

# 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 *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

of the world, when brought into Christ's fold, forget the heavenly aspirations which in spite of himself opened his heart to the gospel? Ought not apologetics, whether in or out of the pulpit, to be fundamentally psychological and Biblical? Yes; there is such a thing as Biblical psychology, though not of the sort which a great theologian once imagined; and exegesis, if it is not to be a piece of dry archæology, must learn to be more psychological. Only thus will it help the apologist and the preacher.

T. K. CHEYNE.

---

BREVIA.

**Assyrisches Wörterbuch, von F. Delitzsch, 2. Lieferung, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1888.**—Last year, in the September number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, we discussed at some length the first part of the long-promised *Assyrisches Wörterbuch* of Dr. Delitzsch; and we took the opportunity of pointing out certain radical defects in his method of work—defects so serious that the value of much of his work was, from our point of view, materially impaired. Shortly after the appearance of this review there appeared a paragraph in the *Academy*, in which the writer expressed his opinion that we had been “too incisive” in our treatment of Dr. Delitzsch’s *Wörterbuch*, but admitting at the same time that Dr. Delitzsch made mistakes in copying Assyrian inscriptions. Following closely on our review of the *Wörterbuch* there appeared reviews by Schrader, Jensen,<sup>1</sup> Sayce, Lyon, Harper, Bezold,<sup>2</sup> and “Bel-ibni,” all of which pointed out grave defects and blunders in the first part of the *Wörterbuch*. Schrader, the generous and learned teacher of Dr. Delitzsch, expressed himself so strongly on the subject of the *Wörterbuch* and its author, that any person but Dr. Delitzsch would have thought twice before he committed to the public a second part of a work in which the same blunders and the same defects which occurred in the first were perpetuated. Mr. Lyon pointed out the mistakes in the work in an impartial way, and “Bel-ibni” discussed the defects of the book with characteristic

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jensen points out that some of the words quoted by Dr. Delitzsch do not exist! See *Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.* Bd. II. pp. 157–163.

<sup>2</sup> *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1888. No. 32, cols. 1079–81.

vehemence and perspicacity. From these reviews Dr. Delitzsch might have learned that his power of copying inscriptions upon tablets was limited; that he made mistakes like other people; that his knowledge of Semitic languages was of the slightest description; and last, but not least, that the time for making an Assyrian dictionary had not yet arrived. We cannot, of course, blame Dr. Delitzsch for not possessing the power of copying Assyrian inscriptions, nor for not knowing Semitic languages; but we do blame him for pretending that he can copy Assyrian, and for trying to make the ignorant think that he does know Semitic languages. We were much surprised when first we found out that he could not copy Assyrian inscriptions, for we understood that the enlightened Saxon Government sent him to England every year in order to make and keep him *facile princeps* in Assyrian: that he is not so, however, we have proved before, and will presently prove again. Before doing so we will explain what we mean by saying that the time for making an Assyrian dictionary has not yet come. It is estimated that there are in the British Museum about 50,000 tablets and tablet-fragments written in Assyrian or Babylonian; the inscriptions upon them relate to every conceivable subject. The most important of all the various collections which go to make up the 50,000 is that which came from Kuyundshik, which comprises about twelve thousand tablets and tablet-fragments. Of this collection rather less than five hundred have been published; and out of the whole series of collections in the British Museum not 2,000, or less than one twenty-fifth part of the whole, have been published.<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Rawlinson has published the greatest number of Assyrian texts, in all, eight hundred; among them being the lengthy inscriptions of Tiglath Pileser I., Shalmaneser II., Assurnasirnal, Sargon II., Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal, and Nebuchadnezzar II. The greatest number of Babylonian texts, more than one thousand, have been published by the Rev. Dr. Strassmaier; and when we remove the contributions of these scholars from the lists of published texts but little remains for any one else to lay claim to. Now Dr. Delitzsch has visited London year after year for several years for the purpose of copying texts, but notwithstanding all these visits,—from 1874–1887,—he has only published, for the first time, copies of twenty texts.<sup>2</sup> His visits

<sup>1</sup> See Bezdol, *Die Thontafelsammlungen des British Museum*, p. 9 (753).

