

occur only in moderate quantity, in conformity with the idea of a Handcommentar.' That is Professor Davidson's opinion of Arndt. It is possible that both Professor Bruce and Professor Cheyne have placed him among the prophets. Is their judgment better than his? For is it not, after all, a matter of position? Again and again has Dr. Cheyne publicly declared himself in advance of his colleague Dr. Driver. He may also be in advance of Dr. Davidson, and Professor Bruce may be forward at his side. Whereupon it were just as easy and just as reasonable for Dr. Davidson and Dr. Driver to say that *they* were in the midst of the prophets, and that their distinguished colleagues had moved somewhere out of the line.

But the last charge is the only really serious one. And how Professor Bruce could have gone so far astray as to blame Professor Davidson for want of earnestness in his work, it is extremely hard to say. Having given a quotation from an article which Professor Davidson contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January of the present year, 'this,' says Professor Bruce, 'is excellent fooling, and one does not grudge an occasional outburst of this kind to a man with a deep vein of humour in him. And it must be acknowledged that the Germans, with their "vigour and rigour," lay themselves very open to the sport of the wit.

Yet we look for more than banter from the acknowledged head of the critical school in Scotland. It is not for him to select the rôle of jester while the critical drama goes on.'

Is it possible, then, that Professor Bruce, who is himself a Scotsman, though not an Aberdonian, has not recognised the union of 'excellent fooling' with deepest earnestness in nearly all the greatest Scotsmen of our day? In a previous paragraph we quoted an example of Dr. Davidson's 'excellent fooling.' Did it seem to anyone a jester's commonplace? Did it seem a piece of excellent fooling for the fooling's sake? If Professor Davidson had *not* had the 'deep vein of humour in him,' does Dr. Bruce or anyone else imagine that he would have expressed a different judgment of that commentator on Ezekiel?

Nevertheless Professor Bruce has happily come to the right conclusion. His last words are these: 'Scotland must look elsewhere for its Luther; in Davidson it has at least an Erasmus.' But it is not in the last paragraph as it is not in the first. It is in the admiration and the love which even the paragraphs reveal that are most astray, and cannot help themselves—the admiration and the love of him who may yet be Scotland's Luther, for him who is more than Scotland's Erasmus.

The Oldest History of the Semites.

BY PROFESSOR F. HOMMEL, PH.D., LL.D., MUNICH.

THE motive for this article has been supplied by the recently published work of Professor Hilprecht, which contains the magnificent results of the excavations at Niffer (properly Nuffer, called in antiquity Nibur or Nippur). The discoveries thus made, under the auspices of the American University of Pennsylvania, throw into the shade all that has been accomplished hitherto, whether we take into account the age and historical importance of many of the texts recovered, the systematic procedure followed in using the spade, or—last but not least—the beauty, distinctness, and extreme

accuracy with which the inscriptions have been reproduced. Since the excavations of the French consul de Sarzec at Telloh, since the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets and the Pyramid texts,—all within the last decade,—we have become accustomed to surprises. But unquestionably the greatest surprise is the appearance of Hilprecht's volume, whose disclosures well deserve to be called sensational.

The South Babylonian ruin-mound at Telloh revealed to us the very ancient *Sumerian (non-Semitic)* civilisation of Babylonia; the discoveries

at Nippur, on the other hand, are concerned with the oldest history of the *Semites* who penetrated into Babylonia from Mesopotamia in the north-west. Already there had been found at Nippur inscriptions (composed in Semitic) of king Sargâni-šar-ali of Agade (Akkad), and his son Narâm-Sin ('Beloved of the moon-god'), the latter of whom took the proud title of 'King of the four quarters of the World.' Belonging to the same period, as far as style goes, yet probably from one hundred to two hundred years older, may be the short (likewise Semitic) inscriptions of the kings of Kiš—Man-ištusu and Alu-mušaršid. These last, then, might be regarded as the oldest hitherto known inscriptions composed in Semitic-Babylonian. The date is determined by the circumstance that Nabonidus, the father of Belshazzar (*c.* 550 B.C.), mentions that Narâm-Sin lived 3200 years before, *i.e.* *c.* 3750 B.C. Even if, for reasons which we cannot here exhibit in detail, these figures may be too high by some three hundred years,¹ yet we obtain for Sargon, the father of Narâm-Sin, the very respectable date of *c.* 3500 B.C.

