

book is published at the University of Chicago Press.

Now go back again. The Rev. Frederic E. Dewhurst in *The Investment of Truth*, from the same press, takes his texts from the Bible and expounds them. There is no volume in all the list that goes deeper into the heart of God than this, the volume of a student, but not of a student apart.

The strength of the Rev. J. Sparhawk Jones, Minister of Calvary Church, Philadelphia, in his volume entitled *The Invisible Things*, published by the firm of Longmans, Green, & Co. in New York, lies in the care with which he explains the historical situation of his chosen text. The 'historical situation' sermon is a favourite with some preachers because it is so easily accomplished. But if anything is to be accomplished by means of it, it is most difficult. Mr. Jones succeeds in inter-

jecting his lessons as the narrative proceeds, so that his sermons have no formal application at the end. And yet he is an earnest successful preacher of the gospel.

We end, as we began, with Dr. Banks. Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls publish some volumes for him. To the one before us he or they have given the title of *Sermons which have won Souls*. There is a certain modesty in the title. For the saying is 'he (not it) that winneth souls is wise.' Dr. Banks would give the credit to the sermon. In the end he would not refuse to give the credit to the Holy Ghost. The point is that these sermons were all preached for the purpose of convincing and converting. And it is interesting to know that the freest quotation of poetry, sometimes the quotation of poems of great length, can be made use of to this end.

The Oldest Library in the World and the New Deluge Tablets.

I.

BY THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.,
LECTURER ON ASSYRIAN TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

When, in 1872, the late George Smith published his great discovery of the Babylonian story of the Deluge, every Hebraist and student of the narratives in Genesis was naturally intensely interested. Though defective, the inscription of which he then gave the first translation was in a sufficiently complete state to furnish an exceedingly connected narrative. Since the date of this first publication, the text has been much improved and augmented, and at present fairly trustworthy renderings of it are obtainable.

Many will remember the renewed attention which was directed to the legend when, in the following year, the same Assyriologist was able to announce that he had found at Nineveh a portion of the missing lines of the first column of 'The Chaldean Account of the Deluge.' It was not very much, it is true, and the new text did not fit in very well, but it was thought that further

research and the recovery of other missing pieces might explain the difficulty of making it agree with the rest. Doubts, however, as to its being part of the original tablet began to be expressed, and when I came to re-edit, with Sir H. C. Rawlinson, that plate of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* on which it was published, I was so convinced that the little piece belonged to another version that I omitted it from the first column of the Deluge story, in which it had been printed, and placed it among the additions (p. 9) at the end of the volume. The principal reason for supposing that it belonged to a different version was, that the narrative was in the third person instead of being in the first, as in the eleventh tablet of the Gilgameš series.

Another event of importance in connexion with the history of the Flood legend was the discovery, by the Rev. V. Scheil, of a fragment of an archaic version from Sipper, which he acquired and published. This fragment, which has since passed into the possession of the great millionaire, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, is very mutilated, and gives but few details with regard to which comparisons can

be made. Of special note, however, is the statement that the copy was written in the time of Ammi-zaduga, the fourth in descent from Hammurabi. This naturally proves the extreme antiquity of the legend; and the numbering of the lines suggests that it had already attained to the importance of a standard work, possibly regarded as belonging to the sacred literature of the country. The colophon also states, that it was the second tablet of its series, which was entitled 'When the man reposed,' a phrase which is explained by Jensen as referring to the occasion of the revealing of the coming of a Flood to the Babylonian Noah in a dream. The tablet discovered by Scheil, when complete, seems to have had no less than 439 lines of writing.

The fragmentary condition of this text is in marked contrast with the now almost perfect document first published by the late G. Smith. Addu (Hadad) seemingly appears therein as the destroyer, and Ea or Aa as the creator (begetter) of man; whilst the Babylonian Noah is mentioned under the name of Atram-hasis, 'the exceedingly wise.' It is noteworthy that the chief actor in the bringing of destruction is the god of rain and storms, Hadad, and that, in the version in Genesis, the Flood is caused by the rain. Like G. Smith's version, the Sippar text represents Ea or Aa as protesting against the destruction. The version discovered by the Rev. V. Scheil seems to occupy the whole of the tablet, and contained, according to its discoverer, four columns on each side when complete. It must therefore have been told at much greater length than that already known.

