

works on the most various subjects, M. Godet paved the way for his theological publications by taking part in the translation into French of the works of German authors, Tholuck, Olshausen, Theremin, and Krummacher, an enterprise which was meant to repair to some extent the desolating poverty with which French Protestant literature was afflicted.

In the midst of this, the Revolution of 1st March 1848 broke out, which detached the Canton of Neuchâtel from the Crown of Prussia, and thenceforth united it wholly to the Swiss Confederation. Such an event could not be without influence on the Church institutions of the country. The *venerable class*, consisting of all the pastors of the Established Church, and long become very unpopular even among the religious part of the people, by the absolute and exclusive power that it exercised in the parishes, was abolished by the new Government, and replaced by a Synod after the Presbyterian manner. While quite adhering to the new *régime*, which still seemed to him to afford the National Church an acceptable and sufficient guarantee of autonomy, M. Godet, like all the former members of the venerable class, has always cherished a kind and grateful memory of that institution, which, however, had evidently run its course.

But the revolution in our small country, as in our great western neighbour land, had created situations and engendered political and religious questions big with division and dissension in the Church and the family. The ultra-royalist party, then called *abstentionist*, because it pretended to ignore accomplished facts, and still to recognise

only the fallen Government, reckoned adherents both among the clergy and the population. Among the pastors and the professors of theology there were some who both refused to perform their official functions, because of the state of revolution, and also to give in their resignation, which would have been to recognise the Republican *régime*. Professor Perret, author of a translation of the Old Testament, which was noted for a time in the French-speaking countries, and M. Guillebert, pastor at Neuchâtel, belonged to that group, whose impracticableness produced in the Church an untenable situation. M. Godet had at that time a clear view of the situation, and the merit of braving the fury of lay and clerical reactionaries, while accepting functions which were left in abeyance in name of a narrow fidelity, mistaken in principle. Applying to our political and ecclesiastical situation the rule laid down by Paul in Rom. xiii. 1, M. Godet justly thought that, without legalising a revolution like that of 1st March 1848, the Christian's duty was to submit to the actual Government, and that this obligation implied a loyal co-operation in the functions of the new institutions whether in Church or State.

Moved by this, he agreed, in 1850, to accept the post of Professor of Exegesis and Criticism of the Old and New Testaments, which had become vacant *de facto* by the refusal of Professor Perret to perform its duties, thus incurring the accusation which failed not to be hurled against him, of stepping into the shoes of the legitimate occupant.

(To be concluded.)

Cyrus and the Capture of Babylon.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., CHESHUNT COLLEGE.

RESPECTING the capture of Babylon in 538 B.C., the only original sources of information that we possess are—(1) The Chronicle of Nabonidus and Cyrus inscribed in four columns on two sides of a clay tablet. Unfortunately, a portion of the text is seriously damaged. This document recounts in chronological order the events contained in the seventeen years of the reign of the last Babylonian king, Nabonidus (or Nabû-nâid). The first or left-hand column of the obverse of the tablet contains a fragmentary and mutilated

account of the first three years of his reign. The remainder of the column is broken off. We then come to the second or right-hand column, where we read the events of the sixth, seventh, and succeeding years, till we come to the eleventh. Turning over to the reverse, we continue reading on the right-hand column and so pass into the events of the final and fatal year of the reign of Nabonidus, when the troops of Cyrus advanced into the heart of Babylonia, and Babylon was captured. The beginning is lost, and the end is

completely mutilated. Of the fourth or left-hand column of this tablet there only remain a few signs containing mention of the temple of Anu.

(2) The second document is the Cylinder of Cyrus. This inscription originally comprised forty-six lines, but the first ten lines as well as the last ten are badly damaged. Even the intervening portion, which is in a much better state of preservation, is injured in certain places.