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* 3 lines from S. 25, 30 lines from K. 5423a, and eighteen texts (partly in

have been so short, and he has spent so little of his time when in London in copying tablets, that this is not to be wondered at; but what really is to be regretted is that Dr. Delitzsch cannot have seen, much less have read, more than one-twentieth part of the inscribed tablets in the British Museum. How then, we ask, is it possible for Dr. Delitzsch to make a dictionary of the Assyrian language, while about forty-eight thousand cuneiform tablets remain unpublished, and while forty-seven thousand are unknown to him? If the reader will think what these facts would mean if applied to Greek or Latin, we imagine that he will not cavil at our statement that the time for making an Assyrian dictionary has not yet come. Moreover, Dr. Delitzsch's statement that his *Wörterbuch* contains "die gesamte bisher veröffentlichte und einen beträchtlichen Theil der noch nicht veröffentlichten babylonisch-assyrischen Keilschriftliteratur," reads not unlike a wilful mis-statement in the light of these facts. What we do want very much, and what it is possible to make, is an Assyrian Vocabulary to all the well-understood historical and other texts: when that is done, some advancement will have been made, and preparation for a complete Assyrian Dictionary begun. Dr. Strassmaier's *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss* was a step in the right direction, only unfortunately that wonderful work does not give the meanings of the 9072 words arranged in it.

In the new part of the *Wörterbuch* the same mischievous system of publishing texts partly transliterated is again followed, and the student is led into error thereby. *E.g.* on page 182, four lines of a text are given, partly in Assyrian and partly in transcription; but why are not the original Babylonian signs given? We don't want Dr. Delitzsch's transcription into Assyrian, we want the text as it is given on the tablet. Give an Assyrian transcript as well if necessary, but we don't want that alone. In his four-line transcript he again proves his inability to distinguish the difference between Babylonian characters, for in the third line he reads *ri* instead of *khu*. It is true that he puts "oder *khu*" on the margin; but the tablet is so clearly and well written that it is marvellous how he has made the mistake, and the sign *ri* occurs so often on the tablet that there is no room for any doubt whatever. Or

transliteration) in the *Wörterbuch*. We are not, of course, reckoning additions to already published texts, or copies taken by him from photographs like the celebrated "Heirathscontract."

page 204 Dr. Delitzsch publishes a part of the obverse of K. 2107. He leaves out the ends of fifteen lines which are clearly to be seen on the left-hand side of the tablet, and the end of a line which is still to be seen after the line ending *naphkar rag-gi*; but no indication of these omissions is given. To publish texts in this way is slovenly and careless. On page 173, line 16, the last character given by Delitzsch as *du* is impossible; it may however be *tum*. On page 171, line 51, the traces of a character which are to be seen on tablet K. 4243 are not indicated; and in line 62, same page, a whole character (*kur* probably) is omitted entirely. On page 233, George Smith's copies of K. 4602 and K. 4400 are printed without any attempt at verification of the text having been made by Dr. Delitzsch, who represents Col. 1 as being complete, although the whole of the left margin of the tablet does not exist! Occasionally Dr. Delitzsch's statements are childish. *E.g.* on page 173 he says that his copy of the fragment published there was made during G. Smith's lifetime, and therefore may not be trustworthy; but why has he not verified and collated his copy during his various visits to London since G. Smith died in 1876? Dr. Delitzsch is very careless in quoting the numbers of tablets. On page 309, he quotes from Haupt's *Akkadische Sprache* K. 24?5, without ever having taken the trouble to find out what the number of the tablet really was. For the information of scholars, we add that the number of this tablet is 2485. Had Dr. Delitzsch taken the trouble to consult the Museum registers he could have found it in a very short time. Another similar case is K. 4338, which he quotes eleven times in his *Wörterbuch* (on pp. 25, 63, 68, 103, 107, 121, 200, 226, 243, 294, and 320), as K. 4378. It is correctly quoted twice by Strassmaier *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, pp. 308, 569. Even when Dr. Delitzsch re-publishes other people's copies, he makes extraordinary blunders, *E.g.*, in his *Lesestücke* he publishes G. Smith's copy of the Deluge text with additions from fragments of tablets acquired in recent years: on page 102, line 52 (tablet 82-5-22, 316) he reads the last character as *bit*, but it is really *ra* and is very clearly written. In line 103 of the same text, the sign *mat* is given very clearly by two tablets; yet in some unaccountable manner Dr. Delitzsch makes it out to be *Khi shu*!! Still more unaccountable is the blunder which Dr. Delitzsch has made in line 121 of the Deluge tablet. The text has *VI ur-ra u mu-sha-a-ti*, "six days and

