

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
171
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

Persian periods. He described with considerable minuteness the contents of this "Library," and illustrated his description by illustrations, chiefly half-tone reproductions, entitled "Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library," "Multiplication Table," etc., thus conveying the impression that these objects were found by him at the place and time described, and were parts of that "Library." I showed that all his photographic reproductions of objects found in the "Library" which he thus described represented either objects purchased a number of years before the alleged discovery of that "Library" or dug up in other parts of the Nippur mounds before the "Library" was excavated. I pointed out that this threw discredit on his other statements with regard to this alleged "Library," and that the whole manner in which the discovery had been handled was such that it appeared to be impossible to rely upon any statement about it made by Dr. Hilprecht, unless and until that statement was supported by manifest and palpable proof of such a nature that it could be verified by the testimony of others or by the contents of the inscriptions themselves.

In his official publications, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series D., Vol. I.*, and *In the Temple of Bel*, as also in his unofficial publications, practically identical with these, namely, *Explorations in Bible Lands During the Nineteenth Century*, and *Die Ausgrabungen im Bel Tempel zu Nippur*, Professor Hilprecht published some eight photographic illustrations of objects found in the part of the "older library," antedating 2000 B.C., described by him as "a combined library and school" found in the northeast portion of "Tablet Hill," "in the rooms nearest to the temple" (p. 524), at a depth of twenty odd feet beneath the surface, namely, an "Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library," two multiplication tables, a "Drawing by a Temple Scholar," two bas-reliefs of "Beltis leading a Worshipper" and "Lutanist surrounded by Animals," a "Hexagonal Clay Prism" and a "Round Practice Tablet." Of these I stated that the first, an "Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library," was purchased from an antiquity dealer, Khabaza, in Baghdad,

eleven years before the alleged discovery of this "Library" at Nippur; that of the multiplication tables, one was purchased eleven years before the alleged discovery of the "Library" by Noorian in Baghdad, the other dug up by me ten years before that discovery, in another part of the Nippur mounds; that the "Drawing of a Temple Scholar" was really a fragment of an archaic stone vase, dug up by Dr. Haynes some time before the discovery of the "Library," in another part of the temple mound; and that the two bas-reliefs, the "Hexagonal Clay Prism" and the "Round Practice Tablet," were also all found by Haynes, not in "Tablet Hill," but in other parts of the Nippur mounds, distinct and more or less remote from the ruins containing the alleged "Library," respectively some months or some years before the alleged discovery of the "older library" by Hilprecht.

In his answers to the questions (3-7) put by the sixteen with regard to these points, Hilprecht admits that these objects (with the exception of the stone vase) were all either purchased elsewhere, or discovered at an earlier date and in a different place (*The So-Called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, pp. 337 ff.), but claims that he had never said in so many words that the objects depicted were found in the "Library" and should not have been so understood. In the matter of the "Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library," in answer to the questions asked (3, A. B. C.), he avers that he had never claimed that it was discovered in the "Library" find on "Tablet Hill" by the expedition of which he was the scientific head in 1900, and "that nobody could gain such impression except thru his own carelessness" (*Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, p. 335), for, if one had studied the list of illustrations on p. 19 of his *Explorations in Bible Lands*, he would have learned that it was "from the original in the Museum of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania," while if he had read footnote 1 on p. 526 of the same volume, he would have learned that "owing to their long delay in reaching Philadelphia, those tablets which were presented by His Majesty the Sultan to the writer have not yet been unpacked." How from this any reader, however intelligent, could have known that "consequently the pic-

ture could not have been made from any original of the fourth expedition" and "of necessity must have belonged to the results of the previous expeditions" I do not know. The note itself is attached to a passage about the syllabaries and lexicographical texts in the "Library," of which Hilprecht says that he saw "hundreds—among the tablets which I cleaned and examined in Nuffar and Constantinople," and is apparently the explanation of the reason why no syllabaries are represented in his illustrations, whereas other classes of texts are represented, namely, that the former were among the gift tablets referred to in the note; and would not be likely to be understood by anyone to refer to the later descriptions of other departments of the "Library," which are accompanied by illustrations.