And now, owing to a discovery by Professor Hilprecht,¹ another version, apparently, of the legend of the Flood has come to light. It was found among a number of fragments excavated by the American expedition to Niffer, which that scholar has been studying for some considerable time, and when taken out of the box in which it was sent to Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) was so covered with crystals, that only a few characters were recognizable. Being attracted by the word *ábubi*, 'deluge,' he proceeded to clean the docu-

ment, a process which, working for an hour or two daily, took about three weeks. Like most tablets from Babylonia, it is of unbaked clay, and measures $2\frac{3}{8}$ in. high by $2\frac{1}{4}$ in. wide, and $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch at the thickest part. The text on what Professor Hilprecht regards as the obverse is lost, but the reverse has the remains of 14 lines of writing, as far as it is preserved, fairly clear. According to Professor Hilprecht (and his opinion is worthy of all respect), the tablet to which this fragment belonged had been inscribed more than 600 years before the date generally assigned to Moses, and, in fact, even some time before the Patriarch Abraham rescued Lot from the hands of Amraphel of Shinar and Chedorlaomer of Elam.

Unfortunately it is a mere scrap, and has text on one side only, that on the other (the obverse) having been broken away—a fate which overtakes tablets of unbaked clay (as this is) even more than those of clay which is baked. As to the size, Professor Hilprecht estimates the original tablet as having measured about 18 cm. (= 7 in.) high by $24\frac{1}{4}$ (= 10 in.) wide, and contained a total of about 130 lines of writing. As it was found among the dated and undated tablets of 'Tablet Hill,' it follows *a priori* that it must have been inscribed at the same general epoch. Now the inscriptions of this stratum, he says, were written before the reign of Rim-Sin of Larsa (about 2000 B.C.), and from other considerations the tablet was written between 2137 and 2005 B.C., or, in round figures, about 2100 B.C. 'This is the very latest date to which this fragment can possibly be assigned, both according to its place of discovery, and the paleographical evidence presented by the tablet itself.'

In the course of his introductory chapters, Professor Hilprecht deals with another inscription, an historical document of the reign of Êrriđu (or Enriđu) -pizir, who calls himself 'king of Gutî and the four regions.' The people of Gutium or Qutium have long been regarded as of Median race, and under this ruler they captured Nippur and subdued the whole of Babylonia. Was it on account of this that the mountain of the ark was located in Media? As Assyriologists know, a geographical list from the library of Aššur-bani-âpli states that Nišir, the mountain upon which the boat of Ut-napištem grounded, was so called, and Aššur-našir-âpli III. (885-859 B.C.) speaks of Mount Nišir as being called Kinipa or Kiniba by the people of Lullu, who in ancient times were

¹ *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*. Series D: Researches and Treatises, edited by H. V. Hilprecht. Vol. v. fasciculus 1: *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. Hilprecht, Philadelphia, published by the University of Pennsylvania, 1910.

neighbours of the Gutî. This mountain of Gutî is associated by Professor Sayce with Jebel Jûdî, which he regards, with great probability, as the late form of the word. Professor Hilprecht is of opinion, with Delitzsch, Billerbeck, and Strack, that Mount Nişir lay originally in the district of the upper courses of the 'Adhaim and Diyâla rivers, between lat. 35 and 36. With a subsequent migration of the Gutî northwards, the mountain of the ark migrated with them, and became attached to an unknown range in the neighbourhood of Lake Van, identified in late times as Mount Ararat.

