

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XLII.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1910.

504TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

MONDAY, MARCH 7TH, 1910.

THE REV. J. TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read and confirmed. The announcement was then made of the impending election to fill eight vacancies on the Council, to take place on May 2nd.

The following paper was then read by the author :—

(Illustrated by Lantern Slides.)

AŠŠUR AND NINEVEH.

By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

Aššur.

OF all the little explanatory verses on the Old Testament there are probably but few which are of greater interest than that referring to the great cities of Assyria. It is that well-known verse 11 of the 10th chapter of Genesis, which, in the Revised Version, tells us that, "out of that land (Shinar or Babylonia) he (Nimrod, who is best identified with the Babylonian god Merodach) went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)." Whether it was Asshur or Nimrod who went forth from Babylonia or not is a matter of but minor importance, as it is the cities which were founded, and not the person who founded them, with which we have to deal.

A very important testimony to the great size of Nineveh is given in the Book of Jonah, where it is spoken of, in verse 2 of the third chapter, as "that great city," and further, in the third verse of the same chapter, as "an exceeding great city, of three days' journey," the distance referred to being commonly regarded as indicating its extent. Naturally, there is some difficulty in

estimating this from such a vague statement, for, admitting that the words are correctly applied, the distance traversed must necessarily depend on the speed of the traveller. Perhaps a preaching-journey, such as that upon which the prophet Jonah was engaged, was slower than an ordinary one, but taking as a rough estimate 10 miles a day, this would make about 30 miles as its greatest extent. Between Nineveh and Calah, however, there is nothing like this distance, so that another explanation will have to be found.

But though I shall refer, later on, to the size of Nineveh, the primary object of this paper is to describe the recent discoveries there and in the old capital, Aššur—a site which, strangely enough, seems not to be referred to in the tenth chapter of Genesis at all. Aššur, however, was a city of considerable extent, and, as the older capital, and the centre of an important branch of Assyrian religious life, a place of considerable importance. Situated between 40 and 50 miles south of Kouyūnjik, the ancient Nineveh, Aššur, which is now called Qal'a Shergāt, was first excavated by the late Sir Henry Layard, in 1852, when some fragments of the great historical cylinder of Tiglath-pileser I., with a few other objects, were found. Excavations were continued on the site in 1853, when other copies of the cylinder were discovered. One of the largest objects recovered at that time was the black basalt headless statue of Shalmaneser II., the king of the Black Obelisk, who came into contact with the Syrian League and Ahab, and received tribute from Jehu, son of Omri.

The date of the foundation of the city is naturally unknown to us, but it was in existence as early as 2000 years B.C., as Ḥammurabi testifies. He speaks of having "restored to the city, Aššur, its good genius," suggesting that the place had passed through a period of depression—in any case, whatever the misfortune was, Ḥammurabi would seem to claim to have remedied it.

The German excavations at Aššur, the city to which the eyes of English explorers had for long been turned, have added much to our knowledge of Assyrian history. About the time of the Babylonian king Abēšu, or Ebišu, ruled viceroy Ušpia, who seems to have been the founder of the temple of Aššur in the city of that name. This ruler was succeeded by Kikia, after whom came Ilu-šuma and his son Ērišum, both of whom were known, from bricks brought from the site by Sir Henry Layard, to have been viceroys of Aššur (*iššak Aššur*). Ērišum built anew the temple of Aššur, which was called Ē-ḫursag-kurkura

“the house of the mountain of the lands,” but in the course of 179 years it fell into ruin, and was rebuilt by Šamši-Adad, viceroy of Aššur. Ikunum, who reigned after Ērišum, rebuilt the temple of the goddess Ereš-ki-gal, the queen of Hades so often referred to in the account of the Descent of the goddess Ištar to that region. At this early date the records are mainly architectural, but it is to be expected that something more of the history of the country may come to light, though as the viceroys of Assyria seem to have been under the suzerainty of Babylonia, their natural warlike nature would be somewhat hidden. It seems to be only when they became kings in their own right that those long and often tedious but exceedingly valuable historical records, giving details of their conquests, and recounting their relations with the countries around—relations generally the result of those conquests—meet our wondering gaze. The Assyrians seem not to have engaged in military exploits for the mere lust of conquest, but because they were ambitious, and wished to hand down their names to posterity as more renowned than any ruler who had preceded them.

According to Mr. Hormuzd Rassam's account, the site of Qal'a Shergāt, as Aššur is now called, is unlike that of the ruin-mounds of other Assyrian cities. Instead of standing out boldly and distinctly from the natural and artificial hills around, it is comparatively flat, the greater portion being simply a gradual slope upwards from south to north. When approaching it from the south or south-east, therefore, nothing can be seen except the ruins of the great temple-tower, Ê-hursag-kurkura, the lower boundary being simply a continuation of the natural hills at those points. Viewed from the north and north-west, however, the platform upon which the city is built has the appearance of a structure towering almost perpendicularly to a height of about 100 feet above the level of the plain.

It is at the north-east corner of the city-enclosure that the temple of the god Aššur, founded, apparently, by Ušpia, lies; and immediately adjoining it is the palace of Shalmaneser I. (about 1330 B.C.) and another small temple. The great *ziggurat* or temple-tower lies a little farther to the W.S.W. Still farther to the same point is the palace of Aššur-našir-âpli (885 B.C.), and W.S.W. of that again, lies the most noteworthy ruin of the place, namely, the temple of Anu and Adad—the well-known god of the heavens and his son, Hadad or Rimmon, the god of the atmosphere. The westernmost erection is the terrace of the new palace of Tukulti-En-usāti (Tukulti-Ninip) I. (1300 B.C.), which seems to have been a building of considerable extent.

