babylonian, and Mandaian. Since the publication of Hrozný's *Die Sprache der Hethiter* (Leipzig, 1917), where he pleads for an Indo-European language, a good many scholars have expressed their opinion on this question. Prince in *JAOS* 41, 210 ff.; Bloomfield in *JAOS* 41, 195 ff.; and Sayce in *JRAS* 1920, 49—83, have criticized Hrozný, admitting a certain Indo-European element but declaring against his position. No reliable scholar seems yet to have been converted to Hrozný's way of thinking, with the exception of Marstrander, *Caractère indo-européen de la Langue Hittite* (Christiania, 1918). However, the matter is still unsettled and will remain so until much further investigation.

Little is yet known of Hittite religion. The names of many gods are extant. Animism was common as such titles as "lady of mountains and rivers" would indicate. Sometimes the same god bore different names in different places, thus, the sun-god was called Telebinuš among the Kanisians, Wôi among the Proto-Hittites and Hebat among the Harrians. There were many demons and all bad luck was ascribed to them. There were temples and pictures of divine beings, and feasts were held in honour of the gods. According as the Hittites came in contact with great foreign nations, their deities were worshipped, such, for example, as Re of Egypt, Asher and Ishara of Assyria, and Mithra, Varuna, Indra and perhaps Nāsatya of India.

The best known Hittite deities were: The sun-god, Teshub, the storm-god, Mâ (?), the great mother, Sandan, her son, Tarhu, Hipa, Sallu, and Tilla.

There are indications that the Hittites developed quite a considerable literature consisting of hymns, prayers, legends, roya
addresses, annals, contracts, letters, &c., and there is reason to believe that the future will reveal the Hittites to us as one of the greatest peoples of the ancient world.

We are now ready to bring together those passages in the Tell el-Amarna Letters which have to do with the Hittites. Long before the Tell el-Amarna period the two peoples, Hittites and Mitannians, had separated, and during the Tell el-Amarna period we find them arrayed against each other. We have seen that Šubbiluliuma, founder of a Hittite dynasty, during the reign of Amenophis III, had conquered Mitanni under Tušratta and put Mattiuaza on the throne. Before this event, however, it seems that Tušratta had been victorious over the Hittites (17:30 ff.). But Tušratta’s defeat is referred to by Rib-Addi in 75:36, who warns the pharaoh against Šubbiluliuma. This resulted in a period of friendship between the Egyptians and Mitannians, reflected in 54:40 ff., and 56:39 ff. However, at a later date, it seems that the Hittite king was sufficiently in accord with the kings of Mitanni and Kašši (Babylonia) to serve Rib-Addi the means of undertaking the overthrow of Abdiaširta and his sons (116:71). But the sons of Abdiaširta had their day, for later they became mighty through the “mighty king” (Egyptian) after presenting him with gold and silver (126:66).

The Hittites were as a rule at enmity with the Egyptians, although the pharaoh did not always seem to realize the situation. On several occasions he was warned against them. Thus, the king of Alašia warns him against an alliance with the king of the Hittites and with Sanbar (35:49; cf. 75:36; 164:21). The Hittites persuaded the king of Ugarit to desert the pharaoh (45:22, 30; cf. 151:55 ff.), they backed the Ube people in their revolt from Egypt (54:29, 33), they persuaded servants and representatives of the pharaoh to desert him (196:17; cf. 197:24), and whenever they could they burned and destroyed the lands of the Egyptians (136:51; 174:11 ff.; 175:11; 176:11). Nevertheless, whenever it suited the purpose of the Hittites they sought alliance with the pharaoh, just as Šubbiluliuma, when he, perhaps, was at enmity with Tušratta, asked for the same relations with the Egyptian king Ḫūria (=Napḫuria?, i. e. Amenophis IV) as obtained between himself and Amenophis III (41).

With Aitugama, king of Kinza, the Hittites were usually in accord. Aitugama served the Hittite king by gaining allies for him (53:13),
and in turn the Hittite king assisted Aïtugama, as when he helped the king of Kinza against Akizzi of Kaṭna (53:9). Of course, Kaṭna was never a favourite place with the Hittite king, and he, with Aziru and other cities, burned Kaṭna and carried off its gods (55). He likewise united with Aïtugama in burning the cities of the pharaoh (174:11 ff.; 175:11; 176:11).

On the other hand, the Hittites as a rule were hostile to Aziru in spite of his alliance with him against Kaṭna (55). The Hittite king was feared by Aziru (157:28), and Aziru complained to the pharaoh that he could not come to Dudu because the Hittite king was in Nuhašše (164:21; cf. 165:18, 39; 166:22; 167:11, 20). And yet Aziru must have been sometimes constrained to cast in his lot with the Hittites, as he did, at least, on one occasion (55), for we learn from 161:49 that the pharaoh reproached him because he had received messengers of the Hittite king.

Hittite soldiers were much in demand. They were sought for in the conquest of Gubla (126:59), and, under the leadership of one Lupakku, they took the cities of Amki and of Aaddumi (170:14 ff.), and they were the terror of the Amurri (165:20?, 35; 166:24) and of the people of Tunip (165:39; 166:25; 167:23). With the exception of a few fragmentary references to the Hittites (51 Rev. 4; 52:30; 59:23; 126:76; 140:31; and 196:10), 43 which is too fragmentary to be clearly determined, and 44 which tells of messengers from the pharaoh to the Hittites, the only other information in the Tell el-Amarna Letters about the Hittites is to be found in Nos. 41 and 42 both of which are Hittite letters. The first, already referred to, was written by Šubbiluliuma to the Egyptian king, in which he desires that the same friendship which obtained between himself and the former pharaoh be continued between himself and Amenophis IV. He then enumerates the presents which he sends. No. 42 was probably sent by the same Hittite king to the same pharaoh, although this cannot be certain because of the fragmentary condition of the tablet. The letter seems to deal with some misunderstanding that had arisen between the two monarchs, and the writer wishing to put an end to such sends an atoning present. However, these two letters, although actual correspondence between the two great rulers, do not add much to our knowledge of either the one or the other. They give us the name of Šubbiluliuma the great king of the Hatti-land, also the
Hittite equivalent of Naphthuria, the name of the Egyptian king. They show us how greetings were sent and how messengers were dispatched back and forth with greetings and presents. They show us how solicitous kings were to retain each other's friendship, and how Subbiluliuma reigned during the lifetime of both Amenophis III and Amenophis IV.

Fragmentary as all these references in the Tell el-Amarna letters are to the Hittites we are thankful for them, for they will take their place in time in the reconstruction of the history, life, and manners of a mighty Oriental people.

Mitanni.

As early as the time of Thutmose III we meet with a foreign land, by name, Miten, which Müller in his AE p. 284 located on the Euphrates. Prior, however, to the conquests of Thutmose I and Thutmose III, it seems that the kingdom of Mitanni extended south-west of the Euphrates and included Naharin; and in the campaign against Egypt, the leader of the forces of Naharin was probably the king of Mitanni. The campaigns of the pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty curtailed and eventually destroyed Mitanni's claim to suzerainty in Amurru and confined the kingdom of Mitanni to the eastern side of the Euphrates.

The Hittite bilingual of Tarkudimme mentions a king of the city Metan (Hilprecht, Assyriaca 122 ff.; Hml Gr² 49, 50, Anm. 2), which is Mitanni. It used to be the fashion to connect Mitanni with Mavnavi (Niebuhr, Studien und Bemerkungen), and locate it in Asia Minor (Wnk Frsch I, 1², p. 20), but Ungnad's researches (VS VII and BA VI, 5) have shown that the land of Mitanni is to be identified with Subartu, which the Babylonians always located in the north-east with Gutium. According to cuneiform Omen texts, the world was thus divided: South, Elam; North, Akkad; West, Amurru; and East, Subartu. Moreover, in an Assyrian list, Tešub is given as Adad of the land Su (an abbreviated form of Subartu), and in No. 100, 21, Subartu is associated with Mitanni. Among the western Semites and the Egyptians, the word Naharina was used for Mitanni, and in the Tell el-Amarna Letters Ḥanigalbat is to be identified with Mitanni.

The land of Mitanni may have originally developed out of one city, namely, Miten (although this city has never been identified),
because of the phrase "land of the city of Miten" and may have belonged to the Hittites, for this peculiar expression is confined to the Hittites (cf. 41, 2, 3; 42, 10; 44, 1, 8, 19).

Winckler (Vorl. Nachr. 46 ff.) thinks that the Mitanni people were the oldest element in the Hittite peoples. At any rate, it seems that they were originally a branch of the Hittite stock, but by the time of the Tell el-Amarna correspondence they were differentiated from the Hittites with whom they were frequently at war.

According to Bork (MVAG 1909, 1, 2), the language of Mitanni is Caucasian and similar in construction to the language of Elam, and Jensen (ZA V, 166 ff.; VI, 34 ff.) thinks that it is neither Hittite nor Indo-European, but Vannic or Caucasian. Recent students of the problem, however, seem to see in Mitannian the oldest indigenous language of Mesopotamia, and very similar to Hittite. The many Mitannian proper names that are preserved appear to be Aryan in character.

In his Vorl. Nachr. 37, Winckler has been able to reconstruct the following dynasty of Mitannian kings who reigned contemporaneously with some of the pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ša-uš-ša-tar} & \\
\text{Artatama I} & \\
\text{Šutarna I} & \\
\text{Tušratta} & \text{Artatama II} \\
\text{Mattiuaza} & \text{Šutarna II (Šuttatarna)}
\end{align*}
\]

Recent discoveries, including those of Ungnad (MDOG 21, p. 34, 39; 25, 66 ff.; VS VII; BA VI, 5), have shown not only that Mitannians were in Babylonia as early as the Hammurabi dynasty, but also that the city of Aššur was founded by them, and that they were the earliest inhabitants of Assyria. But there is a great gap in our knowledge of Mitanni, extending from these early days until about 1430, when Šaušatar conquered the city of Aššur. Šaušatar

* The two men who are supposed to have established the temple and wall of Aššur were Ušpia and Kikia (MDOG 21, pp. 34, 39; 25, pp. 66 ff.), and these are Mitannian names.
was probably a contemporary of Amenophis II (1448–1420 B.C.). From that time until the reign of Tušratta, Mitanni is supposed to have held Assyria in vassalage.

Šaušatar was succeeded by Artatama I, whose name occurs in Egyptian literature (cf. ŽA VIII 385; MVAG 1900, 1, p. 7 A), of whom we hear from a letter of Tušratta (29, 16 ff.; cf. 24 III 52) that he gave his daughter in marriage to Thutmose IV (1421–1413 B.C.). Šutarna I was the next king, and he gave his daughter in marriage to Amenophis III (29, 18 ff.), his sister’s son. He may have been succeeded by a son, Artaššumara, of whom we know practically nothing (17, 11 ff.). However, the next king was Tušratta, about 1390 (17, 11–20), son of Šutarna, and the best known of the kings of Mitanni. Besides lists of presents the Amarna documents contain seven of his letters to Amenophis III, one to the widow of Amenophis III and three to Amenophis IV. A man, by name, Tuḫi, was regent during the minority of Tušratta, but, for some reason or other was later put to death by Tušratta. Tušratta was an energetic king and waged war against the Hittites (17, 30 ff.), but before the end of his reign anarchy arose, and Assyria broke away from his overlordship. This condition was aggravated by the disloyalty of his brother, Artatama, who sided with the Hittites, as did also his grandson, Šutarna.

Tušratta married his daughter, Taduḫepa, to both Amenophis III and Amenophis IV. Tušratta was murdered probably in a court conspiracy, which produced anarchy in Mitanni. This gave Subbiluliuma, the Hittite king, an opportunity of interfering in the affairs of Mitanni, and having placed Mattiuaza, an exiled son of Tušratta, upon the throne, he married him to his daughter and took to himself the rôle of suzerain (MDOG 35, 36; Bohl in Theol. Tijdschrift, 1916, pp. 170 ff.; Figulla and Weidner, Keilschrifttexte I, obv., ll. 48 ff.). A period of anarchy ensued under Mattiuaza, and the next stable reign seems to have been that of Artatama II, a brother of Tušratta. He was succeeded by his son, Šutarna II. The next king may have been Aitugama, but of him we know nothing. From Egyptian sources we learn that Thutmose I, Thutmose III, and Amenophis II waged successful war against Naharina, i.e., Mitanni.

It has been suggested that Tuḫi may be the same as To’i or To’u of II Sam. 8:9 ff., I Chr. 18:9 ff., but this is all that is known of any possible connection at the present time.
One of the greatest characters of Egyptian Amarna history of the Mitannian period was Queen Tiy, wife of Amenophis III and mother of Akhenaten. Although she is not to be identified with Giluhēpa, as some scholars hold, she was most likely a Mitannian princess, for the name is Mitannian in character (e. g., see the Mitannian names in Clay BE XV, such as Ta-a-a, Ta-i-til-la; cf. Kn. pp. 1058 ff.). She was thoroughly acquainted with political circumstances (26, 7—18; 24, 42 ff.; 29, 8, 9, 45 f., 143); she corresponded with Tušratta in favour of Amenophis IV (26, 20 ff.); she influenced the politics of her husband and son (29, 66 f.); and Tušratta sent special gifts to her (27, 112), and greeted her on several occasions (27, 4; 28, 7; 29, 3).

Of Mitannian religion very little is known. The great god of the Mitannians seemed to have been Tešub. The name is written with an ideogram, IM, like Adad of Amurrū, and he is parallel to Adad in character (K 2100, col. 1, 18). He is represented standing on a panther, with a double-axe in his hand. Later he is represented with a saw in one hand and a three-forked thunder-bolt in the other, and wears a beard and long hair. Still later, he appears with a double-axe and a thunder-bolt, and stands on an ox. The oldest occurrence of the divine name Tešub, in proper names, is to be found in one of Ungnad’s texts, namely, Te-es-šu-up-’a-ri (VS VII, 72, 10; cf. Kn 24 IV 36, Ar-te-e-es-šu-pa). The corresponding Mitannian goddess seems to have been Ḥepa, of whom nothing is known.

Besides the Tell el-Amarna Letters, much information about Mitanni comes to us from the Boghazkoi inscriptions, especially about Tušratta and his successor. In the Amarna Letters the name Ḥanigalbat is used for Mitanni, but in the other sources it seems to be used in reference to a part only of the empire of Mitanni (Tiglathpilesers I, Prism V, 34). In Egypt the name Naharina was used.

About the minor affairs of the Mitannians the Tell el-Amarna Letters have very little to say. The so-called Mitanni Letters are 17—29. No. 17 deals with the reign of Tušratta and the regent Tuhi, where we learn about the assassination of Artaššumara, eldest brother of Tušratta, and the death of Tuhi at the hand of Tušratta. It also informs us about Tušratta’s war with the Hittites and his friendly relations with Egypt. No. 18 deals with friendly correspondence between Egypt and Mitanni, and No. 19 is characterized by Tušratta’s love of Egyptian gold. No. 20 continues this charac-
te rization, and, in addition, throws much light upon the way in which princesses and gold were interchanged between these ancient monarchs. No. 21 is similar. In No. 22 we have a list of presents as a dowry for Taduḥepa, and 23 describes how the goddess Ištar of Nineveh decided to visit Egypt, and the pharaoh is advised to receive her with much honour. No. 24, although written in cuneiform, is in the Mitannian language. It seems to contain negotiations concerning two cities, Harwahe and Mashrianni, the former of which was to be assigned to Egypt, the latter to Tušratta. No. 25 is another dowry list, but 26 is important because in it we see the great Queen Tiy intervening with Tušratta for friendship with her son, Ikhnaton. Tušratta wants rich presents. In Nos. 27, 28, and 29 letters from Tušratta to Amenophis IV, we have repeated requests for much Egyptian gold.

Letter 30 is a pass-port letter addressed by an unnamed king, probably a king of Mitanni, to the kings of Canaan, exhorting them to see that his messenger, Akiya, receives no hindrance, but is safely and speedily sent forward on his way to the Egyptian court.

Mitanni is also mentioned in other Tell el-Amarna letters. Thus in 58, 5 [Kat]ihutišupa reports to Egypt that the Mitannian king is making a warlike expedition against him; 75, 38 refers to a report of Rib-Addi to Egypt to the effect that the Hittites have conquered Mitanni (cf. 17, 32, in time of Tušratta); 85, 51 shows the Mitannian king retreating from an attack on Gubla because of lack of water; in 86, 12 and 90, 20 we find the Mitannians supporting Abdiaširta and the Sa. Gaz-people; 95, 27 ff. shows the king of Mitanni in a covetous mood towards Amurru; while 101, 10 probably refers to a tribute which Gubla was obliged to pay to Mitanni. According to 109, 6, Rib-Addi reports to Egypt the former hostility of the king of Mitanni to Egypt; and 107, 26 refers to relations between Aziru and Mitanni. Finally, there are several indications, according to Rib-Addi, that the king of Mitanni was ready to encroach upon the domains of Egypt wherever possible (76, 14; 104, 21; 116, 70).

**Babylonia.**

According to the Tell el-Amarna Letters and the lists of Kassite kings, Karduniaš was a name applied to Babylonia. Originally it seems to have been co-terminous with the southern sea-land, occupied
by the Kassites, the later land of the Chaldees. But according as the Kassite domains extended northward, the name Karduniaš was applied until the whole of Babylonia was called Karduniaš. Sennacherib, for example, used it to designate the sea-land. The word is Kassite but its meaning is still uncertain. Hüsing (OLZ 1915, 1—4) still thinks that it means "sea-land." The word is written Kar-\textit{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{}}}}}Duniaš, Kar-\textit{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{}}}}}Duniaš, Karuduniaš, matuKarduniš and matuKar-
du. The most obvious translation would be "Mountain of the god Duniaš," but no such god is known.

In these latters Babylonia often occurs under the form matuKaši, for example in 76:12 ff.; 104:17 ff.; 116:67 ff. (see Meyer, Aegyptiaca, pp. 62 ff., also GA², pp. 582 ff.). This should be compared with the Hebrew \textit{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{}}}}} as the father of Nimrod, in contrast to \textit{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{\textipa{}}}}} (Gen. 10² J), the son of Ham. In fact it seems that at least one king of the Kassite dynasty, namely, Karaindaš I inserted Kaššu in his title as well as Karduniaš (IV² R 36[38], No. 3). See, however, to the contrary, Sayce in ET XV, 282 ff. But there is no doubt that matuKaši in these same letters refers sometimes to Nubia in Africa. This is probably so in the following instances, 127, 22; 131, 13; 246, Rev. 8 and 287, 72. It is undoubtedly so in 133, 17 where ka-[si] is equated with [matu-me-lu-]ha, if the restorations are to be trusted, for Meluša is undoubtedly Nubia just as Magan is Egypt (see Winckler in KB V, p. XXX, note 1; Zimmer in Ges-
Buhl², 336; Streck, Assurbanipal mit Nachfolgern, III, 794 ff.; Albright, "Magan, Meluša, and the Synchronism between Menes and Naram-Šin," JEA, VII, 80—87). The term Kaši may very well have originated in Babylonia, then may have been carried to Arabia and finally to north-east Africa.

It may be that it was only to later Babylonia, or at any rate, to Babylonia of the Kassite dynasty that the term Kaši was applied, and this happens to be the dynasty whose kings are referred to in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Who these Kassites were it is at present difficult to determine with any degree of certainty. Attempts have been made to connect them with the Koššaiš, a wild people from the valleys of the Zagros, south-west of Media, and with the Koššaiš, the inhabitants of the land of Koššiš, as Herodotus called the land of Susa, both of which places may be identical. At any rate they seem to have been an Indo-Germanic people, a horse-keeping race, and a ruling cast or aristocracy akin to later rulers of Mitanni.
They established themselves in Babylonia about 1750 B.C., and remained in control for about five hundred and sixty-five years. They were a non-literary people, and the only specimen of their language which we have is a short vocabulary (Delitzsch, Die Sprache der Kossäer, p. 25; Pinches, "The language of the Kassites, JRAS, 1917, 101—114), which seems to show some kinship with the Hittites.

As early as the reign of Samsu-iluna, we find Kassite tribes raiding the eastern frontier of Babylonia (King, Letters, III, 242; CT VI, 23b; VS VII, 64, 183ff.; Ungnad, BA, VI, 5, 22), but their conquest of Babylonia was a gradual affair. The founder of their dynasty in Babylonia was a Gandaš (or Gaddash), and at least thirteen kings reigned after him before Karaindaš I, the first Kassite king to have relations with Egypt, as far as we know. Karaindaš I began to reign about 1460, and was thus a contemporary with Thutmose III of Egypt. It was probably to him that Thutmose IV, 1420—1411, wrote, "Establish good brotherhood between us" (1, 64). Karaindaš I also corresponded with Amenophis III, 1411—1375, and gave him his daughter in marriage. The most reliable chronology of the Kassite, or Third Babylonian Dynasty, which has so far been presented, seems to be that found in Albright, "A Revision of Early Assyrian and Middle Babylonian Chronology," RA 18, 82—94, were the following synchronism is worked out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGYPT</th>
<th>BABYLONIA</th>
<th>ASSYRIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose III 1501</td>
<td>Karaindaš I c. 1460</td>
<td>Ašir-râbî I c. 1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenophis II 1447</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ašir-nîrârî III c. 1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose IV 1420</td>
<td>Kurigalzu II c. 1410</td>
<td>Ašir-bêl-nîšēšu c. 1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenophis III 1411</td>
<td>Kadašman-Enlil I c. 1390</td>
<td>Ašur-nâdin-âhî c. 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenophis IV 1375</td>
<td>Burraburias II c. 1375</td>
<td>Erîba-Adad c. 1380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the letters from Tell el-Amarna there are eleven which directly concern Babylonia. Of these two are drafts, or copies, of letters despatched by Amenophis III to Kadašman-Enlil I; three of them are letters received by Amenophis III from Kadašman-Enlil I; five are letters written by Burraburias II to Amenophis IV; and one is a letter from Burraburias II which may have been addressed to Amenophis III. In other letters there are indirect references to Babylonian affairs.
The earliest Babylonian king to whom reference is made in these letters is Karaindaš I, with whom Amenophis III corresponded, according to a letter from Burraburiaš II to Amenophis IV. This letter begins by reminding the pharaoh that “since the time of Karaindaš, when their fathers had begun to correspond with one another, they had always been good friends.” There are no letters extant from Kurigalzu II, but we learn from 9, 19 that he was the father of Burraburiaš II, and, from 11, 19, that he corresponded with Amenophis III and received much gold from him. There is also evidence that he maintained friendly relations with Amenophis III, for he opposed a Canaanitish desire to ally with them against Amenophis III (9, 19—30).

Most of the letters dealing with Babylonia fall in the reigns of Kadašman-Enlil I and Burraburiaš II. The sister of Kadašman-Enlil I married Amenophis III (1, 12), as did also his daughter (4, 33). He himself desired the hand of a daughter of Amenophis III (4), but was obliged to content himself with a less prominent Egyptian. Letters 2 and 3 show that Kadašman-Enlil was anxious to do all in his power to please the Egyptian pharaoh, but received very little in return. He sent him his daughter, but in return did not receive presents as fine as he hoped to receive. He complains that the presents are not at all such as Amenophis had sent to his father. He also complained that Amenophis had detained his messengers, and, furthermore, had not invited him to a festival to which he had hoped to go.

Amenophis III was not a great warrior, having, so far as is known, waged but one war in his life time, namely, that against Nubia at the beginning of his reign. But he was a very active builder. He sought treaties by marriage, marrying the sister of Kadašman-Enlil I (1, 12), and two Mitannian princesses, Giluḫepa, daughter of Šutarna (17, 5) and Taduḫepa, daughter of Tušratta (22). He also married the daughter of Kadašman-Enlil I (3, 5), and his chief wife was Tiy. According to letter 1 Amenophis complains that the messengers sent by Kadašman-Enlil are not of sufficiently high rank, and also complains about the meanness of the presents sent by the Babylonian king. He sends rich presents to Kadašman-Enlil and promises others on receipt of his daughter in marriage (5). Amenophis also refers to correspondence between Babylonia and Egypt in the time of Thutmose IV.
Burraburias was the son of Kurigalzu II (9, 19), and his "forefather," probably grandfather, was Karaindaš I (10, 8). His daughter was probably a wife of Amenophis IV (11). At the very beginning of his reign Burraburias II complains that Amenophis IV did not exchange congratulations and presents with him and demands reclamation for the plundering of his caravans (7). This sideline on the unsympathetic side of Ikhnaton's character agrees well with the present writer's estimate of him as "a clever and self-centered individual henotheist" (JSOR III, 80). Burraburias again complains that his merchants had been robbed in Canaan (8), but apparently without any response from Ikhnaton. Of course Burraburias seems to have had an inordinate longing for gold (9), and exceedingly jealous of his rights in the eyes of the Egyptian pharaoh. For example, he complains that the Assyrians without his knowledge sent messengers to Egypt and he asks Amenophis IV to send them back empty-handed. In No. 11 we learn that Ikhnaton finding that the Babylonian princess whom he desired is dead is assured by Burraburias of another, and Haa, an Egyptian woman who is with Burraburias, is named to take charge of the princess. No. 13 contains what is probably to be considered a bridal gift to Amenophis IV, to accompany the former's daughter to the Egyptian court. No. 14 contains a list of presents from the Egyptian pharaoh to the Babylonian king as pride-price for the latter's daughter.

Letter 12 is from a princess in Babylonia to her lord in Egypt on a purely domestic matter. In a broken tablet a king of Kardunias is mentioned, but his name is lost (200, 9). The usual presents from Babylonia to Egypt were: Silver (5, 28), lapis lazuli (2, Rev. 8; 7, 56; 8, 43; 9, 36; 10, 43, 45; 11, Rev.; 24, 25), wooden articles decorated with gold (2, Rev. 5; 5, 21 ff.), oil (1, 97), wagons (1, 89 ff.), horses (3, 33; 7, 58; 9, 37), and slaves (3, 30).

At all times there must have been considerable rivalry between the two great powers, Babylonia and Egypt. Of this we have evidence in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (e. g. 76, 21 ff.; 104, 17 ff.; 116, 67 ff.; 255, 21), but during the reign of Ikhnaton, Egypt seemed to have grown indifferent to Babylonia as well as to other non-Egyptian lands. This is evident from the correspondence between Ikhnaton and Burraburias II, but this was in keeping with the pacifism of the Egyptian religious king.
REVIEWS


This book is absolutely indispensible not only to every Assyriologist, but likewise to every library which has any books on the Ancient Orient. It contains 1689 entrances on Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian, 15 on Babylonia and Egypt, 6 on Aramaeans, 4 on Armenians, 14 on Elam, 87 on the Hittites, 8 on Cappadocia, 4 on the Kassites and Mitanni, 14 on Babylonia and the Ancient Classical World, 21 on Persia, and 12 in an appendix. There are brief remarks on most of the references. It should be on the desk of every student of the Nearer Orient. Samuel A. B. Mercer


This a second reprint of the fourth edition of Maspero's great work is very timely. In these days of fresh interest in Egypt and Babylonia and of new discoveries in these ancient lands, a book like this is indispensible. In a masterful way Maspero guides the reader through a wealth of accurate information about Egypt and the Nile, the Gods of Egypt, the Legendary history of Egypt, the Political constitution of Egypt, the Memphite Empire, and the First Theban Empire. All this is done by an expert Egyptologist, in a simple and effective manner.

Although Maspero was not a specialist in Cuneiform, he was nevertheless most accurately informed about Mesopotamian affairs, and has marshalled in the second part of this book an astonishing array of accurate material on Ancient Chaldaea, and on Chaldaean civilization. The work is splendidly illustrated, and contains an appendix in which is drawn up a list of the pharaohs of the Old and Middle Empires. An excellent index places this mass of information at the disposal of the student.

Professor Sayce and Mr. McClure are to be thanked for their fine work of editing and translating Maspero's great book.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
Sumerisch-akkadische Parallelen zum Aufbau alttestamentlicher Psalmen. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums XI, 1 u. 2.) Von D. Dr. Friedrich Stummer. Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1922. XIV + 190 S.


St. findet, um auf den Hauptteil der Schrift ein wenig einzugehen, daß die babylonischen Individualpsalmen, die šú-ila-Texte, im allgemeinen aus folgenden Teilen bestehen: Anrede an die Gottheit, ihre Herrlichkeitsschilderung, Selbsteinführung des Beters, Elendschilderung oder Klage, Bitte, Schlußformel. Anstatt nun, wie man es erwarten sollte, zu zeigen, daß dieses Kompositionsschema auch in einem großen Teile der entsprechenden hebräischen Literatur vorliegt (erst so würde die Beeinflussung wahrscheinlich werden), geht der Verfasser sofort dazu über, von den einzelnen Bestandteilen zu reden. Daß sich auch in den 150 Psalmen Ent-
sprechungen zu der babylonischen Anrede, Herrlichkeitsschilderung, Selbsteinführung usw. finden, ist doch zu natürlich; was soll denn der Psalmendichter anderes zur Sprache bringen? (Selbst wenn sich eine ganze Reihe von Psalmen fände, in denen genau das gleiche Kompositionsschema wie bei den Babyloniern nachweisen ließe, so wäre das noch kein Beweis von Beeinflussung, weil dieses Schema psychologisch recht natürlich ist). Trotzdem ist es St. nicht immer leicht, seine Parallelen plausibel zu machen und oftmals gewinnt man den Eindruck, daß seine Darlegungen gesucht und gewaltsam sind. Der gemeinsame Kulturboden muß übrigens von selbst davor warnen, zu leicht an direkte Beeinflussungen zu denken.

Um eine Übereinstimmung des Referenten mit dem Verfasser zu notieren: Die Verwünschungen in Ps. 109, 6—19 habe auch ich stets als nicht vom Psalmen, sondern von den Feinden desselben gesprochen aufgefaßt.

P. MAURUS WITZEL

Die babylonischen Kudurru (Grenzsteine) als Urkundenform. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XI, Heft 4 und 5.) Von Dr. theol. et phil. Franz X. Steinmetzer. Paderborn: Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, 1922. VII + 272 S.


P. MAURUS WITZEL

Ein neuer Ninkarrak-Text. By Johannes Nikel. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1918, pp. 64. 2 Swiss francs.

In this monograph (Bd. X, Heft 1 of the well-known Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums), dedicated to a former teacher of mine in Munich, Dr. Grafen Georg von Hertling, and Reichskanzler, during a period of the Great War, Dr. Nikel transliterates and translates a new Ninkarrak-text, published in Ebeling I, Nos. 15, 16, and gives an excellent commentary with some remarks about the goddess Ninkarrak and related duties. He calls the text a processional, and thinks it was sung while the statue of the deity was carried in procession. Then follows a discussion of the most important texts, in which Ninkarrak is referred to, arranged into two groups, the dated and the undated. Chapter five has to do with the name and meaning of Ninkarrak, where the author shows that both Ninkarrak and Nin-isin-na are the same as Gula, and Gula is the ideogram for rabû, rabîtu, surbû, “the great one.” The last chapter treats of the home, festivals, and symbols of Ninkarrak. Temples of Ninkarrak seem to have been in Larsa and Ur, where it was called é-Ú-nam-ti[1]-la, in Isin, in Borsippa, Sippar, Babylon, Assur, and Ur. The oldest Ninkarrak festival was a New Year’s feast, in the time of Idin-Dagan of Isin, which celebrated the marriage of Ninkarrak with Tammuz. Another festival of Nin-
karrak took place on the 12th of the month Ijjar. It was called the SE.GAR feast, a festival accompanied by offerings. The symbol of Ninkarrak was a dog, a symbol of protection, which seems to point to Ninkarrak as a saviour-diety.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This pamphlet, Bd. LXIII, 1920—1921, Avd. B, No. 3, Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, contains an excellent translation into English of the fragments of Assyrian Laws published in 1920 by Schroeder in Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts, together with some useful notes. The translation is superior to that of Jastrow in JAOS 1921, but still leaves room for much improvement.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This book forms the 4 and 5 parts of Volume XI of the Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. After an introduction, the author lists a description of all Babylonian Kudurru, or Boundary Stones; then he arranges them chronologically, discussing the nature of the contents of their inscriptions, and their material and form. He devotes a long chapter to the scenes represented on the Kudurru—the symbols of the gods, and other symbols. This forms an important part of the work—a part the author is well-prepared to do. The last part of the book is devoted to an examination of various Kudurru details.

This is an important work on this subject, and cannot be neglected by any student of Babylonian history and culture.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


In this little book Mr. Speleers has discussed with ample illustrations the subject of Cuneiform writing, and the nature of the
documents which are written in Cuneiform. He then describes in vivid fashion the Hittite, Hebrew, Aramaic, Palmyrene, and Arabic scripts. The brochure will be found handy and informing.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This interesting text contains two references to Esagila, and throws much light upon late Babylonian history. The same pamphlet contains a note on Lipit-Ištar as legislator, and on a text of the time of Esarhaddon which is now in the University of Zurich.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


In this extract from number 234 of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, we have a most interesting version of the Seventeenth Chapter of the Book of the Dead with full and valuable translation and notes. This pamphlet is indispensable in studying that most important Chapter of the Book of the Dead.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This book is precisely what it claims to be, namely, an introduction. Accordingly, the authors emphasise introductory material. They discuss the principles which underlie a hieroglyphic system, such as Egyptian is. They do this psychologically and historically. They trace the evolution of the system, and its development and extension. They then discuss the script itself. In the second part they discuss the knowledge of the Egyptian script, among the Egyptians themselves, as well as among the Greeks and Romans, and among the Fathers of the Church. Chapter eight is devoted to a decipherment of Egyptian.

In the appendices, covering pages 116—190, we have a rather full classified sign-list (pp. 116—163), and a very useful series of exercises, with originals, word for word translations, and connected translations (164—190). This second section contains texts in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic, which will be found exceedingly useful
to the beginner. But of course, the book cannot be used alone as a beginner's book for the exercises are not sufficiently numerous. It is, as it professes to be, an introduction—and a very excellent one. It deserves to be translated into English.  

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The fourth volume of Paton's great work, Early Egyptian Records of Travel, being materials for a historical geography of Western Asia, has now appeared. The format of this book is similar to that of the previous volumes in the series. The work has been done in the same thorough and detailed manner. The same general criticism may be made of this volume as was made of its companions, namely, that the author has seemed to include too much detail and what appears to be needless duplication in the enumeration of sources and in the matter of transcriptions. But in the case of such a work as this it seems far better to err on the side of abundance than on that of meagreness.

