

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVIII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXVII.

ARTICLE I.

THE SABBATH.

“THE SABBATH WAS MADE FOR MAN.”

Philosophers tell us that all the forces of nature are indestructible. They may go from one form to another, and thus seem to pass out of existence; but, in reality, they are imperishable. The first ray of heat which came to the earth from the sun, though it may have been millions of years ago, exists to-day, somewhere, in some one of its Protean forms.

While physical force is thus, in the divine providence, immortal, it nevertheless wearies and grows tired. Illustrations, which are proofs of this, are easily given. Razors lose the power of acquiring an edge after they have been in constant use for a long time. In such cases, it is necessary simply to allow them to rest a while, and they are again ready for service. As a matter of actual observation, it has been found that the iron or steel of a railway track becomes brittle and liable to dangerous breakage, if it is subjected to the constant pressure and jar of passing trains. If there are suitable intervals of repose, the same number and weight of trains may pass over the track without serious injury. The same fact is observed with regard to cannon; and is, indeed, a truth of universal observation.

A more familiar illustration may better serve our purpose. Moses commanded that the seventh should be a year of rest for the land. There was an economic reason for this, which every

church state." His extraordinary powers are conferred on him by Presbytery, and to Presbytery he is responsible. He has no independent or absolute authority anywhere, not even in his far-off foreign field. Presbytery can bring him back from thence, and take away all his powers. And whenever he comes within the sphere of a Presbytery, his extraordinary powers must lie in abeyance. And whenever the Church's growth and spread causes him to be overtaken by the rule of its ordinary office-bearers, his extraordinary authority must come to an end, unless he will move still further out into the spiritual wilderness. For the Scriptures set forth a government of the Church by her representatives; and to organise and set up a Church to be thus governed, the evangelist is just a pioneer, constantly going on before.

ARTICLE VI.

A NEW "TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS;" OR THE
CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND BIBLICAL HIS-
TORY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. *Ancient Fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldæan, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other Writers.* By ISAAC PRESTON CORY, Esq. Second edition. London: William Pickering. 1832.
2. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.* 1834-1874. London.
3. *Nineveh and its Remains.* By A. H. LAYARD. 2 Vols. New York. 1849.
4. *Discoveries among the Ruins of Babylon and Nineveh.* By A. H. LAYARD. G. P. Putnam & Co.: New York. 1853.
5. *Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity—Asiatic Nations, Persians, Phœnicians, Babylonians, Scythians, and Indians.* By A. H. HEEREN. Translated from the German. 2 Vols. H. G. Bohn: London. 1846.
6. *Nineveh and its Palaces. The Discoveries of Layard and Botta, applied to the Elucidation of Holy Writ.* By JOSEPH BONOMI, F. R. S. L. London.

7. *Travels and Researches in Chaldæa and Susianna in 1849-52.* By WILLIAM KENNETT LOFTUS, F. G. S. London. 1857.
8. *The History of Herodotus: a New English Version, edited, with copious Notes and Appendices, . . . and embodying the chief results, Historical and Ethnographical, which have been obtained in the progress of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphical Discovery.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A., assisted by Col. Sir HENRY RAWLINSON, K. C. B., and Sir J. G. WILKINSON, F. R. S. Four volumes. London. 1858.
9. *Expédition Scientifique en Mesopotamie, exécutée par ordre du Gouvernement de 1851 à 1854,* PAR MM. FRESNEL, THOMAS, ET OPPERT. Publiée par Jules Oppert. Tome II. Paris. 1858.
10. *A Selection from the Historical Inscriptions of Chaldæa, Assyria, and Babylonia.* Prepared for publication by Maj. Gen. Sir H. C. RAWLINSON, K. C. B., assisted by EDWIN NORRIS, Sec. R. A. Soc. Vols. I., II., III. London. 1861.
11. *Classification des Caracteres Cuneiformes Babylonniens et Ninivites.* Ed. DE CHOSSAT. Paris.
12. *Grande Inscription du Palais de Khorsabad.* Publiée et commentée par MM. J. OPPERT et J. MENANT. Paris. 1863.
13. *Les Fastes de Sargon, Roi d'Assyrie (721 à 703 avant J. C.)* Traduits et publiés d'après le texte Assyrien de la grande Inscription des Salles du Palais de Khorsabad. Par MM. J. OPPERT ET J. MENANT. Paris. 1863.
14. *Inscriptions des revers des Plaques du Palais de Khorsabad.* Traduites sur le texte Assyrien. Par M. JOACHIM MENANT. Paris. 1865.
15. *Progres des Etudes relatives à l'Egypte et l'Orient.* Publication faite sous les auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique. Paris. 1867.
16. *Exposé des Elements de la Grammaire Assyrienne.* Par JOACHIM MENANT. Paris. 1868.
17. *An Elementary Grammar, with full Syllabary and progressive Reading Book of the Assyrian Language, in the cuneiform type.* By Rev. A. H. SAYCE, M. A. London: Bagster & Sons.
18. *Les Inscriptions de Dour-Sarkayan (Khorsabad), provenant des fouilles de M. Victor Place.* Déchiffrées et interprétés par JULES OPPERT. Paris. 1870.
19. *The Phonetic Values of the Cuneiform Characters.* By GEORGE SMITH, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, London. 1871.
20. *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.* Von EBERHARD SCHRADER. Giessen: 1872.

21. *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*: Containing Translations of the Documents, and an account of the Evidence, on the comparative Chronology of the Assyrian and Jewish Kingdoms, from the death of Solomon to Nebuchadnezzar. By GEORGE SMITH. London: Bagster & Sons.
22. *Annales des Rois d'Assyrie*. Traduites et mises en ordre sur le texte Assyrien. Par JOACHIM MENANT. Paris. 1874.
23. *Les Premières Civilisations. Etudes d'Histoire et d'Archéologie*. Par FRANÇOIS LENORMANT. Tome second. Chaldée et Assyrie, etc. Paris. 1874.
24. *Chaldean Account of the Deluge, from Terra Cotta Tablets found at Nineveh, with Translation and Text*. By GEORGE SMITH, of the British Museum. London: Mansel & Co. 1874.
25. *Babylone et la Chaldée*. Par M. JOACHIM MENANT. Paris. 1875.
26. *Records of the Past*. 4 Vols. Bagster & Sons: London. [Vols. I. and III. Assyrian, and Vols. II. and IV. Egyptian Texts. All edited by Mr. BIRCH.]
27. *Assyrian Discoveries on the site of Nineveh in 1873-74*. By GEORGE SMITH. London. 1875.
28. *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*, containing a Description of Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs, etc. By GEORGE SMITH. London. 1876.

The unusual length of the above list, as a heading, requires explanation. Though not holding, with the celebrated clerical wit and reviewer, Rev. Sydney Smith, that books should be reviewed and then read, if ever, we do not profess that very many of those above named have been fully or carefully perused. For we propose no detailed nor summary criticism of the works, and neither commendation nor condemnation of the writers. The list is not exhaustive, but only illustrative of a kind and amount of literature which has grown into notice within this century. With one exception, (the first named volume,) these works, some wholly, and some in part larger or smaller, present the enterprises of investigation and discovery made during the last seventy-five, and more especially, the last forty years, in the antiquities of the oldest nations of Western Asia. The results thus far obtained, besides valuable contributions to ancient history, constitute for the Biblical student, important contributions to the

illustration and confirmation of Biblical history. This list may serve as a compendious syllabus of the whole subject, and while exciting the attention of the general reader, as specimens of a novel kind of literature, may furnish some guide, at least better than none, to those desiring to procure books in aid of prosecuting their inquiries in a subject so new and interesting.

The first named work, "Cory's Fragments" consists of a collection of extracts from Eusebius, Josephus, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, Seneca, and Cicero, embodying fragments of several ancient writers. The first named is Sanchoniatho, a Phœnician, and esteemed the most ancient of heathen writers. It is not known in what age he wrote, (though some suppose about the close of the Trojan war,) but his writings were translated by Philo Byblius, a Greek writer, A. D. 117-130. Next in order is Berosus, a Babylonian, of the age of Alexander the Great. Then follow Abydenus and Alexander Polyhistor, and others of less note, all before the Christian era. These contributions of Cory, with others, some well founded, and some apocryphal, have been long before the world, in apologetic literature. They claim this notice, because they may be said to constitute an introduction to those contributions to our knowledge of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires derived from the sources to which our attention is now more specially directed. It will also be seen that the results of discovery in the antiquities of these long buried nations very strongly confirm the statements contained in Cory's collections.

The works following Cory, for convenience of reference, in the order of prosecuting investigations on the whole subject, may be classified as follows :

Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, and 21-28, inclusive, present the discoveries made in the ruins of Eastern empires, Persian, Assyrian, and Babylonian, with specimens of inscriptions, and representations of monuments, bas reliefs, and other illustrations of the customs and life of those nations, both in peace and war. A large number of these inscriptions, translated literally, are presented in the English, French, and German languages.

VOL. XXVIII., NO. 2—16.

No. 2, "Journal of the Asiatic Society," gives from year to year, records of studies, discoveries, linguistic and other investigations, touching all Asiatic people and countries, many numbers containing articles specially relating to the nations of Western Asia, and the antiquities of those nations.

No. 15 presents the progress of French studies and discoveries in the same sphere.

Nos. 5, 9, 11, 19, contain accounts of the deciphering and translation of the inscriptions; the process by which the nature and meaning of the characters was discovered, and in the main at last satisfactorily settled; and then the methods by which the language, when expressed in Roman letters, (or Hebrew, or Greek,) may be correctly rendered into English, French, or German.

Nos. 16, 17, present us formulated principles of Assyrian Grammar, in Etymology and Syntax, and paradigms of nouns, pronouns, and verbs.

No. 20 is entirely devoted to the application of the historical notices obtained from the "Records of the past," so far as brought to light, in the illustration and confirmation of the history presented in the Old Testament. Of course, in this classification, nearly every work indicated as belonging to any one class contains other matter, and in one or two cases, as No. 5 and 9, a very small part of the volume or volumes belongs to the subject under which the works are classed. The design of giving this classification is, at once to aid those who purpose making the subject before us a study, and also to present in this article a more clear and orderly exposition of the subject as it lies before us.

I. *The Deciphering of Cuneiform Inscriptions.* The existence of inscriptions in many localities, especially the western and southwestern parts of Persia, at Behistun, Persepolis, Van, Hamadan, and elsewhere, placed on native rocks, portals of palaces and other public buildings, slabs, tombs, etc., has been known for a long time. The attention of the public was called to these inscriptions by Carreri and Tavernier in the latter part of the 17th century. Inscriptions in the languages of many Eastern nations

had been long known, and some deciphered and translated. The discovery, decipherment, and translation of the Rosetta stone, and the successful labors of Champollion and others in opening to the world the reading of the Egyptian Hieroglyphics, had greatly excited the inquiries of learned and enterprising travelers in Eastern lands. But the inscriptions mentioned above were not made in Hieroglyphics, nor in the characters or alphabets of any known language; nor, indeed, had any one succeeded in satisfying himself or Oriental scholars, whether the characters were phonetic or ideographic. Besides, many of these inscriptions were engraved on places apparently inaccessible, as that of Behistun, 300 feet above the base of an almost perpendicular rock, or others on pillars, to which no available means of access existed which would render the characters visible to the naked eye.

The celebrated traveller Niebuhr introduced into Europe, in 1798, the first exact copies of this kind of inscriptions. Various terms have been used to describe them, of which *cuneatic* or *cuneiform* have obtained most general acceptance or use—the last named being the more common of the two. These names are both derived from the most distinct feature of the characters, the form of a wedge. This, however, is rather an isosceles triangle than a wedge, in its most usual form. The angle made at the apex by the equilateral sides, as presented in the *fac similes*, varies from thirty to sixty degrees, sometimes being nearly a right angle. Of course the two base angles will vary inversely, being wider as that at the apex is narrower. A Greek delta, Δ , (the open space filled) gives a good representation. This *wedge* is the elementary character appearing in inscriptions, in various positions, as *horizontally*, with the base to the left; or *obliquely*, the base in the same direction; or *perpendicularly*, with it at the top. Occasionally, when two are united at their apices, one of course has the base to the right or at the bottom of the character thus formed.

This elementary character is most extensively modified by a line extending from the apex, the distance of the apex from the base, or twice that distance; and the base is curved inwardly, so

sharply as to give the appearance of the *notch of an arrow*. Hence these characters are often called *arrow-headed*. A great variety of combinations of the elementary and of the elongated forms, serve to express different sounds, whether phonetic or ideographic. Thus they are found, two or more, side by side, vertically, horizontally, or obliquely. Such are sometimes crossed by one or more, or the apices of three wedge-shaped forms rest on the base of one, the bases of all being upward; or the apex, simple or elongated, rests on the base of another, and that on the base of a third, and so on. Often the positions are so adjusted as to form, by these modes of contact, a square, parallelogram, or rude polygon, within which other forms are set, the whole constituting one character. But it would be tedious and useless to give more details. In the various inscriptions, differences appear, due to the different skill of engravers or copyists. What has been said will, perhaps, convey to the reader some intelligible view of this singular mode of expressing sounds, syllables, and words, adequately indicative of thoughts.

To the time of Niebuhr's introduction of copies of cuneiform inscriptions into Europe, no successful efforts at deciphering them had been made. As the monuments of a people existing on our continent prior to the race found on its discovery, and greatly in advance of their civilisation, still remain the uninterpreted but silent and mysterious witnesses of the existence of their authors in centuries gone by; so these singularly unique characters remained, shrouding in an impenetrable veil, which none had been able to remove, the silent records of empires, which had risen and flourished and perished before credible profane history began: and of others, whose earlier memorials had formed the material of mingled legend and fact in the incipient efforts of the muse of history. It was especially by means of inscriptions, first surmised and then proved to relate to the least ancient of the Eastern empires, the Persian, that success in deciphering was attained. But this was slowly accomplished.

