

chronicler, 'that although his virtues had been formerly obscured, and lay as a dead coal, waiting for light to kindle it, by reason of tender years and evil company, notwithstanding he being now come to perfecter years and to riper understanding, had shaken off his evil counsellors, and his virtues now shine forth as a light of a cresset, which is

no ordinary light.' And you know how on his early death-bed he was heard again and again to cry aloud, as if defying the evil spirit of his youth: 'Thou liest! thou liest! my part is with my Lord Jesus Christ!'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Farrar, *ibid.* 67.

## Recent Oriental Archaeology.

By A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

ONE of the most important works that have appeared of late years on the archæology of the ancient East is a large volume on *The Seal-Cylinders of Western Asia*, by Dr. Hayes Ward, published by the Carnegie Institution at Washington (1910). The author has made the subject peculiarly his own, and his book embodies the results of almost a lifetime's study. He has prepared the way for it by his work on the seal-cylinders in Mr. Pierpont Morgan's magnificent collection, some account of which has already been given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In the present volume no less than 1315 seal-cylinders are reproduced.

For a knowledge of the mythology, religious beliefs and practices, and artistic development of early Babylonia and the countries dependent on Babylonian culture, the seal-cylinders are invaluable. But the study of them has been attended with many difficulties. It is seldom that the inscriptions which often accompany the designs throw any light upon the meaning of the latter, and the signification of the designs themselves is frequently very obscure. It is only by the use of the scientific instrument of comparison that in many cases their signification has been arrived at, and comparison needs the collection of a large number of examples before it acquires scientific value. In the course of his researches, Dr. Hayes Ward has made many discoveries, and the classes into which he has succeeded in separating the cylinders and the designs upon them, as well as the explanations he has given of them, will render his book a standard authority for many years to come.

The Syro-Hittite cylinders, of which he finds several different types, have evidently specially attracted him, and his chapters upon them are not

the least valuable in his book. They open up a new and very interesting line of study, and will help to throw light on the early relations between Babylonia, the original home of the seal-cylinder, on the one side, and the Amorites of Syria and the Hittites of Asia Minor, on the other. As far back as the copper age the seal-cylinder found its way both to Cyprus and to Troy, and it had been domesticated in Egypt long before the rise of the First Dynasty. A comparison between the seal-cylinders found in these countries with those of Babylonia ought to show to what period in Babylonian history the migration of the seal-cylinder to the West must be assigned. In Cyprus and Egypt, at any rate, it was before the age of the dynasties of Ur or of Khammu-rabi, if not before the age of Sargon of Akkad; the seal-cylinders hitherto discovered in the Hittite region indicate, on the other hand, the period of Khammu-rabi.

It is a pity that Dr. Hayes Ward was unable to give photographic reproductions of the cylinders; copies made by the hand are not always trustworthy, especially where cuneiform characters are attempted to be drawn by persons who are unacquainted with them. The actual reading of certain inscriptions, for instance, on the Syro-Hittite cylinders could never be ascertained from the printed copies of them. I could wish, too, that the book had been provided with an index.

The Abbé Martin's Assyriological work is always distinguished by careful scholarship, and his latest book<sup>1</sup> is a valuable addition to Assyrian philology. It is occupied with the letters dated in the reigns of Nabonidos, Cyrus, Darius, and Cambyses, which have been published by the authorities of the

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres néo-babyloniennes*, by Fr. Martin. Paris: Champion, 1909.

British Museum in the 22nd Part of *Cuneiform Texts*. Most of the letters in this collection are, unfortunately, of little or no interest, and the Abbé has therefore been well advised to edit only a selection from them. Those which he has translated throw light on the daily life of the Babylonian people in the age of the Persian conquest, and show how like it was to that of most Oriental peoples to-day. There was the same oppression by the officials, whether religious or civil, the same unavailing complaints by the victims, and the same jealousies and defamations of character. The High Priest of Sippara, as M. Martin observes, appears in a particularly bad light: 'One of his subordinates is forced to keep the royal horses at his own expense; another, a scribe, he refuses to pay for work done; he interferes in judicial affairs, and is not afraid to extend his protection to a murderer.'

The three most important and interesting letters in the collection are two from a Babylonian officer who apparently commanded the Babylonian forces in the war against Assyria which led to the fall of Nineveh, and a third from an Assyrian king to an official in Babylonia ordering him to send to Nineveh certain tablets which were to be found in the library of the temple at Borsippa as well as in the private libraries of certain individuals there. Unfortunately, all three documents are much mutilated: even as it is, they give us a good deal of welcome information. I must not part from the Abbé Martin without mentioning that he has added a very useful glossary of words to his book.

Professor Prášek has now published the second and concluding volume of his exhaustive work on the history of the Medes and Persians.<sup>1</sup> It is a volume of which he may well be proud. It has been brought thoroughly up to date, and the philological allusions in it have been revised by Dr. Hoffmann-Kutschke, thus ensuring their agreement with the latest results of philological research. Everywhere there is evidence of careful investigation and sound judgment; no authority has been overlooked, and the references are quite a marvel of completeness. The student of ancient history is now in possession of all that is known up to the present of that portion of Persian history which is

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Meder und Perser bis zur makedonischen Eroberung*, by J. V. Prášek. Gotha: Perthes, 1910.

so important for understanding the later books of the Old Testament. Use has naturally been made of the Assuan papyri, and the admirable index at the end is worthy of the book.