The volume contains tables No. XLIII—XLIV. First comes the great "Hymn of Victory" with its variants, and accompanied by full bibliographies, transcription, translation, and comments, covering thirty-one of these large pages. The notes and comments are voluminous. Such subjects as the Titles of Amon-Ra, the Headress of Amon-Ra, Tunic or Kilt, Lion's Tail, Axe-Mace, &c. are discussed with much acumen and learning. Then follow the "Geographical Lists," with full descriptions, drawings, and discussions, which make the rest of this large volume. These lists are here given in their completeness, and are indispensable to all students of ancient Western Asia. A study of these lists with the aid of the Tell el-Amarna letters would repay the most diligent research. The present reviewer is at present engaged in this task in view of his studies in the Tell el-Amarna Tablets. At the end of the volume are most valuable indices to the "Geographical Lists," as well as a full general index. It is fair to say that no oriental library and no student of the ancient Orient can possibly be without these great volumes, with their mass of useful material ready to be used.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

In the Victoria-Museum in Stockholm and in Uppsala there are two splendid collections of Egyptian antiquities. A few of these objects of great artistic and archaeological interest, are described and reproduced in this book. The author promises another volume in the near future, describing the smaller pieces of the collections. Each object reproduced on excellent plates is described in a scientific manner, with important bibliographical notes. The whole work is supplied with an introduction and a brief chronological table. The work is beautifully printed, and because of the excellent reproductions and accurate descriptions of the plates, is indispensable to all oriental libraries and students of Egyptology.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The late Inspector General of Antiquities of the Egyptian Government, Mr. Weigall, the author of many works on Egypt, some technical, others semi-popular, has written an attractive volume, fully illustrated on various subjects dealing with ancient Egypt. Not the least interesting part of the book is the publisher's foreword, where he gives a fascinating account of the brilliant career and versatile talents of Mr. Weigall. There are eighteen chapters on as many different themes of interest in Egyptology, some are serious, such as Chapter IV, "The Preservation of Antiquities," some are scholarly, such as Chapter VIII, "The Tomb of Tiy and Akhnaton," part of which appeared in a previous work on Ikhnaton; and some are facetious, such as Chapter II, "The Necessity of Archaeology to the Gaiety of the World." But the whole book is interesting and stimulating. Many points made by the author are highly questionable, such as his statement on p. 159 to the effect that the Syrian Aton (Adon) was a sun-god, but the popular character of the work would excuse many sweeping statements, which are rather common to the book. However, for the reading public who are at this time interested in the great excavations in Egypt, this book will be found to be one of the very best.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
REVIEWS


This forms Pars II of Fasc. II of Fontes historiae religionum ex auctoribus Graecis et Latinis collectos, edited by C. Clemen. I have often longed for such a series. This book, together with Pars I of the same Fascicule is simply indispensable to every serious student of Egyptian religion.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a pageant of court life in Old Egypt in the XVIIIth Dynasty, reconstructed from the monuments. It is a chapter of Egyptian history in dramatic form. Mr. Gray has done his work well. Beginning with events that led up to the marriage of Hatshepsut with her half-brother, Thutmose II, the author draws out the strong and masterful character of the woman who became “King” of Egypt, and did so much to the glory of Egyptian art and architecture. He then portrays the conflict of wills that went on between Hatshepsut, after the death of Thutmose II, and her nephew, who became the great Thutmose III. As a professed Egyptologist I began the story with some misgivings, but I am free to say that it held me so entranced that I read the book through at three sittings. I should like to say, however, that the author might have added a glossary of terms, such as, shent, uraeus, &c., for persons not acquainted with Egyptian terminology.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is, as it purports to be, a romantic history of Tutankhamen—the emphasis is to be placed upon “romantic.” Whenever the author attempts to be scholarly he falls into error, for example, Tut-Ankh-Aton does not mean “beloved of Aton,” &c. &c. He speaks of the Hittites as a warlike “tribe.” There are some good plates in the book. As a romance I suppose it would pass muster, but even as such one ordinarily expects to be reliable informed.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

Professor Smith has put in book form what has been for a long time desired. A series of articles by the present reviewer published in the Anglican Theological Review covered the same ground. But not only has Professor Smith put his studies in book form, but he has also done the work so well that all students of the Old Testament will feel themselves greatly indebted to him. He divides his subject into three parts. The first has to do with the morals of the Pre-prophetic period, the second with the prophetic period, and the third with the morals of Judaism. Dr. Smith arranges his materials, in the first part, in the generally accepted chronological way, although it is quite possible that J and even E may represent, in certain cases, an earlier tradition than the historical narratives.

In his second division the author shows more originality. In fact, it is here that Professor Smith is on his own peculiar ground, for scarcely any one has done more real thinking on the contents of prophetic literature than he. It is a pleasure to find that Professor Smith has at last disassociated himself from those who consistently insist upon what is a misinterpretation of the value and nature of ritual in divine service of the time of Amos. Dr. Smith says, on page 79, "It will hardly do to make Amos wholly discard ritual and put ethics in its place." Precisely, such a thing would be quite impossible in Israel, no matter how degraded some forms of ritual really did become. He also utters a word of timely warning about what may be called certain prophetical exaggeration, when he says on page 99, "May not the prophets in the excess of their enthusiasm for their ideals have painted existing conditions a little blacker than they really were?"

But in his treatment of the morals of Judaism, in the third section of his book, he seems to have fallen into the very error against which, in the previous section, he carefully warned. For example, he says, on page 179, "The soulless legalism of later Judaism was the direct descendant of Ezekiel's ritualistic interpretation of religion." There seems to be two fallacies here, the first, being the assumption that Ezekiel's interpretation of religion was false, and the second being that later Judaism was soulless. The former is a falacy if only because of Ezekiel's individualization
of religion, and the latter is also falacious in view of the splendid religious literature of "later Judaism."

In chapter ten, Professor Smith has added a new chapter to the study of Old Testament morals, in his splendid interpretation of the Assouan Papyri.

The book is quite full of vigorous thought and freshness of treatment. Mr. Smith knows why the Jew wrote imprecatory psalms, and so does anyone else who understands the true spirit of Judaism. But here and there one may differ radically from the author. For example, did not the author of Job have a positive theory to present? Are religion and morals quite inseparable? Were Jews always deterred from doing evil by fear of chastisement? One might also fault the author on still other grounds. For example, why has he been so meagre in his bibliographical notes? One might have expected a passing reference at least to many important studies in this fascinating subject, not the least being, Balla, Das Ich der Psalmen. However, it is easy to find fault, and lest the reviewer may appear ungrateful, he desires to say that in his opinion, Professor Smith has published the finest discussion of this subject in any language.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The author of this book is well-known to the world of Old Testament scholarship, especially by his Pentatenchal Studies, as well as by numerous articles on Biblical law in the Bibliotheca Sacra. Wiener’s point of view in Biblical criticism is, therefore, well known. I have read the book with a great deal of interest, but without being convinced that the results of modern Biblical research are far wrong. Wiener takes Kuenen’s book, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, as his point of departure, summing up Kuenen’s attitude toward the prophets under three heads: (1) that there is no supernatural element in the prophets; (2) that the prophets did not predict, except to such extent as would be possible for shrewd and well-informed persons possessing no exceptional divine guidance; and (3) that the prophet always addresses himself principally to the circumstances of his own time. Whether Keunen, if he were living, would accept this summing up of his attitude
is rather doubtful. However, Wiener, asserting that the writings of the prophets profess to contain a supernatural element and to embrace prophecies that relate to the future, goes on to prove himself just as critical of the ancient writings before him as those Old Testament critics whom he criticises, and just as arbitrary; compare, for instance, what he has to say about prophecies concerning foreign nations on page 90, or what he says about the future of Israel on page 97. Nor has his boldness diminished since the days of his attack upon Driver and Skinner, as is evident when one reads on page 149, "No competent inquirer who has studied the historical sources carefully and impartially can hold today that ethical monotheism was the creation of the prophets." This in spite of the army of earnest students who have devoted years of toil in a reverent study of the prophets. However, this book is well-worth careful study, for while one will find the author arbitrary, he is never dull, and every page is guaranteed to make one think. The most stimulating chapters perhaps are those dealing with predictions and Chapter XI on the Achievements of the Prophets.

_Samuel A. B. Mercer_


Professor Böhl in his well known clear way presents Gen. 1—25:8 in an excellent Dutch translation, divided into sections, with each section named in italics. There is a fine introduction covering 22 pages of useful information. It is to be hoped that Dr. Böhl will continue this useful publication. _Samuel A. B. Mercer_

*_Sifre zu Deuteronomium._* Von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1922, pp. 144. 8 Schw. Fr.

This is the first part of four in which will be published in translation with notes the important Sifre on Deuteronomy. The translation is made from the printed text of Friedmann, and will place into the hands of all Biblical students a fund of information hitherto accessible only to those who could read the original with ease. The work has apparently been excellently done. There are numerous notes of great exegetical value, and we look forward with eagerness to the remaining four parts of this important work. _Samuel A. B. Mercer_

The Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums has added another excellent monograph (Bd. XI, 1.—2. Hft.) to its list. This interesting study by Stummer is well worth while for it shows how closely allied in form and spirit these ancient religious poems are to those of the Old Testament, but incidentally shows how superior the latter are to the former. The author first takes up the Individual Psalms, studying them as to form, contents, and religious significance, and then he devotes considerable space to the chief characteristics of Babylonian liturgical material, and ends his study by discussing the question of the use of older material both by Babylonian as well as by Old Testament poets. He thinks that Babylonian religious literature considerably influenced that of Israel.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


Within the compass of a small volume, Dr. Margolis, the editor-in-chief of the Jewish version of the Bible, succeeded in condensing his novel treatment of the problems connected with the origin of Hebrew Scriptures. The traditional view as well as the untraditional view of higher criticism concerning date, arrangement and authorship of the various books which form the Old Testament are presented. The author finds both too positive in their conclusions and therefore pleads for “the injection of a measure of learned ignorance” to counteract the dogmatic claims of both the traditionalists and the untraditionalists. Dr. Margolis rejects the modern critical view that the works of the later prophets came into existence before the Pentateuch, and that some Psalms are of still much later date. He claims, not altogether without justice, that the date of each book is, after all, uncertain, and that books of various dates existed long before it was settled as to which of them was to be admitted into the canon. In discussing the question of the origin of Deuteronomy, Dr. Margolis points out that, among the higher critics of the Bible, there are no less than four different opinions, each one of which is defended with equal zeal. Similarly this holds true of many other mooted Bible problems. He is of the opinion
that the book found and promulgated in the reign of Josiah "need not have been any other than the same Torah which Ezra placed before the people for their ratification."

In this work Dr. Margolis appears as a strong defender of the unity of the Pentateuch. It does not follow that this is necessarily a defence of its Mosaic authorship. For, as Dr. Margolis correctly points out, the Mosaic authorship of certain parts of the Pentateuch are already questioned in the Talmud. Yet "whether the Pentateuch as we have it is the Mosaic Torah may be a matter for debate. That it has the Mosaic Torah, which is neither in this strand nor in the other but 'dispersed in them all,' must be the conclusion of sound criticism."

Dr. Margolis treats his subject in a novel fashion. He is a liberal yet reverential student of Scriptures who does not surrender to exaggerated views be they traditional or untraditional. He marshalls his facts and lets them speak for themselves and thus helps both the orthodox and the liberal student of the Bible mutually to understand the views of one another.

Dr. Schaeffer proposes to show in this study that, contrary to Wellhausen and other Biblical scholars, the provisions of Lev. 25:8ff. go back to very ancient times. He thinks that the features of Hebrew economy, as set forth in the year of jubilee, point to a communal conception of property. While it cannot be said that the author has proved his point, nevertheless he has produced an excellent book and has thrown much light upon the subject of tribal economy.

After chapters on tribal organization, tribal solidarity and religion, tribal solidarity and politics, and tribal solidarity and social morality, and tribal solidarity and social economy, the author studies in great detail the subject of the village community among the Hebrews, Babylonians, Hindus, Greeks, Romans, and Russians. He then describes the German mark system, and the tribal systems of Ireland and Wales, and the Old English township system. The book is a veritable mine of useful information and social legislation.

Professor Popper is here carrying on his important research in Biblical Parallelism. This monograph forms Part III of these Studies. The author concerns himself primarily with questions of literary form, but naturally his decisions bear very closely upon questions of interpretation. He here takes chapters 11–35 and 37, 22–35 and subjects them to a rigid examination. The results speak for themselves, and those interested in the form and interpretation of Isaiah cannot be without this thorough piece of work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The results of Biblical scholarship, in respect to the Book of Ecclesiastes, for forty-two years since the time of Dr. Plumptre’s commentary on this book in this same series, have been utilized in this new work. Consequently Mr. Williams’ book is a new one. The author has made use of the best results of recent investigation on the Book of Ecclesiastes, and has produced an excellent commentary. His position in matters of date, integrity, authorship, &c., is sane, and his notes and comments are of the finest. The English translation at the end is a splendid one. This commentary is one of the very best in the series.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

A Critical Examination of the Text of the Syriac Version of the Song of Songs. By Joshua Bloch, 1922.

This is a reprint of an article which appeared in the AJSL 38, 103–139. Its object is to examine a part of one version of the Song of Songs and to determine the nature and value of its testimony. He shows how that the Peshitta is a series of versions, and indicates its use in ascertaining the state of the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament. He concludes that the Peshitta text was made from a Hebrew original differing but slightly from our Masoretic text, although many passages were based upon the LXX. The monograph is an excellent one.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

The excavations carried on at Tell-Houm by the French Custodian of the Holy Land during the years 1905—1921 are magnificently described in this fine work by Father Orfali. Chapter one deals with the last period of the History of Capernaum (Modern Tell-Houm). This is done in a carefully scientific manner. The second chapter gives a history of the excavations at Tell-Houm, with excellent photographs of the synagogue discovered there; and in chapter three the synagogue is fully described with much archaeological and historical detail—splendidly illustrated with drawings and photographs. The fourth chapter presents the archaeological problem, in which the author concludes, after marshalling a splendid array of evidence, that the synagogue at Capernaum dates as far back as the beginning of the first century of the Christian era. In the fifth chapter he discusses the emblems and figures in the decoration of the synagogue, and he devotes the last chapter to an examination of the nature and purpose of the octagon found in the court, and concludes that it was a baptistry, and could not have been built before the sixth century A.D.

After a brief Conclusion, there follow a table of the 130 illustrations, a table of the twelve plates, and an excellent Index. Both author and publisher are to be congratulated on this excellent book, which ought to find its way into every library with an Oriental department.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt.
By Dr. F. Rhode. Catholic University of America, 1921, pp. 185, 2 plates.

This book covers most thoroughly a field which has been very little studied, and is in its way a perfect specimen of what a doctor's dissertation should be. The Melkite Church adopted Arabic before the Jacobite branch, for the very simple reason that Greek was the liturgical language of the Melkite Church and Coptic that of the Jacobite. With the Moslem conquest Greek disappeared while Coptic held its own for centuries. Dr. Rhode gives a list of the manuscripts of the Arabic Pentateuch which are fairly numerous. Out of these he chose eighteen important manuscripts which he
REVIEWS

Describes in detail and groups in families. He finds that there must have been two versions of the Pentateuch in Arabic, the Melkite which is the older and the Jacobite, which is influenced by the Melkite. The Jacobite translation was from the Coptic. The origin of the Melkite version is still doubtful. It shows affinity with the Lucianic Septuagint and the Peshitto as well as with the Hebrew text. The reviewer is inclined to think that the Hebrew textual influence should be traced to other sources. It would be very difficult to distinguish between Peshitto and Lucianic influence, since from our point of view both are closely connected. Eight chapters of Genesis are printed by Dr. Rhode according to the families of manuscripts he recognizes. Dr. Rhode is to be congratulated for this excellent piece of works. Let us hope that he will follow it with a study of the origin of the Melkite version, for which he is evidently so qualified.

John A. Maynard


Dr. Horner is anonymously performing a great task for Biblical learning. This is the sixth volume of the Sahidic New Testament which he has edited and I have tested many chapters with my students and know how accurately his work has been done. The editor has made use of all the available material of this Coptic edition of the Acts, especially the valuable papyrus published by Budge a few years ago. The text is given in the usual very clear type, and on the opposite page is found a very literal translation. The bulk of every page is devoted to a most complete textual apparatus, which makes the work quite indispensible to all students of the Bible, and especially to textual students. It furnishes also an excellent text for students who want to learn to read Coptic. The price of the volume is high, but so is its worth and especially its scholarship. It should be found in every library which aims to have a good Biblical department.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

This is the sixth volume in the first section of a series of books called *l'Evolution de l'Humanité*, five other volumes of which have already appeared. This volume is a study in social organization among primitive peoples and among the peoples of the ancient Orient. Two better scholars could not have been secured to perform this task. M. Davy evidently is responsible for the more anthropological part of the work and M. Moret for that part which deals with the ancient Orient. In early Egypt the authors find that the unit of society was the clan, but in early Babylonia the country was divided into city-kingdoms. But neither of these social conditions are considered to be primitive. The object of the first part of this book has been to describe social institutions previous to the time of the earliest extant historical remains.

Accordingly, the authors find that the earliest form of social organization was the clan, the central factor of which was the totem. Each clan had a name and an emblem. The authors then proceed to show how the fetish came into being, how the office of the chief developed out of the fetish, and how the idea of God grew out of that of a totem, and how it related itself to that of a chief.

In the second part of the work, the authors have sought to present in an objective manner, those historical facts which may be considered parallel with the Ethnographical elements described in the first part of the book. The task has been very logically done, and the results are interesting. It would be quite impossible in the course of a short review to mention only a few of the important problems clarified in this fine piece of work. The authors are aware of the latest attempts to solve difficult problems in Semitics and Egyptology, for example, Clay's *Amurru* and the *Monotheism* of Ikhnaton; and are sane and fair in their estimates. No student of ancient religious and social institutions can do without this excellent book.

*Samuel A. B. Mercer*


After a brief introduction by M. le Général Gourand, Haut-Commissaire de la Republique française en Syrie et au Liban, Ed. Pottier gives a full and interesting account of the archaeological
work done in Syria by the Service des Antiquités, in 1920—1921, and also an account of the founding of the French School in Jerusalem, at the head of which is the well-known Dominican father, Lagrange, and which is officially associated with the American and English schools in the same city. René Dussaud writes of the excavations in Syria in 1921—1922, out of which grew the two first works, La Glyptique syro-hittite by Contenau and La Syrie à l’époque des Mamluks by Gaudefroy-Demombynes. At Byblos there was discovered a tomb of the twelfth Egyptian dynasty, containing many valuable vases, one of which is inscribed. The discovery is described by Virolleaud, and the inscribed vase is described by Ed. Naville, and dated in the time of Sesostris II. This inscription furnishes the date of the tomb and shows how influential Egypt was in Syria as early as 1900 B.C. Pottier then adds some observations upon certain of the objects found in the tomb, and Cumont discusses in full the frescos of the Roman period discovered by Breasted at Eş-Şâliḥiyé on the Euphrates. The article, as well as most of the others, is well illustrated. The illustrations here being taken from Syria, 1922. He also describes the excavations carried on there, namely, at Şâliḥiyeh. The whole book is splendidly illustrated and is a great addition to the scientific literature of ancient Syria.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is volume 9 of a series called Orbis Pictus, edited by Paul Westheim, and published by Ernst Wasmuth. This volume is prepared by Otto Weber. In the introduction Professor Weber gives a very clear account of what is known at present about the Hittites, in which he indicates his belief that just as the Babylonians were "Sumerianized" Semites, so the Assyrians were "Babylonianized" Hittites. He also makes it very clear that the domain of Hittite history was the whole of Asia Minor, and not any restricted portion. He shows that from about 1800 onward the city of Boghazköi became the centre of Hittite civilization. Then follows a very clearly written account of Hittite art and culture from the earliest to the latest times.

Dr. Weber furnishes a list of the source-litterature on the Hittites, and then gives an index of the following illustrations. These
forty-eight pages of illustrations of the finest Hittite works of art are epoch-making in their importance, for they bring together, as was never before done, the master-pieces of this interesting civilization.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This work discusses the “Schatzhöhle” in source and transmission, tracing them to the second century A.D. It is an interesting pamphlet full of useful material. The same author has recently published a fine article in the _ZA_ on Akkadian-Hittite problem.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This paper submitted at the General Meeting of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia shows that it was Alexander the Great who opened communication between Europe and the most distant countries of Asia.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This fine work is a contribution to the political and communal history of the Jews in Egypt, based chiefly on Genizah material hitherto unpublished. The original texts are given in volume two, together with critical and explanatory notes. In volume one are to be found the translations. The work contains an excellent collection of information about the language and life of the Jews in Egypt during the eleventh and twelfth centuries of the Christian era. With the aid of these documents, the author attempts a reconstruction of the life of the Jews in Egypt from the beginning of the Fâtimid reign in Egypt till about the time of Maimonides. After this period is covered, the author adds a most interesting chapter on the communal organization of the Jews in Egypt and Palestine.

The second volume contains, besides a valuable collection of original texts, a series of learned and useful supplements, a full
general index, and a complete Hebrew index and glossary. No student of Jewish life and culture can afford to be without this original, learned, and useful work.  

Samuel A. B. Mercer


After a preface by Mons. Senart, Mons. Finot gives in brief and clear form a history of the Société Asiatique, which has done so much for oriental learning. Then follows the second part, which consists of twelve sections, each dealing with a department of oriental research. This part is opened with an article on Egyptology by Moret, who of course confines himself to French Egyptology. This is likewise true of the writers of the other departments. Moret has dealt fully and well with his subject. No better scholar could have been chosen. The same may be said of Contenau and his subject, although Thureau-Dangin might have been expected to write in the Department of Assyriology, and especially Sumero-logy. Cohen has given an excellent survey of the work done in Ethiopic, as have Lambart done for Hebrew and Chabot for Aramaic. Further oriental subjects are treated by experts, and, so far as the present reviewer can judge, have been thoroughly handled.

Samuel A. B. Mercer
THE READJUSTMENT OF ASSYRO-BABYLONIAN CHRONOLOGY BY THE ELIMINATION OF FALSE SYNCHRONISMS

By W. F. Albright, Jerusalem

Ever since the publication in 1907 of the King Chronicle, with its proof of the partial contemporaneity of the Second Dynasty of Babylon with the First and Third, and its laconic entry ḫlū-šumma šar māt Aššur ana taṛṣī ṣSu(mu)abu, there have been two opposed schools of Babylonian chronologists, one wishing to place the First Dynasty nearly two centuries earlier than the other would allow. Nearly all the material for the discussion has come from Assyrian sources, especially since Weidner and Schroeder have made numerous Assyrian king-lists and synchronistic tables available by publication. The results as developed by Weidner in his important monograph, Die Könige von Assyrien (Leipzig, 1921), with modifications in a later paper (JSOR 6, 121—7),¹ have convinced most scholars, though there are still a few irreconcilables, like the present writer² and

¹ The alteration of the order of fourteenth century Babylonian kings in the latter paper is hardly an improvement. The erroneous list, in flat disagreement with Egyptian data, published in Studien, was corrected in Könige, where it agrees exactly with the writer's list RA 18, 91—2. In the new arrangement Weidner rejects the clear evidence of Chronicle P, so well treated by him previously in Studien, p. 53, n. 3, evidence which only permits the order given by Weidner in Könige. It may be added that the word mār often means "descendant," especially when a king's father was a weakling or never reigned, as may have been the case with Karaindaš II, for example.

² See RA 18, 83—94. Weidner's observations JSOR 6, 121, n. 3 are not undeserved, under the peculiar form in which the paper finally appeared. The paper was originally written in opposition to the conclusions of Weidner's first brochure, whereas in the second one most of the errors of the first were eliminated (cf. preceding note). To the awkwardness of form was added a plethora of typographical errors, so the result was probably unintelligible to the reader. However, though my reconstruction of Assyrian chronology has turned out to be wrong, the treatment of Babylonian chronology seems to be correct in the main.
Olmstead, with whom Forrer, Langdon and others appear to agree, at least tacitly.

Now the situation is radically changed again, with the suddenness we have learned to expect in such matters. With the publication of Schroeder's *Keilschriftexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts* it speedily became certain that Tukultî-Ninurta's date for Ilumamma was 720 years before his time, instead of 780 (cf. KAHI 2, No. 48, 14; No. 59, II, 26 f.). Since the date of Tukultî-Ninurta I is fixed with a very small margin of error at 1260 B.C., we must now place Ilumamma about 1980 instead of 2040 B.C. The most important thing, however, is that now the various statements of the Assyrian historiographers become quite harmonious, and it is no longer necessary to resort to the somersaults of which we have all been guilty, or to assume a second Ilumamma, as the writer tried to do. The simplicity of the Assyrian chronological problem will appear presently; meanwhile we may turn to consider the situation as affecting Babylonian chronology.

Can we accept Weidner's reduction of Babylonian dates before the Cossean Dynasty under the present circumstances? First of all, if our synchronisms between Ilumamma and Sumuabum, Irêsum and Sumulailu are right, we must depress Sumuabum to B.C. 2000, or a little later. This would lower the date of the end of the dynasty to not earlier than 1700 B.C., making it overlap the Third Dynasty by half a century—an incredible supposition. The Second Dynasty would have to be placed a generation later than Weidner wishes to, about 1850 to 1480 B.C. The discrepancy with the date assigned to 'Ammu-ravi by Burnaburias (from whose inscriptions Nabonidus probably got it) and to Gulkisar by Ellil-nadinapal thus becomes even more serious than it was. There are other serious historical difficulties involved in this undue depression of the Babylonian dates, as we shall see presently. Fortunately there is a solution, as simple as convincing, for the problem under

5 AJSL 38, 225–8.

4 In this paper I have resolved to carry the correct form of the sibilants systematically through the Assyrian names. As is well-known, the Assyrians reversed the Babylonian sibilants, every Š becoming s and every s becoming Š (cf. especially Talloquist, *Assyrian Personal Names*, p. XVIII). In Naši (Cappadocian, the so-called Hittite of the Boghazkoi texts), on the other hand, there was no Š, and every orthographic Š should be pronounced s (see Forrer, ZDMG 76, 201 ff.), so I have eliminated the Š entirely in transcribing "Hittite" names.

5 RA 18, 85.
discussion. We have only to discard all synchronisms between Babylonia and Assyria so far known before the fifteenth century, build up independent systems according to the abundant data furnished us by the monuments, and—behold, all difficulties seem to vanish automatically!

Our only evidence for the supposed synchronisms between the first two kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon on the one hand, and Ilusumma and his son Irīsum, on the other, is derived from the new synchronistic lists found in Assur and Chronicle K, cited above. Now, there is a curious fact which may easily be verified by anyone: if we take the new text Assur 4128, published by Weidner, we find that Bēl-bānī is synchronized with Iškilī. Now, counting backward from Bēl-bānī to Ilusumma (including the name—which is doubtless not Ilusumma II—omitted by Weidner and Schroeder, as pointed out RA 18, 85) we have fourteen names; reckoning back from Iškilī to Sumuabum we also have fourteen. Again, if we take such a fixed synchronism as that of Burnaburīš II and Assur-uballīt, none the less certain that it does not happen to be mentioned in our fragmentary sources, and count back, we find in each case 41 names between them and their respective predecessors Sumuabum and Ilusumma. The conclusion seems inevitable, that the synchronisms under discussion are derived purely from mechanical collocation of Babylonian and Assyrian king-lists, an operation carried out by scribes whose ideas of historical method were radically different from ours. This naturally explains why the entry in Chronicle K is so bald and abstract in character. We may therefore disregard our synchronisms and construct our chronology on the basis of positive material.

If then we place the death of Ilusumma about 720 years before the accession of Tukultī-Ninurta I (1260 B.C.) we obtain a date cir. 1980 for his successor, Irīsum I. Now, according to Shalmaneser I, Irīsum built a temple 159 years before its restoration by Samsī-Adad I, while according to Esarhaddon’s historiographers, the same period was only 126 years in length. In any case, the career of Samsī-Adad I, the šar kiššati, falls between 1850 and 1800. If the scribes of Tiglath-pileser confused Samsī-Adad I with Samsī-Adad III, son of Ismē-Dagān II, as quite possible, they evidently dated the former 641 + 60 years before 1120, or about 1520 B.C. If not, the explanation given RA 18, 86, that the correct figure should
be 581 (641—60) must be right, at least approximately. The date given by Shalmaneser I (1280 B.C.) for Samsî-Adad, 580 years before his time, is somewhat too liberal, since Samsî-Adad I can hardly have reigned so early as 1860. Of course we might, at a pinch, consider Tukultî-Ninurta's date as too contracted, but this would be a desperate expedient, since round numbers are almost never too low; errors of generosity are far commoner than mistakes of economy in Oriental numerical operations. As Weidner has seen, the historiographers of Esarhaddon, in assigning a duration of 434 years instead of 580 to the interval between Samsî-Adad and Shalmaneser I, evidently confused the Samsî-Adads, probably basing their calculation on the reign of Samsî-Adad II, which certainly fell about 1715 B.C. (1280 + 434).

It is important to note that the preceding results are roughly confirmed by the position of the different kings in the lists. Corresponding to the 160 years which elapsed approximately from the accession of irisum I to that of Samsî-Adad I, there are eight rulers, at least three of whom stood in lineal relationship. Disregarding the house of Adasi, considered illegitimate by the compiler of VAT 11, 262, we have seven kings from Samsî-Adad I to Samsî-Adad II, a disturbed period of about a century or a little more. From Samsî-Adad II to Asur-uballît there were seventeen kings, over half of whom certainly stood in lineal relationship; the interval seems to have been about 340 years, allowing twenty years to a reign, which, in view of the genealogical succession, cannot be far wrong.

The house of Adasi presents an interesting problem, which I believe can be solved in its main aspects by the evidence of the proper names. The fourth successor of Samsî-Adad I, in the regular line, bore the name Pûn-Ninua, naturally a contraction of Pûn-Ninua-lûmu, like the common name Pûn-Assur-lâmûr. Since it means "May I see the face of Nineveh," the father of the bearer could not well have reigned in Nineveh; the legitimate line continued to hold sway in the old capital, Assur, while Adasi and his followers ruled in Nineveh. This also explains why Esarhaddon traces his ancestry to Bêl-bânî son of Adasi; the usurping Sargonids fixed their capital with Sennacherib at Nineveh, and naturally

* See already Weidner, Könige, p. 13, n. 3.
seized upon a connection with the ancient Ninevite dynasty, whose irregularity had been glossed over by time. The rebellion of Adasi took place, in all probability, soon after the death of the great šar kīššati; but after the death of Bēl-bānī the control of Nineveh fell into the hands of foreign mercenaries, whose origin is again betrayed by their names, which are nearly all gentilic. Sabā'a clearly came from the district of Sabum in the Zagros, often mentioned in the texts of the Dynasty of Akkad, and perhaps connected with the Mount Sabu of the Lugalmarda Epic. Zimzā'a I cannot explain, but Lullā'a naturally means “The man of Lullu (Lulluwa),” also a district of the Zagros. Sar-ma-Adad, however, who came to the throne about 1750, is surely identical with the Sar-ma-Adad who succeeded Pān-Ninua in the regular line; apparently he reconquered Nineveh for a short period, only to lose it again to the foreign mercenaries. It is hardly likely that the Assyrians regained Nineveh again after the fall of the Adasi dynasty; if this latter event occurred, as seems probable, about 1700 B.C., we find ourselves already in the period of great migrations and of the racial movements which brought the Indo-Iranian Manda into northern Mesopotamia. Nineveh was doubtless

7 As a possibility we may suggest the derivation of the name Zimzā'a from the town and district of Zinzār in Syria, often mentioned in the 'Amānah Tablets (EA 1116 f.), which has been happily identified with the classical Sizara, Arabic Saizar, modern Qa'at Seizar northwest of Ḥāmah. There is no difficulty about the form of the gentilic, which follows the usual law of conformation to the triconsonantal norm; cf., e.g., Kāskī (i.e. Kašk) and Gašga for Kaškaš, Gašgaš, Subarū from Subartu, Elamū from Elamtu (like Makkīyyu* from Makkatu*, etc., in Arabic). The m instead of n is due to the fact that m and n were just as interchangeable in Assyrian before a bilabial as before a dental; cf. hamšu and hanšu, šamšu and šanšu, etc.

8 That the Indo-Iranian invaders of Mesopotamia in the second millennium already bore or received the name Manda is now certain; cf. the writer, JPOS 1, 75 f. (on the reference to the Manda in the "Chedorlaomer" text) and FORRER, ZDMG 76, 247 ff. In the light of the fresh material now becoming available for the history of the Hyksos irruption (cf. JPOS 2, 121—8), it is certain that this epoch-making event occurred during the latter part of the 19th or the first part of the 18th century B.C. From the fact that the Hyksos leaders were certainly not Indo-Iranians, though there may have been such elements among their hordes, and that the Manda figure prominently among the allies of Kudur-Lagamal in the 17th century (JPOS 1, 75) it becomes probable that the Hyksos were driven out of their homes in Southern Russia or Transcaspia by a great Indo-Iranian invasion. The exact date of the foundation of the Manda states of Mitanni and elsewhere in Northern Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Syria is doubtful; it would seem that they entered into the heritage of the old Ḫurrian kingdom of Armenia.
a religious center of the Mitannian state from its foundation, which must have taken place about this time—hardly later than 1600 B.C.

Turning then to Babylonian chronology, there is no obstacle left to a readjustment on the basis of the Babylonian material. Since the writer has no new material on this subject, it is sufficient to refer to the treatment of the subject by Eduard Meyer (GA 3, 1, 2, 370 f.); Olmstead, AJSL 38, 327; and the writer, RA 18, 86 f., 93 f. If Kugler has really, as reported, given up his astronomical basis of Babylonian chronology, the ordinary historian can only have recourse to documentary material. The chronological table given below will show that the historical material handed down from Babylonia, Assyria and Asia Minor is best harmonized by placing the rise of Assyria and Puzur-Asir I during the reign of Samsu-iluna, ‘Ammu-rawih’s son and successor, when the Sea Lands revolted. The development of Assyrian power under Sarrukên I then falls automatically two or three decades before the fall of the First Dynasty under the attacks of Mursilis I. The brilliant career of Samsî-Adad I falls about a century after the close of the First Dynasty, and probably about a generation after Telibinus, the last great king of the first Hittite Empire.

If we examine the situation in Babylonia between the end of the First Dynasty and the beginning of the Third, a period of about a hundred and eighty years, we find the kings of the Second Dynasty in control, but their capital must have remained in the Sea Lands. It may safely be assumed that Babylon lay in ruins

9 The writer’s treatment of the chronology of the Second Dynasty was spoiled by insistence on the combination of the Damiq-ilišu alluded to in the date formula of the 37th year of ‘Ammi-ditân with the third king of the Second Dynasty instead of with the last monarch of Isin, following Poebel (ZA 20, 229 ff.) and Meyer (GA 1, 28, 453). Now, however, Scheil has proved (RA 12, 200) that we should render “year after which ‘Ammi-ditân destroyed the wall of Dûr-Damqi-ilišu;” the town of Dûr Damiq-ilišu is elsewhere mentioned, and naturally derives its name from the last king of Isin.

10 Forrer’s conception of Sarrukên I of Assyria as a great world emperor will hardly stand. The cuneiform geographical text published by Schroeder, KAVI No. 92, surely refers to Sargon of Akkad or Sargon II of Assyria; I am inclined to regard it as referring in reality to Sargon II, though undoubtedly clothed in an archaistic garb borrowed from the inscriptions of Sargon of Akkad (cf. JPOS 1, 191 ff.). The famous Cappadocian tablet with the impression of Sargon I’s seal proves nothing in regard to the extent of his direct power, since the intimate social and business relations between Cappadocia and Assyria about 2000 B.C. are quite sufficient to explain it.
during part, at least, of this time, since no inscriptions from it have been found there. The paucity of inscriptions from the first half of the Third Dynasty may readily be explained because of the illiteracy of the Cossean conquerors, but the kings of the Sea Lands seem, from their Sumerian names, to have prided themselves on their patronage of Sumerian culture, so this solution will not work. It is supposed, to be sure, by adherents of the short chronology, that the rulers of the Second Dynasty controlled only Southern Babylonia and the Sea Lands, but such pompous names as Gulkišar, "Devastator of the Universe," and Melamkurkurra, "Thunderbolt of Foreign Lands," cannot possibly be reconciled with such an assumption. When the unknown capital of this dynasty, perhaps Dūr-Ea of Chronicle K, has been excavated, we will very likely find royal inscriptions which will cast an undreamed of light on kings now known only by name, and victorious reigns now hardly dreamed of. It can hardly be accidental that the first ruler of the Sea Lands whose entire reign fell, according to our chronology, certainly after the fall of the First Dynasty and the retirement of the Hittites, is also the first to bear a magniloquent name, while the last king of the dynasty, Ea-gâmil, whose reign fell certainly after the beginning of the Third Dynasty, is the first to abandon this practise. The order of the first kings of the Cossean Dynasty is different in different lists, so we shall have to wait for more definite information before identifying the Agum and Kaštiliaš of Chronicle K with certainty. It may easily be that the correct order is Gandaš, Kaštiliaš I, Agum I, etc., in which case Ea-gâmil was conquered by Ulamburiaš I, brother of Gandaš's successor. This would also explain why Assur 4128 writes the names Ea-gâmil and G[an]duš in the same line, contrary to its usual practise, and why VAT 9470 places [G]an[duš] after [Melam]mi-ku[rukru], thus omitting Ea-gâmil entirely. The Cossean invasion may have taken place during the reign of Melamkurkurra (assuming that this monarch ruled somewhat longer than King-list A, which is often wrong in detail, allows him), while the Cossean conquest of the Sea Lands occurred in the reign of Gandaš's successor. At all events, the fact that Agum II was apparently not king of Sumer or Southern Babylonia may be easily explained on the assumption

11 Cf. RA 18, 94, n. 1.
that there was a rival Cossean Dynasty there; we need not suppose, in contradiction to VAT 9470 and Assur 4128, that the Second Dynasty continued to rule until well down into the Cossean period.

In the following table I have tried to present the view of the sequence of events in the age under discussion which appears most probable in the light of the chronology just presented. Naturally, it will be long before we have a definite solution of all the problems hinted at in so summary a presentation, but we need treatments which take into consideration all the elements of the situation. No nation of the Ancient East can be isolated any longer by the historian, and this obvious fact is our justification.