Among other erections may be mentioned the temple of Nebo, built—or more probably rebuilt—by Sin-šarru-iškun, the Saracos of the Greeks, under whom the fall of Nineveh and the domination of Assyria took place. This foundation contained a treasure-house of the goddess Tašmêtu, the spouse of Nebo. Another important building on the site was a temple to the goddess Ištar, who seems to have borne the name of Ninaittu. Numerous private houses and graves, some of them excellently constructed vaults, with terra cotta coffins, have been found. Of the smaller antiquities some examples have been published, but bas-reliefs similar to those found in such numbers at Nineveh and Khorsabad, are rare or non-existent. Concerning certain royal figures and stele I shall have something to say later on.

From the photographs which have been published it is satisfactory to notice that Mr. Rassam's description of the ruins is correct—the great *ziggurat* or temple-tower is the only thing appearing prominently above the surface of the ground. Notwithstanding the interest of this structure I am compelled to leave it for the present, as I have not sufficient material for a good description of it. Later on, when a detailed account with restorations, similar to that treating of the temple dedicated to Anu and Adad, which has been so well described by Dr. Andrae, the chief explorer of the site, has appeared, I hope to return to the subject.

Though it is somewhat surprising, we probably know more about the comparatively worse-preserved temple of Anu and Hadad than about the great *ziggurat* which was, in the days of its supremacy, such a prominent feature of the city. But the temple to these two gods is so interesting that a special monograph concerning it has been written by Dr. Andrae, the Director of the excavations, and it is on this account that the description which I am about to give of it is possible.

The lowest structures of the Anu-Adad temple are of Aššur-rêš-iši, who was the ancient builder, if not the founder, of this double shrine. This ruler, who was the father of the well-known Tiglath-pileser I., records his name on the bricks which his builders used, as follows:—

(1) *Aššur-rêš-iši* (2) *šangu Aššur* (3) *âpil Mutakkil-Nasku* (4) *šangu Aššur* (5) *âpil Aššur-dan* (6) *šangu Aššur-ma, banu bit Addi* (8) *u Anim.*

"Aššur-rêš-iši, priest of Aššur, son of Mutakkil-Nusku, priest of Aššur, son of Aššur-dan, priest of Aššu likewise, builder of the house of Adad and Anu."

This inscription is not produced by means of a brick-stamp, but is written by hand, probably with a rectangular stick of wood, a corner of which, pressed into the clay, forms the wedges—no matter what their shape—with which we are so familiar. The words are all usual ones, and the text is composed with a due regard to the rules of Assyrian grammar, as far as their ideographic system allowed. It is noteworthy that, in this and other inscriptions found on the site, the name of Adad precedes that of his father Anu—whether because he was the more popular god, or for some other reason, is uncertain.

Like all the structures of this class in Babylonia and Assyria, the corners of the buildings are directed, roughly, towards the cardinal points. Its rear looked therefore towards the northern city-wall, which sloped from north-east to south-west, and its front towards the south-west, facing the central portion of the city. The temple proper seems to have consisted of a rectangular terrace with its entrance on the site referred to, flanked by two towers, by which one gained access to a central courtyard, and thence into the rooms where the religious ceremonies were performed, the priests' private rooms, and those wherein the holy vessels and utensils were kept. As it was a double temple, the architects arranged the rooms in each portion symmetrically, and each god had the same number of rooms in the fane dedicated to him—four small rooms arranged round a central chamber which was apparently the sanctuary. The broad recess at the north-western end of each hall suggests that at that end lay the holy place, where the image of the god of the fane stood, and the priests performed their ceremonies. On each side of these rooms, at the angles of the north-western front, were the two massive temple-towers, which Dr. Andrae supposes to have been in four stages, access being gained to them from the terrace, and also, probably, from a corridor which ran between the chambers (dividing the temples from each other), or from the chambers themselves. Though no sanctuaries are shown at the tops of these temple-towers, it is not improbable that there was one in each case, similar to that of the temple of Belus at Babylon. It is to be noted, however, that a sanctuary at the top of every temple-tower was not an absolute necessity, as the ceremonies may have been performed in the open air. Dr. Andrae's restoration of the earlier structure, which I now describe, does not represent the outer walls as being decorated with those deeply-recessed panels which are such a characteristic of structures of this kind, both in Assyria

and in Babylonia. As will be seen later, however, this decoration was employed in the later structure.

It is needless to say that brick structures such as these were constantly needing repairs, and the successors of the builders were accustomed to regard it as their duty to carry them out. Tiglath-pileser I., the son and successor of Aššur-rêš-iši, fulfilled this task with great thoroughness, and records it in detail on his great cylinders, now preserved in the British Museum, and published in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. i, pl. 15, l. 60 ff. This king states that the temple tower was built or founded by Šamši-Adad, viceroy of Aššur, about 1821 years B.C. It had been demolished by Aššur-dan, who ruled about 1200 B.C., but this king had not been able to rebuild it. For some reason which does not appear, Tiglath-pileser does not refer to the work of his father Aššur-rêš-iši—perhaps he only began the work towards the end of his reign, and Tiglath-pileser may have had the superintendence of it, for he expressly states that it was at the beginning of his reign that the gods ordered their dwellings to be rebuilt. He then made the bricks, cleared the site, reached the core, and laid the foundation upon the ancient nucleus—brickwork first, and then blocks of stone. He built it, he says, from its foundation to its battlements, and made it larger than before, and he rebuilt also the two great temple-towers, which were adapted to the dignity of the two gods' great divinity. Here it may be noted that translations similar to this were made before the discovery of the site, so that, if there were any doubt as to Assyriologists having found out the way to translate the wedge-written inscriptions, the temple of Anu and Adad would, in itself, suffice to prove beyond a doubt that the renderings were correct. The interior of the two-fold temple, he says, he made bright like the centre of the heavens, decorating its wall like the glory of the rising of the stars. Having founded the holy place, the shrine of their great divinity within it, he caused Anu and Adad, the great gods, to enter there, set them in their supreme seat, and thus gladdened their hearts.

