

assert what no unprejudiced thinker and no philosophic student of religion will deny. And this I believe to be the real interior truth of the Athanasian doctrine, albeit Athanasius himself may not have seized it in its fulness, as certainly he did not unfold it in his teaching.'

Who are the Maoris? This is the title of a book by Mr. Alfred K. Newman, published by Messrs. Whitcombe & Tombs (7s. 6d. net), and this is the question which it is written to answer. 'I claim,' says Mr. Newman, 'that this book contains evidence that cannot be criticised away, and that it establishes: (1) That the Maoris came from Northern India; (2) that their cradle land Hawaiki was India; (3) that I have recovered the lost history of the Maori race; (4) that I have conclusively proved the route of the Great Migration from the banks of the Indus to New Zealand; and (5) that the Maoris are an Aryan-Mongolic people but dominantly Caucasian.'

These are great claims to make, but this anthropologist knows what he is about. The array of evidence is very strong and it is presented effectively. More than that, the book contains much valuable information on religion and folklore, and even not a little illustration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. 'Some Maoris were wailing over a

death. A friend of mine, a Hebrew, who heard it, exclaimed, "My God, the lamentation of my people, the very air, everything is the same." The author has a great opinion of the Maoris as a race, and great hope for their future. Altogether the book is a notable one, not to be overlooked by the student of ethnology or of religion.

Since Wordsworth's 'Ode to Duty,' has there been a finer persuasive to the obedience of that

Stern Daughter of the Voice of God

than this book on *The Foundations of Duty*, written by the Right Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net)? Nay, it is a surer persuasive, for Dr. Diggle shows that Duty done is the source of all joy in life, and duty is done out of true love. The great error of our time, he says, is to assert our rights and forget our duties. We have rights, but in the assertion of them we are sure to let in vanity or jealousy: in the doing of our duty there is only unselfishness and peace. Our duties are to all about us—God, man, and the beasts. And they touch every part of our being—physical, psychical, spiritual. These fundamental things being understood, we are encouraged to face particular duties, the culture of conscience, the observance of Sunday.

Ancestor-Worship and the Deification of Babylonian Kings.

By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., LECTURER IN ASSYRIAN, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE constant additions to the mass of material from Babylonia, more especially the many inscriptions relating to temple accounts found at Drehem and Jokha, have not only revealed to us the political relations of the kings and their viceroys (*patesi* or *iššakē*), but religious beliefs and practices also receive illustration, and may prove to be of interest.

It is needful to state at the outset, however, that the documents in question give no descriptive details concerning the ceremonies attending ancestor-worship and deification—they simply record gifts of animals, probably as offerings to various gods, among which the names of four kings of Ur (about

2500 B.C.) are to be found—rulers who, as already known from contemporary documents, had been deified.

How far the deification of kings in Babylonia goes back we do not know, but it was certainly practised at an exceedingly early date, as the legends of the prehistorical heroes Enweduranki (*Euedoreschus*), Ubara-Tutu (*Otiates* for *Opartes*), Gilgameš, and many other traditional rulers, as well as the historical kings Šarru-kîn (Sargon), Šargani, and Narâm-Sin of Agadé show. Coming down to later but still archaic times, the most noteworthy instances are the kings of the dynasty of Ur already referred to—Dungi, Bûr-Sin, Šu-

Sin (generally read Gimil-Sin), and Ibi-Sin, with (apparently) others.

An exceedingly important text bearing upon the deification of kings is one in private hands, in which Sur-Engur, Dungi, and Bûr-Sin are referred to as divine personages to whom offerings were made. The record reads as follows:—

‘5 sheep, 5 full-grown kids, (for) Enim-Nannar, the king’s (Šu-Sin’s) son. Babati (is) the bringer. 1 full-grown kid (for) the throne of Sur-Engur; 1 full-grown kid (for) the throne of Dungi; 1 full-grown kid (for) the throne of Bûr-Sin.

‘1 ox (fed on) barley, in the name of Nidudua, has been slain before the king in the midst of the assembly (?). Received from Intaêa (on) the 22nd day. Certifier: Nûr-Sin, the scribe.

‘Month of the sublime festival, year Šu-Sin, the king (ascended the throne).’

Though simply an account of gifts to the temple, this inscription in reality records the performance of a great ceremony. We have first the offerings on account of Enim-Nannar, the king’s son, followed by those offered before the seats (or thrones) of the king’s immediate ancestors—father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, which last (Sur-Engur) appears as the founder of his dynasty. This took place in ‘the month of the sublime festival’ (*Iti Izin-mah*)—identified with January—in Šu-Sin’s accession year, and it seems not unlikely that the offerings were made on the occasion of the ceremonies connected with that king’s mounting the throne.

Though there is no statement to that effect, the question naturally arises, whether these were offerings to the dead, or simply on their behalf. Prepositional particles are entirely wanting in connexion with the names Enim-Nannar, Sur-Engur, Dungi, and Bûr-Sin, suggesting that they are all in the same case—in other words, that ‘of’ may be inserted before them, and that the particle in question is translatable by the preposition needed in the language used by the translator. The offerings must therefore have been ‘for’ the person (the king’s son) and the thrones of the departed kings.

This new text seems also to indicate that each king had his special seat in the temple of the god when worshipping, as did also, probably, the people of lower rank. In the time of the dynasty of Babylon, and therefore, we may assume, during the period immediately preceding, the women wor-

shippers either carried their seats to the temple, or they were carried thither for them by an inferior in position.¹

With regard to the temple in which these offerings took place, it was probably that of the god of Jokha, where the deified kings had their shrines with the divine being, whom, when alive, they adored, though they naturally occupied an inferior position. This association of deified kings with the gods of the land was no new thing, as some of the tablets of the preceding reign (that of Bûr-Sin, Šu-Sin’s father) clearly indicate:—

‘60 sheep (fed on) barley, $\frac{5}{8}$ of a qa each, 40 qa the fodder, contribution for the god of Jokha.