One of the two inscriptions of Sargon, already published by Hilprecht in 1893, runs thus: 'To the god Bel, the great lord, [this is dedicated by] Sargâni-šar-ali, the mighty, the king of Agade, the founder of the "House of the Ocean of Heaven," the temple of Bel at Nippur. Whoso removes this tablet, his foundation (*i.e.* the ground whereon he stands, or the place where he dwells) may Bel, Samas, and Istar uproot, and his seed may they destroy.' The inscription of Alu-mušaršid is as follows: 'This is dedicated to Bel by Alu-mušaršid, king of Kiš, out of the spoil of Elam, after he had subjugated Elam and Barakhsi.'

A beautiful relief of Narâm-Sin, which bears a representation of himself, has also been discovered at Diarbekr (Amid), on the Upper Tigris. The original is in Constantinople. The portrait,² with the accompanying inscription, are given in Hilprecht (Pt. II.). The latter, which unfortunately is half destroyed, reads thus: 'Narâm-Sin . . . to the god En-ki (= Ea), in the four quarters of the world has he made . . . and a terrace has he

¹ If, as I assume, the chronographers of Nabonidus fell into the mistake of adding the numbers of the first two N. Babylonian dynasties (± 2000 B.C.), treating them as successive, while they seem to have been really contemporaneous.

² It will be found, on a reduced scale, in Hommel's *Geschichte d. alt. Morgenlandes* (Stuttgart, 1895, p. 47).

reared; whoso removes this tablet, his [foundation may the gods . . .] uproot, and his seed may they destroy and . . . ' Through Hilprecht we know that foreign victories, especially in the direction of N. Syria, led to the assumption by the Babylonian kings of the proud title, 'King of the four quarters of the World.' An expedition of Narâm-Sin to the land of Magan (Arabia) was already known from Oppert's *Expédition en Mésopotamie*. Now has come to light monumental testimony to a victory gained by him over N. Mesopotamia (Diarbekr), and since later inscriptions affirm that his father advanced as far as the Mediterranean, we may conclude with all the greater certainty that the latter point was reached also by Narâm-Sin himself.

The scheme of early Babylonian history which we were justified in constructing hitherto (after the publication of de Sarzec's *Découvertes* and Pt. I. of Hilprecht) was something like the following:—

Shortly before B.C. 4000—kings and the so-called elder Patesi ('priest-kings') of Sirgulla. Inscriptions purely Sumerian.

c. 3700—kings of Kiš, who certainly ruled over Sippar and Agade in N. Babylonia, and had possession also of Nippur. With their predecessors war had already been waged by the Patesi of Sirgulla, as is proved by an inscription of En-timinna. Inscriptions begin to be Semitic.

c. 3500—Sargon and Narâm-Sin. Inscriptions likewise Semitic.

c. 3300 ff.—the younger Patesi of Sirgulla, most notable of whom is Gudea (*c.* 3000 or 2900). Inscriptions Sumerian.

c. 2800—the so-called elder kings of Ur (Urgur [Ur-ba'u] and his son Dungi. The latter overthrew the Patesi of Sirgulla. Inscriptions Sumerian.

c. 2500 (±)—a series of Semitic kings of Nisin, who stand in the closest relation to Nippur, but rule also over Ur. Their inscriptions, however, are composed in Sumerian.

c. 2300—the so-called younger kings of Ur, who were likewise Semites.

c. 2100—kings of Larsa, the first of them Semites; but thereafter comes a king of Elamite descent, Iri-aku (the Arioch of Gen. xiv. 1), son of Kudur-Mabuk, who was overthrown (*c.* 1900 B.C.) by the king of Babel, Khammurabi (of the first dynasty of Babel, which, remarkably enough, was of Arabian origin).