After a description of the *Bit hamri*, which seems to have been the treasure-house attached to the temple, or to one of the two shrines (that of Adad) which it contained, Tiglath-pileser calls upon the gods whom he had thus honoured to bless him, and hear his supplication, granting fertility and plenty to his land, and in war and battle bringing him safely back, etc. He states that he had performed the usual ceremonies, anointing the memorial-slabs of Šamši-Adad, his father (ancestor), with oil, sacrificing a victim, and then restoring them to their place.

He asks that the future prince, when those temple-towers grew old and decayed, might treat his own inscriptions in the same way, and calls down a deadly curse, and all the displeasure of his gods, on any who should destroy his inscriptions. Tiglath-pileser's own inscriptions, impressed on the bricks of temple, read as follows:—

<i>Tukulti-âpil-êšarra</i>	Tiglath-pileser,
<i>šangu Aššur mâr Aššur-rêš-iši</i>	priest of Aššur, son of Aššur-
	rêš-iši,
<i>šangu Aššur bît Adad bêli-šu</i>	priest of Aššur, the house of
	Adad, his lord,
<i>êpuš-ma ikšir</i>	he has (re)built and paved.

Time passed, and though the temple was in all probability repaired as occasion required by the successors of Tiglath-pileser I., it had reached such a state of decay by the time of Shalmaneser II. (859 B.C.) that that king thought himself justified in rebuilding it. It will be remembered that Shalmaneser II. was the king who came into conflict with the Syrian league, to which Ahab of Israel and Ben-Hadad of Damascus belonged. Inscriptions on what are called *ziqati*, found on the site, record the work which he executed on the temple as follows:—

“Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, son of Aššur-našir-âpli, king of Assyria.”

[Here follow references to his conquests in Armenia, the West, Babylon, and the sacrifices which he offered in Borsippa, the renowned suburb-city of Babylon, of which he speaks also elsewhere. As the cradle of their religion, Babylonia, and especially the capital and the cities around, must have been a land of veritable romance to the pious Assyrian.]

“In those days the temple of Anu and Adad,
my lords, which earlier Tukulti-âpil-êšarra (Tiglath-pileser),
son of Aššur-rêš-iši, son of Mutakkil-Nusku (had rebuilt), had
fallen into ruin,
to its whole extent I built it anew.
I brought beams of cedar, (and) set them for (its) roof.
Let the future prince renew its ruin,
restore my written name to its place—
Aššur, Anu, Adad, will hear his prayer.
Let him restore my *ziqati* to its place.
Month Mahur-ilani, day 5th, first year of my reign (or possibly,
of my twenty expeditions).

From this we gather, that the restoration of the temple of

Anu and Adad by Shalmaneser II. was no mere work of simple repair, but a rebuilding of the structure, as, indeed, Andrae's plans indicate. The halls and rooms were to all appearance decorated with all the skill of the Assyrian artisans, and cedar, probably from Lebanon or Amanus, were used for the support of the flat roof of the outer structure. Contrary to what we should expect, the temple, when rebuilt, was smaller than the structure erected by Aššur-rêš-iši, the father of Tiglath-pileser I. The design, it is true, was more symmetrical, but as the new structure was wanting in breadth, it must also have been wanting in boldness. The entrance seems to have been to the left of the centre of the terraced front elevation, and the central courtyard was smaller. It was from this last that access was gained to the rooms used for the ceremonies and for the furniture of the temple. Passing through extensive vestibules, the visitor reached the main halls, which, instead of recesses regarded as holy places (which were probably separated from the main halls by curtains), were provided with side-rooms on the right and left of the halls to which they belonged respectively. The two *siqurrāti*, to which access was probably obtained from the terrace above the chambers, were towers in stages similar to those of the earlier structure, but their outer walls were panelled, not plain. A fine view of the river to the north-west must have been obtained from these heights. The absence of formally straight lines in Dr. Andrae's restoration is not altogether unpleasing, and is, in fact, in accordance with the picture on the grant of land obtained for the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph* by the late George Smith, and now in the British Museum. The carving on the stone in question is very rough, and the details are not, therefore, very marked, but it may be noted, that the shrine on the top is very distinctly shown, suggesting that similar erections may have existed on the similar buildings in the city of Aššur. After this, the restorations of Assyro-Babylonian temple-towers in Perrot and Chipiez's *History of Art in Chaldea* strike one as being rather formal.

Among those who repaired and restored the structure at a late date, Dr. Andrae mentions King Sargon of Assyria, the well-known ruler who captured Samaria. In Shalmaneser II.'s courtyard (which has, by the way, a very good well in the south-west corner), an excellent pavement of tiles almost exclusively of Sargon was discovered. The inscriptions thereon were in the two languages, Assyrian and dialectic Sumerian, and read as follows :—

“For Aššur, the father of the gods, his lord,
Sargon, king of the world, king of Assyria,
magnate of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad,
has caused this pavement to be laid, and with bricks of the
sacred oven,
the pathway of the court of E-hursag-gal-kurkura
he has made bright like the day.”*

This “pathway” finds a parallel in the festival-street at Babylon, and was probably for the processions of the gods when their statues were carried round to visit other shrines and temples, both of the city Aššur and the neighbouring towns.

One of the pictures published shows the entrance to the room designated F, looking from the courtyard. Before it is the pavement of Sargon, and below that, the older pavement. The earthen vessel near the centre is said to be a collecting vase, possibly for offerings.

The desolation which this once flourishing town and temple present may be gathered from the general view from the East, showing the remains of the old North and the late West temple-towers. On the left are the lowest foundation-courses of the courtyard-wall, and in the middle are the remains of walls of some of the rooms. The remains of the late West temple-tower are to be seen behind.

