

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVI.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1914.

555TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD (BY KIND PERMISSION) IN THE ROOMS OF THE
ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS, ON MONDAY, APRIL 20TH, 1914,
AT 4.30 P.M.

MR. A. W. OKE TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced that Mr. Alfred Haigh had been elected an Associate of the Institute.

The SECRETARY also announced that the Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury had been elected a Vice-President, and Mr. Joseph Graham a Member of Council.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Dr. T. G. Pinches to read his paper, which was illustrated by numerous lantern slides.

THE LATEST DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIA. By
THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

I.—CREATION-STORIES.

AS in the past, since its foundation in the first half of the last century, the science of Assyriology continues its forward march; and as it progresses, it heaps up a fund of knowledge—small in this country, but greater in volume abroad; for it is the one domain of Oriental research in which discoveries of importance and real interest, in its various branches, can be made. Every day brings Assyriology's votaries nearer to more precise interpretation of the inscriptions, and every year many new texts, some of them of considerable importance, are brought from the ruin-mounds of Babylonia and Assyria. Now and again finds take place in the museums where documents harvested in former years lie, awaiting the time when they can be studied at ease and their contents made known.

Earliest in the order of time—if their contents were really historical—are the legends, headed by those dealing with the Creation. Of these, three versions are known—that detailing the fight between Bel and the Dragon, which was first translated by George Smith; the creation-legend of Cuthah; and the bilingual version, which is simply an introduction to an

incantation, or a series of incantations—though it is none the less important on that account. In addition to this, a fragment, apparently of a fourth version, was discovered by George Smith when excavating for the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph*. The Babylonians were therefore rich in accounts of the first beginnings of things, and the religious man had a choice of beliefs without much danger of being regarded as heterodox.

Further information concerning these legends, as also of those dealing with the Flood, have reached us from Philadelphia, in America. In that city, at the University Museum, the opening of the cases containing the inscriptions discovered at Niffer (the Calneh of Genesis x) has been resumed, with exceedingly gratifying results. One of these documents, inscribed in three columns on each side, has, in the first (to use the words of the translator, Dr. Poebel), "instructions concerning the building of cities, which, it seems, were given by the gods to the first men, whose creation must have been related in the now missing preceding lines." The end of the first column, however, supplies something of the missing portion, where, referring to the acts of the gods, we read, according to Poebel: "After Enlil, Enki, and Nin-hursagga had created the black-headed ones (the Babylonian designation of mankind), they called into being in a fine fashion the animals, the four-legged (beasts) of the field.*"

Now in the legends hitherto known, or at least the two principal ones, it is Merodach who is credited with the creation of living things. To all appearance, then, this new version was composed before the worship of Merodach assumed the importance which it ultimately had, for his name seems not to be mentioned, the creators being Enlil, the older Bel; Enki, generally called Êa; and Nin-hursagga, "the Lady of the mountain," one of the names of the "Lady of the gods," who, in the bilingual story of the Creation, was associated with Merodach in the creation of mankind. This fact, with the identification of all the deities with Merodach, shows that, in the changes to which Babylonian belief was, in the course of centuries, subjected, every effort was made to disturb the current beliefs of the people as little as possible.

There is no doubt that this was one of the older forms of the Babylonian Creation-story—at least with regard to the formation of mankind and the beasts of the field, in which, unlike the Bible-account, the more perfect, mankind, seems to

* A common Babylonian way of referring to animal life.

have preceded the less perfect—the birds and creeping things. This is a point in which the Biblical account is the more consistent, though we cannot speak with absolute certainty, as the Babylonian records (except the bilingual version) are not complete at this point. The *Daily Telegraph* fragment, moreover, reads, as far as it is preserved, as follows :

“When the gods, in their assembly, created [living things]
They formed the azure(?) firmament(?), they compacted(?)
the
They sent forth the living [creat]ures
The beasts of the field, [the animals of] the field, and the
denizens of
. to the living creatures
[The beasts of] the field and the denizens of the city they
brought [into being(?)].*”

This inscription, which is very mutilated, seems to have formed part of a relation in the first person, as it has, in line 8, the words *ša ina puhri kinti-ia*, “which in the assembly of my family.” The next line contains the name of the god Nin-igi-azaga, “the Lord of the bright eye,” one of the names of the god Éa as god *šu nemeqi*, “of deep wisdom” (among other things) as a creator.

A Comparison with the Creation-narrative in Genesis i.†

Damascius, in his “Doubts and Solutions of the First Principles,” makes a special reference to the Babylonians

* The following is a transcription of this fragment, as far as it is preserved :—

E-nu-ma ilāni ina pu[h]ri-šu-nu ibnū
ubaššimu . . . bu]rumi ikšu[ru
ušápú [šikn]at napišti
būl šēri u[nam] šēri u nammašše
. ana šiknat napišti
. bul š]ēri u nammašše āli uza'i-
. gimri mammašti gimir nabuuti
. ša in puhri kinti-ia
. -ma ^dNin-igi-azaga miina šu-ḥa-
. p]uhri nammašti uštarri[h]
. kulla ḥamāni ir-
. iš qa pi ši
. iš qa pi ši u ša

. ši at
† Suggested by a consideration of Mr. Maunder's paper thereon at the last Meeting of the Victoria Institute.

rejecting the "one-principle" of the universe, and constituting two, namely, Tauthé and Apsón (Tiawath and Apsū). These two forms of the waste of creative waters, which the early Babylonians conceived as existing, and as being the origin of all things, can hardly be regarded otherwise than as spirits of evil, and therefore, everything which they produced was, like themselves, full of bad principles, confused in shape and conception, and malevolent of disposition. The question with the Babylonians was not, therefore, how evil came to be, but in what way did good arise from this crude, unformed, evil, and violent progeny of those two principles?

And here we have an exceedingly interesting outcome of Babylonian cosmogony, and a very natural way out of the difficulty, namely, the doctrine of evolution. Not all the offspring of these two "first principles" were evil—some of them were good, and these good ones gave birth to others as good as, or better than, themselves. These were the gods of the heavens and all their host, whose perfection in goodness and righteousness, however, aroused hostility in the minds of Tiawath and Apsū, who, aided by their son Mummu, tried to destroy them. The dragons of Chaos, however, inspired such fear in the breasts of the good gods who had descended from them, that none of them succeeded in destroying Tiawath, Apsū, and their brood, until Merodach, the "Steer of Day"—the sun in his youthful strength—took from Apsū the tablets of Fate, which enabled him to rule the earth, and entrapped Tiawath in his great net, afterwards dividing her body, and placing one half as a covering for the heavens (the waters above the firmament), while the other part of her remained below, as the waters below the firmament. The ultimate result of Babylonian conceptions concerning the origin of the universe and the life therein would therefore seem to have been three—the two principles of evil with whom Creation originated on the one side, and Merodach and the good and the just gods of heaven, who created mankind "to redeem" (seemingly) Tiawath, Apsū, and their evil offspring and followers (when the fulness of time should come), on the other.

How early the date of the first conception of this philosophy goes back we do not know, but the perfection of the theory of evolution and redemption (?) may be set down at about 2000 B.C. Now my contention would be that the Hebrew strictly Monotheistic revelation of this same event was not only not derived from it, but was issued in opposition to it—to show the beginning of all things, to emphasize the fact, that that

beginning was good, and the creation of a good God, and that evil, when it came into the world, was an intruder, and had no part in the original scheme.

II.—THE FLOOD.

