The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Hilprecht's *Assyrica Assyrica, Eine Nachlese auf dem Gebiete der Assyriologie*, Dr von H. V. Hilprecht. I. Teil mit drei Tafeln. Pp. 136. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1894. 7 Mk.

George A. Barton

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 04 / May 1895, pp 215 - 217
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201765, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201765

How to cite this article:

George A. Barton (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 215-217 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201765

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

introduced into the text, is οὐ (for οὐτω) τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα ὑποτιθέασιν in 9, 5, 1451b 13, but about this great doubt may be felt. I should prefer to understand ὀνόματα ἐπιτιθέμενῃ just before in the sense of 'while giving' or 'though it gives names.' How could Aristotle say that 'poetry,' that is tragedy and epic as well as comedy, gave expressive names? They were only given in comic writing. In 4, 3, 1448b 10 (τὸ συμβαῖνον ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων) parallel passages seem to show that τὰ ἔργα are not 'works

of art,' but 'real experience.' Cf. 26, 4 1462a 19 and several places elsewhere. Let me conclude by submitting in turn to Prof. Butcher's criticism an emendation that occurred to me when I was comparing his translation with the text. In 24, 3, 1459b 21 τραγωδιῶν τῶν εἰς μίαν ἀκρόασιν τιθεμένων should we perhaps read καθιεμένων? Καθίεναι is a technical expression in this sense, whereas τιθέναι is used rather of instituting a competition or offering a prize.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

HILPRECHT'S ASSYRICA.

ASSYRICA, *Eine Nachlese auf dem Gebiete der Assyriologie*, von Dr. H. V. HILPRECHT. I. Teil mit drei Tafeln. Pp. 136. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1894. 7 Mk.

THIS work is Vol. iii. No. I. of the 'Publications of the University of Pennsylvania—Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology.' In the publication of this series the University is contributing not to its own advancement only but to that of the cause of literature and science as well. American scholarship has in the past contributed too little to the advance of knowledge, partly no doubt because the average professor cannot afford to publish a work so purely scientific that its sale will be unremunerative. An institution which makes it possible for the specialist in its faculty to put before the public the results of his investigation, renders him, itself and scholarship an important service.

The contents of such a series is necessarily miscellaneous. In that of which we speak, *Recent Archaeological Explorations in the Valley of the Delaware River* finds a place in the same volume with an article *On the Articular Infinitive in Demosthenes*. As these volumes are, however, published in separate parts, each of which may be purchased by itself, the miscellaneous character of the entire volume is no drawback to the usefulness of its parts. If Professor Hilprecht's little volume is an index of the worth of the series, many branches of learning are to be congratulated that the University of Pennsylvania has made public in this way the work of its professors.

Assyrica, like the series in which it appears, is a miscellaneous publication of articles on themes of cuneiform investigation, or, as its title characterizes it, 'glean-

ings from the territory of Assyriology.' It contains seven essays, each upon a different topic, though some of the subjects treated are closely related to each other. A polemic tone pervades most of the book, since three of the essays are called forth by criticisms of European scholars on Professor Hilprecht's *Cuneiform Texts*, published in 1893, and two others are designed to correct mistakes made by two other European Assyriologists. This polemic tone is not, however, except in one or two instances, conspicuous and one is grateful to the critics for thus inducing the accomplished author to state more fully than he had done in his previous work the reasons for some of the positions there taken.

The first essay, entitled *Die Urkunde aus der Zeit des Königs Bēlnādinapi und Herrn Professor Oppert's Textemendationen*, was called forth, as its title implies, by the publication by Oppert in vol. viii. of the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* and also the *Journal Officiel de la République Française* of a transliteration and translation of the text Hilprecht had edited in his *Cuneiform Texts* pl. 30 and 31. Oppert in his interpretation of this text had, in the absence of all documentary proof, conjecturally emended Hilprecht's readings at several points in a way somewhat harassing to the American palaeographer, especially as 'bad copying' on the part of the editor was urged as the occasion for some of the emendations. The inscription in question is a most important one, since it is an account of the way in which Bēlnādinapi, a king otherwise unknown but whom the document shows to have been the successor of Nebuchadrezzar I. of Babylon, restored, on complaint of the owner, the proper boundaries to a piece of land which Ekarra-

ikisha, the governor of the province, had unlawfully reduced in size. This glimpse into the legal processes of an age long gone by, as well as the revelation of a new royal personage, together with his place in history, were so important that immediately on the publication of Hilprecht's *Cuneiform Texts* Jensen published a short article on it in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, which was soon followed by Oppert's interpretation of the whole inscription.

