

gelical Movement has been written by the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, M.A., D.D., Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead (Morgan & Scott; 6d. net).

The urgent—and soon to be more urgent—question of Nationality is discussed by Dr. J. Holland Rose in a book entitled *Nationality as a Factor in Modern History* (Rivingtons; 4s. 6d. net). The emergence in the different countries of Europe of the sense of being a nation is traced back to its origin and then forward to its results. Sometimes it is the work of a thinker, like Dante for Italy, or Schiller and Fichte for Germany. Sometimes it is due to a sudden clash of war. But always it is a great thing, with far-reaching results. Of its results we see as yet the veriest beginnings. Is it to be good in the long run, or evil? Dr. Rose would save every modern nation from too much self by recommending an international outlook. 'Men,' he says, 'are asking everywhere: Can International Law and morality ever be re-established in such a way as to restore confidence? Pessimists and cynics deny it. On historical grounds, I dissent from this sombre estimate. For, as has appeared in these studies, Nationalism shows signs of having exhausted its strength except among the most backward peoples. This war is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the movement in its recent narrow and intolerant form. The persistent attempt of one nation to overbear its weaker neighbours in order to achieve world-supremacy has sufficed to unite against it nearly all the world; and the frightful exhaustion which failure must entail will be a warning to would-be world-conquerors for centuries to come. Further, as we

have seen, the more brutal and perfidious the violation of International Law, the stronger is the demand for the re-establishment of that law, with adequate guarantees for the future.'

Canon J. M. Wilson, D.D., has published two lectures to men which he delivered in College Hall, Worcester, in December 1915. They were on *The Natural and the Supernatural in Science and Religion* (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net). He says: 'I once gave a lecture in Aberdeen to a highly scientific audience, on a special scientific investigation in astrophysics. The caretaker of the hall, presumably not a scientific man, spoke next day enthusiastically to one of my friends about the lecture. "It was a grand lecture," he said, "a grand lecture indeed—the grandest I ever heard: *I didn't understand a word of it!*"' Canon Wilson did not mean to make the caretaker understand that lecture; but he wants him to understand these two. And yet how difficult their topic!

Mr. Arthur Herbert Buss says that the title of his book *The Real Object of Life* (Stock; 3s. net) was suggested by the perusal of the works of the Ven. Archdeacon Wilberforce. More than that, the book contains so much of Archdeacon Wilberforce that it could almost be said to be his.

Mr. Gustav Spiller has commemorated the twenty-first anniversary of the Union of Ethical Societies by editing a volume of essays to which he gives the title of *A Generation of Religious Progress* (Watts; 1s. net). The essay by Professor J. S. Mackenzie on 'Educational Ideals' is good enough to give the volume a reputation.

Early Babylonian Chronology and the Book of Genesis.

BY THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., LONDON.

AMONG the recently published Babylonian chronological inscriptions are two well worthy of study, the first being the early list of prehistoric and half-mythical kings published by Dr. Arno Poebel in *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (University of Pennsylvania: *The University Museum Publications*

tions of the Babylonian Section, vol. iv. No. 1, and vol. v., 1914), and the other a small tablet from Nippur giving a list of the kings of Larsa who preceded Hammurabi and Samsu-iluna, published by Professor A. T. Clay in *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection* (New

Haven, 1915). The evidence which the first has to give implies the independence of the Hebrew record; whilst the latter seemingly shows that we have to look for light upon the fourteenth chapter of Genesis in another direction from that which has hitherto attracted us.

With the exception of the fragment whose reverse, containing the names of the Dynasty of Ur (about 2300 B.C.), was published by Hilprecht, all the texts edited by Poebel are written in narrow columns (hardly more than an inch wide) and quite in the style of certain tablets of the 3rd millennium B.C., except that the script is later. The fragments found are apparently early copies of the records to which Berosus, that Babylonian priest whose work upon the history of his country has been so often quoted, had access.