In the seventeenth century, Tavernier and Carreri had copied a few lines of an inscription in Persepolis, but without attempts at any explanation. Subsequently, the travellers Pietro Della

Valle and Figueroa expressed the opinion that the inscriptions should be read from left to right, with which it might seem Chardin coincided, but with the additional suggestion that they were to be read *perpendicularly*, as Chinese. This much, however, was generally agreed, that these characters represented some kind of language, whether ideographic or phonetic. For the inscriptions were often accompanied by sculptured figures of persons, by dress, and other circumstances, representing kings, warriors, conquerors, and captains. It was fair to presume the writings gave some account of the scenes depicted. Those on other monumental structures were properly supposed to give names and other memorial tributes to the mighty dead whose remains had occupied the tomb, or whose fame had been commemorated on the portals, pillars, or limestone and marble statues, of palaces now in ruins, which they inhabited while living. Still the most learned Oriental linguists were all confounded; and conjectures, theories, and speculations, however plausible and ingenious, for several years failed to furnish a clew by which the meaning of this strange language might be discovered. Tychsen wrote, "*De Cuneatis Inscriptionibus Persepolitianis Lucubratio.*" Rostock, 1798. S. S. Witte discussed form and origin of the characters in a work, "*Ueber die Bildung der Schriftsprache und den Ursprung der keilförmigen Inschriften zu Persepolis.*" Rostock, 1799. Dr. Fr. Münter prepared a "*Versuch ueber die keilförmigen Inschriften zu Persepolis.*" Kopenhagen, 1802. Hager gave (in *Monthly Magazine*, 1801) a "Dissertation on the Newly Discovered Babylonian Inscriptions." Tychsen and Münter *thought* they had ascertained the characters were alphabetical and to be read from right to left! Hager undertook to show that they were monograms; and a few years later, Lichtenstein took ground that in the combinations of characters, only one was essential, the rest being arbitrarily added, and they must be read from right to left. This illustrative notice of works on the subject is given, rather to serve as memorials of incipient labors, than for any conclusive view presented by them. Tychsen and Münter did, indeed, announce a surmise, which ultimately proved correct, that a particular sign was employed to

denote the separation of words. This account of unsatisfactory labors of the most learned men must also impress us with the fact that, in whatever light the final alleged results of more successful efforts are to be regarded, the incipient steps of the enterprise were taken with great deliberation and caution. Hence the satisfaction with which such men receive the conclusions of others, raises a strong presumption in favor of the correctness of those conclusions.

Mr. (afterwards Professor) G. F. Grotefend, a young student of Bonn, without the advantages of Oriental scholarship, boldly essayed to extract the meaning of one of the inscriptions of Persepolis, copied and brought to Europe by Niebuhr. "He led the gallery into these treasuries of antiquity." Men of the first intellect and learning had recently succeeded, after protracted labor, in finding a key to interpret the hieroglyphics of Egypt. "But the Rosetta stone contained a Greek version of the hieroglyphic sentences. Plutarch had dissected the Pantheon, and given the names of the gods; and Manetho had classified the dynasties and transmitted the names of the kings. Without these helps, probably the meaning of the Egyptian signs would have been still a mystery." Mr. Grotefend, on the contrary, had only the *bas-relief* figures and the cuneiform writing presumed to explain them. Had he possessed a translation, it would have served but little purpose in aiding him to assign phonetic values to these characters. Even supposing that they were originally hieroglyphics, which had acquired corresponding phonetic significations, as many are now believed to have been, they had "no voice or sound" by which to indicate their parentage. Besides, a careful examination had satisfied those best able to judge, that the copy before him presented a triplicated inscription; but whether trilingual or *triliterated*, was so uncertain that an eminent scholar expressed, along with a belief they were triliterated, his opinion that "the Persian kings had taken great pains to immortalise themselves in choosing three different *alphabets* to narrate their exploits." Mr. Grotefend decided that they were trilingual, subsequently ascertained to be the fact, in the inscriptions of that region, generally; but he was still with-

out any means of ascertaining what the languages were. Presuming that one might be ancient Persian, as the inscription was found in Persepolis, and most probably related to one of the Achæmenian dynasty—a royal personage being prominent among the figures—he endeavored to ascertain what known name of a king might correspond with certain combinations of characters making one word. Tychsen and Münter had detected a certain word frequently recurring, which they vainly endeavored thus to identify. Mr. Grotefend surmised that that word might itself be the word for *king*, and, as an appellative, would supply no help unless he understood the language. But he also presumed, very properly, it might follow a proper name—that of a king. Now, proper names are rarely translated, but only transliterated; and allowing for some variations of orthography, a cuneiform word would be, substantially, phonetically correspondent with that of some known king, as spelled in Hebrew or Greek letters. He selected a cuneiform word which seemed to consist of seven characters. For this, *Cyrus*, however spelled, was not correspondent. He then tried *Darius*. The correspondence being sufficiently exact, by the knowledge of the Persian pronunciation as given by Strabo, he was satisfied the characters in that word were correctly deciphered, and the phonetic values were thus obtained. By a similar process, he identified Hystaspes and Xerxes. The reading of the last name was confirmed, about the same time, by two inscriptions, one hieroglyphic, and the other cuneiform, on a vase, in a cabinet of medallions in Paris. That in hieroglyphics was known to contain the name Xerxes, and the cuneiform word corresponding was identical in its characters with that which Grotefend had so read. The word following the names of Darius and Xerxes contained characters, the phonetic values of which, ascertained from their occurrence in the proper names, now read, gave a word which corresponded, with a very slight orthographic variation, to that in the Zend language, meaning *king*. Grotefend had thus acquired the phonetic values of thirteen characters, which subsequent and more accurate criticism, by himself and others, confirmed to be substantially correct as to all, but

literally correct as to most. In his work, he was encouraged and aided somewhat by a literary friend, M. Fiorillo, but the discovery was really his own. He read a memoir on the result of his labors, before the Royal Society of Göttingen, in the year 1802, and his discovery was then announced, but not published, in the *Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen*. In that journal he gave some account of his work in 1805, which, however, did not appear to present as favorable a view as his memoir had done. In 1814-15, he published several papers in the "*Mines de l'Orient*," and in 1815, a full narrative of his process of discovery, in Appendix II. to Heeren's work. [No. V. at the head of this article.] This was republished, somewhat modified, in later editions of that work. His attention was mainly occupied, during many years, in considering how to obtain proper phonetic values for the cuneiform characters, of which he had at first discovered about one-third. His work for some time did not receive the appreciation it deserved. Baron de Sacy gave a favorable review of his labors before 1815. But it was not until 1820-22 that European scholars indicated a disposition to coöperate. Then Saint Martin added the values of a few more characters, and Professor Rask those representing M and N. In 1836, MM. Burnouf and Jacquet and Prof. Lassen and Dr. Beer brought the results of long critical labor and attainment to increase both the extent and accuracy of the science, in the foundation of which, however, with one consent, Grotefend must be regarded as the leader.

While European scholars were employed in their quiet studies, and about the period when their conclusions were awakening a wider-spread attention, (1830-35,) a young officer of the East India Company's army, stationed in Persia, Major (afterwards Col. Sir) Henry C. Rawlinson, was examining the Persepolitan and other inscriptions. His first moderately successful efforts in deciphering were displayed on some tablets obtained in Hamadan. They proved of the most favorable character, in all Persia, for resolving difficulties. Having very infrequent and imperfect information of the progress of study on the part of European scholars, he had little more than occasional hints of the discovery

of Grotefend, or the process by which he reached his results. But these perhaps encouraged, if they did not aid, him in his investigations. Before the facts, for several years known in Europe, had come to his knowledge in his distant residence, he had made a successful beginning in deciphering, and, by a singular coincidence, had identified the same names, and thus obtained phonetic values of the same characters which Grotefend had done. Indeed, by the time (1836) when he became acquainted with Grotefend's labors, he had obtained the phonetic values of eighteen characters. By the aid of powerful telescopes, Col. Rawlinson secured a copy (after several successive attempts) of the celebrated Behistun inscription. During the years 1835-6-7, he also succeeded in deciphering it, and in making a partial translation. This was completed in 1846, and published in the *Journal of the Royal Academy Society*. He gracefully acknowledged the aid he had derived from European scholars (especially giving full credit to Prof. Grotefend) in deciphering, and to Prof. Lassen and Mr. Westergaard, in translating.

For this latter work, Col. Rawlinson possessed some greater facilities than those enjoyed by his European collaborators. He could copy the inscriptions himself, or have them copied under his personal superintendence. In translating the old Persian, a knowledge of the Sanscrit was essential; and forty years ago that had not progressed in the West as it has since done. But he resided in a region which contained scholars of some fair attainments in that language, and was conversant with people in whose dialects its vestiges were abundant.

His success in translating the Persian text of the Behistun inscription, paved the way for more rapid progress in his labors on the other two; one of which may be called the Scythic, and the other the Assyrian or the Babylonian.* He had found the

* We adopt a nomenclature which is employed by Col. Rawlinson to designate these texts in the *Royal Academy Journal*, Vol. X., 1847; XIV., Part I., 1851; and XV., Part I., 1853. In the title of the work published in 1857, he calls the text Babylonian, and in the "Memoir" he treats the alphabet as Assyrian. He gives in his Essay, in Vol. X., other distinctions. But those used above are sufficient, and our space

phonetic values of the characters occurring in about ninety proper names, found in all three texts to be the same. Every acquisition of the phonetic value of a character facilitated progress; so that by the year 1854, he had deciphered and translated all three languages of the Behistun inscription, and published full accounts of his work. No one could be more fully aware of imperfections in that work than he was. Yet he avers his confidence in the correctness of deciphering and translation of historical records. The general correctness of the deciphering was evinced, at an early period of his labors, by the remarkable coincidence in results obtained by scholars of different nations, separated by long distances and laboring independently. Col. Rawlinson's alphabet varied in but one character from that perfected by Prof. Lassen, on the basis of Grotefend's discovery. In 1863, says Col. Rawlinson, "the first critical body in the world, the Institute of France, conferred on M. Jules Oppert its biennial prize of 20,000 francs (about \$4,000) for his Assyrian decipherings, thereby guaranteeing in the face of Europe the authenticity and value of our labors, and putting to shame the continued scepticism of England."

In view of this same scepticism, the Royal Academy Society, in 1857, on the suggestion of Mr. H. Fox Talbot, who had sent, in a sealed envelope, a translation of the first lithographed cuneiform inscription, (that of Tiglath-Pileser I.,) appointed Col. Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks of Ireland, and M. Oppert of Paris, to make each a translation of the same. A committee of the best Orientalists was also appointed to examine and compare these translations. It was, of course, stipulated that each translator should make a translation without having any communication with the others. The work was performed, and received from the Committee a careful scrutiny. Dr. Hincks having failed to receive a copy of the text in time to make a translation of the whole, sent only about half; M. Oppert had a defective text, and also failed to make a translation of the whole, and this being in the English of a Frenchman, prevented as full a comparison as does not allow a critical exposition; which, indeed, would add little, if anything, to the reader's apprehension.

was desirable; Mr. Talbot and Col. Rawlinson, with few omissions, translated the whole. The judgment of the committee was decidedly favorable. Having noticed occasional discrepancies, they yet found that the similarity "was equal to what it would be in the translation of an ordinary historical inscription written in Egyptian hieroglyphics made under the same circumstances." They further expressed a conviction that this test established the general correctness of the valuation of the *characters* of these inscriptions. This report was made in 1860. It has been already stated that in 1854 Col. Rawlinson admitted the existence of many difficulties, which hindered entire confidence in the values of some characters, especially in other than plain historical composition. In the course of nearly twenty-five years, many of these difficulties have vanished. For some time the question of classification was very variously answered; but it is now pretty well established, both by the extensive use of words, common in root or form, or both, to the Assyrian and Hebrew, and by the close resemblance of its paradigms of nouns and verbs and pronouns, that it is decidedly a branch of the Semitic stem. Doubtless there are many words in its vocabulary of Turanian and of Arian origin. This would be supposed, when we bear in mind that in the course of ten or fifteen centuries, the nations of the Mesopotamia must have received immigrants, or introduced, by the fortunes of war, large numbers of people from nations to the northeast and north, the southwest and west. Doubtless, also, in this as other tongues, there are words pronounced very differently from the manner required by the ordinary phonetic value of their elements. Many, too, as in our words, "viz."="to wit," "etc."="and so forth," "A. D."="year of our Lord," might retain a foreign spelling, or the abbreviation of it, presenting, to the Assyrian, the meaning in that language. Still much difficulty exists in deciphering and in translating, owing to the existence of characters which are in one case ideographic and in another phonetic, called polyphones; and there are *variant* readings and *variant* forms of the same root. The phonology of the probable inventors of the cuneiform characters and the Assyrian phonology differ. Hence there exist several

sounds for the same character, as *hu* and *u*; *d*, *dhi*, and *t*; *g*, *c*, and *k*; *m* and *v*, are respectively represented by the same character. Critical study, and the comparison of various texts, with extensive practice, have overcome, to a great degree, these difficulties; and now that the elementary books are prepared, and increasing numbers are devoting attention to the study, doubtless in time the language will be acquired with no greater difficulty than that which attends the acquisition of the Chinese. It is now over seventy-five years since the inscriptions of the Rosetta stone were brought to the attention of the learned, yet the study of the ancient Egyptian language has hardly passed through a stage of cultivation greater than that of the Assyrian. But much as has been effected, the field is constantly opening, and more complete discoveries await diligent investigation.

In this sketch, there has been opportunity to give no more than incidental notices of the work of French and German scholars. In fact, up to 1845, they had been foremost in the work of discussion, experiment, and discovery, in relation to cuneiform writing. Col. R. says at that time "the English had been content to leave these investigations almost entirely to continental scholars," and "interpretations which would satisfy the criticism of France and Germany might be received with suspicion in London." Dr. Hincks and Mr. E. Norris, subsequently so prominent, were then only beginning to be known, and Mr. George Smith had not commenced his noble career, recently closed, so sadly for the interests of learning, by his death. But from the point of view we occupy, we cannot but look with satisfaction on the past, and hopes for the future. The progress in discovery and invention is slow. Many failures, many difficulties, involve repeated efforts, and require unwavering and persistent assiduity. The discovery of only one island rewarded the first voyage of Columbus, notwithstanding all his trials, disappointments, and risks; but a continent sprang up before an amazed world as the final result. The "stool on which erst king Alfred sat," was father to the luxurious "sofa" of which Cowper sang: and the dim, uncertain daguerreotype, failing of expression and wanting in shading, would hardly be recognised

as the prototype of the splendid portraits and pictures which filled the Photographic Hall at the Centennial Exhibition.

II. Another department of discoveries now calls for proper mention. The knowledge of some, even imperfect, method for deciphering and translating the cuneiform inscriptions gave great impulse to enterprises of Eastern travel, and occasional specimens of inscriptions found in the ruins of the cities of Mesopotamia gave special direction to such enterprises, with a view to searching those ruins for whatever relics they might contain. It had been long known that Herodotus, LIV., LXXXVII., had mentioned, that Darius caused to be engraved on two white marble pillars, an account of his expedition in Scythia and crossing of the Bosphorus; and the engraving was in *γράμματα ἀσσύρια*; and Strabo, LXIV-V., and XV., III., distinguished these from the *γράμματα περσικά*. The inference was, that the Assyrian letters were cuneiform inscriptions.