Parallel Chronology of Assyria, Babylonia, Cappadocia and Egypt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babylonia</th>
<th>Assyria</th>
<th>Hatte (Egypt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Sea Lands, Elam)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammu-rawiḫ</td>
<td>c. 2120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Larsa</td>
<td>c. 2090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsu-iluna</td>
<td>c. 2080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iluma-ilu Abišû</td>
<td>c. 2040</td>
<td>Puzur-Asir, iššakku c. 2040 (Fall of Dyn. X) c. 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammi-ditân</td>
<td>c. 2010</td>
<td>Salim-ăhum c. 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Itti-ili-nibi)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ilu-summa c. 2000 (XIIth Dynasty) c. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Damiq-ilišu II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ikûnum c. 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsu-ditân</td>
<td>c. 1950</td>
<td>Sarrûkên I c. 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mursilis takes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>c. 1920</td>
<td>Puzur-Asir II c. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon under Dyn. II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guškišar</td>
<td>c. 1875</td>
<td>Telibinus c. 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pešgal-daramaš</td>
<td>c. 1820</td>
<td>Samsî-Adad I, šarru c. 1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adara-kalama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ismê-Dagânu I Anittas of Kussar c. 1800?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekurul-anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Division of kingdom (XIIIth Dynasty) 1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melam-kurkurra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bêl-bâni in Nineveh c. 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandash finds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyn. III</td>
<td>c. 1742</td>
<td>Sarma-Adad, reunion c. 1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaštiliaš I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Nineveh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Cf. JEA 6, 97.
13 Anittas' victory over Biyustis of Hatte is surely to be placed shortly after Telibinus. Kussar seems to have kept its hegemony until the time of Hattusilis II, who reigned in Kussar. Excavations at this still unknown site will doubtless fill the great lacuna in Hittite history.
14 Cf. JPOS 2, 122 ff.; ALT, ZÄS 58, 49 f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Babylonia (Sea Lands, Elam)</th>
<th>Assyria</th>
<th>Hatte (Egypt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Dyn. II c. 1720</td>
<td>Samsi-Adad II c. 1715</td>
<td>(Hyksos invade Egypt) c. 1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ḫumban-ʻummena)</td>
<td>Ismē-Dagān II c. 1700</td>
<td>Irruption of Manda¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Untaš-GAL)</td>
<td>Samsi-Adad III c. 1680</td>
<td>(Hyksos under Ḫayān) c. 1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kudur-Lagamal?)¹⁶ c. 1650</td>
<td></td>
<td>(War of freedom begins) c. 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agum II c. 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Amosis expels Hyksos) c. 1570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹² Cf. above, n. 8.
¹⁶ Cf. JPOS 1, 71 f.
SOME RECENT LITERATURE ON THE MOSLEM EAST

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College


The posthumous work of the learned Mez is in the main, a survey of Islamic Society in the tenth and eleventh century after the victories of Nicephorus Phocas which brought about a temporary weakening of the Muhammadan power in the Near East. The title Renaissance of Islam is therefore well chosen since from political crises, defeats and divisions, there grew a spiritual sense of unity in Islam, more independent of the political unity of the past. Knowledge of this period would be of great value to those who think that the conquest of Moslem lands by European powers means the ruin of Mohammedanism. Indeed the modern renaissance of Islam is somewhat parallel to the movement studied by Mez, and also due to a political bankruptcy. The work of Mez is thorough and based on very careful reading not only of published Arabic sources but of some of the manuscripts kept in European libraries. One regrets that the author who owes so much to Maqdisi, denatures his name into Muqaddisi. It is too bad that Le Strange
set this fashion among Western Arabists. Mez should have known better, however, since Huart's publication.

Lothrop Stoddard's book treats of this new renaissance of Islam. It comes to us now in a French translation. On account of the present condition of the exchange, German books are dear in America and French books cheaper than ours. There are flaws here and there in Stoddard's book. Some statements are rather exaggerated, as for instance (p. 10) "several generations before Muhammad, Arabia exhibited an exuberant vitality. The Arabs renounced their ancestral paganism and instinctively turned towards higher conceptions." It is scarcely more correct to say that in Persia (p. 13) "the austere monotheism of Muhammad was transformed into a complex mystical worship called Shi'ah." The author had forgotten that the Turks were largely Nestorians before they became converted to Islam, and so he calls them heathen (p. 18). He would also see a connection between Wahabism and Babism (p. 34). But when it comes to modern times—and that is what we are looking for in a book of this type, Mr. Stoddard handles his material with a sure hand and groups it like a master. He shows the rise of pan-islamism, of the new Asiatic unity, which ignores the ancient barriers of religion. He describes the westernization of the East as another cause of unrest, because it brings about more dissatisfaction. He tells us of the new nationalism, and of the social transformation caused by the beginning of industrialism, and its attendant misery for the masses. The West is sowing wind in the East and may reap a whirlwind. The duplicity of European diplomacy (p. 198 ff.) has destroyed the faith of the East in the ideals of Western nations. On all these points, Mr. Stoddard will enlighten the average man as much as H. G. Wells did by his Outline of History, although he is of course better informed than Wells. Lord Northcliffe who certainly had a world vision said that Stoddard's book should be in the library of any one who wants to know what the world will be in 1950. The reviewer would perhaps not be so positive, but he will say that the book would help one to understand one of the elements of the new world which is being prepared for our sons.

André's work lacks the scholarly apparatus of Mez, and some of the fairness of Stoddard, but he makes up for it by his first hand knowledge of the Muhammadan world. The author is an officer
in the French army and has travelled much. He knows men. He has read the literature of the subject (in French mostly) and his six pages of bibliography will give to the reader a number of titles of books and articles (not always of great value) which one may not easily collect. The references are sometimes too vague (as in vol. II p. 158), where evidently he was quoting from memory. The leading idea of the book is that Islam is not now such a social unit as people are prone to think. It is like a tree. Suckers growing from the original stock took root in new lands, became separated little by little, so that a tenuous connection kept them united to the main stock (vol. I p. 2). There is some truth in that figure, if you make the tree a banian tree, for the unity of Islam is deeper than André likes to imagine. The author does not like the Turks. Evidently the Turkish nation deserves a severe condemnation since it refused to let the diplomats carve it before it died. No doubt Turkish rule was not perfect in the East, but no other Northern race could have done better. Since European powers interfered, and took advantage of racial differences, a good deal of blood has been shed in Asia Minor, but who is to be blamed for it, is it not first of all, the conquering Westerner? The panturian movement which André fears, and from which he would like to divorce the Arabian Islam, is the result of the diplomacy of the West. The author suggests as a barrier against panturanism, a Franco-Japanese alliance, which would also prevent the Anglo-Saxons from conquering the whole world (vol. II p. 320). These are idle suggestions, of course; world-movements are not subject to our fancy. Aside from its political schemes, Captain André’s book is one of the best ever written on modern Islam, because it is so well-informed, interesting, clear and orderly.

We have in Massignon’s three volumes the most important contribution made by Western scholarship on Islam during several years. Indeed we wish that the two volumes on the Passion of Al Hallaj be known by the general public, for they deal with some of the most interesting problems of history and religion. No one to-day knows Islamic mysticism better than Massignon. He is qualified as a philologist, a scholar, one who has lived for years among Moslems, and who learned with his heart as well as his intellect. The author is a Catholic, and it seems that Catholics devout and otherwise can understand Islam well, partly because
mysticism develops so easily in both systems. Psichari has told us of what he learned in Mauritania, de Foucault considered for a while the possibility of becoming a Moslem. Father Hyacinthe felt very strongly the appeal of the ritual of Islamic prayer. Perhaps some one will tell us what deep psychological affinity is revealed by these facts, and why the hero of the Garden of Allah should be a Trappist and not a Presbyterian. It might help us to understand also how Massignon understood Al Hallaj so well and gave us a real masterpiece. The first volume tells us of his life, of his travels, and ministry of preaching, of some of his miracles. It is arranged like a source book, for that is the only way it could be done, since there is a conflict of testimonies, and a "harmony" would not be history. As you read, you make your own history, or romance. In 913 Al Hallaj was sent to prison by the vizir of Bagdad because he declared openly that he was one with God. He was tried again on the same ground and sentenced to death in 922. He was first scourged, his hands and feet were cut off, and finally he was crucified. His long agony was a triumph, and he pronounced wonderful words. The morning after his crucifixion, he was beheaded after he had given to his disciples two more beautiful sayings. Then his body was burned and the ashes were scattered. He had announced his resurrection and some saw him, risen from the dead. Now Al Hallaj is one of the saints of Islam, and the tomb where part of his body was buried is a holy place, visited by pilgrims.

The second volume deals with the remarkable mystical theology of Al Hallaj. First it takes up its psychology, in its Quranic origin and development in the hallagian doctrine, the "science of the hearts", the degrees of divine presence in the soul and the transforming union. Another chapter expounds Hallagian metaphysics, cosmogony, theodicy, eschatology, and polity. It shows at the end, how holiness is devotion to the community, as well as a permanent union with the divine fiat, which is the Quranic type of holiness in Jesus. A plate facing p. 770 represents Al Hallaj as Christ crucified. It is quite evident that the legends of the Passion of the Bagdad martyr has been worked out in that light from a very early date. However we are dealing here with a teaching concerning holiness which is quite authentic. Massignon gives then a good deal of Hallagian material in translation. He
concludes this volume with an amazing bibliography under 1736 numbers. Number 1695 gives us fourteen titles of previous works of Massignon himself on the Hallagian question.

The third volume deals first with the technical vocabulary of Moslem mysticism. This is of course a most important contribution to Arabic lexicography, a science inchoate as yet. From its very nature, it will not appeal to as large a circle of readers as the former volumes. This section is followed by an historical treatment of Islamic mysticism which is of fundamental value.

Massignon's work emphasizes the importance of the religious element in Islam. He deals with the dynamics of it, which Stoddard and André have a tendency to minimize in their emphasis on the racial element.

Professor Lévy’s handbook treats of a literature which in its best part is largely mystical, and with one of the Muhammadan nations who has racially, for better or for worse, been different from the others. His study of Persian literature is very complete, and with its seven pages of bibliography, gives an excellent introduction to the subject. It is written in clear English. Professor Lévy is uncommonly honest. He, a Persian scholar, admits that except to the professed student of Zoroastrianism, the value of the Avesta lies in its philological rather than its literary interest, which is no greater than that of the Levitical portions of the Pentateuch (p. 10). Would that other orientalists had always written as plainly, instead of giving us dithyrambic evaluations of certain of the Sacred Books of the East. Professor Lévy’s book deals first with pre-islamic literature, then with the Abbasid period, the Mongol domination, and finally, modern Persia. It is with some sadness that we read in its concluding pages that Western education imported into Persia, has caused a rise of patriotism and nationalism, one feature of which has been the exaltation of the Shah-nama, so that the mystic literature of Persia “the best and most universally appreciated” is now falling into disrepute. We are sorry for the Persians, as we are sorry for other young men from the Near East, who coming to our schools, have lost the ideals of their fathers. Ideas bandied about across the terraces of European cafés will be a poor substitute for Jami and Jellaludin. The great problem in the East is now how can the past be built into the future. André would let the Muhammadans adapt their own culture to changing
conditions, under proper guidance. The trouble is that guidance may be taken for—or even meant to be—interference, and in this case, the Strangling of Persia.

Professor Lévy's work deserves and will certainly have a second edition, towards which we suggest a few corrections. On p. 15 the statement that the Kur'an was the new Bible of the Arabs may mislead readers into the idea that it supplanted an older book. The first paragraph on p. 16 should be rewritten. The saying of Umar is certainly unhistorical and has no place here, and of course there was a literature under the Omayyads. On p. 21, last line the word "somewhat" is not necessary. On p. 28 the statement that Hamadani "invented" the Makamat should be qualified. These small points take very little off the value of the excellent handbook which the American Branch of the Oxford University Press brings to this country.
THE ANAPHORA OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN ORTHODOX

Translated by Samuel A. B. Mercer

THE ANAPHORA OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN ORTHODOX WHICH THEY RECITED TOGETHER, IN THE HOLY GHOST, WITH ONE VOICE

The introduction

Saying

Majestic art thou, O Lord, in the clouds and above the heavens; glorious art thou in all thy ways. O God, the God of Sabaoth; perfect art thou; never wast thou without existence, never didst thou sin, never wast thou completely manifest in thy divinity, for it was unable to be seen, nor could thy true nature be known. He was glorified in heaven and on earth, and among all that live in the sea, and in the rivers and in all that is in them. By his might were all things created; and by his power he established all! He is one with the Father, and the Father is one God, and the Father is in truth the light and the Son.

The deacon shall say

It was decreed that we announce the substantiality of the Father with the Son and of the Son with the Father before all creation and before the heavens were made, and before the hills were brought forth, and before the fountains of the deep were seen, and before the thunder and lightening broke forth, and before the thunder roared and the lightening flashed, and before the Kingdom was created, and before all creatures which are in the waters under the heavens and earth were made, for no one was so profound as to be able to create his essence. He exalted himself above the heavens, and came forth from the divine abode and created four beasts, all of them full of eyes; and a light went

1 Mercer, MS. Eth. 3, 168 a—183 a.
forth from their mouth like a flame of fire. And, again, thus he brought forth the earth, and spread out the sea, and the wind, and the fire; and, again, thus he went forth and directed with his right hand, and declared that the kingdom of the Father and of the Son of the Holy Ghost comes not by observation nor by power of thought, for the Son knows what they are—the Son and his Father. The time of probation is not announced, and the question of the day of the Son is unknown. His procession from the Father is miraculous. His essence is not known, for it is hidden. To his Father's right hand he has passed. He is the protector of his Son, even him whom he loves. Even as the Son is like the Father, so the Father is like the Son; but not that the Son may be a companion of creation, but that he may serve. As he was conceived so did not create the heavens and the earth. It is not that he assisted, for he was able, not being man, who is weak and powerless and inactive. But a flame of fire proceeded from the mouth of him who spoke in his time. He created that which was and the moment that shall be, which is the wisdom of thought and the wisdom of being. As he bore the burden of the world and built with his might so he bore the foundation and made permanent the firmament. He established the waters above and he created the beginning. He developed in simplicity, he was perfected in flesh and he stretched out the heavens; he collected the waters and gave them motion that they may be a body, he decimated the waters into armies and brought them forth in portions, he numbered the portions and explored their heart and depth.

The intercession

The deacon shall say

Ye who sit.

The priest shall say

The Son of the Father is as to the Son, not a day nor an hour was he alone, for his father was with him in the presence of his holy ones. But it is his glory which sanctified those who are fitted with the holiness of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. And he did not create Adam, our Father, nor he who went forth, for he was made of dust or earth and water, spirit and fire, but from his throne he did not move at all, but he com-
pleted all, and afterwards rested. He it was who made us power-
ful and sustained us after he was revealed. And after he made
and finished all; after he created us he justified our sins, and he
forgave us; afterwards he created Eve, the mother of life, in
paradise he laboured that he might bring into it those whom he
loved. In like manner he prepared, that he might bring into it
those who love happiness, who crave it and desire it, who choose
and select it, who are well pleased with it.

The deacon shall say

Towards the east.

The priest shall say

Therefore with a loud and clear voice, that we may not fail,
when he unites wine and water, that we may not be neglectful
when there comes forth from his glory. Let us learn of the apostle
about the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. The Father
corresponds to the Son, and the Son is Jesus Christ, who cor-
responds to him. The Son corresponds to the Father, for God is
the Father of the Son. The Holy Ghost is he by whom the Son
came forth from the Father, and by whom the Father received
from his only Son council and power and strength. These are
not divided, nor are they separated nor are they unequal, nor are
they confounded, nor is there anything added to this divinity of
God. God decreed for his ministers his own substance. Therefore
our hearts speak first and our hearts speak last, our hearts rejoice
and our hearts give thanks, and our hearts speak praise, and our
hearts exult, our hearts supplicate, and our hearts desire, yet no
man knows exactly his will. We are united and we declare him
to all. We make him known to all. We took him away from
obscurity, and we brought him near to those we are far off. We
proclaimed his will and his love, and we showed forth his tender-
ness, the tenderness of the heart of the Father and of the Son
and of the Holy Ghost.

The deacon shall say

Behold the door and the dwelling of my Father and our Father,
the Holy Ghost; the dignity and beneficence and benevolence of
the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the fire and flame
and coal, like their essence and like their perfection; and time which is not for ever, but his day which is for ever and ever, henceforth world without end.

The deacon shall say

Let your thoughts be on high, etc.

The priest shall say

The Lord be with you all.

The people shall say

With thy spirit.

The priest shall say

Let anger be far and let compassion and goodness be multiplied. Never let them end. Let them ever be with us. Let sin be put away, and let us turn to Him. When our sin is put away, and cleansed by the waters of the flood, let those who obey His word, and who are in the presence of their Father, preserve, protect, and justify those who are one with the eternal God of Gods, the eternal Light of Light, the eternal one whom we name and call the Son. As the face of the earth and as the face of the place of his throne is robed in fire, so will habitation be adorned with water above his abode and around it, whence it is poured out from above. From his presence there shall go forth thunder as the brilliance of fire, bright and great as the brightness and greatness of lightening round about. Before him who is on the throne are four beasts, who carry above their heads an expansive throne, with a large canopy, and around about the throne are four and twenty priests of heaven. All men look upon these beasts, and upon one clothed and sprinkled with blood, with writings on his head. And they prostrate themselves before the throne three times, and to him who is clothed and sprinkled with blood with the writings on his head. And there went up a sacred smoke which filled the temple and all space beneath it. He who sat upon the throne was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone; and there was a rainbow around about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats, and upon the seats were seen four and twenty elders
sitting, clothed in white raiment, and they have on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throng proceeded lightings and thunderings and voices. And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal. And in the midst of the throne, and around about the throne were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within. And they rest not day and night, saying, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts give glory and honour and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

We pray thee, O Lord, give ear; judge, we beseech thee, O Lord, on behalf of those who sleep and rest after this transient life, and after the power of death have come upon them and the tomb has closed its mouth upon them.

We pray thee, O Lord, that thou wouldst awake those, whom thou wilt raise victorious, and whose body will rise and unite itself with the soul, and that thou wouldst give them a good reward, such as eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, and such as the heart of man has not comprehended, and who will be united with thy Son, Jesus Christ, for ever and ever.

*The deacon shall say*

On behalf of those who sleep.

*The priest shall say*

O God, the Father, who didst send thine only Son that he might take up his abode in flesh; who was transfigured though not knowing death; confined in the womb though not restrained,
living in this world though not limited, who became man though 
God, he was born though the essence of life, be was murtered 
though the source of life; he was exalted in glory though a son, 
he was supreme in power though subject to punishment, he gave 
commandment to his family though subject to their care, he sub-
mitted to John for his baptism though he was creator, and pure 
from sin, he was the sources of all though he changed water into 
wine to satisfy the multitude in the field.

The Institution

The priest shall say, stretching forth his hands

Have mercy upon them who close their eyes that they may 
not see him, who are deaf that they may not hear him, who 
withheld their hearts that they may not understand him—he who 
was like unto man, yet without sin. He was made a judge of 
judges and selected from among men his twelve apostles. He came 
among them and manifested himself a witness of the mistery of 
the eucharist. He took bread in their presence; he blessed and 
break, and said unto them: “Take, eat, this bread is my body 
which is broken for you for the remission of sins.” Likewise, he 
blessed the cup and said: “Take, drink, this cup is my blood, 
which is poured out for you for the remission of sins.” In the 
same night that he was betrayed, they took him, and at daybreak 
the elders of the Jews and the Chief Priest with Pilate, the governor, 
sat in council to judge him—the just and gentle, as a lamb, meek 
and mild—they sat in council to judge him, surrounding him. 
In their presence the hosts of Angels might have smote them! 
But they smote him, who was without sin: they cast him down— 
him before whom they should have prostrated themselves; they 
acted arrogantly towards him, before whom the archangels pro-
strated themselves with great fear; they placed upon his head a 
crown of thorns; they stripped his garment from him and clothed 
him with a purple robe; they led him forth to crucify him, to a 
place called Calvary, bearing his cross; he became fatigued with 
the weight of the cross, for it was heavy; they counted him with 
his malifactors, and make him subject to the cross; they crucified 
him without compassion, even as a sinner; they led him forth 
and pierced him with a spear. O sacred feet that were pierced
with the spear; O sacred mouth—bitter was the water, bitter the myrrh, bitter the gall mixed with vinegar. Jesus cried in pain and supplicated his Father. He bowed his head, and gave up the Ghost. They pierced him in the side with a deadly spear. He died. They took him down from the Cross and placed him in a sepulchre—not in a sepulchre for the foreign, but for the elect. They wrapt and bound him with love and care.

The Inclination

The priest shall say

The Lord be with you all.

The people shall say

With thy spirit.

The priest shall say

Give ye thanks unto our God.

The people shall say

It is right, it is meet.

The priest shall say

Lift up your hearts.

The people shall say

We life them up unto the Lord our God.

The Lord's Prayer

Our Father, who art in heaven, thou art our Lord and our God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ. He existed before creation in his divinity. He came down from heaven. He was crucified. He died and was buried. He rose again on the third day. He ascended into heaven. On the day appointed, he appeared to his disciples, transfigured, pierced in hands and feet, and he remained with them teaching them of his kingdom. On the fortieth day he ascended into heaven, to the Father, who sent him. He again went forth, to those in sin, with glory in the clouds of heavens. O Lord have mercy upon us, according as we put out trust in thee.
The Communion

*The people shall say*

As thy compassion, etc.

*The priest shall say*

Let us assemble together to render thanks to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Vouchsafe, O Lord, thy unity to all those who desire it. Let all those who receive it be purified by it, and let all those who share it be satisfied. Let the roots of sin be burned up; let iniquity be eradicated; let blame be done away; and let the soul be perfectly regenerated from sin. Let the door of light be opened, and let the glorious portals be revealed. Let thy Holy Spirit, from above, be sent upon us. Let him descend, and come; and let him transform the bread that it may become the body of Christ, our God, and let the chalice be changed that it may become the blood of Christ our Lord. Let the congregation be perfected in holiness. Let the Church teach them, teaching them love, purity, and long-suffering, for ever and ever.

*The priest shall say the prayer of the Fraction*

*The priest shall say*

Let us adore.

*The priest shall say*

O God, maker of all things, giver of all things, container of all things, whom angels and archangels worship, powers and dominions, might and strength, the sun, the moon, and stars, and all grades; for from the beginning subjection, majesty, and dominion are his. He who was rich in all made himself poor in all. Love drew down the mighty Son from his throne, and brought him even to death. O rich, who resisted not those who dragged him along, and bent his neck to those who slaughtered him! O Lamb, who was dumb before his shearers! O patience, who opened not his mouth in his suffering, before those who smote him. O bread, who came forth from the treasures which Joseph brought, and found therein the precious gem of the onyx. O chalice, who came forth from the virginal chamber! This sign of the cross, which is separate from the bread, is not separate or different, the form and
softness, and taste are one. As the form of this sign of the cross is not separate nor different from the bread, in like manner his deity is not separate nor diverse from his humanity. And therefore he is not separate nor diverse. This sign of the cross is not separate from the bread. Thus thy majesty was commingled with our lowliness, and our lowliness with thy majesty, O Lord our Almighty God.

_The deacon shall say_

Pray.

_The priest shall say_

Let sweet odour come forth, and purify your spirits, your souls, and let it not depart from us. Behold, Emmanuel is with us—the Lamb of God and his oblation! Behold the Father of Light is with the Son and with the Holy Ghost! Behold the angel of light is with us to offer up this mystery, for ever and ever.

_The priest shall say_

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world, even the body and the blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world, in the faith of him we follow.

_The deacon shall say_

Ye who are standing.

_The priest shall say_

We beseech thee, O God, by the love of thy Son, Jesus Christ, that thou wouldst lead us before the greatness of thy majesty. To thee be glory, for ever and ever.

_Prayer of Penitence, while the priest turns, breathing_

In the beginning was the Word; the Word was the Word of God; the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, as of the only begotten of his Father; and the Word came forth from the Father, and as many as receive him to them gave he honour and glory.

_The deacon shall say_

Pray.
ANAPHORA OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN

The priest shall say

The priest shall say:
The Cherubim and the Seraphim surround us, and stand before him with their hands before their eyes, and their ears intent to hear him.

The Benediction

The priest raising his hand

O God, our Lord and our God, and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, bless and sanctify us, that we may be meet to partake in these holy mysteries. Give us, we beseech thee, thy body and blood. Admonish us that we may be obedient unto thee. Send to us thy Holy Spirit, that he may guide us into all truth, and that he may instruct us to eat and drink of the life-giving food. Let us all draw nigh to God in faith, in humility, and in adoration; in prayer and in purity. Let us come in the fullness of his grace, and in the reality of his body and blood, which were given for us. Let the hands of the priesthood, who offer up prayer and praise at all times for us, ever be with us and over us. Let the Three Hundred and Eighteen Orthodox ever intercede for us, for ever and ever, Amen.
SHORT NOTES ON THE AMARNA LETTERS

By John A. Maynard, Bryn Mawr College

1. In Knudtzon 35 l. 54 and 55 read ḫad-mi-iš.
2. Kn. 64 l. 22, translate, whom I had forgotten.
3. Kn. 102 l. 13 tiḥtati gabba, I am at the lowest.
4. Kn. 117 l. 55, translate, then there will be a breathing space (lit. breath) for me.
5. Kn. 127 l. 12, read [ri-ib]-addi, Rib-addi will bring forth.
7. Kn. 127 l. 25, whether I have loved Gubla the faithful city.
8. Kn. 129 l. 7, who are they? Heavy dogs...
9. Kn. 129 l. 16, who is very heavy.
10. Kn. 129 l. 54, read tu-ḵa ba-li... now thou waitest without [hope].
11. On the basis of Kn. 29 l. 141, ia-nu-um-ma-a, l. 142, e-ip-pu-us-ma-a, i-na-an-di-na-a, l. 102, mi-i-na-a (Ch. Harper’s Letters 792 obv. 10 mi-nu-u) I raise the question whether the lengthening of the vowel does not stand for an interrogation.
12. Kn. 120 l. 23, UR is probably the womb and the first word in l. 24 may have been a form of pitū, open.
13. Kn. 120 l. 34, translate, they will obey (without it).
14. Kn. 143 l. 6, 7, translate, thou art the eternal sun, the good breath of [the Sun God?].
15. Kn. 29, 182 and 185, giš-KU-SAG is a mace.
16. Kn. 147, 56, nuḫti and batiti are equivalent and mean I rested or I am at rest.
17. Kn. 127, 8, raḵalu is from a form RGL and may mean he has acted deceitfully.
18. Kn. 117, 63 shows clearly that people thought that the land of Amurru could be conquered in one day. This needs no commentary as to the size and political importance of it.
REVIEWS


Those of us who were initiated into things Babylonian by Jeremias' *Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East* envy our younger brothers who will learn to know the culture of the Near East in Jean's book. This is the work of a good assyriologist, who has ably edited difficult texts, and has understood them, who has no theories of his own to force upon a limited reading public, who examines facts honestly and subjects his judgment to the evidence of archeology, who thinks clearly, writes well, has a well balanced mind. The author surveys successively prehistoric times, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Canaan, the Egean, the Egyptian supremacy (or Empire). He begins a new chapter with the coming of the Northerners (or as he calls it, the great maritime migrations). This introduces the Philistine and Hebrew invasions, Assyria and Babylonia. Cyrus opens a new period including Persian, Greek and Roman history, Hellenism, the revival of Jewish nationalism, Palestine and Greco-Roman times. There are a number of supplementary chapters giving archeological tables, classified historical periods, lists of patesis and kings in Babylonia, Assyria and Elam, important dates. These are followed by elaborate indices, lists of Sumerian, Accadian, Egyptian, Hebrew, and Greek words and biblical quotations. It is quite evident that Mr. Jean does not want to say everything in his book; his treatment of the Egyptian material will not please some Egyptologists who have been accustomed to take the lion's share in things Eastern and who will probably be displeased to see Babylonia placed before Egypt. Jean's treatment of Amurru is blissfully ignorant of our American controversies on the subject, although of course the author knows them well. We wonder why South Arabia is not taken up by him among countries which had some influence on Palestine, at least in connection with Gaza. We note that the author accepts the short chronology for Egypt and dates Hammurabi from 2123 to 2081. And of course he does not identify the Hebrews with the Habiri. The reviewer never could understand
how this identification could have ever been made in the face of the geographical evidence of the Amarna letters which certainly is far more important than philological arguments in these matters. The best parts of the book are those dealing with Sumerian civilization and Canaanite chronology; they are marvellously accurate and packed with information which is so well presented that one does not realize at first what deep scholarship the author is certainly showing with the greatest simplicity of form.

John A. Maynard


This is volume 8 of the first section of a series of books on the Evolution of Humanity published by Mons. Henri Berr, director of the Revue de Synthèse historique. It has been sadly needed in French, for while France has always been in the fore-front of archeological research in Mesopotamia, she has done very little in comparison with her activities along Egyptological lines, to make the civilization of ancient Mesopotamia accessible to the general reader. In fact, the period previous to the time of Hammurabi has never before been thus presented.

The work is wisely divided into two parts, the first dealing with Babylonia and the second with Assyria. This is as it should be for while Assyria inherited the culture and civilization of Babylonia, she impressed her own character and war-like colouring upon it. The same order is followed in both sections, namely, first a historical background, then a discussion of the art, literature, and science of the civilization under consideration. The work has been excellently done, and is provided with a good index. There is very little to criticize, although, it might be suggested that kurkur (p. 17) does not mean "countries" but "mountains" or "hills" or "uplands." The book is thoroughly reliable and takes its place among the best works on the subject.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society. No X. London and New York: (Longmans, Green), 1923, p. 66. 7 s. 6 d.

This volume gives us several valuable articles and reviews. W. M. Calder writes on the medial verbal -r termination in Phrygian. W. J. Perry who knows megalithic culture so well compares it to
Hebrew mythology in An Interpretation of Old Testament Traditions. The gods of Genesis must be interpreted in the light of Ezekiel 28, as beings akin to the kings of Tyre, who could animate images, who lived in paradises, who could walk on hot stones, who were connected with the sky, and superior to mankind. In Sky-folk in the O. T. M. A. Canney studies the mal’akhim. John A. Maynard

The Introduction of the Cadmeian Alphabet into the Aegean World in the light of Ancient Traditions and Recent Discoveries. By Robert Eisler. This is a reprint from the January and April numbers of the J.R.A.S., 1923, in which the author upholds the truth of the theory of ancient Alexandrian scholars that Cadmus brought the alphabet to Greece from Egypt. His arguments are convincing, and should be read in detail in order to be appreciated.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Herein one finds an excellent outline of the history of Egyptian Art, introduced by four chapters, one on Egyptian Geography, the second on Ethnography, the third on History and Chronology, and the fourth on Religion. The next chapter (which should be V instead of IV) begins the syllabus of Art, which is full and detailed.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Sayce, Thureau-Dangin, and Jastrow had already called attention to the similarity in name between the Septizonium built in 203 A. D. by Septimius Severus and the name of some Babylonian stage towers, Septizonium being taken by them as equivalent to E-ub-imin. Dr. Dombart, an authority on the stage-towers of Babylonia, gives us now a reconstruction of the Roman monument with true architectural acumen. The author rightly thinks that the aim of the monument is to show Caesar as ruler of the whole world and even of time. There is no direct relationship with Babylon.

John A. Maynard
Archives from Erech. Time of Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus.

Goucher College measures up to the highest standard of a College's appreciation of scientific research. It is natural to expect that creditable collections of Babylonian tablets be found at such places as Yale, Pennsylvania, Harvard, and Chicago. But that a collection of 1000 tablets is found at Goucher College, a larger collection than these at Smith and Haverford, is highly to its credit. The Goucher College collection is due to the interest of its president, William W. Guth, and to the co-operation of Professor Clay.

In the volume before us Dr. Dougherty has published the first part of this fine collection. Other volumes will be published under the general title of "Goucher College Cuneiform Inscriptions." The inscriptions in this first volume of the series belong to the time of Nebuchadrezzar, and other tablets in the same collection belong to the time of Nabonidus, Nabopolassar, Cambyses, Amel-Marduk, Darius, Cyrus, Neriglissar, Kandalanu, and Barzia. Nearly three hundred are uncertain as to date, and more than fifty are in Sumerian, and belong to a very early period.

Selected texts are transliterated and translated with lexicographical notes. Many of these texts will be found to be of inestimable value to the student of ancient civilization. For example, No. 35 is a lease of property from a woman for four years, showing that a Babylonian woman in the sixth century could own and lease considerable real estate; No. 15 deals with the bailment of a man; &c. No. 355 relates to Belshazzar, the famous son of Nabonidus. On page 35, Dr. Dougherty has written an interesting note on mat Tezma-a, which occurs in No. 294, in which he shows that Arabia was intimately connected with Babylonia in the sixth century B.C.

The translations and discussions are followed by indices of personal names, names of places, names of temples, and names of canals and gates. A full catalogue of the tablet is given, with a list of contents. The autographed texts, covering fifty-six plates, with four hundred and twenty texts, have been excellently done. Goucher College is to be doubly congratulated, first on its possession of such a fine collection of tablets, and, secondly on the fact that
its staff has among its members a scholar who is capable of publishing them in such detail, with such accuracy, and so acceptably to the best cuneiform scholarship.  

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is the first number of the first volume of a new periodical devoted to Cuneiform, and if all succeeding numbers be as interesting as this one, there will be no need of complaint. We welcome this new periodical and pledge Dr. Weidner our earnest support.

Number one contains the following articles: Astrologische Texte aus Boghazkői by the editor; Textkritische Bemerkungen zu einem medizinischen Kompendium by Meissner; Hymn to Ishtar by Langdon; Schenkungsurkunde des Kurigalzu by Ungnad; Ein medizinischer Text aus Kujundjik by Ebeling and Unger; and a short article by Schroeder on šarrat-nipi. The number ends with some notes and comments. The whole is in type-written form. We look forward with much interest to succeeding numbers.  

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Dr. Lewy has published in autograph form a series of interesting studies. It is hoped that he will continue them. This series is devoted to the Cappadocian texts. In his preface he discusses the dative verbal suffix in Old Babylonian, in Assyrian, and in the Cappadocian texts. Then a section is devoted to the demonstrative pronoun, another to a discussion of the divine name Sin, and still another to a study of the Old Assyrian language. Then come thirteen texts in translation, with good notes. Finally there is a list of words discussed.

This book is indispensable to students of Babylonian and Assyrian Grammar, and is a long step forward in the direction of the creation of a norm whereby the age of literary material can be estimated on the basis of grammatical forms.

In his discussion of the name Sin he thinks that the pronunciation of Zu-in = Sin was simply ZU. His discussion of the early form of Assyrian contains many interesting points, connecting Assur and
Ishtar with the cities Aššur and Kaniš as their respective sacred cities, and showing that Ušpia and Kikia probably do not represent the earliest stage of Assyrian history. These interesting studies must be carefully read in order to be fully appreciated.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a model of what such a handbook should be. It is not a mere catalogue of the Art Institute's fine collection, but is really a guide, illustrated by the Institute's objects to Egyptian sculpture, art and literature. There is an excellent résumé of Egyptian sculpture, a brief chronological table, some notes on Egyptian art, and a history of this particular collection. Then Dr. Allen arranges his materials thus: Coffins, relief sculpture, statues and statuettes, ushebtis, glazed ware, minor arts in stone, metal work, beads, amulets, scarabs, papyri, and Graeco-Egyptian paintings. Each section is arranged chronologically, and interspersed with valuable historical and religious observations, and with notes on sculpture, architecture and art. The whole is well documented. Would that every Egyptian collection were as well published!

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Here in romantic fashion the famous writer Grethe Auer represents herself as living in the time of Rameses II and tells of the remarkable reformation in art and religion brought about by Ikhnaton. She has coloured her story by her own deep feeling and social vision. She is a deep admirer of Ikhnaton and sees in him a man of truth and reality, who wishes to see things as they are.

As a work of art this reconstruction of Grethe Auer is unsurpassed. But whether it represents with accuracy the condition of affairs in Ikhnaton's time is highly doubtful—almost certainly not. Nor does history tell us that Ikhnaton was the ideal person as he is herein represented.

In sixteen beautiful plates Clara Siemens of Berlin has reproduced many of the scenes of Ikhnaton's times, which archeology has
brought to light. Miss Siemens' drawings represent the ideal rather than the real, and are often far more beautiful than the originals, or at least make the originals seem far more beautiful than they really are. The work is beautifully and artistically produced, and well worth its modest price. No oriental library should be without it.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


No greater and important work has been published for many years. The work is not entirely new. It is a new edition of Erman's great work, which was published over forty years ago. The work has been done by a first-class Egyptologist, Hermann Ranke. It has been expanded, corrected, and enriched, while retaining its original divisions and order. There is the same number of chapters, and each chapter bears the same title, but each one has been most thoroughly brought up to date, although whole paragraphs here and there stand almost word for word as they were in the earliest edition.