‘30 sheep (fed on) barley, $\frac{5}{8}$ of a qa each, 20 qa the fodder, contribution for the god Dungi and the god Bûr-Sin.

‘(From) day 1 to day 30 the total of their barley (is) 7 gur 150 qa; the total of their fodder 6 gur. Certifier: Alullul. Seal of the viceroy.

‘Month . . ., year (the king) invested the lord (priest) of Istar’s great festival hall.’

This date corresponds with the 5th of Bûr-Sin, which seems to have been the year when celebrations in honour of Dungi were largely made. Thus another tablet bearing the same date as the above records the entry into the temple of the god of Jokha, for Dungi, of 1 kid, 4 ‘sheep of barley,’ and 4 ‘sheep of grass,’ from Alullul. This same tablet also details a list of 4 ‘sheep of barley’ and 3 ‘sheep of grass,’ one of each being ‘(for) the chariot, day 6,’ and two of the former and one of the latter ‘(for) the chariot, day 7’ (the dates suggest a connexion with Sabbath celebrations). All these seem to have been received as offerings ‘(for) Dungi,’ in the month of his festival in the year named. The 6th year, and probably others, saw similar offerings, in which, as in the case of the tablet translated above, Bûr-Sin was associated as a divine personage with the god of Jokha and with Dungi, his predecessor.²

The possibility of the above offerings being made really on behalf of, and not to, Dungi, Bûr-Sin, and

¹ *O. T. in the Light of the Records*, 3rd ed., p. 175.

² In the lists of gods such names as *Sur-Zuenua*, *Sur-Zagaga*, *Lu-Enlila*, ‘*utukku of Ékurra*,’ and others with *lu* as first element, are, in all probability, the names of deified kings. In *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, xxv. pl. 19, a Bûr-Sin appears as third of a list of eight *gud-dub* of a deity whose name is only partly preserved, but which may be the moon-god Sin.

the other personages, seems to be set aside by the fact that the two rulers mentioned appear on the same plane, and in the same connexion, as the god of Jokha himself, on behalf of whom offerings would probably not have been made.¹ Moreover, offerings could be made to the seats and the chariots of these deified kings, but not, one would imagine, by those objects. As the seats occupied during the lifetime of renowned and venerated personages, and the chariots in which they rode, were regarded, in a sense, as part of their being, or as imbued with a measure of their spirit, they could naturally become, and did to all appearance become, objects of veneration, both during their lifetime and as long after their death as their greatness was fully realized. In many personal names of the time of the dynasty of Babylon (Hammurabi and his successors), and at other periods, the great cities, centres of worship of renowned deities, are invoked, apparently as containing, in like manner, a measure of the personality of their divine patrons.

Nothing is said in these inscriptions about the persons to whom the offerings were made being

¹ Professor Stephen Langdon also renders 'for,' in the sense of 'given' or 'offered to' (*Archives of Drehem, passim*).

dead, and this seems to imply that they were all regarded, even Sur-Engur, the founder of the dynasty, and his son Dungi—the former's name without, and the latter's with, the divine prefix—as being still alive. For the rest of the world, however—those who did not believe in the gods of the Babylonians—the offerings made to them were sacrifices to the dead. In all probability the animals presented were ultimately slain and eaten by the priests and others who had a right to partake of them. A ceremonial feast similar to this would offer a parallel to what took place at Baal-Peor, when the Israelites joined in the heathen worship of the place, and 'ate the offerings of the dead' (Ps 106²⁸).²

² It seems likely that Sur-Engur was not regarded as equalling his descendants Dungi, Bûr-Sin, Šu-Sin, and Ibi-Sin in greatness, or in piety, hence the absence of the sign of divinity before his name, placing him on the same level as his great-great-grandson, Enim-Nannar.

As four of the royal names are compounded with Sin or Nannar, we may have here an indication that the royal family became devotees of that deity after attaining the position of rulers of Ur, the god's principal seat. In accordance with Babylonian belief, their souls were probably regarded as having gone to dwell with the moon-god, their divine protector, on departing this life.

In the Study.

New Biography.

THE standard Life of Napoleon for English readers is *The Life of Napoleon I.*, by John Holland Rose, Litt.D. No Life comes into real competition with it, except Sloane's, and that is the work of an artisan, this of an artist. Dr. Rose first published his Life in 1901. Since then five editions have been exhausted. The sixth edition, just issued, is in a single post octavo volume, though the paging of the two crown octavo volumes of the fifth edition is retained. It is thus a volume of clear type with 512 and 596, or in all 1108 pages (Bell & Sons; 6s. net).

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published the *Life Story of Madame Annie Ryall: Gospel Soloist* (1s. 6d. net). The biography has been written by her husband, Mr. W. Bustin, and in addition to a

Foreword by Dr. A. C. Dixon, there is an Introduction by Mr. J. W. C. Fegan. Others have contributed poems, letters, and appreciations, showing that of the true servant also it may sometimes be said, 'Verily she has her reward.'

The same publishers have issued new editions of *God's Fellow-Workers*, by the Rev. C. B. Keenleyside, B.A., B.D. (1s. net); and of *Henry Moorhouse*, by the Rev. John Macpherson (1s. 6d.). They have also ready *The Herald of Mercy Annual for 1914* (1s.).

William T. Stead.

It would have been utterly out of place if the biography of William T. Stead had been like other biographies. But it is entirely in keeping. There never was a biography like it. The title is *My Father*. The author is Miss Estelle W. Stead (Heinemann; 10s. net). The early chapters are