Besides, nearly coincident with the publication of Grotefend's discovery and the interest awakened in it,—about 1815-22—Niebuhr and J. C. Rich had engaged in partial, but not fruitless, explorations among the ruins on the Tigris and Euphrates. So fully had "Time's effacing fingers," and the sands of over 2,000 years, obliterated certain traces of the site of Nineveh, that the best informed travellers were in doubt whether it was on the eastern or western bank of the Tigris. Mr. Rich brought to the attention of European antiquarians more specific knowledge of the remarkable mounds both on the east bank of the Tigris and near the supposed site of Babylon on the Euphrates. One of the mounds on the Tigris, opposite Mosul, measured 178 feet in height, 1,850 in length, and 1150 in breadth. Partial openings had been made in some mounds, and stones for building the bridge of Mosul and other purposes obtained. Similar excavations in the mounds on the Euphrates had brought to light cylinders and bricks. He had also succeeded in purchasing a few relics from the natives, to add to the small stock in European museums, which had been limited to a few seals and cylinders with mythological emblems, an inscription on a stone sent to

London by Sir Harford Jones, a circular-headed tablet, and some other unimportant fragments.

But Mr. Rich's reports, together with the awakened interest above mentioned, produced marked effect. The French Government in 1842 appointed M. Botta, nephew of the historian, consular agent at Mosul. If done, as believed, with a view to scientific research, this was a wise step, by reason of his long residence in Egypt and the East, and his known enterprise and indomitable perseverance in scientific pursuits. His first efforts in a mound called Kouyunjik, a little north of a village called Niniouah, supposed by the natives to mark, at least in part, the site of the ancient city, proved unsuccessful. In a few months he moved to Khorsabad, still further north, led by having had two bricks with inscriptions brought to him from that place. Here he was soon called by his workmen to see the revelation of a new world of antiquities. Gradually these were laid open. Among them was an immense monument, in richness and ornament comparable to the most sumptuous productions of Egypt. This was the great palace of Khorsabad. By aid of the French Government and the services of an eminent artist, M. Flandin, notwithstanding vexations, delays, and opposition of the local authorities and the Turkish Government, in about two years the whole palace was laid bare, measured, the rooms examined, and a large variety of relics obtained: such as a bronze lion, winged bull, tablets with inscriptions and *bas-reliefs*, representing the various scenes of ancient life, and other choice specimens of Assyrian sculpture. Many of the larger specimens were very heavy, weighing each two or three tons. With great difficulty and after numerous delays, these treasures of antiquity were safely launched on the Tigris, landed at Bagdad, and in December, 1846, this first collection of Assyrian antiquities ever brought to Europe was placed on the wharves of Havre, and thence deposited in the Louvre in Paris.

The awakened interest in Eastern discoveries extended to England. True, the Government was slow to feel it; but one enterprising traveller, sustained by private enterprise at first, and subsequently by the authorities of the British Museum, was

not far behind M. Botta in entering on the work of exploration; and proved his equal, if not his superior, in successful effort. Mr. A. H. Layard made his first visit to western Asia as a private traveller in 1839, engaged in the investigation of archæological and geographical questions. On this tour he, with a large party, paused a short time at Mosul, and passed on, exploring portions of the Mesopotamia, and extending his journey eastward into Persia, stopped a short time investigating the ruins of Susa, seeking inscriptions, such as had been found in Persepolis, Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and other places.

In 1842 he visited Mosul again, and joined M. Botta while at Kouyunjik, one of the mounds east of that place and part of the ruins of Nineveh. He was unable, earlier than 1845, to follow in the steps of Botta as a discoverer. It was at that time that Sir Stratford Canning was British minister in Constantinople, celebrated for his liberal and enlightened views, and especially for his protection of English and American missionaries. By his munificence, Mr. Layard was enabled to commence his career. Khorsabad is the most northern of a series of mounds, generally the locality for villages, which extend along the eastern banks of the Tigris the distance of about twenty miles to Nimroud. Within this distance and nearly opposite Mosul, which is west of the river, are the mounds known as Kouyunjik and Nebbi Younis, the traditional place of the grave of Jonah.

Mr. Layard commenced his excavations at Nimroud. He met with the usual obstacles due to Turkish prejudices, suspicions, and stupidity, but soon succeeded in obtaining many relics, such as Botta procured. On his discovering a large sculptured human head, the Arabs averred it was that of Nimrod, and he was ordered to desist. He removed to Kouyunjik, when he speedily brought to light a rich collection of sculptures in excellent preservation, such as representations of kings, priests, and symbolic trees. He also found an obelisk of black marble, a large winged bull and winged lion; with representations in sculpture of battles, sieges, victories, processions, sacrifices, and banquetings. He made his first contributions to the British Museum in 1847, and, after a short trip of recreation to England,

resumed his work in 1848, increasing the collections with which that museum now abounds.

Did our limits allow, it would be interesting to notice the labors of Ainsworth and other contemporaries and more immediate successors of Botta and Layard. But we must content ourselves with a bare notice of discoveries during the last twenty years. Extensive excavations, both on the site of Nineveh and its suburbs, and of Babylon, have opened to view increasing numbers of monuments of the departed glory, the wealth, the arts, the power, and the pomp of those empires. Col. Rawlinson estimated the number of such, including many fragments, as high as 20,000 in the palaces of Kouyunjik. It is thought that rooms were appropriated as libraries, and the tablets arranged according to the subjects of their inscriptions. There were probably upper rooms, and in the destruction of the buildings their contents fell to the places where they are now discovered, many very much damaged; though the smaller articles, as cylinders from an inch to three inches long, and of diameters from three-fourths of an inch to one and a half, are in better preservation. Contributions from these discoveries have enriched the European museums to an indefinite extent. Our readers are referred to the works of Layard, Botta, and Bonomi, and the more recent volumes of Mr. George Smith, for fuller details. We now propose a brief summary of—

III. *The Results of the Discoveries which have been sketched.* The two departments of labor, one for the collection of material and the other for deciphering and translating inscriptions copied from rocks, pillars and slabs of marble, terra cotta tablets, cylinders, stone obelisks, seals of agate, chalcedony, onyx, and rock crystal, have gone on, hand in hand, for more than thirty years. Three folio volumes, containing lithographed copies of more than three hundred inscriptions, have been published. The language in which they were written, and which, with the nations who employed it to record their histories, had died from the thoughts and knowledge of men for twenty-three centuries, has been disinterred, quickened and formulated in grammars, elucidated in lexicons and translated into the tongues of the leading

civilised nations of the world. Besides many of these translations made, experimentally, over twenty years since, a systematic plan has been set on foot for giving to English-speaking people full accounts of these ancient nations. Two volumes, containing twenty-five or thirty of these inscriptions translated, are before us, the work of five most eminent Assyriologists. Others will follow from time to time. The publication of the lithographed inscriptions is accompanied by brief notices of their contents, by which, together with the translations already in our hands, we learn most interesting facts respecting these celebrated nations of the ancient world. Of this knowledge, we have space to give only brief illustrations. The history of Assyria and Babylon is presented in outline, from a period 2,000 years B. C., or 1,200 before our earliest existing historical records. We have given the names and titles of twenty-five Chaldean monarchs preceding the rise of the Assyrian *Empire*, thirty of Assyrian monarchs of the kingdom and empire, from the 13th to the 6th century B. C., and five of Babylonian kings, from the fall of Nineveh to that of Babylon. We learn the special histories of the leading monarchs, their wars, conquests, and administrations of their governments, such as Tiglath-pileser I. in the 12th century, Assurdanipal, (Sardanapalus of the Greeks,) Tiglath-pileser II., Shalmaneser I. and II., Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Nebuchadnezzar, with many others. There are inscriptions both bilingual and trilingual, (mostly of the former, in Proto-Babylonian and Assyrian,) containing lists of the names of quadrupeds, birds, and other animals; of stones, countries, towns, cities, and other geographical facts; of parts of a house, and of vessels, with their tonnage stated in numbers, parts of the human body, and of wooden objects. Then we have lists of verbal roots and forms, grammatical phrases and their construction. Family and other proper names, synonyms for kings, and their titles, are given. There are presented also the names and attributes of the gods, their temples, with forms of invocation, hymns, and prayers. Besides special histories of several reigns, we are informed of the synchronous history of Babylon and Assyria of a period as early as the 12th century B. C. Then there has been obtained and

translated a chronology of Assyria from B. C. 893 to B. C. 666. A most interesting feature of these documents is the record of contracts, deeds of sale of houses, lands, and slaves, male and female, and of loans of money. In science we have written evidence of the cultivation of astronomy, in reports of eclipses, equinoxes, and changes of the moon. But astrology was a more favorite pursuit, and works on this subject are very numerous, setting forth the portents of the moon, Jupiter, Venus, the sun, and other heavenly bodies, and of the clouds; also rules for the division of the year into twelve months of thirty days each; and tables for the three divisions of the night, and for knowing the favorable and unfavorable months for military operations.

The inscriptions presenting historical, biographical, and religious subjects, are generally accompanied by sculptured representations of their statements. In some cases they merely give brief notices, as on symbolic figures, of their character; on tombs, of their occupants, etc. The rooms of the palaces were paved and lined with slabs, marble or terra cotta, and under or over most of them are sculptures in bas-relief, picturing monarchs in royal attire, or going forth to battle, or seated on the throne deciding causes; especially ordering the disposition of captives, who are represented in just such dress as set forth their nationalities, and sometimes receiving, at once, the prescribed punishment, flaying alive, or other cruelty, such as having the eyes put out, and this done by the king himself. Then there are armies on the march, sieges, battles of the field, or conflicts of besiegers and besieged; the vanquished fleeing, pursued, and trampled under the horses feet and chariots of the conquering monarch and his forces. There are triumphal processions, followed by captive kings and the gods of the vanquished nation. The spears, slings, bows, and quivers, swords and lances, the *bommereng*, and also war engines or battering rams, occur in connexion with the scenes depicted, as also in hunting scenes. The small arms evince great skill in carving, engraving, and decorating the handles. There have also been brought to light the dress, both of men and women, of kings, princes, captains, and soldiers; and though the country being interior, we have but few specimens

of large sailing vessels, yet there are many of boats, and the methods of propelling them; and of rafts, and modes of crossing streams in willow circular boats covered with skins, or by inflated skins supporting the swimmers.

Illustrations of wealth, elegance, and luxury are not so frequent or full, as the ruin of these cities was by the spoils of war: and articles of the sort such illustrations would demand are not to be expected. Still we find representations of pleasure houses, gardens, feasts, and banquets, and of elegantly constructed and fancifully shaped articles in bronze, as bells with iron tongues, bowls, cups, flagons, wine strainers, dishes, plates, and spoons. There are also found remains of bronze ornaments of the throne and larger articles. Studs and buttons of ivory and mother-of-pearl have come to light, and figures of bracelets, ear-rings, amulets, wristbands, and men's finger-rings; while specimens of glass, and of the earliest known sun-glass, with indications of a knowledge of embossing, engraving, and painting by enamel, evince great progress in the arts of ornamenting. We have agricultural implements, ploughs, picks, saws, etc., figured in bas-relief, and fragments found in the ruins.

To these illustrative notices of the contributions to our knowledge of these ancient nations made by discoveries which have been sketched, our limited space only allows us to add, in a few concluding pages, some brief illustrations and confirmations of profane and sacred history furnished from the same source.

The cuneiform mode of writing appears, on the best investigations, to have originated in Babylon, and so passed into Assyria; the language used being adapted to both, and thence later was adopted in Persia. There are monuments of its existence from nearly 2,000 years B. C. to about 300 B. C., or from the calling of Abraham to a date of the era of Seleucus and Antiochus. This period includes that of the Old Testament writers from Moses to Malachi. The last century and a half of it touches that of the earliest profane historians known to us. The Scriptures state, Gen. x. 10, of Nimrod, a grandson of Ham, "the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, (Babylon,) and Erech, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." Of Asshur, the son of Shem, in verse 11, it is

said, "Out of that land (Babylon) went Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, (or the streets of the city,) and Calah." Cush was the oldest son of Ham, and Nimrod the oldest son of Cush, while Asshur was Shem's second son. It is believed Shem was Noah's oldest, as Ham was his youngest son. Gen. ix. 24. Thus Nimrod and Asshur were not so far from being contemporaries as to create any suspicion of inaccuracy by Moses, especially as the building of Nineveh may have been Asshur's ultimate enterprise; the inscriptions showing that *El-assur*, the town of Assur, (the *Ellasar* of Gen. xiv. 1,) was in earlier times the capital of the kingdom. They also confirm Moses' account in the constant recognition of Nimrod, and especially of Asshur, as founders of the kingdoms of Babylon and Assyria. And further, Erech, Accad, Calneh, Calah, Resen, Ellasar, and Ur, formerly untraceable, except in brief mention in Genesis, now, by the bricks and stones of Mesopotamia, have their position, relations, and importance, all revealed, and their mention by Moses in connexion with Babylon and Nineveh explained, and his historical character vindicated.

The fragments of Berosus and other writers of the era just before Christ presented long since much of the legendary and mythical period of the history of our race, as given by Assyrio-Babylonian writers. The period 2234 B. C. by various chronological schemes, based on the data of inscriptions, has been accepted as that of the rise of these two leading nations of Western Asia, and harmonises with the numbers of Berosus. Of the antecedent period, including that before the flood, we have no contemporary records; and the immense number of years, varying from thirty-four thousand to several hundred thousand, are only elements of those boastful and exaggerated accounts of their ancestry, in which, in common with the Chinese and the Hindoos, the writers of these nations indulged. No facts and no monuments sustain them.

We have not space to consider the theories and speculations respecting the descendants of Shem and Ham—the contests of the rival tribes and those of the kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon for long centuries, from the mention in the inscriptions

of their earlier monarchs, to the rise of the Assyrian empire in the thirteenth century, say 1273 B. C.

During this period, of about seven hundred years, we have mention of Cherdorlaomer king of Elam, Amraphel of Shinar, both Babylonian, and Arioch of Ellasar, (El-Assur,) Assyrian, and Tidal of Goim, (e. v. nations,) which elsewhere, in ancient monuments, is a proper name. The *Kudur-mapula* of the inscriptions is believed to contain, in the word *kudur*, [represented by equipollent consonants in כְּדֹר] a name, common to the kings or chiefs of Elam, as Pharaoh to those of Egypt; and in *laomer* of the Hebrew and *mabuk* of the Babylonian, the equivalent for *mapula*, specially distinctive. In the inscriptions he is noted by a term meaning "Ravager of the West." We have thus an illustrative evidence of the credibility of Gen. xiv. 1, 9.