Naturally there is much to say concerning these interesting and extensive ruins, which testify, among many others, to the great and active life of the ancient cities of Assyria, at one time the scourge of the then known world. The walls and their gates, the numerous other temples, especially those of Aššur, Nebo, and Ereš-ki-gal, the Queen of Hades; the palaces; the platforms; which you have seen in the plan; and the “hunting-box” of Sennacherib, which lay outside the walls to the north-west, all present points of interest. Descriptions of these, however, will be best undertaken when satisfactory monographs

* The following are the two versions of this inscription of Sargon, and will give an idea of the differences of the two idioms:—

1. *Assyrian.*

Ana Aššur ābi ūlāni bēli-šu Šarru-ukīn šar kiššati šar māt Aššur šakkanak Bāb-ūli šar māt Šumeri u Akkadi ušalbin-ma agurru utuni elliiti tallakti kisal E-ḫur-sag-gal-kurkura kima āme unammir.

2. *Sumerian.*

Aššur adda dimmerene lugalaniir Šarru-ukīn lugal kišara lugal mada Aššur-ge neurru Tindir lugal Kingi-Ura-bi segalurra udun azagga unenidudu neqin kisal E-ḫur-sag-gal-kurkura ā-dīme ban-lah.

dealing with them are published, like that of Andrae upon the Temple of Anu and Adad, which has furnished material for this portion of the present paper.

Though the objects of art do not by any means equal in number to those from Nineveh, Calah and Khorsabad, there are still a few which are worthy of notice. One is a sixteen-sided column of basalt with a strange-looking capital, supposed to be of the time of Tiglath-pileser I. Another good specimen of Assyrian art consists of fragments of bronze on which chased figures in relief may be seen, reminding one of those magnificent brazen gates which Mr. Rassam was so fortunate as to discover at Balawat. This shows figures in procession, seemingly going to meet the Assyrian king, and introducing a smaller figure, apparently a child. There are several scenes on the Balawat gates which can be compared with this, and in the light of Shalmaneser's historical inscriptions, it is seen that the little personage is a princess who is represented, and that she is being surrendered by a conquered prince or chief to the Assyrian king to become one of his wives. The proportions seem not to be so well kept as in the case of the Balawat Gates, but the work in general is good.

Nineveh.

Aššur is regarded as having been the first capital of Assyria, and Nineveh the second; but Dr. Rogers lays claim to the honour of chief city of the kingdom for two others in addition—Calah and Khorsabad, the order being Aššur, Calah, Nineveh, Khorsabad (built by Sargon on the site of Maganubba), and then Nineveh again. If so, this is a case of kings proposing and God disposing, for notwithstanding all that Sargon did for Dūr-Sarru-ukīn, now Khorsabad, its importance declined after his death, and Sennacherib, his son, showered his favours on Nineveh, which remained the capital of the land until the downfall of the Assyrian monarchy in 606 B.C.

And it is apparently in consequence of what Sennacherib did for the city that its glory revived. Two German scholars, Messrs. Meissner and Rost, have edited and translated very successfully the inscriptions in which that king records his work there, so that we have had for a considerable time rather full details of his architectural, horticultural, and defensive achievements.

Lately, however, fresh attention has been attracted to them, for the British Museum has been fortunate enough to acquire another text—a prism similar to the monument known as the

Taylor Cylinder, inscribed for the same monarch. This text has, on its eight faces, no less than 740 lines of writing dealing with his campaigns and his architectural works. There is the usual honorific introduction, and this is followed by his first campaign, which was against Merodach-bal-adan; his second, directed against the Kassites and the Yašubi-galleans; his third, which passed in the land of Hatti, the territory of the Hittites, and was undertaken to chastise Hezekiah and punish the Ekronites; his fourth, which was against the small Chaldean kingdom of Bit-Yakin; and his fifth, directed against certain states occupying the mountain-fastnesses of Mesopotamia. After these well-known narratives, however, we get details of two little-known military expeditions, in which Sennacherib did not personally take part, but which were led by his generals. The first of the two was against Kirua, ruler of the land of Que (Cilicia), whom he calls "city-chief" of Illubru, and describes as one of his officials. This man not being, as his name implies, an Assyrian, naturally thought to make himself independent of Assyrian rule, and to this end got the city of H̄ilakku (Cilicia) to revolt, and the inhabitants of the cities Ingirâ and Tarsus to rally to his side. These allies occupied and blocked the Cilician pass, hoping to be able to arrest the Assyrian troops in their advance. In this, however, they were unsuccessful, the forces sent against them being armed with all the thoroughness for which the Assyrians were renowned, and even more thoroughly than on former occasions. The Cilicians were first defeated "among the difficult mountains," and the cities of Ingirâ and Tarsus were captured and spoiled. Next came the siege of Illubru, carried on with the help of all kinds of warlike engines, and its fall followed in due course. Kirua, the governor, was captured, and much spoil taken. Having been brought to Nineveh, he met the fate which awaited him, that of flaying—whether alive or dead the record does not say. At the re-occupation of Illubru, which followed, Aššur's emblem was set up, and, facing it, the memorial slab which had been prepared for the purpose.

According to Polyhistor, Sennacherib proceeded against Cilicia in person, a statement which, if he be referring to the same campaign, must be regarded as incorrect. This historian also says that he fought with them a pitched battle, in which, though he suffered great loss, he was successful in defeating them, and erected on the spot a monument of his victory, consisting of a statue of himself, and a record of prowess "in Chaldean characters." Sennacherib does not mention

any statue, but there may well have been a bas-relief above the inscription to which he refers. Confirmation of Polyhistor's statement that Sennacherib rebuilt the city of Tarsus after the likeness of Babylon, and changed its name to Tharsis, may possibly be confirmed by records of a later date—if such ever come to light. Though it is not much, this new chapter in the history of the Apostle Paul's native city is interesting. It had already been taken by the Assyrian king Shalmaneser II., about 850 B.C., when Katī, the then ruler, was deposed, and his brother Kirri placed on the throne in his stead.