In the volume referred to, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, on p. 425, Professor Hilprecht begins the account of the work of the fourth expedition, taking up one by one the various mounds and buildings excavated by it. After describing the various buildings excavated or partly excavated in the temple complex, with the adjacent city gate and the wall about the same, he proceeds, on p. 508, from "this brief review of the principal results obtained by the fourth expedition in connection with its work on the temple mound" to occupy himself "for a few minutes with the larger triangular hill to the south of the latter," i. e., "Tablet Hill," and from this point to the bottom of p. 532 he is ostensibly describing the discovery made by the fourth expedition on that hill between October, 1899, and March, 1900, of a "Library," the text being accompanied with photographs of the excavated rooms of "the Temple Library and Priest School of Nippur," in the northeast part of the mound (p. 509), a plan of these rooms (p. 523) in the "Northeast Portion of the Temple Library," and a detailed account of the tablets found in this particular complex of rooms (p. 524). The character of this "northeast wing as a combined library and school was determined," he tells us (p. 524), "immediately after an examination of the unearthed tablets and fragments." He then proceeds to describe the school system in use in the Nippur Temple School, the "college" course, "the

course in art," etc. From the "technical" books "on the shelves," which "gave all the necessary information on the subjects treated in the school," he proceeds (p. 529) to the "more scientific works, tablets for religious edification, and 'books' of reference. To the first-mentioned class belong the many mathematical, astronomical, medical, historical and linguistic tablets recovered." And then he gives (p. 530) this illustration: "Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library," without any indication that it was not in fact one of the astronomical tablets dug up by the fourth expedition in Tablet Hill, but a tablet of uncertain origin purchased eleven years before from an antiquity dealer in Baghdad, at a time when the northeast wing "of the Temple Library" lay over twenty feet below the surface of a virgin ruin mound.

With regard to the two clay bas-reliefs, Professor Hilprecht admits in his answer (pp. 335 f.) that they were found some months before the supposed discovery of the "Library," in a different mound, and gives three explanations of his use of them as illustrations of the "Temple Library": (1) "I nowhere stated that these two tablets were found by me." (2) "According to information received from Dr. Haynes at Nippur, who had reserved these two reliefs with others for my examination, they were excavated by him at 'Tablet Hill.' Only in March, 1908, I found in his diary under April 11th and 12th, 1899, that they were discovered in Mound X., opposite 'Tablet Hill.'" (3) "Their discovery in Mound X. [a mound on the other side of the great canal which separates Nippur into two distinct parts] does not alter the fact of their having been found in the 'Temple Library of Nippur,' for the Temple Library of the Cassite period was situated in Mound X." (pp. 335 f.). The second answer really explains. It is only to be regretted that Dr. Hilprecht did not earlier consult the records of the Expedition, which show the facts to be as I alleged in 1905. I can only characterize answer 1. as an evasion. If he did not mean to be understood as claiming that these objects were excavated by him in "Tablet Hill" in the fourth expedition, as illustrations of the finds from which he published them, he should have indicated that fact intelligibly in the con-

text. Answer 3 is also an evasion, and quite irrelevant to the controversy. We are dealing with the "educational department" of the "Temple Library" of the period antedating Hammurabi, found in the northeast part of "Tablet Hill." When we ascertain that an object alleged to have been excavated there really came from some other place, it is absurd to evade the difficulty by explaining that the other place was the "Library" 1000 years later, in the Cassite period, which, by the way, is in itself an unproved assumption, apparently unthought of at the time of the publication of *Explorations in Bible Lands*.*

As to the "Drawing of a Temple Scholar," which was published in the German lecture referred to as an illustration of the art course in the Temple School, Professor Hilprecht claims (Answer 7, p. 337) that Dr. Haynes told him that it was found on "Tablet Hill." The records, however, show that it was discovered before Dr. Haynes began to excavate on that hill, in another part of the ruins. Moreover, by Professor Hilprecht's own admission, it was not a drawing of a temple scholar, but, as stated in my original paper, a fragment of a stone vase, having, therefore, nothing to do with the "Temple Library." I had supposed that this fragment of a stone vase was also referred to, without publication of the illustration, in both of his official publications, *In the Temple of Bel at Nippur* and *Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia*, in passages almost identical in wording with the passage in the German Publication (cf. *The Nippur Library*, p. 155), but in answer to the questions of the sixteen Professor Hilprecht states (p. 338) that the object referred to in those passages is different, being an unbaked clay tablet, "now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople." He does not say whether in point of fact this object was excavated by the fourth expedition, and formed part of the "Library" find, as stated by him in his original publication.