Mr. George Smith's last publication presents us the legendary and mythical accounts of the Creation, Fall, Flood, and notices of the building and destruction of the Tower of Babel. His translation is from tablets of the age of Assurbanipal, an Assyrian monarch of the early part of the seventh century, say 670 B. C. These tablets purport to be copies of ancient Babylonian records, which had been composed not earlier than 2,000 nor later than 1,550 years B. C. Of course documents which are full of the elements of Babylonian mythology and intrinsically devoid of real historic value, are not *in themselves* confirmatory of the scriptural accounts. But they are as evidently not copies, nor designed forgeries in the interest of revelation. Still they are *confirmations* in this respect, that the salient facts of the inspired narrative are the staple, so to speak, of these myths. (1) Of the Creation, we are informed that the gods were generated from a *chaos* of watery matter, called Tiamat, the *Thalath* or Talassa of Berosus' legend, the first corresponding to Hebrew Tehom—deep, or abyss—the latter to the Greek θάλασσα—(Attic θάλαττα). Then follows the *creation* of constellations of stars, two other bands of stars, to point out the year; the moon to give light till the dawn of day, and its phases are described; and the sun, by the regularity of its orbit, the type of a judge, to regulate the world. Next we are told of the *creation*,

not *evolution*, of "strong monsters" of the sea, then "living creatures and creeping things" of the land, **cattle and beasts** of the field. Next comes the *creation*, not *evolution*, of man and woman, or two beings to be with the other animals, described as "beloved of the gods," "noble" and "good." They are addressed and reminded of their relation and other duties. This address is by one called simply **GOD**, not one of the deities. The geography of man's birth-place provides four rivers, the Tigris, Euphrates, Surappi, and Uhni, and the place is called **Gan-duni**, reminding us of the *Gan-Eden* (Hebrew) or Garden of Eden, Gen. ii. 15, and the man is called *Admi* or *Adami*, as a name of the race. There is no mention of a "tree of life" or "knowledge of good and evil," but the tablets are mutilated; and these may have been mentioned, since there are found on gems or seals and the walls of palaces, sculptures of a tree, with two figures, one on each side, holding out their hands to the fruit, and in the back-ground a serpent appears; and also of another tree, guarded by two cherubim. (2) The Fall is stated to have been produced by some agency of a dragon, the figure representing which has the eagle's head, a scaly body, claws for feet and wings on the back, resembling the griffin, a symbolical creature known in heraldry. The dragon is cursed with the man for the sin of the latter, who is denounced as subject to all the evils which afflict mankind, as family quarrels, tyranny, disappointment, deprivation, injury by his wisdom, and trouble of mind and body. (3) The Chaldaean account of the Flood is an extended myth, bringing to view some striking points identical with Noah's flood:

"1. Command to build the ark,	ch. vi. 14.	col. i. l. 21.
2. Sin of the world,	" vi. 5.	" i. l. 22.
3. Threat to destroy it,	" vi. 7.	" i. l. 22.
4. Seed of life to be saved,	" vi. 19.	" i. l. 23.
5. Size of the ark,	" vi. 15.	" i. l. 25, 26.
6. Animals to enter the ark,	" vi. 20.	" i. l. 43.
7. Building the ark,	" vi. 22.	" ii. l. 1-9.
8. Lined within and without with bitumen, " vi. 14.	" vi. 14.	" ii. l. 10, 11.
9. Food taken in the ark,	" vi. 21.	" ii. l. 19."

Without further tabulating the correspondence, we add the

remaining summary: "Coming of the flood; destruction of the people; duration of the deluge (*time* different); end of deluge; opening a window; ark rests on a mountain; birds sent forth—dove, then swallow; returned; then raven, never returned; building the altar and offering sacrifice; its savor; deluge not to come again; covenant and blessing; and translation of the patriarch (confounded with Enoch)."

We have not space to state the difference in details, of measures, times, place of mountain, etc. The correspondence is wonderful, and shows a common origin in this and many other legends and that origin, the facts stated by Moses. The same remark holds good of the many legends of the creation.

4. The notices of the tower of Babel are few. Near the site of Babylon is a vast mound, one hundred and fifty feet high, originally pyramidal, but, by the abrasion of the corners, now conical. This mass is formed by the ruins of a structure which, by the best authorities, is regarded as a temple of the seven planets. From inscribed cylinders obtained in the ruins, Sir Henry Rawlinson discovered a narrative by Nebuchadnezzar, declaring that the structure had been partially built by a former king, but had, in its unfinished condition, fallen into decay, and he had now repaired and completed it. On the top of the ruins is a mass of vitrified brick, which many travellers, from Benjamin of Tudela to our day, recognise as the mark of lightning employed by God to destroy what they regard as originally the Tower of Babel. Mr. Smith found inscriptions from the same locality, in a fragmentary condition, which contains such expressions as "He (the father of all gods) confounded their speech;" "their counsel was confused;" "their strong place, all the day they founded; to their strong place in the night, he entirely made an end." These are certainly striking passages. It may be, as supposed, that the original structure was the tower, though the mass of vitrified brick may not have been the effect of lightning, and the proud monarch probably repaired and devoted to the purpose of a temple, such as the ruins now attest, the wreck of the edifice which had, sixteen hundred years or more previously, been destined for the purpose described by Moses.

Passing to the period when the relations of Israel and Judah with Assyria began, we find several important confirmations of the Scripture history.

A few preliminary remarks will introduce these. Formerly Ctesias was regarded as authentic, and on his testimony it was believed the Assyrian history was entirely contradictory of the sacred. But the inscriptions of the "rocks" have established the contrary view. The chronology of Assyria, gathered from these sources by Rawlinson, sustains accurately that of Demetrius the Jew; and while our chronology (Usher's) is thus shown to be incorrect by twenty or twenty-five years, the sequence of events is undisturbed, and our confidence in the credibility of the Scripture record remains unshaken. Again, this confirmation is not peculiar to this record. The third book of Herodotus finds a running commentary in the Behistun inscriptions, even in some *minutiae*, in this case sustaining the judgment of that historian pronounced by Rawlinson, viz., that while liable to be led astray by a temperament inclining him to exaggeration in the poetical and marvellous, he is fully trustworthy, to the extent of his opportunities, on dates, names, and actual results, as facts, irrespective of the modes by which they were accomplished.

Further, the inscriptions have, by their full disclosures of the prowess and power of the kings of Assyria and Babylon, fully justified the accounts given in Scripture. The ruins of palaces measuring 600x600 and 300x360 feet, and 45 high, and the immense stones used in their erection, leave no room for incredulity as to the size or materials of Solomon's buildings; and the elegant architecture of the later buildings, as Nebuchadnezzar's palace, present a confirming comment on the history of his deputation of artisans from Judæa. Of special confirmations of the sacred record, we select a few specimens out of a mass sufficient to fill this entire article.

1. In 1 Kings xx. and xxii. chapters, we read of the war by Ben-hadad of Syria against Ahab; that he led thirty-two subject or confederate kings; after losing one hundred and twenty-seven thousand men in this campaign, he was yet able to continue the

war three years, and finally fights a decisive battle against Judah and Israel, in which Ahab was slain. Though no trustworthy Syrian records are before us, we find in the Assyrian inscription, known as the black obelisk, notices of the power of Ben-hadad—his numerous feudal kings and great armies—which fully sustain this apparently exaggerated narrative.

2. The same record sustains the accuracy of the Book of Kings, by mentioning Hazael as Ben-hadad's successor, 2 K. viii. 7, 15; and Jehu is named in the record as one who submitted to the Assyrian king and paid tribute of silver, gold, and other costly articles.

3. The next mention of Israel in the inscriptions is connected with Pul. Though there is some doubt as to the orthography of the name, we learn he took tribute from the country of Khumri, i. e., *Beth-khumri*, in Hebrew, Omri, which is Samaria (so called because he founded the city. 1 K. xvi. 24).

4. Tiglath-pileser follows Pul in the list of Assyrian wars. He is represented as taking tribute from Menahem; but the Scripture says it was Pekah with whom he warred. Menahem, however, had been dead but a short time, and it is a fair supposition that the engraver of the inscription only made what is called a clerical error. See 2 K. xvi. 7, in which mention is made of a tribute voluntarily paid by Ahaz to this king, who mentions him especially as a tributary.

5. Shalmaneser is, in Scripture, the name of an Assyrian king, who, 2 K. xvii. 3-5, came against Samaria to chastise Hoshea for failing to pay tribute, and for seeking aid in his obstinacy from Egypt. Such appears at first sight to be the scope. But in verse 3 it is said that, as the result of the invasion, Hoshea became his servant, and rendered to him tribute. In verse 4, instead of "Shalmaneser," we have "the king of Assyria" simply, to whom Hoshea refused tribute, etc., and who successfully besieged and after three years took Samaria, carrying the people captive into Assyria and distributing them in various places. No Assyrian record satisfactorily authorises us to assign this conquest to Shalmaneser. On the contrary, it is assigned to Sargon, in his extensive annals found
VOL. XXVIII., NO. 2—19.

in his palace at Khorsabad. In Isaiah xx. 1, we read of Tartan sent by Sargon, King of Assyria, who fought against Ashdod and took it. Interpreters have been long puzzled by this passage. Dr. J. A. Alexander rightly surmised as the most probable solution of the puzzle, that Sargon was not another name for any to whom it had been proposed to assign it, but was that of *another* king. The affairs of the Assyrian Empire appear to have been complicated, by the statements of the monuments of Shalmaneser. It is, then, with a probability of the nature of a moral certainty, that Sargon succeeded Shalmaneser, in some revolutionary manner. In all his inscriptions, departing from the usual style of preface, he never mentions ancestors, and his lineal successors never trace their genealogies beyond him. In his annals he not only claims the subjugation of Samaria, and captivity and deportation of the people, but also relates his importations of people from his provinces, and their settlement in Palestine. Among those provinces, by the by, he names one of Arabia. This explains the presence of Geshem the *Arabian*, among Nehemiah's opponents in his pious labors. Nehemiah vi. 1. We have thus not only a confirmation, but an explanation and a supplement of the sacred text.

But we have so far miscalculated the space the matter of this article would require, that we feel compelled here rather abruptly to close. There remain the more striking and full coincidences of sacred and Assyrian history in the account of the wars of Sennacherib, and pages may be filled with confirmatory illustrations of historical and other passages of Scripture. It is abundantly evident that both from mythical story and trustworthy annals, there come valuable contributions to the credibility of sacred history. Exhumed carved and sculptured monuments of limestone and marble; gigantic figures of men and beasts, and symbolical creatures; pillars, tombs, portals, slabs, statues, and seals; the pavements and walls of palaces and temples with baked clay bricks; tablets, vases, and cylinders, have brought to us a new "testimony of the rocks;" not to impair, but to sustain, the inspired records. The inscriptions they bear, or by which they are explained, after more than twenty centuries of silence,

speak in language, not in theories and speculations, and echo the voices of Moses, Samuel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, speaking on the pages of the Bible.

To our generation it has been given to "know but in part," and, as to much, to "see as in a glass darkly." One palace alone covers with its ruins one hundred acres of ground, of which only a very small portion has been thoroughly examined. Mounds of as great or of less extent are thickly scattered over the regions adjoining the sites of Nineveh and Babylon. Meanwhile, as discovery opens new treasures, the study of the Assyrian language is constantly receiving new votaries; and increased accuracy of decipherment and of translation promise results for the future, of which the present, intrinsically valuable as they are, may prove but the first-fruits in the great harvest of historical truth and confirmation and illustration of the venerable documents of the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Whether we shall feel justified in calling the attention of our readers to this subject again, depends on circumstances. We greatly desire its prosecution by some one: and for the present, take our leave, in the words of Francis Thynne, an old critic, by asking "credit for diligence in breaking the yce and givinge lighte to others, who may moore easely perfecte than begynne."

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIX.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXVIII.

ARTICLE I.

THORNWELL'S WRITINGS.

The Collected Writings of JAMES HENLEY THORNWELL, D. D., LL.D., *late Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C. Vols. I., II.* Edited by JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical Polity and History in the same Seminary. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. New York: R. Carter & Bros. Philadelphia: Alfred Martien. Louisville: Davidson Bros. & Co. 1871. Pp. 659, 622, 8vo.

The Same, Vols. III., IV. Edited by JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., and JOHN L. GIRARDEAU, D. D. 1873. Pp. 817, 640, 8vo.

These elegant and portly volumes have been several years before the public, as the dates upon the title pages will show; and yet, full as they are of the deepest and most inspiring thought of one of the greatest thinkers of the age, expressed in a style of the clearest and purest English, they have not, so far as we know, been commended to the attention of theologians and scholars in an extended review. Perhaps their extraordinary merit has been the cause of this apparent neglect. It might seem to indicate some audacity of enterprise, or, at least, some want of modesty, in an ordinary man, to make such an attempt. The men who are best qualified for the task were prevented from undertaking it, by their connexion with the lamented author, either as his editors or as his biographers; and other men have,

ARTICLE V.

A NEW "TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS;" OR, THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS AND BIBLICAL HISTORY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We resume our inquiries on this subject. In the April number of this REVIEW for 1877 we presented an account of the discoveries and deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions exhumed from the ruins of Nineveh, Babylon, and other places, in the region once occupied by the empires of Assyria and Babylon: and added a brief summary of the results of these discoveries, as bearing on the credibility of the historical books of the Old Testament. According to the intimation then given, we now propose to present some additional specimens of these "results," and also more extended and minute accounts of those already briefly stated.

I. In the tenth chapter of Genesis, Moses has given us "the generations of the sons of Noah." We need not discuss the question whether we have the names of all the immediate descendants, much less of all those of the third generation from Japhet, Ham, and Shem. The list of Ham's posterity includes several names of tribal or national communities. We notice, in verses 5th, 20th, and 31st, in very nearly the same terms, statements indicating that these lists of names constitute a genealogical, geographical, ethnographical, and linguistic chart of the earlier post-diluvian population. The records relating to Ham's and Shem's descendants are much fuller than those of the families of Japhet.

1. Recent investigations by antiquarians, both into the history and languages of Western Asia, by the aid of the cuneiform inscriptions, have led the best ethnologists to accept these "*Toledoth* (generations) of Noah" as a most admirable and trustworthy basis for the earliest histories of our race; for the inscriptions confirm, in an eminent manner, the credibility of this venerable and most ancient document of the Jewish Lawgiver.