In the essay before us Professor Hilprecht has himself interpreted the inscription with his usual care and skill, vindicating fully the correctness of his previous publication of the text.

The second essay, *Eine missverständene Tafel aus Sippar*, is an interpretation of a little tablet brought from Babylonia by Dr. Ward in 1885, on which is inscribed the record of a votive offering consisting of five hides together with a humped or Indian ox. This tablet Mr. Pinches of the British Museum had published in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, April-June 1893, understanding it to 'relate to the substitution of an offering of a certain kind of merchandise for the single head of cattle due.' Hilprecht's interpretation turns mainly on his rendering of the phrase *ina libbi*—an interpretation which is well substantiated by the references which he gives. The right understanding of this phrase, together with the elucidation of *gi-la-du* by גִּלְדּוּ, 'skin' or 'hide,' Job xvi. 15, makes

the meaning of the tablet clear and proves it to be a simple votive inscription.

The third essay, *Ein neue Zahlwörterfragment aus Nippur*, has no polemic tendency. It is a description in German of a fragment of a contract tablet from Niffer which contains several numerical forms syllabically spelled, some of which were not previously known. Professor Hilprecht had previously published a shorter account of the same in English in the *Oriental Studies* of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, and promises to give us the cuneiform text in a later volume of his *Texts*. The tablet gives for the first time the following feminine forms of the numerals 6, 7, 8 and 9, viz: *šiš-šit-ti* *sib-ti*, *sa-man-ti*, *til-ti* and are a welcome addition to our knowledge.

With the fourth essay, *Bemerkung zu Winckler's Altorientalische Forschungen* ii., Dr. Hilprecht's answer to some of Winckler's strictures on the introduction to his *Cuneiform Texts* begins. Winckler objects to Hilprecht's arrangement of the Kassite or

Kossaeen kings, and holds that Kadashman-Bil and Kadashman-Turgu are two different persons, while Hilprecht replies with many analogies to support their identification, making as it seems to us a convincing proof. Hilprecht's remarks at the end of this essay, disproving Winckler's explanation of *uknū* as = 'antimony,' present a line of argument which Professor Haupt substantially followed simultaneously with the Philadelphia Professor, having published his results in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* for July 1894. These gentlemen are undoubtedly right, as opposed to Winckler, in identifying *uknū* with lapis lazuli as Lyon had previously done, *Å-BOR* with magnesia, and in ruling antimony out of the case.

The next essay, *Die Ergänzung der Namen zweier Kassitenkönige*, leads Professor Hilprecht to discuss the chronology of the Kassite kings, and here he is brought once more into conflict with Winckler's views as he has expressed himself in his *Altorientalische Forschungen*. The argument of Hilprecht is here based largely on statements of Nabonidus the last King of Babylon, whom he rightly regards as good authority, and is marked by close, logical and convincing reasoning.

The sixth essay on *König AN-MA-AN der Königliste und Fürst AN-A-AN von Erech*, is a reply to a bold hypothesis of Professor Hommel, published in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, for Nov. 1893. Dr. Hilprecht has little difficulty in successfully puncturing the hypothesis.