*It may be said incidentally that two other bas-reliefs, of a hog and a buffalo, referred to by him on page 528, as belonging to the "Library," and illustrative of the course in art followed in the temple schools in that period, were both discovered, not as he there alleges, in the northeastern part of "Tablet Hill," but in an entirely different part of the Nippur ruins, as has been pointed out by Fisher.

The "Hexagonal Clay Prism" and the "Round Practice Tablet," published in *Die Ausgrabungen im Bel Tempel zu Nippur* and its English translation, *In the Temple of Bel at Nippur*, an official publication of the University, were not included in the questions of the sixteen, but they also are admitted by Dr. Hilprecht (*Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, p. 36) not to have come from "Tablet Hill," and therefore not from the so-called "Library" find, in connection with the description of which they were published as illustrations, but to have been unearthed by Dr. Haynes from three to six years earlier in another part of the ruins.

In other words, Dr. Hilprecht admits the truth of my statements that "of the eight illustrations which, from the text, would appear to be illustrations of objects from the 'older temple library' in the northeast section of 'Tablet Hill,' that is, that portion of the 'Library' which was destroyed before the time of Hammurabi and the remains of which were discovered some twenty to twenty-four feet beneath the surface of the ground by Haynes, not a single one* actually represents an object found in that group of rooms, or even on Tablet Hill, and two did not come from Nippur at all."

In his answer Hilprecht attempts to shift his ground by claiming practically that these objects and anything found at Nippur, or which he judged came from Nippur, belonged to the "Temple Library," and that this library was by no means confined to the "Tablet Hill," but that other parts of the mounds constituted, at different times, the "Library." But even granting that all Nippur was one big temple library, this has nothing to do with the question of his original publications, to which my criticisms referred. In the published works cited by me he described with the utmost distinctness the exact position of the "Temple Library" at specified dates, gave an account of the tablets which he alleged were taken out of it by him, or by the fourth expedition of which he

* As stated above, he seems possibly to claim that the stone vase was found there, but in admitting that it was a stone vase also shows that it was not a library text or copy book, as he had claimed.

was the "Scientific Director," at places precisely described by him, and gave in the text the various illustrations to which reference has been made to bring before the eye the contents of that "Library." There is in that part of the narrative containing those illustrations no note and no mark of any sort which would indicate to the reader that these objects were selected miscellaneously from purchased collections and the like to illustrate the general contents of the "Library," and until after the commencement of this controversy, when the facts had been brought out by others, Professor Hilprecht never indicated that the illustrations were other than they had universally been accepted as being, actual specimens of the objects found by him in the great find called by him the "older Temple Library" in the northeast corner of the "Tablet Hill" of Nippur. Moreover, these illustrations were used, not once, but a number of times, in different publications and editions of publications; and in all that time not a single illustration was introduced of an object actually coming from that "older Temple Library" which he claimed to have discovered.

There is another question asked by the sixteen, with regard to the basis on which Hilprecht made his claim of having discovered a library. On the evidence of Mr. Fisher and Mrs. Haynes, which was very specific and definite, I stated, in the paper above referred to, *The Nippur Library* (p. 163), that the tablets found in the great find at the northeast corner of "Tablet Hill," stated by Dr. Hilprecht in successive publications to have been 17,200, 23,000 and 24,000 (crescendo) in number, had been packed up before he came and that at the time when he announced the discovery of the "Library" and declared its contents he had in fact only about twenty specimen tablets to examine, the rest having been already boxed up. Professor Hilprecht, in his answer (Question 8, pp. 338 f.), declares that he had about 200 tablets, reserved for him by Dr. Haynes, and so well chosen that "even after I had personally examined the tablets excavated by the fourth expedition in Constantinople in 1902, I could only confirm my previous judgment of this collection." Here there appears to be a conflict of testimony. I should be glad