Professor Hilprecht's latest work has an interest much beyond that of a merely Assyriological publication.<sup>2</sup> Among the cuneiform tablets from the library, or libraries, of the ancient Nippur which have been recently examined are some of exceptional interest. Besides lists of cuneiform signs and proper names, grammatical treatises in Sumerian and Semitic, geographical and similar lists, lists of weights and measures, months and dates, medical prescriptions, hymns, prayers and liturgies, mathematical and astronomical texts, there are also historical documents, as well as chronological tables. They have come from the site known as 'Tablet Hill,' which Professor Hilprecht believes to have been ruined at the time of the Elamite invasion of Babylonia in the age of Khammu-rabi and Rim-Sin. At all events, between this period and that of the Kassite king Burna-buryas (1400 B.C.) there is a break in the history of Nippur: no tablets are met with, and in the Kassite age which followed the restoration of the temple by Burna-buryas the library seems to have been transferred to the western side of the Shatt en-Nil.

Most of the texts from 'Tablet Hill' are written in Sumerian, but two were found last autumn by Professor Hilprecht, and pieced together from a number of fragments, which are in Semitic Babylonian. One of these is a record of a hitherto unknown king of Gutium or Kurdistan—the Goyim of Genesis—whose name is read Erridu-pizir by the discoverer. As he calls himself king 'of the four quarters of the world,' like Sargon of Akkad, Erridu-pizir must have been a great conqueror, and have claimed universal dominion. Professor Hilprecht believes that the capture and sack of Nippur which is described in so many songs of lamentation was his doing.

The second text is still more interesting, as it is a fragment of an early version of the Deluge story. Unfortunately, the discovery of it has aroused a considerable amount of acrimonious and not alto-

<sup>2</sup> *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, vol. v. part 1. *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia, 1910.

gether fair controversy in America, with which we on this side of the Atlantic have no concern. Professor Hilprecht, however, laid himself open to attack by claiming for his text that it was not only an early version, but the earliest at present known. But this cannot be proved, as it is undated, and the forms of the characters are not older than the close of the Khammu-rabi period, while a fragment of a version discovered by Professor Scheil a few years ago is actually dated in the reign of the fourth successor of Khammu-rabi. Moreover, it must be remembered that the well-known version of the story discovered by George Smith goes back, like the epic in which it is embodied, to the Khammu-rabi age, though the edition of it which has come down to us belongs to the time of Assur-bani-pal.

The new text is but a fragment, and the translation of what remains, therefore, is not always very easy. I cannot follow Professor Hilprecht in reading what is left of line 12 (. . . *ku um mi ni*) as *ku mi ni* 'instead of a number,' though I am unable to suggest any alternative rendering. At all events, I do not know what he could be thinking of in proposing to translate the biblical

*l'minêhu* 'instead of a number'; the Hebrew words could never mean this.

But I am at one with him in holding that the Babylonian story of the Deluge, with its close approximation to the language of Genesis, was known to the Hebrews before the Mosaic age, and I cannot do better than quote some of his concluding words: 'There remains no other period to be considered when the oldest version of the Deluge story could possibly have entered Canaan than the time when Abraham, whom I regard as a truly historical person, left his home on the Euphrates and moved westward; in other words, the period of the first dynasties of Isin and Babylon, of which Khammu-rabi or Amraphel is the central figure. This is the time when the Amorites knocked at the gates of Babylonia, invaded the country, and soon overthrew the old order of things, at the same time getting themselves intimately acquainted with Babylonian literature and civilization, which they finally accepted.' Abraham was an Amorite in the Babylonian acceptance of the name, and, as one of the upper classes, would have been educated in the learning of the Babylonians.

## The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

### PART IV.

On the theory above stated about Luke's two authorities, we assume that there was some considerable difference between them in word, but not in fact. The contemporary authority (lost, except as Luke preserves it) mentioned words that were not taken into the Church Rite, and there is a noteworthy difference between Mark and Luke as to the words spoken after the Cup, about which I do not venture to make any suggestion. But with regard to the general fact of difference between the two authorities, it is sufficient to prove their absolute independence of one another, but not sufficient to show any inconsistency or contradiction. Rather, it amounts simply to the degree of difference that will always be found between two witnesses reporting without mutual consultation part of the words and acts of a

rather complicated incident. According to our view, the difference would probably have been greater, had it not been for the influence of the Church Rite, which preserved the memory of the central and most important part of the whole series of acts and words.

The variation in form between Lk 22<sup>16,18</sup>, parallel as they are in most respects, is also highly important: 'I say unto you, I will not eat (this Passover), until,' etc., and, 'I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until,' etc. Jesus, as we know, ate the meal, and did not merely give to the disciples to eat, but He did not eat this Passover. Hence, while eating the meal, He says, 'I will not eat the passover, until.' . . . On the other hand, in respect of the wine, which formed no part of the Passover, He