Dr. Poebel tells us that the second column of the new inscription mentions some of the antediluvian cities of Babylonia, which Enlil bestows upon certain gods. In this portion there is a reference to the city Larak, identified long ago with the Larancha of Berosus, according to whom it was the seat of many of the prediluvian kings of the land—Amempsinus, who reigned 36,000 years, and Opartes (miswritten Otiartes), the Babylonian U(m)bara-Tutu,* the father of Xisuthrus of Surippak, whose reign lasted 28,800 years. It is needless to say, that additional information concerning these primitive Babylonian rulers will possess a value which everyone can appreciate—indeed, the story of the father of Xisuthrus, the Babylonian Atra-hasis (the Chaldean Noah), the “exceedingly wise,” the favourite of the gods, who saved mankind from destruction, and attained to immortality without death, would be especially welcome.

And the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th columns, Poebel tells us, refer to the flood of which Atra-hasis was the central figure. At that time, we are informed, Ziugiddu, “the long lived,” was king. He was a *pašišu*, or anointing priest of Enki (the god Éa)—all these ancient Babylonian patriarch-kings were priests of some kind or other—daily and constantly serving his god. “In order to requite him for his piety, Enki, in column 4 (the first of the reverse), informs him that it had been resolved, at the request of Enlil, ‘in the council of the gods, to destroy the seed of mankind,’ whereupon Ziugiddu—this part of the story, however, is broken away—builds a big boat and loads it with all kinds of animals. For seven days and seven nights a rain-storm, as we are informed in column 5, rages through the land, and the flood of water carries the boat away; but the sun then appears again, and when its light shines into the boat, Ziugiddu sacrifices an ox and a sheep. Lastly, in column 6, we find Ziugiddu worshipping before Enlil, whose anger against man had now abated. for he says: ‘Life like that of a god I give to him,’ and ‘an eternal soul like that of a god I create for him,’

* The Greek form Opartes shows that, at the time Berosus made his translation (about 250 B.C.), U(m)bara-Tutu was pronounced *Opartu*, or similarly (for *Obartu*, *Obartutu*, *Ombartutu*, *Omaratutu*).

which means that Ziugiddu, the hero of the Deluge story, is to become a god."

As you all know, Babylonian stories of the Flood had already come to light, the first being that translated many years ago by George Smith, and forming the main portion of the contents of the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš-legend. Besides this, a fragment was found by Smith and now forms part of the *Daily Telegraph* collection; another, discovered by Father V. Scheil, has been acquired for the Pierpont Morgan collection; and a small fragment of a fourth version was discovered and translated by Prof. Hilprecht in 1910—a version bearing, perhaps, a greater resemblance to the Biblical account of the Flood than the others in the portion which has been preserved.*

The new text at Philadelphia, however, is, according to Poebel, an entirely different account, "as will be seen from the fact that the hero bears a name different from that found in the other Deluge stories."† This new version, moreover (unlike those translated by Smith), is not written in Semitic Babylonian, but in Sumerian. Like many other legendary compositions of the Sumerians and Semitic Babylonians, it is couched in poetical form, and as such, Poebel suggests, served some practical purpose, ritualistic or otherwise. For various reasons he thinks that the tablet was written about the time of Ĥaminurabi, and is therefore older than the versions already known (though that discovered by Scheil runs it very close). It is probable, however, that all the versions of the Flood and the legends in general are much older than the time when they were written—in other words, they antedate the tablets upon which they have been preserved to us.

For further details of the new version of the Flood-story, we must of course wait until the text itself is published, but just two notes may be made upon Poebel's abstract. The name of the patriarch, Ziugiddu, is new and unexpected, and its terminal *u* seems to suggest Semitic influence; though, as Poebel makes no comment upon this, no argument can be based thereon. The giving to Ziugiddu of an eternal soul raises the question, whether the Babylonians believed men to have possessed immortal souls before the time of Ziugiddu, or only afterwards.

* For a description of this, see the *Journal of the Victoria Institute* for 1911, pp. 135 ff.

† His other names are *Ut-napišti^m* (or *Uta-naišti^m*) and *Atra-ḥasis* ("the exceedingly wise"), reproduced in Greek as Xisuthrus (= *Hasis-atra*).

III.—EARLY KINGS.

From the colour of the clay, the shape, and the script, Dr. Poebel thinks that another tablet from the same place, Niffer, belongs to the series. This portion, however, is inscribed with a list of kings—in fact, there seem to have been three tablets, each measuring about $5\frac{1}{2}$ by 7 inches, upon which some primitive Babylonian historian had written an outline of the world's history, as he understood it. The first tablet probably contained an account of the Babylonian theogony, including the conflict between the gods—the younger and more advanced generation—and “the deity of Primeval Chaos,” typified by Tiawath, the sea, and “ultimately resulted in the creation of heaven and earth out of the two parts of Chaos.” If this be correct, the story agrees with the account in the fight between Bel and the Dragon.* It would be at this point that the tablet just described comes in, with the history of the world down to the time of the Flood.

For those who prefer something of a less speculative character than the Creation and Flood-legends, however, the third tablet is of greater importance. This portion, when complete, gave a history of the world from the time of the Flood to the reign of the king under whom the tablet was written. The reverse—about an eighth of the whole text—was published in 1906 by Prof. Hilprecht, and gives two of the last dynasties on the list. Dr. Poebel, however, has succeeded in copying the much-effaced obverse, which contains the names of the kings immediately after the Flood, and he states that he has also found “larger and smaller fragments of three other and older lists of kings.” All Assyriologists and specialists in Semitic history will await this additional material with eagerness. Not only are the names of the kings given, with the lengths of their reigns, but also in some few cases there are historical details. As might be expected, the list takes us back into the true legendary period, for we find there Gilgameš, the traveller-king of Erech; Dumu-zi(da) or Tammuz, the luckless spouse of the goddess Ištar; Etanna, who, clinging to the body of an eagle, made a daring ascent to heaven, etc. Etanna is said to have reigned 625 years—short when compared with the thousands of years that his predecessors ruled, but a wonderfully long period

* Otherwise Merodach and Tiawath, the Dragon of the Sea or waste of waters, to whom the Babylonians attributed the creation of the earliest living things.

nevertheless. Another king, called "the Scorpion," reigned 840 years; whilst Lugal-banda, a deified king of Erech, ruled for 1,200 years. Soon, however, the list becomes entirely historical, and the reigns are of the ordinary length—"36, 7, or 20 years."

A very long period must, in view of these long reigns, be assigned to the epochs dealt with, and this would appear to be confirmed by certain summations. Thus one of the tablets, written under the 134th king, the 11th of the dynasty of Isin, reckons 32,175 years, and another from the Flood to the 139th king, the last of the dynasty of Isin, 32,234 years.

And this brings us to the exceedingly important chronological list published by Prof. Scheil in October, 1911, which seems to be upon a precisely similar plan. This inscription gives the dynasties of Opis, Kiš, Erech, Agadé, and Erech again, and among the historical references we find one stating that Azag-Bau, queen of Kiš, who ruled for 100 years—she was the founder of her dynasty—was the wife of a wine-merchant; whilst another informs us that Šarru-(u)kin of Agadé was apprenticed to a gardener, and was cup-bearer in the temple of Zagaga. It is the final phrase of this important chronological document which attracts attention, however, for it tells us that "the rule of Erech was changed, and the army of Gutiu" acquired the dominion." This is a reference to the celebrated Median invasion, and from the time of the Flood until this date, according to the Greek writers, was a period of 33,091 years, during which time, however, only 86 kings ruled—a number which falls far short of the reality.

It seems not unlikely that this great Babylonian chronological document will prove to be a completion of that recognized by G. Smith among the treasures of the British Museum in 1873. It is needless to say that that scholar fully realized the value of his find, notwithstanding that its completeness fell far short, to all appearance, of the new records just announced.

IV.—ABRAHAM'S PLOUGH.