The other campaign referred to was against Tilgarimmu, a city on the borders of Tubal, which Assyriologists have identified with the Biblical Togarmah—a comparison, however, which is not altogether satisfactory; though it may, by chance, turn out to be correct. This place was ruled by a king named Hidi, who had "consolidated" (such seems to be the meaning of the verbal form *irkušu*) "his kingdom," apparently meaning that he wished to be considered as independent of Assyria. Again the superior armament, and, it may be supposed, the organization of the Assyrians, prevailed; and after the usual siege, the city was taken and destroyed, and the gods of the people carried into captivity. At the end, Sennacherib mentions the amount of military supplies which he captured and distributed among his forces. This was apparently not an important expedition, but it added to the glory of his reign, and is on that account recorded.

But the longest section of the text is that detailing the work which Sennacherib did at Nineveh, his capital, to which he has devoted no less than 345 lines of writing. He describes the city as the place beloved by the goddess Ištar, wherein exist the shrines of all the gods and goddesses—and in this statement we may see why he thought more of Nineveh than of Dûr-Sarrukīn, his father's great foundation—the new city and royal residence did not appeal to him because it was a place of but little religious and historical interest. This view of his favour towards Nineveh is rather confirmed by the words which follow, wherein he goes on to say, that Nineveh is the eternal groundwork, the everlasting foundation, whose design had been fashioned and whose structure shone forth from of old with the writing of the (starry) heavens—practically a claim that it had a divine origin. It was a place craftily wrought, wherein was the seat of the oracle, and all kinds of art-works, every kind of shrine, treasure, and thing of delight (?). It was there that the kings his fathers had ruled the land of Assyria before him, and

directed the followers of the god Enlil, in which last we may, perhaps, understand the Babylonians as being meant. None of these kings, however, had beautified the city as he had done.

For the work which he had in view, therefore, he brought the people of Chaldea, the Arameans, the Mannites or Armenians, Que and Hilakku (both mentioned as countries, though in the historical part the latter appears as a city), the land of Pilišti or Philistia, and the land of Tyre. These nationalities, which had not submitted to his yoke, he placed in servitude, and they made bricks for the extension and decoration of the city.

The work which first appealed to him was the building of a palace for himself, and to this end he pulled down the former palace, the terrace and foundation of which had been destroyed by the Tebiltu, a violent stream, which since remote days had sought to reach the structure. In order to safeguard it in future, he turned aside the course of the river, and reclaimed, from another stream, the Khosr, a piece of land 340 cubits in length by 298 in breadth. The palace itself was enlarged, when rebuilt, to a length of 700 great *suklum* and a width of 440, and he caused palaces (that is, separate sections or divisions of the whole structure) to be built, and adorned with gold, silver, and all kinds of valuable woods. To this palace he added a gateway made after the likeness of that of a Hittite palace, and from the excavations which have been made on Hittite sites, it seems probable that this was a special arrangement of winged lions and bulls, such as the Assyrians had themselves been accustomed to employ for decorative purposes. I quote here Sennacherib's words:—

“ . . . a house of double doors (*i.e.*, porch)
in the likeness of a palace of Hattu,
I caused to be made opposite its gates.”

It therefore seems clear that it is the arrangement which is referred to, and not the ornamentation. The lines which follow are characteristic of the East, the land of sweet odours and precious wood:—

“Beams of cedar and cypress,
whose scent is sweet, the products of Amanus
and Sirara, the sacred* mountains,
I caused to be set up over them.”

In the shrines within the royal chambers Sennacherib opened *apti birri*, which are regarded as meaning “light-holes,” or windows, and in their gates (the gates of the shrines apparently)

* Or “the snow-capped.”

he set up female winged colossi of white stone and ivory (or perhaps stone of the colour of ivory), which bore *iluru* (? columnns) and whose claws were curved. "I set them up in their gates, and caused them to pass as a wonderment," says the king. If one might make a suggestion with regard to these interesting objects, it is that they were small and more of the nature of statuettes than of statues, and were in fact possibly the same as that beautiful winged lioness found by the late G. Smith at Nineveh in 1873-4. He describes it as a winged cow or bull (it is restored in accordance with this description) in fine yellow stone, with a human head surmounted by a cylindrical cap adorned with horns and rosette ornaments, wings rising from the shoulders, and a necklace round the neck. On the top of the wings, which stretch backwards, stands the base of a column in the usual Assyrian style. He describes it as being 3 inches high without the feet (which are wanting), 3 inches long, and having a breadth of $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches. As the face is unbearded it is almost certainly intended for a female, and the absence of any traces of an udder makes it more probable that it is intended for a winged lioness-sphinx rather than a woman-headed cow.

Architectural details concerning the newly-erected palace follow. The recesses of the chambers were lighted "like the day," and the interiors were surrounded with decorative ornaments of silver and copper and with burnt brick and valuable stones, one of them being lapis-lazuli. Some of the great trees used in the construction of the palace had been brought, the king says, from secret places among the mountains of Sirara, their positions having been revealed to him by Aššur and Ištar, lovers of his priesthood. The stone (marble, or perhaps alabaster) used was regarded in the times of his fathers as a fit decoration for the sheath of a sword (implying that it was something rare), and was brought from the land or mountain of Ammanana, and a stone called *tur-mina-banda*, identified by Mr. L. W. King with *breccia*, which was used for the great receptacles of the palace, came from the city Kabridargilâ on the boundary of Til-Barsip (Birejik). The white limestone used for the winged bulls and female colossi, and other similar statues of alabaster came from the district of the city Balaṭu, near Nineveh.

These bulls and lions were made in a single piece of stone, and it is noteworthy that the transportation of similar objects, probably for the palace in question, is represented more than once on the slabs from Sennacherib's palace which were discovered by Layard and are now in the British Museum. It does

not require a very lengthy inspection of these gems of Assyrian art to realise that they are exceedingly instructive illustrations of the way in which the great Assyrian palaces were built. We see there the palace-platform being constructed, and the finished and unfinished human-headed bulls being dragged to the positions in which they were to be set up. The king speaks of the perfection of the form of the female colossi of marble:—

“Like glorious day their bodies were bright,”

and we can easily imagine the imposing effect which they had when they were new and fresh from the sculptor’s hands, on the day when the palace was completed.