Though Professor Hilprecht's new fragment is so very small, and has not a complete line even in its most perfect part, in all probability it gives us, of all the text which it originally had, the portion which, at present, Assyriologists would most like to have. The number of lines preserved is about 14, with characters varying from 1 to 22 in each, all of them fairly clear, and, as Professor Hilprecht says, of the period of king Rîm-Sin. The following is Professor Hilprecht's transliteration and translation (with slight modifications):—

1. (?)-ša(?) ši-il(?) i-(?)-. . .-(?)-ka
2. a-pa-aš - šar
3. ka-la ni-ši iš-te-niš i-za-bat
4. ti la-am'a-bu-bi wa - ši - e
5. (?) -a-ni ma-la i-ba-aš-šu-u lu-kin ub-bu-ku
lu-pu-ut-tu hu-ru-šu.
6. . . .^{su} êlippam ra-be-tam bi - ni - ma
7. . . . ga-be-e gab - bi lu-bi-nu-uz - za
8. . . . ši-i lu^{su} ma-gurgurru ba-bil-lu na-at-rat
na-piš-tim
9. . . . -ri(?) zu-lu-la dan-na zu-ul-lil
10. te-ip - pu - šu
11. -lam(?) u-ma-am ši-rim iṣ-ṣur ša-me-e
12. ku-um mi - ni
13. -pa(?) u ki[n] - ta ru(?) - . . .
14. u(?)

Translation,

1. thee,
2. . [the confines of heaven and earth] I will loosen,
3. . [a deluge I will make, and] it shall sweep away
all men together ;
4. . [but seek thou lif]e before the deluge cometh forth ;
5. . [for over all living beings], as many as there
are, I will bring overthrow, destruction,
annihilation.
6. build a great ship and
7. total height shall be its structure.
8. it shall be a houseboat carrying what has
been saved of life.
9. with a strong deck cover (it).
10. . [The ship] which thou shalt make,

11. . [into it bri]ng the beast of the field, the bird
of the heavens,
12. . [and the creeping things, two of everything] in-
stead of a number,
13. and the family
14. and (?)

In the photograph (of which Professor Hilprecht has sent me an exceedingly good copy) there are traces of a line before that numbered 1, but the characters are not sufficiently clear to enable them to be read with certainty. Also, in line 1 itself, I should feel inclined to read *ša a-ši-ri-ia*, but all is uncertain, and Professor Hilprecht, who has studied the tablet at first hand, is much more likely to be right. The following are his suggested completions, upon which the restorations in the English version are based:—

2. [*Uṣurat šamê u êrsitim*] or [*Kippat šamê u êrsitim*].
3. [*A-bu-ba a-ša-ka-an-ma*].
4. [*U at-ta-ma še²-e (or bu-lit) na-piš-ti*].

5. The character preceding *-a-ni* looks to me as though it might be the aspirate ('). If this be the case, the completion of the word is more difficult than even the discoverer of the text regards it, and he does not put forward anything more than suggestions.¹ *Ûbbuku* is the Pu'ul of *âbâku*, 'to overthrow,' and *luputtu* is practically a synonym of that word. *Hurušu* is probably written for *hurrušu*, from *harâšu*, 'to grind,' 'crush.'

6 and 8. The different expressions for 'ship' are noteworthy. The usual word is *êlippu*, 'boat,' and in G. Smith's version it is also called *êkallu*, 'palace'—literally, 'great house,' and *bitu*, 'house,' simply. Here, however, it is called a ship—literally a 'great boat' (*êlippu rabêtu*). *Ma-gurgurru*, which Professor Hilprecht translates 'house-boat,' seems to be connected with *ma-gur*, the Semitic *ma-kurru*, 'shrine' or 'ark,' and if this be the case, it would explain why the Hebrews used the word תַּבֵּה. *Gabê* Professor Hilprecht connects with גַּבֵּה, 'to be high'—*gabê gabbi*, 'the whole (or 'total') height.' He has some exceedingly interesting remarks upon the nature of the 'strong deck' with which the craft was covered in, and quotes the first Nineveh version: *kîma âpsê šâšî ṣullil-ši*, 'like the Abyss, as for that (boat), cover it in,' and also the

¹ Can it be *gab'âni*, 'heights,' referred to by Professor Hilprecht on p. 52 of his book?

second version: (*šulul-ša*) *kīma kippati šamē lū dan elliš*, 'let its covering be strong above like the vault of heaven.' It was, therefore, to all appearance, a house-boat with a domed roof, and the expressions used suggest that the structure within it may have been circular, even if the boat itself were not.