Coming to the period of the "Dynasty of Babylon"—the dynasty to which Hammurabi belonged, the new inscriptions which have been published do not add very much to our knowledge, either of the life of the period or the history of the time. We are still in doubt as to how this dynasty—which was of foreign origin, and seemingly kept the remembrance of that origin clearly in mind—came to the throne. Probably the most important work upon the period is Ungnad's corpus of translations—1,417 in number—in his book, *Hammurabi's*

Gesetz, which gives us numerous illustrations of the enactments contained in his Code of Laws. This, naturally, has considerable bearing on the manners and customs of the people, but I do not propose to go into that subject now, as it would lead me too far, and take up too much time in a general lecture like this.

An interesting detail, however, is that published by Professor Clay's *Documents in the Temple Archives of Nippur dated in the reigns of Cassite rulers*. This is contained in an archaic picture, copied from impressions of a cylinder-seal, representing ploughing. It was a seal made for a personage named Warad-Nin-sar, who was probably a farmer. The plough is drawn by two humped oxen, such as the Babylonians often used, and a man with a short beard, raising his arms, seems to be directing the operations. The handles of the plough are held by a longer-bearded agriculturalist, draped to the feet, and his long skirts must have hampered his movements to a certain extent. The most interesting figure, however, is one walking beside the plough, who, with his skirts bunched up to hold the grain, is engaged in pouring the seed down a vertical tube with which the implement is fitted. Two emblems occupy the field above, the larger being in the form of a Greek cross surrounded by an outline—as commonly found during the Kassite period, and possibly an emblem of divinity in general.

Similar ploughs to this are shown on other monuments—notably Esarhaddon's black stone in Babylonian script, now in the British Museum—and it is clear that such "improved" agricultural implements were common in the East—the Semitic East—of ancient times. But the noteworthy thing about it is that the seeding device was regarded by the Jews as being an invention of Abraham. This interesting fact has been pointed out by the American Professor James A. Montgomery, who quotes the very interesting statement concerning it made in the Book of Jubilees—a kind of Midrash on Genesis composed about the second century B.C. According to this work, the people made idols, and indulged in all kinds of abominable practices, instigated thereto by Satan, who tried in every way to corrupt and destroy the people of the land. Among other things, Prince Mastema "sent ravens and other birds to destroy the land, and rob the children of men of their labours. Before they could plough in the seed, the ravens snatched it from the surface of the ground. And it was for this reason that he called his (Abraham's father's) name Terah, because the ravens and (other) birds reduced them to destitution and devoured

their seed." (This etymology for Terah is probably due to the Arabic *تراج*, *tarik*, "to be sad, afflicted.")

When, however, Abraham was born, he became known on account of his youthful piety—so much so that his mere word sufficed to disperse the flocks of ravens which came to devour the scattered seed. That year the people were enabled to sow and reap, but we are told that Abraham taught those who made implements for oxen, the artificers in wood, and they made a vessel above the ground, facing the frame of the plough, to put the seed therein, and the seed fell down therefrom upon the ploughshare, and was hidden in the earth, so that they no longer feared the ravens. And after this manner they made vessels above the ground on all the plough framework, and they sowed and tilled all the land, according as Abraham commanded them, and no longer feared the birds.

The author of the book, Professor Montgomery suggests, may have been a Babylonian Jew, who thus made Abraham the inventor of this combination of plough and seeding machine. In the opinion of the Jews, Abraham was the discoverer of letters, astronomy, and the arts, and it is therefore quite consistent that he should have invented this device. Perhaps we shall sooner or later find the name of the seeding tube in Assyro-Babylonian, but we can hardly hope for a confirmation of the statement that the Hebrew Abraham was its inventor.

Though this cylinder-seal belongs to the time of the Kaššite kings (Nazi-muruttaš, fourth year—fourteenth century B.C.), the plough depicted must have been invented at a much earlier date—possibly, indeed, in the time of Abraham. Unfortunately, the early Babylonian tablet dealing with agriculture does not refer to the plough, either because it belongs to a too early date, or (as is more probable) because it is imperfect.

Seemingly, after taking possession of his field, the farmer surrounded it with a protection of reeds, and proceeded to capture any stray gazelle that he might find, and get rid of the birds (*šabita ukaššad, ériba idikki*). In another paragraph the digging of the field, the protection of the seed, the capturing of birds, and the removal of weeds or undesirable growths—ŠAM-IN with KUR before it is more likely to mean "herb" which is "hostile" than "snail" as the thing which is "hostile to the herb." In the next paragraph there is a reference to the watering of the field and the increase of its grain. Then, "in the day of harvest," he divided and parted the field, and measured to the proprietor the portion due to him according to the contract.

Notwithstanding the usefulness of the implement, the plough seems to be but rarely mentioned in the inscriptions. A word found in the laws of Hammurabi, and written with the Sumerian group GIŠ-GAN-UR, which is translated by the Semitic *makaddu*, is translated, doubtfully, as "plough," but this, as a star or constellation, is explained as *kakku ša Aê ša ina libbi-šu apsā tammaru*, "the implement of Ae (Aos), in the midst of which thou (mayest) see the deep," and this, taken in connection with the fact that in those laws it is coupled with the watering-machine (possibly the *šadouf*), makes it probable that it indicates the wooden conduit which carried the water to the fields. This group, GIŠ-GAN-UR, however, has another rendering, namely, *maškiktu*, seen in the phrase *ina maškikat mušarē ušakkak*, "he shall seed the furrows with the wooden conduit," in Sumerian: *giš-gan-ur mušarene giš-abūra*, i.e., with the tube of the plough.

V.—THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED TABLETS FROM ERECH.

Tablets are always coming from the nearer East—either from Babylonia, or from Assyria, or from one of the countries of old under their influence (the Hittite States, or Syria, or Palestine)—so that we are always getting additions to our material. A hundred thousand documents (mostly of little import) are known, and it is probable that a hundred thousand more at least await discovery in those lands.

Among the most recent discoveries are the sites of Drehem and Jokha—sites which, however, are to all appearance unmentioned in the Old Testament, or, indeed, in any ancient record. Their historical value, nevertheless, is considerable, as they give us the names of many new kings, not only of the dynasty which ruled in these districts, but also of the states in the neighbourhood.

Of greater importance, however, because of Biblical reference, is the site of Erech, now known as Warka, which is the old Arabic form of the same name. As we learn in the tenth chapter of Genesis, verse 10, Erech was founded by Nimrod (Merodach), the order being "Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh," all in "the land of Shinar," as Babylonia was then called. One of the best indications that Nimrod is Merodach is furnished by the bilingual Babylonian story of the Creation, which attributes the foundation of Babylon, with its temple Ê-sagila; Erech, with its temple Ê-anna; and Niffer (stated by the Rabbins to be Calneh), with its temple Ê-kura, to the deity in question. We have in this a distinct confirmation of the Biblical record,

notwithstanding that the inscription which furnishes it is a heathen religious text—an incantation for purification.

As far as I have been able to examine them, the new inscriptions from Erech are of the later period of Babylonian history, and are mostly trade-documents, generally or often mentioning transactions connected with the religious life of the place—the great temple where the god of the heavens, Anu, with the goddesses Ištar (Venus) and Nanâ were worshipped. The small collection I have seen embraces the period from Nabopolassar to the period of the Seleucidæ—that is to say, from 626 to the end of the second century before Christ.

Probably the most interesting inscription of the collection is one referring to a necklace or collarette, dated in the 19th year of Nabopolassar. This tablet has, on the reverse, a rough sketch of the object, and if the reading of the inscription were certain, it would have some philological value. The necklace contained 41 white *nurmar* and 4 other *nurmar*, possibly “pearls,” and was priced at 3 *mana* 57 shekels of silver.

Another tablet—a contract for barley—dated in the 1st year of Nebuchadrezzar, has the name of the governor and the *šatam* (“treasurer”?) of Ê-anna, the great and renowned temple of Anu at Erech.