And here, in the course of his description, Sennacherib touches on another subject, namely, the casting of bronze. When, in early days, he says, the kings his fathers wished to make an image of themselves in bronze to set up in the palaces (or temples) they made all the artizans groan in their construction:—

“Without instruction, not understanding the matter,
for the work of their desire,
they poured out oil, the fleece of a sheep
they sheared within their lands.”

This, as Mr. King points out, probably refers to some ceremony in which oil and a fleece were used, in order to bring good luck upon the work. Sennacherib, however, through the clever understanding which the divine prince Nin-igi-azaga (the god Ea, patron of handicrafts) had conferred upon him, combined with his own research and inquiry into the matter, was able to make “great columns of bronze,” and colossal lions “open of knee”—probably meaning with the legs separated from each other, and not joined together with a core of metal.

“By the counsel of my understanding,
and the inquiry of my mind,
I formed the bronze-work, and
made its execution artistic.
Of great beams and framework,
the forms of 12 shining (?) lions,
with 12 bull-colossi
sublime, which were perfect as to form,
(and) 22 colossal heifers, upon whom
was lusty beauty, who were mantled with strength,
and vigour abounded,
according to the command of the god
I made moulds of clay, and

poured copper (bronze) therein—
as in the casting of half-shekel pieces
I completed their formation.”

What was the improvement which Sennacherib effected? The want of a precise translation renders this doubtful, but we may, perhaps, guess that he had come to the conclusion that much labour, and also a considerable amount of metal, would be saved by casting these objects as a shell round a core of clay which, being constructed with a wooden framework, could afterwards be removed, and the same employed over and over again. In any case, the process here detailed is most interesting, and when more is known of the Assyrian technical terms, may even add something to our knowledge of the history of bronze-casting.

Two of these brass colossi, when finally produced, were overlaid with what is suggested to have been gilding, and were placed, with others of limestone and male and female colossi of alabaster, in the gates of the palaces. Numerous other details concerning the colossal bulls and lions which the king caused to be made follow, and he states that he made columns of bronze, and also of all the different kinds of wood which the Assyrians regarded as precious, for which the colossi seem to have formed supports, and the whole was erected as colonnades (?) in “his lordly dwelling.” After this come references, apparently, to the bas-reliefs which the king caused to be carved, the slabs being described as having been produced wonderfully, and if this be the true rendering, the specimens in the British Museum confirm Sennacherib’s words concerning them—they are wonderful.

Next comes Sennacherib’s account of the irrigation works which he constructed. In order to have water daily in abundance, he caused swinging beams and brazen buckets to be fashioned, and having set up the necessary framework over the water-reservoirs and attached them thereto, they were used for the watering of the fields and plantations. Here we have a description of that well-known Eastern apparatus, the *shadouf*, which Sennacherib would seem to have introduced into Assyria—it is said from Egypt.

“ . . . Those palaces I cause to be produced beautifully—
as for the vicinity of the palace, for the wonderment of
multitudes of men
I raised its head—‘The Palace which has no rival’
I called its name.”

And then comes the description of the surroundings of the palace—the great park or plantation “like mount Amanus”

which he laid out, wherein were all herbs and fruit-trees, trees produced on the mountains and in the land of Chaldea (a plain low-lying and flat), and trees bearing wool. This, as my former colleague of the British Museum points out, must be a reference to the growing of cotton, as is shown by the statement, that it was used for the fabricating of clothing.

At this point he quits the references to his palaces, and speaks of his work on the city of Nineveh. From former days, he says, the area of its circuit had been 9,300 cubits, and the princes going before him had not built an inner and an outer wall. Here we have two rather surprising statements, for this estimate of its area is too small to accord with what we have learned from ancient writers, and the absence of defensive walls is not what we should have expected from the Assyrians. If true, however, it would show how remarkably confident they were that the city would not be taken by an enemy—it must have been indeed the city of a nation which trusted in its own power.

This state of things, however, he immediately proceeded to rectify, for he states that he increased the size of the city by 12,515 cubits, and from this portion of the record we gather that the *suklum* and the *âmmat* or cubit were the same. The great wall, of which he records the laying of the foundation, he called "The Wall whose glory overthroweth the enemy." He made its brickwork 40 (? cubits) thick, which would probably not greatly exceed the estimate of the late George Smith, who reckoned it at about 50 feet, but added that excavation would probably decide that point—and we may add, that it would also, perhaps, decide the measure of the *suklum* or *âmmat*. The height of the walls he raised to 180 *tipki*, which, according to Diodorus, should amount to about 100 feet. These were pierced by fifteen gates:—

"To the four winds fifteen city-gates,
before and behind, on both sides,
for entering and going forth,
I caused to be opened in it."

Then follow their names, with which, though they are sufficiently interesting, I will not tire you. As specimens of their nature, however, it may be mentioned that the gate of the god Aššur of the city of Aššur was called "May Aššur's viceroy be strong"; whilst "The Overwhelmer of the whole of the enemy," was the name of the gate of Sennacherib of the land of Halzi—an indication, perhaps, of Sennacherib's birthplace. The gate of the Mesopotamian city of Ḫalah was called "The

Bringer of the produce of the wooded heights." The gate of Sin, whose name forms the first element of Sennacherib's own name, was called "Nannar (=Sin) the protector of the crown of my dominion," the moon god being "lord of the crown" in Assyro-Babylonian mythology. What would correspond with the "water gate" was called "Ea, the director of my water-springs"; and the Quay-gate was named "The Bringer-in of the tribute of the peoples." Interesting, also, is the name of the gate *Pakidat kalama*, "The guardian of everything," which was the gate of the tribute-palace or armoury—possibly a kind of museum wherein were placed all that the Assyrian king regarded as curious or precious in the way of tribute, gifts, and trophies. The identification of the fifteen Ninevite gates will add much to the interest attaching to the site of that ancient city.