The first of these documents was originally published, with translation and notes, by that indefatigable Assyrian scholar of the British Museum, Mr. Theoph. G. Pinches, in the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (1882), vol. vii. pp. 139-176. See also the *Proceedings*, vol. v. p. 10. The second is published in the original cuneiform text in vol. v. of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (and also in Abel and Winckler's *Keilschrifttexte*, pp. 44 foll.).¹

Both these cuneiform texts are transcribed and translated in an excellent and most useful work edited by that eminent Assyriologist and teacher of our younger Assyriologists, Professor Eberhard Schrader of Berlin. I take the present opportunity of calling the attention of Semitic students and Old Testament scholars to this valuable repertory of Assyrian and Babylonian literature, with its accompanying maps. I refer to the *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek* (Cuneiform Library), published by H. Reuther of Berlin, and consisting of a considerable collection of the most important Assyrian and Babylonian texts, with transcription and translation. The original cuneiform is not given, and, to a certain extent, this is an advantage, as it renders the price more acceptable to the student. The three handy volumes which have hitherto been published contain the historical inscriptions of the Assyrian kings from the earliest times (1400 B.C.) down to the last (Assurbanipal). We have also numerous inscriptions of Babylonian monarchs from the time of Gudea (3000) and of Hammurabi (2100 B.C.) to that of Nabonidus. The Assyrian transcribed text stands on the left-hand page, and on the right is the translation. The names of the contributors, Abel, Bezold, Jensen, Peiser,

¹ An excellent figure of the baked clay cylinder of Cyrus will be found by the reader opposite p. 78 in Budge's *Babylonian Life and History* (Religious Tract Society). The cuneiform text of lines 15-21 of the cylinder will be found on p. 80. This very passage, recording Cyrus' advance into Babylon under the favouring auspices of Merodach, I shall have occasion to quote further on.

and Winckler, are a guarantee that the transcriptions and translations are given with the utmost accuracy that is possible to highly-trained Semitic acquirement and constant practice in the decipherment of cuneiform texts. I shall make use of this work (vol. iii. part ii. pp. 120-136), where the reader will find the inscriptions to which I have referred transcribed and translated by the practised hand of Professor Schrader himself.

Let us first examine the Chronicle of Nabonidus and Cyrus. This is the correct designation of the document. For, though it professes to record the events of the reign of Nabonidus, it is obvious that it was drawn up under the instructions of Cyrus, who intended that the annals of Nabonidus should be so written as to reflect glory upon himself. With the details respecting the earlier part of the reign of the Babylonian king, we are not immediately concerned. All that we need notice here is the fact that Nabonidus appears to have been strangely neglectful of the interests of his kingdom. In the annals of his *ninth* year we are informed that he remained in the town of Temâ,² while "his son [Bel-shar-uşur, the Belshazzar of Daniel] and the officers of State (*rabûti*), as well as the troops, stayed in the province Akkad." The national festivals fell into abeyance (*bañil*). During the New Year festival the king still remained in inactive retirement. "The king came not at Nisan to Tintir (or Babylon). Nebo did not enter Babylon, Bel did not march forth" as was usual (in the annual procession from Borsippa) to meet the god Nebo. The same thing had already been said of the seventh year of the reign of Nabonidus. What the cause was it is not quite easy to say. It must be remembered that the narrative we are reading was drawn up in the interests of his successor. Professor Hommel, in his valuable *History of Babylonia and Assyria* (p. 783), thinks that the reason why Nabonidus did not take part in the New Year ceremony at the temple of Sagilla was that a priestly revolution had broken out, occasioned by the supine attitude of the king, who appears to have been a religious fanatic with a craze for temple restoration, and for

² The position of Temâ is uncertain. Pinches, in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vii. p. 152, thinks it is the same as Tumâ, a quarter of Babylon, and is strongly supported by Hommel (*Gesch.* p. 783). Tiele, on the other hand, in his *History*, p. 470, footnote, expresses doubts.

researches in temple-archæology in Sippara, Ur, Larsa (Ellasar), and other towns, at a time when all his energies should have been devoted to strengthening the military defences of his capital. Meanwhile, the danger which threatened him from the growing power of Cyrus became more menacing as the months rolled on. This becomes evident as we read the "Chronicle" and note the references to Cyrus which recur throughout. Already in the second column of the obverse (for the sixth year of the reign of Nabonidus, 550 B.C.), we read that Ishtumigu (Ishtuvigu) or Astyages had marched against Cyrus, king of Anshan (or Elam), that the troops of the former had revolted against him, and had delivered him up to Cyrus.¹ And again in the ninth year (547 B.C.), we learn that Cyrus, king of Persia, had marshalled his troops, and had crossed the Tigris below Arbela. "In the month Iyyar he marched into the land . . . slew its prince, and carried off its booty." Dr. Winckler, in his *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*, p. 131, thinks that this land was Singara, or some other independent kingdom lying between the Euphrates and the Tigris.²

