

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the coming years;
My heart shall reap where it has sown,
And garner up its fruit of tears.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea;
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.¹

2. This is the secret of strength in a Church. The Church has a great work to do, and of all great enterprises stillness is a characteristic. The ascending water, the descending rain, the revolving planet, the electric current are all illustrative of mighty law combined with mighty stillness. The great upholders of, and sufferers for, our common Christianity have always been the quiet men, the silent people. But the strength of Christ's Church does not lie in quietness more than in confidence. The latter is the cause and condition of the former. God would here expressly teach His people that their hope was faith in God, in taking Him at His word, in preserving their position as God had

¹ John Burroughs.

given it, in receiving by simple faith the strength that He had promised, and in expecting confidently the victory which He had told them would be surely theirs. It was the same truth as St. John taught when he said, 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

Dr. J. Campbell Gibson, in his *Mission Problems and Mission Methods in South China* (p. 256), gives the following experience of a persecuted Chinese woman:—

She had been the means of leading her husband to Christ. In the persecution which followed, her husband fled for refuge to the chapel in the neighbourhood; she remained in the village to bear the brunt of the opposition. 'She was not allowed to draw water from the village well. None would sell rice or any food to her; none would speak to her. Her own daughter, when she heard that her parents had burned the family idols, cast them off and would not acknowledge them as her parents. Yet the woman herself testified that during this time of trial she was never cast down. "The Lord," she said, "never left us, not for an hour, else how would these people not have destroyed us altogether? We were being persecuted and hated, yet in my heart there was peace." Her own son took an active part in the persecution, but he too was won at length. Besides her husband, her son, her mother, her younger brother, and two sisters were brought to Christ under her influence. She was afterwards the means of bringing in many more.'

Light upon Early Babylonian History.

BY T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., LECTURER IN ASSYRIAN AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

THAT the recovery of the early Babylonian chronological lists, and therefore of the history of the country in primitive times, is far from being hopeless, is proved by the document just issued in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* for October 1911, where the Rev. P. Scheil publishes a tablet which has recently come into the hands of a private collector. This text gives the dynasties in power before the Gutian invasion, which took place about 2500 B.C.

The text in question must have measured, when complete, about 7 inches long by 3½ in. wide. The writing is large and well formed, and originally consisted of about 29 lines on the obverse, of which 25 remain, and 21 on the reverse, of which 18 remain. The tablet is damaged in places, but the principal harm which it has sustained is the loss of the lower end of the obverse, which has taken away about four lines from that side, and

the beginning of the reverse, with three or four more lines besides. In all, the names of seven kings are wanting at this point, though one of them—perhaps two—can be restored from other sources.

To make the document look complete, a fragment of another tablet, of nearly the same width, and similar as to colour of clay, has been joined on. It is to be hoped, however, that this can be detached without injury to either document, as it is of an entirely different nature, referring, as it does, to certain square roots similar to those published in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iv. pl. 37 [40], and by Hilprecht in the *University of Pennsylvania Expedition*, vol. xx.

The text of the chronological list is in Sumerian, and reads as follows:

U^{ki}pi^{ki}-a Un-zi Lugal-am usu mu in-ak
Un-da-lu-lu i-mina mu in-ak

3. *Ur-saga* *âš mu in-ak*
Bâ-ša-(⁶) Utuki *niša mu in-ak*
I-šu-il *niš-lama mu in-ak*
6. *Šu-(⁶) En-zu dumu I-šu-il-ge i-mina mu in-ak*
Âš lugal-e-ne mu-bi šuš-ušu-ilima mu in-ak-eš
Upia(⁶)-a bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi Kis(⁶) šu-
ba-tum.

At Opis, Un-zi became king, he ruled 30 years.
 Undalulu, he ruled 12 years.

3. Ur-saga, he ruled 6 years.
 Ba-ša-Utuki, he ruled 20 years.
 Išu-il, he ruled 24 years.
 6. Šu-Enzu (I.), son of Išu-il, he ruled 7 years.
 6 kings, they ruled 99 years.