Erman has written a brief and interesting preface, in which he gives expression to his complete confidence in Ranke's work, and tells about the way in which he undertook his own original work. Ranke also writes a brief preface.

A careful reading of this new edition reveals on almost every page results of the material published since the time of Erman's work, for Erman had finished his book before the publication of Petrie's great works, before the publication of the Tell el-Amarna Tablets, and before the publication of the Pyramid Texts and many other important Egyptian texts.

Anyone acquainted with the original form of Erman's book or with it in its English dress by H. M. Tirard, under the title, Life in Ancient Egypt, will not experience any difficulty in using this new edition. But it nevertheless calls for a complete reading, for at every turn the evidence of new material is found.

It goes without saying that no important library, and no student of Egypt can possibly do without this newly written and illustrated Ägypten, written and re-written by two great masters of Egyptology.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

In this reprint from the Recueil des Travaux Dr. Speleers has published an interesting text on a limestone slab, which was acquired for the Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire at Brussels by Capart in 1907. When it was bought it was said that it came from Memphis. The text is a part of the 182nd chapter of the Book of the Dead, a part of the Book of the Dead which does not happen to have many versions. This text belongs to the Nineteenth Dynasty, and that, together with three others, is used by Speleers to reconstruct the text of the 182nd chapter. The reconstruction has been well carried out. The text is then given (in a four-fold form where necessary) and a translation is made. The article ends with a careful discussion of the composition of the chapter and a helpful commentary.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This book has now been on the market for nearly four years, and has been often reviewed. The subject of which it treats has been discussed more or less thoroughly in many journals and by many scholars, among them Gardiner and Sethe. Ranke, in O.L.Z. 1921, 298 F., writes a rather unfavourable review, and much of what he says may be justified. However, Eisler has certainly brought together a good deal of material, and while he probably has not proved his point, namely, that the Sinai inscriptions contain a Canaanitish dialect of the Hyksos period, he has accumulated much evidence to the effect that they contain a Semitic writing, influenced by the hieroglyphic.

The work must be taken into consideration in all future discussions of the important problem which its author tackles.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

"And in the Tomb were found." By Terence Gray. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1923, pp. 236. $ 2.50.

Though not for the Egyptologist, this book is none the less interesting, for it portrays the human element in the relics of
ancient Egypt. The author takes several personalities, Khufu of the Old Kingdom, a representative of the Middle Kingdom, Rameses II of the New Empire, and a representative of the Seventeenth Dynasty, and he presents each in the setting of his own time. The book is well-worth reading, even by a scientific student of Egyptian.

SAMUEL A. B. MERcer


This is a great subject treated by a really great scholar. Professor Dr. König has presented the scholarly world with a fine discussion of Messianic prophecies, abundantly enriched by comparative, historical, and exegetical material.

There are four chapters, the fourth of which covers pages 71—356. The work proceeds in a very logical manner. Chapter one consists of definitions of the ideas of prophecy, Messianic, and Messianic prophecies. These definitions are concise and in agreement largely with conservative Old Testament scholarship, although his definition of prophecy is more conservative than that which would be acceptable to most Old Testament scholars, and it is herein that König's book will be most severely criticized. His interpretation of prophecy is very largely the well-known old-fashioned one, and will not meet with much sympathy with students of Old Testament prophecy.

The second chapter has to do with the background of Old Testament Messianic prophecy, and König rightly finds precious little in Babylonian, Egyptian and other nearer oriental literature, which has to do with a real conception of a messiah. He goes over the usual ground, familiar to students of oriental literature, and seeks in vain for real Messianic prophecies.

In chapter three, Dr. König carries on the discussion of Chapter two instituting an inquiry as to the possible historical relationship between Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament and those passages in oriental literature which have been taken as Messianic.

The author's real work begins with the fourth chapter, wherein he traverses the whole field of Hebrew and Jewish Messianic prophecies as it appears in the Old Testament, in the Apocrypha and in the Pseudepigrapha. Every passage is scrutinized from Gen. 3. 15 to the latest Jewish pre-christian evidence. There are some instances where König is at one with modern higher critical findings, such,
for example, as the dating of the Book of Daniel. But on the whole his attitude is that of conservative Biblical criticism, emphasizing the predictive character of biblical Messianic prophecies. However, this is a work to be reckoned with, splendidly arranged and thoroughly worked out. No Old Testament student can afford to be without it.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


In a former pamphlet on Die Bedeutung des Namens Israel, eine quellen-kritische Untersuchung, Professor Sachsse had defended the thesis that Israel was originally the name of a people and that the name of an individual was secondary. He investigates which people is meant by Israel. He first studies the Davidic boundaries, ideal and real, making a moderate use of cuneiform sources to illustrate the biblical material. He than investigates whether or not Davidic boundaries were larger than even ideal Israel. Then the main problem is whether Judah belonged to Israel or not. The author takes up data which might show that Judah did not belong to Israel, namely the fact that Judah is not mentioned in the song of Deborah, the testimony of 1 Sam. 27, 10 and 2 Sam. 19, 44. He shows that there was a religious bond of unity between the North and the South, which is embodied in the name Israel.

Professor Sachsse writes clearly and his argumentation is always solid. We shall look forward to the third instalment of his work which will give us his religious interpretation of the name Israel. However, we have a feeling that the first two sections have really been a development rather than a preparation of his etymology eliašar which he defended already in ZAW 1914, 1 ff. This etymology is questionable in the light of Semitic onomatology. Besides the name Israel has been found by Scheil in cuneiform at such an early date that Sachsse's etymology and perhaps his discussions may apply to the name Jeshurun but not to Israel.

John A. Maynard


As the preface of this work points out, this guide was prepared especially for Roman Catholics. This fact is emphasized by appending
the Stations of the Cross. But it is hard to imagine a better guide to the Holy Land, from the point of view of the avarage traveller, than this one. Besides the twenty-six tours arranged and described, the book is replete with abundant and valuable information. It begins with advise as to equipment, the best season to visit Palestine, means of travel, passports, money, &c., &c., and ends with a series of well-chosen extracts from the Old and New Testaments. It seems to be a far better book than Baedeker in many respects, and this second edition is brought thoroughly up to date.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This book is No. 5 of Volume I of the Series on Semitic Philology, published under the editorship of Professor Potter, by the University of California Press. It contains a reconstructed Hebrew text of Isaiah 1—35 and 37, 22—35. The object of the publication is to show typographically the overwhelming preponderance of parallelism in the received Masoretic text, and to show how great or how small are the changes necessary to restore the original form of the oracles contained in these chapters.

There is an Index of verses and a list of corrections. The text is beautifully and very accurately printed, and serve as a most suitable text with which to introduce students to a study of prophetic literature.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

The Targum to Canticles according to six Yemen Mss. compared with Textus Receptus as contained in De Lagardes's Hagiographa Chaldaice. By R. H. Melamed. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1921, pp. 117.

This dissertation for the Ph. D. degree offered by a student at Dropsie College is all a model thesis should be, a thorough treatment of a limited subject. After a short but very clear general introduction, the author takes up the various manuscripts and then notes the textual variants, the grammatical variants and the errors. He then reproduces in extenso the text of his manuscript A, a very good British Museum text and gives the variants in the margin. While the Targum to Canticles has little value to textual criticism of the Old Testament because of its late date, the philological and religious interest of it is very great. Dr. Melamed died recently and will be missed among us.

John A. Maynard
REVIEWS


Pages XXVI + 112 of this book are a reprint of Part I of this work which appeared in 1916 under the title "The Coptic Psalter." Part II consists of pages 113—396, and contains a Homily on the Archangel Gabriel by Celestinus, Archbishop of Rome, a translation of which Dr. Worrell gives, and a Homily on the Virgin by Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, from Manuscript Fragments in the Freer Collection and the British Museum. This also Dr. Worrell translates. As in the case of the Psalter so here, the editor prints the Coptic text. The work is magnificently printed by the Norwood Press in Massachusetts. An excellent list of Contents is furnished, as well as an index of Coptic words and forms, an index of Greek words, an index of Biblical passages, an index of Names and Places, and an index of Words in other languages.

Part I contains, besides the Sahidic text of the Coptic Psalter, a Psalter fragment and a Job Fragment. This is all introduced by full accounts of the manuscripts, their nature, appearance, contents, and affinities. There are some photographs of the texts, two of which, on plate II, are photographed upside down. The text is furnished with critical foot-notes which will be found useful, and is an earlier one than Budge's but later than Rahlfs'. It lies in date between these two, that is, between 700 and 400 A.D.

The two Homilies are splendidly edited. Both were written certainly before 975 A.D. They will be found of great interest to students of the history of dogma and homiletics. At the end of Part II is a short Magical text, consisting of a single leaf, written in a Middle Egyptian dialect. Its contents deal with the perils of the deep and sickness.

The whole work of editing has been excellently done, and Oriental students are greatly indebted to Dr. Worell for these excellent texts, full notes, and reliable translations. **Samuel A. B. Mercer**

_Die Syrische Jakobosanaphora nach der Rezension des Ja'qóbh von Edessa._ Von A. Rucker. Münster in Westfalen: Verlag der Aschendorff'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923, pp. 120.

Professor Rucker gives us as the fourth of the _Liturgiegeschichtlichen Quellen_ edited by Mohlberg and Rucker a very thorough
study of the text of the Syriac anaphora of James according to the recension of Jacob of Edessa. In the introduction he classifies the manuscripts and printed texts, and compares the Syriac text with the Greek. He then gives us both of these texts with complete notes on the variants, ending with scripture, Syriac and Greek indices. Liturgical students are greatly indebted to Dr. Rücker for the accuracy of his work, the excellency of his method, and the completeness of his erudition.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Coptic Theotokia. By De Lacy O'Leary. London: Luzac & Co., 1923, pp. 80. 10 s. 6 d.

In this book the author has published the Coptic hymns to the Virgin, using as a basis for his text Vatican Cod. Copt. XXXVIII, Bib. Nat. Copte 22, 23, 35, 69, and other MSS. as well as fragments recently found at the Dér Abû Makâr in the Wadi Natrum. He gives in the original Coptic the Theotokia, or hymns to the Virgin, for each day of the week, even preserving the mis-spellings and errors of the originals. But this is as it should be, for the student has a real facsimile of the originals before him. In an introduction Dr. O'Leary discusses the probable authorship of the hymns, and gives valuable details as to the use of the Theotokia in monasteries and secular churches. The work is indispensable to students of Oriental liturgics and will be found useful by all Coptic scholars.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Commentary of Father Monserrate on his journey to the Court of Akbar. By J. S. Hoyland and S. N. Banerjee. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1922, pp. 287. $3.00

Father Monserrate's memoirs covering his missionary embassy to Akbar remained unedited until 1914 when the Latin text was published by Father Hosten. The volume now before us gives us the first translation in English by Hoyland of this valuable source, with excellent notes by Mr. Banerjee. The preface begins with a comparison between Akbar and Asoka which leads to a valuation of Akbar's character far different from that of H. G. Well's Outline of History for instance. Akbar had no intention of becoming a Christian, and even if he had been so inclined he was too much of a cunning politician to have entertained it very long. The editors show that he was far more interested in the Sikhs and the Jains,
and of course of himself. Father Monserrate's account of his visit to Akbar's court is a very interesting book as well as a valuable historical source. It is very naive and yet keen, scholarly and extremely uncritical. We see in his book how worthless the reports of travellers can be, when they deal with religion and customs. The good father saw at Gwalior thirteen nude Jain sculptures; they must be to him Christ and his apostles. He and his companion had constantly to engage in controversy with Moslem doctors and these discussions became as many victories of Western scholarship and Western Koranic knowledge: no doubt Akbar was delighted to see what was for him two foreign fanatics baiting the no-less fanatical mullahs. It is interesting to show how the latter are driven to propose an ordeal by fire which the Jesuits very wisely and keenly declined to undergo because fire they said had indeed consumed by accident many Korans as well as Bibles. Father Monserrate does not seem to have learned in all the years he spent in India that the Hindus are naturally courteous and that approval of his statements did not mean really very much. Finally he became discouraged by what was now clearly Akbar's drift towards Hinduism and they withdrew from his court after accompanying him to Kabul on a military campaign. The book would be difficult reading without Professor Banerjee's accurate notes, without which the quaint spellings of the missionary would be hard to understand. We would only take exception to the statement (p. 22) that Hassan was poisoned by his wife. This is at least doubtful. This is the only criticism we would make of a book which deserves to be well known, for its archeological and historical value as well as for the human interest of it.

JOHN A. MAYNARD


Dr. Haase has herein given an excellent translation of the Coptic text of the Council of Nicaea, with excellent introductions and notes. He shows that the Coptic texts were not official, but grew out of different sources brought together into one body of canons. His discussion of the theological importance of the Coptic sources is particularly good. Dr. Haase sums up his fine piece of work with a series of results in a most convenient form.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER
REVIEWS


This book is of very unequal value. The author knows modern history but, in spite of a praiseworthy industry, is not very familiar with historical methods. His sources and authorities are usually not quoted by page and used most uncritically. One wonders whether he knows much of Arabic for surely the statement that the colloquial Arabic of Algeria is punic (p. 266) is stupendous. The author does not know modern historical works, not even Lammens whose Yezid would have given him a few more points in his controversy against Arab culture. For the book is polemic through and through. M. Servier is even pro-Turkish because he dislikes the Arabs so. He understands better the new movement in Islam and there he has something of value to say. He advises the settlement of thousands of French women in Algeria as missionaries of the modern civilisation laïque of France. He would use the white Fathers to christianize the Berbers, although the results so far have been very meager. On the whole, one has the impression that the author does not quite know what should be done, and indeed who does? The Moslem problem is not an easy one; it will not be solved by methods which make a hundred converts or so to Christianity and a few “men without a country” while the native population increases by millions and is antagonized by the policy followed. The method of Napoleon III which Servier criticized as quixotic is probably better.

John A. Maynard


This is one of the volumes in the Bücherei der Kultur und Geschichte edited by S. Hausmann. The author studies successively the country, its history first from earliest times to 2200 B.C., then from 2200 B.C. to the Greek colonisation, then the Scythians, their tombs, their kurgans, the Greek cities, their tombs, the late Hellenistic and Roman periods and the coming of the Huns. The volume is abundantly illustrated. Dr. Ebert is a master of his subject and will long remain an authority for those of us who because of their ignorance of Russian are not able to follow up the current literature of the subject. There is much in Herodotus that is made clearer
by him and much that the student of Assyrian and Persian history will read with the greatest interest.  

John A. Maynard


The Mackie Ethnological Expedition was fostered by Sir James G. Frazer and entrusted to Mr. Roscoe, a former missionary of the Church of England in East Africa. This volume, the first result of the Expedition is one of the best ever written from an ethnological point of view, partly because Mr. Roscoe is a trained observer and an authority on Bantu customs, partly because he had no one with him who knew English; indeed there is nothing in the book to tell you that the writer is an Englishman, except of course his mastery of a clear cut English. The Bakitara (or Bunyoro as they are called on our maps, and even in the author's own map) are part of the Negro-Hamitic people called Bahuma, shepherd invaders from the North. The conquered aborigines were chiefly agricultural. There were various clans both among the pastoral people and their serfs, and clan exogamy was enforced, with the exception of the royal family. The totem was the greatest factor in marriage relationships. There was one God, with two other names; he had no priesthood and no temples; in time of distress prayers were made to him (or to them, if the other names were formerly subordinate gods) with hands and eyes raised skywards. This God left the care of this world to beings, offspring of God, who lived as men, and then being immortal departed, leaving behind them their priests. Mr. Roscoe describes these priests male and female, the magic rites, taboos and omens; the king's life surrounded with taboos is described in detail and then the customs of the people, the cattle taboos, agricultural life, industries, warfare, and hunting. There is a very complete index, and the book is illustrated with a large number of photographs. It is quite certain that Mr. Roscoe's book will be much quoted by every student of semi-primitive culture. Let us hope that in the near future, other negro-hamitic tribes will be studied as thoroughly, before Africa's traditions be transformed by foreign influences and an iconoclastic brand of civilization. If only there were a hundred men like Mr. Roscoe at work now! This volume like everything coming
from the Cambridge Press is perfectly presented. Sir Peter Mackie's generosity has had its reward.  

JOHN A. MAYNARD


Mr. Hardy's survey of the History of Africa is the only complete history of Africa from ancient to modern times and it is fair and well proportioned. The author studies first Africa before Islam, then Islam and the growth of African empires, the coming of Europe, and the growth of African rationalism. The author knows the Northern part of the African of course better than the Southern which is far less interesting to the French readers, but he has certainly given us an excellent piece of work. The book is well written, the introduction especially betrays the hand of an expert geographer. The author believes as everybody eventually must that Africa has gone through a process of dessication, the Sahara was inhabited in prehistoric times and Negritos lived in its Southern part. The dessication of the region bordering in Senegambia can be studied since the foundation of the city of St. Louis. This dessication is of course of great importance to us as bearing on the original home of the Semites since Arabia is really a part of the Sahara. The author accepts Maspero's historical views more than we would be disposed to do. In Sudanese questions he follows Delafosse but does not apparently think much of Frobenius whose views are not mentioned, as they should be, for after all they are not altogether questionable. The chapter on the awakening of modern nationalism is excellent and alone would be worth more than the price of this excellent little book.  

JOHN A. MAYNARD


In the course of investigations carried on during the years 1910—21 Mr. Evans acquired the material for the present book. In reading it we have to keep in mind the author's purpose, to present "storehouses for facts to be made use of by students of custom and religion" (p. 198), not to set forth final results; the time for these, in the judgment of Mr. Evans, has not yet come
(p. v). Consequently there is little attempt at explanation, rather we find the simple recording of what has been seen and heard. Folk-lore and custom are emphasized more than religion. Generally speaking the book does not add much to our knowledge of the religious beliefs, this is due partly to the reserve of the people in talking of their religion, partly to the author's ignorance of the various dialects. Sun-worship seems to be more commonly practised, animistic beliefs appear everywhere, idols are few, priestly offices are commonly exercised by women. There is little evidence of totemism. Most of the folk-tales have no apparent religious application, and the same may be said of the tabus; but further study may show a religious significance which does not appear at first sight. There is much of interest in the folk-tales, especially in the creation stories (pp. 45 sqq.); P'landok, a species of small deer, plays the part of B'r'er Rabbit. In the recorded customs we find much that is unique. Mr. Evans has put us in his debt by furnishing this copious supply of information concerning a comparatively little-known people, and setting it forth as readably as he has done, for there is not a dry or dull line in his book.

F. H. Hallock


This remarkable little book is one of _The Heritage of India Series_, edited by Bishop Azariah and Dr. Farquhar. It is scholarly and sympathetic. The author gives us first a short introduction on the Rigveda, its theology, and the life of the Aryans. This is followed by forty hymns classified under a separate heading for each god. Many of us had already read portions of metrical translations of the Vedas in Macdonell's _History of Sanskrit Literature_ and thought then that they could scarcely be improved. Apparently the author has not been satisfied with his own work. The beautiful hymn to Aranyani for instance is corrected in several places. Dr. Macdonell's book is more than an epitome of Vedic theology, or a guide to the earliest literature of India. It is an inspiring piece of work. It will arouse the interest of many in Vedic studies.

John A. Maynard

The history of political theories among the Hindus was frozen out of Western Orientalism by Max Müller when he proclaimed the dogma that Hindus, being philosophers and adepts of passivity, had no place in the political evolution of the world. This opinion pleased certain interested people for reasons that it is needless to explain. Writers of text-books, and even of source books on political science may therefore be excused if they did not even mention India as a field of study for the youth of American colleges. Their authors are not of course aware of the existence of the Arthasastra which has only recently come to light but even of books long known to Orientalists as the Manusamhita and the Santiparvan sections of the Mahabharata. The Oxford University Press is therefore doing a real missionary work among our intellectual class, sadly misinformed on political subjects, by bringing to us the works of N. N. Law and more recently the excellent history written by Professor Ghoshal. The author knows Sanskrit and Pali of course, he is thoroughly at home in Western methods of investigation, he accepts the cautious chronology of European Sanskritists, he understands the meaning, the value, and the purpose of historical perspective, which we usually call the evolutionary point of view. The first phase of his book covers the period of the Vedas, Brahmanas and Upanishads. Vedic kings were at first mere captains of war, league chiefs like the rulers of the German invaders of the Roman Empire. However, we find already in the Rig Veda a doctrine of the king’s divinity which, in the Brahmanas is made to justify a more despotic authority. This dogma arose in the usual way of interpretation of the sacrificial ritual; it can be easily understood as parallel to the process of deification of Brahmans. At the same time, a nobility of service crowded out the old nobility of birth. Mr. Ghoshal shows that in the Brahmanas we find also the germ of the Buddhist theory of the social contract rediscovered in Europe not so long ago. In the second chapter, the author shows the political theories in the process of normal growth. In the Dharmasutras, the concept of Dharma is held to be derived from the Divine will, but it embodies as well the idea of unity of society in a diversity
born of a thorough specialization. Mr. Ghoshal shows then the broad agreement of the Arthasastra with the Dharmasutras. He examines various theories on Kautilya’s work and shows that it is a masterful reconstruction of older material. Thus does it differ from Machiavelli’s work. The following chapters take up the Mahabharata, the Manusamhita, the synthesis of the Arthasastra and Dharmasutras, the work of scholiasts and commentators, Kaman-daka, the minor Smritis, and the Puranas. Mr. Ghoshal handles this mass of material very lucidly, and does not allow interest to lag even in his presentation of medieval political theories. Very vividly he shows the constant interrelation of ideas and the uni-fying thought which is that in India, polity is a true partnership in a life of virtue. Western writers do not always appreciate this deep ethical value of Hindu collective thought, or its religious inspiration. Its very artificiality is the result of a pure idealism. Mr. Ghoshal claims, and we think also demonstrates, that Hindu political thought resembles more the medieval and modern European thought than the Greco-Roman. The reviewer agrees with him and thinks that it is one of the many redeeming features of modern thought and of its affinity with real religion. It follows from Mr. Ghoshal’s point of view that Hindu political theories do not belong to a museum of curious antiques from strange parts, but that the men to whom the British Raj has given the privilege and the responsibility of being the political pedagogues of India, will do well to study the history of its political theories with care and carefulness, sympathy and patience. Indeed we do not see how one can afford to ignore Mr. Ghoshal’s book if one cares to think out some of the problems of present India, and that means, the future of the British Empire. Mr. Ghoshal’s book was printed by the Banerjee Press of Calcutta, and the fact that it is published by the Oxford University Press dispenses us from saying more. There is a good index and a good working bibliography. Altogether it is a fine piece of work.

John A. Maynard.
NECROLOGY

Friedrich Delitzsch Ἀ

Von Otto Schroeder, Berlin.


überwunden hatte, bemühte er sich, für das Sumerische die gleichen Hilfsmittel zu schaffen, wie er es für das Akkadische (Assyrische) getan; als Frucht seiner Arbeit konnte er 1914 in schneller Folge drei Werke erscheinen lassen: „Sumerisches Glossar“, „Grundzüge der Sumerischen Grammatik“, „Kleine Sumerische Sprachlehre für Nichtassyriologen“.


Zu den wertvollsten Arbeiten Delitzsch's überhaupt möchte ich seine 1881 erschienene Monographie „Wo lag das Paradies?“ zählen, die eine vorzügliche Darstellung der Geographie des alten Orients enthält.


Bis zu einem gewissen Grade gehören hierher auch die berühmten „Babel und Bibel“-Vorträge (1902), denen Delitzsch einen guten Teil seiner Bekanntheit bei Nichtassyriologen, aber ebenso viel Anfeindungen zu verdanken hat. Noch heftigere Angriffe


Die nur eine Auswahl des Wichtigeren enthaltende Rundschau möchte ich nicht abschließen, ohne noch auf zwei Kriegsschriften hinzuweisen, die so recht den abgeklärt versöhnlichen Geist erweisen, der in Friedrich Delitzsch lebte; die eine ist die Wiedergabe der am 15. Dezember 1914 gehaltenen Rede „Psalmworte für die Gegenwart“ — eine Predigt voll wärmster Frömmigkeit, der die Hörer in Andacht lauschten —, die andere die liebenswürdig verständnisvolle Schilderung der „Welt des Islam“ (1915).

Noch ein Wort über Delitzsch’s Persönlichkeit, wie sie sich seinen Hörern und Mitarbeitern zeigte. Delitzsch war der geborene Lehrer. Mit Sorgfalt bereitete er sich auf seine Vorlesungen vor, auch auf die Anfängerkollegien; daher gelang es ihm, selbst die schwierigste Materie in so faszinierender Form vorzutragen, daß allen Hörern das Mitkommen möglich wurde. Die Gabe, zu fesseln und anzuregen, kam ihm wie im akademischen Unterricht so erst recht bei seinen Vorträgen aufs glücklichste zu statten. Seinen Untergebenen war er ein warmherziger und freundlicher Vorgesetzter; und wenn etwas zu bemängeln wäre, so höchstens das, daß er Gegnern und Feinden gegenüber — und die hatte sogar er — allzu anständig und nobel war, und daher — woran auch die zunehmende Schwerhörigkeit eine Mitschuld trug — sich lieber
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zurückzog als den Kampf aufnahm. Denen, die ihn gekannt haben, wird Delitzsch als Forscher, Lehrer und Mensch teuer bleiben.

Carl Bezold †

Von Otto Schroeder, Berlin.


Weiteren Kreisen wurde Bezold durch die nach Form und Inhalt gleich ausgezeichnete Monographie „Ninive und Babylon“
bekannt (1904). Die assyriologischen Arbeiten der letzten Jahre erschienen zumeist als Schriften der Heidelberger Akademie; zusammen mit Boll behandelte Bezold mehrfach astrologische Texte, insbesondere um die Verbindung zwischen Keilinschriften und griechischen und arabischen Autoren nachzuweisen.

Seit Jahren arbeitete Bezold an einem Thesaurus der Assyriologie, dessen Einrichtung etwa der des Berliner Ägyptischen Wörterbuches ähnlich gedacht war; als Proben veröffentlichte er 1915 „Historische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur“, d. h. Umschrift und Übersetzung der von Messerschmidt veröffentlichten Urkunden, 1920 „Babylonisch-assyrisch alāku, gehen“.
ESAGILLA UND DAS GROSSE MARDUKFEST ZU BABYLON

Von Th. Dombart, München

Vom Standpunkt des Judentums\(^1\) aus betrachtet, ist uns der Turmbau zu Babel charakterisiert als das Symbol\(^2\) menschlichen Wahnwitzes und heidendischer Gottlosigkeit, indem die Menschen sich einen „Namen“ machen, bis in den Himmel aufsteigen und sich Gott gleichsetzen wollten.

Vom Standpunkt der alten Sumero-Babylonier und Assyrer\(^3\) läßt uns allerdings die Betrachtung der Geschichte des Babelturms und seiner Brudertürme rings im babylonisch-assyrischen Bereich eine — wenigstens dem ursprünglichen Motiv nach — wesentlich andere Vorstellung erkennen, die zum Bau dieser machtvollen Sakraltürme führte. Danach war es tiefes religiöses Bedürfnis und zähe Treue gegenüber den Göttervorstellungen der uralten, sumerischen Bergheimat, was den in der Ebene zwischen Euphrat und Tigris angekommenen Sumeriern und ihren babylonisch-assyrischen Nachfolgern die architektonisch wie religiös großzügige Aufgabe nahegelegt hatte, berggleiche Sakraltürme in Ziegelmassen aufzuschichten, ursprünglich sogar auch mit Bäumen und sonstigem Naturwuchs zu bepflanzen,\(^4\) damit die Himmlischen der alten Gebirgsheimat auch hier, mitten in der Ebene, dennoch „Zuneigung fassen“ und auf der Höhe dieser Ziegelberge ihren Wohn- und Thronsitz einnehmen möchten wie auf den altheimatlichen, in die

---

Wolken ragenden Bergspitzen und damit das Volk aufblicken könne zu den künstlichen Thronbergen um Hilfe, die von den dort oben residierenden Göttern herabkommen sollte.5


5 Vergleiche den in der babylonischen Gefangenschaft entstandenen Psalm 121 (KAUTZSCH, Textbibel, Tübingen 1906).


O Marduk, mein Gebieter, meine frommen Taten schaue freundlich an! ... Wie die Ziegel von Etemenanki (dem Götterthron) festliegen für ewig, so gründe Du die Grundfesten meines Thrones bis in ferne Tage! ... Wenn Marduk mit Freuden seine Wohnung nimmt in Dir, o Tempel, so berichte dann dem Marduk, meinem Herrn, meine frommen Taten!

Die Vollendung der ganzen Prachtanlage war aber erst Nebukadrezzar II. beschrieben, der, wie wir eben hörten, als Kronprinz bei der Grundsteinlegung schon hatte mit Hand anlegen dürfen. Er rühmt sich vielmals seiner Taten:


Die ganze Anlage des Esagilla-Bezirkes (Abb. 1) lag mehr oder minder in der Mitte der Altstadt Babylon, etwas gegen Westen neigend, unmittelbar am Ostufer des Euphrat, also von diesem Fluß im Westen begrenzt, während als Ostgrenze, ungefähr parallel dem

8 Langdon-Zehnpfund, a. a. O. S. 127.
Flußlauf, nordsüdlich das Ischtartor durchziehend, die breite Prozessionsstraße verlief. Nördlich des Esagilla-Bezirkes, einschließlich seiner Garten- und Felderflächen, zog westöstlich der Kanal Libilchegalla hin, hinter dem sich die Königsburg erhob; südlich dagegen fanden sich unter anderem einige Tempel, wie z. B. der des Ninib.

Westöstlich, von der steinernen Euphratbrücke und dem Uraschtor her, führte, mitten durch die gesamte Esagilla-Anlage hindurchgehend, und zwar zwischen dem Peribolos, der den Turm umschloß, und der großen Tempelanlage südlich davon, die kleine Prozessionsstraße (des Nebo), welche am südöstlichen Periboloseck im rechten Winkel sich mit der nordsüdlich daherkommenden großen Prozessionsstraße (des Marduk) traf.

In dieser großen Tempelanlage außerhalb, südlich des Peribolos, dürfen wir vielleicht nicht, wie man zunächst glaubte, „Esagilla“ schlechthin sehen, sondern etwa lediglich die Teile des großen Esagillaheiligtums, welche in den Bauinschriften stets besonders
als zu Esagilla gehörig genannt werden: Ekua (den Marduktempel), Kaduglisag (den Sarpanittempel) und Ezida (den Nebotempel), in dem, wenigstens später, d. h. in neubabylonischer Zeit, auch das Schicksalsgemach (Dulkugga) lag, welches früher scheinbar in oder dicht bei der Zikkurrat untergebracht war. Die Hauptsache an Dulkugga scheint ein Hof und eine Toranlage gewesen zu sein, wo gemäß dem altorientalischen Brauch derjenige thronte, der die Rechtsentscheidungen, hier Schicksalsbestimmungen, traf.

In engster Beziehung zum Festkult von Esagilla stand noch — obwohl vermutlich (wie in Assur, vgl. Abb. 3) außerhalb der innern Stadtumwallung, im freien Feld, bezw. in der Vorstadt, nördlich am Euphratufer gelegen — das Frühlingsfesthaus, wo an Neujahr unter großen Opferdarbringungen die Hochzeit Marduks mit Sarpanit gefeiert wurde. Dorthin führte, vom Ischtartor her, aus der Altstadt, die prunkvolle, breite Prozessionsstraße, deren Hauptteil Aiburschabun hieß.


Und wie alles, was zum Tempel Esagilla mit seinem Stufenturm von Babylon und zu dem ganzen Kultbezirk „Schuannaki“ gehörte, so war unter Nebukadrezzar auch die ganze Profanstadt und Festungsanlage auf die Höhe des Prunkes gebracht worden samt der kleinen und der großen Prozessionsstraße.

Am imposantesten kam das alles natürlich zur Geltung bei der Feier des großen Mardukfestes, an Neujahr, wenn die Sonne aus dem niedern Stand der Winterzeit loskam und am II. Nisan beim Aufsteigen über den östlichen Horizont mit ihren Strahlen erstmals wieder durch die offene Türflucht der gegen Osten frontierten Gipfelkapelle den auf dem Turm stehenden leeren Goldschatztrafen und so die Vorstellung wieder befriedigten, der Sonnengott selbst nehme dort oben auf dem Bergthron Platz.

10 Langdon-Zehnpfund, a. a. O. S. 127.
11 Herodot I, 181/2.
Doch dieser Augenblick war sozusagen erst der letzte Höhepunkt des großen Festes. Bis das soweit kam, waren lange Tage von hoher und höchster Bedeutung schon vorausgegangen.

Wir verdanken es namentlich den unermüdlichen Bemühungen H. Zimmerns,12 daß wir uns bereits einigermaßen ein Bild von all diesen Veranstaltungen und Festlichkeiten machen können, wenn auch noch manche Lücke klafft und vieles noch der Klärung harrt. Die unklaren Stellen müssen wir eben einstweilen übergehen und kleine Lücken mit, soweit möglich, begründbarer Phantasie ausfüllen.

Im Herbst, bei der Tag- und Nachtgleiche, wenn Marduk seinen Leidensgang angetreten hatte, wenn die Naturkräfte die Frühsonne mit ihren Strahlen nicht mehr die goldene Gipfelkline hoch oben in der blauglasierten Himmelskapelle des Turmes von Babylon treffen ließen, wenn die Tage nun kürzer wurden, bis zum Tiefstand der Sonne, dann kam die Natur und das Volk in Trauer. (Wir können als auf eine gute Analogie bei uns hinweisen auf die herbstlichen Totengedenktage Allerheiligen, Allerseelen und Totensonntag.)

Das unerbittliche Geschehen im Rahmen der Naturgesetze wollte natürlich bis zu einem gewissen Grad nicht als ungöttlich aufgefaßt werden. Und so stellte man sich das Geschick des leidenden und sterbenden und wieder auferstehenden Gottes als durch die Tat der übrigen Götter bewirkt vor, ließ also den Hauptgott von seinem eigenen Götterkreis zur finstern Stätte des Gefängnisses, Gerichtes und Todes bringen, dort einschließen, aburteilen, töten und begraben und — am Neujahrsfest wieder befreien oder auferstehen.

Nachdem die Zikkurrati, einerseits die Abbilder der Naturberge und andererseits die örtlichen Wiederholungen des im hohen Norden vorgestellten Welt- oder Länderberges, auch als die finsteren Stätten schlechthin aufgefaßt wurden, als die Stätten des Gerichtes („Haus am Rand des Berges“)13 und als Ort der Unterwelt und des Todes („am Berg anlegen“ = sterben),14 ja als „Göttergräber“,15


13 Zimmern, a. a. O. 1918, S. 3.


15 Dombart, Sakralturm S. 37/38.
so liegt der Gedanke auf der Hand, daß der Gott während der Zeit, da er nicht auf dem Thron der Gipfelkapelle Platz nehmen konnte, sondern gefangen gehalten, abgeurteilt, getötet und begraben wurde, eben im dunklen Innern seines Thronberges eingeschlossen oder begraben gedacht war (wie etwa bei uns die Volkssagen heroisierte Könige und Kaiser in Bergen gefangen und der Wiederkunft harrend schildern).

Erst bei dieser Annahme paßt der babylonische Mythos vom leidenden, im Berg gefangenen, aber am Neujahrsfest wieder befreiten Gott plastisch zu den Baulichkeiten.

ZIMMERN hat darauf hingewiesen, daß auch dieses Leiden und Sterben oder „Verschwinden“ des Gottes offenbar durch eine Art religiösen Volkstrauerspiels dargestellt wurde im Herbst (vergleiche hierzu etwa die Oberammergauer Passionsspiele!).


Gedenken und Bewegung zeigte sich erst wieder, als es auf das Neujahrsfest zuging, wo das „Aufstehen des Götterherrn Marduk“ 16 gefeiert werden sollte.

Wie bei uns dem Auferstehungsfest an Ostern die Karzeit und speziell eine Karwoche vorangestellt ist, um dem Volk in Gedanken, Wort und Darstellung die ganze Furchtbarkeit zu Gemüte zu führen, die erst durch den Sieg des Auferstehenden überwunden wird, so hielt man es auch schon bei den alten Babylonern.