Following on this, Sennacherib described what he did in the way of constructing the outer wall named *Bad-nig-erim-hulhula* in the old Sumerian language, which he interprets as meaning "that which terrifies the enemy." This wall was constructed with foundations of enormous depth—as far down, in fact, as "the waters of the underground courses," at which point blocks of stone were placed as a foundation, and it was then carried up to the height fixed upon for the coping with further massive blocks. The object of the wall's great depth was to frustrate attempts at undermining in case the city should be besieged—a vain precaution, if the accounts of the taking of Nineveh be true, for it is said that some part of the wall was undermined by one of the rivers flowing near, and fell down; and that it was through the breach thus formed that the allied forces of the Medes, Babylonians, and others, entered. "I made its work skilfully," the king then says, as if satisfied with what he had done.

He then returns to the city itself, the area of which he enlarged, broadening its open spaces, and making it bright "like the day"—an improvement which Oriental cities often need. Above and below the city he then constructed plantations, and placed therein the vegetation of the mountains and the countries around—all the sweet-smelling herbs of the land of Heth (Palestine and Phœnicia), and certain plants called *murri*, among which, more than in their native places, fruitfulness increased. These and other plants he set therein, and planted them for his subjects—probably the higher, rather than the lower, classes of his people. A description of what he did to improve the water-supply for these plantations, and wherewith, at the same time, apparently, he watered all the people's orchards,

and a thousand cornfields above and below the city, forms a fit conclusion to this portion of the narrative.

To retard the current of the river Khosr the king constructed a swamp, in which its waters lost themselves. Reeds and rushes were planted within it, and wild fowl, wild swine, and apparently deer placed therein. All the trees which he planted thrived exceedingly, in accordance with the word of the god. The reed-plantations prospered, the birds of heaven and the wild fowl of distant places built their nests, and the wild swine and forest-creatures spread abroad their young. The trees useful for building he used in the construction of his palaces—the trees bearing wool they stripped, and beat out for garments.

To celebrate the completion of the work a great festival was held, worthy of such a king, who, whatever may have been his conduct with regard to other nations, seems to have attended well to the needs of his own people. Assembling the gods and goddesses of Assyria in his palace, numerous victims were sacrificed, and gifts were offered. There was oil from the trees called *sirdû* (which may therefore have been the olive), and there was produce from the plantations more than in the lands whence the trees therein came. On that occasion, too, when the palace was dedicated, he saturated the heads of the people of his land with oil, probably from those trees, and filled their bodies with wine and mead. The inscription ends with the usual exhortation to those “among the king’s his sons, whom Aššur should call for the shepherding of land and people,” to repair the wall when it should fall into ruin; and having found the inscription inscribed with his name, to anoint it with oil, sacrifice a victim, and restore it to its place. “Aššur and Ištar will hear his prayers.”

After this pious wish comes the date:—

“Month Ab, eponymy of Ilu-itti-ia, governor of Damascus.”

In all probability many will say that we have here a view of the great and (it must be admitted) cruel conqueror in an entirely new light, namely, as the benefactor of his country. And if what he states be true, the question naturally arises: What modern ruler could say that he had done as much for his capital as Sennacherib claims to have done for Nineveh? And who shall say that he claimed unwarrantedly to be the benefactor of the great city? The sculptures from his palace exist to confirm his record. We see the winged bulls, of colossal size, lying down on the sledges on which they were transferred from the quarries to the site of the palace, sometimes placed uprightly,

and carefully propped up to prevent damage by breakage. The sledges, which the Assyrians called ships or boats, are being dragged and forced forward by means of enormous levers upon rollers by armies of workmen, the captives taken in his warlike expeditions—Armenians, Phœnicians, Tyrians, Cilicians, Chaldeans, and others, driven to strenuous effort by the whips of unsparing taskmasters and the loud voices of the directors of the work. In the background, behind the slaves toiling at the great cables and the levers, we see the soldiers of the guard, and behind these again extensive wooded hills. In other sculptured pictures, however, it must be the pleasure-grounds of the palace which are represented, with a row of trees, alternately tall and short, in the distance. This scene is placed on the banks of a river, whereon we see boats, and men astride on inflated skins. At another point we see the great king himself in his hand-chariot, superintending the work. Here the background consists of reeds and rushes, and we see the deer to which he apparently refers, and also a wild sow with a litter of young. One of Layard's pictures, which is described as a representation of an "Obelisk or stone in a boat," implies that these boat-like sledges were made to float or to be moved on land by means of the rollers referred to above. In this case the "boat" is in the water, and being dragged by long rows of labourers, many of whom are naked, and all seem to be toiling in the water. The ropes attached to the boat-like sledges or rafts are excessively long, and even in the incomplete state of the slabs as Layard saw them, 36 men to each may be counted. The great pioneer of Assyrian exploration gives, in his *Monuments of Nineveh*, second series, an excellent drawing of a winged bull and human figure from one of the gates of the old wall of Nineveh, showing, if any proof were needed, how very excellent the work of Sennacherib's sculptors was. It is said that some of the remains seen by Layard on the spot have been since his time destroyed, and if this be the case, it is a deplorable loss. Fortunately we have Layard's drawings, and know what they were like.