The above will now enable the reader the better to appreciate the surprising nature of the recent discoveries.

Thanks to the circumstance that the excavations at Nippur have been directed with true archæological intelligence and with the utmost care, and not in the violent fashion which is too common in such operations, we can use the different strata dug through as excellent chrono-

logical aids. Directly beneath the platform on which was built the 'step' temple of King Ur-ba'u of Ur (c. 2800 B.C.), there was another platform composed of bricks of a peculiar form and size, stamped with the names of Sargon and Narâm-Sin. From this it follows that when the Bel temple erected by Sargon and Narâm-Sin had fallen into decay after some 700, or, according to another reckoning, 1000 years, Ur-ba'u cleared away all the rubbish down to the original platform, and laid upon the latter a new platform, on which he rebuilt the temple. An accumulation of eleven metres of rubbish had to be removed by the Americans before they reached the level of Sargon's platform. Now, since the temple of Bel was completely destroyed soon after the birth of Christ, these eleven metres of stone and earth contain nearly 4000 years of Babylonian history (c. 3500 B.C.—200 A.D.). But Mr. Haynes has now continued the excavations below Sargon's platform, till water and virgin soil have been reached. In all he has sunk shafts to the depth of nine metres beneath the platform. As the traces of pre-Sargonic buildings discovered during this process are of notably smaller dimensions, and no longer reveal the presence of a more ancient 'step' temple, Hilprecht rightly concludes that the rubbish-heaps belonging to the epoch prior to B.C. 3500 must have accumulated more slowly, and that they presuppose a longer lapse of time than that between Narâm-Sin and the final destruction of the temple of Bel. Hence the inference that the pre-Sargonic temple of Bel, whatever was its form, must have been founded not later than during the seventh thousand years B.C., and in all probability still earlier.

Mr. Haynes' discovery of the temple archives has also brought to light a whole series of votive inscriptions of the pre-Sargonic period. The majority of these texts were indeed broken into pieces, having been intentionally destroyed, probably by the Elamites (c. 2285 or 1917 B.C.). In particular, the two great *vase-inscriptions* had to be laboriously pieced together by Hilprecht out of hundreds of minute fragments—a task entailing years of toil, which nearly cost him his eyesight, and which could have been accomplished by scarcely another living Assyriologist. These inscriptions are accompanied by a relief (fortunately unbroken) of the earliest date, which shows the most singular points of contact with the oldest Egyptian style of art. They contain

the most startling disclosures regarding the history of the pre-Sargonic period, and go back palæographically to a date earlier even than that of the Sumerian kings of Girsu and Sirgulla, known to us from the discoveries at Telloh. To all appearance it is Semitic kings with whom we have to do. These pressing southwards from Mesopotamia (the 'city of the bow,' which, as Hilprecht proves, must be Harran) and N. Babylonia, have conquered Uruk (Erech) and Ur, and are in possession of Nippur. The inscriptions indeed are still Sumerian, but Hilprecht adduces weighty reasons for concluding that, in spite of their apparently good Sumerian names, the princes who composed these inscriptions were the first (?) pioneers of the Semitism which afterwards became more and more the predominating element.