Let us consider two historical statements occurring in the midst

of these lists of mere names. In chap. x. 7, "the sons of Cush" is followed by several names of countries, which were settled by his descendants. Then, verse 8, follows, "Cush begat Nimrod," who is said to have been a "mighty one in the earth." As Cush was Ham's oldest son, and Nimrod *may* have been the sixth son of Cush, we can hardly suppose he was born earlier than forty or fifty years after the flood, so that when he had reached his prime, nearly one century had elapsed since the flood. In x. 10, we are told of Nimrod "the BEGINNING of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." In verse 22, we learn that Asshur was Shem's second son; and in verses 11-12, "out of that land (Shinar) went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh and Rehoboth, a city [*margin* the streets of the city] and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah, the same is a great city," or, literally, "it is the great city."

2. These historical notices are, evidently, as to chronology, anticipative. The whole chapter, as above intimated, is of the character of a chart, covering, in its very significant family, tribal, and national names, a long tract of the history which Moses and others were yet to write. The history of the flood having closed, chap. ix. 18, the writer adds of Noah's sons, verse 19, "of them was the whole earth overspread." Then follows the episode of Noah's drunkenness and its results, and a statement of the length of his life. The history is resumed chapter xi.: "The whole earth was of one language and one speech." We are not informed how long Noah and his sons and families and descendants remained in Armenia. They became nomadic—xi. 2, "as they journeyed," or "*in* their journeying," indicates that fact. The verb rendered "journeying" is literally (a) "to pull up," then (b) specially "to pull up stakes" or tent pins, (c) then "to move camp," and so to journey from place to place. Our version adds "from the east" (or *margin*, eastward). But the Hebrew word, קָדַם first means *before*, *in front*, and as, to the Hebrews, in modes of speaking, the east was in front and the west behind, this word acquired the meaning of "east," and denoted generally all the regions *east* from Palestine, especially those each side of the Euphrates and Tigris and Armenia. When the word is com-

pounded with a prepositional prefix, it denotes *eastward* if connected with any word to which it shows a relation, but otherwise, as here, it may mean the *east*, in a wide sense, denoting all the region, as above mentioned. In later Hebrew writings (and once in Moses' writings, Deut. xxxiii. 15), its predominant meaning is "of old" or "of old time"—a signification suitable here, "in their journeying of olden time." In any case, there had been a movement from the north to the milder region of Shinar, and "they dwelt there." How long they *dwelt* before undertaking the tower, being defeated and dispersed by the divine power, we have no definite information. But we are told that in Peleg's "days" "the earth was divided." He was born 100, and died 339 years, after the flood. We are not told Nimrod's age. He was grandson of Ham. Salah, grandson of Shem, may be accepted as fully, or nearly, his contemporary. Salah lived, Gen. xi. 14-15, 403 years.

The Scriptures do not state the exact time when the "*beginning*" of Nimrod's kingdom occurred, nor when "Asshur went forth," etc. Nimrod, as a grandson of Ham and sixth son of Cush, was born, perhaps, between forty and fifty years after the flood. He would thus be about fifty or sixty years old when Peleg was born. Now, meanwhile Noah's descendants had reached Shinar. The building of the tower would not necessarily, nor even probably, be undertaken immediately, there being yet too small a population for such an enterprise: and the people "*dwelt*" in Shinar, implying time for settled abode. "The division of the earth" occurring in "Peleg's day," implies some relation to the arresting of the enterprise by "the confounding their language and the scattering of them abroad upon (not over) the face of all the earth." Gen. xi. 7-8. As "Peleg's days" covered a period of two hundred and thirty-nine years, it is allowable to place this event not earlier than one hundred years after the flood, nor later than three hundred and thirty-nine, when Peleg died. The necessary increase of population for the enterprise of building would be gained, by, say, one hundred and fifty or two hundred years after the flood. Some time was doubtless required for the process of building, till arrested by

the divine power. We may therefore approximate the settlement of the time of this event, and infer from what has now been said, that it was not less than two hundred nor more than three hundred years after the flood.

3. We now inquire of the best authenticated records, exhumed from the ruins opened on the Tigris and Euphrates. An inscription on the rock at Bavian, made by Sennacherib about 692 B. C., speaks of his having recovered certain gods carried away by the Babylonians four hundred and eighteen years previously, after a battle fought with the Assyrian forces under Tiglath Pileser I., that is, $692 - 418 = 1110$ B. C. Other inscriptions, found at Sherghat, give an account that during his reign Tiglath Pileser had rebuilt a temple which had laid in ruins sixty years; and that this temple had been built six hundred and forty years previous to its destruction or falling into ruins. It was then built $1110 - 60 = 1050$ B. C. There may be some question as to the accuracy of this calculation, as there are uncertainties respecting the exactness of the time when the inscriptions were actually composed, and the periods assigned, both for the time the temple existed and that in which it lay in ruins. Though both Assyrians and Babylonians were remarkably careful respecting the records of their history, yet we do not know whether the matter of this temple presents accurately the period designated, as we cannot know whether it was given by dating from its foundation or its completion, and whether the time of its lying in ruins was from the date of its disuse or its actual destruction or falling into decay. But next, the most trustworthy opinions, derived from Berosus, Calisthenes, and other sources, do not give entirely satisfactory results respecting the period from 1810 B. C. to the "beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom. The earliest monumental king is Uruch, who styles himself "King of Ur," who built a temple in honor of Bel-Nimrod, or Nimrod of Scripture. He is identified by Rawlinson with a god called "Bel-Nipur," or as he renders it, "The Hunter Lord." So far as these monumental data aid, they confirm the Scriptures in assigning the "beginning" of the kingdom of Babylon to Nimrod. Uruch was perhaps as "King of Ur" a tributary to Nimrod and

then his successor. The words "king" and "kingdom" are not to be accepted, used in those remote days, as denoting a ruler with a splendid court and palace and large armies, or a dominion over wide regions and large populations. Both then, and as late as the time of Benhadad's "thirty-two" tributary "kings," (1 Kings xx. 1,) the terms often denoted no more than "chiefs" of tribes or petty principalities.

4. We are disposed then to accept the received dates of the Bible as substantially correct. The only desired modification is one which will give a longer period than usually allowed for the space between the flood and the dispersion. The accounts of Berosus, and of others based on his, assign 2,234 B. C. as the time of the "*beginning*" of Nimrod's kingdom. We *may* accept this date, supposing a very small "*beginning*." But allowing a hundred years longer from the flood greatly relieves the difficulty, and no settled facts forbid this.

The time then of the "*beginning*" of Nimrod's kingdom antedates that of any political organisation of Western Asia known to us, and perhaps of any in the world. We cannot here discuss the question of the greater antiquity of Egypt. It is possible, accordant with the views of some, that Nimrod may have first established the "*beginning*" of a kingdom in Egypt, or may have done so after his exploits in Shinar or Chaldæa, either by personal effort or the superintendence of others.

The period of Asshur's emigration was subsequent to Nimrod's work. He is recognised in the inscriptions as "the great God," "the great Lord," "the King of all Gods," who rules supreme over them, and sometimes is called "the Father of Gods." The Assyrian kings, with characteristic religious tone, ascribe their success to his aid, and they waged war, ravaged, and destroyed to extend his worship. All they did was done for his honor, as well as for their own and for the glory of the kingdom, and to teach his laws and set up the emblems of his dignity. Not more was the religion of the followers of Cromwell mingled with their counsels, recognised in their enterprises, and prominent in their victorious rejoicings, than was that of the Assyrians. "Asshur was the name of the god, of the founder of the king-

dom, of the country, of the town (long the capital), and of the citizen. To distinguish in what sense the word *Asshur* (or *Ashur*, as sometimes spelled) was used, there was a character, called a *determinative*, attached. What Mahomet was and is to the Mahometan, William the Conqueror to the Englishman, or Washington to the American, Asshur was to the Assyrian, with the added regard due to the great God. The name, Asshur, is a constantly recurring element in the formation of names, just as we have the divine names, El, Jehovah or Jah. and Adoni, either in full or abbreviated, in Jewish names of places and persons.

5. It may be well to notice the marginal reading of Gen. x. 11: "Out of that land he (*i. e.*, Nimrod) went out to Assyria," etc. But the word נִמְרוֹד would need the termination of the ה local, denoting direction to a place, also including, often, the idea of arrival. The allegation that Ninrod's name and fame were perpetuated in Assyria does not form a conclusive argument for this reading. For it is evident that whenever and for whatever cause unsuccessful rebellion and forcible expulsion or voluntary emigration "Asshur went forth," the cities he built existed as far back as 2,900 B. C. But there is no evidence that a separate and independent government existed. Nimrod, deified at his death, seems to have had his memorials in the neighborhood of Nineveh.

We see in this discussion that the credibility of the facts stated by Moses respecting these ancient empires, whatever chronological discrepancies may appear or really exist, is well sustained by the most trustworthy native "records of the past."

6. Corroborating these direct confirmations of the history of Moses, are some rather inferential yet sustaining illustrations of its entire correctness.

(1.) It is well known to readers on the subject that in the ruins of Babylon are found but few stones. Bricks, baked by fire or sun-dried, were evidently the almost exclusively used material. As the country was flat and subject to overflow by the waters of the Euphrates, mounds of solid brick-work, or with earth added, were prepared, on which the buildings might be erected. In the region of Nineveh, there has ever been an

abundant supply of the best building stone. Yet the same mode of preparing a foundation and the same extensive use of brick are evinced by the ruins. Moses' description of the building of the town, in using "brick for stone" and "slime for mortar" (having no limestone from which to procure lime), corresponds with facts now abundantly patent; and further, his giving precedence to Nimrod in time, is evinced by the fact that the Assyrians derived their plan of building from the Babylonians.

(2.) For a long time the Mosaic statement of "beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom, Babylon, Erech, etc., in the land of Shinar, and that of the "building of Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah, and Resen" by Asshur, has been contested, on the ground that the origin of the kingdom of Babylon was attributed to a descendant of Ham, and that of Nineveh to a descendant of Shem, and yet there had been an almost identical style of civilisation—in religion, manners, language, and material and civil growth and power. All the grounds of this rejection of the Mosaic testimony are removed by the monumental records. The inscriptions on the bricks, by their position at the base of Babylonian ruins evidently the most ancient, present a language very different from that of later periods. Indeed, these archaic inscriptions are, both in the characters used, approaching the pictorial or hieroglyphic type, and in the vocabulary and grammatical structure of the language, monuments of a distinctly Cushite race, of decided ethnic and linguistic affinities with the Ethiopic and the speech of the people of Egypt, Phœnicia or Palestine. Abraham, who emigrated from "Ur of the Chaldees" about twenty centuries before Christ, it seems easily held intercourse with the people of the land "whither he went," and even with the Egyptians. His great grandsons, Joseph's brethren, whose grandmother and mother were both Aramæans, and Joseph himself, doubtless (on his first arrival in Egypt) needed interpreters, for their own tongue must, in the space of nearly two centuries, by their Aramæan connexion, have been greatly changed. The archaic language of Chaldæa has now been proved, from the sources above mentioned, while predominantly of the Cushite family, to have also contained distinctly marked elements of the

Turanian (Scythic), Aryan, and Semitic families of language. The "Chaldæan" of the bricks is not that of the time of Nebuchadnezzar, which is more nearly allied to the Hebrew. Mistakes have been made even by such scholars as Heeren, Niebuhr, Lowth, and Gesenius, by a common application of the term "Chaldæa" and its derivations alike to the early and the later race inhabiting the lower Mesopotamia.

It is evident, in spite of Bunsen's sneers at believers in the Bible history,* *there was an Asiatic Cush*. The traditions of Greeks, especially Homer's lines, Od. i. 23, 24, of the Ethiopians: "They were divided at the ends of the earth, towards the rising and the setting sun;" Strabo's statement, on the authority of Ephorus, that "the Ethiopians were divided by the Arabian gulf into Eastern and Western, Asiatic and African;" the tradition as to Memnon, on the authority of Hesiod and Pindar, that he led an army of Susianians and Ethiopians to assist Priam, and, at the same time, was claimed as King Amunoph III., known as "the vocal Memnon," thus uniting Eastern and Western Ethiopians; the traditions of the Armenians, who apply the name Cush to Media, Persia, Elymas, and Aria; and the mythological names and genealogies, connecting the divinities of both regions, as holding common relations to each: all tend to confirm the monumental testimonies to the differences of ethnic and linguistic relations between the early Babylonians and Assyrians, and accord with the scriptural statement.

(3.) The only biblical statement touching the dimensions of the city of Nineveh are given by Jonah iii. 3, 4: "Nineveh was an exceeding great city, of three days' journey [literally, a walk† of three days]. And Jonah began to enter in the city a day's journey,"—or, a walk of one day. Various modes of explaining this, consistently with statements from other sources, have been proposed. The discoveries of Mr. Layard suggested to him one which appears most probable. In Genesis x. 12, after naming

* "The Bible mentions but one Cush—Ethiopia. An Asiatic Cush exists only in the imagination of interpreters, and is the child of their despair." (Philosophy of Universal History, Vol. I., p. 191, as quoted by Rawlinson.)

† See Ezek. xlii. 4.

Nineveh, Rehoboth, and Calah, Moses adds, "and Resen between Nineveh and Calah, the same is a great city;" literally, "it is the great city." Now if we read, "Nineveh and streets of a city," as the margin suggests, the word city evidently indicates Nineveh, the building of which involved laying out the streets; then the other two places are included, the whole in Moses' time having grown into one. Diodurus Siculus, 100 B. C., gives the dimensions nearly sixty miles around. Mr. Layard is satisfied that the dimensions of Nineveh, including its "suburbs," form nearly a parallelogram eighteen by twelve miles, which agrees with the account of Diodurus and confirms Jonah's statement. Jonah's "walk of one day" on entering the city is not connected with the measurement, but only informs us of his occupation, perhaps, in taking a general survey before proceeding to give his solemn and effective warning.

7. For many centuries after the "beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom and the "building" of Nineveh, there were alternately wars and seasons of peace between the people of Chaldæa or the Southern Mesopotamia, and those of the Northern Mesopotamia. The Chaldæan kingdom is supposed to have existed eight or ten centuries before the Assyrian people succeeded in establishing their independence. Then the inscriptions give us notices of alliances as well as disputes. The independence of Assyria was followed by its greater prosperity, till from a comparatively unimportant kingdom it grew to the dimensions and power of an empire; and ultimately first subdued its rival and then absorbed its territory into its own.

II. We thus far find no very important notices—indeed, none of certainty—existing between these Mesopotamian states and the chosen people.