Another important word to which the author of the book refers especially is *mini* in the expression *kum mini*. If the reading be right (and the only other possibility would be to render it as one word, *kummini*, which is less satisfactory), then Professor Hilprecht is justified in comparing it with the Hebrew *lēmīnehū, lēmīnehā, lēmīnehom*, translated 'after its (their) kind.' The rendering which he recommends for the Hebrew, however, is 'instead of its (their) number,'—not seven, or any other number, but two only. If this be the case, it suggests that the writer of this portion of Genesis introduced into his narrative the Babylonian *minu*, which, deprived of its termination, became a homophone of מ, already used in the narrative of the creation (Gn. i. 24). He cites Delitzsch, *Hebrew Language*, pp. 70f., and *Prolegomena eines neuen Hebräisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, pp. 142 ff. He concludes with the following comparisons:—

Nippur Version.	Biblical Version, Gen. 6 : 13-20; 7 : II.
Line. 2: 'I will loosen.'	7, II: 'all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.'
3: . . . 'it shall sweep (or 'take') away all men together';	6, II: . . 'behold, I will destroy them with the earth.'
4: . . . 'life (?) before the deluge cometh forth.'	18: . . 'but with thee I will establish my covenant.'
5: . . . over] 'as many as there are, I will bring overthrow, destruction, annihilation.'	17: 'and behold I do bring the deluge upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; everything that is on earth shall perish.'
6: . . . 'build a great boat and'	14: 'make thee an ark.'
7: . . . 'total height shall be its structure';	15: 'and thus shalt thou make it . . . and thirty cubits its height.'
8: . . . 'it shall be a house-boat carrying what has been saved of life.'	16: 'A roof shalt thou make to the ark, in its (entire) length thou shalt

Nippur Version.	Biblical Version, Gen. 6 : 13-20; 7 : II.
Line. 9: . . . 'with a strong roof cover it.'	cover it; ¹ and the door of the ark thou shalt set in the side therefore; (with) lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.'
10: . . . the boat] 'which thou shalt make,' 'into it [bring] the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven.'	19: And from every living thing, from all flesh, two from everything shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female,
11: 'instead of a number'	20: (two) from the birds instead of a number thereof; (two) from the beasts instead of a number thereof; (two) from everything creeping on the ground instead of a number thereof;
12: . . . 'and family' . .	18, 6: 'and thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee.'

Assyrian literature was evidently rich in Flood legends, and it is not to be wondered at that Hebrew literature also contained the account of the great catastrophe. It seems impossible that one or more of these versions should not be augmented and completed as the result of future researches, and it is to be hoped that the prospect will stimulate those who have the wherewithal to renewed effort. Even if the Flood stories do not come to light, there are innumerable other things worth having, which would reward the explorer, and, in turn, delight the subscriber or financier of an expedition.

[Since writing the above, Prof. A. T. Clay has communicated to me his opinion, that the frequent belongs to the Kassite period, and adds that 'no record was kept of finds by Haynes on 4th campaign' (*i.e.* the 4th season of excavations at Niffer).

The writing, judging from the photograph which Prof. Hilprecht has been kind enough to send me, is careful, and such as one would expect from a conservative scribe. I have not had an opportunity of examining many tablets of the Kassite period at first hand, but two tablets of that dynasty in the Amherst collection offer respectively early and late characteristics (one is dated in the reign of Sagarakti-Surias, about 1330 B.C.). It might therefore be argued that no hard and fast line with regard to the date of the script

¹ 'Our English version is evidently wrong here. Cf. Ball, "The Book of Genesis" in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, pp. 5 and 52 f.; also Gunkel's "Genesis" in Nowack's *Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, pp. 129 ff.'

can be drawn, and that the new Deluge-fragment may belong either to the early Kassite or the late Hammurabi period. At least one letter of Burra-Burias (1450 B.C.) is written in a similar style, though the characters are larger and less spread (*Tell El-Amarna Tablets of the B.M.*, pl. 10 b). *From the Script, therefore, I should prefer the latter date for Prof. Hilprecht's new fragment.]*

II.