In the matter of officials—their names are not only important historically, but are likely to be so likewise chronologically—an inscription dated in the 19th year of Nebuchadrezzar is of greater value. This refers to a loan of 1 *mana* 22½ shekels of gold, granted by “the Lady of Erech and Nana” (the goddesses of the city) to Nabû-êṭir-napšati, Governor of the Land of the Sea; Nabû-šûzizanni, deputy-governor of the same, and Zilla the scribe. It is at once an historical document and a picture of Babylonian life. This loan was consummated at Babylon—not at Erech—in Nisan, the first month of the Babylonian year, in the presence of Maruduk-iriba, the mayor(?) of Erech; the *šatam* (? treasurer) of the temple of the Syrian Hadad, here called *Amurrû* (“the Amorite god”); a priest of Ur (of the Chaldees); and Nabû-nadin-šum the scribe, and was to be repaid in the month Tammuz.

Now this and other tablets show that the temples of Babylonia were exceedingly rich, and we see from this inscription that they could make their riches useful to the State, for the money was granted without interest (provided that it was repaid at the date mentioned), and in view of the importance of the persons to whom it was lent, there is every probability that it was for some public purpose—what that may have been is not here stated.

From a tablet preserved in the British Museum we see that the three principal personages—the governor, deputy-governor, the mayor (?) of Erech, the priest of Ur, and Bêl-uballit, “Governor of the other side,” had all been at Babylon two years previously, probably in connection with some other public business, or, perhaps, as attendants on the king. Travelling backwards and forwards in ancient Babylonia was therefore common, especially on the part of officials. Evidently Nebuchadrezzar’s reign was one full of life and activity, but already many then alive were to see its downfall and the beginning of its decay.

But, it may be asked, whence did the temples of Babylonia obtain their great riches? To all appearance—indeed, there is no other explanation—they came from the offerings of the faithful, either of produce of the earth, from tithes and dues, or from lands donated to the shrines and temples. The date plantations of “the Lady of Erech and Nanâ” were therefore very extensive, and were in all probability let out to farmers and orchardmen, whilst the produce of those cultivated under the priests’ directions was loaned at interest, or for work to be performed, or else was sold. It was in this way that the temples obtained their enormous wealth—wealth which had practically been accumulating for thousands of years, unless unfavourable conditions at any time interrupted this accumulation, and caused, as is possible, a lessening of the temple’s funds. The histories of the Babylonian temples have yet to be written, but if the material accumulates as it is now doing, this will be possible before long, and many will be the revelations as to their resources. Not only had they lands and plantations, but also they possessed a considerable number of cattle, both small and large, as more than one of the inscriptions which I have seen indicate; and these animals were marked with the special mark (*šindutu*, adj., masc. plu.) of the temple.

Like the rest of the Babylonians, the Erechites worshipped “gods many and lords many”—Addu or Hadad, Amar, Amurrū (Awurrū), “the Amorite god,” Êa, the god of the sea, Bâbu or Bau, the “glorious” goddess of healing; Bêl (Merodach); Gula, a name of Bau; Dammu, “the strong one”; Nebo, whose great popularity was increased by his name being compounded with that of numerous Babylonian kings, including Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar; Nergal, the god of war, disease, and death; Ninip (Anušat, according to Pognon); Šamaš the sun-god; Sin the moon-god; Zagaga, god of battle; and others, besides the patron-deities of the city, Anu, Antu^m, Ištar, and Nanâ. All

these were popular deities during the period of native rule, but with Nabonidus and his son Belshazzar, native dominion came to an end, and foreigners ruled the land—first the Medo-Perians, then the Seleucidae, and finally the Arsacidae. At what date the Babylonians forsook the worship of the “merciful Merodach” is unknown, but the later inscriptions, which are large and fine tablets, show personal names compounded almost exclusively with those of Anu (the great deity of the place), Ištar, and Nanâ (the goddesses worshipped with him). With the fall of Babylon, its patron-deity, Merodach, together with his consort, ceased to exist for Erech—they had failed to defend the independence of the land, and though their shrines were retained in the temple, with the people Merodach and his companions—his manifestations—lost their influence. “Babylon the Great”—the old and renowned capital of Shinar, the beginning of Nimrod’s kingdom—had indeed fallen—she had lost her position not only among the nations, but also in the land to which she belonged. But the famed Tower of Babylon, the rallying point of the nation after “they left off to build the city,” still retained its place in their minds, if not in their estimation, as we shall presently see. Perhaps they hoped that it would again become a rallying point, and Alexander, had he lived, would undoubtedly have tried to realize this, but it was not to be. With his passing, the influence and the importance of Babylon passed away, never to return.

VI.—TOWER OF BABEL AT BABYLON.

The history of the rediscovery of the description of the Tower of Babylon has an interest which is not without its sadness.

Before his last journey to the Semitic East, where, in former years, he had seen some success, George Smith, the Assyriologist, had in his hands, for a time, an inscription which, with his usual sharp-sightedness, he recognized as a detailed account of the great Temple of Belus at Babylon, and the Zikkurat or Temple-tower connected therewith. Knowing its importance, he published a short but exceedingly valuable abstract of the tablet’s contents (*Athenæum*, Feb. 12th, 1876), doubtless with the hope of being able to turn his attention to the document again on the completion of his work in Babylonia. This hope, however, was never fulfilled, for he died in the East, and is buried in the Christian churchyard at Aleppo.

Scholars naturally recognized the importance of his description

of this tablet, and it has often been quoted—Professor Sayce even reproduced G. Smith's rendering in full in his Hibbert Lectures of 1887,—but no one knew the whereabouts of the original document. I myself have often spoken of the disappearance of the record—once before this Institute—in the hope that the newspapers would carry the news farther—perhaps to the notice of the owner—but without success, or at least without effect. Probably no seeker for the document lost hope, however, for clay, when in a good condition, is practically indestructible—wilful damage alone can utterly ruin a clay record.

This being the case, none were surprised, and most scholars were gratified to learn, last year, that the missing inscription had come to light again at last, and was in the hands of the Rev. V. Scheil. The document, however, did not belong to him, but to Mme. Fémery, who had possessed it for a long time, and its whereabouts had been indicated to Father Scheil by M. Schlumberger in 1912. Under the title of "Esagil, ou le Temple de Bel-Marduk," Father Scheil, aided by the well-known architect and archæologist, M. Marcel Dieulafoy, has published a most valuable monograph upon the record. Both these scholars are Members of the Institute of France.

The tablet first described by Smith is a beautifully-written document, $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches high by 4 inches wide. It is inscribed with 39 lines of writing in seven sections on the obverse, and 11 lines in three sections on the reverse. In the large blank space which follows are three lines wide apart—the colophon—which state that the copy in question was made in the 83rd year of the Seleucid Era (229 B.C.).

The first section contains the dimensions of the *du-mah* or "sublime sanctuary," wherein were to be found the sanctuaries (*du*) of Istar and Zagaga, and the *azamû* of the Ušukina, or "place of Assembly," where the New-Year ceremonies took place in the first fortnight of Nisan, the first month of the year. The "sublime sanctuary" and the shrines connected therewith did not form part of the Tower, but of Ê-sagila, the great Temple of Belus (Bel-Merodach). The *du-mah*, which was a kind of terrace, and which contained the shrines of Istar and Zagaga, measured, according to Dieulafoy, $633\frac{1}{2}$ Babylonian feet from north to south and 270 feet from east to west. To the east of this again was the great terrace, 540 feet wide (from north to south) and 720 feet long (from east to west). These two structures were centred on a lower platform measuring in total depth (east to west) 990 Babylonian feet. The total depth of the lower terrace (whereon the higher central portion stood) was 200 feet.