nights," a reading perfectly intelligible and certain, because what happened on the seventh day is stated in line 123. Dr. Delitzsch however reads *VI ur-ra XVII mu-sha-a-ti*, "six days and seventeen nights," which reading he thinks preferable to that of G. Smith. Now a slight examination of the original tablet shows that the sign *u* "and" is perfectly clear, and that what Dr. Delitzsch has made seven wedges of is nothing more or less than a HOLE in the surface of the tablet, which has become partly filled with dust!! On page 109, line 279, first character, Dr. Delitzsch, following G. Smith, writes *da*, but says in a note that the sign may possibly be *sha*; a very short examination of the text clearly shows that the sign is really *ra*! Such mistakes in copying are, however, not so important as one which we will now mention. Many years ago Dr. Delitzsch copied tablet K. 247, on which he imagined that he saw a dialectic form of a word, and on the right-hand side of it the observation *naqbu*. He then thought that *naqbu* was the phonetic equivalent of the well-known ideograph *eme sal*, and was the first, as Prof. Haupt remarked,<sup>1</sup> to explain it as meaning "Female Language," or "Woman's Language."

Upon this statement a whole theory about the Sumerian and Accadian language was built up by Delitzsch, Haupt, Sayce, and Hommel. But quite recently Dr. Bezold has proved<sup>2</sup> that the reading *naqbu* is a mistake for *eme sal*, and thus this elaborate and wonderful theory falls to the ground with a crash, burying in its ruins much of its founder's reputation. We earnestly hope that Dr. Delitzsch's new theory as to the correctness of Halévy's "*Antisumerischem Standpunkt*," advertised on the cover of the new part of the *Wörterbuch*, will last longer than the old one which Dr. Bezold has demolished.

A great deal of space in Dr. Delitzsch's *Wörterbuch* is occupied by profitless discussions. *E.g.* on pp. 234-236, he discusses the word *uqu*, which Sir Henry Rawlinson, so far back as 1851,<sup>3</sup> considered to be an unusual word meaning "people." Sir Henry's

<sup>1</sup> The Babylonian "Woman's Language" (*Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, V., p. 69).

<sup>2</sup> Bezold, "Remarks on some unpublished Cuneiform Syllabaries," p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See Rawlinson, *Memoir on the Babylonian and Assyrian Inscriptions*, p. xlviii (1851). If Dr. Delitzsch had taken the pains to find out what Sir H. Rawlinson had really said, he would not have fallen into the trap laid by Dr. Oppert (Le colonel Rawlinson crut d'abord voir dans ce mot [*uqu*] un monogramme complexe).

views on this point were not accepted universally, but after three pages of argument Dr. Delitzsch is obliged to come to the absurd conclusion that *uqu* is a "Sumerian loan-word which suddenly came into use again in the latest period" (in *ú-ku* ein *sumerisches* Lehnwort zu sehen, das plötzlich wieder in spätester Zeit in Curs gekommen wäre). Scattered throughout the book are several examples of abuse of other students of Assyrian, which can do neither the writer nor the reader any good. *E.g.* on p. 311, in discussing the word *akhru* he talks of the "*bedauerliche Unsicherheit, um nicht zu sagen, Unwissenheit*" which characterizes Dr. Strassmaier's copy of a certain word. Now, considering that Dr. Strassmaier has published 1000 difficult Babylonian texts and the *Alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, not to mention other works, it is not to be wondered at if he occasionally mis-copies a sign; moreover, it must be remembered that he does not claim infallibility as Dr. Delitzsch does. After the examples given by us above, it is clear that the words *Unsicherheit* and *Unwissenheit* really describe the copies of Dr. Delitzsch. We will quote another passage to show how Dr. Delitzsch regards the labours of one of the early Assyrian scholars. On p. 286, speaking of Dr. Oppert's translations, he says, "Freilich wird mir gleichzeitig bei meinem—ebenjetzt—erstmaligen<sup>1</sup> Lesen der Übersetzungen Opperts recht klar, dass meine Methode in der Erforschung des assyrischen Wortschatzes derjenigen meines verehrten Pariser Fachgenossen noch weit mehr entgegengesetzt ist als ich bislang glaubte, und ich schöpfe daraus vom (*sic!*) neuem (*sic!*) den Muth, auf dem in diesem Wörterbuch betretenen, freilich unendlich mühsamen Weg, den assyrischen Wortschatz einzig und allein aus sich selbst unter Berücksichtigung aller bislang bekannter Belegstellen der einzelnen Stämme und Wörter zu erklären, unentmuthigt vorwärts zu schreiten."<sup>2</sup> The only remark we have need to make on this conceited observation is, that if Dr. Oppert's translations and method of work do not correspond with those of Dr. Delitzsch, so much the worse for Dr. Delitzsch.