The rule at Opis was changed, Kis acquired the dominion.

9. *Kis(⁶)-a Azag-(⁶) Ba-u sal (⁶)kaš-tin-na suhuš*
Kis(⁶) mu-un-gi-na
lugal-am *šuš-nimin mu in-ak*
Ba-ša-(⁶) Enzu dumu Azag-(⁶) Ba-u-ge
niš-ia mu in-ak

12. *Sur-(⁶) Za-ga-ga¹ dumu Ba-ša-(⁶) En-zu*
âš mu in-ak
Zi-mu-dar *ušu mu in-ak*
U-zi-wo-dar dumu Zi-mu-dar-ra-ge âš mu in-ak

15. *El-mu-ti²* *û-gi mu in-ak*
I-mu-(⁶) Babbar *û-gi mu in-ak*
Na-ni-ia³ *eš mu in-ak*

18. *ussa lugal-e-ne mu-bi ilima-šuš-nimin-âš in-*
ak-eš
Kis(⁶) bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi Unug(⁶) šu-
ba-tum.

9. At Kis, Azag-Bau, wife³ of a wine-merchant,
 became queen,⁴ she ruled 100 years.
 Ba-ša-Enzu (II.), son of Azag-

- Bau, ruled 25 years.
 12. Sur-Zagaga, son of Ba-ša-Enzu, ruled 6 years.
 Zimudar ruled 30 years.
 Uziwadar, son of Zimudar, ruled 6 years.
 15. Elmuti⁵ ruled 11 years.
 Imu-Babbar⁶ ruled 11 years.
 Nania⁷ ruled 3 years.
 18. 8 kings, they ruled 586 years.

¹ In this and other names beginning with UR, I transcribe *sur*, as is indicated in the fragment of the Gilgameš-legend discovered and published by Meissner (see *PSBA* for May 1903, p. 115, iv. 3-4: *Su-ur-Su-na-bu for Ur-Šanabi*).

² Or *Im-mu-ti*.

³ Lit. 'woman.'

⁴ Lit. 'became king.'

⁵ Or *Immuti*.

⁶ Or *Ikul-Babbar*.

⁷ Or *Naniah*.

The rule of Kis was changed, Erech acquired the dominion.

Unug(⁶)-ga Lugal-zag-gi-si lugal-am

- niš-ia mu in-ak*
 21. *Gi lugal mu-bi* *niš-ia in-ak*
Unug(⁶)-ga bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi A-ga-
de(⁶) šu-ba-tum.

At Erech, Lugal-zaggi-si became king,

he ruled 25 years.

21. 1 king, he ruled 25 years.
 The rule of Erech changed, Agade acquired the dominion.

A-ga-de(⁶)-a Šar-ru-ki-in ab-ba-ni nu-giš-šar

24. *ga-šu-gab* *é(⁶) Za-ga-ga*
lugal A-ga-de(⁶) -du-a
. mu in-ak
 27.
 (About four lines are wanting here.)

REVERSE.

(About three lines lost here.)

A-ba-îlu . . . mu *in-ak*
I-li-i-din[nam] *I-mi-îlu*

3. *Na-mu-um-šarru* *I-lu-lu-qar*
lama-bi *eš mu in-ak-eš*
Du-du *niš-gi mu in-ak*
 6. *Su-kar-kib dumu Du-du-ge* *û-ia mu in-ak*
û-mina lugal-e-ne mu-bi eš šuš û-mina in-ak-eš
A-ga-de(⁶) *bala-bi ba-kur*
 9. *nam-lugala-bi* *Unug(⁶) šu-ba-tum.*

At Agade, Šarru-kin, his protector⁸ a gardener

24. libation-priest of the temple of Zagaga,
 became (?) king of Agadé;
 he ruled . . . years.

(Here comes the break between the obverse and the reverse, representing about seven lines.)

Abâ-îlu, he ruled . . . years.