The great Temple-tower, called Ê-temen-an-ki, "the House of the foundation of heaven and earth," lay farther to the W.S.W. It lay in the great courtyard—the terrace of Ê-temen-an-ki—measuring 1,200 Babylonian feet each way, and entered, according to the plan of the German explorers, by nine gates. Of these the names of six only are given, the others having been blocked, seemingly by rows of cells placed against its eastern wall. Section 3 of the inscription gives us the names of these gates: the Sublime Gate; the Gate of the Rising Sun; the Great Gate; the Gate of the Lamassu (protecting genius); the Gate of Abundance; and the Gate of the Glorious Wonder (*ka-u-di-barra*). These gates and the courtyard or platform itself, were used for the ceremonies of the Ê-*kur* (Temple of the Land)—so called, perhaps, to distinguish this sacred portion from the inner sanctuaries, both of the Tower and of the Temple of Belus.

Within the enclosure of the platform or terrace, near the western wall, lay the *kigallu*^m or platform of the Tower itself, measuring 600 Babylonian feet each way. This was the base of the first stage, and the substructure (*kigallu*, § 4) of this world-renowned building. Centred to the extreme south-western edge of this, again, lay the true substructure (*kigallu*, § 5)—in reality the Tower's lowest stage—measuring 300 "enlarged" feet each way. This rose to a height of 120 feet above the platform upon which it stood.

Here the tablet mentions (§ 6) the chapels or sanctuaries of the Tower, six in number, which surrounded it on this level. Two of these were situated on the east, and dedicated, one to Merodach, and the other to Nebo and his spouse Tašmêtu^m. The latter was seemingly 45 cubits square and 40 high.

On the north, in couples (§ 7), were the temples of Êa and Nusku (the gods of the waters and of light respectively); on the south was the Temple of Anu and Sin (the god of the heavens and the moon); on the west were the *Tu'um* and "the temple of the net"; and behind these, facing "the Gate of the Implements," was "the house" or "temple of the couch."

The association of the "net" (*nam'istu*^m) with the *tu'um* is interesting, suggesting, as it does, that the latter may be the Babylonian form of the Hebrew *Tehom* or "deep," and the concrete idea of the deified Tiawath (Tiamtu) of the Babylonian Creation-story. Dieulafoy has followed George Smith in rendering *tu'um*, by "double" or "twin," and this is a possible rendering. The twin-sanctuaries would in that case be the temples of the net and of the couch and throne respectively.

That the vocalization of the word for "twin" may be either *tu'amu* or *ta'umu* probably presents no difficulty to this interpretation. Nevertheless, I think well to place the other possibility on record, as well as a third alternative, namely, that the final *um* may be the case-ending of the nominative with the minimation. In this case we should obtain the form *tu'u^m*, the first element of *tohu we bohu*, "formless and void" in Genesis i, 2.

It is to be noted, also, that *tu'um* occurs without any prefix whatever, either of god, or of temple, increasing the probability that it was a "laver or sea"—preferably, perhaps, the latter, and symbolical of the brood of Tiawath whom, with her, Merodach caught with his net and his snare.

No image of the primæval Dragon symbolizing Chaos is mentioned here, otherwise the Dragon whose image Daniel so mysteriously destroyed (see the apocryphal book of Bel and the Dragon) might be compared. Perhaps her image was in the Temple of the Net which entrapped her, for it is not by any means unlikely that "Bel and the Dragon" may be founded on fact, and that the priests of Bel practised the deceit attributed to them. There is no evidence, on the other hand, that the Babylonians worshipped the Dragon of Chaos, though the ancestors of the Yezidis or "Devil worshippers" may have done so. It is, moreover, exceedingly unlikely that King Cyrus believed either in the Babylonian Bel, or in the mythological monster whom the god slew. That the scene of Daniel's trap to catch the three score and ten priests of Bel, and to destroy the Dragon with seethed balls of pitch, fat, and hair, causing the Dragon to "burst in sunder," may have been laid here, is exceedingly probable.

In front of the Temple of the Couch was the Temple of the utensils of the shrines, corresponding with it in length and breadth. Here, also, was a covered court shut in. The couch is described as being 9 cubits long and 4 cubits wide. There was a throne set by it, which, however, was separate from it— or, as the tablet says, the couch and the throne were two.

At this point the writer turns to the Tower itself—

The court containing the Gate of the Sun-rising (the eastern gate), the Gate of the South, the Gate of the Sun-setting (the western gate), and the Gate of the North, is a third—length, width, and height—of the base (?) of the Tower of Babylon. This is its (the Tower's) description:—

150 feet square, 55 feet high, of worked brick, was the lowest stage.

- 130 feet square, 30 feet high, enamelled, the second.
 100 feet square, 10 feet high, recessed, the third.
 85 feet square, 10 feet high, recessed, the fourth.
 70 feet square, 10 feet high, recessed, the fifth.
 40 feet long, a fraction under 35 feet wide, 25 feet high,
 variegated to the top, the seventh—the house *šahuru*.

And here we have it in all its details, as nearly as we understand them—the great Tower of Babel, the remains of which utilitarian Turkish contractors have removed from the face of the earth—that is, all but the core of unbaked brick. The tenth section of the tablet, which immediately follows, states, apparently, that this is a description of the extent and the area of the building, not examined, but written, verified, and made clear according to the copy preserved at the neighbouring town of Borsippa. It is sincerely to be hoped that the original of this present document will be found.

The tenth section gives the dimensions of 68 plantations and 20 meadows belonging to the Tower, and after this comes the colophon, in three lines of writing wide apart. It is as follows:—

“Tablet of Anu-bêl-šunu, son of Anu-balaš-su-iqbi, descendant of Aĥu’utu, the Tir-annaite (= Erechite).

“(Written out) by the hand of Anu-bêl-šunu, son of Nidintu^m-Anu, descendant of Sin-liki-unnini. Erech, month Chisleu, day 26th,

“year 83rd, Siluku (Seleucus), king.”

The owner of the tablet had therefore gotten a namesake of his to write it out for him—a member, seemingly, of a very ancient family, that of Sin-liki-unnini, the traditional writer of the tablets of the Gilgameš-legend, the eleventh of which contains the story of the Flood.

In his elevation of the Tower of Babylon, attached to the Temple of Belus, called Ê-sagila, M. Dieulafoy adheres rigorously to the data of the tablet, and does not insert the possible dimensions of the missing sixth stage—in which, in fact, he does not believe. George Smith, however, thought that it ought to be restored, and in this he was probably right. It seems possible that, at the time the inscription was drawn up, the sixth stage, being in ruin, had been cleared away, and the sanctuary at the top erected on the fifth stage. Or is this due to the fact that, when “they left off to build the city,” as stated in Genesis xi, 8, they left off building the Tower as well,

and the seventh stage, which they intended to add, was never erected? There is much that we have to learn about this wonderful construction, which, rising in its majesty 200 *Babylonian feet or more, must have been a conspicuous and brilliant landmark—like many another in that land—upon the Babylonian plain.

With regard to the discoveries made by the German explorers at Babylon, I was hoping to be able to say a few words, but the time needed to get a recently-published book from Germany was too great. I need only say, at present, that an outline of these will be found in my paper "Discoveries in Babylonia and the Neighbouring Lands," which was read before the Institute on February 15th, 1909. For the sake of completeness, however, I recapitulate here with further details something of what I then said, and show some new slides, the best of which a friend, with very great kindness, has been so good as to give me.

From the extant remains Babylon is estimated by Delitzsch to have been about as extensive as Munich or Dresden, but there must have been a great extension of the city outside the inner walls. Any outer defences which the Babylonian capital may have had would seem long since to have disappeared. Whether it will be worth while excavating the land around the inner city is doubtful, but the German explorers have probably formed an opinion upon this point.