War der eigentliche Festbeginn erst am 8. Nisan und der letzte Höhepunkt am 11., so setzten doch schon acht Tage vorher die Vorbereitungsveranstaltungen ein.

Das war eben der Zeitpunkt des Neumondes zur Zeit der Frühlings-Tag- und Nachtgleiche, wo neues Leben und neues Hoffen heraufziehen wollte, wieder im Anschluß an das alljährlich neue Naturgeschehen und mit Hinweis auf die erstmalige Weltschöpfungstat. Da setzte das Neujahrsfest ein (vgl. Esra 7, 9) nach festem Kultritual.

Am 1. Nisan, wo die Neumondnacht noch fast ganz dunkel war und kaum eine fadenfeine Mond-Silbersichel sich zeigen wollte,
da gab es um den „im Berg“ gefangenen gehaltenen, mit dem Ähren-
gewand bekleideten Gott nur Trauer und Klagen, Rufen und
Schreien nach dem verschwundenen Gott, hin und her durch die
Straßen, von Hoch und Niedrig, von Göttern und Menschen „am
Tor des Begräbnisses“, bis man ihn endlich findet, bezw. bis man
seinen Aufenthalt im Bergverließ feststellen darf: „Wo ist Bel?
Wo ist Bel?“ ... „Wer wird ihn herausführen?“ ... „Mach Bel
wieder lebendig!“ usw. Er wird geschildert als verwundet,
vom Speer getroffen, zerschlagen, getötet, verschwunden. Leer, d. h. ohne
seinen Besitzer, fährt der Mardukwagen zwischen Esagilla und dem
Festhaus hin und her. Aufruhr entsteht im Volk. Das dauert Tage.
Schließlich wird von den zwei mit Bel-Marduk gefangenen gesetzten
Verbrechern einer enthauptet, stellvertretend.

Am 2. Nisan, noch in der Nacht, erhebt sich der Urigallu-
Priester (Großbruder) des Marduktempels Ekua vom Schlaf, geht
hinab zum Fluß zur Waschung, bekleidet sich mit einem Linnen-
kleid, betritt allein das Allerheiligste und trägt geheimnisvoll
klingende, uralte, sumerisch-akkadisch abgefasste Gebetslieder mur-
melnd vor, ein Lob auf Marduk als den Welten- und Götterkönig.
Den Schluß bildet die Bitte um Erbarmen für Babylon, Esagilla
und alle Einwohner. Beim Hellwerden öffnen sich die Tore
des Tempels und die übrigen Oberpriester samt den Kalu-
und Gesangspriestern treten ein, zum gewöhnlichen Tagesopferdienst
mit Schlachtung von Schafen, Rindern, Fischen, Vögeln usw. und
Darbringung von Früchten, Honig und Weinspenden etc. Die
auf Thronschreinen ruhenden Götterkönigstieren Anus und Enlils
werden dabei feierlich hin und her gehoben und wieder niederge-
setzt. Eine Beschwörung aller Widersacher fehlt auch nicht.
(Wir werden erinnert an das „fugite partes adversae“ der Liturgie
am Fest der „Inventio Crucis“ (3. Mai), das man als Beschwörungs-
formel z. B. auf Kirchenglocken bei uns findet gegen die Wetter-
geister).

Der 3. Nisan verläuft in ziemlich analoger Weise. Ein neues
Moment ist aber am Vormittag das Erscheinen von Kunsthand-
werkern verschiedener Sparten, die damit beginnen, zwei Kult-
puppen anzufertigen, welche einige Tage später zu einem Sühne-
ritus fertig sein müssen. Die Kunsthandwerker bringen bis zu
dieser Fertigstellung Tag und Nacht im Tempelbezirk zu und
werden sogar aus der Tempelküche verpflegt.
Auch am 4. Nisan wiederholt sich das nächtliche Aufstehen des Urigallu-Priesters mit Waschung am Euphrat, Kleidung in Linnen- gewand usw.

Neu erscheint ein Gebet auch an Beltija, als die Gattin des Bel-Marduk, außerdem die Fürbitte für ein gutes Geschick des Königs und des Urigallu-Priesters. Dieser tritt dann hinaus auf den „hehren Dul“ (Hof), nimmt Front gegen Norden (Abb. 2), also gegen das „φῶν χαλκόπυλον Δίδ Βῆλεο“ Herodots (I, 181), die von dem

Mit dem Hellwerden öffnen sich wieder die Tempeltore und die Tagesdienst-Priester beginnen ihre Opfer usw. Der Urigallu-Priester des Marduktempels aber hebt mit der Rezitation des Weltschöpfungsepos an, beginnend mit den geflügelten gewordenen Worten „Enuma elisch“ („einst als droben“), was bei uns etwa entsprechen möchte dem Beginn des biblischen Schöpfungsberichtes: „Im Anfang da Gott schuf ...“.


Bei den Lobgesängen wurden Marduk und seine Gattin Sarpanit unter Gestirnnamen angerufen mit dem fast endlos wiederkehrenden „Beruhige dich“, das an das immer wiederholte „Bitt für uns“ der Lauretanischen Litanei gemahnt.

Nach dem Öffnen der Tempeltore und den Morgenopfern für Bel und Beltis gibt's ein Besprengen, Räuchern und Schlagen der kupfernen Kesselpauke.
Ekua, Kaduglisag, Ezida, die Heiligtümer des Marduk, der Sar-panit und des Nabu werden rituell gereinigt in $1\frac{1}{3}$ Stunden durch die Beschworungspreister im Auftrag des Großbruders (von Ekua), der aber während der ganzen Prozedur sich selbst im Hof aufhalten muß.

Nun kommt die Handlung, bei der von Schwertträgern einem Schafbock („Sündenbock“) der Kopf abgebaut wird, worauf mit dem Blut die Tempel bestrichen werden. Die Schlächter aber müssen mit dem Kopf des Widders zum Fluss eilen und in die Steppe fliehen, wo sie sich verborgen zu halten haben. Der goldene Traghimmel aus dem nördlichen Marduschatzhaus wird durch die Kunsthandwerker aufgestellt, die dann abtreten müssen.

Es folgen noch allerlei Kulthandlungen, abschließend mit einem Opfergebet für den König, wenn er Marduks „Hände ergreifen“ wird, d. h. für die Festsituationen, wo der König den Gott durch die Geste der Handergreifung zum Aufbruch einlädt für hochheilige Augenblicke.


Nun ist die Bahn soweit frei, daß die Götter rings aus dem Land, von nah und fern in Babylon eintreffen konnten, früh am Tag, beim Hellwerden, von Borsippa, Kutha, Kisch, Sippar, Uruk, Nippur usw., auf Wagen und Schiffen, um Marduks „Hände zu ergreifen“. In erster Linie kam da Nabu „wegen des Wohlbefindens seines Vaters Marduk“.


Unter Ermahnungen, künftig sicher nichts mehr zu versäumen, erhält der König schließlich aus der Hand Marduks seine Insignien durch den Großbruder zurück.

Es folgt eine Verbrennungsszene als Sühneritus und der König und der Urigallu sprechen ein Gebet an den Feuergott Nusku.


Der 8. Nisan, ja, das war nun der erste eigentliche hohe Festtag, wo der wieder in Gnaden angenommene König dem Marduk im Ekuatempel entgegentrat, zum ersten symbolischen „Ergreifen der Hände“ des Gottesbildes, was nach dem erläuternden Festritual etwa soviel bedeuten sollte wie: Auf! Großer Bel-Marduk! Komm mit! Die versammelten Götter warten auf Dich im Schicksalsgemach. Dadurch fand des vorher doch gedemütigten Königs

Und nun erfolgt wirklich der erste Aufbruch des Mardukbildes, der erste öffentliche Austrag des Auferstandenen, um sich dem Volk zu zeigen. Der Schiffswagen (carrus navalis, woher nach Hommel 17 unser Wort Karneval herzuleiten wäre) fährt vor und das Marduk-bild oder eine Mardukmaske wird hinaufgehoben, was heißen soll, Marduk steigt nun ein, um in feierlicher Prozession auszuziehen, unter dem Namen „Anschar des Himmels“, dem ersten der sieben Namen, die er im Verlauf der weiteren Festabwicklung beigelegt bekommt. Sein nächstes Ziel ist das Schicksalsgemach (Dulkugga), der Ort der Schicksalsbestimmungen in Ubschukina (nach Schrader der „Versammlungsraum“ der Götter zur Schicksalsbestimmung im Weltberge; also hier in einer Räumlichkeit des künstlichen Weltbergabbildes, im Babelturm zu suchen oder etwa zu Füßen [„am Rand“] des Berges; später scheinbar im östlichen Anbau des großen Südtempels?) Dort warten seiner die versammelten übrigen Götter.


auf seinem Schiffskarren nordwärts auf der Feststraße dahinzieht, benannt mit dem fünften Namen als „Asari-lu-dug“.

Zunächst ging der Zug über die Brücke des Libilchegalla-Kanals, vorbei am Tempel E-mach, dann durchs Ischtartor und nun über die Brücke des vom Euphrat her die Altstadt umströmenden Arachtu-Kanals; nun etwas nordwestlich, entlang der Kaimauer, stromaufwärts.

Ob der Schiffswagen schon bei der Hinfahrt aufs Wasser gesetzt wurde, ist fraglich; er hätte stromaufwärts wohl an einem Tau gezogen werden müssen.

Auf oder an der Arachtu wird Marduk unter der sechsten Bezeichnung genannt: „Schul-ba-ab“. 

So gelangt die feierliche Prozession, zuletzt durch eine Zedernallee, glücklich draußen in der freien, junggrünen Frühlingsnatur der Vorstadt an, beim Festhaus, wo Marduk nun mit seinem siebenten Festnamen als „Gott des Gebetshauses“ gepriesen wird, sobald er sich, mit dem Blick gegen Osten gewendet, im Thron-

Abb. 3. Das bit aiku (Neujahrsethous) von Assur
(Nach Andrae: Die Festungswerke von Assur)
gemach auf dem großen Thronbett niederließ samt seiner Gattin Sarpanit.

Die anderen Götter gruppieren sich teils zu seiner Rechten und Linken, teils ihm gegenüber. Der Oberpriester bringt das goldene Spendegefäß und Handwasser zum Besprengen.

[Das von Nebukadrezzar II. in neuer Pracht erbaute Festhaus ist auf dem Ausgrabungsfeld bis jetzt noch nicht wiedergefunden; aber es wird im wesentlichen nicht viel anders gewesen sein als das, welches Sanherib draußen vor den Stadttoren Assurs erbaute, mit Pflanzenanlagen im Hofe wie rings um die ganze Anlage.]


Kräftig steht schon die zunehmende Mondsichel am Himmel, die Nacht etwas erhellend. Drinnen aber im Dunkel des Festhauses bedarf man der Fackeln, beim dritten Händeregreifen zur Einladung: Auf! Bel-Marduk! Ziehe wieder heim, fasse wieder Zu-neigung zu Deinem Tempel und laß Dich nieder auf Deiner goldenen Kline hoch oben in der Himmelskapelle!

Händen. So kehrt Marduk unter Sang und Musikspiel besonders feierlich wieder zurück gegen die Altstadt. Dort angekommen, wird das Mardukschiff wieder zum Wagen.


Hell schießt am östlichen Himmel schon die Garbe des Zodiakallichtes auf, die Vorbotin der Sonne. Es ist ja Ende März.

Abb. 5. Der Turm von Babel
Rekonstruktion
es hoch herab und das Volk, geführt von seinen Priestern, nimmt den Jubel respondierend auf, frenetisch, brausend, zu Lob, Preis und Ehre Bel-Marduk in der Höhe!

Nun war es erreicht, das Ziel des Festes, und eitel Freude, Singen und Reigen, Opfer und Freudengelage füllten den eben erst begonnenen Tag.


Es ist wieder Alltag; aber Bel-Marduk herrscht von neuem in voller Machtfülle über Babylon und Babylonien.
DIE PSALMENGATTUNGEN IM LICHTE DER ALT-ORIENTALISCHEN HYMNENLITERATUR

Von Friedrich Stummer, Würzburg


Es sei gestattet, daß ich zunächst ganz kurz die Ergebnisse meiner Untersuchung über den Aufbau der sumerisch-akkadischen Hymnen und Gebete wiederhole und daran gleich die Besprechung einiger Fragen knüpfe, die in diesem Zusammenhang interessieren. Daran soll sich eine ebenso gedrangte Übersicht über das anschließen, was über den Aufbau der religiösen Lyrik der Ägypter zu sagen ist.

In der sumerisch-akkadischen Literatur zerfällt das religiöse Lied auf den ersten Blick in die zwei Hauptgruppen des „Handerhebungsgebetes“ (inim-nim-ma šú-il-la) und der „Flötenklage“ (er-šem-ma, akk. takribtu ḫalḫallātī). Ersteres dient dem privaten, letzteres dem öffentlichen Kult. Die Benennungen stammen von den Sumerern und Akkadern selber. Ich gebrauche sie aber a potiori auch für solche Stücke, die zwar nicht ausdrücklich als solche bezeichnet sind, aber doch die charakteristische Form der „Handerhebungsgebet“ oder der „Flötenklage“ haben, ja zuweilen gegen die überlieferte Bezeichnung, die z. B. den berühmten Hymnus an Sin IV R 9 als inim-nimma šú ila bezeichnet, während er tatsächlich die Eigentümlichkeiten des er-šem-ma hat.

Für das „Handerhebungsgebet“ ist nun folgender Aufbau charakteristisch: es beginnt


2. Der folgende Teil setzt den Lobpreis des Gottes in Hauptsätzen fort. Ich habe ihn — in Ermangelung eines besseren Ausdrucks — „Herrlichkeitsschilderung“ genannt.2


4. Der von mir „Elendschilderung“ oder „Klage“ genannte Teil nennt das Anliegen, das den Beter bedrückt, woran sich

5. die Bitte anschließt.

6. Der letzte Teil enthält ein Gelöbnis des Beters für den Fall der Erhörung.

2 Doxologie wollte ich nicht sagen, weil damit in der Liturgik bereits ein bestimmter Begriff verbunden ist. Aretalogie paßte deshalb nicht, weil es sich durchaus nicht immer um ἀπεταί, d. h. mythologische Krafttaten, handelt.
Es ist klar, daß schon „Anrede“ und „Herrlichkeitsschilderung“ ein Ganzes geben, das für sich und in sich abgeschlossen ist. Wir werden ein solches Gebilde Hymnus nennen können. Dieser wird zum Dankgebet, wenn die Herrlichkeitsschilderung wesentlich in einem Bericht über den gnadenreichen Erweis der Macht des Gottes im Leben des Beters besteht, mag nun der Fall, um den es sich handelt, ihn persönlich oder eine Gemeinschaft betreffen, mit der er sich verbunden weiß (Familie, Volk).


3 Betritt die Bitte nicht den Beter selber, sondern eine andere Person (etwa den König) oder eine Gemeinschaft (Stadt, Volk), so haben wir eine Fürbitte; würde die Person etc., für die gebetet wird, dabei angesprochen, so entsteht das Segengebet. Ein solches liegt z. B. in dem von V. Scheil, Catalogue de la collection Tisserant (RA XVIII [1921], 1—33) unter Nr. 21 veröffentlichten Text vor, den ich in E. Weidners Archiv f. Keilschriftforschung zu behandeln gedenke.

4 Vgl. meine eingangs erwähnte Schrift S. 61 f. u. S. 88 f.
Auch die Berufung auf die übrigens nur in geringer Zahl sich findenenden Abweichungen vom Schema ändert gar nichts. Ich denke da zunächst daran, daß etwa in einem Texte, der sich sonst an die Form der Handerhebungsgebete hält, die Herrlichkeitsschilderung oder die Klage fehlt. Hier sind offensichtlich psychologische Zufälligkeiten am Werke, z. B. daß der Beter durch die Reihe der epitheta ornantia, die er in der Anrede untergebracht hat, seinem Prädikationsbedürfnis Genüge getan oder auch sein Wissen und Können in der Schilderung der Macht und Größe der angerufenen Gottheit erschöpft hat. Oder seine Anliegen sind so allgemein, daß eine Elendschilderung oder Klage nicht nötig ist. So liegt der Fall etwa in den Gebeten des urigallu an Marduk und Šarpanitum.5 Das sind Texte, die Jahr für Jahr rezitiert werden, auch wenn kein besonderer Anlaß vorliegt, der die Bitte um Erbarmen für Esagila und ähnliche nahelegt. Diese Bitten gehen nur aus dem allgemeinen Bewußtsein der Abhängigkeit des Menschen von den höheren Gewalten hervor. Diese Selbstverständlichkeiten auszusprechen, ersparten sich die Verfasser dieser und ähnlicher Texte — wohl auch deshalb, weil sie zu ihrer sprachlichen Gestaltung noch nicht die geistigen Voraussetzungen besaßen. Irgendein Gefühl für bestimmte Formen und Stile läßt sich jedenfalls nicht als wirkende Ursache aufzeigen.

Nicht anders verhält es sich mit den Erweichungen und Um bildungen des Schemas, die sich in der babylonischen Literatur bereits in deutlichen Spuren finden. Hier mag vor allem die Vorwegnahme der Selbsteinführung erwähnt werden. So nenne ich die Erscheinung, daß mitunter Formeln, welche sich in der Selbsteinführung finden, an den Anfang des Textes heraufgenommen werden. Daß es sich um eine Vorwegnahme handelt, beweist die Tatsache, daß dann die Selbsteinführung im Korpus an der gehörigen Stelle wiederkehrt oder, richtiger gesagt, erst eigentlich vollzogen wird. So wenig hier irgendeine Rücksicht auf Stil oder Form wirksam ist, ebensowenig ist das der Fall bei den übrigen Erweichungen des Schemas, etwa wenn Anrede und Herrlichkeits schilderung oder Klage und Bitte sich gegenseitig durchdringen.

Von „Stilmischung“ kann hier selbstverständlich keine Rede sein, da es sich nur um eine Formvermengung oder um Wanderung

5 Hehn, Hymnen und Gebete an Marduk (BA V, 279—400), Nr. XXIV u. XXV.

erhebungsgebet" gegenüber als charakteristischer Typus, als eigene Gattung dar.


7 Die Literatur der Ägypter. Leipzig 1923.
8 Sitz.-Ber. der Berliner Akademie 1911, S. 1088 ff.
9 Vgl. auch Literatur der Ägypter, S. 383.

Wichtig für unseren Zusammenhang ist aber, daß auch in Ägypten Hymnus und Bittgebet nicht als selbständige Gattungen angesehen werden können: sie sind immer miteinander vereinigt. Auch hier wäre also die "Stilmischung" chronisch. Es gilt also, was wir oben bemerkt haben, auch von der ägyptischen Psalmodie.

möchte hier im Vorbeigehen doch die Frage aufwerfen, ob wir nicht in der Beurteilung solcher Herrlichkeitszchilderungen überhaupt, also auch bei der Würdigung nichtbiblischer Literaturen, umzulernen haben. Wir sehen in ihnen meistens die captatio benevolentiae, also etwas Adulatorisches. Ob sie das sein wollten oder wenigstens ausschließlich sein wollten? Oder ob nicht die Herrlichkeitszchilderungen — wie auch schon die Anreden — dazu dienten, das Vertrauen zu wecken, d. h. ob der Beter sich nicht damit ermutigen wollte, gerade diesen oder jenen Gott mit seinem Anliegen anzugehen? Wie dem auch sei, wir haben solche hymnische Bestandteile im Psalter häufig genug. Die Erklärung dieses Tatbestandes als „Stilmischung“ hat, wie schon gesagt, etwas Mißliches: sie hebt eben im letzten Grunde die Gattung doch auf.


10 Macmillan, Some Cuneiform Tablets bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (BA V 331—712), Nr. XVI, S. 594 ff.


11 Sumerisch-akkadische Parallelen, S. 175.
12 A. a. O. S. 176.
13 A. a. O. S. 171.
Es kann also sehr wohl der Fall sein, daß ein alttestamentlicher Psalm oder Gebetstext, der sich im Aufbau der aus Babylon uns bekannten Form anschließt, tatsächlich jünger ist als etwa der eben erwähnte Ps. 39. Der alte strenge Stil und das durch die vorhin geschilderten Einflüsse gelockerte Schema haben offensichtlich nebeneinander bestanden. Ob aber der Verfasser eines Psalms die ursprüngliche Form des Aufbaues oder das erweichte Schema wählt, in welchem man die reine „Gattung“ der Klage erblickt zu müssen glaubte, hängt offenbar gar nicht von irgendeinem Empfinden für „Stile“ oder „Gattungen“ ab, sondern sind hier subjektive Stimmungen maßgebend. Daher ist die Tatsache, daß ein Psalmist das Schema oft bis zur Unkenntlichkeit erweicht, durchaus noch kein Beweis für künstlerische Selbständigkeit. Der Verfasser von Ps. 35 hebt mit proleptischen Bittformeln an und vertieft sich dann so in sie, daß er nur in V. 10 zu einem sehr kümmerlichen Ansatz einer Herrlichkeitsschilderung kommt. Dann fährt er fort mit Elendschilderung (V. 11—16), Bitte (V. 17), Schlußformel (V. 18), jenseits derer der Psalm mit neuer Elendschilderung weitergeht (V. 19—21), um in der Bitte (V. 22—26) und in einer zweiten Schlußformel (V. 27—28) nun wirklich zu Ende zu kommen.

Noch ein kurzes Wort über die öffentlichen Liturgien! Es gibt Psalmen, die sich ohne weiteres als solche dadurch kennzeichnen, daß sich in ihnen Litaneien und motivabwandelnde Gruppen finden wie in Ps. 118 oder Gottesreden (vgl. etwa Ps. 50 und 60) — ganz wie wir es in den alten sumerischen Tempelliturgien gewöhnt sind. Ferner ist zu sagen: den proleptischen Selbsteinführungsformeln des privaten Gebetes entsprechen hier Formeln, die zum Lobe Gottes auffordern, wie z. B. bei den Ps. 135, 136, 148 u. a. Sie werden gerne ähnlich gehäuft wie jene. So wenig dort ein bestimmtes stilistisches Prinzip zu finden ist, nach welchem diese Häufung erfolgt sein könnte, so wenig möchte ich hier aus dem Auftreten wiederholter Aufforderungsformeln Schlüsse etwa auf die Verteilung des Vortrages solcher Psalmen auf Chöre ziehen. Schließlich mag der Gebrauch solcher Ausdrücke auch rein literarische Form geworden sein, so daß es denkbar wäre, daß ein Dichter oder Beter sie auch da verwendetete, wo es sich um einen Erguß rein persönlicher Gefühle handelte und der Gedanke an die Abfassung eines Liedes für den Kult ganz ferne lag. Das würde ein
Eindringen öffentlich-liturgischer Formen in das Privatgebet bedeutet, wie es in anderer Weise in Ps. 42 und 43 tatsächlich vorliegt, wo sich der Kehrvers in einem Psalm findet, an dessen privatem Charakter kein Zweifel bestehen kann. Auch im babylonischen Kulturkreis beobachten wir ja mitunter ein Eindringen öffentlich-kultischer Formen in den Individualpsalm. Dagegen treffen wir meines Wissens nur in Israel die Tatsache an, daß das Schema des Privatgebetes für Zwecke des Gemeindegottesdienstes verwendet wird. Das geschieht z. B. in Ps. 80 durch den Kehrvers V. 4. 8. 15. 20. In diesen beiden Fällen, d. h. also bei der Verwendung öffentlich-kultischer Formen im Privatgebet und umgekehrt — und nur hier — hat also eine wirkliche Stilmischung stattgefunden.

Da war sie eben auch allein möglich. Denn die öffentliche Liturgie hat sich sowohl im sumerisch-akkadischen Kulturkreis wie in Israel durch eigene Formen charakteristisch von dem Individualpsalm unterschieden. Diese sind aus der Eigentümlichkeit der Tempelliturgie erwachsen, wie schon gesagt. Wir können letztere als dialogisch bezeichnen, da mehrere physische oder moralische Personen sich in sie teilen (Gottheit und Gemeinde, bezw. Priesterschaft; Vorsänger und Priester- oder Volkschor o. ä.). Im Gegensatz dazu muß die Liturgie in Ägypten monologisch gewesen sein, d. h. die Hymnen etc. sind von einer physischen (Priester) oder moralischen Person (Chor) vorgetragen worden, wobei das Volk gänzlich, wie es scheint, von der tätigen Mitwirkung ausgeschaltet war.14 Anders war es bestimmt in Israel. Bezeichnend für den Unterschied ist ein Vergleich des Textes der Stele des Berliner Museums Nr. 17272, den W. Wreszinski in der Orientalistischen Literaturzeitung XVIII (1915) 353—359 veröffentlicht hat, mit Ps. 26. Dort (Rs. col. 3) freut sich der Beter, im Hause des Amon zu sitzen und den Lobgesang aus dem Munde der Priester zu hören, während der Psalmist den Altar Jahwes in feierlichem Umzug umkreist (V. 6), um laut anzustimmen den Lobgesang und die Wundertaten Jahwes zu erzählen (V. 7). Wie weit in Babylonien und Assyrien das Volk im eigentlichen Sinne aktiv beteiligt war, wäre noch zu ermitteln. Der dialogische Charakter der Tempel-

14 Was Roeder a. a. O. im Register unter „Litanei“ zitiert, fällt nicht unter diese Kategorie, wenigstens nicht, wenn man dem Terminus „Litanei“ seinen richtigen Sinn gibt. Es handelt sich eher um „motivabwandelnde Gruppen“. 
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FONCK lists the current literature. The small space given by SONNENSCHEIM to our subject should teach us humility! There are good working bibliographies in the first volume of Cambridge Ancient History, p. 626 ff. cf., also 1129.
History of Assyriology

1134. — Bezold. JSOR 8, 101—102.

The first generation of assyriologists is fast going. We have obituaries of Ball, Bezold, Delitzsch, and of Heuzey who was an outsider but did good work. Sayce gives us interesting memoirs. Shelton tells the story of the University of Chicago Expedition to the Near East.

Excavations

954. Pillet. *Expédition scientifique et artistique de Mésopotamie*. (Cf. RB 32, 313—314; Maynard, AJSL 40, 75; Mercer, JSOR 7, 87.)


1143. R. de Mecquenem. Fouilles de Suse, campagnes des années 1914, 1921, 1922. RA 19, 109—140.


Petrie, Hogarth, and Hall give valuable suggestions to travellers in the Near and Middle East in this British Museum publication. Hall’s address to the Fifth International Congress of Historical Sciences is noticed in RB 32. He apparently endorses Thompson’s hypothesis that Babylonia was an Elamite settlement before the coming of the Sumerians. There is evidently something to be said for that view. In the popular articles listed above Hall and Woolley describe the work done at Ur. Lyon and Rippmann popularize Koldewey’s work. Macalister gives a short summary. Masters writes well of Rawlinson and Layard but is not very scholarly. De MECQUENEM tells of the work done on the Achaemenian palace and on an Elamite necropolis. Weidner tells of the work of Thompson at Ur and of Hall at Tell el Obeid. Langdon tells of the work done by Mackay at Kish in No. 1150. Cf. also 1379, 1382, 1384.

**Texts**

799. G. Contenau. Tablettes Cappadociennes. (Condamin, Rec. S. R., 1923, 88—90; Sayce, JRAS, 1923, 133—134.)

970. Genouillac. Textes économiques d’Oumma. (Mercer, JSOR 7, 38; Condamin, R. Sc. R., 1923, 90—92.)

971. Legrain. Historical Fragments. (Luckenbill, AJSL 40, 146—147; Meissner, TLZ 48, 221.)


1152. O. Schroeder. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts.* Heft 2. (Meissner, OLZ 26, 156—159.)


Clay edits the fourth volume of the Morgan Collection. Deimel edits the 43rd volume of the Wiss. ver. d. DOG. The first volume of Langdon gives Sumerian and Semitic religions and historical texts, most of them being transliterated and translated by the editor. The texts include a part of the great Lugalbanda myth, a Sumerian hymn to Enlil-bani, a hymn to the Mother goddess used against the demons, a record of the erection of a temple to Nin-egal by the wife of Rim-Sin, a Sumerian inscription to Hammurabi from Sippar, a Semitic tablet of regulations for the disposal of sacrifices at Erech, a school text with syllabary, and list of gods, a cylinder of Nabonidus, a brick of Nebuchadrezzar, one of Ashur-etil-ilani, a Sumerian hymn to Nidaba, one to Dungi, a liturgy of the cult of Kish and other material. The second volume gives important Sumerian dynastic lists from before the flood to Sin-Magir, a cylinder of Sin-idinnam, and a tablet containing date years of Hammurabi. Some of the texts of Thureau-Dangin had already been edited in RA but most of them are new. They deal mostly with astronomy and ritual. Condamin in his review discusses the Labartu text. Langdon translates text 56. Meissner corrects several passages in Schroeder.

Other texts by Boissier 1217, 1135; Delaporte 1317; Dougherty 1256; Gadd 1245; Holma 1384; Jean 1258, 1259; Langdon 1226, 1260, 1279, 1332, 1360—1363; Legrain 1227, 1236, 1237, 1318; Price 1238; Thompson 1398; Thureau-Dangin 1163, 1253, 1282, 1336, 1373; Zimolong 1164, will be listed separately because of their special character.
Related Languages


WITZEL is very severe on KLUGE. BALL recorded many of his philological theories in his translation of the book of Job. CZERMAK gives linguistic parallels with Sumerian. DREXEL thinks that comparison between African linguistic phenomena and Sumerian will be of great value. SCHEBESTA approves VAN OORDT’s comparison of Sumerian to Bantu. This Zulu divine name would be the Sumerian An-gal-gal.

Signs and Writing

1161. E. Unger, Die Entstehung der Keilschrift. 1922, p. 10.
1162. — Das Alter der Keilschriften von Fara. ZA 34, 198—205.

In Orientalia, DEIMEL studies the ancient forms of 58 signs. UNGER supplements Deimel’s work on the Fara signs. SPELEERS treats of cuneiform writing. Cf. also 1160.

Syllabaries


THUREAU-DANGIN studies the fragment AO 7762. ZIMOLONG publishes a text of which the Yale syllabary is the first part.
UNGNAD offers important corrections to it. Langdon gave us also a school syllabary (cf. 1151).

Lexicography

1171. J. Offord. The word for satrap. PEFQS, 1919, 138—139.
1173. — Ein übersehenes Lehnwort aus dem Akkadischen. OLZ 22, 111—112.
1176. — KA. KA. SI. GA=(blotzer) Lautwert. ZA 34, 195—197.
1177. — Sum. ku(g), nicht azag=akk. ellu, rein. ZA 34, 192—195.

Bezold treats of the verb malî. Gadd studied Ebeling, KAR 209 translated by Meissner, OLZ, 1922, 201—202. In JSOR Langdon studied the word muttatu, hermaphrodite and zaḫannu, a vessel. Offord approves Pognon's identification of satrap in cuneiform. In the second article, Perles shows that the word newInstance to serve is a denominative of šarrutu, kingdom. Thureau-Dangin shows that zag-ga=kanzuzu, means gums and that one should read rib-ku, a kind of beer for lab-ku in Rit. accad. p. 84 (cf. 926). Luckenbill's reading ku(g) is now accepted by Zimmern. Cf. also 1289.

Sumerian Grammar

The expression of the comparative degree in Sumerian. JAOS 43, 243—244.

A. Deimel. Übersicht über die einfachen sumer. Wortstämme. Or. 4, 45—55.


The Sumerian affixes tam and kam. JAOS 42, 301—304.


P. Haupt compares with other languages with his usual thoroughness. Poebel gave us an excellent Grammar. Ungnad studies again the Greek transliterations of Sumerian words edited by Pinches in PSBA 24.

Assyrian Grammar


A. Deimel. Übersicht über die einfachen sumer. Wortstämme. Or. 4, 45—55.


Assyrian Grammar

W. F. Albright. The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse. JPOS II, 69—86.

B. Landsberger. Der 'Ventif' des Akkadischen. ZA 35, 113—123.


B. Meissner. Die Keilschrift. 1922, p. 112.


T. Rosenberg. Assyrische Sprachlehre u. Keilschriftkunde für das Selbststudium. Wien, 1923, p. 188.

E. Speiser. The etymology of תַּבֵּר. JQR 14, 329.

Albright shows that the name Hilakku, Cilicia appears for the first time in the records of Tigrath-Pilezer III (not IV). S.-E. Cilicia is Arzawa in Hittite, in Babyl., Ursu, now preserved in Arsus. This district was later called Quweh. There is a connection between Hilakku and Hanigalbat. In the second article he says that KAV 92 supports his view that Magan is Egypt and Meluḫa is not on the Persian Gulf. The reviewer is left unconvinced until the references to these lands in Ptolemy have been explained. In the third article Albright identifies Shinar with Ḫana whose capital was Rešeph. Amraphel was the king who captured Babylon in the 17th century. The fourth article defends the Magan theory of the author, and identifies the Tidni of Gimil-Sin with the Amorites. The Ḥyksos were nomads from Transcaspia. There is also an important note on the Amorite language. Deimel shows that Sumer (Shinar) is dialectic for Ki-en-qi by a well known phonetic change. Garstang
shows that Arzawa is Cilicia; he identifies several other places and gives us two good maps of the region. Horn will be important for a study of Assyrian campaigns. Landersdorfer equated Siphar-vayim with Sipri. Lane locates Opis at Tel-Abri. Luckenbill brings some texts which prove that it cannot be. Lane has also a good outline of early history. Lewy rejects Albright’s identification of Hatti with Syria in JSOR 7, 18. Paton is important for the Geography of Syria at the time of the Amarna letters. Price studies the place names in Gudea and raises some practical questions on Magan and Meluha. According to Ungnad, the Luwish are the Wolf people. They are very close to the Hittites and are identical with the Amorites. Barbaros is the Assyrian barbaru wolf.

Chronology

1205. Albright. The readjustment of Assyro-Babylonian Chronology by the elimination of false synchronisms. JSOR 8, 51—59.
1206. A. Condamin. La date de Hammourabi révisée. RScR, 1923, 84—88.

Poebel’s review of Gadd is most important. Albright proposes a radical treatment of synchronisms. Condamin adopts Kugler’s new date for Hammurabi namely 1945—1900. Kugler’s treatment of the month sê-kin-kud is, however, open to question. Cook studies the chronology of Mesopotamia before 1580 B.C. See also 1233, 1369, 1434.

History

A. General.

1210. H. G. Hutchinson. The greatest story in the world. 1923, pp. 49—75.
1213. R. C. Thompson. A small handbook to the history and antiquities of Mesopotamia from the earliest Times to the End of the Sasanian period. Bagdad, 1918. (Cf. JRAS, 1919, 605—607.)

Cowan is not an expert. Hanslik etc. popular. Hutchinson writes for boys. Jean gives us an excellent survey of Near East history. He deals also with history in the record of his trip to the Near East. Cf. also Delaporte’s work (1288).

B. Origins. Sumer and Akkad.

1224. E. G. H. Kraeling. The origin and real name of Nimrod. AJSL 38, 214—220.
1226. — *The Chaldean kings before the flood*. JRAS, 1923, 251—259.

Olmstead makes a searching criticism of Clay's theory, especially of its geography. Pfeiffer versus Clay. Petrie approves Clay's thesis because there was a strong Semitic power in N. Syria at the close of the Middle Kingdom. Mainly on the basis of the breed of small cattle, Adametz says that the Egyptian Hamites and the Sumerians came from the region of Afghanistan and Persia. Albright corrects Weidner's translation of the šar tamhrī epic and reconstructs the history of Sargon's period. Boissier on Isin dynasty. Christian writes an excellent article on the two groups of Semitic languages, the oldest represented by Accadian, Mineo-Sabean, Abyssinian and Mehri is of hamitic type and its origin is East Africa. The other group (Canaanite, Aramaic, Arabic) is a pure Semitic type from N. W. Africa. The article is based on philological comparisons. Contenau shows that the fall of the Assyrian colony may be due to pressure by Hittites and Mitannians which may have brought about also the setting of the first dynasty in Babylon. He shows also that the rules for business agents in the Cappadocian tablets are the same that we find later in Hammurabi's Code. Cook writes on the Semites. Gaerte shows similarity of adorned cups found in Susa with the prehistoric cups
of Nagada and the Babylonian map of the world. Kraeling shows that Nimrod was a city king of ancient Marad, west of Nippur. Langdon writes on early Babylonia, the dynasties of Akkad and Lagash, the Sumerian revival, and the Empire of Ur, in the Cambridge Ancient History. In JRAS he edits a text which he claims to be the long sought Sumerian original of Berossus' list of antediluvian kings. Very valuable discussions of this text by Albright (1216), Burrows (1218) and by Deimel (1222) who gives a reproduction of Langdon's copy. Legrain edits the missing fragment of CBS 13972 and translates this Sargon text entirely. It shows how Sargon worshipped Dagan in the West. Lewy studies the Cappadocian tablets of Contenau and Smith, their data on the spread of the Semites, and on law, more especially on loans. Luckenbill attacks Clay's West Semitic theory, shows that Akkadians came to Akkad from the South, but had to skirt the settlements of Southern Babylonia. He has a good discussion of names. Moret reconstructs the political development of the Near East to the coming of the Northerners. His book is fresh and invigorating but does not altogether do justice to the Elamite and Mesopotamian contribution to history. De Morgan maintains that Arabia was the center of the Semites. He holds to the dessication theory. Petrie shows that Sumerian civilization antedates the Egyptian. The third dynasty of Kish synchronises with the first of Egypt. Thompson studies the dynasties of Isin, Larsa, and Babylon, the age of Hammurabi, and the Kassite conquest. Ungnad's pamphlet emphasizes the role of the Subaru. The Hebrews are a mixture of Subaru and Semite. The Mitanni are an Indian group which left Iran in 2500. The Indo-Aryans and Persians lived in Iran until they separated and became differentiated. There is also a chronological discussion. Weidner translates and studies the state documents in cuneiform from Boghazkoy. Cf. also 1151, 1200, 1389, 1394.