Ili (?)-idin[nam], Imi-îlu,

3. Nanu^m-šarru, Iluluqar,
 these 4, they ruled 3 years.
 Dudu, he ruled 21 years.

6. Šukarkib, son of Dudu, he ruled 15 years.
 12 kings, they ruled 197 years.

The rule of Agadé was changed,

9. Erech acquired the dominion.

Unug(⁶)-ga Sur-nigin lugal-am eš mu in-ak
Sur-(⁶)gigir dumu Sur-nigina-ge âš mu in-ak

⁸ Lit. 'elder,' 'father,' or the like; but the character *ab* is broken, and somewhat doubtful.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 12. <i>Kud-da</i> | <i>ãš mu in-ak</i> |
| <i>Ba-ša-ni-ni</i> (or <i>Ba-ša-i-lī</i>) | <i>ia mu in-ak</i> |
| <i>Sur</i> ^(kⁿ) <i>Babbar</i> | <i>ãš mu in-ak</i> |
| 15. <i>Īa</i> | <i>lugal-e-ne mu-bi niš-ãš in-ak iš</i> |
| <i>Unug</i> ^(kⁿ) <i>ga bala-bi</i> | <i>ba-kur</i> |
| <i>nam-lugala-bi ugnum Gu-ti-u</i> ^(kⁿ) <i>šu-ba-tum</i> | |
- At Erech, Sur-nigin became king,
- | | | |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| | he ruled | 3 years. |
| Sur-gigir, son of Sur-nigin, | he ruled | 6 years. |
| 12. Kudda, | he ruled | 6 years. |
| Ba-ša-nini (-ili), | he ruled | 5 years. |
| Sur-Babbar, | he ruled | 6 years. |
| 15. 5 kings, | they ruled | 25 years. |
- The rule of Erech was changed,
the army of Gutiu^m acquired the dominion.

After a space, comes the date when the tablet was written, the month and the day, but not the year, for which the scribe apparently trusted his memory :

Iti Šeg-a ū ušū-kam
Month Sivan, day 30th.

This important chronological document is apparently an early copy of a part of the text published by the late Geo. Smith in the third vol. of the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1874 (paper read Nov. 4th, 1873). The text brought to the notice of the world by Smith was regarded by him as being 'Fragments of an inscription giving part of the chronology from which the Canon of Berosus was copied,' and this, in fact, is the title of his paper. It has remains of the first column, parts of four lines of the second, parts of five lines of the fourth, and 15 lines of the fifth, the third and sixth columns being entirely lost. The tablet now published by Father Scheil contains the contents, or part of the contents, of the lost third column. Between the dynasty of Gutiu^m and that of Babylon, with which the fourth column of Smith's fragment, as preserved, begins, Scheil places the dynasties of Ur and of Isin. Fixing the date of Hammurabi at about 2100 B.C., and adding to this the total of the dynasties whose duration is given,—Opis, 99 years; Kis, 192 (or 586) years;¹ the first of Erech, 25 years; Agadé, 197 years; the second of Erech, 26 years; Ur, 117 years; and Isin, 225 years,—we obtain a total of 881 years, to which we have to add the duration

¹ For possible explanations of the discrepancy between the real total and that given by the scribe, see Scheil's paper in the *Comptes Rendus*, 1911, p. 612.

of the Gutian dynasty, which was given on the next tablet of the series. What other dynasties ought to be inserted where the various lists are pieced together, and also how many dynasties preceded those given by this new text, is not known. It is to be noted, however, that as far as can be seen, there was no overlapping. A Median dynasty, which may be identical with that of Gutiu^m in this tablet, is said by Berosus and Abydenus to have reigned for 224 years, and to have consisted of 8 kings, headed by Zoroaster (?). Adding this provisionally, we get about 1105 years B.C. as the total to be added to the date of Hammurabi for the earliest ruler, Unzi (or Kalamzi)—3205 B.C. This makes the date of Sargon of Agadé to have been about 2889 B.C.—more or less—against the 3800 years B.C. indicated by the chronology of the scribes of Nabonidus. The evidence of the American excavations at Niffer, where the bricks of Sargon of Agadé are said to occur immediately under those of Sur-Engur in the ruins of the great Temple-tower, has, therefore, about the value which was attributed to it. There were probably only 13 kings between these two rulers, with a total (including the 225 years of the Median dynasty) of 250 years. Whether the Median kings restored the Babylonian temples or not is doubtful—their religious beliefs probably differed entirely, especially if the authorities mentioned be correct in giving the name of the first king of the dynasty as Zoroaster (?).