North of the Temple of Belus and the Tower lay the palace built by Nabopolassar (probably on the site of some smaller and more ancient erection), and enlarged by his son Nebuchadrezzar. The throne-room was a noteworthy chamber, tastefully decorated in enamelled brick. On the eastern side of the palace ran the sacred procession-street, on the right of which lie the ruins of the temple of the goddess Nin-mah, "the sublime Lady," spouse of Merodach, who, with him, created mankind. Proceeding northwards, one comes to the Istar-gate, with its decorations in enamelled brick showing the dragon, the lion, and the bull of Babylon. The ruins of the Nin-mah temple have an altar before the entrance. Dr. Koldewey, the architect of the exploration party, has made a very attractive restoration of this building, with its lofty entrances facing the street and in the courtyard. One would like to know how these buildings were lighted. A number of inscriptions were found in Ê-mah (the temple of Nin-mah), some of them referring to the buildings of Babylon in general. They were of the Assyrian

* See, however, the note upon the above, p. 192.

king Aššur-banī-apli, Nebuchadrezzar, Evil-Merodach, and probably other rulers. Koldewey suggests that a statue of Nin-mah occupied a central position on the platform of her temple; and that it was here that Alexander made his daily offerings, according to custom, when he was ill (Arrian, *An.*, vii, 25).

In the southern portion of the city lay the temple of Ninip (in Semitic *Anušat*, according to Pognon). Unlike Ê-mah, this temple (which was called Ê-pa-tu-tila) had a courtyard east of the centre of the building, and three entrances. The chambers have recesses and platforms before which the ceremonies were performed, and which are closely centred to their respective entrances, implying a wish that worshippers in the courtyard should have a chance of seeing what was going on within. Numerous inscriptions were found likewise here—cylinders of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadrezzar (the last brought, in ancient times, from the Tower of Babylon), and 150 contract-tablets of the period Esarhaddon to Artaxerxes. These give nothing of importance for the history of the temple.

A very noteworthy thing is the evidence of other erections in this part of the city. The upper layers of the ground are thickly covered with Parthian graves, and Parthian and Greco-Parthian buildings are visible. Beneath these are house-ruins of the Babylonian period, the later houses being built over the earlier ones. This, says Koldewey, goes down to the level of the foundation water, and does not end even there, either beneath ruin-mounds, or where we find level ground. It is of interest to note also that the ancient city was not merely co-extensive with the existing mounds, but reached far beyond on every side.

APPENDIX.

THE CAPTURE OF BABYLON BY CYRUS, 539 B.C.

In accordance with my intention at the time, I add here a new rendering of the account of the capture of Babylon by Ugbaru or Gubaru, Cyrus's representative, as an addition to the remarks which I made on the occasion of the reading of the Rev. Craig Robinson's paper "The Fall of Babylon and Daniel v, 30," on December 9th last.

This tablet forms one of a collection acquired by the Trustees of the British Museum in 1879, and the text was published by

me, in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. vii, part 1 (1880). It is not my intention to give here the whole inscription, but simply the events of Nabonidus's 17th year—that referring to the tragic event in the history of Babylonia and the native kings whom culture would seem in a measure to have unfitted for resisting the apparently ruder political powers around them.

“ [17th year. They requested ?] Nebo to go forth from Borsippa [to Babylon, and he went and dwelt in Ê-sagila]. The king entered into Ê-tur-kalama* ; [and made sacrifice ? The people of the upper sea ?] and the lower sea revolted. A journey of Bel went forth ; the New-Year festival with success (?) they held. In the month [Nergal and the god]s of Amarda, Zagaga and the gods of Kis, Nin-lil and [the gods] of Hursag-kalama entered Babylon. At the end of the month Elul the gods of Akkad . . . who are over the atmosphere and under the atmosphere, entered Babylon—the gods of Borsippa, Cuthah, and Sippar did not enter. In the month Tammuz Cyrus made battle in Opis on the river Tigris among the people of Akkad. He proclaimed (?) the people of Akkad rebellious (?)—he slew the people. On the 14th day Sippar was taken without battle—Nabonidus fled. On the 16th day Ugbaru, governor of Gutium, and the soldiers of Cyrus entered Babylon without battle. Afterwards Nabonidus was made prisoner (?)—he was taken in Babylon. At the end of the month the guards of the land of Gutium closed the gates of Ê-sagila—no loss of anything in Ê-sagila and the temples took place, and the least thing (?) passed not out. In Marcheswan, the 3rd day, Cyrus entered Babylon. The deputations (?) before him were numerous, asking safety for the city—“Cyrus, the safety of Babylon, all of it, command.” Gubaru, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon, and from the month Chisleu to the month Adar, the gods of Akkad which Nabonidus had brought down to Babylon, returned to their sanctuaries (?). In the month Marcheswan, the night of the 11th day, Ugbaru [went] against [the citadel ?], and the son of the king died. From the 27th of the month Adar to the 3rd day of the month Nisan there was weeping in Akkad—all the people bowed their heads. On the 4th day Cambyses, son of Cy[rus], extended (?) the grant to the temple Ê-nig-ġad-kalama.”

* The temple of Ninip (Anuſat, according to Pognon).

(The remainder of the inscription is too mutilated for a satisfactory translation.)

Whether I have succeeded in giving better renderings of certain difficult passages time alone will show, but two or three points come out with prominence. At the beginning of this long paragraph, in which I have inserted some words to make up the sense, it seems clear that the reproach levelled against Nabonidus, accusing him of removing the gods from their shrines, was correct. This, however, would seem to have been a common practice in days of national danger, such as he felt the country to be in, and it is perfectly certain that he would have been blamed if he had not done it. The god Bêl, referred to in connection with the New-Year festival, is Bel-Merodach, and on this occasion it was the custom for the other great gods of Babylonia to visit the head of the pantheon in the capital wherein his chief shrine lay. This was situated in the temple Ê-sagila (*see* p. 181). The meeting place of the deities was called Ubšukina—a counterpart and namesake of the heavenly meeting-place wherein their divine feasts took place. The following is a description of the ceremonies which were performed at the shrine of Merodach at Babylon:

“The gods, all of them—the gods of Borsippa, Cuthah, Kiš, and the gods of the cities, all, to take the hands of Kayanu, the great lord Merodach, will go to Babylon, and with him, at the New-Year festival, in the holy place of the King (*i.e.*, Merodach himself), will offer a gift before him. As for that day, on its appearance, Anu and Ellila will go from Erech and Nippur to Babylon to take the hands of Kayanu-Bêl, and will march in procession with him. To the temple of offerings all the great gods will go together to Babylon.”

The tablet which gives these instructions also seems to detail the reason why the ceremony was performed—it was apparently to be present when Merodach was represented as going down to the prison where the captive gods, who, at the Creation, had resisted the gods of heaven, were confined. There Merodach was regarded as going, opening the gates of the prison, and comforting them. The expression here used is a very interesting one, for it reads *inaš rêssunu*, “he raiseth their head,” and it is apparently owing to this ceremony that the Temple of Belus was called Ê-sagila, “the house of head-raising,” for it was there that “the merciful Merodach” became reconciled to the gods who had been his enemies. An unsuspected beauty in the Legend of Merodach here meets us.

From this inscription it would seem that the gods of Sippar,

Cuthah, and Kiš ought to have taken part in this ceremony, whereas the "Annalistic Tablet" mentions the gods of Amarda or Marad, those of Hursag-kalama, and the gods of Akkad (northern Babylonia) who were "under the wind and over the wind" as having entered the city, but not the gods of Borsippa, Cuthah, and Sippar. It was probably in this that Nabonidus went astray—it was not that he took the deities to Babylon, but that he took the wrong ones—gods whom he ought not to have taken, including many whom the scribe does not name. It was on account of this that evil overtook the city and the land, in the opinion of the Babylonians.