C. Babylonia


Boissier edits a new text. Dougherty shows that Nabonidus was in retirement at Tema while Belshazzar was ruling in Babylon. Cf. also 1011. Legrain edits Nebuchadnezzar 20 and a new cylinder Nabonidus. Mercer surveys Near East history during the Amarna period. Price edits a duplicate of a short inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II. Schoff studies after Daugherty, Arabia as a dependency of Babylon. Ungnad shows that CT 36, 6, 7 is a partial duplicate of Nies II 33, and writes on land measurement. Weissbach studies again the inscriptions of the Dog River. Zimmern and Friedrich study Hittite correspondence of great historical interest. Cf. also 1151, 1225, and 1232 and remark on 1024.

D. Assyria


1243. J. D. Davis. The statue of Shalmaneser at Ashur. PTR 17, 184—189.


1247. J. A. Maynard. Recent historical material on Ashurbanipal. JSOR 6, 99—105.
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1248. — New historical material on Ashurbanipal. JSOR 7, 21—29.
1249. — Inscriptions from Ashur. JSOR 8, 1—12.
1250. B. Meissner. Die Eroberung der Stadt Ulhu aus Sargons achtem Feldzuge. ZA 34, 113—122.
1251. J. Offord. The assassination of Sennacherib. PEF, 1918, 88—90.


Business Documents


1259. — L'Elam sous la dynastie d'Ur. Les indemmites allouées aux "chargés de Mission" des rois d'Ur. RA 19, 1-44.


1262. — Studien zu den altassyrischen Texten aus Kappadokien. 1922, p. 89.

1263. O. Schroeder. Altassyrische Kontrakte. ZA 34, 161-165.


Meissner and Ungnad offer corrections to Chiera. Luckenbill would place the new King Enlil-amah found by Chiera at the beginning of the Cassite period. Augapfel studies documents in Clay's BE VIII—X. Dougherty edits texts from the Goucher College collection. Gry studies Murashu texts and texts from Kamu' near Harran. Jean's book studies civilization, proper names, palm tree culture, precious stones. He denies the existence of totemism (p. 29-31). He edits a number of texts. The article on the indemnities paid to envoys of the kings of Ur gives a number of texts from the Musée Impérial Ottoman. Langdon edits Sumerian texts with notes. Lewy studies the Cappadocian tablets. Cf. also 1227a. Schroeder studies documents in KAV and, in the second article, three receipts of grain in KAH. Cf. also 1265, 1271 and 1352.

Kudurru-Stones


See also Hommel's article 1356.

Law


Bohl studies devolution and growth of antifeminism. The article was originally published in *Nieuwe Theol. Stud.* I, 161—168;

Letters


Civilization


Answer by Benedite, p. 414—418.
1289. L. B. Ellis. AE, 1923, 17—20 (review of Hrozny’s *Das Getreide*).
1291. H. R. Hall. *Babylon the Great* in Hammerton’s *Wonders of the Past.* II, 301—316.
1295. — *Textiles and costumes among the people of the ancient Near East.* 1923, p. 207.
1297. J. Offord. *How cedars were transported.* PEF, 1918, 181—183.

L. Spence. *Splendours of Nineveh and Khorsabad* in Hammon
ton’s *Wonders of the Past*. I, 243—255.

M. Rostovtzeff. *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. 1922.

O. Schroeder. *Gesetzte assyrische Ziegelstempel*.ZA 34, 157
—161.

R. C. Thompson. *Some notes on Modern Babylonia*. JRAS,
1923, 233—242.

— *The rock of Behistun* in Hammerton’s *Wonders of the
Past*. II, 467—476.

Baikie tells vividly the story of Lagash, Babylon and Nineveh
making these ancient cities live before our eyes. Brendon’s article
and those of Gadd 1290, Hall 1291, Spence 1302, Thompson 1305a
are wonderfully illustrated. Capart does not admit a foreign origin
for this knife handle. Benedite maintains his point of view (cf. 203).

Deimel studies the cultivation of glebes at the time of Urukagina,
the kinds of grain used, and how it was stored. He shows that
apin means plow (p. 24—25) and that sesame was dig (NI)-ga
(p. 29—32). Delaporte studies civilization, history, institutions,
beliefs, techniques, first of Babylonia, then of Assyria. The work
is excellently done. Hrozný’s pamphlet is studied by Ellis who
brings up more lexicographical parallels. Hunger’s work is popular.

Littmann shows influence of Babylonian culture on the Bagdad
nights. Lutz studies the art of preparing fermented drink in the
Near East. Mercer and Peet review this work severely. The other
volume deals on weaving and cloth making. Nopcsa shows that
the plow with bent beam originated in Mesopotamia while the
plow with the straight beam originated in two places, Egypt and
north-west of the Caspian. Offord shows that cedars were floated
to a point near Antioch and then taken over land to the Euphrates.

Perry’s thesis of diffusion of civilisation from Egypt touches on
Sumerian and Babylonian cultures. It leaves us unconvinced.
Popenoe treats only Arabic sources, but they are of great value to us. Price
studies transportation by camel and by sea. Radcliffe finds no
trace of fishing with a rod among Assyro-Babylonians. Rostovtzeff
shows the importance of iranized Mesopotamia and its influence
on the Transoxian region. Schroeder shows that the Babylonians
used large seals or stamps with moveable type. Thompson tells us
of buildings, utensils, clothing, and toys, as seen to day.
Metrology, Mathematics, Coinage


Art and Architecture


Dombart does not find any direct influence of Babylonian symbolism in the Septizonium. Hall studies the art of Early Babylonia especially the copper lions of El Obeid; he takes up the Gebel el Arak knife handle and accepts Benedite’s point of view. Speleers
makes an exhaustive study of the furniture, well illustrated. His syllabus covers Babylonia-Assyria, Syria, the Hittites, Aram, Elam, and Persia. Cf. also Gadd’s article 1167 and several articles on Temples as well as on Civilization.

Seals


Delaporte continues his Catalogue. Legrain contributes a most important article on a collection of seals. He finds that Aba is the wife of Martu (p. 155) who is the god of the sand storms on a seal made circa 2300. He has a good study on the crooked stick, nomadic symbol of Martu (p. 153—154). De Mecquenem lists seals of the Schlumberger collection and some found in Susa. Mercer studies ritualistic attitudes in the seal. Miller interprets a seal in the light of mythology. Ward lists the Morgan collection. Cf. also 1339.

Myths

1331. S. Langdon. Tagtug a male deity. AJSL 39, 197.
1332. — The Babylonian Epic of Creation. 1923, p. 227.
1336. F. Thureau-Dangin. La passion du dieu Lillu. RA 19, 175—185.
1337. A. Ungnad. Das hurritische Fragment des Gilgamesh-Epos. ZA 35, 133—140.
1338. — Das wiedergefundene Paradies. 1923.

Ball deals with the utilization of myths by the Hebrews. Deimel reviewing Witzel says that the Dragon myth is not in Gen. 1. Clay's book was well received by some conservatives (Kyle and Keyser) but Allis declared to be an overstatement both on philology and archeology. Easton declared it had no apologetic value. Luckenbill retranslated the text. Albright made remarks on some of Luckenbill's rendering. Clay answered Luckenbill in an-
other book (cf. 1399). Dennefeld established the human personality of Tiamat. The monuments representing the conquest of the dragon have nothing to do with the epic *Enuma eliš*. Gen. I is therefore not a monotheistic redaction of the Babylonian epic. Haupt would read Omorka (um-engur) and tauathe; he is philologically very sound. Holmberg touches only on Babylonia. His work was published in the Annal. Acad. Scient. Fennicae. Langdon defends his interpretation against Schroeder and Chiera on the basis of an early syllabary. His masterful study of the Epic of Creation gives a transliteration of all the texts, with a translation which brings out many new points. There is with it an excellent study of the liturgical use of myths, and of the myth of the Death and Resurrection of Marduk (35—49), and a note on the passion of Lillu (p. 215), (cf. 1336). Pessérico and Poplicka study the Gilgamesh Epic. Poplicka deals largely with the sources which are partly astral. Pöebel studies the figure of Ishtar and especially the Descent. Rovira translates Enuma eliš and finds no direct influence on O. T. Ungnad studies the Hurriam fragment of Gilgamesh. In his pamphlet he shows that Paradise is an astral myth. It is in Pegasus. The flaming sword is Perseus. Thureau-Dangin edits a new Sumerian epic of the death and Resurrection of Lil (on Accadian Lillu) the mad god son of the great goddess. Wensinck compares to the trees in Genesis the mythological light or tree of precious stones found by Gilgamesh at the East End of the earth and the tree of Eridu. He studies these trees on the seals. Zimmern reconstructs this part of the text of the Epic. He studies CT 16, 36 IV ff. and its duplicate, the seven oldest cities, and their ante-deluvian sages. Cf. also Miller 1321, Kirchner 1420, Witzel 1435.

Religion


1345. — *Poles and posts.* (Babyl. a. Assyr.) ERE X, 91—93.

1346. — *Possession.* (Babyl. a. Assyr.) ERE X, 133—134.


1377. — *Über Alter und Herkunftsort des babylonischen Neujahrsfestruals*. ZA 34, 190—192.

ALBRIGHT studies the goddess of fertility, the serpent, and the vineyard paradise. In a short note he corrects 908. BROOMFIELD says that Yau was the Babylonian Moon God worshipped by Abraham at Ur. DEIMEL criticizes Nielsen 1366. DHORME studies the text of Ebeling 1354 and would rather compare it to Job than to Ecclesiastes. DOELGER touches on Babylon. DOUGHERTY translates a number of texts and finds a class of priests and priestesses answering to the Nethinim. EBELING’s Quellen was imperfectly listed by us JSOR 7, p. 74, 1105. His further work on a Babylonian Kohelet (cf. Quellen, II, 50—70) was studied also by GRAY who accepted Ebeling’s view. Cf. also 1350. FARBIDGE’s work is weak on Babylonia. HOMMEL studied the symbols of the gods on the Kudurru. JASTROW’s address on belief in immortality among Babylonians and Assyrians edited by Sneath. KAMAL-UD-DIN using ZIMMERN 1378 in his Moslem propaganda. KOHLER is not very thorough in the Babylonian section of his book. LANGDON gives an excellent study of the Righteous Sufferer (also studied by LANDSBERGER 1364) which was called the Babylonian Job; the Dialogue of Pessimism (cf. 1350, 1354) the Babylonian Proverbs and the so called rules of monthly diet which are really incantations. He also edits six pages of text. The hymn he studies in RA 19 is Ni. 9205, a duplicate of Pinches, JRAS, 1919, 190—191. It relates to the amours of the divine pair as a nature charm. The hymn to Belit edited by him supplements ZA X, 292—298. Of the Sumerian hymns then studied by Langdon, the first is new, the second (CT 36, 26—27) is a hymn in honor of the deified Dungi. LANDSBERGER writes on Babyl.-Assyr. religion in this textbook. MERCER studies WITZEL 1375. NIelsen finds among all the Semites a fundamental triad of two gods and a goddess. PRENTICE reedits a well known inscription with a triad made of Nabu (Simios), Tashmetum (Symbetylos) and the Solar lion. SCHNEIDER studies neolithic sun worship and deals with chronology (p. 39—42). SCHROEDER shows that Armada is the god of Arpad. SPEISER shows, on the basis of Aramaic, that usurtu=authority. THORNDIKE touches on Babylonian magic. THUREAU-DANGIN studies a grant to the temple by alienation of public land. WEIDNER studies some letters in Clay’s Letters from Erech (678) which are important for new year’s rites. WITZEL offers a new translation of Gudea Cylinder A. MEISSNER corrects him in places. ZIMMERN versus
Scheil 495 maintains the reading Anunitu. In ZA 34 he studies Thureau-Dangin Rituel 926 on the New Year’s festival. Zimmern’s pamphlet on the same subject was imperfectly entered by us, JSOR 7, 74, 1106. For other books or articles cf. Ebeling 1150, Langdon 1332, Mercer 1320, Perry 1298, Thureau-Dangin 1385, Jirku 1407, Dhorme 1402, Ball 1398, Jean 1258.

**Temples**


1381. — *The form and nature of E-PA at Lagash*. JAOS 43, 92—95.


Andrae describes the Temple of Ishtar at Ashur. Meissner offers philological corrections. Barton translates a difficult text which describes the building of a sanctuary. In the second article he shows that the E. PA is a Ziggurat. Gordon tells of the excavation of the Temple of Sin at Ur. Hommel says that *en* is an ancient silo for wheat, hance a sanctuary of Nidaba. Nun is a chapel-spring of Enki. En-nun is parallel to pr. wr. Cf. also Deimel 1287, Thureau-Dangin 1373, Pinches 1281.

**Divinations**


HOLMA edits new texts and announces their translation. THUREAU-DANGIN shows that the Ma-ku-a of Marduk was not a boatlike chariot but a real boat. The text of Nr. 9 of Tabletes d’Uruk translated by him tells us of omens derived from what happens to the boat.

Names


Contenau—the name has a psychic reality. Lewy—Schroeder’s date (1389) is 500 years too high. The lists are new Assyrian. Ranke studies names in the Boghazkoy texts and compares to hieroglyphic forms.

Astronomy

1394. — Studien zur babylonischen Himmelskunde. RSO IX. 287—300.

Schnabel studies VA 7819 and several of Thureau-Dangin’s Tabletes d’Uruk. Sidersky shows that the method of Kidinnu was according to Albiruni adopted by the Jews in the second century in the place of direct observation. Meissner doubts that there was an eight year cycle as early as 534 as Kugler says because in intercalary month was still put in, by order of the king, in the time of Nabonidus. With his study of some names of constellation, Ungnad shows that the horse is mentioned in a letter of the time of Samsu-iluna. He came from the west, *sisu* being derived from
aswas. Weidner translates KuB IV, 63, 64 with notes. In the second article, he studies Harper 1237 (p. 299—300), Astrology in dreams (p. 297—299), a prayer to Sirius on an amulet KAR II, 76 (p. 295—297), and historic reminiscences of the end of the First Babylonian dynasty in astrological texts (p. 287—295).

**Medicine**


**Babel and Bibel**


1401. F. Delitzsch. *Die große Täuschung*.


1408. — Der Ursprung des Wortes יבּ. ZAW 39, 151—152.
1411. — Eine altorientalische Freundschaftsformel. ZAW 39, 150—151.
1412. — Elohim und ilu ilani Habirui. ZAW 39, 156—158.
1413. — Ich habe dich bei deiner Hand gefaßt. ZAW 39, 159.
1416. — Zum Briefstil im A. T. ZAW 39, 146—147.
1424. — Metušelach. ZAW 40, 154—155.
1427. S. A. B. Mercer. O. T. and other oriental Wisdom. ATR 6, 118—123.
1430. B. Sommer. Der babylonisch-biblische Schöpfungsbericht und die Wissenschaft. 1922, p. 76.


It is noteworthy that this section of our bibliography is now very large. WITZEL gives a good review of STUMMER's work. The latter will be continued. BALL compares Daniel and the Babylonian Job. CLAY's work calls attention to the neglected area on the Upper Euphrates as the home of Amurru and the centre of Semitic culture. CLAY 1400 shows that Jerusalem is an Amorite name. DELITZSCH calls attention to the Sumerian influence on the Psalter. His book roused much opposition among German theologians. Cf. the section on the subject in our O. T. bibliography. DHORME says (p. 364) that Magog is mat ga-ga, and Gog and is the god Ga-ga from the neighbourhood of Hanigalbat. The third chapter of EICHRODT is a comparison of Hebrew and Babylonian eschatology. GUNKEL reprints his book of 1894 *without change*! HEINISCH compares the Babylonian and Hebrew ideas of the 'Word' which are very similar, although their genesis is different. In the second article he shows that in Babylonia, attributes of the deity became personified as gods, diseases as demons. No such development in the O. T. JIRKU 1408, derives this word not from šalsu, the third, but from Hittite šalliš, great, mighty. In 1409 he compares the contract between Jacob and Laban to K Bo I. In 1410 the pillars 2 Kings 11, 14 compared to Šurinu of Shamash. In 1411 he compares these formulas, to texts in KBo I. In 1412 he shows that ilāni was applied to one god and compares with elohim. In 1413 he compares Is. 42, 6 to KBo correspondence. In 1414 he says that the passage is a continuation of a treaty between Jojakim and Necho, compared here to the Hittite correspondance in KBo I. In 1415 he doubts the equation with Hammurabi. He compares Tid'al and Tudhalia. In 1416 the epistolary style in 2 Kn 5, 6; 10, 2; 2 Kn. 19, 10 is compared to Babylonian. In 1417 the discovery of the Code in 2 Kn 22, compared to a Hittite parallel in KBo I. JIRKU's volume 1418 is a welcome supplement to KAT 3. JENSEN compares accounts of Solomon and Tiglathpileser III, Shalmanezer and David and ignoring dissimilarities draws the un-
warranted conclusion that the cuneiform history influenced the form of the biblical. KIRCHNER versuS Zimmern. KÖNIG 1421 finds no real influence of Babylonia on Hebrew prophecy. In 1422, he attacks Delitzsch's Babel und Bibel. KRAELING compares the name of Terach with a place N. of Harran Tel ša Turaḫi, Shalm. Mon. II, 78 and Methushelah with Lugal-maradda. LANGDON shows that the Habiri first appear as Mercenaries in the service of Warad-Sin. The Hebrews were a branch of them. Philologically (versus Luckenbill, AJSL 32, 37) Habiri may well be compared with 'ibri. MERCER compares O. T. with Assyro-Babylonian and Egyptian sources. PETERS approves Kraeling's location of it at Borsippa (784). SOMMER — popular, illustrated comparison. PFEIFFER compares with kuribu. VACCARI studies the astrological aspect of messianism in Babylonia, contracts with true messianism. VENETIANER sponsors an incongruous derivation from ilu IM. WATERMAN shows that the date of the flood was 36,300 years ago according to the Nippur scribes. Good study of chronology. WITZEL studies Langdon's text. Other articles bearing on the subject are scattered in the bibliography. They are too numerous to be entered here.

Babel and Hellas

To this section belongs also Ungnad's pamphlet 1392.
SOME RECENT BOOKS ON EGYPT

By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Trinity College, Toronto


The year 1923 has been a very eventful one in Egyptology, not only because of the continuation of the epoch-making discovery of Carnarvon and Carter in November of 1922, but also because of scholarly activities in published works, as well as in plans for future research and study.
The following survey aims neither at completeness nor comprehensiveness. Its purpose is not to tell of the details of discovery, such as that of Tutankhamen's Tomb, nor of the plans for the reconstruction of the text of the Book of the Dead, being laid by Gardiner and Breasted, it is merely to review a group of books, which have come to hand, and which are representative of certain lines of Egyptian research in the study and in the field.
The first item in this survey was begun in 1910 and has just been finished. It is a monumental work, and both the author and publisher have placed all students of Egypt and her culture under a deep debt of gratitude. The work is very appropriately dedicated to Erman. In part 17, the author writes his Vorwort, giving in detail his purpose, and especially a plan of the work and how it
may conveniently be used. For this latter purpose he has printed a *Verzeichnis der Tafeln*. The plates are numbered consecutively from 1 to 424. In each case the name of the plate is recorded, the owner of the grave from which the scene on the plate comes, the collection or museum where the original is to be found, and the number of the particular scene. There is added a list of the places where the scenes in their originals may be seen, with the reign or dynasty to which they refer. This is all very systematically done.

It was Doctor Wreszinski’s original intention to publish the material with very full notes and observations. This plan was fully carried out with the first hundred plates, but had to be abandoned because of causes arising out of the war. It is sincerely to be hoped that the author may yet find a means of publishing more of his notes and observations!

This great publication not only places hundreds of splendidly reproduced Egyptian scenes at the disposal of the student, but also furnishes him with a great mass of material for his study. In word and picture there is here a mine of valuable information. With the aid of these pictures it can be easily determined what, for instance, were the usual objects offered in mortuary services, at any period. For instance, in the 18th dynasty, we find bread, fruit, fowl, fish, flowers, wine, and beer, as the most usual *res sacrifici*. We also learn that during that same dynasty, offerings could be made magically, in the form of pictures. Magic turned the pictures into realities. Even the earlier false door need only be pictured, the parts of it being inscribed with magic words. As early as 2660 B.C. animals were common among sacrificial offerings (pl. 67). The following plates give a good idea of the variety of the *res sacrifici* in ancient Egypt, 114, 120, 143, 167, 189–190, 196–198, 201, 210, 212, 256, 350, 389. The offering table is very clearly depicted, for example, on pls. 5, 383, and the altar for burnt offerings and libation vases appear on table 59. Priests are often represented, with shaved head, performing in accordance to the right of some particular deity (e.g. 95, 74, 84). Religious processions can with ease be followed (129, 390) and temples (6) and shrines with their barques (3, 75) are well shown. Many religious ceremonies are described in pictographical form, such, for example, as mourning (8), embalming (309), Opening of the Mouth (127, 209), celebrations
for the dead (268, 278), funerals (387—388, 419, 421), burials (166, 181, 362), prayer (111), and festivals (118). The work, so well done by Dr. Wreszinski, will remain a standard work and indispensable source of study for all students of Egyptian religion and culture.

Borchardt’s *Porträts der Königin Nofret-ete* is an example of what the finest work in publication can be. Beautifully printed and splendidly illustrated, there is nothing more for the reader to desire, for the literary contents are as reliable as the work of printing and publishing is fine. The beautiful picture of the wife of Ikhnaton is herein reproduced in color, as well as a picture of the royal family at Tell el-Amarna. In the Introduction, the author has given full geographical and historical information about these valuable pictures, where and when they were found, with translations of the inscriptions. In one of these inscriptions, the phrase “The son of Ra,” in reference to Ikhnaton, reminds one of the kind of evidence which makes it so difficult to accept the theory of Egyptian monotheism. This same thought recurs in reference to the altar picture, which Dr. Borchardt rightly thinks was used as an object of adoration by the Egyptians of Tell el-Amarna. This important object is represented in its restored original position on page 23. Borchardt’s observations are most important for the history of custom and general culture, for example, he compares the coiffure of Ikhnaton’s time with that of the 18th Century, A.D.

In his Anhang, the author seems to think that the Queen of Ikhnaton was not of royal stock, but the daughter of a military official, and gives expression to the possibility of the Asiatic origin of Nofret-ete’s family. Nofret-ete’s third daughter married Tutankhamen, who, Borchardt suggests, might have been a brother of Ikhnaton. Nofret-ete had six daughters in all. The author makes the interesting suggestion that Nofret-ete was the Egyptian queen who had asked the Hittite king for a son in marriage (*cf. ZA 35 [1923], 37 ff.)*.

In 1915 Mrs. Luise Klebs published her *Die Reliefs des alten Reiches*, now comes her second great work, *Die Reliefs und Malereien des mittleren Reiches (VII.—XVII. Dynastie, ca. 2475—1580 v. Chr.)*. Like Wreszinski’s work, this book contains a valuable mass of material for the study of Egyptian religion and culture. After an introduction in which the history of the period is given in out-
line, a discussion of the source of the reliefs and paintings follows. Then there are given the reliefs from the temples of the gods and from the cities of the Middle Kingdom. A section is devoted to the graves of the same period, and this is followed by a full account of the stelae in all its details, of the sarcophagi, the Ka-statues, the Ushabti-figures, of amulets and of other grave objects. The second section of the work, a very important one, gives scenes from the life of the nobility, and after a section on burial scenes, there follow scenes from the life of the common people. This is by far the largest and most important section. Then there are scenes from the Cult of the Dead, and miscellaneous ceremonies. In every case full literary sources are added to the discussion.

Ceremonial dance played a considerable rôle in Egyptian religion, and this is fully described and illustrated on pages 145 ff., eight species being recorded. On page 167 one finds an excellent outline of sacrificial ritual, and the different phases are discussed in the following pages. Gestures, in prayer, come in for specific description, where an interesting comparison can be made with those of the period of the Old Kingdom. Further on, there comes a good description of the priesthood and the various priestly orders, with their duties, and finally Mrs. Klebs has brought together a list of the res sacrifici of the Middle Kingdom. For a reconstruction of the religion of this period no work is more important than this.

In his interesting study "Les Scènes de Chasse," Professor Speleers has shown conclusively that in this particular Assyria has borrowed from Egypt which in its very early stages possessed an art of a nature altogether unknown in Assyria. The thesis adds another link to the chain of co-ordinating the culture and civilization of the ancient Orient.

Only a part of Capart's great work Leçons sur L'Art Egyptien, which was published in 1920, appears in this book, called Egyptian Art. And yet it is no mean book. It contains the introductory studies, in which the famous scholar goes deeply into the question of origin and of motives in Egyptian Art. The translation has been excellently done, and a series of unusual illustrations has been added. Among the best of the eleven chapters of this book are Chapter Five, which discusses "Architectural Hieroglyphics and kindred subjects," chapters seven and eight on "Fundamental Forms in Architecture," and especially the last two chapters on
The Conventions of Egyptian Drawing,” and the “Artistic Ideas of the Egyptians.” These two chapters are packed with interesting suggestions. The author does not think that the representation of full faced shoulders on a profile body is the result of inexperience in art and of feeble groping in the study of rendering the human figure, but considers it quite conscious, voluntary and methodical. He shows that the Egyptians had their own ideas of perspective, which may be fully justified (p. 155). Casually he gives expression to a belief that the hieroglyphic sign for God represents a mast surmounted by one or several bandages as a flap, that obelisks were considered divinities “of flesh and bone,” who needed food offerings, which the religious texts prescribed, and that many of the Egyptian columns imitate cult-emblems stuck in the ground and standing free. The whole work is most original and thought-provoking, especially in all matters of art.

For over forty years it has been the ambition of every worthwhile Egyptologist to translate the pyramid texts. At last in 1894 Maspero made the first attempt, but it was not complete. The difficulties were too numerous. In 1908 Sethe published the first systematic edition of the original texts, and since that time many scholars have studied different aspects of the text. Last year (1923) the indefatigable Adjunct-keeper of the Musées Royaux de Cinquantenaire in Brussels, Dr. Speleers, tackled the problem, with the result that we have what is practically the first complete translation of the Pyramid Texts in any language.

He does not claim perfection for his translation, far from it. He realizes that in these ancient texts there are many words whose precise significance entirely escapes us. Many words are unknown, and others, while translatable, fail to convey to us their special meaning. He has made his translation very literal in order to approach as near as possible to the original in idea and thought. The pagination of Sethe’s edition has been followed throughout.

The translation seems to have been done with a great deal of success, considering the difficulty of the original. There are, however, a great many places where difference in interpretation would be natural. Thus in section 25 is not to be compared with the Hebrew and to be translated “extend”? In 29 perhaps should be translated “disaster,” and may be ren-
dered “become mighty” or “to become young.” In 33 would it not be better to render $\text{become mighty}$ or “to lay hold on”? In 117, should not $\text{become young}$ be rendered “he wore,” or “he swallowed”? In 126 the phrase containing $\text{take not the eye of Horus away.}$ In 136, 87 $\text{shall not be sundered (s\text{m-w-f})}$; $\text{rendered}$ “it shall not be sundered (s\text{m-w-f})” $\text{from thee}$. This is a passive form (s\text{dm-w-f}), cf. Hearst, Medical Pap. I and XI. In 136, 88, one should translate “By means of (\text{seize}) the eye of Horus he quenched or overcame (\text{lay hold on}) the water”; cf. Harris, Medical Pap. I, VI. In 158—167, 95 render “which he carried about (hlnf) with him” (\text{seize}); and 158—167, 98c should be rendered “which they licked (or eat)” \text{water}. These are some of the many instances of difference of opinion in rendering these difficult texts. A perfect translation must await many more years of patient research. M. Speleer’s translation marks a new epoch in the study of the Pyramid Texts. The world of Oriental scholarship is much indebted to him, for he has accomplished a splendid piece of work.

Shortly before the great master of Egyptology, Gaston Maspero, died, he had been engaged in an extended and critical study of Erman’s Ägyptische Grammatik, third edition. At his death this study was left incomplete, and M. É. Chassinat has now published it in practically the same condition in which it was laid down by Maspero. Students of the Egyptian language have much to regret in the failure of Maspero to complete his important study. Already Maspero had outlined a plan, in RT 37, 147ff., of an Introduction a l’étude de la grammaire égyptienne and in RT 37, 147—202, and 38, 85—164, had published a part of a chapter on Phonology. His plan was a very ambitious one, for he apparently differed from Erman considerably in his view of the form and nature of the Egyptian language.

In the fragment, published by Chassinat, we are not privileged to see what Maspero’s most important decisions were. On the
contrary, we are given a series of running comments on the text of Erman's Grammatik. For example, he points out, in opposition to Erman, that in the manuscripts of the first Theban era the sign does not always indicate a plural, but on the contrary is a phonetic indication of the presence of even in singular words. He also says that , , , , , inr is not necessarily an abbreviation, but probably an indication of an pronunciation. He notes that is perhaps also a dual, and that , , , is a fem. collective. These and many other instances show how rich this publication is in well substantiated observations on Egyptian grammar, and they make us more conscious of our great loss in the death of Sir Gaston Maspero.

The science of Coptic Grammar has acquired a new and thorough adherent in the person of Eugène Dévaud, of Fribourg, in Switzerland, who has just published the first part of his Études d'Étymologie Copte, and who promises the second part very soon. The whole work is presented by M. Dévaud as a doctor's thesis, at the University of Neuchâtel.

The first part of this work contains a series of new etymologies, consisting of twenty-eight words, whose etymology Doctor Dévaud has established. He divides these twenty-eight words into three groups, viz: those that are Egyptian in origin, secondly, those that have only a Coptic origin, and, thirdly, those which are foreign in provenance. Each of these words is studied with the greatest care and detail, each statement about them being authenticated by full references. Thus belongs to the first class, to the second, and to the third. is the Egyptian word ; is from the Coptic ; and is from the Semitic root , , , . He adds two new etymologies at the end, namely, those of the words and , the first being the Egyptian word , and the second the word . This is a thorough and scholarly piece of work, and the second part is awaited eagerly.

In an article published in Volume 36 of the Muséon Dr. Dévaud published a series of notes which are designed to substantiate points made in the Second Part of his Études d'Étymologie Copte, a copy of which I have not yet seen.
M. Speleers' next work is one of great value. Les Figurines Funéraires Égyptiennes are studied archaeologically and in a literary critical way. The book has four divisions, or chapters. The first chapter deals with generalities, the second with archaeological study of the figurines, the third with Chapter VI of the Book of the Dead, and the last with the significance of these figurines. It is interesting to note the evidence brought forward to show that Ushabtiu were used in the Middle Kingdom, but that at a later period they occur in great numbers, one tomb containing 365, or apparently one for each day of the year. Chapter II is packed with interesting material well illustrated.

A large number of these funerary figurines are inscribed with the sixth chapter of the Book of the Dead, an inscription as old as the end of the Old Kingdom. Dr. Speleers brings together in this chapter the six versions of Chapter VI of the Book of the Dead, and subjects them to a thorough examination and concordance, studying each word and phrase in detail. On pages 155—157 the author recapitulates the results of his study of Chapter VI.

The last chapter of the book contains many interesting observations on religious matters especially, for example, he says that the religion of Egypt knows of three different worlds, that of the living, that of the gods, and that of the dead. These three are then described in detail, and it is known how their conception gave rise to a confusion as to the function of the three kinds of mortuary statuettes.

Passing from the art, grammar, and religion of Egypt, we come to a book packed with interesting material which gives in systematic form a detailed knowledge of the economic and social life of Egypt in general, and of the agriculture of Egypt in particular. This book is by Dr. Fernande Hartmann, who shows that agriculture was highly developed among the Egyptians at a very early period, due primarily to the very favourable conditions native to that country—the climate, the Nile, and the configuration of the Valley of the Nile. These points are developed in the Introduction, where the author also shows that agriculture began in the paleolithic era in Egypt.

This book is divided into two parts—the first dealing with the cultivation, and the second with growing. In the first part, the author discusses and enumerates the vegetation used by the ancient
Egyptians; the instruments used in cultivation; and the methods of cultivation. This is all discussed with the greatest detail, and with systematic minuteness, and is illustrated by numerous drawings from the inscriptions and papyri. The same is true of part two, where the author enumerates and describes the kind of animals used by the ancient Egyptians; how they were captured; and the instruments employed in their capture.

It would be impossible in a review of this nature to show the completeness and thoroughness of this fine work. It is a veritable mine of indispensable information for the student of Egypt's social, economic, and agrarian life. Every statement is most carefully documented, which renders the book a most reliable collection of facts. It is the kind of work which relieves the student of a feeling of the necessity of making this research for himself. This particular piece of research work is done for all time, and need not be repeated. It needs only to be augmented according as new inscriptions and new papyri appear. The whole work is well summed up in eight pages of conclusion. This is followed by an excellently arranged bibliography, arranged chronologically.

A related subject comes in for a thorough treatment by Dr. Lutz in his book called *Textiles and Costumes among the Peoples of the Ancient Near East*. He has given a connected account of the art of cloth making among the peoples of the ancient Near East, and in doing so has discussed the manner in which these peoples obtained their fibers, how they prepared them for the spindles, their method of dyeing, and how the yarn was woven into different qualities of cloth. In all this Egypt receives its full quota of space.

The author, in the course of his study, makes it clear that certain fashions held sway, at certain periods, yet without vitally affecting the elementary forms of dress which were always quite simple and few in number. However, he observes, the methods of draping were numerous, and often depended upon the individual sense of form and beauty. He also finds that the art of weaving is one of the oldest acquired by primitive man, reaching back to the pre-historic time, and originally learned from the animals and from nature.

The material used in the textile industry of the Ancient Near East was relatively small, that used by the Egyptians having been especially the fibers of the papyrus plant and the flax plant, and the
fibers gained from the wool of animals. In spinning and weaving, the Egyptians used the spindle and the foot loom, and the industry was both a home and a manufacturing one. The monuments do not depict the method of bleaching, but we know that salt and soda (natron) were extensively used. The art of staining textile substances with permanent colors is very old and was brought to perfection in Egypt. In Chapter IV the author gives an excellent account of the costumes of African and Mediterranean peoples, Egyptian dress being described in detail. It was not until the beginning of the new Empire that the distinction between the different classes and crafts were rigidly expressed in dress. While the oldest male dress was the loin-cloth, the oldest female dress was a shirt-like, tightly fitting garment of the tunic type, which covered the body from the breast to the ankles; but later there appeared a wider and looser type. The garments of the priestly class had to be of linen, and their attire varied according to rank.

The work is profusely illustrated, there being 151 in the text, and a serviceable index is appended.

Closely related to the above subjects is the theme of a new book by W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*. The book is divided into six chapters. The first reviews the framework of Egyptian society, the second the administration, the third rights and wrongs, the fourth private life, the fifth supplies and commerce, and the last construction and defence. The work is based upon the most reliable information, and there are innumerable interesting situations described. The book was written for popular consumption, and yet the expert will find it useful. Petrie contrasts the "Berlin" system of dating with the "Egyptians," which latter of course, means Petrie’s dating, although his system is not without reasonable plausibility. However, the most reasonable system so far is the "Berlin" system. This, nevertheless, detracts but very little from the authoritative value of this excellent little book.