Unfortunately, the beginnings of the inscriptions published by Poebel are broken away, but, notwithstanding this, these records are exceedingly important. At the point where the text opens, the long reigns with which the list began are already getting shorter. The first complete name is that of Qalumu^m, who reigned 1 *ner* and 5 *šušši*—i.e. 900 years. It is important to note that this name is to all appearance not Sumerian, but Semitic—a fact which pushes back Akkadian (*i.e.* Semitic Babylonian) influence some hundreds—perhaps thousands—of years. The next name, Zuqakip, ‘the Scorpion,’ is also, apparently, Semitic. The absence of the nominative ending *u* may be due to a desire to make the name look foreign. Zuqakip reigned 840 years, and was succeeded by Arpu^m or Arpi, the son of a *muškinu*—‘plebeian,’ or the like—who reigned 720 years.

At this point we come to a name in connexion with which a famous legend is recalled: *Etana, siba, lu ana-šu al-é-da*, ‘Etana, the herdsman, the man who ascended to heaven.’ He seems to have reigned 635 years. Whether he was regarded as belonging to a fresh dynasty or not is doubtful, but he seems not to be indicated as having descended from any of his predecessors. It will be remembered that Etana ascended to heaven to ask the goddess Ištar to enable him to acquire the divine ‘herb of bearing,’ so that his wife might bring forth a son who should succeed him; and that the desired offspring duly came into the world is indicated by this inscription, which records that his name was Piliḥ or Balih, and that he ruled for 410 years. So far, there appears to be no trace of

this ruler in Babylonian literature, though there is every probability that his name will ultimately be found.

The next king was En-men-nunna, who is possibly the Ammenon of Berosus (there is every probability, however, that two kings bore this name, as he ruled only 611 years, whereas the Ammenon of Berosus ruled for 12 *sari*, or 43,200 years). En-men-nunna was succeeded by Melam-Kiš, ‘the glory of the city Kiš,’ whose reign lasted 900 years. Apparently Melam-kiš had no son, and he was therefore succeeded by his brother Bar-sal-nunna, who reigned 1200 years—what the length of his life may have been reckoned at we can only guess, but a moderate estimate would be about 2100 years.

At this point the text begins to get defective, and the names are doubtful. One of the most important rulers, however, seems to have been En-we-bara-gi-šu, who was the 21st on the list. The 22nd is doubtful, but the 23rd ruler was a son of En-we-bara-gi-šu, whose name is indicated by the character AG (?). The traces shown in the photo-lithograph certainly justify Poebel’s reading, though a slight modification of the interior of the character would supply the Sumerian sign Me, ‘battle.’ But supposing that Poebel’s identification of the character be right, other readings are likewise possible. Thus instead of Ag, we might read Me, ‘the wise,’ Ša, ‘the active,’ Na, and Ki, both the last meaning ‘teacher,’ or the like. This character is used to express the name of the god Nebo, who had all these characteristics. Ag (or Me, etc.) reigned 625 years, and was the last of his dynasty.

Here comes the first summation, which reads as follows:—

‘23 kings. Total of their years: 18,000 (and possibly some additional hundreds, tens, and units), 3 months, and 3 days.’

They were exact—those old Babylonians—but their memories played them tricks in handing down their traditions. It may be supposed that there is some system in this early chronology, and if so, it will ultimately be determined; but until we get some sensible Babylonian reduction of these long reigns, this early chronology is bound to be uncertain.

When a tablet is mutilated, it is generally the beginnings and the ends of the columns which suffer, and that is the case with this inscription.

The result is that some of the lines in col. 2 are defective. We can gather, however, that the preceding dynasty lost its power, and that of E-anna, 'the house of the god Anu' (Erech as represented by its great temple), took its place. After this we have the royal list of the dynasty of Erech, the first king being Meskin-gašer, the son of Utu or Šamaš, the sun-god—'he was high priest, he was king—he ruled 325 years,' says the tablet. His son, whose name Poebel reads Enmer-kar, but which might also be transcribed En-we-ir-dilgan, followed him, and reigned 420 years.