to believe that the statement made by me on the basis of the diary of Mrs. Haynes, her own statements and those of Mr. Fisher, present at the time, were incorrect. I wish that those 200 tablets, so admirably chosen, might be published, giving us actual specimens of this great literary find. Surely these specimens, "constituting part of the earlier Temple Library of Nippur," examined by him, packed under his directions, and "sent in 1900 from Nippur," must be available long ere this, and the publication of these tablets on which he based his conclusions that the great find made by Haynes in the northeast part of "Tablet Hill" was in fact a library, and from the examination of which he drew his material for the minute description of the contents of that "Library," ought to set all controversy regarding that find at rest. Unfortunately, up to the present moment, altho the controversy began three years ago, no such material has been published out of that reported find of from sixteen to twenty-four thousand tablets of a literary character. In the investigation before the Trustees of the University, Hilprecht presented a number of tablets to prove, apparently, the value of the objects found at Nippur, and that there were a number of "literary" tablets among them; but no mention is made in that testimony of the provenance of those literary tablets, or whether they came from "the earlier Temple Library," the point really under discussion; and the "circa 200 tablets" which might have proved the case were not produced at all. Since that date he has published a volume of *Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Tablets from the Temple Library of Nippur* (1906), containing in all forty-seven tablets, of which, for the first time in his publications, the provenance is carefully noted. Of these only fifteen can, by his own showing, have come from that famous find about which this controversy has arisen.* Of the other thirty-two ten were found in another part of "Tablet Hill," in what he calls the "administrative and business department," some nine and some ten years before

* The "Library" was excavated nine years ago and since that date only fifteen out of the 17,200, 23,000, 24,000 (reduced in his answer to "more than 16,000") tablets discovered have been published.

his "School and Temple Library" began to be excavated. The remainder belong to the Cassite period and come from other parts of the Nippur ruins; except one which was bought by Noorian at Baghdad from men who had been conducting illicit excavations at Sippara.

I am inclined to suspect that there is not the actual conflict between Dr. Hilprecht's statement and that of Mrs. Haynes and Mr. Fisher which there seems to be, but that Hilprecht's statement is of the nature of an evasion: that he refers to the collection of choice specimen tablets reserved by Haynes from his work at all the mounds of Nippur during the entire period of the fourth expedition, 1898-1900; while they refer to the tablets reserved from the "Library" find, to which the question actually referred.

However that may be, the fact remains that we have no more evidence about the actual contents of those 17,200 or 23,000 or 24,000 tablets, whichever it may be, to-day than we did after the publication of my paper. As already pointed out, the specimens published by Professor Hilprecht in his accounts of the contents of that "Library" prove, on his own evidence, not to have been dug up there; and nothing else has yet been put in their place. We are still to-day in the same position as when I read my paper on *The Nippur Library* before the American Oriental Society in 1905, and every allegation made in that paper with regard to the great "Library" find in the northeastern part of "Tablet Hill" at Nippur has been established as a fact by Professor Hilprecht's own testimony.

Besides "the educational department—the school and the technical library," found in the northeast corner of "Tablet Hill," Professor Hilprecht claimed, also, to have discovered "the business and administrative department of the Temple" of the same early period, before 2000 B.C. This "was established on the bank of the great canal" (p. 524), on the southwest side of "Tablet Hill." The part of this which was excavated comprised "forty-four rooms and galleries, more or less connected with each other" (p. 521). Of the contents of this "business and administrative department established in the 'Library,' where contracts were

executed, orders given out, income and expense lists kept, etc." (p. 532), Professor Hilprecht gave one example, the Lushtamar tablet. It would seem that there could be no doubt of his having described this letter as actually found in those forty-four rooms and galleries which he claimed to have excavated, for, on the same page from which the last extract was taken, separated from it only by the words, "I have to add little to what has been previously stated," he goes on to say: "A number of letters were found intact. The envelopes, sealed and addressed more than four thousand years ago, immediately before the city was conquered and looted, were still unbroken. While writing these lines one of those ancient epistles of the time of Amraphel (Gen. 14) lies unopened before me. It is $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches long, $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches wide, and $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches thick. One and the same seal cylinder had been rolled eleven times over the six sides of the clay envelope before it was baked with the document within. It bears the simple address, 'To Lushtamar.' Though sometimes curious to know the contents of the letter, I do not care to break the fine envelope and to intrude upon Mr. Lushtamar's personal affairs and secrets, as long as the thousands of mutilated literary tablets from the library require all my attention."

In answer to the question (1): "Was the tablet excavated from the remains of the so-called Temple Library? If so, when?" Professor Hilprecht admits that it was purchased, but claims that he bought it from an Arab, who had been employed in the work of the expedition, a few hours after he had left Nippur, at the close of the first expedition, and that he had, therefore, good reason to suppose that it came from "Tablet Hill."