BY FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH.

THE newly published pamphlet of Professor Hilprecht¹ has caused an unusually great sensation.

In the first thirty-two pages, that is to say, the first half of the work, consisting of four sections, the third and fourth of which (pp. 14-32) are most fascinating, Hilprecht discusses the contents of the ancient Temple Library of Nippur, which he discovered ten years ago, and the greater part of which was buried in 2100 B.C. during an Elamitic invasion. In these pages we see, from most accurate quotations, according to the catalogue numbers, after ten years' work of cataloguing (just completed), that in the reports sent out to Europe by Hilprecht in the year 1900, which were so injudiciously characterized by his American collaborators as fraud and falsehood, not one word too much was said.

The contents of this library, which up to the present include about 20,000 tablets and fragments (a great number of which, however, still lie underground in the ruins of Nippur), are not a whit less rich than those of the much younger library of Sardanapal. Like its younger sister, it also contains lists of cuneiform characters (so-called syllabaries) and ideograms, grammatical paradigms, lists of place-names, gods and temples, plants, stones, and animals, implements, names of professions, and names of measures and months, besides chronological lists,² medical prescriptions, oaths against all kinds of misfortune, tables of omens, inscriptions of buildings, purely historical texts,³ epic fragments, mathematical and astro-

¹ *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur* (Philadelphia, 1910, ix and 65 pp. in 8vo).

² A list of kings of the period from 2300 to 2000 B.C. (kings of Ur and Nisin), which may be described as a historic monument of the first rank, was published two years ago along with a series of mathematical tables by Hilprecht.

³ A very important text of this kind, 500 lines in length, will be further discussed below.

logical tables, and, above all, an abundance of hymns to the gods, written in pure Sumerian, which, at the present time, prove to be of inestimable importance for the development of Assyro-Babylonian religion. For Dr. Hugo Radau, an exceedingly clever collaborator of Hilprecht, has recently, in a fairly long article,¹ reproduced a series of examples of such hymns, which enable us to form a more correct opinion about them. Thus, one of these songs, a song of praise (seventy-seven lines in length) to the goddess Ištar as the morning-star, begins with the following words:

The goddess Istar will I extol, a song of praise will I sing to her,
With cream, dates, and sweet milk, with pastry and seven fishes
Will I load her table, who is called 'Proclaimer of the World.'
Dark wine will I pour out for her,
Clear wine will I pour out for her,
Dark wine and intoxicating drink made from grain
[i.e. beer].

This introduction to a song composed in pure Sumerian reminds us very forcibly of the beginning of a hymn already handed down in Semitic Babylonian, which probably also emanated from the Nippur Library (*Cuneiform Texts of the Brit. Mus.* vol. xv. pl. i.):

The song of the mistress of the gods will I sing,

The mother-goddess, her song is sweeter than honey and wine.

Is it really sweeter than honey and wine,

Sweeter than grapes and figs,

Than the choicest of purified cream?

Yes, it is sweeter than grapes and figs!

So also in the first line of the song of Moses (Second Book of Moses, chap. 15), we read: 'I will sing Jahweh, for highly exalted is he!' and in passages of the Psalms also, e.g. Ps 19¹¹, 'The judgments of Jahweh are sweeter than honey and the honeycomb,' or 119¹⁰³, 'Thy word is sweeter than honey to my mouth.'

These examples show us at a glance that fixed

¹ 'Miscellaneous Sumerian Texts from the Temple Library of Nippur,' pp. 374-457 of the volume which appeared at the end of January 1910 in honour of Hilprecht, *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume: Studies in Assyriology and Archaeology* (with about 45 plates). Thirty European scholars have contributed to this volume, including four Englishmen, ten Frenchmen, and fourteen Germans.

forms of introduction and the poetical similes of Oriental poetry existed in very early times. There is abundant material here for a new history of the art of ancient poetry (so-called poetics).