I may be allowed, at this point, to refer to a theory of my own which hitherto has appeared to many an extremely bold one, but which has gained enormously in probability through the recent discoveries—I mean the theory which looks to Babylonia for the origin of the Egyptian civilisation. The results described in Hilprecht's work, when I first made acquaintance with the latter, gladdened but did not surprise me. I had long ago postulated as the necessary consequence of my theory, that six or seven thousand years B.C. there must have been Semites in Mesopotamia or N. Babylonia, who were under the influence of the still older Sumerian civilisation, and the monumental evidence of this has now begun. The more the ancient Babylonian hieroglyphs (from which between 3000 and 4000 B.C. the cuneiform proper was developed) disclose to us their original design, the more evident becomes also the agreement between their fundamental elements and those of the Egyptian hieroglyphs—an agreement which up till now I have succeeded in proving in the case of some fifty signs. And the more exactly the Sumerian reveals its secrets, the more clearly can we trace in the old Egyptian (which, from the point of view of grammar indeed, is purely Semitic, but from that of the vocabulary is a mixed language) quite a number of glaring instances of Sumerian loan-words. *Dies diem docet.*

At this point, both Assyriology and Egyptology must be prepared to meet an objection. How do such results harmonise with the traditional biblical chronology, according to which the creation of the world took place only c. 4000, and the Deluge c. 2300

B.C. (the latter date being only about four hundred years before Abraham, and thus about the period of the kings of Nisin)? And yet, on the other hand, the proof of the Babylonian origin of Egyptian civilisation strikingly confirms the biblical tradition regarding the land of Nod (Gen. iv. 16) and the land of Shinar (Gen. x. 10 and xi. 1-9). Here, as in the case of the monarchical period of Israelitish history in its relation to Assyrian chronology, the believing Christian is face to face with the dilemma—Are the facts or the numbers, the kernel or the husk, the more important? With elements so perishable, and exposed to risk of alteration by copyists, as is confessedly the case with numbers often denoted simply by figures, the answer to this question should not be hard to find. If we take further into account the fact that in regard to the numbers given in the patriarchal lists of Genesis, the oldest versions (Massor. Text, Sept., and Samaritan) differ essentially, we may with a good conscience admit, in view of the results of archæological research, that the biblical dates, prior to the time of Abraham, do not belong to the matter inspired by God's Spirit; and that even if the pre-Abrahamic chronology was the subject of such inspiration, yet it has been so obscured by the work of copyists during more than a thousand years, that we cannot be sufficiently grateful to God for the new light which is being thrown upon it by the monuments which have been awakened from six thousand years' slumber.

A second possible objection, even if it could be substantiated, would make little or no difference to the situation. I refer to the doubt one often hears expressed by non-Assyriologists, whether dates resting upon Babylonian tradition (e.g. Narâm-Sin 3200 years before Nabonidus) are really to be depended upon. Well, granting that this date, which in any case I am willing to reduce by three hundred and sixty years, is to be rejected, still in no case can Sargon and Narâm-Sin be brought further down than *c.* 2700 B.C. In that event we should obtain for the kings of Sirgulla a date *c.* 3000 B.C. (an extremely safe but for many reasons very improbable figure), and for the recently discovered inscriptions of Hilprecht *c.* 3500 B.C. After all, however, the founding of the temple at Nippur would take us back at least to 5000 B.C. This would make very little difference to the doubts suggested by the biblical chronology, for the Sumero-Egyptian civilisation certainly did

not take its rise in Paradise, or come into the world as a *deus ex machinâ* after the expulsion of the first human pair from the garden. I have gone into these questions all the more fully, because many theologians at present see a difficulty in this contradiction between the testimony of the monuments and the chronology of the Bible, and I am anxious to afford them what help I can in removing their apprehensions. We will now take up in order the pre-Sargonic kings and their inscriptions:—

At the head of the list, for what appear to be valid reasons, Hilprecht places some short texts, which read thus: 'To the god En-lilla ("lord of the air," Semit. Bel) has En-shag-sag-an-na (Semit. perhaps Bel-šar-šamê, "the lord is king of heaven") dedicated the spoil of Kiš, the hostile' (Hilpr. Nos. 91, 92).

'To the god En-lilla, king of the mountains (*i.e.* the cloud-mountains) has En-shag-sag-an-na, lord of Ki-Ingi (*i.e.* Semit. *Sumer*), king [of the world?] (traces are still visible of the word *kalamma*) . . . [dedicated this]' (Hilpr. No. 90).