George Smith, in his *Assyrian Discoveries*, gives us a good account of Nineveh. He states that the north wall measures about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, the south rather more than half a mile, the east wall about $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles, and the west over $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles. No extension of the city outside the walls seems to have been recognised by the Assyrians, except that called *Rébit Ninua*, probably meaning "the extension of Nineveh," which seems to have been on the north, stretching towards Khorsabad. It has been identified with great probability, as the Biblical Rehoboth-Ir. In the

Book of Jonah, however, Nineveh is stated to have been an exceeding great city of three days' journey, and that being the case, the explanation that Calah on the south and Khorsabad on the north were included seems to be very probable. The distance between those two extreme points is about 30 miles, which at 10 miles a day, would take the time required. Ovid, in his story of Pyramis and Thisbe, states that the tragedy which he relates took place near the pyramid at the entrance of Nineveh. This was the traditional tomb of Ninus, and may well have been the great temple-tower excavated by Layard at Calah, in which he found a long passage, the original object of which was difficult to determine, and it cannot be said therefore whether it had ever been used as a tomb or not. It is to be noted, moreover, that in Genesis x, 11, 12, Resen, between Nineveh and Calah, is described as being "the great city." As it seems never to be spoken of in the inscriptions (the only Resen mentioned having lain seemingly on the north of Nineveh proper), it could not have been a city of any dimensions, and this parenthetical description may therefore refer to all the sites mentioned. As Jonah's missionary visit to Nineveh took place during the reign of Jeroboam II, 783-743 B.C., Khorsabad must be excluded; but perhaps the extent of the united cities, "Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah" (with Resen), was sufficiently great for a three days' preaching journey without taking the northern foundation of Sargon in.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REV. DR. IRVING.

As one who joined heartily in the unanimous vote of thanks to Dr. Pinches for his paper, every paragraph of which bristles with interest, I venture to touch upon a few points by way of eliciting fuller information, as I should have done had there been time for discussion when the paper was read.

(1) One would be glad to know to what extent animal or vegetable remains have been found in those buried cities. Such remains (like those found by Dr. Macalister in the ruins of Gezer and in all the three successive cities of that site) are of great interest for students of Anthropology. Professor Ridgeway of Cambridge, for example, has lately shown me hoof-bones ("coffin-bones") of *Equus* or *Asinus* completely calcified by a well-known natural process for which the soil, the building material, and the climate of Palestine furnish all the necessary conditions.

(2) On p. 161 Dr. Pinches speaks of the flat timbered roofs of the buildings ascribed to Shalmaneser II. It would seem that so late as the eighth century B.C. (and perhaps later) *gabled roofs* were unknown among those oriental nations of the Euphrates-Tigris region. This point is interesting as tending to confirm the surmise of Professor Ridgeway that the Celtic nations have to be accredited with the invention of the latter structure, through utilising horizontal branches of trees to support their tent-coverings in the primeval forests.

(3) It is very instructive to learn that the haughty Sennacherib, the mighty conqueror and destroyer of cities and small states, had a better side to his nature as a ruler and as a benefactor of his own people, though the hard and stern side of his character, in his attempt to crush Hezekiah, appears only in Holy Writ. We too often perhaps overlook the more humane side of the later Nebuchadnezzar shown in what he did for the later Babylon by way of founding a royal college and a system of competitive examinations for the more efficient training of higher civil servants, as recorded in Daniel i; a system which Cyrus ("God's Shepherd") seems to have continued and improved upon under the *régime* of the Medes and Persians. All this goes to show progress in the humanisation of those heathen peoples, and that the great monarchies of antiquity were really far from being mere phases of tyranny and bloodshed, as the evidence of the monuments and the unsupplemented records of the Old Testament may lead us to suppose.

(4) Intensely interesting to anthropologists is the information which is now given to us of the advanced working in bronze in the days of Sennacherib, and Dr. Pinches informs me that artefacts in copper and bronze (if not iron) can be traced back in those ancient Babylonian lands, to at least 3000 B.C.* Have we not here a clue to the mixed race that is incidentally mentioned (Tubal Cain in particular) in Gen. iv, 16-23, as having sprung from Cain and a pre-Adamic woman?

The later Hallstadt and La Tène ages (Early and Late Celtic) in Europe seem to have been anticipated in Sumerian lands by at

* This is a greater antiquity moreover than is assigned to the Minoan Period ("Bronze Age") of Crete. See Howes, *Crete the Forerunner of Greece* (1909).

least 2000 years. What the skill of the later Celtic artificers in bronze and iron (and gold) was, is well known. No fools (as many moderns airily suppose) were those ancients, who could apply the malleability of native copper (as in the copper-plated chariot of Sennacherib) or the alloying of tin with copper for casting purposes; nor were those, who, as simple observers of nature, could detect the lasting nature of the slab of diorite, on which Hammurabi's portrait and laws were incised, more than a millennium earlier.

(5) Then again the artistic power of the men, who drew and cast those figures on the bronze tablet of Sennacherib's time, strikes one as something surprising; and the more so when one looks at them more closely, and perceives the expression of agility, elegance of figure, nerve, and accuracy of detail in figure after figure of the horses thereon delineated. They bring out the qualities of the "wild horse of the mountains," to which Professor Maspero refers in his account of the "frenzies of Ishtar," and with that vigour of expression which we are learning to see in the early drawings of the horse by our palæolithic ancestors (see Boyd-Dawkins' *Cave Hunting*; and the writings of Professor J. Cossar Ewart).

A. IRVING, D.Sc.

NOTE ON THE ABOVE BY DR. PINCHES.

References to the animal and vegetable remains in Babylonian and Assyrian ruins are rare, and for this reason any that I may have come across in the descriptions I used escaped my notice. Gabled roofs seem to have occurred in Armenia (Botta, Pl. 141; Bonomi, *Nineveh and its Palaces*, 1878, p. 186).

There is no doubt that both the Babylonians and the Assyrians were most intelligent and energetic sections of the human race, and had made really good progress in arts and crafts at an exceedingly early date. Babylonian sculpture was probably hampered by dearth of stone, but the fragments which did fall into their hands were used with excellent effect and considerable success. The Assyrians were originally less advanced than the Babylonians, but the sculptures which have come down to us show that they speedily made up for lost time. About 640 B.C. marks the zenith of Assyrian art.

I am exceedingly obliged to the Rev. A. Irving for his most interesting and appreciative notes upon my paper.—T. G. P.