As we read further in the Chronicle, the same story of supineness and neglect on the part of Nabonidus meets us with wearisome iteration in the tenth and eleventh years of his reign. For a few years longer this painful state of national decrepitude and suspense was to continue. Now Babylonia contained within its borders a considerable population of resident aliens, to whom every fresh tidings of the approaching Persian conqueror awakened eager anticipation and exultant joy. These were the exiled Jews that had been carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar. The name of Cyrus became associated with the hopes and ideals cherished by the loftier minds of the Hebrew nation. The restored and purified commonwealth of the future, for which they sighed, was brought ever nearer to the inspired consciousness of the prophetic writers that composed the soul-stirring oracles in Isa. xxxv., xl.-lii., lx.-lxii. (and perhaps

¹ Comp. the great Cylinder of Nabonidus from Abu Habba, col. 1, lines 29-33.

² After this we must place the expedition of Cyrus against Cræsus, king of Lydia, to which Herodotus refers (i. 75 foll.). The siege and capture of Sardis, and the overthrow of the Lydian monarchy, shattered the alliance of Amasis, king of Egypt, with the Lydian power, upon which the feeble and tottering Babylonian empire was resting as a last buttress in the presence of the advancing might of Persia.

also in part Jer. xxxi., xxxiii.), as the successive conquests of Cyrus became known in Babylon. All these utterances gain in vividness as we follow the victorious career of Cyrus from 550 onwards. When the news of his crossing the Tigris, in the ninth year of Nabonidus (547 B.C.), came to the ears of the Jewish residents, we can well understand how the personality of the conqueror became the nucleus of prophetic announcements of coming deliverance. Cyrus was Jehovah's anointed servant, "whose right hand I have holden,"³ to subdue nations before him, and loins of kings do I ungird, opening before him the folding-doors, while gates shall not be closed. As for me, before thee I will march, making the lofty places level, shattering the bronze folding-doors, and hewing in pieces the iron bars . . . he shall build my city, and my exiles he shall allow to depart" (Isa. xlv. 1, 2, 13). The humiliation of the Babylonian deities is proclaimed in the exultant strains: "Bel crouches, Nebo falls. Their idols are destined for beasts and cattle; your carried things are borne as a burden by the weary beast."

As time went on, the priestly party among the Babylonians, and probably the nobility as well, became more and more disgusted with the supine helplessness of their king. Priests in all ages of the world's history have never been backward in opportunism, and we know that in this case they were not lacking in worldly shrewdness. Perceiving the inevitable drift of events, they went over to the side of the Persian conqueror in good time. The clay cylinder of Cyrus clearly indicates this, and its contents show that he owed his success, in part at least, to the friendly neutrality and co-operation of the priestly party. Both in the cylinder and in the Chronicle we find language used in describing the relation of Merodach to

³ The same phrase as the Assyrian *ša ašbat* (or *attamah*) *katušu*. That a foreign king should be selected for this high honour is not altogether without parallel in the Old Testament literature then existing. The "deliverer" whom Jehovah appointed to rescue Israel in the days of Jehoahaz from the oppression of Syria was no other than the Assyrian Rammânirâri III. (2 Kings xiii. 5) about 800 B.C. Note also the language of Ezekiel in reference to Nebuchadnezzar (xxix. 18, 19, xxx. 10, 11, 24, 25); and comp. Cheyne, Bampton Lectures, p. 280, where the writer justly regards him as a monarch that deserved the epithet *šar mišari*. How different became the sentiment of Hebrew prophecy towards Babylonia a quarter of a century later!

Cyrus somewhat analogous to that of Isa. xlv., in which the favour of Jehovah to his anointed servant Cyrus is the theme on which the prophet dwells.¹ Passing over the opening lines of the terra-cotta Cylinder, which are seriously damaged, we read: "The gods who dwelt there abandoned their abodes in wrath because he (*i.e.* Nabonidus) had brought them to Shuanna (= Babylon). Merodach . . . permitted the return of the inhabitants of all countries, rejoiced and looked with favour on him (*i.e.* Cyrus), and was concerned for the righteous prince,² whose hand he grasped, namely, Cyrus, king of the city Anshan (in Elam), whose name He proclaimed and recorded for sovereignty over the whole world" (lines 9-12). Further on (lines 14 foll.) we read that "Merodach, the great Lord, looked on his (*i.e.* Cyrus') righteous heart with joy, commanded his (*i.e.* Cyrus') march to His town, Babylon, and caused him to take his way to Tintir (or Babylon); like a companion (*ibru* = Heb. תִּבְרָ) and helper He marched by his side."