Notwithstanding that there is no indication that the dynasty had come to an end, a break in the list occurs here, and the next king is apparently not only not descended from the preceding ruler, but also not a man, but a god. He is called 'Lugal-banda, the herdsman,' and he ruled 1200 years. Lugal-banda means 'powerful king,' or 'king of youthful strength,' and as a deity seems to have been identified with Nergal, the god of war and pestilence. In support of this, it may be noted that he was worshipped at Marad, which was one of the centres of the Nergal-cult. He was also adored, with his consort Nin-sun, at Erech. In reality, however, he was probably closer akin to another god of war, En-urta or En-urašti (Ninip)—a renowned deity to whom several fine hymns of a legendary nature were addressed.

This great divine ruler, with his 1200 years' government in Babylonia, was succeeded by another still better known, for his name and worship spread over all the ancient Semitic world, and even took root in Greece and Rome—Tammuz, whom a section of the Hebrews also adored. The note added to his name in the new text implies that he was not, as other records state, a shepherd, but a fisher or hunter—'His city was Ha-a, he ruled 100 years.'

We all know the story of Tammuz or Adonis—how, whilst hunting, he was killed by a wild boar, typifying winter, and thereafter passed the winter months in the realm of Persephone, the Eres-ki-gal of the Babylonians, but was allowed to spend the summer months on high, as a sun-god, in the company of Istar or Venus, his spouse. The shortness of his reign—100 years—compared with his predecessor's 1200, implies that something untoward was regarded as having happened to

him. That he should have come to be described as a shepherd is due to the fact that, as a sun-god, the fleecy clouds which sometimes attend the sun's setting and rising were regarded as forming his heavenly flock, and gave Tammuz the pastoral character with which we are familiar.¹

Again the royal list changes, and the next ruler, we are told, was Gišgil-gameš, the semi-historical Gilgameš, who heard from the lips of the Babylonian Noah, Ut-napišti^m, the story of the Flood. The text seems to tell us that his father was A(?) . . . , and Poebel shows that his mother was Nin-sun, the spouse of Lugal-banda. Gišgil-gameš is described as a high priest of the city of Kullab, and is stated to have reigned 120 (or 180) years. The mutilated state of the inscription gives us only half the name of Gilgameš' son, namely, . . . -lugal. Four or five names, now lost, finished the column, and then comes the information that the dynasty lasted for a period of 2171 years.

The next dynasty is that of Ur, the well-known city where Abraham dwelt. This contained only four kings—Mes-anni-pada, 'the hero proclaimed of Anu,' 80 years; Mes-kiaga-anna, 'the hero beloved of Anu,' 30 years; Elulu (?), 25 years; and Balulu (?), 30 years. As this dynasty lasted only 171 years, we seem to have reached really historical times.

At this point the text is very defective, but Poebel was able to give an indication of the dynasties—Awan: 3 kings for 356 years (4); . . . 1 king for 7 years (5); Ur: 4 kings for 108 years (7); Adab (?): 2 or more kings (8); Kiš: 4 or more kings (9); Erech: 1 or more kings (10); Opis (?): 1 or more kings (11); Kiš again: 3 or more kings (12); Opis again: 6 kings for 99 years (? 13); 4th (?) dynasty of Kiš: 8 kings for 106 years (? 14); 3rd dynasty of Erech: Lugalgag-gi-si for 25 years (? 15); Agadé:

The following are the kings of this important dynasty:—

1. Šarru-kiń (Sargon the earlier).
2. (I)ri-mu-uš, king of the Host.
3. Man-ištu-su, king of the Host.
4.
5. Narám-Sin, 44–54 years.
6. Šar-gali-šarri, Šar-kalé-šarri, 24 years.
7. Igigi; 8. Imi; 9. Nani; 10. Elulu, Ilulu
—4 kings for 3 years.

¹ If Tammuz be the *Daños* of Berosus, this must have been a second appearance as ruler on earth.