One of the best of the more popular books on any Egyptian subject recently published is that by Dr. Blackman, entitled *Luxor and its Temples*. It is one of the best, because it was written by a first-class Egyptologist, who can defend, with accurate proof, every statement which he makes. The book is tastefully published and artistically illustrated by Major Benton Fletcher. A useful table
of dates and a Sketch-map of the neighborhood of Luxor precedes the first chapter.

With much detail and sufficient local colour, chapter one is devoted to a description of life in ancient Luxor, one of the most interesting parts of which being the description of a dinner-party. "How Thebes became the capital of Egypt" is well told in chapter two. Here we follow the destiny of the Old Kingdom, the Bolshevism of the transition period, the Hyksos and their foreign rule, the supremacy of Herakleopolis, and the war of Egyptian liberation. Then "Thebes, the World's first Monumental City" is described, in the days of the great Monarchs of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. Much space is allowed for descriptions of religious ceremonies, especially for the Festival of Opet. In chapter four "Some great Kings in time of War" are discussed, and chapter five is devoted to Queen Hatshepsut. In some respects the most interesting chapter in the book is the sixth, which contains portions of poems, songs, and romances, splendidly rendered, and discussed with insight and penetration. The book ends with an excellent chapter on Funerary Temples. Dr. Blackman's book is one of the few which successfully bridges the gap between the layman and the scholar in matters Egyptian.

*The Wisdom of the Egyptians* by Brian Brown is a compilation done, not without discrimination. After an Introduction in which some idea is given of the race to which the Egyptians probably belonged, and of their religion, a chapter is devoted to the Story of Egypt, and one to a fuller account of the Religion of Ancient Egypt. This latter lacks system, and is merely a catalogue of certain religious phenomena. Then follows the compilation with comments—Ptah-Hotep, Ke'gemi, Amenemhet, the Book of the Dead, Hermes Trismegistus, the Vision of Hermes, and the Story of the Book of Thoth, with a chapter on Egyptian Occultism and Symbolism. There is nothing particularly original about the book, but it does place some of the wisdom literature of ancient Egypt in a convenient form.

The great sensation of the year, of course, has been the opening up of the Tomb of Tutankhamen, and with it has come the publication of many books on the subject. The most important of these will now be passed in brief review.

The first of these in point of the time of publication was Elliot
Smith’s *Tutankhamen and his Tomb*, with 22 illustrations, 2 maps, and a valuable though brief, bibliographical note. After the Introduction, historical in nature, an account is given of the exploration of the Theban Tombs of the Kings. Then a chapter is devoted to Tutankhamen himself, and one to the Significance of the Discovery. Ancient and modern tomb-robbing is well described, and a chapter is devoted to the Ethics of Desecration. In the way of padding, it seems, two chapters are added on the Story of the Flood and “Getting to Heaven.” As an authority on Egyptian anatomy, Elliot Smith has no rival, and this book would be interesting, if only for that reason. But otherwise it is not as satisfactory a book as Budge’s *Tutankhamen, Amenism, Atenism, and Egyptian Monotheism*.

Budge has brought together in this publication the texts of hymns to Amen and Aton which are of prime value in a study of the religion of the period of Tutankhamen. He gives an account of the reign and times of Tutankhamen, but his interest lies in the religion of that age. Herein he has contributed many valuable suggestions. He rightly disparages the philosophical speculations ascribed by some enthusiasts to Ikhnaton, and thinks, again rightly, that Ikhnaton desired to see Aton recognized as the national god of Egypt. But that does not mean Monotheism—far from it. He further states that the “Monotheism” of Ikhnaton was not at all new, at any rate from a religious point of view. Budge’s account is sane, and a safe interpretation of the state of religious thought of the time of Tutankhamen.

Professor Capart’s book, *The Tomb of Tutankhamen*, was not meant to be a scientific book at all. It consists of a series of articles written during the first part of the year 1923, and contributed to various daily newspapers. Their merit consists in the fact that they were written by an eye-witness in the person of a first-rate Egyptologist. That in itself renders the little book of permanent value.

Mercer’s book was written with the intelligent layman in mind, and is meant to furnish him with a small and handy *vade mecum* in his reading about Tutankhamen and Egyptology. The great “find” is first described, with some detail. Then a brief résumé of Egyptian history up to and including the time of Tutankhamen is traced. Then follows a transcription of all known inscriptions
dealing with Tutankhamen's reign. Chapter four contains some observations upon a possible relationship between Tutankhamen and the Hebrews, which at the very best is merely a possibility. The most useful part of the book is to be found in the succeeding chapters, where a brief idea of Egyptology and its content is given, and where a useful list of technical Egyptian terms is found, arranged alphabetically. A chronology and bibliography with an index, conclude the book. The beautiful illustrations are the work of Canon Watson of Gambier, Ohio.

Arthur Weigall has written many interesting books, learned and semi-popular, on ancient Egypt, but none more full of human interest than *Tutankhamen and Other Essays*. Mr. Weigall has had much first-hand experience in Egypt, having been in the past Inspector-General of Antiquities of the Egyptian Government, and member of the Catalogue staff of the Cairo Museum. He is, moreover, a writer of great ease and grace, and keeps an open mind in most matters of dispute, although he sometimes seems to possess the enthusiasts' credulity. However, whatever he says about Egypt deserves the greatest consideration.

In this book we have an interesting mixture of scholarly material and matter of popular interest. The following chapter titles indicate where much technical material may be found: "Tutankhamen: The Historical Problems," "The Problem of Egyptian Chronology," "The Quarries of Wady Hammamât," &c.; while these indicate popular material: "The Ancient Ghouls of Thebes," "The Malevolence of Ancient Egyptian Spirits," "The Gateway of the East," &c. Besides much Egyptian learning, the book contains much sage political and economic advice. One thing he makes clear is the reasonableness of the present attitude of the Egyptian Government towards excavations and excavators.

He makes the interesting suggestion that Tutankhamen was a courtier of the reign of Ikhnaton, by name Tutu, and rejects the surmise that he was a son of Ikhnaton by a concubine, but does not refer to Borchardt's theory that he was a brother of Ikhnaton. He also makes the very questionable supposition that Tutankhamen was the Pharaoh under whom Moses returned to Egypt and organized the exodus. He likewise holds the theory of Egyptian monotheism in the reign of Ikhnaton—all of which are questionable and most likely without reality. But the book is the most
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fascinating which has yet appeared on any Egyptian subject.

The most important and most authoritative book connected with the great Tutankhamen "find" is that written by Howard Carter himself, entitled The Tomb of Tut. Ankh. Amen. In Carter's book we have the first authoritative account of the Earl of Carnarvon's famous discovery, told in a fascinating way. There is a frontispiece portrait of Lord Carnarvon and about one hundred illustrations from photographs taken by Harry Burton of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The volume is the first in a proposed series, which it is hoped the present trouble in Egypt will not delay, and which is dedicated to Carnarvon. The first record of a purely scientific nature is awaited eagerly by all Egyptologists, but that, of course, cannot be published for some time yet.

After the preface with an excellent plan of the tomb, drawn to scale, there follows an introductory biographical sketch of the late Lord Carnarvon by Lady Burghclere, told in a charming way. Chapter one deals with the King and Queen, in which Carter well says that the King's father-in-law, Ikhnaton, has been much over-rated, and in which all that is known of Tutankhamen to date, is recorded. His tomb so far has precious little to add to what was previously known. In chapter two, the Valley and the Tomb are described in full, and this is continued in chapter three. Chapter four describes the work of preparation, and chapter five describes the finding of the Tomb. In chapters six to eight the actual work of excavation is described; chapter nine deals with Visitors and the Press; chapter ten with work in the Laboratory, and the book ends with a chapter on the Opening of the Sealed Door. We have thus a well-illustrated and popular account of the work up to the closing of the Tomb in the spring of 1923. The value of the book consists first of all in the fact that it was written by the discoverer of the tomb itself, and secondly in the unrivalled collection of photographs of the numerous objects found in the tomb, which is appended to the book. There are seventy-nine plates in all.
A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES FOR THE YEARS 1918—1923

By John A. Maynard, Bryn Mawr College

This bibliography is a continuation of the Old Testament Bibliography written for the Anglican Theological Review by H. C. Ackerman, ATR I, 214—239; 314—332; II, 43—70). No bibliography of such a field can be complete even though one omits the homiletic or devotional material. Students may need therefore to supplement our list with the current bibliographies of the Biblische Zeitschrift and of Biblica. In a forthcoming number of the JSOR Dr. Mercer will publish the sequel to his Old Testament Archeological Bibliography. (For former articles of Mercer cf. JSOR 3, 19—34 and 6, 134—152.) We thought it useful to give references to important reviews of books listed, when we had a record of them, thus

making up for the necessary meagerness of our critical notes. Students should also use in connection with this bibliographical study of the O. T. the sections on Babel and Bible in the Assyrian bibliographies which we publish yearly in JSOR. This article refers only to books and articles dealing with the O. T. generally. Other articles will follow.

Introduction

7. The Companion Bible, being the Authorized Version of 1611 with the Structures and notes, critical, explanatory, and suggestive, and with 198 appendices. p. 2150.
9. Hodges G. How to know the Bible. 1918, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, p. 360.


Arnold examines Margolis' point of view. He says that neither the Pentateuch nor the prophetic collection are a canon but an edition. None of the books they contained ever existed in just that form apart from the rest. Batten—good textbook. Bewer classifies in historical sequence the various sections of the Bible, gives copious translations of his own and notes. *The Companion Bible* is, according to ET 34, 254, a monument of wasted ingenuity.
Genung and Hodges—good and clear popular introductions. Hoepfl conforms to the Biblical Commission without variations. Jeffries writes for young people. Lewis is modern and clear. Margolis exhibits a healthy scholarly skepticism towards modern criticism although he is not a traditionalist. He writes for the young educated Jews. In Meinhold we find nothing original, it is the critical school assuming the attitude of the Macedonian phalanx. Moulton does not care to be scholarly in appearance but he knows how to present the Bible in a dramatic way. The O. T. is the first act, Wisdon Literature appears in the interlude, N. T. is the second act, Revelation the Epilogue. Neumark is unacademic, thoughtful, not always safe. Niebergall who edits the historical books in this volume belongs to the phalanx of Wellhausen’s army. Peake, helped by the best scholars in England, has given us a standard work. Allis does not like it. Redlich is practical and modern. Sampey is traditional, but not fiercely. Thomsen writes a good popular introduction. L. K. Wild studies the literary types of the Old and New Testaments. Cohu’s book (No. 67) belongs also to this section.

Translations with Notes


29. Crampon. La Sainte Bible. 1923.


34. Lods A. ed. La Sainte Bible (Bible du Centenaire).

Crampon's work revised, an excellent Roman Catholic translation with notes, Gressmann and Kautzsch revised but fundamental character remains. Lods and his collaborators continue their work which is of a similar scope. Schloegel probably thinks he is a traditionalist but others know better.

**Shorter Bibles**

36a. Kent C. G. *The shorter Bible, the O. T.* New York, Scribner, 1921, pp. 653 (Ackermann, ATR 5, 154—155; Fox, PTR 20, 118 ff.).

Batho uses the R. V. with introduction and notes based on good scholarship. The first volume covers from Gen. to 2 Sam. 1. Kent and a well chosen group of collaborators give new translations of selected passages. An excellent work. Reid tabulates what should be omitted. Rogers prepared a very good lectionary. The second volume has introductions and notes.

**Bible Dictionaries**


Boehl is reliable, moderately critical, well informed. Potts knows little and is not aware of it.

**History of Israel**


51. Hunting H. B. *Hebrew Life and Times*. New York, Abingdon Press, 1921, p. 188.


59. Mercer S. A. B. *Life and growth of Israel*. Milwaukee, Morehouse, 1921, p. 186 (Ackerman, ATR 4, 346—348; Cook, JThS 23, 322; Maynard, JSOR 6, 36—38).


Baikie retells the Bible stories in excellent style; he is conservative but well informed. Bailey has given us one of the best books of this kind. De Barenton (as he calls himself) is fantastic. Bertholet is thorough but ignores the extra biblical material, even the Assuan papyri. Brown is forceful and inspiring. Cook gives the latest results. Erb is wild. Foakes-Jackson keeps close to his text and does not force his own interpretation upon the reader. Fowler writes for college classes so as to arouse and hold interest. Grant gives vividly the historical and cultural background. Hunting is a modern scholar and writes for week day Bible school. Jean presents an admirable survey of Bible history from palaeontological ages to the beginning of our era; he knows the sources and writes clearly. Jirku presents the cuneiform material recently discovered, supplementing Zimmern's revision of Schrader's KAT. The fourth edition of Kittel's fundamental work goes from prehistory to the exile. Meffert has an apologetic tone. Matthews describes well the civilization and history of Israel and growth of the Hebrew Canon. Mercer and Nairne write excellently, both are modern. Phelps is unconventional. Sanders gives good outlines. Mrs. Whitman writes a teacher's handbook. She is quite modern and an adept at dramatization. Not always accurate enough.

The Modern Point of View. Constructive Presentation


78. Malden R. H. The O. T., its meaning and value for the church of to-day. London, Macmillan, 1919, p. 259 (Barnes, JTS 21, 82—83).
83. Pommier J. Notes inédites d’Ernest Renan sur les commentaires des livres sacrés. RHR 84, 1921, 209—229.


Box shows value of O. T. in university curriculum for culture and the formation of an educated democracy. Burney—excellent sermons based on true scholarship. Cohu—noble and honest book of a convert to the modern view; it is really an introduction to the O. T. Fullerton tells of the use of O. T. in the Christian Church and shows how modern scholars preserve its abiding significance. Gauthier shows in O. T. a double current of ideas, from God and Godward. Hauff is popular. Kittel’s volume is a fourth edition. His article studies the present outlook for O. T. science. Lods tells us of the Strasburg school, of Reuss and other pioneers. McFadyen’s first volume is a collection of non technical articles reprinted. The second is a homiletic study of 55 passages interpreted from the modern point of view, and is also reprinted from periodicals. Madden is homiletic. Marti is retrospective. Martin is excellent and inspiring. His book has a mission. Mercer shows the application of O. T. to human problems. Pommier gives us some of the unpublished notes of Renan. Rice is stimulating. Sampey is moderate and defends the supernatural from a modern point of view. Schwartz tells us some good things about Wellhausen. H. P. Smith writes a sequence of essays on the various ways in which the O. T. has been interpreted from the days of the Hebrew writers themselves to the modern critical movement. J. M. P. Smith defends the teaching of O. T. Steel and Volz are constructive.

**Methods of Criticism**


98. — The present ills of O. T. Theology and their remedy. BS, 1923, 465—470.


100. Peters J. P. Some uses of Numbers. JBL 38, 15—23.

101. Smith H. P. Moses and Mohammed. AJTh 23, 519—524

102. Weir T. H. German critics and the Hebrew Bible. BS, 1918, 70—79.


106. — The names of God in the O. T. PTR 18, 460—492.

107. — The use of "God" and "Lord" in the Koran. PTR 17, 644—650.

108. — Use of the words for God in the Apocryphal and pseudepigraphical Literature of the Jews. PTR 18, 103—122.


Bennett shows that no translation is the translation. Harari surveys the popular tradition in Israel. Fitchett is antiquated. Kegel is apparently unaware that Wellhausen’s theory developed since the Prolegomena. He finds weapons against a ghost in Weiner, Dahse, &c. Kittel shows the new tendency opposed to Wellhausen’s historico-critical school. Koenig versus evolutionism in O. T. Minocchi shows how the papyri correct some assumptions of critics. He opposes Bellelli’s criticism of the papyri. Peters shows the im-
importance of considering the schematic arrangement of numbers 5, 7 &c., in Biblical documents. Welch says that the reliability of the Mas. Text in the use of divine names needs to be investigated anew both in the Pentateuch and the rest of the O. T. Deuteronomy has a history before its promulgation. Much of P is pre-exilic. Weir found the critics wanting. Wilson undertakes laborious statistics to disprove the critical theory on the use of names. He insists upon their different meaning. The whole attempt is based on logical fallacies. Every article ends with the usual peal of oratorical thunder. Smith attacks Wilson's article on the Koranic use of Rab and Allah and its implications.

The Delitzsch Question

114. — Die moderne Babilonisierung der Bibel in ihrer neuesten Erscheinungsform. Stuttgart, Belser, 1922, p. 44 (Nowak, TLZ 48, 30—31; Synave, RSPT, 12, 81—82).
118. Sellin E. Das A. T. und die evangelische Kirche der Gegenwart. 1921, p. 103.

Delitzsch reprinted his Babel und Bibel without change, a rather characteristic thing. He issued a double pamphlet on The Great Mystification, which has been brewing in his mind since the days of his youth, claiming that the O. T. is now meaningless, that
Israel never really had a vital mission to the world, and that the Jews are a real danger. Delitzsch stirred a hornet's nest in Germany. Bergdolt, Koenig, Meffert, Sellin and Theis writing against him.

Text of the O. T.


121. Perles F. *Analekten zur Textkritik des A. T.* Neue Folge, 1922 (Dhorme, RB 32, 471—472; Loehr, OLZ 26, 278).


Delitzsch collected important material for textual investigation. Perles continues his original emendations. Slotki claims that the *pisgo be’msa’ posuq* has three functions but usually shows that words are missing. Smith catalogues Biblical manuscripts in America, including versions.

The Versions

We note here only books and articles bearing on the O. T. as a whole. No attempt has been made to collect material bearing on the Vulgate. This part of the work is excellently done in Biblica.


126. — *The printed texts of the Peshitta O. T.* AJSL 37, 136—144.


128. Lake K. *The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the copies sent by Eusebius to Constantine.* HTR 11, 32 ff.


130. Ottley R. R. *A handbook to the Septuagint.* London, Methuen, 1920, p. 301 (Ackerman, ATR 4, 82—83; Mercer, ATR 4, 58; Brooke, JTS 22, 74—76).

D’ALÈS calls attention to the value of neglected Old Latin versions, untouched by Marcionic influences. In his first article, BLOCH shows complexity of problem, in the second, the need of a critical text, in the third that the version was made by Aramaic speaking Jews. LAKE says that both the Sinaitic and B are early rather than late in the fourth century. MANGENOT tells of the origin, preparation and content of this Polyglot. OTTLEY less technical than Swete adds much material not found in the latter. ROHLFS studies Ethiopic versions. THACKERAY shows where we can distinguish various hands in the Greek version; it began with translation of festal lessons and was closely correlated with the beginning of Jewish worship; later it was influenced by its rubrics. VACCARI studies a carshuni Ms. VASCHALDE collects the Coptic versions. ZAHN studies Symmachus.

Hebrew Poetry
139. — The origin and nature of parallelism. AJSL 35, 113—127.
142. Lods A. *L'état actuel des recherches sur la métrique hébraïque.*
RHR 82, i22—i32.

Benkner shows where Lowth plagiarized a passage of the "Orator." Gordon surveys the systems offered. In his first article, Isaacs compares with Sanscrit metre and applies the system of *morae.* In the second he shows that parallelism has a biological basis, the verse being a breathing unit. Jahnow studies the dirge. Koenig shows that there was no epic because of the absence of mythology among the Hebrews; poetry is lyrical or epico-didactic in places. Lods shows the value of a prudent use of metrics for textual criticism.

(To be continued.)
REVIEWS


A new series of Cuneiform inscriptions has begun under the most favourable auspices, for it is published by the Oxford University Press, and edited by Professor Langdon. It is called the Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Inscriptions. The first set of this series is called The H. Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum, and this book makes the first volume of this set and of the whole series.

In the preface the editor and author tells us that this series was designed first of all to publish the tablets and inscribed monuments presented to the University of Oxford by Mr. H. Weld-Blundell of Queen’s College, and secondly, to publish the philological material which will accrue to the joint expedition to Mesopotamia of the University of Oxford and the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History. The Field Museum undertakes to publish all the archaeological results.

In the first season’s work of the expedition, the temple tower of Unirkidurumah was laid bare, and the platform of the temple of Emete-ursag, dedicated to the god Ilbada and the goddess Innini, was located and defined. The other finds followed in rapid succession.

The contents of this volume is miscellaneous. The first text is W.-B. 162 called “The Legend of Enmerkar and Lugalbanda.” It is a long poem, well preserved, except the first few lines, and containing a legend which seems to tell of the appearance of the goddess Innini (Ištar) in a dream to Lugalbanda her son. Then Lugalbanda apparently describes the desperate condition of the Kingdom of Erech, whose king is Enmerkar. The king trembled with terror and Lugalbanda hastens to his aid, but is prevented by dragons, who infest the mountainous passages. Lugalbanda
finally reaches Erech and rescues Enmerkar. After some time Lugalbanda succeeded Enmerkar as King of Erech.

Dr. Langdon believes that the poem is based upon two historical traditions: (1) Lugalbanda of Där in the North came to the assistance of the second king of the Erech dynasty; and (2) The Sumerian Cults of Där and Ashnunak were imitated at Erech, which henceforth became the center of the worship of Anu and Innini.

The translation and transliteration of this important text is done with unusual success and accuracy. In a note on Col. III, l. 17, Langdon calls attention to a phrase containing an interesting grammatical construction. It reads, sâb-ba Ama-ušumgal-an-na-ra mu-un-ši-bar-ra-gim. He points out that gim is construed with the entire phrase, which is regarded as a noun, and the whole phrase has then the force of an adverbial clause. This construction is so far unique. There seems to be a few misprints in the rendering, namely, Col. I, l. 21, ni should be ni, and gim should be gin; Col. I, l. 32 should have “Unto the inhabitants of the city,” likewise in l. 34.

The next text W.-B. 160 is a “Hymn to Enlil-bani,” the eleventh king of the Isin dynasty. The tablet is dated more than a century after the reign of the king. The next is a “Hymn and Prayer to the Mother Goddess for Succor from Demons.” The end of the poem contains a remarkable address to the grain goddess Nidaba, as Innini, in which seventeen of her temples are mentioned. In Col. III, l. 7, “upon” should read “at.” Col. III, l. 25 d. Nin-tu-ra-ta proves that the mother goddess, commonly read Nintud, is to be read Nintur.

The next text, W.-B. 2, “Record of the erection of a Temple to Ninegal by the Wife of Rim-Sin,” has a partial duplicate in Berlin. This new text proves that the name Nin-egal means “queen of the great house,” an indication of an underworld deity. There then follow nine other texts transliterated and translated. Some of them are of great importance. Thus, W.-B. 9 contains a list of gods, the original of a copy published in KAV, Nr. 65; W.-B. contains an account of the consultation of the wise men and the search for the ancient foundation of Naram-Sim; W.-B. 1922, 190, contains the only historical text recovered from the reign of Ašureṭililāni, son and successor of Ašurbanipal, which was written
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in Babylonia; W.-B. 186 is a Hymn to Nidaba, and seems to assume that the earth had been created ages before the gods created mankind. The last text herein translated is from a Prism belonging to Mr. E. S. David, and is a "Liturgy of the Cult of Kēš," a place which was either a part of Erech, or in the vicinity of Erech. The goddess worshipped there was Aruru, another name for Ninharsag. The Tammuz of Kēš seems to have been d. Lil. The Liturgy belongs to the same cycle as those of Tammuz and Ištar.

The texts are autographed in Dr. Langdon's characteristically clear and accurate manner.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


Perhaps the finest work which has ever been written on the subject of Ancient History is now before us in its first volume which deals with Egypt and Babylonia previous to 1580 B.C. It is published by the Cambridge Press, which is a guarantee of mechanical excellence; it is edited by Bury, Cook and Adcock, which is a guarantee of its scholarship. Specialists have been procured to write upon their own subjects in the realm of Ancient History. After a brief preface by the editors, the work begins. Professor Myers writes the first chapter on Primitive Man in Geological Time. This and the second chapter written by the same author, on Neolithic and Bronze Age Cultures, are thorough and reliable in every respect. The two chapters furnish an excellent background for the historic study. They are an excellent resume of the best that is known of these subjects in their bearing upon the Ancient East. Chapter four is written by Professor Macalister, the famous excavator of Gezer. Macalister writes in a most fascinating way on the subject of Exploration and Excavation, giving a brief resume of these matters with regard to Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Philistine, the Hittite lands, and the early Greek countries. Here and there the work seems to be abbreviated, but I suppose necessarily so on account of the nature of the volume. However, the subject of this chapter is treated with excellent proportion.

The chronology of the Ancient Nearer Orient is written by Dr. Cook. This is a very difficult subject, and Dr. Cook has made
an excellent resume. The Egyptian Chronology however, which has been done by Dr. Hall, is not as clearly put as Cook's work on Mesopotamia and the Old Testament. Mr. Wace does the work for prehistoric Greece. Cook also writes Chapter 5 on the Semites, which is exceptionally done, but where one misses a reference to the recent work of Clay on the original home of the Hebrews. It is however unfortunate that he refers to the religion of Ikhnaton as a "remarkable monotheism." It seems that the more deeply men study the religious reformation of Ikhnaton and the religion of the previous period, the more one realizes how far from Monotheism in the ordinarily accepted sense of that term, the religion of Ikhnaton was. In spite of the fact that many of Clay's theories may not be acceptable at the present time, his work should have been mentioned with some detail.

Professor Peet writes very clearly on the Predynastic Period in Egypt, and Dr. Hall treats of the union of Egypt and the Old Kingdom as well as of the Middle Kingdom and of the Hyksos Conquest. Dr. Hall quotes with approval what Josephus has to say about the period of the Exodus, and thinks that the expulsion of the Semites in the reign of Ahmose is the original of the biblical story. It is interesting to note how often Dr. Hall, as well as other students of the Orient, prefers the slightest extra-biblical evidence to the most detailed biblical information.

Peet contributes an interesting discussion of Life and Thought in Egypt under the Old and Middle Kingdoms. He seems, however, much carried away by Breasted's theory of an Egyptian messianism in spite of what Gardiner has written about this. The messianism of the Admonitions is as far from the messianism of the Hebrew prophets as the North Pole is from the South! It is strange to see Peet, who is otherwise so sane in his judgments, make the statement he does about messianism on page 346. The same is true of what he has to say about Egyptian Ethics on pages 347 and following.

The next three chapters are written by Langdon, viz: Early Babylonia and its Cities, the Dynasties of Akkad and Lagash, and the Sumerian Revival. These three chapters are done with Langdon's characteristic care and learning. He, however, seems to me to over-emphasize the religious side of things in a book on history, although most students will be glad of that over-emphasis.
He stresses the belief that 3200 B.C. may be regarded as the first approximately fixed date in Sumero-Babylonian history. This is interesting in view of what has been written upon Mesopotamian Chronology. Langdon’s chapters are full of most valuable philological notes. Of course he makes many statements which are to some extent questionable, such as, for instance, on page 384, when he says that according to the old Sumerian belief “each individual was protected by a god and a goddess who were ever present about him.”

The next three chapters are written by Thompson of Oxford, viz: Isin, Larsa, and Babylon, the Golden Age of Hammurabi, and the Kassite Conquest. Thompson always writes in an instructive fashion and with great accuracy. His last chapter is interesting, as it forms a prelude to the Amarna Age about which he has some interesting things to say.

An informing chapter, systematically written on the Art of Early Egypt and Babylonia is contributed by Dr. Hall, and the last chapter is written by Mr. Wace called Early Aegean Civilization. The whole is supplied with full and excellent bibliographies, which of course may be criticized in some respect for certain important omissions, but that is to be expected in a work of this kind. Then comes a most useful synchronistic table which is followed by a comparative table of principal sequences, and then there is given a list of Egyptian Kings of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, with a list of Kings and Patesis of Babylonia. The whole is concluded with a detailed General Index.

It goes without saying that this book is indispensable to every student of Ancient History, not only that, but it will be found of the greatest service by all Nearer Oriental scholars, and we eagerly look forward to the second volume in this great work. No scholar and no student of the Orient, and no important Library can be without this work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a monumental work, written by a man, who has prepared himself for this particular piece of work by years of toil, and by many special monographs on different phases of Assyrian history. One takes up this work with a feeling of confidence in
the guide who is to take us through the intricacies of Assyrian history. Nor during the journey are we ever disappointed, for Professor Olmstead knows his ground well.

The book is a difficult one to review, or rather, to criticize, for Olmstead has scrutinized every statement he has made, and whenever his statements are questionable, they, as a rule, turn out to be as authoritative as can possibly be made in our present state of knowledge.

Professor Olmstead has done his utmost to make his work as attractive as possible; indeed, for some reason or other it seems more difficult to make Assyrian history interesting, than any other Oriental history. Accordingly, his chapter headings are attractive. Such, for example, are: "At Home in the Desert," "The Winning of the Sown," "Dark Centuries," "In the Palace of the King," "Rusash of Haldia" and "Golden Midas," "Purple Patches of a Historian," "Egypt at Last," "Heirs of the Ages," "The Assyrian Wolf."

In the first twenty-seven chapters the political history of Assyria is traced with the greatest detail and accuracy, abundant use being made of Old Testament material wherever necessary. In fact, there often seems to be a superabundance of quotations from Hebrew sources in comparison with native Assyrian inscriptions. Full account is taken of international relationships. From about chapter forty, onward, emphasis is placed upon social, commercial, artistic, literary and religious elements in Assyrian civilization. In fact this aspect of the book seems rather out of proportion for a book on history. However, it adds a sense of completeness to the whole, and affords an opportunity for tracing historical implications.

The volume is beautifully, even sumptously printed. One is reminded of Breasted's *History of Egypt*, issued by the same publishers. Indeed, Olmstead's book is equally, if not more handsome than Breasted's. Nor, I think, has this escaped the mind of the author. It might otherwise have been better for the work, for one feels that here and there the author is striving for just that style which so clearly characterizes Breasted's book, namely, aptness of expression and originality of phraseology. Breasted is a master at this. Olmstead is not, and should have adhered more closely to his own rather matter-of-fact style. This attempt on Olmstead's part is doubly unfortunate, not only because his natural style is
entirely different from Breasted’s, but also because his own style is often so wretched. This is particularly true of his Preface, which must have been written in a great hurry. His style is ambiguous in the extreme. Read, for example, the last sentence in his third paragraph, or any part of page VIII. How clumsy the following sentences are: “We trace the spectacular rise of Haldia where a generation ago thought only of a savage Armenia” (p. VIII), “or in the discovery of a new plant, the tree wool men shred for garments” (p. IX), “If often we can only confess our ignorance and our hope for future information, in others results of first-class value have been secured” (p. XI), etc. etc. throughout the book! The difficulty seems to be often due to the author’s objection to the use of the relative pronoun. I hope that this does not seem too ungenerous, for the reader’s pleasure depends upon the clearness with which the author expresses himself.

A future edition, of which I hope there will be far more than one, ought to remedy these faults.

On the whole Olmstead has well documented his work. There are, however, some places where one might expect further reference; such, for example, is, p. 54, where a reference to the present controversy about Magan and Meluhha might be expected. Here and there one finds an indefinite statement, such, for example, as “the Early Empire” on page 95, for, presumably, the “Old Kingdom,” nor, would one call “Baal Melkart,” a Phoenician deity, a “patron saint.” The author’s statement about a “pure Monotheism” reminds us of Breasted’s enthusiasm for Ikhnaton’s Monotheism, but without nearly the same amount of reason or evidence. The phrase, “trust in Nabu, trust not in any other God,” said by an Assyrian, convinces very few of Assyrian Monotheism. Again, is “Soothsayer, run back home to Judah” (p. 170) an accurate interpretation of what Amaziah did say? Misspellings are very rare, though there are some, such as “basilicar,” p. 499, for “basicalia;” nor are barbarisms lacking, such as “As he leaves over the pages” (p. 646) an unauthorized translation of a German usage.

One almost feels ashamed to note such shortcomings as the above, in view of the sense of gratitude due the author for this great work. I want to repeat that, at the present stage of our knowledge of Assyrian history, this book is by far the best, most
accurate, and most complete work we have. It is indispensable to all students of ancient history, as well as to all Assyriologists. It will remain the standard history for a long time, and it should have, as it will, the greatest circulation.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is the last word on the Babylonian Epic of Creation. At last we have this great Epic in an almost complete form, and now translated with scholarly and brilliant comments by the Professor of Assyriology in Oxford University. Dr. Langdon writes a full and critical introduction to the great Epic, in which, among other things, he points out that the texts in the Ashurbanipal edition were derived directly from Babylonian sources. The present text of book 6, is almost entirely from the Aṣṣur text, but all copies in both South and North were ultimately derived from the copies of the Library of Esagila, the Temple of Marduk in Babylon.

Dr. Langdon briefly traces the history of the editions of the Epic of Creation, mentioning the more important works. He justly lays emphasis upon the importance of Ebeling’s work, and shows how the texts published by that scholar contributed to the restoration of book 1, and book 6, but unfortunately, as he points out, the astronomical form contained in book 5 receives no aid from Aṣṣur. Book 5 is now the only incomplete portion of the seven books. He goes on to show that the Epic was undoubtedly written in the period of the first Babylonian Dynasty, and gives his reasons for this assertion. Originally the Epic contained only six books, the hymn of the names of Marduk which now forms book 7, probably existed as an independent poem and was finally attached to the Epic at a late period. It disagrees with the poem in many points. The author then gives a full analysis of the contents of the book, showing that it closed with a scene based upon the Babylonian celebration of the New Year’s Festival, which was held during the first eleven days of Nisan, or at the spring equinox, when the gods of all Babylonia came up to Babylon in their sacred boats to assemble in the Hall of Fates in Esagila; that is, the poem is in reality a ritualistic creation based upon an older
Sumerian myth. Dr. Langdon then goes on to answer the following two questions: What was the nature of the old Sumerian myth, and, what was the meaning of the New Year Festival, which inspired the poem? He shows that the Epic is a solar myth and intimately connected with the spring sun, whose return from the region of darkness was celebrated by a long festival at the beginning of the year. He then describes the ritual of this festival. Dr. Langdon refers to Zimmern’s work, which brings this festival into close conjunction with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. But Dr. Langdon wisely refuses to go into a discussion of this matter, for he realizes, I think, that much which Zimmern has said is rather premature, although there will be much more said on the subject by competent theologians in the future. He then gives a transcription and translation of this important text which was published by Zimmern, with full discussion and notes. A careful reading of this translation with its analysis, shows how imaginary much of Zimmern’s interpretation is.

Then come the transliteration and translation of the Epic itself, with full grammatical, historical, religious, and critical notes. Nowhere is there to be found such an abundance of critical material on the Epic of Creation as in this book. One needs only to refer to Langdon’s note on the word manzazu covering pages 149—151. It is manifest that Langdon has expended a great deal of time upon the study of these astronomical terms, and has placed all students of the Epic under the greatest obligation to him. The book ends with a full index. No student of Babylonian religion can possibly do without this splendid piece of work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


M. Jean has herein added to the splendid work already done by LeGrain and Contenau in furnishing material for a reconstruction of the civilization of ancient Sumer and Akkad. The 224 tablets published in this book form part of a collection in the possession of M. Jean himself. Out of these 176 belong to the Second Dynasty of Ur, 18 to the Dynasty of Larsa, and 24 to the First Dynasty of Babylon. A special point is made of the proper names contained in these texts.
A full and informing introduction lays before us the chief information gleaned from these texts. First, the proper names are listed—just as the Sumerian and Akkadians themselves did—with historical, religious, and critical notes and deductions. Then the objects in wood are studied with similar care and detail; and after that the metals come in for scientific treatment; and on pages 60—61 interesting conclusions are tabulated. The texts are finally given in partial transliteration and translation, and at last come the autographed textes themselves.

It cannot be too emphatically stated that these texts, though individually of not profound importance, are collectively indispensable to a reconstruction and co-ordination of the civilization and culture of the Ancient Orient. M. Jean has made a most worthy contribution to this end. No library of Oriental books and no first-class student of ancient history and civilization can be without these texts and M. Jean's study of them.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

Der Schicksalsglaube bei den Babylonern. Von Chr. Fichtner-Jeremias. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922, pp. 64. 90 cents.

This interesting little book begins with a thorough study of the word Šimtu, "destiny," and its synonyms. Then follows the theological discussion. The gods are the lords of destiny—destiny is an expression of their will. However, as a rule one particular deity is considered the determiner of destiny, and that usually is the god of heaven, although each locality has its own summus deus. Then the author gives a list of those Babylonian gods who have been considered gods of destiny. The chief are: Anu, Ningirsu, Bau, Ninâ, Ninḫursag, Ištar, Enlil, Ea, Ninlil, Šamaš, Sin, Nergal, Mammetu, Namtar (the personification of destiny), Marduk, Ašur, Nabû, &c.