1. Some suppose Chushan-rishathaim of Judges iii. 8-10, called "king of Mesopotamia," may have been an Assyrian monarch; but it is more probable he was the ruler of some part of the regions of Syria lying much further north than those then pertaining to the Assyrian empire, as the word Mesopotamia is literally "Syria of two rivers."

2. In 2 Samuel, 8th and 10th chapters, we have an account of the wars of David with the Moabites, Ammonites, the Syrians of Zobah (under Hadadezer), and of Beth-rehob, and other enemies; and in x. 16 we find, when the combinations against David had been broken up, that Hadarezer "sent and brought out the Syrians that were *beyond the river*," i. e., the Euphrates. Now we know from the inscriptions that Tiglath Pileser I., about the year 1120 B. C., had subjugated the Aramæans or Syrians. At the close of his reign, troubles arose between Assyria and its former superior kingdom and now rival, Babylon. Of the results, no monuments have been discovered to inform us; and for nearly two hundred years we find few, and these unsatisfactory, records of any important events; even the names of the kings, for a large part of the period, have not come to light. Now, these "Syrians from beyond the river," thus incorporated by Tiglath Pileser in the kingdom or "empire" (as it is reckoned by historians), were without doubt then so loosely attached to Assyria that they retained their national name; yet in Psalm lxxxiii. 8, among the many nations and tribes whose efforts against David are deprecated by the poet, we read, "Assur is also joined with them," the writer thus indicating them by their locality and political relations. We are aware that high authorities have held this Psalm to be descriptive of another period—the wars in which Jehoshaphat was engaged, related in 2 Chronicles, 20th chapter. But there is no notice in that history of any auxiliaries of Syrians from "*beyond the river*" aiding Ammon and Moab. On the contrary, the auxiliaries named (verse 2) are expressly said to be "*from beyond the sea on this side Syria*," the Sea of Galilee or the Dead Sea being meant.

But while this mention brings into view the relations of a portion of the people politically connected with Assyria, it is not the relation of Assyria as such. The inscriptions, however, enable us to understand why this was the case. The Assyrian power was then too weak, or fully occupied in other wars with its powerful rival, to take part in arresting the growth of this rising power in Palestine. During the extensive warlike enterprises of Tiglath Pileser and his immediate predecessors, from

Asshur-ris-ilim back for a century to Tiglath-inin, the condition of the Hebrews was not such as to invite attention, and the relations of Assyria and Egypt had not then called for alliance with the governments of Palestine, by the one or the other, as in after-days, to facilitate the passage of large armies in their contests for wider dominion. The first manifestation of this policy mentioned in the Scriptures was, perhaps, the invasion of Judah by Shishak in the time of Rehoboam.

III. We are thus brought to that most interesting part of our inquiries, when the Assyrian government became connected with those of the Holy Land, either as an ally or *suzerain*; the first rather in form, the latter in reality; for the kings of Assyria, in the manner of other ancient imperial rulers, exacted tributes or enforced involuntary presents.

1. Before adducing examples of the confirmations of Scripture history derived from the monumental inscriptions of Assyria and Babylon, a few preliminary statements are important.

(1.) In the annals of the Assyrian monarchs, statements of warlike expeditions and conquests of various nations are presented. In most cases these monarchs had already become somewhat known in history, and also a knowledge more or less definite of the period in which they flourished already existed. In such cases, and by frequent recurrence of the name of the monarch, little or no difficulty in identification occurred. In others, however, less known, much obscurity surrounded the name. Then the spelling of a name, which had been translated or transliterated by the Scripture or classic writers who had used it, increased the obscurity. And still farther, as is well known of Scripture characters, two or three names were sometimes applied to one person. Diligent and careful study and repeated reviews of decipherments have removed nearly all occasions of doubt on this score.

(2.) The Assyrians appear to have kept a current chronology, to which the title, "Assyrian Eponym Canon," has been given. This was the indication of every year by the name of a king or some other eminent and well known person. And events were

recorded as occurring in the "Eponym" of such person. Fragments (more or less entire, and in great numbers) of such a Canon have been discovered, deciphered, and arranged in a tolerably good order. As the Assyrians did not adjust this Canon to the eras of Jewish or Grecian chronology, to them it was only valuable as a summary of their own history. It occasionally added to the name and year of the Eponym a brief historical statement. But Assyrian scholars have identified in this record, by means of trustworthy records of other nations, several names of persons of eminence; the special occasion of whose distinction, such as an accession to the crown or a great victory, has become a well known era. They have thus adapted to this Canon the chronology of the synchronous period as given by Grecian or Scripture authorities. Thus the Canon has become a valuable contribution to the settlement of many questions in the history of this remote part of the world, and of its remote periods, from 930 to 688 B. C. Still it has been found impracticable to form accurate synchronous histories of ancient nations. While there has been found the nearest approach to synchronism in the chronology of Assyria, Ptolemy, and our Bible, still many discrepancies exist. These are due to the causes which oblige the best scholars to speak cautiously, such as (*a*) different modes of reckoning time among different nations, and by the same nation at different periods; (*b*) doubtful decipherments and readings of the inscriptions, in the manner above mentioned, as to names occurring only once; (*c*) and this occasions doubts as to dates.

(3.) It has been found best, in the inquiries now before us, to accept the Assyrian chronology for events and persons belonging to Assyria and Babylon, and the Scripture chronology for events of the Jewish history: and then if the same event is mentioned by both, with different dates, to overlook such difference (never very great) as due to some such causes as above mentioned, or to periods of anarchy, or revolution, *interregna*, or other reasonable grounds for accepting the existence of error in the chronology of one or the other nation. In a similar manner differences may be adjusted when to the same date different events are assigned,

one of which, by other trustworthy evidence, may be known to have occurred at another time.

These remarks are made once for all, and suggest as a corollary, that even when apparent discrepancies in the chronology of our Bibles and the monumental records admit of no solution satisfactory to rigid criticism, we are not to conclude none is possible, for even a correction of biblical chronology is not a "denial of the faith;" and scholars, equally tenacious of the divine authority of the Scriptures, may yet differ as much as twenty years on the period when Uzziah, for instance, became king of Judah.

2. What has been said finds an application in solving some questions arising in examining the first case of an Assyrian invasion of the Holy Land recorded in Scripture. In 2 Kings, xv. 19, 20, we read: "Pul, king of Assyria, came against the land: and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, of all the mighty men of wealth, . . . to give the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria turned back and stayed not there in the land." Also in 1 Chron. v. 26: "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and Tilgath-pilneser, king of Assyria, and he [Tilgath-pilneser] carried them away [the descendants of Reuben and Gad and half tribe of Manasseh, verse 18], and brought them unto Halah and Habor and Hara and to the river Gozan, unto this day." Before, but especially since, the introduction of the monumental records into the elucidation of Scripture history, this passage has occasioned not a little difficulty of satisfactory explanation, and consequently many schemes of solving the questions to which it has given rise have been proposed.

The name of Pul does not occur either in the Assyrian Canon or in any monumental inscriptions of Assyria. Some have supposed Pul was a usurper, aspiring to the throne in the first half of the seventh century—a period otherwise known to have been one of great trial and perhaps revolution in the kingdom. Others, that as a usurper, he had arisen in Babylonia, from which

it is known Assyria continued to be often harassed, even after it had become really a part of the empire; and as the name Pul is not properly Assyrian, but could be found on Babylonian bricks, Mr. Rawlinson rather favored this view. Mr. Rawlinson also presented another suggestion, that Pul and Tiglath-pileser were names of the same person, and, strangely enough, the passage in 1 Chron. v. 26 was quoted to sustain the suggestion. There it is said, "*he* carried," etc., which most obviously refers to Tiglath-pileser. But as no act had been predicated of Pul, the pronoun, being in the singular, was understood to denote him and Tiglath-pileser as one person. But we need not discuss these various surmises. Mr. George Smith, in the Assyrian Canon, published shortly before his lamented death, favors the opinion that Pul is the name of a monarch first read as *Vul-lush*, then, on more correct decipherment, *Vul-nirari*. It is well known that the Hebrew affords only about half a dozen words of Hebrew origin, and several of them doubtful, in which the letter ך is initial: and as ם is a cognate labial, the spelling of Vul would, by the Hebrew writer, be very naturally varied to Pul.

The contraction of names was not unusual in Assyrian, as Agu for Agukah-rimi, and Ragmu for Ragmu-seinina-namari, and Shalman for Shalmaneser (Hosea x. 14). The earliest period in which Pul could be a contemporary of Menahem is 773-771 B. C. Then Shalmaneser III. was king of Assyria, according to the Canon. But in an inscription of Vul-nirari, he speaks of himself as "the king whom, *in his son*. Asshur . . . has renowned," thus pointing to his son, Shalmaneser, who was most likely, and according to a custom in other oriental kingdoms, as Judah for instance, as well as Assyria, associated with his father. In this way Vul-nirari or Pul might still be king, though Shalmaneser is so reckoned for that date, just as Jotham appears to have been reckoned as king in the dates, while Uzziah still reigned. Now we read in an inscription of Vul-nirari, that "he subjugated and took tribute and taxes from *Omri*," the name by which the Assyrian inscriptions frequently designate both the city and the ruler of Samaria, because Samaria had been founded by Omri

(1 Kings xvi. 24). The fuller name, often used, is Beth-khumri, the Assyrian rendering of the Hebrew Beth-Omri, *i. e.*, the House of Omri—a mode of denoting a dynasty or government frequently occurring; the English and French nomenclature. “House of Stuart” or “House of the Bourbons,” etc., etc., furnishing parallel examples.

It only remains to say, that, with a very small margin for differences in chronological order, the time of Menahem and that of Pul synchronise. It was evidently at the beginning of Menahem's reign that he paid the tribute; for it seems to have been in order to secure the aid of the Assyrian monarch in “confirming the kingdom in his hand.” It was a time of disorder, misrule, and assassination, and Menahem had reason to fear the fate he had brought on his predecessor Shallum, which Shallum had brought on Zechariah.

3. The next monarch from Assyria who came to carry on the subjugation of the kingdom of Israel, was Tiglath Pileser (in one monumental record read Takultipalesar, and in another, Tagultipalesar). The Assyrian authorities, as copied by the best scholars, assign the accession of this monarch to 747–745 B. C. It is evident from his inscriptions that he had much intercourse with the rulers both of Israel and Judah. In one place he mentions tribute from Menahem. This is not noticed in Scripture; but as it is said expressly of him, 2 Kings, xv. 29, that he came “in the days of Pekah,” it has been supposed the name of Menahem was used by his scribe for Pekah, having overlooked the fact of a change. It is quite probable, as Pekah had obtained the kingdom by murdering Pekahiah, a son of Menahem, that another Menahem, perhaps son of Pekahiah, not named in Scripture, had sought to avenge his father's death, and it may be had some temporary success. Tiglath Pileser also names Azariah of Judah. This could not be Azariah (Uzziah), for he must have died before Tiglath Pileser's accession. In 2 Chron. xxi. 17, we find the name Jehoahaz (the youngest son of Jehoram) called in chap. xxii. 1, Ahaziah, and verse 6, Azariah, where we know that Ahaziah is meant. This use of several names for the same person was not uncommon. Hence Ahaziah (or Azariah) as the

inscription names him, was evidently Ahaz. This view is strengthened by the fact that Azariah was a contemporary of Menaheim, and it is presumable, as the scribe confounded Menaheim of Israel with Pekah, he might as readily have confounded Ahaz and Azariah. Tiglath Pileser is mentioned again. Rezin, also named in the inscriptions of this king, who was king of Damascus, and Pekah, king of Israel, had united in an attack on Judah, in the reign of Ahaz. This is mentioned in 2 Kings xvi. 5, and Isaiah vii. 1. In 2 Kings xvi. 7, we read: "Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant, thy son: come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me." Then verse 8 informs us how Ahaz "took the silver and gold which was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasuries of the king's house, and sent a present to the king of Assyria." Then the "king of Assyria hearkened to his request." He invaded Damascus and carried away the people captive to Kir, exactly fulfilling the prophecy of Amos i. 5, and slew Rezin. In Tiglath Pileser's inscriptions we find mention of the "Damascus besieged," and its king "caged like a bird." Several cities and "the house of the father of Rezin" are noted among the captured places, and "sixteen districts of Syria, like a flood I swept." The king was Rezin. A more extended account of the war against Ahaz by Rezin and Pekah is given in 2. Chron. chap. xxviii. From this it seems that they had devastated the land, Pekah cutting down 120,000 men in one battle, and his generals taking captive of Judah 200,000 women, sons and daughters, with much spoil—which were carried to Samaria, though subsequently restored; and Rezin carried vast multitudes to Damascus. The king of Assyria, as we have seen, by attacking Damascus, relieved the capital from the siege. But it does not appear that he really helped Ahaz, notwithstanding the costly present. When Tiglath Pileser had subdued and slain Rezin and utterly defeated Pekah and his successor Hoshea, instead of strengthening, "he distressed Ahaz." 2 Chron. xviii. 20, 21.

One hundred years before the days of Tiglath Pileser, in the time of Shalmaneser, we have notices of the incipient tributary

relations of Israel to Assyria. But the inscription relating this finds no corresponding mention in the Scriptures. By these various invasions, the kingdom of Israel had been nearly destroyed. Tiglath Pileser had carried captive the people of Naphtali and from the trans-Jordanic tribes. The fatal schism in the close of Solomon's reign and beginning of Rehoboam's, had weakened the great empire founded by David and ruled by Solomon, and Assyria had constantly and steadily extended her warlike enterprises westward. The successes thus far only whetted the appetite for conquest, which the victories of centuries had not appeased.

4. Next to Tiglath Pileser appears Shalmaneser IV., mentioned only in 2 Kings xvii. 3, and parallel, xviii. 9. Hoshea had succeeded Pekah, as Pekah his predecessor, by assassination, and he succeeded to a kingdom of diminished size and under tributary subjection to Assyria. Shalmaneser came up against him only to rivet the fetters by which his predecessor had been bound. "He gave him presents," 2 Kings xvii. 3, is but a euphemism for "he paid him tribute." On an obelisk in the ruins of Nimrod there are bas-relief representations of captives loaded with spoils such as Jews might be supposed to bring; and in the order of these records, those on the back part of the obelisk are assigned to the period including the time of Shalmaneser. Until the discovery of Sargon's Inscriptions, Assyriologists identified him with Shalmaneser, and ascribed to the latter these bas-relief records. But since that discovery, in view of the shortness of Shalmaneser's reign, only six years, this opinion has been somewhat discredited. At all events, the Scripture accounts of the fall of Samaria and the overthrow of the kingdom of Israel are so fully confirmed by Sargon's annals, that we at once proceed to notice these.