With regard to the dynasties themselves, the earliest given by this tablet, that of Opis, is new to us. It is noteworthy that though the first four names are Sumerian, Išuil may be Semitic, and the Sumerian Šu-Enzu may be read in Semitic as Gimil-Sin. Gimil-Sin II., son of Sur-Bau, and grandson of Dungi, belonged to the dynasty of Ur, which reigned at a later date. Noteworthy is the name of the third ruler, Ursag, 'the warrior' or 'hero.' A ruler of Opis named Zuzu, defeated by Ê-anna-tum, *iššak* of Lagaš, is regarded by Scheil as having in all probability reigned later.

The position of Opis is not yet definitively known, but Winckler and Hommel agree in placing it on the right bank of the Tigris, below Bagdad. In a text detailing the advantages of pilgrimages, Upè (Opis) occurs between two mentions of a place called Laban; in the 2nd vol. of the *Cuneiform Inscr. of W. Asia*, Upi (Opis) occurs on the same line as the city of Eššu, and before Èridu, the

Babylonian sacred city, and Ni-tuk (Tilmun, regarded as the head of the Persian Gulf, including the island of Bahrein). The archaic geographical list in the 4th vol. of the same work, pl. 36 [38], has the ideograph for Opis after that for the city now represented by Jokha, and before Magan and Meluhha (east and west Arabia, including the peninsula of Sinai—see Hommel, *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*). Though these lists are not of much use in determining the positions of cities, there seems to be confirmation here in the position assigned to Opis.

From Opis, the dominion passed to Kis, now represented by the site Oheimer, formerly written Hymer, described by Layard as being about eight miles NE. of Hillah (Babylon). From its size, it was a place of considerable importance, and must have occupied the position in primitive times which Babylon assumed later. Azag-Bau, in Semitic Bau-êllit, seems to have been the first ruler of the united Babylonian states, and though only the wife of a wine-seller, founded the city of Kis. The length of her reign, which is set down at 100 years, needs explanation—it may be that she reigned so long that people lost count, or she may have had a daughter with whom she shared the throne, and the latter continued in her name after Azag-Bau had passed away.¹ Her name is found in the following omen :

‘If a young animal be male and female,
it is the omen of Azag-Bau,
who ruled the land—
the king forsook (?) the land.’

It is a great gain to have found the relative position of queen Azag-Bau, more especially as her name is given after that of Sargon (of Agadé) in the bilingual list of rulers in *Western Asia Inscriptions*, vol. v. pl. 44. The line following states, however, that the names are not in their proper order. No other known king of Kis occurs among the remaining names of the new tablet.

Though his power passed away after his death, Lugal-zaggi-si, king of Erech, who succeeded to the overlordship of Babylonia, was one of the most renowned rulers of ancient Babylonia. Originally *iššak* of Umma, he ravaged and captured Lagaš, and claims to have carried his arms beyond the Tigris and the Euphrates, and as far as the upper

¹ 120 years of life and 100 years of rule, however, would not be impossible.

sea. He was a contemporary of Uru-ka-gina of Lagaš, whose date is likewise brought into the possibility of being fixed.