11. Dudu, 21 years.
 12. Šu-dur-kib, son of Dudu, 15 years.
 Total, 12 kings for 197 years.

After this came the 4th (?) Erechite dynasty (17), beginning with Sur-nigin (3 years), and his son Sur-gigir (6 years). As its 5 kings ruled during a total of 26 years only, it is probable that they fell in defending their country against Gutiu^m (Media). The dynasty of Gutiu^m (18) consisted of 11 kings, and lasted 125 years. Among them was Er-ridu-pizir, who was also 'king of the 4 regions.' The last Gutian ruler was Tirigân or Tirriqân.

The next was the 5th (?) dynasty of Erech (19), and this was followed by the 2nd (?) dynasty of Adab (20). After the fall of Gutiu^m, however, Ur had assumed an important place among the Babylonian states, and its 3rd dynasty (21) of 5 kings for 117 years, now ruled Babylonia. This text informs us that its last king, Ibi-Sin, ruled no less than 25 years. The power of Ur now gave place to the dynasty of Isin, consisting of 16 kings, who ruled for 225 years and 6 months. Among these kings were Išme-Dagan with a reign of 20 years, and Libit-Išiar, his son (11 years). The last king of the dynasty was Damiq-ili-šu (23 years).

The dynasties which follow this are very mutilated and therefore sometimes more than doubtful. Most important from the point of view of completeness is that which is estimated to have been the 35th, the dynasty of Larsa.

And it is just that dynasty which the new Yale tablet, published by Professor A. T. Clay, gives. Unlike the long chronological list just described, in which everything is compressed into as close a compass as possible, this little inscription was repeated twice—once on the obverse, and again on the reverse of the tablet. The following is the list of kings in accordance with Professor Clay's copy:—

- 21 years, Nablanu^m.
 28 years, Emışu.
 35 years, Samu^m.
 9 years, Sabaya.
 27 years, Gungunu^m.
 11 years, Abi-sarâ.
 29 years, Sumu-ilu.
 16 years, Nûr-Addi.
 7 years, Sin-idinna^m.

- 2 years, Sin-iriba^m.
 6 years, Sin-ikiša^m.
 1 year, Sili-Addu.
 12 years, Warad-Sin (Eri-Aku).
 61 years, Rim-Sin.
 12 years, Hammu-rabi (Ammu-rapi or Amraphel).
 12 years, Samsu-iluna, his son.
 Its (the dynasty's) years are 289.

Notwithstanding that by far the greater part of the reverse is wanting, the traces of characters or names, and of the regnal years, close to the edge on the left, confirm, in the main, the figures given on the obverse. The summation, too, is correct, though the reader may well ask why the alien Hammu-rabi and Samsu-iluna, his son, are added to the dynasty.

But the great difficulty is this list's disagreement with the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. If Ellasar be *al Larsā*, 'the city Larsa,' and Warad-Sin (Sumerian Eri-Aku) Arioch, then the latter pre-deceased Hammu-rabi (Amraphel) by no less than 30 years. Admitting the identity of Ellasar, the question arises, Have we been comparing the right dynasty; and, admitting the identity of Amraphel with Hammu-rabi, ought we not to ask ourselves as to the identity of the city? Otherwise, we must add another error (the third) to the added *l* in Amraphel, and the transposition of the letters *l* and *r* in Ellasar—that of the substitution of Arioch, 'Aku's (the moon-god Sin's) servant,' for Rim-Sin, 'the moon-god Sin's wild bull.' According to the chronology of Hammu-rabi's reign, it was in his 31st year that he overthrew Rim-Sin of Larsa, and, according to this tablet, Rim-Sin had then been on the throne 61 years, implying that his brother (for both Warad-Sin or Eri-Aku and Rim-Sin were sons of the Elamite Kudur-Mabug) ceased to reign 30 years before Hammu-rabi mounted the throne of Shinar or Babylonia.

The identification of Arioch with Rim-Sin, however, would probably not be altogether a disadvantage, as it would make the 12 years after Rim-Sin's deposition available for the placing of the expedition in which Amraphel and Arioch were engaged, as Rim-Sin was still alive in the time of Samsu-iluna, with whom he came into conflict.