For the story of the capture of Babylon we betake ourselves once more to the Chronicle of Nabonidus and Cyrus. In the third column, on

¹ See the instructive remarks of Tiele, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, p. 473 foll.

² Iš-ti'-i-ma ma-al-ki i-ša-ru, where iš-ti'-i is the Iftéal Imperf. of שָׁעַר, familiar to the Hebrew scholar. These and similar phrases used in reference to Cyrus have a special interest when compared with like expressions used by the Deutero-Isaiah. It is impossible to resist the impression that both Babylonians and Hebrews became influenced by a common sentiment towards the Persian conqueror. Compare not only Isa. xlv. 13, but also xli. 2 and xlii. 6 (on which see Cheyne's notes); xlii. 1 would clearly point to the conclusion that the sentiment first arose among the Hebrews at a time when there was no thought of the Babylonian priesthood making common cause with Cyrus. That the Jewish community should have been capable of influencing the Babylonian upper classes of society is rendered quite possible, if not probable, by the facts disclosed by the Egibi tablets. These were probably the documents of a great firm of Hebrew bankers (I'gibi = עֵקֵב), "Messrs. *Jacob*," through whom an immense mass of business must have been transacted from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to that of Darius. See Sayce, *Fresh Light*, etc., p. 138, who compares them to the Rothschilds of our day. That the commercial Jewish community, backed by great money power, should have hailed the advent of the Persian conqueror as likely to inaugurate an era of greater commercial security and prosperity for themselves, and should have been able to impress these views on the upper classes of Babylonian society, is no very improbable supposition. Jer. xxix. 5-7 (comp. Davidson's *Ezekiel*, Introd. p. xx) suggests that exiled Israel lived in comparative prosperity.

the reverse of the tablet, lines 12 foll., we read: "In the month Tammuz, when Cyrus fought a battle at Uḥ, on the river Nišallat (?) with the troops of Akkad, the inhabitants of Akkad rose in rebellion. On the 14th, Sipar was captured without a battle. Nabonidus fled. On the 16th, Ugbaru (*i.e.* Gobryas), governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus entered Babylon without a battle. Subsequently, Nabonidus, after being hemmed in,³ was captured in Babylon." The following lines are very difficult, and therefore omitted. In line 18 we read: "On the 3rd Marcheswan, Cyrus entered Babylon. Peace he established in the city. He proclaimed peace to the whole of Babylon. Gubaru, his viceroy (previously called Ugbaru, *i.e.* Gobryas), he appointed viceroy over Babylon. From the month Kislev until the month Adar the gods of Akkad, whom Nabonidus had brought down to the city, returned to their towns."⁴ Lastly, we return to the clay Cylinder of Cyrus, in order to supplement the foregoing narrative. (Lines 17 foll.) . . . "Without conflict or battle He (Merodach) caused him (Cyrus) to enter Shuanna (a quarter of Babylon), His town. Babylon he spared. . . . With Nabonidus, who feared Him not, He filled his (*i.e.* Cyrus') hand (*i.e.* delivered Nabonidus into his power). All the inhabitants of Babylon, the mighty ones, the chief priests, bowed before him and kissed his feet. They rejoiced in his kingdom. Their face shone." It is not necessary to quote the proclamation of titles that follow. These are the usual commonplaces of Assyrian and Babylonian royal inscriptions.

From the original sources of information we shall now turn to secondary sources. These are the narratives of Herodotus and of Berossus.

The narrative in Herodotus is more complete. We need not pause long over the absurd story told in Book I. c. 189 about the rage of Cyrus against the River Gyndes (tributary of the Tigris) on account of the loss of the sacred white horse in its stream. That the Persian king should have wasted a whole summer season in cutting 360

³ *Irtakasa*, Iftéal of *rakušu*, "to bind." Hommel renders (*Gesch.* p. 785): "After Nabonidus had intrenched himself . . ." (*sich verschanzte*), giving the Iftéal a reflexive sense.