Since a somewhat later king of Erech and Ur likewise styles himself 'king of the world' (*lugal kalamma*), and mentions the sanctuaries of Ki-Ingi, it may be conjectured that the above-mentioned En-shag-sag-an-na was also king of Erech.

Of almost exactly the same age are the signs employed in the short legend on the very ancient relief, before referred to, which runs: 'To the goddess Nin-din-dugga ("lady, awakener of the dead") this is dedicated by Ur-En-lilla (Semit. Amil-Bel, "man" or "servant of Bel"), the great administrator' (Hilpr. No. 94).

About the same date, perhaps a little later, we must place two princes who bear the title not of king but of Patesi ('priest-king'). To the one belongs the short inscription (Hilpr. Nos. 108, 109) beginning, 'To the god Za[-mal-mal], Utuk, Patesi of Kiš has [dedicated this,]' and to the other the text (Hilpr. No. 96), 'To the goddess Nin-lilla (Semit. Beltu) has Aba-En-lil, son of Lugal-badug, administrator (*dam-kar*) for the life of Ur-En-lil, Patesi of Nippur, and for the life of . . . [dedicated this].'

It is not impossible that this Ur-En-lil (Amil-Bel), who is here called Patesi of Nippur, is the same as the author of the above relief.

The vase-fragments, which, as far as the signs go, are somewhat more recent (Hilpr. 103, 104, 102, 110, besides the somewhat shorter parallel text 105), have quite a peculiar interest, because they give us the first detailed information regarding a hostile encounter between a king [of Erech] and the kingdom of Kiš, already known to us as the foe of En-shag-sag-an-na. ' . . . king of [Erech] on the day when Bel looked upon him in favour, attacked Kiš, set up En-bil-ugun as king thereof, burnt the city of the king of Šab-ban, and of the king of Kiš, full of enmity, burnt the spoil [of Kiš], brought back . . . dedicated his image, his polished silver, his furnishings, to the god Bel in Nippur.'

My translation here differs in some respects from Hilprecht's. We know that about the time of Sargon of Agade (a considerable time, therefore, after the period referred to

in our inscription), one En-bil-ugun was brother of the king of Erech. Hence I regard the above En-bil-ugun as an Erechite, whom the conqueror of Kiš *set up* (the sign may be read either *ku* or *dur*) there as king, whereas Hilprecht sees in him the conquered king, and renders *dur* by *cast down* ('I cast down En-bil-ugun the king of Kiš'). Again, Hilprecht would render *Sab-ban*, 'hordes of [Gish]-ban.' The city of Gish-ban ('city of the bow') will meet us directly afterwards as a place of great importance and on a friendly footing with Erech. There is, however, a different city Šab-ban (written Ud-ban) between the lower Zab and the river of Opis, which is possibly identical with the ancient Opis (Upe), and which, remarkably enough, appears elsewhere in the closest connexion with Kiš, namely, in the inscriptions of the kings of Sirgulla. This city suits the context well, it is the 'city of the hordes of [Gish]-ban.'¹

A king of Kiš, who also perhaps owed his throne to Erech, is introduced to us by the inscription, Hilpr. No. 93. 'To the god En-lilla (Bel), the god of the mountains, and to the goddess Nin-lilla, lady of heaven, his dispenser of corn (?), the consort of En-lilla, [this is dedicated] by Ur-Dun-pa-uddu (Semit. Amil-Nabû, "man of the god Nebo"), king of Kiš, king of [Šab-ban].'