The name of Cyrus's general is given in the Annalistic inscription as Gubaru or Ugaru—variants which suggest that the Babylonians really pronounced the name as *G'baru*. It will be noticed that he is called "Governor of Gutium," a portion of Media, and it is therefore safe to say that he was a Mede. The Darius who took Babylon in the account in the Book of Daniel was also a Mede—the two men, therefore, would seem to have been one and the same. Both took Babylon, and both appointed governors in Babylonia (though in this text the number given in Daniel—120—is not stated) afterwards. They may both be identified with other people, but that Gubaru or Ugaru is the "Darius the Mede" of Daniel, is a conclusion from which there is no escape.

One of the most important statements in this noteworthy inscription is that referring to the Temple of Belus, Ê-sagila, in lines 16-18. There we find a mention of certain *tukkume* of Gutium or Media (with the character for leather before the word) having shut the gates of Ê-sagila—*Babani ša Ê-saggil upahhir*—and apparently in consequence of that *batla ša mimma ina Ê-saggil u êkurāti ul iššakin*, "loss of anything in Ê-sagila and the temples was not made." As we know, there was a considerable amount of valuable property in the temple, and measures for its due protection had apparently been taken—a stroke of policy which evidently impressed the Babylonians, and did not a little to reconcile them to Persian rule. The conqueror had preserved the treasures of their great sanctuary intact—a thing which no conqueror had probably ever done before—and they found him worthy of their confidence. Though only a governor and commander-in-chief of the Persian forces, he had the power and authority of a king, and this is the title which Daniel gives Darius the Mede.

It was not until four months later—the 3rd of Marcheswan,

that Cyrus entered Babylon, and was met by the *hariné*, which I have doubtfully rendered as deputations—the rendering demanded, apparently, by the context. It is noteworthy that Belshazzar was killed a week after the arrival of Cyrus at Babylon, but the honour of the capture of the inner city or citadel belongs to Gobryas. Though Cyrus had no hand in the operations, it is probable that the attack was only decided on after consultation with him—as for the deputations, they evidently knew that it was Cyrus who was king, and that everything depended upon him.

As Nabonidus had been captured, Belshazzar, his son, became king in the eyes of the Babylonians, and is rightly so regarded in Daniel—indeed, it is not improbable that he had been associated with his father on the throne for many years; hence, as has been often pointed out, the appointment of Daniel, by Belshazzar, as “the third ruler in the kingdom.” Note, also, that this appointment on the part of Belshazzar implies that he regarded his father as being still alive, and still virtual head of the state. Daniel, however, was fully aware of the precarious position of his royal master, shut up there in the inner city, or in the citadel, with the Medo-Persian army at his gates, and the answer which he is stated to have given is not one which we should regard as altogether respectful. “Let thy gifts be to thyself, and give thy rewards to another,” was the preface to his interpretation of the handwriting. Though we have much to learn about this historical event, so far all the records fit well in together. Babylon was taken, as the Babylonian record says, without fighting, but “the city of the king’s house” still held out. It was to gain this that the army of Cyrus entered by the drained river-bed, and it was there that the last stand of the Babylonians took place.

NOTES.

P. 167. For a translation of the Semitic Creation-Story, see the *Journal of the Victoria Institute*, 1903, pp. 17–56.

P. 168. Dr. Poebel’s description appeared in the *Philadelphia Museum Journal* for June, 1913.

P. 169. The concluding lines of the *Daily Telegraph* fragment quoted are, as far as they are preserved, as follows:—

7. . . . all the denizens, all of the creation
8. which in the assembly of my family
9. and Nin-igi-azaga
10. the assembly of the denizens was glorious

11. all the

The "glory" of the "denizens" would correspond with the expression "very good" in Genesis i. Note, however, that this is a version of the gods' Creation, not Tiawath's.

P. 171. *Ziugiddu*. If I have read the characters shown by the half-tone blocks published by Dr. Arno Poebel (*Philadelphia Museum Journal* for June, 1913) aright, this name of the Babylonian Noah is written with the characters $\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$, *Zi-û-giddu*, "Being + day + long."

Concerning him, Dr. Poebel says that he was a *pašišu*-priest of Enki (the god Ēa), daily and constantly in the service of his god. To requite him for his piety, Enki tells him that, at the request of Enlil (the older Bel), the gods had resolved "to destroy the seed of mankind." *Zi-û-giddu* thereupon—this part, however, is broken away—builds a great boat and places thereon all kinds of animals. The storm rages for seven days and seven nights, after which the sun appears again, and when its light shines into the vessel the patriarch sacrifices an ox and a sheep. In the end, *Zi-û-giddu* worships before Enlil, whose anger against men had now abated, for Enlil says: "Life like a god I give to him (? *ti dingira-gime munnašummu*), an eternal soul like a god (*zi dūr dingira-gime*) I create for him."

Immortality was therefore regarded as having been conferred upon the Babylonian Noah—possibly, also, upon his descendants. *Zi-û-giddu* thus became "the being of everlasting day"—the gods' eternity.

P. 171. In the version which the Babylonian Noah (*Ut-napištim*) related to Gilgameš, his sacrifice was of the produce of the earth.

P. 173. It must have been from this record that Berosus obtained the material for the history of the world, now lost.

Professor Hilprecht's notes upon the list of kings will be found in *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A: Cuneiform Texts, vol. xx, part 1, p. 46, and plates 30 and XV.

P. 174. Professor Scheil's description of the Chronological tablet was published in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* for the year named. Mr. George Smith's paper appeared in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. iii, p. 361 ff. (1874).

P. 175. The dynasty of the Kassites (Cossaeans) ruled from about 1780 to 1210 B.C.

P. 175. "Prince Mastema" is one of the names of Satan in Rabbinical writings.

P. 177. If the rendering at the end of the first paragraph here be correct, the seeding-plough was in use before 2000 B.C.

P. 177. Among the new royal and other names revealed by the tablets from Jokha may be mentioned *Libanuk-šabaš*, viceroy of Marhašu; *Habalul*, viceroy of Adab or Udab; *Nišiliim*, viceroy of

Tutula; *Ibdati*, viceroy of Kubla; and *Hulibar*, viceroy of Tahtahuni. Among Dungi's sons were *Sur-Enzu* and *Istar-il-šu*; and *Šu-Sin*, grandson of Dungi, had a son named *Enim-Nannar*. All these were of the time of the dynasty of Ur, about 2300 B.C.

P. 178. The tablets here referred to form part of the collection of Mr. Harding Smith.

P. 185. The lowest stage or plinth of Ê-temen-anki (the Tower of Babylon) measures, according to the scale, about 95 metres (about 312 feet). This amounts to 300 "enlarged feet" (Babylonian) in Dieulafoy's scheme. George Smith calculated that the height equalled the width of the base, in which case it measured the same, 312 feet. M. Dieulafoy, however, makes it to have measured about 250 feet in all, above the level of the plain. But it is admitted that the height of the Tower is very uncertain, and modifications of the estimates thereof may be expected.

P. 185. The friend to whom I owe the slides referred to is Mr. W. L. Nash, L.R.C.P., Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.

P. 186. Various readings of the Aramaic form of the name transcribed as *Anušat* by Pognon have been suggested, among them being my own and Professor Prince's (independently argued) *Ênn-rêštū*, "primæval Lord," or the like. Hugo Radau reads *En-usāti*, "lord of healing," whilst others favour *En-arišti*, *En-maštu*, etc. The deity in question was one of the gods of war, and is generally called *Ninip*, though *Nirig* is also a possible reading. For details concerning his character, see the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, December, 1906, pp. 270 ff. Interesting additions might now be made to the legends about him translated in that paper.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, in thanking the Lecturer, referred to the great difficulty in interpreting the cuneiform inscriptions, and said how necessary it was that there should be a succession of great scholars, like the Lecturer, to study them. He welcomed the references to the late George Smith, and to the Hibbert lectures which Professor Sayce delivered in 1887. For himself, he found the slides which had been exhibited of absorbing interest, especially those relating to the Tower of Babylon.