A section is devoted to the tablets of destiny (duppi ilâni) and one to the "word of destiny" (NAM). Then other interesting aspects of destiny are considered. The second half of the book deals with "destiny and man," where many interesting observations are made, in the matter of the determination of destiny, and also of the passive idea of destiny in the lives of men—the relationship between destiny and pessimism, destiny and punish-
ment for sin, destiny as good, and the relationship between destiny and death. The book is highly suggestive and stimulating.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

Bagdad, Babylon, Ninive. Von Sven Hedin. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1923, pp. 410. $ 3.06; Halbpergament geb. $ 3.60.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1918, and a second edition has been called for. It is difficult to imagine what appeal the volume makes now that most of its ideals are frustrated. It is a glorification of the work of the Turks in Mesopotamia. Nevertheless, it makes interesting reading, especially so to students of the Orient. It begins with a general discussion of the Turks in the World War, then in a systematic way it takes us down through Asia Minor and Mesopotamia to Bagdad. Many interesting places are visited, and much ancient history and many modern customs are passed in review. There is a great deal that will be found of interest to the student of archaeology. The book is well illustrated and has a good map. The author writes well, and the story is told in a fascinating way.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is the sixth volume of this great work, indispensable to Assyriologist as well as to the student of ancient law. Those who know the first five volumes realize the scientific character of this work, and what a source of information it is! It is to be regretted that Kohler is no longer with us, but his place has been taken by Koschaker whose name is a guarantee of the continuation of the scientific character of the work. Of course Ungnad carries on his specific work on the linguistic side of the laws.

Most of the material in this volume comes from South Babylonia and represents the period of the dynasties of Isin, Larsa, Babylon and Kish. The work is divided in the same way as previous volumes, and the translation is given with the same care, including a concordance of the texts at the end. The legal notes that used to be appended to the previous volumes are to be found scattered throughout the work in connection with the various texts. This sixth volume now makes up 1993 translated texts in this series.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

With an introduction by Professor Langdon and illustrations and maps, this is a very important book on a topographical examination of the region between the ancient capital of Babylonia and Opis, where besides the sites of Babylonia and Opis, lie those of Kish and Agade, the author identifies Opis with the ruins opposite the present junction of the River Adhaim with the Tigris, and he likewise proves the location of Nimrod's Dam, and the point where Nebuchadnezzar's Median Wall joined the Tigris.

In a series of appendices the author prints a transcription of all available ancient literature upon the points which he discusses. There are twenty of these appendices, which form a veritable sourcebook on his subject.

Mr. Lane has spared no pains in his search for evidence in establishing his points, and his personal examination of the topographical features of the area under consideration make the work of first-rate value to all students of the archaeology and history of Mesopotamia. No student of Babylonian history and civilization can be without this book.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is part of Volume 5 of the Yale Oriental Series—Researches, in which the author assembles, transliterates, and translates a series of texts to show that the Širkūtu was an order of male and female persons dedicated to various Babylonian deities, especially Marduk, Nabû, Bēl, Shamash, Nergal, and Ishtar. They were marked with a star, and their duties seemed to be connected with the routine of temple activities, and were in special quarters connected with the temple. While most of the Širkūtu were obliged to do menial work, some of them occupied high social and commercial positions. Dougherty compares them to the Nethînîm of the Old Testament.

The author has contributed an excellent series of observations on religious practices to the study of Babylonian religion.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

This paper was read before the British Academy on July 11, 1923. In it Mr. Gadd has added a new fact to the chronology of the Ancient Orient, viz: that Nineveh fell, not in 606 B.C., but in 612. In the course of this paper Mr. Gadd proves his point with fulness of evidence, and with complete satisfaction.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


A new science is just appearing above the horizon, and the first scientific series devoted to a study of the Inscriptions of this new science, namely Hittitology, is beginning to appear. The series is called Hethitica and is edited by Dr. Frédéric Hrozný, and published by Paul Geuthner in Paris. No more able person could have been chosen for this editorial work, for Dr. Hrozný had done more than any other person towards the decipherment of the Hittite language. In this first part of the series Hrozný publishes the Hittite code of laws in transcription and translation. These laws were written down in the Hittite Cuneiform about 1350 B.C. For the Hittite this code takes the same place as the code of Hammurabi does for Babylonian.

The original text of the code was edited by Hrozný himself in the Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi in 1921. In this work Hrozný gives a critical transliteration and French translation of that text. A second volume is to be devoted to a detail commentary and a glossary.

The present work is done with the care and scholarship that we have learned to associate with Hrozný. There are full critical notes on every important point, and the text itself is given in photographic form so that the translator's readings may be checked up. This work will undoubtedly be the source of a good deal of detailed study in the next few years, especially in the matter of comparative law in the ancient Orient.

The Oriental world of scholarship is deeply indebted to Dr. Hrozný for this fine piece of work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


This little volume makes the first number of a new series of publications under the title Orient und Antike, edited by Berg-
straesser and Boll of the University of Heidelberg, and published by Carl Winter in Heidelberg. This is a detailed study especially of the geography of Asia Minor in the time of the Hittites. It is somewhat similar to the notes published by Garstang in the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, Supplementary Papers One. Dr. Götze furnishes a helpful map of that region in which it is to be noted that he identifies Alashia with Cyprus. This is perhaps the best that can be done at the present time.

There are five subjects which the author studies, namely Kizwadna, which he locates on the coast of the Black Sea; Das Obere Land, which is studied in detail, several places being identified that formerly were questionable; Arzawa on the northern coast of the Mediterranean, just north of Alashia; Die Gashgash-Länder which he places east of Arzawa. This little pamphlet is packed with important geographical and historical information.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The Hittite question has left the realm of guesswork and is now really scientific. Dr. Contenau gives us an excellent historical survey of the various problems (language, race, culture, art), then a bibliography which includes reviews of the books listed, and two indices. The work is very thorough and will be indispensable to all orientalists. We would add Vincent, La sépulture des patriarches Rev. Bibl. 1920, pp. 513—515, valuable for some references.

John A. Maynard


In this, the third number of volume sixteen of the Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Frank, the Assyriologist, has added one more attempt to those already made, especially by Sayce and Thompson, to decipher the Hittite inscriptions. Hrozný and others have been doing valiant work on the Cuneiform inscriptions in Hittite, but very little certainly prevails yet about the most difficult tasks of all, namely, to decipher the Hittite hieroglyphics.

This attempt has been systematically done, and I believe it has taken us a step nearer the final solution, although I do not think
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that the goal has been reached. That probably is too much to expect, before fuller bilinguals have been found.

After the attempt at decipherment, a list of geographical, divine, and personal names are given. Then there follows a discussion of the script and the language, and at the end the author gives a handy list of signs. No student of Hittite can be without this scientific piece of work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The collection of various manuscripts of the late Sir Marc Armand Ruffer into a volume "Studies in the Paleopathology of Ancient Egypt," edited by Roy L. Moodie and published by the University of Chicago Press, makes possible the delving into a vast fund of knowledge on these subjects. The amount of detailed laboratory work accomplished by this indefatigable worker commands respect, as do the results of this prolonged endeavor.

In the light of present theories of focal infection and of diet one cannot but attempt to trace a vicious circle. The studies of teeth, with the many illustrations indicate a practically universal state of mouth infection, with many extreme oral abscess conditions. The evidences of attrition are everywhere found so that, knowing the Egyptians to have been a grain-eating nation—almost to the exclusion of other types of diet—we are constrained to consider cause and effect in this regard.

Passing to the osseous studies we find almost universal arthritic lesions. Spondylitis or arthritic involvement of other articulations present in specimen after specimen. Here again we may jump at a logical conclusion and trace our circle from diet, through poor and infected teeth to the arthritic lesions which find their counterparts in the present day.

The detailed care with which lesions of the teeth have been noted and classified is particularly worthy of comment. The book presents facts that should be of great interest to the dental profession as well as the medical.

Longevity would seem to have been the exception and with the prevalence of arthritic lesions is hardly a source of wonder.

The chapter on the effects of consanguineous marriages presents facts quite at variance with the prevailing conception of such
unions. It would appear that, quite to the contrary from lay opinion, the children of such marriages were normal or quite above normal in intelligence and physique.

Altogether this series of studies presents a wealth of interest not only for physician, dentist and student of anthropology, but for the lay student as well.

FREDERICK F. MOLT


In these two brief articles Dr. Blackman has packed a mass of reliable and informing knowledge about this interesting phase of Egyptian worship. On page 3 he gives an excellent outline of the Egyptian liturgy. He shows in the second part of his article how naturally the Sun Cult of the reign of Ikhnaton grew out of the religion of the previous period. He also shows that the so-called "Monotheism" of Ikhnaton is merely a step onward from that of the previous period. He is inclined to think that Ikhnaton was an older man, than one usually thinks, when he came to the throne, and that he was quite capable of formulating his own peculiar religious ideas himself. Dr. Blackman shows with considerable success, that Ikhnaton's religion consisted in a worship of the material sun and not of a mysterious power incorporated in it, but I do not think that he has succeeded in showing that the religion of Ikhnaton can be truly called Monotheistic. Ikhnaton recognized Ra and allowed himself to be represented as a divine being.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


This is the latest volume in the Biblical and Oriental Series, edited by Samuel A. B. Mercer. The author places the Tutankhamen discoveries in their proper setting. So much has appeared in the dailies and magazines that any clear statement is of great value to us. The author begins with the story of the discovery, often told, but never so clearly; he then shows Tutankhamen's place in Egyptian history, translates the Inscriptions of his reign, shows what connection there is between Tutankhamen and the Bible. The following chapters give us a survey of Egyptology and of Egyptian culture and religion, followed by a glossary of technical
Egyptian terms. This little book deserves to be widely read. It is based on a thorough knowledge of the subject. How few writers remember to give credit (as Mercer does p. 55) to the great Arabist Silvestre de Sacy who as early as 1802, identified several demotic letters on the Rosetta Stone. He, and not Thomas Young, is the forerunner of Champollion. We wish Mercer had made more use in this book of his own excellent article on Ikhnaton in JSOR 3. 70—80 with its healthy iconoclasm, but of course, he had so much to say that he is to be congratulated on knowing when to stop. The illustrations in this book are by Dr. O. E. Watson and are really very good. We note that Mercer believes there was a triple Exodus, the third one taking place under Merneptah. The reviewer is not convinced but this is not the place to discuss the point.

John A. Maynard


Sir Wallis Budge has brought together in this Second Edition, revised and enlarged the three volumes of his English translation of the Chapters and Hymns of the Theban Recension of the Book of the Dead. It is published with twenty-two excellent plates, and four hundred and twenty vignettes. This is the second impression of the second edition which appeared in 1909. There are thus in this one volume the contents of three previous volumes.

There are over two hundred pages of Introductory matter of the greatest interest. Sir Wallis gives in a most interesting way, a history of the Book of the Dead, an account of Osiris, and discusses the question of Resurrection, Immortality, &c, in Egyptian religion. Then there follows a series of hymns from different papyri. This is all in the Introduction. Then follows the translation made with the utmost care, and with excellent illustrations and explanatory notes. The book is indispensable for all general students of Egyptian religion, and it deserves a very large circulation.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


After a brief introduction containing a short biography of Maspero, Cordier has brought together in chronological order a list of all
the books, articles, and reviews, ever written by Maspero, extending from 1867 to 1917 inclusive. Then he gives a full list of Volumes of Maspero's *Etudes de Mythologie et d'Archaeologie Egyptiennes* with contents. This is followed by biographies and notes about Maspero. There is a full index as well as the good portrait of the great Egyptologist. The *Bibliographie* will be found very useful.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The Twelfth volume of Researches in the *Yale Oriental Series* comprises a series of lectures on Biblical Archaeology delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, and bears the sub-title *Hebrew Legends in Babylonia and Israel,* a title which indicates the author's special thesis, namely, that the source of the early narratives in Genesis and of much else in the Old Testament is Amorite.

Professor Clay began to propound this new and startling theory as early as 1908 in a course of lectures which he delivered at the Episcopal Theological School in Virginia, and which he published under the title *Amurru the Home of the Northern Semites, a study showing that the religion and culture of Israel are not of Babylonian Origin.* During the fifteen years since the publication of this volume in 1908, Dr. Clay seems to have found abundant evidence to substantiate his position, and this he presents in the volume under review, attempting herein to bring the issue to a conclusion and to establish his contention.

In a series of introductory remarks, which should be read with the greatest of care, the author tells the circumstances under which he discovered that the name of a god, written ideographically KUR-GAL in cuneiform was scratched in Aramaic as 'vr. In 'wr Dr. Clay saw 'Ur (In Ur of the Chaldees) and held it to be the same as Amur(ru). This was the first step in the long way towards the Amurru thesis. Not long afterwards others confirmed this equation, and thus it was established that the Aramaic writing showed that Amurru was also read Uru or Uru.

The next step on the way was made when Clay discovered that the name of the god written ideographically Nin-IB was scratched on a clay tablet in Aramaic characters as 'nwšt, which he read
En-Mashtu = En-Martu, and regarded it as Amorite. This equation has been disputed, but Clay has good reasons to hold to it.

A few years later Professor Clay discovered the reading of the second part of Nin-IB to be Urta, and Urta = Wartu = Martu. Thus Nin-Urta, which he thinks was read En-Urta, was originally the consort of the Amorite Uru, and in time became masculinized to Nin-Urta.

His next step was to show that the Nisín Dynasty (2357—2154 B.C.) was Amorite, for the name of the founder was compounded with Uru, namely, Ishbi-Urra. He also conjectured that for two milleniums prior to the time of Hammurabi, Western Semites at times were able to conquer Babylonia. In conclusion, he inferred that it ought to follow that a civilization existed in Amurru, which could have produced myths and legends.

In 1909 Clay published his book entitled *Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites*, which is now well known. Since the appearance of that book he has steadily fortified his thesis. In 1919 came *The Empire of the Amorites*, in which he attempts to reconstruct two or more milleniums of history for Amurru prior to 2000 B.C., and this was supported in his next book *A Hebrew Duluge Story in Cuneiform and Other Epic Fragments in the Pierpont Morgan Library*.

The introductory remarks then proceed to show how on the above basis, the famous Zu-bird, the shepherd Marad, Tammuz and Gilgamesh were all Amorite; that the Semites were in Syria as early as 4500 B.C.; and that the Semitic Babylonians came from Amurru.

After these introductory remarks, Professor Clay states his four-fold argument, namely, (1) that in respect to Amurru, Babylonia, and Egypt, migrations and invasions were mainly from and not to Amurru. As a result, external influences upon the culture of Amurru were very little, while Amorite influences outside its own border was very great; (2) that a comparison between the climatic conditions in Amurru and those in Babylonia points to the former as the original source of the Creation and Deluge stories; (3) that the names of deities and persons found in the texts involved, are regarded as pointing clearly to Amorite priority; and (4) that the language and literature are consistent with the theory that the civilization of Amurru is older than that of either Egypt or Baby-
lonia, the Babylonian language being a broken down Amorite language which in all periods, due to migrations, was influenced by the mother tongue.

The rest of the book is occupied in supporting the author's thesis, by examining the stories of the Creation and the Fall, the Sabbath, the list of Antediluvian patriarchs, the Deluge Story and the legend of the Tower of Babel. These chapters must be read in detail in order to follow the numerous penetrating interpretations which Professor Clay has to offer. Granted Amurru as the center of a great culture and civilization in antiquity, Clay makes out a very strong case for the Western origin of these Biblical stories and legends.

In an appendix Clay gives a translation of the Enuma Eliš as "the Amorite story of the Creation," of a Bilingual Babylonian Story of Creation, of the Phoenician Cosmogony, of the Story of Creation ascribed to Oannes by Berossus, and of Damascus on the Theogony of the Babylonians. After an Index, far too brief for this important work, comes an Addenda, in which the Author with considerable success, defends, against Luckenbill, the reading of certain signs in his text published in A Hebrew Deluge Story.

Probably the weakest link in Dr. Clay's chain of argument will be found to be the inference that a vast civilization existed in Amurru which actually produced great myths and legends. Personally, I believe that the author's linguistic arguments are in the present state of our knowledge, irrefutable. This may, of course, be different with further information. I believe also, that, for example, our Biblical Story of Creation is not in any real sense Babylonian, and that there was an advanced civilization in Syria long before 2000 B.C. But whether Babylonian culture had so much of its origin in the west as Professor Clay wishes us to believe, is not as clear. It is quite possible that with fuller knowledge, the whole of Clay's argument will be substantiated, but at present, I think, he tries to prove too much. Of course I am convinced that no one knows the field better than Clay, and his special knowledge furnishes him with a certain instinctive feeling in the matter which others may not yet be able to feel. Moreover he is a pioneer along the line, and a certain boldness and tendency to over-emphasis may well be pardoned, but I am convinced that there is more to be said in favor of the Amurru thesis than most
of us would have dreamed of in 1909. This masterly work cannot be brushed aside. In the interests of truth its arguments must be reckoned with. Every paragraph of the book demands the closest study.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is a doctor’s dissertation, written under the direction of Professor Volz of Tübingen. It is a systematic piece of work, divided into three main sections, “Die Volksreligion als Grundlage der individuellen Religion,” “Die Sicherung der eigenen Persönlichkeit,” and “Des Menschen Hingabe an die Gottheit.”

The author shows the dependence of both religions upon the idea of the power of the gods, and the fundamental character of sin in both. His research is reliably done, and his conclusions are dependable. He emphasizes the strong egotistical motive in both religions, and, shows how this is related to an emphasis upon the idea of future life.

He rightly emphasizes the fact that the difference between the religion of Israel and that of Babylonia consists not in the idea of God, but in the consciousness of God. The dissertation is a fine piece of work.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


There has not appeared a more important Festschrift for a long time than this one edited by Hans Schmidt in honour of Gunkel. There are two parts, the first dealing with matters related to the religion and literature of the Old Testament, and the second dealing in the same way with the New Testament.

A Review of such a book as this can do little else than indicate the nature of the contributions. The first part consists of ten fine monographs. It is difficult to say which are the most interesting. Gressman begins the book with a study of the “Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Sage,” in which, among other things, he makes and interesting comparison between the Joseph and the Achikar stories. This is followed by Eissfeldt’s study of the
“Stammessage und Novelle in den Geschichten von Jacob und von seinen Söhnen,” in which an excellent literary analysis is presented. The third article is by Schmidt himself, called “Mose und der Dekalog,” in which he makes some interesting points about the Ark, which he thinks was a chest and not a throne. Then follows an article by Baumgartner, called “Ein Kapitel vom hebräischen Erzählungsstil;” one by Hölscher, “Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion,” in which he objects to the belief that Josiah put a wholesale end to the high-places; one by Balla, called “Das Problem des Leides in der Geschichte der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion,” in which he emphasizes the general Hebrew and Jewish attitude towards this problem, namely, that it is beyond man’s comprehension. Haller has written well on “Die Kyros-Lieder Deuterojesaias,” thinking they were written in the military camp of Cyrus. Mowinckel contributes a study on the style of the “Vorderasiatischen Königs- und Fürsteninschriften;” and Volz writes on “Der Heilige Geist in den Gathas des Sarathuschtra.” Kahle studies “Die Totenklage im heutigen Ägypten,” and at the end of the first part is an excellent index.


The Festschrift is unusual in that the collaborators work according to a well-arranged scheme. The work is a notable contribution to Old and New Testament studies, for every writer is an expert.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


To write a review of this book would be to write another commentary on the Old Testament. The author has handled this great subject with much tact. He has not been swayed by any
theory of origins or derivatives, but has studied the Old Testament in the light of the Ancient Orient, with a view to illuminating the former. In this he has been most successful. There is no book where more interesting material can be found by students of the Old Testament. The biblical text is followed step by step in the light of Oriental knowledge. Of course, the book is not final in any sense. In fact, already its reproduction of the Babylonian Creation Epic must be revised in the light of the new texts. But this is as it should be in a science like Assyriology, which is still in its youth, if not in its infancy.

The author shows his independence of thought and investigation by suggesting that the identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi must be abandoned, and by saying that Shinar is not Babylonia, and that the identification of Elassar with Larsa is uncertain. We need more of this caution, yet without undue scepticism.

There are lacunae here and there which we wish might have received a temporary filling, such, for example, as Gen. 49: 10, which receives no attention.

Dr. Jirku is thoroughly up to date. Already he has digested the Hittite Code, and in a well-arranged table has compared it with the Hebrew and other codes. Yet he must now change his date of the fall of Nineveh from 606 to 612 b. c.

These are merely a few points about a book packed with interesting material.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Next to the work of Gesenius this splendid book by Father Joüon is the best Hebrew Grammar that I know of. It is not only splendidly printed in clear black type, well spaced and well arranged, but it is also written with the greatest of care and learning. After a brief preface the author launches into a definition of Hebrew grammar, and an attempt to place Hebrew in its proper position in relationship to other Semitic languages. He then traces a history of Hebrew grammar, mentioning the great works published in recent years. The rest of the book is written in an orderly and systematic way, the first part being devoted to the script and phonetics, the second part to morphology, in which excellent tables are given; and the third part to a thorough syntax
REVIEWS

of the language. In a separate book the Paradigms are beautifully spaced and printed, and a full index of words and subjects discussed, with texts, are given.

To the mind of the reviewer, this is not a book with which to begin learning the Hebrew language. For that purpose there are simpler and smaller books, but this is a book for the advanced student who wishes to make a thorough study of the form and syntax of the Hebrew language, and for this purpose no other book is better, for not only are the rules given with great detail and exactness, but every point established by the author is abundantly illustrated.

This grammar should attract the attention not only of French students but of English as well, because of its conciseness, its clearness, and its fullness. The book is such an excellent piece of work that the reviewer expresses the wish that it may be some day translated into English.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Professor Schmidt has herein issued a second enlarged and improved edition of his great work Die großen Propheten. The first edition was published just after the war broke out in 1914. During the war the author was in military service, and at the end of that period it soon became clear that a second edition of his book was called for. This was apparent as early as 1918 while Schmidt was a prisoner in the hands of the English. This new edition is no mere reprint but contains a great deal of new material. The divisions are about the same as before. In the introduction there is to be found an excellent resume of Oriental history in the time of the great prophets. After that there follows a penetrating study in the history of Israel and Judah in the time of Josiah. Then come the books of Isaiah and Micah, followed by a history of Judah in the time of Manasseh and Amon. Then the prophecies of Zephaniah and Nahum, and the history of Israel in the time of King Josiah with the study of the law book of the same reign. Then follows a treatment of the prophet Jeremiah with a history of Judah up to the time of the death of Jehoiakim. Then comes a continuation of the prophecy of Jeremiah with a history of
REVIEWS

Judah in the time of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah. The prophet Ezekiel follows Jeremiah, and after that the Lamentations and the book Jonah. Students of the first edition will remember the characteristics of this great work, and it will undoubtedly not be long before another edition is called for.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


The twenty-second series of Croall lectures were delivered by the Regius Professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages in St. Mary’s College, University of St. Andrews. In them Dr. Kay has given us a simple and interesting sketch of Hebrew Religion from its earliest stages down to the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. He has described Judaism, Christianity and Islam with many touches of real insight into the religious phenomena of these religions, and perhaps the most interesting chapter of all is his last chapter in which he describes the heritage and obligations of Semitic religion in general.

In a summary as brief as this must necessarily be, there are many places where one would not necessarily agree with the author. I am inclined to think that on page 36 he has not by any means done justice to the religions of Egypt and Babylon, nor does he exhibit the necessary chronological care in a work of this kind in the matter of the relationship between Ezra and Nehemiah (p. 54). He does not show himself abreast of the best of recent thought on the matter of the origin of the various Semitic peoples, such, for example, as the Aramaens, but perhaps such points should not be over-emphasized in a work of this compass, and where the author has been so successful in putting into popular and reliable fashion the main religious ideas and conceptions of the Semitic peoples. The work is a worthy contribution to the subject under consideration.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER


This beautifully illustrated and intelligently written book well deserves the reputation which it has already won among general students of the Bible. The author has aimed at simplicity and brevity in his story of Israel and of Israel’s writings and in this
he has been pre-eminently successful. He has made the old story of Israel's history and religion live anew. The titles of his chapters indicate to some extent the vividness of the author's descriptions; thus the first chapter is called Camels and Tents. Chapter 8 is entitled The Divine Right of Kings; Chapter 10, To Your Tents, Oh Israel; Chapter 13, Prepare to meet thy God; Chapter 17, The Just shall live by his Faith; Chapter 22, The First Churchmen; Chapter 27, The Kingdom of Heaven. The author's bibliographical references are usually helpful and often comparatively complete. It is very strange that in discussing the book of Job he mentions C. J. Ball's The Book of Job, which, while a magnificent work, is far too technical for general readers. He omits such splendid works as those of Jastrow and Buttenwieser. On page 309, the Destruction of Nineveh, should now be given as 612 instead of 606, and on page 310, the question of the chronological relationship between Ezra and Nehemiah should be indicated. The book is a splendid contribution to an attempt to bring the Old Testament with all its fascination, to the attention of the public. It deserves as it is receiving, the widest possible circulation.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


Dr. Sulzberger has conducted an interesting and important investigation in the Status of Labor in Ancient Israel. He has collected a mass of evidence to show that the _ger_ were a large class, that they were the conquering inhabitants of Palestine, and that the majority of them had remained in the land as feudal employees of the conquerors. He goes on to show that those so settled were called _toshabim ger toshab_, or _ger we-toshab_. He also shows that the minority not so settled, became _sekarim_ or wage earners.

He shows how that at the final conquest of Canaan the Hebrews took the land of the Canaanites and divided it among themselves, retaining the previous inhabitants as workingmen. Most of these remained settled in the land as peasants and became the _toshabim_, while those who were not so settled worked for a daily wage as _sekarim_, and the general term applied to both classes was _ger_. When one of these _gerim_ died his family were not driven out of their homes, but remained on the land and worked on it.
He further shows how the word ger had undergone curious transformations. At first, for many centuries, it simply meant stranger. After the Hebrew conquest of Canaan it acquired the additional meaning of laborer, a meaning which it retained during the whole period covered by the biblical writings. This study by Dr. Sulzberger is one of the most thorough and convincing pieces of work which has appeared on the Bible for many a day. The conclusions reached are sometimes revolutionary, but he seems to have generally proved his point.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


The aim of this book by Dr. Hoschander seems to be to interpret the book of Esther from an historical point of view, and to show the historical origin of the Festival of Purim. The historical event on which the narrative of the Book of Esther is based is treated fully in the author’s sixth chapter, in which the nature of the danger recorded in the Book of Esther is described in full, the danger being the introduction of anthropomorphic images into the Zoroastrian religion. He continues a description of the reform of Zoroastrianism as the supreme religion of the Persian Empire, and how the reform effected the Jews, and the rise of the persecution which was dictated by the policy of the Persian empire with which the Jewish religious conceptions came into collision. Dr. Hoschander’s interpretation is original but seems to be based upon a thorough analysis of the history and religion of the times. It is a thorough and scholarly piece of work, and shows that it was in opposition to the supremacy of the worship of Anahita that the Jews were proved disloyal. The book deserves to be read by every student of the Old Testament. Samuel A. B. Mercer


Dr. Cowley has herein published a complete collection of all pre-Christian Aramaic papyri, many of which have never before appeared in English. Some of the documents are dated, and nearly all of them belong to the Fifth Century B.C.

The author begins with a list of books and articles on the subject, and then gives a table of the papyri. After an introduction
comes the real work of the book, namely: the texts with full grammatical and exegetical notes. The volume ends with an index of words and names.

Cowley’s object has been to establish the text and translation of each papyrus for further study. The documents are from various sources, of which Elephantine and Assuan are the most important. The most important perhaps are the Jewish Feast (No. 21) and the Petition to the Viceroy of India (Nos. 30—33).

The text will be found most useful as contemporary evidence in the study of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and will throw much light upon the everyday life in a Jewish community in the Diaspora, as well as elucidating many religious problems. For example, the Jews of the Egyptian Diaspora seem to have recognized four other gods besides Ya’u, that they knew nothing about the laws of a Central Sanctuary, that their religious practices were not at all like those of the Jews in Jerusalem, and that they did not seem to regard the Law of Moses as being of great importance.

Dr. Cowley promises a supplementary work on the grammar of these texts, comparing it with Biblical Aramaic. In this volume he includes the important Aramaic version of Ahikar and of the Behistun inscription. The introduction is a master-piece. In short, this book forms an epoch in Aramaic publications, and will make a most splendid text book for future students of the Aramaic language.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


A second edition of Rodriguez’s little handbook for students of Hebrew shows how successful the author has been in producing a really useful grammar. The book is divided into Grammar, Syntax, and Selections. It is brief and concise, very often too much so, as in the case of the verbal suffixes on pages 62—63. It is a typical European grammar, without exercises, except the selections at the end in which is excluded, rather unwisely, I believe, for beginners, the fifth chapter of Judges. Then there is a Spanish-Hebrew vocabulary, although there are no exercises on turning Spanish into Hebrew.

Samuel A. B. Mercer

As the author says in his preface to this book, the study of the history of costume is to-day an indispensable factor in the study of the history of civilization. This subject is even more important from a practical than from a theoretical and an intellectual point of view. Artists, craftsmen, modistes, theatrical managers, film directors are all eager for accurate knowledge of the costumes of all lands and of all ages. To the present date most works on the subject have been devoted almost exclusively to European costume and have paid little attention to that of the Orient. This book is therefore a very valuable contribution because it presents comprehensive information on Oriental costume in a direct, vivid, and practical manner. It includes the lands where Oriental garb is worn from Morocco to Japan, including among other countries Algeria, Sudan, Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Turkey, Asia Minor, Persia, Afghanistan, India, Tibet, Burma, Turkestan and China. The author has travelled far and observed carefully not only exhibits of costume in museums and private collections but also garments worn by natives of these countries at the present day. Although he admits that it is impossible to show an exhaustive representation of all of the clothing worn in all these places, he has attempted to pick out the characteristic forms which most commonly meet one's eye, and the definite types of garments belonging to Eastern lands.

The book contains 128 plates, each 9 by 11 3/4 inches, which reproduce the garments in exact colours. On each of these plates in most cases one garment only is represented. Trimmings, embroideries, and borders are enlarged and shown in actual tones so as to be easy to copy. The mode of fastening is also represented and this too is enlarged at one side of the plate whenever necessary. Frequently one side of a garment is turned back in front so as to disclose the method of lining and the appearance of the material on the under side. The plates give garments both for men and women: cloaks, coats, jackets, trousers, undergarments, mantles; sometimes even boots and caps for the costume are also illustrated.

One of the most important features of this book for the person who is copying the costume is the fact that the plates do not show them draped on figures, as do most of the earlier books on
the subject, but each piece is spread out quite flat so that it is a very simple matter to take a pattern from it. In cases where folds or gussets would cause difficulty to the copyist, a sketch is given showing seams and the method of joining. If a garment is very complicated several separate views of it are given. The scale is 1:10. A person who could not cut a pattern from these plates would be, I think, exceedingly stupid.

The text describes each of the costumes shown in the plates, telling to what country it belongs, its local name if possible, the material of which it is usually made, the colours preferred, the station in life of the person who wears it, and where the original may be found.

One mistake in date must be due, I think, to a typographical error. Page 13 of the text, No. 26, gives the description of a Coptic tunic which is dated as about “400 v. Chr.”, 400 B.C. This must be intended for 400 n. Chr. or 400 A.D. as a Coptic garment could not possibly be before Christ.

This book is certainly a valuable contribution to the study of costume.

Cornelia G. Harcum


This is an interesting study in the evolution of Oriental costume which although complete in itself may, as the author says, be used as a supplement to the preceding book by those who are especially interested in the theoretical side of costume. It is a comparative discussion of costumes in many parts of the world and traces the phases of their development from the simple shoulder cover with a hole for the head in the centre, the so-called poncho, from which many garments develop. The book deals more especially with the types of clothing which are mere draperies in which man wraps himself than the type of garment which has many seams.

There are 126 illustrations taken chiefly from representations on ancient monuments and showing the draped type of costume as worn on the human figure. An illustrated table on page 70 gives original types of garments and the forms that have developed from them.

The successive chapters deal with the development of the shoulder cover into the shirt, the further development of the shoulder cover
into a garment opened in front, the two pieced shoulder cover, the diagonal piece placed over the shoulders, the garment with a shoulder seam, the hip cover and its evolution, the travellers coat, trousers, various kinds of cloaks, the scarf or mantle, the Indian drapery, the collar or neckerchief, and jackets or vests.

Cornelia G. Harcum


The indefatigable adjunct keeper of the Museum in Brussels presents us in this pamphlet with an excellent and exhaustive study of Vestments in the Ancient Nearer East. It is a splendid addition to Reimpell's fine work which appeared in 1921. After a brief introduction the author notes the effects which climate had upon the kinds of garments used by the people of the Orient, and then he goes into much detail in his description of Babylonian, Assyrian, Syrian, and Hittite clothing. Chapter 2 is devoted to a description of these garments, and this is accompanied by illustrations which present a vivid picture of what Oriental clothing was. The author adds an excellent appendix of the names of Oriental clothing. The whole thesis is a splendid contribution to the subject under discussion.

Samuel A. B. Mercer


This is the twelfth volume of the series *Quellen der Religions-Geschichte* edited by the Commission on History of Religions at Goettingen, a series which bids fair to become at least as large as the *Sacred Book of the East* and to be of fundamental value. This volume gives us the first four Mandalas of the Rigveda (354 hymns). Two other volumes, which are nearly ready, will complete the translation, and also give indices, and an introduction. The editors of the series had already in 1913 given us a selection of Rigvedic hymns translated by Hillebrandt, which has been very well received. They are greatly to be commended for adding to this a translation of all the hymns, without disturbing the arrangement of the received text. Geldner's translation is a great improvement on the work of his predecessors; he has not toned down the naive greediness of the priests, nor spoiled the often crude literalness of
metaphors, as Max Mueller did so often. He is not afraid of question marks where other translators were less cautious. With each hymn he gives a few notes, telling us about the meter and strophic arrangement and sometimes the contents, and textual critical notes. These notes are sometimes meagre. We think that more of the symbolism of the hymn should be explained, because the mind of western readers does not always see what the metaphors really mean. This is especially true of Agni, Indra, and Maruts hymns. In places Geldner has been overcautious. Why not render barhis by „sacrificial grass?” The translator feels that he must give the name Suryas its bracketed translation as Sun God. Why does he not explain also other terms which are less familiar and whose meaning is fairly if not altogether certain as Aśvin, Rṣi, or even the mysterious word atrin (p. 40)? We know by experience that anyone reading these hymns aloud to a class needs to translate as many terms as possible into English—or German—as the case may be. Hymn No. 6 should clearly be entitled An Indra und die Marut. These criticisms are of course, observations or mere specks. The work of Geldner is excellent and will remain for many years the standard translation of the Vedas. We are looking forward to the second and especially the third volume with great expectation. It is sound pedagogy to give the introduction after the translation as Geldner is going to do.

John A. Maynard


Irrigation in India is written by one who, due to his position as Assistant Inspector-General of Irrigation for the official Triennial Review of Irrigation in India 1918—21, is well informed on the subject. In the first part, the author discusses the necessity for irrigation, the types of irrigation works, and the extent and growth of irrigation in India. In the second part, the History of State Irrigation in India is considered in some detail. He shows how by improvement of old indigenous works the British engineers conceived the idea of new and greater works; how, in spite of early failures, irrigation has been developed to pacify lawless tribes, to protect large areas from famine, to populate waste tracts, and in most cases actually to earn an income for the state as well as to
increase food production. Thus the "government works render over a hundred thousand square miles of precarious country, which otherwise would be in continual dread of famine, certain of their crops... In 1920—21 the value of the crops irrigated was no less than 156 millions exactly double the capital cost of the works." The discussion would have been made more valuable to the average reader if maps showing rainfall, topography and drainage, and the irrigation projects had been included.

FLORENCE WHITBECK.

Subject Index to Periodicals. London: The Library Association. Section 1, No. 1, of the year 1920 of this important catalogue has just appeared. It contains 639 entries on Classical, Oriental and Primitive Languages. These entries were obtained from an examination of about one hundred periodicals. The Subject Index cannot be too highly recommended to students of Oriental Research.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER
NOTICE

The following books were received too late to be reviewed for the October Number, 1924, of the Journal. A review of them will appear in January 1925.


*Assyrian Medical Texts.* By R. Campbell Thompson. London: John Bale, Sons and Danielsson, 1924, pp. 34. 2/6.