An alternative explanation would be the existence of another Warad-Sin, otherwise Eri-

Aku or Arioch II., after the deposition of Rim-Sin.

But perhaps the Eri-Ekua (or Eri-Aku), otherwise Eri-Eaku (or Eri-Aaku), brought forward by me in 1895 (see the *Journal of the Victoria Institute* for 1895-96) is the true Arioch.¹ The texts there translated suggest that he may have been a *protégé* of Chedorlaomer (if not of Hammurabi), but in that case he could not have been recognized, as Clay's list clearly shows, by the people of Larsa. All is uncertainty, but this seems to be the only way out of the difficulty. The fact that the texts published in the *Journal of*

¹ See also *Actes du dixième Congrès International des Orientalistes*, 1894. Première Partie, *Comptes Rendus des Séances* (Leyden, 1897), p. 100. No discussion ensued at the meeting, but a well-known German Assyriologist was said to have dissented (privately) from the identifications suggested. He afterwards wrote to me, in an off-hand way, that the reading *Ekua* (in Eri-Ekua) was wrong, but gave no reasons for that pronouncement.

the Victoria Institute are late does not prove that they are unhistoric.²

² That Rim-Sin was still living when Samsu-iluna came to the throne is implied by the text published by King in *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings* (see vol. i. p. 69). As Hammu-rabi reigned at Babylon 45 or 55 years, this would necessitate the addition of 14 or 24 years to Rim-Sin's exceedingly long reign. Perhaps we ought, therefore, to ignore the total of 289 years for the dynasty of Larsa, and see whether the adoption of another be not possible. If the figures for Rim-Sin's reign be two units (two years) instead of a soss and a unit (61 years), Warad-Sin (Eri-Aku) would again become a contemporary of Hammu-rabi, the probability that he may have been the Arioch of Gn 14 would be restored, and other difficulties of identification would be removed. Instead of two years, 11 years (a ten and a unit), or 20 years (two tens) might be suggested as alternative corrections, according to the requirements of the colophon dates of Rim-Sin's reign. That he was apparently able to take the field against Samsu-iluna is noteworthy.

The detailed chronological lists, however, give only 43 colophon dates, which probably represent the true length of Hammu-rabi's reign.

Contributions and Comments.

Proverbs xviii. 10.

'A tower of strength is the name of Jehovah ;
In it will run a righteous man and be exalted.'

SUCH is the order of the words and a literal rendering of the verse. 'In it' means naturally 'in the name of Jehovah.' So in Mic 4⁵, 'For all the peoples walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of Jehovah our God for ever and ever.' Cp. Zec 10¹², 'And I will strengthen them in Jehovah ; and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith Jehovah.'

'In it' glances back to 'strength,' recalling 'I will go in the strength of Jehovah' (Ps 71¹⁶).

'Tower of strength' is like 'horn of salvation,' the former term in each case being subservient to the latter.

In 'run' there may be a reminiscence of David's conflict with Goliath. 'I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts. . . . David hastened, and ran toward the army to meet the Philistine. . . . Then David ran, and stood over the Philistine' (1 S 17^{45ff.}).

A sense of relationship to God imparts alacrity in His service.

G. H. WHITAKER.

Souldern, Oxon.

'When Mothers of Salem.'

In the March number of the *Expositor*, Professor Rendel Harris makes the interesting suggestion that the masculine gender in the Greek covers a pair of persons of opposite sexes, and he uses this idea in several connexions. It has made me think again of the masculine gender in the story of the children brought to our Lord, where in each Gospel we read *ab̄rotis* not *ab̄ratīs*. Would this allow us to assume the presence of fathers as well as mothers in those who brought the children to Christ? If so, we can no longer sing with our children the old hymn, 'When mothers of Salem their children brought to Jesus.'

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.
Toronto.

Numbers vii. 89.

THE verse is apparently the conclusion of a narrative or statement concerning *The Voice*, and has been inserted here at the end of the story of the offerings of the princes and the dedication of the altar after the completion of the Tabernacle,