Next in the order of time comes the gem of the whole collection, the vase-inscription of 132 lines, which Hilprecht had laboriously to piece together out of about a hundred fragments, some of which were quite minute (Hilpr. No. 87). The first sixty-four lines may be translated thus: 'Lugal-zag-gi-si (Semit. perhaps Sharru-mâlt-imâkki-kni, "the king is full of eternal strength"), king of Erech, king of the world (*kalamma*), priest of heaven, hero of the goddess Nisaba (or the goddess of corn), son of Ukush (written *ú-ú*; the sign *ú* has, however, also the values *sham* and *kush*), who (viz. Ukush) was Patesi of Gish-ban and hero of the goddess Nisaba, he who is viewed with favour by the true eye of the king of the mountains (*i.e.* the god Bel), the great Patesi of En-lilla, he to whom the god En-ki (Ea) has given wisdom, he who is called by the sun-god, the exalted servant of the god Sin (the moon-god), he who is endued by the sun-god with strength, the shepherd (or guardian) of the goddess Istar, the son born of the goddess Nisaba, nourished by the goddess Nin-charsagga with the milk of life, the servant of the god Um, who (Um) is priest of Erech, the slave reared by the goddess Nin-acha-giddu, lady of Erech, the great administrator of the gods. When the god En-lilla (Bel), king of the mountains, bestowed upon Lugal-zag-gi-si the empire of the world (*kalamma*), and gave him success in the eyes of the world, when he filled the lands with his fame, and subjected them to him from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, on that day he established his way from the lower sea by the Tigris and Euphrates to the upper sea; from the rising to the going down of the sun En-lilla gave him [rule] over all, and gave rest to the mountain and to the plain.'

In what follows there is special mention of the 'sanctuaries of Ki-Ingî' the cities of Erech, Ur, Larsa ('the

favourite city of the sun-god'), and Gish-ban ('the favourite city of the god of battle,' by which, in this instance, the moon-god is meant).

For a number of reasons (and I could add to them), Hilprecht makes it extremely probable that the majority of the newly-recovered kings, in spite of their apparently Sumerian names (which, however, are merely translated into Sumerian), are Semites who penetrated into Babylonia from the north, that Kiš (E. of Babel), Erech, Ur, and Larsa mark the stages of this triumphal progress, and that their starting-point, Gish-ban ('city of the bow'), must have been the ancient bow-shaped Harran in Mesopotamia. The inscriptions indeed are still Sumerian, for prior to the time of Sargon and Narâm-Sin no one had ventured to employ in official documents the Sumerian cuneiform script to express the Semitic language. Yet, as Hilprecht remarks, the use of the term *dair* for 'eternal' is itself sufficient to prove that the authors of these inscriptions were Semites, or, as I should be inclined to put it more cautiously, that the Semitic Babylonians had for long been settled in the land. Even if several of the kings in question were Sumerians, yet the armies they commanded were essentially composed of Semites. If, on the other hand, they were themselves Semites, yet such was the influence exercised over them by the civilisation of the Sumerians, whom they and their predecessors had driven southwards, that they assumed Sumerian names, and caused their inscriptions to be composed in the Sumerian language.

Let us now recapitulate the results to which we are conducted by the new discoveries. It was probably the kings of Erech who, in the most ancient times, had possession of the sanctuary of Bel at Nippur. Occasionally, however, this was in the hands of the kings of Kiš (in these texts always written *Kiš-ki*, with the determinative for 'place' added, so that we have no hesitation in identifying it with the well-known city of Kiš to the E. of Babel). Whether the king, who after a bloody war subjugated Kiš, was a king of Erech, is not certain; but, for reasons explained above, extremely probable. If we knew that he, like his successor Lugal-zag-gi-si, came from Gish-ban (Harran), we should have here two great Semitic rivals—on the one side, Gish-ban and Erech (to which kingdom perhaps Sippar

¹ Or perhaps better, 'of the hordes of the bow' (cf. the 'peoples of the bow' of the Egypt. inscriptions), *i.e.* the Semitic nomads of anterior Asia.