⁴ Upon this and other passages Professor Sayce founds the ingenious theory that Nabonidus obtained his unpopularity by offending local priesthoods by centralising the various cults in Babylon under the supremacy of Merodach, the god of the capital (Hibbert Lectures, 1887, p. 87 foll.).

channels (*i.e.* 180 on each side of the river) as a mode of punishing the river is obviously improbable, and may be compared with the legend of stripes and fetters inflicted by Xerxes upon the Hellespont more than half a century later (*Herod.* vii. 35). Blakesley, in his *Commentary* (1854), suggests that the myth may have been based upon the existence of irrigation works, and cites in confirmation Xenophon's description of the canals running into the Tigris (*Anab.* ii. 4, § 13). Certainly, the number 360 suggests a Babylonian origin, as it seems to be based upon the sexagesimal system that prevailed in ancient Babylonia.

In the following spring, as we learn from the narrative of Herodotus (chap. 190), Cyrus advanced upon Babylon. "The Babylonians marched out of the city, and awaited him. Upon his approaching near the city, the Babylonians came into collision with his troops, were defeated in battle, and shut up within the city rampart." They had long foreseen the siege, and had taken precautions to meet it by the accumulation of provisions. For a time Cyrus was in considerable perplexity (chap. 191). At length he stationed the [whole] army, some at the point where the river enters the city, and the rest behind the city, at the point where the river issues from it. He then gave orders to the army to enter the city whenever they saw that the river-bed had become fordable. Having made these dispositions and given these instructions, he himself retired with the non-combatant portion of his army. Having arrived at the lake, Cyrus did to the river and the lake what the queen of the Babylonians (Nitocris) had done. By diverting the stream by means of a canal into the lake, which was at that time a marsh, he made the old river-bed fordable, when the river had subsided. When this subsidence had taken place, the Persians, who were posted for that express purpose, entered Babylon by the river-bed of the Euphrates, after it had retired to the depth of about the middle of a man's thigh. Had the Babylonians obtained previous information of, or had understood what Cyrus was doing, they would not have allowed the Persians to enter the city, but would have destroyed them utterly. For, having closed all the gates that open on the river, and having themselves mounted on the stone dams that line the edges of the stream, they would have taken them (the Persians) like [fishes] in a weel. But as it was, the Persians came upon

them unexpectedly. Owing to the size of the city, when, according to the report of the inhabitants, the distant portions of the city were captured, those of the Babylonians who occupied the centre of the city did not realise that they were in the hands of the foe; but, as there happened to be a festival, were at this time dancing and enjoying themselves until they learnt the reality in grim earnest."¹

The glaring contrast between this narrative of Herodotus and that of the cuneiform tablets, which are nearly contemporary with the events they describe, must strike even the most casual reader. In the first place, the tablets say nothing about the diversion of the Euphrates. It is true that Mr. Budge, in his useful *Babylonian Life and History*, to which I have already referred (p. 82), suggests that "there is no reason why Cyrus should not have had recourse to this means as well as to fighting"; but here, I think, he is treating the "Father of History" too seriously. For if the Persian king had actually adopted this method of capturing the capital, it is difficult to understand why there is no reference to so remarkable a feat of skill in surmounting physical difficulties in either of the cuneiform documents from which I have quoted. Though both are mutilated, the portion of the text that deals with the actual capture of the city is tolerably complete and clear, despite the difficulties in syntactical construction, to which Professor Sayce referred at the recent Oriental Congress. And there is undoubtedly not a syllable in either the Cylinder or the Chronicle that makes the faintest allusion to the supposed feat of engineering skill. Blakesley indeed, like most of us, doubts whether the feat was possible.

But there are other discrepancies between Herodotus and the cuneiform records which are quite as startling. According to the latter, there was no siege of Babylon at all. The capture was effected not by Cyrus, but by Gobryas without striking a blow. This happened on the 16th of the month Tammuz. It was not till Marcheswan (in Babylonian *arach Samnu*, or the eighth month of the Babylonian calendar), *i.e.* over three months after the capture, that Cyrus himself made a solemn entrance into Babylon.