Besides, Hilprecht gave fuller and more accurate information concerning an almost completely preserved inscription, about 500 lines in length, of an old king of Gutium (cf. the king of the Gai in Gn 14), probably belonging to the time between Sargon of Akkad and the kings of Ur. His name is *Erridu-yizir* or *En-rida-yizir* (i.e. 'the Lord has formed a seed' [descendant]), and his title is 'the mighty king of the Guti and the four (sacred) river-banks,' which refers to the sacred wine-country east of the Tigris, between the Hamrin Mountains and the Zagros (or Pushti Kuh); north of this sacred district, which in Sumerian is called 'country of the four quarters of the heavens,' lay the land of Gutium. The most noteworthy feature of this text is that, like the inscriptions of Sargon and those of his son Naram-Sin, it is written not in Sumerian, but in Semitic. It is therefore the oldest Semitic inscription that we possess of this great length.

But the most interesting specimen that Professor Hilprecht gives¹ from the Temple Library of Nippur, which is furnishing more and more, is a fragment of a new recension of the Deluge, which, translated and with the additions which suggest themselves as necessary (put by me in square brackets) runs as follows:

[The springs of the deep] will I open,
 [A flood will I send], which will affect all mankind at once.
 [But seek thou deliverance], before the flood breaks forth,
 [for over all living beings], however many they are, will I bring annihilation, destruction, ruin.
 [Take wood and pitch] and build a large ship!
 [. cubits] be its complete height.
 [.] a house-boat shall it be, containing those who preserve their life.
 [.] with a strong roofing cover it.
 [. the ship] which thou makest,
 [take into it] the animals of the fields, the birds of the air

¹ As the work of sifting and cataloguing is proceeding rapidly (there are still about 15,000 numbers to catalogue!), we may be prepared for many more similar surprises during the next ten years.

[and the reptiles, two of each] instead of (their whole) number,

[.] and the family of the

The great significance of this fragment, as Hilprecht clearly explains, lies (1) in its extreme antiquity (c. 2200 B.C.), and (2) in its connexion with the versions of the Babylonian Deluge-legend, so far known, as well as with the Biblical account of the Deluge, which itself, moreover, can be traced back to two different accounts of similar matter which have been combined. Although the majority of the additions, as we have already said, suggest themselves, the one in the second last line requires a rather long explanation to justify it, for which we refer the reader to Hilprecht's pamphlet. His referring to the Biblical statement (Gn 6²⁰) that two of every kind of animal were to be taken into the ark (the other statement that seven were to be taken [Gn 7²] comes from another account) quite naturally leads him to add a similar statement before the words 'instead of the (i.e. their whole) number' (Bab. *kum mini*); for only then do these words have a sensible meaning. But it is necessary to add that the Hebrew words *le-minê-hu*, which are as a rule wrongly translated 'according to its kind,' must have meant 'for its number,' so that the very same expression appears word for word in Babylonian and in the Old Testament (*min* = Bab. *minu*, 'number').

The most noteworthy difference in our new (though written at such an ancient time) text-fragment of the well-known Assyrian version belonging to Sardanapal's library (seven centuries B.C.), which itself can be traced back to ancient Babylonian times, is that in the latter the sender of the Deluge is the god *En-lil* (or Bel of Nippur), while the saviour of Noah is the Chaldæan supreme god, *Ea*—that is to say, there is a clear antagonism between the Babylonian and the Chaldæan supreme god. The whole thing, therefore, is traced back to a similar disagreement in the pantheon, as if it were a scene of jealousy between Zeus and Poseidon in Olympus. Here, on the contrary, it is, exactly as in the Old Testament, one and the same deity who causes the flood, and determines upon, and takes in hand, the deliverance of his favourite, Noah. In this fact lies the great significance of the new find in the history of religion.