Not the least valuable of these essays is the last, entitled *Die kielschriftliche Legende auf dem 'Boss of Tarkondemos'*. The 'Boss of Tarkondemos,' first brought to the notice of scholars by Mordtmann, was given this name by Sayce, to whom is due the credit of having recognized its importance as a Hittite object. It is circular in form and was apparently the boss of a shield. It pictures a man whose shoes with their pointed toes attest his Hittite nationality. It bears a legend in cuneiform and in Hittite characters, and affords a possible key for a beginning of Hittite decipherment, as all scholars have recognized. Sayce in *The Hittites* translated the Assyrian legend '*Tar qu-u-dim-me*, king of the country *Erme*,' while other scholars read the name of the country variously *Zu*, *Zume*, 'the city of waters,' etc. Professor Hilprecht reads it '*Tar-ku-u-dim-mi*, king of the land of *Me-tan*,' identifying *Me-tan* with the Metanni of the El-Amarna tablets. This reading is palaeo-

graphically probable, or we may be sure such an expert in Assyrian palaeography as Professor Hilprecht would not have put it forward, and on careful examination commends itself. It has also the merit of representing a country of which we have some information and seems to be a little step towards the solution of the much-vexed Hittite problem.

These disconnected essays profess to be nothing more than chips from the workshop of a busy scholar, but they are contributions to the discussion of a variety of topics which no Assyriologist can afford to do without, and which are not without interest to the classical scholar, since such investigations help us to a better understanding of the people from whom Greece borrowed some of her elementary principles of art, and clear up for us many problems in such writers as Herodotus and Xenophon. The book is

characterized by broad and accurate learning, close, logical reasoning and a fertility of hypothesis happily combined with sobriety and good judgment.

It is to be regretted, from the standpoint of the English and American reader, that this valuable little book is written in German, though that will not affect its use by scholars. If, however, the statement of Professor Sayce, made at the Oriental Congress in London in 1892, were ever true, that 'Assyriology is one of the fashionable studies of the day in America,' the publication of such a work as this in German will, we fear, place it beyond the reach of those who study because it is the fashion.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

*Bryn Mawr College,
Pennsylvania.*

PAIS' HISTORY OF SICILY AND MAGNA GRAECIA.

Storia della Sicilia e della Magna Grecia, di ETTORE PAIS, Prof. ord. nella Università di Pisa. Vol. i. Carlo Clausen, Torino e Palermo, 1894. Pp. 623. 4to.

THIS is the first instalment of a work which seems likely to extend over many volumes. The four chapters which the volume contains cover little more than half the space and are of the nature of introductory dissertations: (1) on the ancient inhabitants of South Italy before the arrival of the Greek colonists; (2) the ancient inhabitants of Sicily before the arrival of the Greek colonists; (3) the foundation of the Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily; (4) the extension of Greek colonization in Italy and Sicily from the end of the eighth to the beginning of the fifth century. The other half of the volume is occupied by sixteen appendices for the most part on points already treated at some length in the text; while two—on the 'sources' and on the chronology of the settlements—often referred to at the foot of the page, are still held over for the second volume, which has been kept back partly to enable Professor Pais by renewed visits to South Italy and Sicily to examine the monuments lately brought to light by Paolo Orsi and Antonino Salinas, 'l'illustre direttore del Museo nazionale di Palermo,' by means of which he hopes to be able to resolve various questions of historical

topography. The work therefore promises to be one of considerable magnitude. It is in fact in a certain diffuseness, and in a tendency to discuss at great length points of minor importance, sometimes only remotely connected with his subject, that the chief defect of Professor Pais' learned and laborious work consists. Details of every kind are accumulated and discussed sometimes to the point of exhausting our patience, and the same proposition is restated and reviewed with what seems unnecessary and sometimes tiresome reiteration; while the conclusion to which the writer wishes to bring us is not always drawn sharply and clearly. It would also have been of great assistance in reading such a book to have had the help of a marginal analysis or the mechanical aid of a more consistent division of the matter in paragraphs. In its laborious collection and discussion of the ancient authorities, in knowledge of all that has been done by scholars, historians, and archaeologists on the subject, the book is admirable. Many will differ with certain of his conclusions, but no one will be able to say that Professor Pais has been ignorant of what others have said, or has passed over difficulties. He is perhaps too much under the dominion of a ruling idea. He has, unlike Mr. Freeman, joined the story of Magna Graecia with that of Sicily, rightly judging that in origin and historical development they are one; and