In answer to the question: "What terms of purchase did you make with the Arab thief who you say stole it from the mounds at Nippur?" He replies: "I cannot remember the price. I stipulated that he deliver it to the then head of the firm Blockey, Hotz & Co., in Baghdad, or to any member of our first Babylonian Expedition who might remain in Baghdad" (p. 333). According to the story given elsewhere in the volume and referred to by page numbers in the answers to the questions of the sixteen, Hil-

precht bought the tablet on April 18th, 1889, paying for it at the time, marking it for identification and handing it back to the Arab thief to be delivered in the manner indicated. He states that the museum marking indicates the date on which he learned that this tablet had been duly delivered, "in accordance with the terms of its purchase by me" (*Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, p. 37), namely, July 5th, 1889. Elsewhere the tablet is admitted by him to be part of the Prince collection of seventeen tablets, each bearing the date July 5th, 1889. Mr. Noorian's note books, as also a memorandum from him which Hilprecht himself publishes (p. 310), show that seventeen tablets were purchased by Noorian in Baghdad on July 5th, 1889, with money from Professor Prince, which had been left with him by Professor Hilprecht. These were packed and sent to Hilprecht on October 26th of the same year, the letter notifying Hilprecht of the sending bearing date October 27th, 1889 (p. 311). Noorian's personal notebook shows that these seventeen tablets were purchased from Abdul Toma, who had been a foreman under Rassam in the excavations conducted by him at Sippara and, at the date of this purchase and earlier, was engaged in illicit excavations at Sippara and the sale of the results to antiquity dealers. In view of the then existing conditions, and of Hilprecht's extremely limited knowledge of the Arabic language at that period, the story of his underhand purchase, without the knowledge of Noorian or any other member of the expedition, of a valuable tablet on the boat leaving Nippur, the return of that tablet to an Arab thief in such trustful manner, to be delivered to someone or other connected with the expedition at a later date, seems incredible, if not absolutely impossible. (Why should he not have put it in his own pocket then and there?) This difficulty of belief is naturally increased by the lack of confirmatory evidence as to the price, as to the appearance on the tablet of the mark which Hilprecht says he put upon it, as to the reception of the tablet by Noorian. Not quite in agreement with Hilprecht's statement, above referred to, that the date on the tablet indicates the time when he first heard of its delivery, is his admission that it is really part of the Prince collection, the dates on which indi-

cate the date of purchase by Noorian in Baghdad, July 5th, 1889, Hilprecht suggests that Noorian confused the tablet which the Arab thief brought him with the tablets of the Prince collection. But Noorian, whose native tongue was Arabic, absolutely denies all knowledge of such a transaction. No Arab ever brought him a tablet bought by Hilprecht, and he never notified Hilprecht of the receipt of such a tablet. Moreover, of this tablet he is especially sure. It is a tablet of a very striking character, which, once seen, is not easily forgotten, as Professor Hilprecht himself points out, the most perfect example of a case tablet which the University of Pennsylvania possesses, so exceptionally fine that Hilprecht objects to having it opened, because its value lies in its exquisite perfection. In point of fact, Abbas and one or two other of our workmen did bring to Noorian a few wretched fragments from Nippur, the result of some digging undertaken by them after we had left the mound, not before. The few poor fragments found by them were packed and sent on to Hilprecht for the University of Pennsylvania. These facts were communicated to me by Noorian upon my arrival in Baghdad in December, and have been confirmed by him since, he being now a resident of New York. It should be added that Hilprecht names July 5th as the date at which he first received notification of the delivery of this tablet, which would imply that it must actually have been delivered very shortly after the purchase, not later certainly than about June 1st. It would be interesting to see the letter which contained this notification, or to know how Hilprecht, who had left the country, received the notification.

In the hearing before the Committee of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, attention was called to the fact that the matter of the provenance of the Lushtamar tablet might be settled by opening it; but, whereas in his official publications, as *In the Temple of Bel at Nippur* (p. 114), Hilprecht had expressed the intention of opening the tablet to learn its contents, and stated that he had only been prevented from doing so up to that time by the press of other matters, he now opposed it, on the ground

that such opening would entirely destroy the value of a unique and very precious tablet (p. 189).