5. As already briefly stated in the REVIEW for April, 1877, the terrible disasters just mentioned were the results of Sargon's enterprises. We read, 2 Kings xvii. 3, 4: "Against him (Hoshea) came up Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and Hoshea became his servant and gave him presents. And the *king of Assyria* found conspiracy in Hoshea, for he had sent messengers

to So, king of Egypt, and brought no presents to the king of Assyria as year by year. Therefore the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison. Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land and went up to Samaria and besieged it three years." "In the ninth year of Hoshea," (the last of his reign,) "the king of Assyria took Samaria and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor, the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." We observe in this narrative, that the visit of Shalmaneser was evidently in the *beginning* of Hoshea's reign, inasmuch as Hoshea continued "year by year" to pay tribute; and as the siege lasted three out of the nine years of his reign, this payment must have been kept up several years. It is also evident that from the first payment, verse 3, there was a lapse of time to the period of Hoshea's defection. As Shalmaneser reigned only six years, the work of conquest was carried on by his successor, Sargon, whose voluminous annals are now before us. These supplement and explain the brief records given above, which are not repeated in the book of Chronicles. Sargon was the besieger and conqueror. Says he: "Samaria I besieged, I conquered; 27,290 people, dwelling in the midst of it, I carried captive; fifty chariots from among them I selected, and the rest I distributed; . . . and the *taxes of the former king*" (*i. e.*, we suppose, Shalmaneser,) "I fixed on them; I appointed a governor of mine over them." After naming several remote tribes of the Arabians, which he had conquered, and some of which he had destroyed, he adds: "The rest of them I removed, and in the city of Samaria I placed them." Though this special passage has not a verbal counterpart in the Scriptures, yet, besides the fact of the existence in Samaria, at the time of Nehemiah, of Arabians, we have the express statement of similar importations from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, and Sepharvaim—verse 24—and the immediate results of this importation on the religious condition of the people of Samaria as stated in the remainder of the chapter. This deportation was in keeping with that by Tiglath Pileser, 1 Chron. v. 26, already noticed, and was kept up till the time of Esar-haddon.

The very name of kingdom of Israel never more existed. The mixed inhabitants of Northern Palestine, and the low moral, as well as other, cultivation of the people of Galilee in the time of our Saviour, remained standing monuments of this harsh policy of the Assyrian kings, and the heavy wrath of the God of their fathers whom they had despised.

The crowning sin of the later monarchs of Israel, and the immediate provocation of Sargon's severity, was the constant effort for forming alliance with Egypt. The Assyrian was jealous of Egyptian growth; and as Palestine lay in the only feasible route for large armies from Egypt to Assyria, the vassalage of its two remnant kingdoms of David's empire was a prize in the contest for which by these two great powers, these kingdoms were laid waste. Their resistance to whichever monarch was superior—him of Assyria or him of Egypt—incurred exemplary retribution, of the kind and measure of which we have a specimen in the quotation from Sargon's annals already given. Isaiah xx. 1, dates the time of one of his prophecies by "the year that Tartan came into Ashdod, where Sargon, king of Assyria, sent him, and fought against it, and took it."

Sargon, as other wise generals, disliked "a fire in his rear." When he had despoiled Samaria and quelled a rebellion in Arpad, Damascus, and Samaria, by crushing a usurper in Hamath who had caused and led it, he turned his arms against the south, and having formerly struck heavy blows on the borders of Egypt, now proceeded to follow up his conquests. The immediate occasion of this enterprise, doubtless one long meditated, was the revolt of Ashdod, as its name imports, a stronghold, the Azotus of Acts viii. 40. With Ashdod other neighboring powers were combined. Against this alliance Sargon enjoyed his wonted success; and although he may not be said to have so conquered Egypt that it at once became a part of his empire, yet, by the conquest of the lands adjoining it on the northeast, he prepared the way for its final overthrow under the arms of his grandson Esar-haddon.

We close these notices of Sargon by a remark respecting his policy of "changing the abodes" of conquered nations. This

was not first adopted by him, for his predecessors had used it, as we have seen, notably in the course of Tiglath Pileser; but he carried out the plan to the fullest practicable extent. His deportation of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Israel was not at first supplied by importations from abroad. "And the Lord sent lions among them." 2 Kings xvii. 25. This ascription of the visitation to the direct agency of the Lord is entirely correct. But it was not a miraculous agency. It was of the orderings of that same wise and holy providence by which such an event follows the depletion of a country, and against the occurrence of which, in the time of the occupation of Palestine by the Israelites under Joshua, God was pleased to ordain that the native inhabitants should not be cut off too suddenly. Deut. vii. 22. It was not in Palestine only that Sargon carried out this policy. We find he transported the Tibarim to Assyria and replaced them with Assyrians; Hamath and Damascus had the places of captives taken to Assyria supplied from Armenia. Similar vacancies in Zayros and in Ashdod and Commukha were filled in like manner from other countries, Assyria and those of vanquished people. Thus the stronger races were weakened by dispersion, and the weaker races by the sundering at once of all the ties which bind natives of a country to their soil. Sargon's successors, down to Esar-haddon and the kings of Babylon, as Nebuchadnezzar, pursued the same course. In this way they proposed to strengthen the empire, otherwise endangered by its very extent, and enforce peace and order, as much by policy (if not more,) as by war.

6. Sennacherib, "the great king, the king of Assyria," 2 Kings xviii. 19, succeeded his father, Sargon. Our readers are doubtless familiar with the thrice-told narrative of his expeditions against Judah and Jerusalem. 2 Kings xviii., xix.; 2 Chron. xxxii. 1-22; and Isaiah xxxvi., xxxvii. It is needless to occupy our limited space with full quotations of either of these portions of Scripture. Those not familiar with the narrative will better understand what follows by a careful perusal of at least the chapters of Kings or Isaiah.

We have very full monumental records of Sennacherib. The VOL. XXIX., NO. 3—13.

narrative of his relations to Judah opens thus: "Because Hezekiah, king of Judah, would not submit to my yoke, I came up against him, and by force of arms . . . I took forty-six of his strong fenced cities; and of the smaller towns I took and plundered *a countless number*. From these places I captured and carried off, as spoil, 200,150 people, old and young, male and female, together with horses and mares, asses and camels, oxen, sheep, a countless multitude. Hezekiah himself I shut up in Jerusalem as in a cage, building towns round the city, to fence him in, and raising banks of earth against the gates, so as to prevent escape. Then upon this Hezekiah there fell the fear of the power of my arms, and he sent out to me the chiefs and elders of Jerusalem, with thirty talents of gold and eight hundred talents of silver,* and divers treasures, a rich and immense booty." Read 2 Kings xviii. 7 and 13-16. The apparent discrepancy in the "three hundred talents of silver," verse 14, and the "eight hundred" of Sennacherib's statement, was formerly variously and perhaps satisfactorily explained. But more recent discoveries show that the talent of silver was different in weight from that of gold, both in Palestine and Assyria, and that in Palestine three talents of the heavier weight equalled eight talents of the lighter in Assyria. These statements are made on the authority of most eminent Assyriologists and numismatologists, who will not be suspected of special *inclinations* to sustain the credibility of the Bible.

In verses 14-17 of the same chapter, we are told that Sennacherib was at Lachish at the time of the above-mentioned events. Of this fact we have bas-relief representations and inscriptions in explanation, showing the king conducting the siege, and others which represent him, after the conquest, seated on a throne, declaring the fate of captives: to some, flaying alive; to some, impaling—both means of a most cruel death; to others, deportation; and to a few, release. That the annals of Sennacherib contain no allusion to the disaster he suffered in the loss of his large army, is only consistent with the custom of all such monarchs, to record

* More than \$1,000,000.

only victories and successes. The Assyrians recorded the loss of the Egyptian capital, and the Egyptians, through Herodotus, the account (though incorrect in causes and details,) of this disaster to the Assyrians. In his annals, Sennacherib gives a list of eight names, "all kings of the *Hittites*," a general title of the various tribes or nations on the western sea. Among these is "Menahem of Samaria." The best and not improbable explanation of what might otherwise be reckoned a glaring anachronism, is the rational supposition that a descendant of Menahem and of his name undertook, on Hoshea's death, depopulation of the land, and general revolution, to reëstablish and occupy the throne of Israel.

Sennacherib may be said to have brought Assyria to the height of its glory in arms, in arts, and in political power. But his declining years were embittered by the efforts of Babylon to throw off the Assyrian authority, and he died the victim of the ambition of his sons. It is interesting to notice that his contemporary, Hezekiah, marks, in his history and reign, at once the culmination of the Judæan portion of the separated kingdom of Rehoboam, and also the first signs of its gradual decline. Sennacherib, who, having survived many years and warred successfully (after his great disaster) in other regions, had no more come against Judah, and had thus left Hezekiah a time of peace and prosperity, justifying the comprehensive eulogy of 2 Chron. xxxi. 21: "In every work that he began in the house of God and in the law, . . . to seek his God, he did it with all his heart and prospered." A eulogy as appropriate to his pious life after as before his conflict with "the great king." In his sin, in the matter of the messengers of Merodach-baladan, "God left him to try him," and then announced the final downfall of his kingdom; and though there was "fear in his latter days," they were saddened by the prospect of a melancholy future for his descendants and his people. No divine message comforted the closing years of Sennacherib, and to him no prophet lifted the veil from the scenes of the departing glory of his kingdom.

7. Esar-haddon ascended the throne through the bloody scenes of a civil and fratricidal war. The half brothers, the murderers

of their common father, were subdued. He then, perhaps to put an end to the continual outbreaks of the Babylonians, proposed to unite the kingdoms of Assyria and Babylon under one government, and for the first ten years occupied during part of his vacations from numerous wars the palace he had built in Babylon, and ruled over both kingdoms. Towards the close of his reign, he abdicated the throne in Nineveh in favor of his son, and ruled in Babylon alone.

The inscriptions of Esar-haddon, supplemented by those of Assur-bani-pal, his son and successor, give us evidence confirming the record in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11-13, of the captivity of Manasseh: "The Lord brought upon (the people) the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns." This is perhaps better rendered, took him *with the thorns*, by which the nose or lip was pierced, in order to insert the hook with which captives were led, and of which the *bas-reliefs* present pictures. So God says to Sennacherib, Is. xxxvii. 29, "I will put my hook in thy nose." As the word here rendered *hook* is of common etymological origin with that for *thorn*, Job xl. 26, (E. V. xli. 2,) which is also used in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, this last passage might very well be rendered, "with the hooks," "and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon." We have already stated that Babylon and Nineveh were in turn the royal residences. Though Esar-haddon is not named in our passage, the captivity was effected by the "captains of the host;" and in his inscription he mentions Manasseh as one of twenty-two kings brought before him, as it seems, for review. Though the place of the review is not named, there is much in the context to intimate that it was Babylon. If it was Nineveh, that does not contradict the statement as to Manasseh's ultimate destination.

There is no very positive statement of Manasseh's release found on the monumental records; but there are statements in an inscription by Assur-bani-pal, which may be so interpreted. The question, however, is not regarded as of sufficient importance to justify us in occupying so much of our limited space as would be necessary for its proper solution. But the great feat of Esar-

haddon, so fully completed that his son was only engaged for a while in quelling some revolts, was the conquest of Egypt, which Sargon had begun and Sennacherib prosecuted. Nahum iii. 3-10, addressing Nineveh, says: "Art thou better than No-Amon [E. V. populous No, or nourishing No, *i. e.*, Thebes,] that was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round about it? . . . Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was without end [E. V. infinite.] Put and Lubim were thy helpers. Yet was she carried away; . . . her young children also were dashed in pieces at the top of all her streets." Various hypotheses have been advanced respecting the author, measure, and time of the great overthrow, by the mention of which the prophet warns the kingdom of Assyria of a like ruin a century before its fall. The inscriptions of Esar-haddon and his son tell the story. The cruelty of all Eastern nations, and especially of Assyria at that period, leaves no room to question the correctness of the prophet's picture. Esar-haddon subdued Egypt, drove the king Tirkaheh to the mountains of Ethiopia, and thenceforward boastfully styled himself either "king of the kings of Egypt and conqueror of Ethiopia," or "king of Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Meroe, and Ethiopia."

Esar-haddon, however, having fallen into ill-health during the latter part of his life, Tirkaheh returned, drove out the Assyrian governors from Egypt, and resumed the throne. But his success was short-lived. Assur-bani-pal soon suppressed the revolt; and the chief boasting of his inscriptions is in the form of recounting what he had accomplished, in securing the conquests of his father and grandfather or repressing revolts.

By the blow now struck, the power of Egypt was stunned. Although the efforts of its people to retrieve its independency were occasionally successful, the success was temporary. The nation steadily declined, and has more and more fully verified Ezekiel's terrible picture, chapters xxix.-xxxii. It has long become "the basest of kingdoms," "ruled over nations no more," but ruled mostly till 350 B. C. by Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, and thenceforward by Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks, so that there has been, for all these centuries, "no more a

prince of the land." Isaiah had been sent (in the year when Sargon sent Tartan to Ashdod, Is. xx. 1-4) with a symbolised prophecy. As Isaiah was divinely directed (symbolically) "to walk naked and barefoot three years," "so shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners and the Ethiopians captives . . . naked and barefoot . . . to the shame of Egypt."

Connected with the capture of Manasseh, Esar-haddon, Ezra iv. 2-9, probably effected the last deportation of the people of Israel, and introduced the people whose names are given in this passage: "Dinaïtes, Apharsathchites, (probably same as) Apharsites, the Tarpelites, the Archevites, the Babylonians, the Susanchites (of Susianna), the Dehavites, and the Elamites." Before noticing the correspondence of the nationalities represented by these names with Esar-haddon's accounts of his importations, let us see what light his language throws on the exportation of those whose places these supplied. He writes: "I gathered the kings of the Hittites and of the side of the sea, all of them." These are general terms for the inhabitants of Palestine and the country east of it, as far as the Desert and to the northeast to the Euphrates. According to Joshua i. 4, the country given to Israel was from "the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates," (south and southeastern and north and northeastern boundaries) called "all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea," the Mediterranean, the western boundary. So Shalmaneser II., in his inscriptions, uses *Hittites* in this wide sense. Heth, second son of Canaan, was, Gen. x. 15-18, associated with Sidon, as progenitors of the various tribes which made up the families of the "Canaanites." Now Esar-haddon had "gathered" the "kings" of this region, and he includes in this, as we learn from the context, multitudes of people and other spoils. He then adds: "People, the conquest of my bow (or arms), from *the lands and sea of the rising sun in the midst*, I placed, and my general governor over them I appointed." That is, he transported the people with their kings to his dominions, and replaced them by Apharsites (Persians), Babylonians, . . . Susanchites and Elamites "of the lands and the sea of the rising sun." This great importation is to be distinguished

from the settlers imported by Sargon, as they seem to have been for the most part from countries of the more remote east and the Caspian Sea.