also belonged), and, on the other, Kiš and the 'city (or land) of the hordes of the bow' (Šab-ban). At a later date we encounter the two, Gish-ban and Kiš, as common opponents of king E-dingirra-na-du (generally written E-an-na-du) of Sirgulla. In any case Lugal-zag-gi-si held not only Erech, which evidently had not yet been occupied by his father, who is merely styled Patesi of Gish-ban, but also the cities much farther to the south, Ur and Larsa, so that the great canal (mod. Shatt-el-Hai, connecting the Euphrates and the Tigris), on whose eastern bank Sirgulla was situated, now formed the boundary between his kingdom and that of Sirgulla. This condition of things appears to have lasted for a considerable time, for Hilprecht has succeeded in putting together a somewhat more recent vase-inscription (Hilpr. No. 86), which names two kings of Erech and Ur, a certain Lugal-ki-gub-nigul-gul and (his son?) Lugal-si-kisal.

Regarding the reaction which subsequently set in from Sirgulla, we have information from recent discoveries of de Sarzec, which supplement and confirm the scheme deduced by Hilprecht. We learn that a great victory was gained over Gish-ban. This is celebrated by E-dingirra-na-du, the Patesi of Sirgulla, both in the well-known 'Vulture-stele' and in the so-called 'galet' (a kind of stone plate) inscription of 150 lines. The result of this victory is seen in the deliverance of the cities of Erech, Ur, and Larsa, which we formerly found in the possession of kings who traced their origin to Gish-ban. Elam also (as an ally of Gish-ban?), Kiš, and Šab-ban were humbled by Sirgulla, as well as a city Az, which I have no hesitation in identifying with the city known from Sargon's history as Azu-pirāni ('Azu of the elephants'). There were at that time elephants in the vicinity of Harran, and Gudea also mentions Az as near to the upper sea, a circumstance which again appears to point to Mesopotamia. The situation of this Az, a city which afterwards completely disappeared, thus supports most satisfactorily Hilprecht's identification of Gish-ban with Harran.

In conclusion, we may notice briefly the further development of Babylonian history. En-timīna, a successor of E-dingirra-na-du, has left a votive inscription at Nippur, from which we learn that in consequence of the above-mentioned victory over Gish-ban, Nippur also came at least for a time

under the sway of Sirgulla. Then follows the period during which, in the north, the city of Agade came to the front, and during which Kiš also must have made a new upward movement, for its kings now omit the determinative of place, and style themselves simply *lugal kiš* (Semitic, *šar kiššati*, 'king of the whole' *sc.* world), a title which certainly included the possession of Mesopotamia, and at a later period was borne by several of the kings of Assyria. After the reigns of Sargon and Narām-Sin (*c.* 3500 B.C.) comes a gap of several centuries till the time of the younger Patesi of Sirgulla (including the powerful Gudea) and the so-called older (but *now* more correctly, the middle) kings of Ur, namely, Ur-gur and Dungi. (For information regarding the subsequent period, see the above chronological survey.)

As often happens with recent 'finds,' and especially with the most important of these, a whole series of new perplexing questions arises, which never occurred to anyone before. Amongst these is that relating to Babel. The city *Ur-a-ki* (sign for 'city' with two parallel strokes inserted) is referred by Heuzey to the time of E-dingirra-na-du and associated with Gish-ban and Kiš. Should the name be read *Gishgal-a-ki* and regarded as equivalent to Babel, or was it only at an after period identified with this city? For the sake of the narrative of Gen. xi. we should fain be able to answer these questions. One thing, however, is certain, the oldest history of the land of Shinar and its conquest by repeated advances of the Semites from Harran as their oldest centre, is always coming more fully to the light, however obscure for the moment some details may be. Moreover, it is precisely the cities named in the Bible—Erech, Akkad, Ur, Larsa (Ellasar)—that are evidencing themselves to be far older than was formerly supposed. One is tempted to ask whether after all the Talmudic tradition may not be correct which identifies Kalneh—the only other remaining city of importance—with Nippur, the oldest Semitic sanctuary of North Babylonia.¹ Be that as it may, every one of my readers will assuredly unite with me in testifying their gratitude to the rediscoverer of Nippur, Professor Hilprecht, and in wishing him health and strength to achieve fresh triumphs.