Hilprecht's own statements show that the publication of the Lushtamar tablet as a specimen of the contents of "the business and administrative department established in the library," was quite unjustifiable, even if all his other claims with regard to the tablet are accepted. Unfortunately, however, I do not see how, in view of the contradictions and incredibilities contained in these statements, any reliance can be placed upon his story.

Besides Hilprecht's "ancient library," with its educational and business and administrative departments, in the volume already referred to he claims to have ascertained the existence on the same hill, at a higher stratum, of a "later library" (p. 516), in which he found a jar containing about twenty inscribed objects, constituting "a veritable small Babylonian museum." Among other things this jar contained "the fragment of a large tablet with the plan of houses, canals, roads, gardens, etc.," a reproduction of which he gives (p. 518) under the title: "Large Fragment of a Clay Tablet, containing the Plan of Nippur and its Environments." With regard to this jar and the plan contained in it the sixteen asked no questions. I had, however, discussed this discovery in the paper referred to, *The Nippur Library* (pp. 160 f.), pointing out that Mrs. Haynes and Mr. Fisher denied the discovery of any such jar, and that Mr. Fisher claimed to have had the plan in his possession for cleaning and sketching some months before Hilprecht's arrival at Nippur, and before work had been begun on "Tablet Hill." Here there is a direct issue of veracity. Hilprecht continues to assert that his account of the discovery of the jar and the plan is true. With equal positiveness Fisher, the architect of the expedition, asserts that he had the plan in his possession to clean and to draw before Hilprecht ever came to the mounds, and that the object is such an unmistakable one that it is impossible for him to be in error. Mrs. Haynes corroborated from her diary Fisher's statement and claimed that no such jar as Hilprecht described was ever discovered. She herself had seen the contents of the jars actual-

2015-1-14 AM

5-13

ly discovered, which were described by her in her diary and were quite different. Dr. Haynes now adds his testimony to that of his wife and Mr. Fisher, agrees with them as to the jars found and their contents, and identifies the date and the spot of the finding of the tablet fragment containing the map, which was discovered by him, he says, before Hilprecht came to Nippur, in no jar whatsoever, and not in the region in which Hilprecht claims to have found it (*Philadelphia Public Ledger*, April 22d, 1908).

This little pamphlet is intended both as a response to Hilprecht's answers, which seem to me, while attempting to evade the real issues, to be in fact an admission of substantially everything alleged by me, and also as a summary of the situation as it now stands. My hope is that, instead of controversy as to the past, we may now have an actual publication of the Nippur material in an orderly and scientific way, which will enable the world to ascertain precisely what was discovered, with proper identification of the provenance of each object. If this unsavory controversy shall end in such a good result, I shall be sufficiently repaid for my part of the pain and unpleasantness.

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH,
NEW YORK, December 14th, 1908.

PRINCETON U.

Princeton University Library



32101 077794699

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalisists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientologists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
171
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientologists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065

HILPRECHT'S ANSWER.

BY THE REV. JOHN P. PETERS.

Scholars are justly tired of the Hilprecht controversy, and it is therefore with much hesitation that I have decided, in view of the contents of Professor Hilprecht's late volume, *The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, to prepare and send this small pamphlet to oriental scholars as what I hope may be my last contribution to an exceedingly unpleasant theme. I shall confine myself to the matters discussed by me in a paper read before the American Oriental Society in April, 1905, and the questions of sixteen orientalists to Professor Hilprecht, based on the contents of that paper, with Professor Hilprecht's answers to the same. I am inclined to think that, on the whole, one who has taken the trouble to read what has been published will need nothing further, and yet it is just possible that the rather elaborate contents of Professor Hilprecht's book, in which those questions and the answers to them occupy a relatively small and obscure place, as well as his method of answering the questions by page references to other parts of the volume, may produce confusion in some minds.

The substance of my paper on the Nippur Library, referred to above, was this: Professor Hilprecht, in four publications, two of them official publications of the University of Pennsylvania, described the discovery by him in the year 1900 of a "Library" in "Tablet Hill" at Nippur, giving the number of tablets found, the precise parts of the mound called by him "Tablet Hill," in which the different sections of this library, the "educational department," the "business and administrative department," etc., were located, the depth of the strata which represented the different periods of the "Library," the "older library," of the period antedating Hammurabi, and the "later library," of the Neo-Babylonian and



Original from
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

2206
71
(RECAP)
Digitized by Google

310065