All Herodotean distortions of fact grew up during a period of less than a century that inter-

¹ It is noteworthy that Dan. v. rests upon a parallel tradition. Was it Greek in origin?

vened between the capture of the city and the composition of his history by the Greek writer. Oriental investigations, moreover, have tended to throw discredit on the narrative of Herodotus, though he appears to have visited Babylonia and Persia, and the minuteness of the descriptions in Book I. chaps. 178-183, certainly seems to be that of an eye-witness (comp. also vi. 119). That he saw much of what he relates may be inferred from his own distinct statement in chap. 183, respecting the great image of Bel, ἐγὼ μὲν μιν οὐκ εἶδον, τὰ δὲ λέγεται ὑπὸ Χαλδαίων, ταῦτα λέγω, while this sentence, combined with the recurrence of ὡς ἔλεγον οἱ Χαλδαῖοι, or phrases like it, show that much that Herodotus sets down as history in the first three books consists of unsifted hearsay. The systematic archæological investigations of the past fifty years have brought out into clear relief the defects of the Greek historian's narrative. A striking illustration of this is afforded in Grote's *History of Greece*. In that work the tale of the capture of Babylon, related by Herodotus, is set forth with all due gravity. In justice to Mr. Grote, however, it should be remembered that his history was begun before 1846, at a time when Assyriology as a science was only struggling into birth.¹ It was in this year that Sir Henry (then Major) Rawlinson published, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, his epoch-making researches on the bilingual Behistun Inscription of Darius. This, combined with Lassen's researches, laid a secure foundation for the decipherment of cuneiform. Ten more years wrought a vast change, and the translation of Herodotus by Professor George Rawlinson, with elaborate notes by Sir Henry Rawlinson (1858), was the first thoroughgoing attempt, so far as I am aware, to critically sift the records of the Greek historian in the light of modern archæology, to which the unrivalled geographical and cuneiform acquirements of Sir Henry Rawlinson had contributed so much. The last and worthiest attempt in the same direction in this country is Professor Sayce's annotated edition of Herodotus (1883). It called forth considerable controversy when it appeared, and its estimate of Herodotus is only partially sustained by that painstaking and cautious scholar, Professor Tiele, whose discriminating remarks

¹ Moreover, Grote expressly states: "To what extent the information communicated to him [Herodotus] was incorrect or exaggerated, we cannot now decide."

(*Babylon-Assyr. Gesch.* p. 9)² on this subject should be read by the student after he has perused Professor Sayce's brilliant and incisive attack upon the "Father of History" in the Introduction to *The Ancient Empires of the East*.

Passing over the references in Josephus' *Antiquities*, which contain nothing of any importance on the subject of the conquest of Babylonia, we come to those of Berossus (contained in Josephus, *Contra Ap.* I. chap. 20, and Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* ix. 41). Berossus was a Babylonian priest of Bel, who wrote, between 300 and 250 B.C., a work on Chaldæan history in three books, the importance of which may be judged from the universal testimony of ancient writers that he understood and made use of original Babylonian records. This work has only come down to us in the form of excerpts embedded in the writings of Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius. Probably most of these citations were again borrowed from such writers as Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus. The significance of Berossus as an authority is enhanced by the fact revealed by monumental evidence that cuneiform was employed as late as the time of Domitian. Berossus probably read and wrote both Greek and cuneiform. The passage from Berossus may be found in Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, p. 68.

"In the seventeenth year of his (Nabonidus') reign, Cyrus came out of Persia with a great army, and, having conquered all the rest of Asia, he came hastily to Babylonia. When Nabonnedus (Nabonidus) perceived that he was advancing to attack him, he assembled his forces and opposed him, but was defeated, and fled with a few of his attendants, and was shut up in the city of Borsippus (Borsippa). Whereupon Cyrus took Babylon, and gave orders that the outer walls should be demolished, because the city had proved very troublesome to him and difficult to take. He then marched to Borsippus to besiege Nabonnedus. But as Nabonnedus delivered himself into his hand without holding out the place, he was at first kindly treated by Cyrus, who gave him a habitation in Carmania, and sent him out of Babylonia. Accordingly, Nabonnedus spent the remainder of his time in that country, and there died."