¹ The city of *Kul-unu*, which at one time was supposed to be Kalneh, should rather be read *Kullab* (properly *Kul-ab*), so that this identification must be given up.

P.S.—Since this article was written, M. de Sarzec has brought a number of tablets from Telloh, which are dated from the reigns of Sargânishar-ali and his son Narâm-Sin; e.g. thus, 'In the year when S. marched against Martu.' We learn at the same time from these tablets that a Patesi of Sirgulla named Lugal-ushumgal was contemporaneous with Sargon as well as with Narâm-

Sin. The statements of Professor Hilprecht, M. Heuzey, and myself have been thus confirmed in a manner exceeding our most sanguine expectations, because Lugal-ushumgal belongs to a later date than the 'kings' and the older Patesi of Sirgulla, his epoch being between the latter and the Patesi of the statues (Ur-Ba'u, Gudea, etc.).

Requests and Replies.

In the translation of the New Testament into current English, which you reviewed some time ago, I find the rather startling assertion that Paul and his friends, Aquila and Priscilla, were by profession 'landscape painters' (Acts xviii. 3). Will you kindly say how this translation arises, and what foundation there is for it?—N. P. of M.

I FIND, on a cursory glance, no authority who considers that *σκηνοποιός* (Acts xviii. 3) can be understood in the sense of *σκηνογράφος*, scene-painter. There seems to have been in the mind of the translator some confusion between *σκηνογράφος* and *σκηνοδόχος*: the latter is often mentioned as equivalent to *σκηνοποιός*, both words meaning 'one who makes tents by sewing the materials together'; and perhaps the translator, seeing *σκηνοποιός* explained as *σκηνοδόχος*, accidentally misread the word as *σκηνογράφος*, and rendered accordingly. There may, however, be some better authority; and I may be doing the translator injustice. I should be glad to learn what were his reasons.

Pollux, 7, 189, says that in Old Attic Comedy *σκηνοποιοί* were *μηχανοποιοί*, 'makers of *machine* for the stage,' which misled a commentator, Michaelis, into the translation, 'Kunst-Instrumentenmacher.' But none of these renderings brings us nearer 'scene painter' or 'landscape painter.'

Verbal consideration, and the use of cognate words, *σκηνοποιέω* and *σκηνοποιία*, as well as the facts of life and surroundings, show that Paul did not work as a landscape painter; but I need not argue a case that seems so clear.

W. M. RAMSAY.

Aberdeen University.

I notice that in your September issue, page 552, Mr. Mackie refers to the 'nail-knobbed club or rod,' and 'the shepherd's plain staff.' Mr. Henry Harper, also an authority on the customs of the East, says, in his *Letters to my Children*, page 30, 'The rod, you see, was used for guidance, for comfort; the club, or "staff," for offence or defence.' I am neither a Hebrew nor Arabic scholar, and therefore cannot weigh and judge between these apparently contradictory statements. Can you help me to a decision?—N. P. of M.

The general meaning of the words translated *rod* and *staff* is a walking stick. Of the two uses for defence, and for help in walking, the former would seem to be the more fundamental and important in the East. A Syrian, when carrying a walking stick, usually puts the heavier end to the ground, and keeps the thin end in his hand, as if to be ready for protection.

It is only in the case of the shepherd that a distinction has to be observed, as he carries *two sticks*, each specially adapted to the purpose for which it is carried. These are (a) a straight club, 2½ feet long, made of oak, with a thick knob at one end into which nails are sometimes driven. At the other end a hole is made through which a string is passed, so that the club may be hung at the side. (b) A thinner stick, in length equal to the shepherd's height or longer, with a bent handle. It is a help in clambering among the rocks, and with it he can hook down a branch while he knocks off the leaves with his club.

After this explanation of the facts about the shepherd's club and crook, there remains only the consideration as to which can be best