Esar-haddon, we have seen, had transferred to his son the dominion of Assyria at Nineveh, and established his own government over Babylon. Under the successor of Assur-bani-pal, the Assyrian empire fell into decay, already greatly weakened by the inroads of Scythians; and the Babylonians succeeded to the possession of the southern, western, and large parts of the northern portions. Into the many questions connected with the descent of the kingdom from the rule of Esar-haddon to that of Nebuchadnezzar, it is not pertinent to our present purpose to enter, except to notice the general agreement, that he was the son of Nabopolassar, a general of the last Assyrian monarch, who, sent to resist the attacks of the Medes and Babylonians, had renounced allegiance to his monarch and joined the enemies who succeeded in overthrowing the kingdom. It seems generally conceded that in Nebuchadnezzar the Babylonian kingdom found at once its most eminently successful monarch in extending its authority, and the most distinguished in contributing to the grandeur and elegance of the capital and advancing a material civilisation of the most splendidly luxurious kind.

. 8. No historical annals of Nebuchadnezzar's like those of his predecessors have yet been discovered. This is less to be regretted, as his era approaches very closely that of authentic history. Indeed Berosus, whose credibility we have seen sustained by the inscriptions as to important facts, was a native of Babylon, and says he witnessed the defeat of the Egyptians by Nebuchadnezzar.

The monumental inscriptions of preceding reigns make frequent allusions to the contests of Assyria and Egypt. The geographical position of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel subjected them to the attacks of first one and then another of those great powers, each being desirous to secure the alliance or vassalage of the Jews so as to facilitate a passage one to the other. Meanwhile, in the waning condition of both Israel and Judah, such a relation was very tempting, especially in times of weak faith in

God or apostasy from him: We see in the history of Manasseh, Jonah, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah, how all this was illustrated. In this way, during the threatened attacks of Nebuchadnezzar as recorded by Jeremiah, internal strifes in Judah weakened its power of defence and hastened the catastrophe of the nation.

But though Nebuchadnezzar left no historical annals that have come to light, his account of his great buildings, fortifications, canals, and reservoirs, of which remains are still traceable, and the immensely greater number of bricks stamped with his name than with that of any other, are strikingly illustrative confirmations of the notices of his greatness contained in the Bible. Indeed, they form an extended commentary on Daniel's description of him, in unfolding to him his memorable dream, related in Daniel, chapter v., and especially verse 30: "Is not this great Babylon, which I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" He built the great wall of Babylon estimated to contain 5,400,000,000 cubic feet. The wall indeed was rather rebuilt and enlarged by him. One reservoir made by him was 140 miles in circumference and 180 feet deep, the water used for irrigation; another, in Babylon, of vast dimensions. One of his many canals was 400 miles long, the traces still remaining. About one hundred sites of ruins, in the region lying around Babylon, attest his vast enterprises by containing bricks on which his name is inscribed. Well might this city be called the "beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," "the golden city," "the glory of kingdoms." Its "broad walls" mentioned by Jeremiah are described by the king; and its impregnable position, effected under his orders by the labors of thousands of captives from conquered nations, bade defiance to all the known methods of besiegers. In the inscription above mentioned the king uses this singular language: "Four years . . . in all my dominions I did not build a high place of power; the precious treasures of my kingdom I did not lay up. In Babylon, buildings for myself and for the honor of my kingdom, I did not lay out"—other negations follow, to the effect that he refrained from the worship of "Merodach my lord." No similar instance of the record of a king's inaction can be adduced.

To what period can allusion be made, unless to that of the miraculous punishment inflicted by God, as recorded in the fourth chapter of Daniel?

9. We conclude these notices with the case of Belshazzar. For a long time the confirmations of the Scripture account in Daniel, chapter v., derived from profane writers, failed to explain the apparent discrepancy with profane history, in that the name of Belshazzar is not mentioned by any author. Nabonadius (by Herodotus called Labynetus) is the name of the king ruling Babylon when taken by Cyrus. No satisfactory method of identifying Belshazzar with him or any other had been proposed. Now, however, on the cylinders of Nabonadius, discovered in the ruins of Mugheir, we find an inscription, mentioning the association of Nabonadius and his son *Belshar-uzur*, in a prayer, asking the protection of the gods for them, in terms indicating the co-sovereignty of the son. That he is spoken of in Daniel's report of the queen's language to Belshazzar as a son of Nebuchadnezzar ("thy father Nebuchadnezzar"), creates no difficulty, in view of the well known wide sense of the terms "father" and "son." The queen was, possibly, the widow of Nebuchadnezzar; for it is evident by the best chronology that Belshazzar was very young at that time. Nabonadius, we know from profane history, was pursued by Cyrus and taken at Borsippa, whither he had fled, after a disastrous battle fought before Cyrus invested Babylon.

10. We now propose to present a few specimens of illustrations of Scripture passages, taken at random from some hundreds collected in our inquiries on the subject of this article.

(1.) We read in Genesis iii. 1: "The serpent was more subtle (or cunning) than any beast." We remember our Saviour's language, "Be wise as serpents." Now we find in the Babylonian and Assyrian mythology representations of the god *Hoa*, who, among other attributes assigned him, has those of "knowledge" and "understanding," and is called the "teacher of man." His emblems were the "wedge" or "arrowhead," as the alleged inventor of the cuneiform writing, and also, more conspicuous, the

VOL. XXIX., NO. 3.—14.

serpent, thus showing the existence of a traditionary knowledge of the fact stated in Scripture.

(2.) In Joshua vii. 21, we have mentioned "a goodly Babylonish garment" among the articles secreted by Achan and which had excited his covetousness by their value. On some of the monuments of the most ancient periods are seen the representations of dresses which by their appearance on the bas-relief seem evidently of a most costly character, and though the texture is not obvious, the folds evince them of a high finish and finely woven. At the least, we have thus evidence of the early progress of the arts in Babylon which this narrative implies.

(3.) The reader of 1 Samuel xvii. 38, is disposed to inquire of what use an armor, such as Saul lent David, could be in David's case, who was only expert in slinging. But we find that Sennacherib's slingers were dressed in a "coat of mail to the waist, a tunic to the knees, closely fitting trousers, and short boots or greaves."

(4.) The Scripture accounts of military operations are most fully sustained by these sources. In 2 Samuel xx. 15, "They cast up a bank (a heap of earth with stones and wood) against the city;" 2 Kings xix. 32, "nor cast a bank against it," as methods by which besiegers approached the walls to shoot over them. In Ezekiel xxiii. 24, are mentioned "chariots and wagons" to convey the army, and "bucklers, helmets, and shields," defensive armor; Jeremiah iv. 2^a, "horsemen and bowmen;" vi. 23, "the bow and spear;" li. 3, the "archer," the "spear" and "sword;" 2 Samuel xvii. 25; Nahum iii. 3, as the means of offensive warfare; and preëminently the war-chariot, in places too numerous to cite. Of all these and whatever are mentioned in Scripture as appurtenances of war, the monuments give in bass-relief profuse representations, so that for a pictorial Bible nothing better could be supplied for illustrating the military narratives than copies of these works of ancient Assyrian art.

(5.) In the boastful speech of the Assyrian king, Isaiah x. 8-11, 13, 14, and especially the messages delivered from Sennacherib to the Jews by Rabshakeh (the chief butler) recorded in

2 Kings xviii. 32-35, xix. 10-13, we have the counterparts, in specimen, in the annals of Shalmaneser, Sargon, Tiglath-pileser, as well as Sennacherib; and the description of the haughtiness of the kings of Assyria by Ezekiel, xxxi. 3-10, and of the king of Babylon, by Isaiah, xiv. 6, 13, 14, and Daniel, v. 23, might have appeared drawn, in substance, from the annals preserved in the inscriptions.

(6.) The cruelties practised on the 'vanquished, as death, by flaying the victim alive, by impaling, by decapitation, by burning, or by torture; the maiming, mutilation, or blinding of prisoners, and slaying sons before a parent, Jer. lii. 10, 11; sending captives into the hopelessness of slavery, or that of expatriation, with similar specimens of inhumanity, well sustain Jeremiah vi. 23, "they are cruel and have no mercy;" Habakkuk i. 6, "a bitter and hasty (rash) nation" who "march through the land to possess dwellings *not theirs*;" Nahum ii. 13, Assyria, as a lion, who "still tore in pieces for his whelps and strangled for his lionesses;" and iii. 1, denounced as a "city of blood;" Isaiah xxxiii. 19, "a fierce people," and many other scriptural statements of similar purport. Indeed, we may well say that there is scarcely a feature of the character and conduct of the Assyrians and Babylonians drawn by the inspired penman which is not vividly and faithfully portrayed by the inscriptions and the stone or clay pictures which they explain. The reader of the Bible who has been rather inclined to regard some of the statements respecting these nations given by the writers of Scripture, especially the prophets, as poetical exaggerations, may dismiss all such views. To a great extent many of such statements are rather below than above the realities, as presented by these imperishable and unvitiated records. The heaviest charges against the Jewish people for their treatment of enemies, held by sceptics as either adequate to destroy our confidence in the inspired records, or at least to detract from the divine authority of their institutions, even when such charges apply only to sporadic cases, pale, in every element disgraceful to human nature, before the delineations of these heathen nations drawn by their own royal authors.

(7.) We close these summary illustrations by a brief allusion to the consonance of the statements of Scripture and the monumental records as to the extent and power of these ancient empires. The Scriptures give statements of the extent of Assyria, by indicating the regions incorporated into the empire through the names of representative nations. Sometimes a comprehensive statement is followed by such an enumeration as has been intimated. This is the language of the haughty monarch, 2 Kings xix. 13, "Thou has heard what the kings of Assyria have done *to all lands* by destroying them utterly." And it was more than a vain boast. In connection with this history, we find the names of all representative nationalities then known, recognised as those of vanquished people, Babylon, Egypt, and Ethiopia alone excepted. Media, the Mesopotamian lands, and all west and north, except Judah; and in preceding notices of the conquests of Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, and Sargon, there is mention of particular nations, either as subdued by Assyrian arms, or as those to which the captured Israelites were removed. Then we find among the latter, Babylon, and the wars of Sargon had already brought Egypt and Ethiopia into that subject condition, that, though they continued to struggle for independence, the Assyrian power finally predominated. And when Assyria had fallen, the seat of empire was but transferred to Babylon, which next appears in Scripture as *the* oriental empire. Before it Egypt succumbed, and soon passes out of view of the Bible writings as an independent kingdom. Of the power of these empires, the Scriptures, in the books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Daniel, give vivid delineations. However brittle the tie by which tributary nations were held, till Babylon fell, she was the "ruler of nations," Isaiah xiv. 6. Of Nebuchadnezzar, says Daniel, v. 19, "all people, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew; and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he set up; and whom he would he put down." And the rapid rise and extension of power to which Assyria attained during the period from Tiglath-pileser to Sennacherib, or Babylon during the period from Esar-haddon to Nebuchadnezzar, was followed by even more rapid disintegra-

tion in both cases. For in these empires the conquered nations were not actually incorporated so as to be integral parts of one great nation, but only subdued and ruled by the genius and martial power of monarchs for the time being. The effeminacy and weakness of Nabopolassar's successor brought on the decay of Assyria, and the Babylonian empire of Nebuchadnezzar fell to pieces under his inefficient successors. This aspect of oriental empires is clearly illustrated in that of David, which in less than fifty years was divided, and the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, wasting strength in wars against each other, fell the prey of the stronger empires of the East.

IV. One great result of these enquiries will be stated in these concluding remarks.

For several centuries, indeed by the earliest defenders of the inspired authority and authenticity of the Scriptures, one of the strongest evidences adduced has been the striking fulfilment of prophecies respecting Assyria and Babylon. The howling waste and utter ruin and desolation of the great capitals and surrounding regions for two thousand years have been the wonder of all travellers in the East. We need not detain the reader by more than this reference to a subject so fully and ably presented by Keith and other writers on the apologetic value of fulfilled prophecy. These great cities were the ministers of God's judgments on his apostate people. In turn, they became the illustrations of his terrible indignation and wrath for their pride and cruelty, their luxury, lust, and debasing vices. Then having fulfilled prophecy in their overthrow, an overthrow even more wonderful than the splendor and power had been, they were left, for centuries, in their ruins, the mournful and silent, yet eloquent, witnesses of the truth of the divine word. Men looked for no more; but God, who, in his wise and holy providence, had preserved his once chosen and then rejected people the enduring miraculous fulfilment of prophecy, has, by his same providence, now summoned from the dust and desolations of generations new witnesses to his truth, only less wonderful, in that they are not miraculous fulfilments of prophecy. They tell the story of

the Bible, so far as the events narrated are synchronous with those related in the Scriptures: not *exactly*, that no suggestion of collusion may arise, yet *substantially*, that the testimony may be unsuspected. The record is in no known language of any age since it was used. The material could not be tampered with, nor the writing forged. The decipherers and translators have been representatives of no special type of an evangelical Christian faith, and some of no implicit Christian faith of any kind. They have not been of any one nation alone, and of at least three distinct languages. Human ingenuity could not devise a method to secure a testimony more trustworthy, more free from all grounds of suspicion. That the testimony is not to *all* the historical records of the Bible is of course admitted. But they are to a great extent to those which are of a representative character; and the confidence thus induced for these, by a perfectly logical course of reasoning, must attach to the rest to a most satisfactory extent.

As before intimated, we are probably only on the threshold of these inquiries. Another generation may stand amazed in view of new confirmations and illustrations that any especially of Christian lands ever yielded to doubt respecting passages now not clearly understood. Sceptics, yet professed interpreters of the Bible, but a short time before these discoveries bore fruit, denied (as is usual) what they found inconsistent with their *a priori* decisions or their imperfect historical knowledge: such as the biblical record of the founders and founding of Babylon and Nineveh, and the invasion of Chedorlaomer. All such scepticism has been set aside by these records. And we may rest confidently assured that from the same sources other similar difficulties will be virtually removed, and the day not be distant. when, with one accord, all will acknowledge all that "Moses in the law and the prophets have written" to be the wonderful, the solemn, and the effective verities of the God of truth.