

examples, Nabunit naming himself on his bricks and cylinders indifferently  $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{E}$   $\gg\text{E}$ , or  $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{E}$   $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{E}$   $\gg\text{E}$ , or  $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{E}$   $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{Y}$ , and the three several and equivalent forms occurring not unfrequently in the course of the same inscription

I do not pretend at present to explain how it happens that  $\gg\text{Y}$   $\gg\text{Y}$  has the phonetic power of *nit*, but the fact is undoubted, and Dr. Hincks therefore must abandon all his readings of *Nabu-binyuchur*, *Shamsi bin*, *Ben-Hadad*, *Assur-yuchura-bal*, together with his three sons of Esar-Haddon, and a number of other historical illustrations, which he has recently delivered "ex cathedra," with the same confidence that characterizes his announcement of genuine readings, and which are thus calculated to mislead enquiry, and to retard the progress of discovery.

The only single addition which I have to make to my sketch of Assyrian history, as published in the *Athenæum* of March, 1854, is, that in the S. E. palace at Nimrud many relics have been recently found of the son of *Asshur-bani-pal*, whom I name provisionally *Asshur-emit-ili*,<sup>1</sup> and that under this king, who reigned probably from B.C. 645 to 625, must therefore be placed both the Scythian inroad and the destruction of Nineveh by the Medes.

H. C. RAWLINSON.

---

*Letter from Dr. Hincks, in reply to Colonel Rawlinson's Note on the Successor of Sennacherib.*

*Killyleigh, Co. Down, 29th Nov. 1854.*

Dear Sir.

I observe that a communication from Colonel Rawlinson was read at the last meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society, containing what he conceived to be rectifications of statements made by me in a report and letter of mine published in the *Literary Gazette*. I trust the Society will accept a communication from me, tending to show that these are by no means rectifications.

Of Colonel Rawlinson's two objections, the first is of little importance. He says that the true name of the eldest son of Sennacherib is not *Assur-nadin*, but *Assur-nadin-iddin*. I have met with this name in three different forms in three different Bull inscriptions copied by Mr. Layard. In one the name is distinctly *Assur-nadin*. In the

<sup>1</sup> Meaning perhaps "Asshur is the chief of (*il*, stands over) the gods."

other two an addition to this is found, which I at first read *sumi*. Afterwards, I found an explanation of the *whole* conclusion of the name on a tablet in the British Museum, from which I inferred that it should be pronounced *nadin*, without any addition. Unfortunately I have mislaid my notes of the inscription on this tablet; and I am therefore unable to give my reasons for thus reading it more specifically than I have done. It is a matter of but little moment.

All the other points of difference to which Colonel Rawlinson has referred in his communication may be reduced to this:—A certain royal name appears on tablets in the British Museum, and on bricks found at Babylon on the river side, which Colonel Rawlinson believes to be a variant of the name of *Nabu-nahid* (or, as he calls him, *Nabu-nit*), who began to reign in 555 B.C.; but which I believe to be a variant of the name of Nabopolassar, who began to reign seventy years earlier. The question is, which of us is right? That it is one or other of these kings seems pretty evident; for the father of this king is mentioned, and he was not a king. He was, according to Colonel Rawlinson, *Nabu-dirba*, and filled the high office of "*rubu-emga*." Colonel Rawlinson has adduced, in support of his theory, a statement of Berosus that Nabunit executed some considerable works at Babylon; but Berosus mentions the outer walls of the city as all that he built; whereas the bricks are from the river side. On the other hand, in the great inscription at the India House, Nebuchadnezzar distinctly mentions these works by the river side, as having been completed by himself; they having been commenced by his father, Nabopolassar, whose bricks might, therefore, be naturally expected to be found in their foundations. Besides, if Mr. Layard's copies be correct, the final character in the disputed name is interchanged with one which is interchanged with the character which ordinarily expresses the last element in the names of Nebuchadnezzar and his father,—*yuchur*, as I read it. That is to say,  is interchanged with , which is interchanged with . On these grounds, I must retain my opinion as to the person to whom this name belongs; and of course I attach no weight to the objections brought against my other readings, that they are dependent upon, or connected with, this. The rectification which appears to me most needed is that Colonel Rawlinson should cease to attribute to Nabunahid the bricks and the buildings and the parentage of Nabopolassar.

Believe me to remain, yours very truly,

E. Norris, Esq.

EDW. HINCKS.