As an example of the guess-work employed by Dr. Delitzsch in finding the meanings of words, we instance the following. On p. 266 he gives the verb *azar* "to curse"; and he says that this

<sup>1</sup> This statement does not agree with the numerous references to Dr. Oppert's *Documents Juridiques* made by Dr. Delitzsch in his *Wo lag das Paradies*, pp. 147, 148, 177, 192, 206.

<sup>2</sup> This appears to be a stock phrase of Dr. Delitzsch when speaking of other people's books. *Comp. the Literar-Centralbl.*, 1887, No. 42, col. 1440.

meaning can be deduced with certainty from the substantive *izzirtu*, "curse." Now, this meaning of *izzirtu* is a guess on the part of Dr. Delitzsch, based upon the fact that it occurs in parallelism with *irriti*, which he thinks is identical in meaning with *arratu*, "curse," comparing Hebrew root ארר. But the root of *izzirtu* can quite properly be נזר, or even אצר, and the only instance of the use of a verbal form supposed to be taken from the root ארר given in the *Wörterbuch*, throws light neither on the first nor the second radical. On p. 316 Dr. Delitzsch laughs at Mr. S. A. Smith for translating *i-zir-tu* (*i-šir-tu*) by "document," and adds, he might have guessed a thousand other meanings, "statt dessen er ebenso gut auf tausend andere Bedeutungen rathen könnte." Now, Mr. Smith gives this translation as doubtful (See *Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, Nov., 1887, p. 72, line 1), and therefore Dr. Delitzsch's remark only applies to his own piece of guess-work. We cannot close our criticism of Part 2 of the *Wörterbuch* without commending the beautifully neat and clear writing of its author. It would be better however if Dr. Delitzsch would learn to write cuneiform characters as they appear on the tablets.

But the reader of this review will, after this exposure, be inclined to ask if there is anything certain at all in Assyriology; and we can answer with truth, and say that there is. Assyriology is a young and healthy science, and the line of demarcation between what is and what is not known in it is very clearly defined. What is known becomes better known each day; and what is not at present known may quite possibly become known in the immediate future. What we protest against is the assumption by professed Assyriologists of knowledge which they do not possess. To become even a respectable copyist of Assyrian, much practice in copying is required; and to explain Assyrian inscriptions with anything like accuracy, a good knowledge of the better-known Semitic dialects, like Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic, is required. To read a few books in each of these dialects, some years of hard study are required; and as neither Dr. Delitzsch nor his imitators have gone through this course of study, it is clear that they cannot possess the information to be derived from it. From force of circumstances it is impossible for Dr. Delitzsch ever to be a good copyist of Assyrian. If he cannot spend three months of each year in copying tablets, no amount of pretension and no amount of skilful adaptation of other people's copies of texts will make him one. Semitic languages he



can learn if he will give the time to study them ; and that he should at once devote himself to this important branch of his study, no one who knows any Semitic dialect, and who takes the trouble to read his so-called philological observations, can doubt. We much regret that he has been so ill-advised as to continue to publish the incomplete, undigested, and, in many cases, badly explained list of Assyrian words which he calls a "Wörterbuch," as it can do him no credit and only adds another to the long list of pseudo-scientific works on Assyrian which are now becoming so common. If he would help in publishing the forty-eight thousand unpublished texts in the British Museum, he would be employing his time with some chance of success.

E.

---