It is disappointing to find this account inconsistent in some details with the cuneiform docu-

² Comp. also Wiedemann's *Gesch. Aegyptens*, p. 81 foll., and Gutschmid's *Neue Beiträge*, p. 87 foll.

ments, though the differences are not so great as those which we had occasion to notice in dealing with the narrative of Herodotus. Like Herodotus, Berossus ascribes the capture of Babylon to Cyrus, which is contradicted by the "Chronicle." At the same time, I am disposed to think that the divergences between Berossus and the cuneiform narrative are exaggerated by Tiele (p. 479). Both place the capture of Babylon in the seventeenth year. Both refer to a preliminary battle in which the forces of Nabonidus (reverse lines 12, 13) were defeated by Cyrus. Both refer to the flight of Nabonidus, and, if we follow Professor Hommel's rendering (mentioned in footnote, p. 399), to his intrenching himself (*irtakasa*) in or near Babylon.¹ If Professor Schrader's reading of the text is correct, there is no mention in the Chronicle of the death of Nabonidus, but only of that of his wife; Rev. 23, *aššat šarri mītat*, "the wife of the king (Nabonidus) died," and it is for her, apparently, mourning (*bikitum*) is prescribed in Akkad from the 27th Adar until the 3rd Nisan.² It is quite possible that, if the last column of the Chronicle had been preserved intact, further details would have come to light vindicating the concluding portions of the narrative of Berossus.

¹ According to Berossus, in Borsippa, which was in the close neighbourhood of Babylon. The capture, according to the cuneiform narrative, was effected in Babylon itself.

² Both Tiele and Hommel read the text otherwise, as though it stated that *Nabonidus* died, but the latter hesitates.

Let us hope that a duplicate may one day be discovered that will set these and other doubtful points at rest. Since the above was written, I have been informed by Mr. Pinches that he regards the true reading of the doubtful passage (Rev. 23) as *u mar šarri imât* "and the son of the king died." We might indeed read with Dr. Hagen the shafel *ušma-at* instead of *ima-at* (Schrader, *mita-at*) "and (Gobryas) slew the son of the king." Dr. Schrader tells me that he is not indisposed to accept Mr. Pinches' suggestion. Now this son of Nabonidus was Belshazzar (see Schrader's *Cuneiform Insc. and O. T.* vol. ii. pp. 130-134), and thus the tradition preserved in Dan. v. 30, "On that night was Belshazzar . . . slain," is confirmed and also the statement of Berossus that Nabonidus survived in Carmania (see my article in *Critical Review* for April, p. 136).

Lack of space prevents me from discussing the interesting questions connected with Isa. xiii.-xiv. 23, and also of xxi. 1-10. The reference to exiled Israel in xiv. 1, and to Elam as the foe of Babylon in xxi. 2, show that it is impossible to refer either of these oracles to the circumstances of the reign of Sargon or of Sennacherib. Like Jer. l. li., they show evident traces of that period of anxious and exultant expense through which captive Israel passed on the banks of the Euphrates as they watched eagerly at the gates of Babylon and other towns for news of the advance of Cyrus, Jehovah's "anointed servant."

Contributions and Comments.

Arabian Parallels to Biblical Passages.

Two Arabian parallels to passages in the Scriptures may be interesting. One relates to the episode of the speaking ass in the narrative of Balaam, viz. Num. xxii. 21a, 22-34 (one excludes ver. 21b, because the passage is manifestly taken from a different source from the narrative in which it is inserted, and ver. 21b is therefore presumably a connecting link added when the insertion was made). Compare the "strange tale" told, according to Mr. Doughty, by certain Bedouin tribes of a camel speaking with human voice and rebuking the Bedouins for neglecting the rules of primitive hospitality (Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*,

vol. i. p. 426). The other illustrates our Lord's use of a current Jewish proverb in Matt. vii. 3, "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" Wünsche quotes a good Talmudic parallel from Erachin, fol. 16b. But there is also a parallel in the anthology of early Arabian poetry called the Hamâsa. No. 37 of Book v. in this collection contains a satirical poem by Waddah ibn Isma'il, which closes with, "I indeed see in thine eye a beam set across, and thou marvellest if thou beholdest in mine eye a mote." It is a poem of four lines, thoroughly Arabian in its imagery; Biblical influence is therefore entirely out of the question.

Oxford.

T. K. CHEYNE.