A LADY asked whether there was any special significance in the Tower of Babylon; was it unique, or were there many such?

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES said that the shape of the altar shown on one of the slides had struck him as being exactly like the altars

shown in the astronomical figures on boundary stones. He asked for information as to the substitution of the constellation Libra for that of the Altar in the Zodiac. He believed that the modern zodiacal Libra was spurious and was introduced by Egyptian influences.

Mr. M. L. ROUSE said that at the great Palestine Exhibition in 1907 a seed-plough of the same kind as that portrayed in these most ancient inscriptions was driven by a Bedouin upon a model field; in surprise he asked the driver whether wheat was not usually sown broadcast in the East, but received the answer that many other seeds were sown broadcast, but wheat was always sown through this leather hopper and tube set behind the ploughshare.

Until that evening he had not known which of the two great towers lying respectively in the heart of the ruins of Babylon and at Birs Nimrud was the original Tower of Babel, the former corresponding to Ê-Sagila, or Temple of the Lofty Head, the latter to Ê-Zida, or Temple of Life; he now knew that it was the former.

He noted that according to this latest found Deluge Story the God Ea was constantly served by Ziugiddu (or Noah) before the Deluge, and since, in the Gisdhubar story it was Ea who warned the good man to prepare the ship of deliverance, was not the name *Ea* really a variant of *Jah*, the shorter alternative Hebrew name for the true God?

Colonel VAN SOMEREN urged that if the Tower of Babylon was only 200 feet high, it could not fulfil the Biblical description of "reaching up to heaven." There was no verb in the Hebrew at all. He had read that the real meaning was that the Tower was an observatory; perhaps with a planisphere or map of the heavens laid out at the top? Could the Lecturer enlighten them on this point?

The Rev. F. A. JONES observed that the period chiefly dealt with by Dr. Pinches was an intensely interesting one, it being so close to that represented in Scripture as immediately following the Flood. It was remarkable how entirely the account of Berosus was confirmed, even in its chronology, by the contemporary inscriptions already deciphered, and we were probably on the eve of discoveries which would elucidate the strange period he gave as 33,091 years, which read as days was 91 years, and so read made his chronology practically the same as that of Genesis.

The ruins at Nippur were reported by Haines as going down to virgin soil 33 feet below the present level of the plain, and Mr. Jones said he could only understand that on the assumption that the level of the plain was raised by a flood; if so the lowest Ziggurat was antediluvian: a conclusion to which several other facts in that connection pointed.

The Rev. A. IRVING, B.A., D.Sc., would only detain the meeting at that late hour with one or two brief remarks (suggested by his own recent work*) on the most valuable paper that they had just listened to. One point that especially struck him was the bold perspective, in which it tended to place Abraham as an *historical personage*, in the face of much speculation of late years as to the mythical character of the Patriarchs. He enquired if the term "cattle" (p. 179) included the *horse*, that animal being never mentioned in the Genesis enumerations of the possessions of the Patriarch, used mostly for war purposes (chiefly by the Egyptians) in those Pentateuchal times [and ignored in the Tenth Commandment].† Might it be possible that the Babylonian term "black-headed" (p. 168) had some reference to traditions or survivals of the negroid (?) Neolithic people of the Grimaldi Race?‡ And was it possible to fill in hypothetically the gap (p. 169) so as to read "denizens of [the caves]"? He desired to associate himself with Dr. Pinches' "contention" in the paragraph: "How early the date . . . original scheme" (pp. 170, 171). It seems to suggest an Abrahamic inspiration for the Creation Story of Genesis!

On the motion of the CHAIRMAN, the Meeting returned a hearty vote of thanks to the Lecturer, and to the Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, who had furnished some of the slides by which the Lecture had been illustrated.

The LECTURER thanked the Meeting for the appreciative attention which had been given him, and for the cordial vote of thanks. In reply to the first question, he would say that towers like that

* See *Reports of the British Association* for the years 1910, 1911, 1913.

† Cf. Job xxxix, 19 ff. The wild horse was known long before, and had probably been domesticated by the Neolithic men. Its immediate ancestry dates back to the Pliocene Period, in which remains of several species of *Equus* are well known.

‡ As described by Professor Marcellin Boule from the Grimaldi grottoes near Mentone. Any clue, which seems to bring us on Biblical lines into touch with pre-Adamic races, is of interest.

of Babylon were not rare in Babylonia and Assyria, and they probably varied in size with the importance of the place and the consequent opulence or poverty of the religious foundation therein. Answering Dr. Coles, he stated that it seemed to him hardly likely that Libra was originally the picture of an altar, though altars were found on the boundary-stones. In the only place where the name was spelled out it appeared as *Zibanit*, which was regarded as the word for "scales." (As this is of late date, it may have been introduced, as suggested, by the Egyptians.) In reply to Mr. Rouse, he was glad of the testimony that the seeding-device, of which he had shown a picture, was still used in the country. The lecturer regretted not having made himself clear as to Ê-sagila and Ê-zida. Ê-sagila was not the tower, but the great temple of Merodach connected with the Tower in Babylon, which seems to have been called "The House of the Foundation of Heaven and Earth." Ê-zida was the "Everlasting House" at Borsippa, and the tower in connection with it was called Ê-urwe-imina-an-ki, "the House of the 7 regions of Heaven and Earth," symbolizing the seven planets (including the sun and moon). The meaning of Ê-sagila was "head-raising," not, apparently, in the sense of a tall structure, but as the place where the people, or the hostile gods of old (see p. 188), were comforted—"lifted up" from their downcast state. Both Ê-sagila and Ê-zida had been restored by Nebuchadrezzar. Mr. Rouse had suggested that Êa (the name of the god of the waters and of deep wisdom) was a variant of Jah (or its original form); but this the lecturer hesitated to confirm, notwithstanding that his friend, Professor Fritz Hommel (*Journal of the Victoria Institute*, 1895, p. 36) had already pointed out the likeness. (Naturally there is also the question of an ancient identification of two names originally distinct to be considered.) Colonel Van Someren was right as to the Tower of Babylon not being very high (see p. 192, note to p. 184). A tower, whose top "was in the heavens," simply meant, as has already been recognized, a very high tower. Whether there was a planisphere at the top or not the lecturer could not say, but he thought it unlikely, though small planispheres of baked clay existed. The house at the top was the abode of the god Merodach. Replying to the Rev. F. A. Jones, the antiquity of the ruins at Niffer had been estimated by an examination of the accumulations as dating from about 10,000

years ago, but this was naturally open to correction, and the high date of Nabonidus for Narâm-Sin (3,200 years before his time) is regarded by Assyriologists as being about 1,000 years too early. Referring to Dr. Irving's suggestion that the "black-headed people" had their origin in traditions of negroid (?) neolithic cave-dwellers, the lecturer said that was a matter of opinion. "Men of the black head" was a description of the Babylonians themselves—in contradistinction thereto certain Gutian (Median) slaves were described as being "fair." The word translated "denizens" (*nam-mašše*)—see p. 169—occurs in the fifth line of the bilingual story of the Creation, apparently as indicating dwellers in cities; and it is noteworthy that the Sumerian equivalent is written *adam*—see the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1891, pp. 402 and 403. In early lists of domestic animals asses were often referred to, but never horses, which seem to have become fairly well known to the Babylonians 2,000 years B.C. (The tablets referred to on p. 179 are much later than this, but there is no mention of horses.)

The Meeting adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

LATER NOTE BY THE LECTURER.

Since the writing of the note on Ziugiddu (p. 191), Dr. S. Langdon has published his reading of the name,* which he gives as *Zid-ud-giddu*, for *Ud-zid-giddu*, and translates "long is the breath of life." This is a fuller transcription of the name as I have read it (following Poebel). The rendering "being of everlasting day," however (p. 191), seems to me to be worthy of consideration.

* *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, June, 1914, p. 190.