The statement concerning Šarru-kin, as Šargāni of Agadé is here called, is exceedingly interesting. The autobiographical legend concerning him is well known. It states that he was the ‘mighty king, the king of Agadé.’ His mother was a priestess, he knew not his father, and his uncle was a mountaineer (‘loved the mountain’). It was in the city of Azupirānu, lying upon the Euphrates, that she conceived him, and brought him forth in a secret place. She then laid him in a receptacle whose opening she closed with bitumen, and committed him to the river, which did not overwhelm him, but carried him to Akki, the A-BALA or *naq mē*, ‘the outpurer of the (holy) water,’ who adopted him, and made him his orchard-keeper, in which capacity the goddess Ištar favoured him. How he became king is not stated, but at the time of the composition of this legend he is said to have reigned a number of years ending in 5—35, 45, or 55 years. He then goes on to speak of his conquests, and makes recommendations to the king who should come after him.

This ignorance as to who his father was is not confirmed by his historical inscriptions, however, for he states, on his bricks, that he was son of Dati-Bêl. The next name in this list was probably that of Narām-Sin, his son, who, according to Nabonidus, reigned 3200 years before his time—*i.e.* about 3750 B.C. Whether there was more than one Babylonian Sargon is doubtful, but it is to be noted that there is a very curious entry, apparently referring to this king, in the *W. Asia Inscriptions*, vol. ii. pl. 48, i. l. 40, where the ancient Babylonian form of the character for ‘king,’ doubled, the lower component slightly different, and glossed *dadru*, is explained as *Šarru-kin* (Sum. *Lugal-gina*), *šar kêtî, dabib kêtî, dabib damqâti*, ‘Sargon, king of justice, pronouncer of justice, pronouncer of good fortunes.’ This would seem to imply that he was in some way twice a king—either morally, by the nobility of his character, or because of a belief that he had appeared on earth again in the person of a later ruler bearing the same or a similar name.² It seems unlikely

² See my paper in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* for Jan. 13, 1885, p. 65 ff. Professor Hommel seems to have come to the same conclusion (*ib.* p. 68, footnote) a couple of years earlier.

that Šargani and Šarru-kin are the names of two kings which have been confused; but such a thing is not impossible—in any case, the inscriptions of Babylonia will probably ultimately set us on the right track.

Father Scheil also announces that he has found, engraved upon a votive piece of marble, in a private collection, the name of Ašlultu^m, wife of a certain Šarru-kin.

In all probability the later kings of Agadú, whose names are all new to us, were far from being as warlike as Šarru-kin and his immediate successors, and the dominion of Babylonia passed again to Erech under Sur-nigin. He reigned only three years, and was followed by his son; but the absence of any indication of relationship among their successors suggests that, though Erech retained the overlordship, the remaining kings of the dynasty did not reign in a direct line. This, with the short duration of their reigns, seems to indicate, as Professor Scheil points out, the instability of their position, and the possibility of divisions, and consequently of weakness, in Babylonia generally. Now, therefore, was the opportunity of the warlike rulers of Gutiu^m, and Babylonia fell, for a time, under their dominion. The next dynasty in chronological order was that of Ur (about 2300 B.C.), which may have been the rescuer, so to say, of

Babylonia from the foreign yoke which oppressed her. Unfortunately, the first years of Dungi's reign are wanting in the chronological date-list from Niffer which has been published by Prof. Hilprecht, so that we have no record of any campaigns which he may then have made.¹ If the tablets of the preceding period were written under the Gutian rulers of Babylonia, it seems probable that the kings of that dynasty did not reside in Babylonia, but governed from their own capital. It would also suggest an explanation for such a date as 'Year the water returned' (? to its former level); but be this as it may, the tablet bearing this date-colophon² refers to 'oxen and sheep of (*or* for) the king of the Gutians,' and others refer to butter and oil for the land of Gutiu^m.³

In the tablet of which fragments were published in 1873 by the late George Smith there were about two columns of Babylonian dynasties preceding the earliest given here.⁴ It would almost be worth while sifting the earth of the old palaces of Nineveh over again, with the hope of finding further fragments—not only of this, but also of numerous other inscriptions of importance.

¹ For a translation of this, see *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i. p. xiv.

² *Ib.* p. 15.

³ *Ib.* p. 20.

⁴ See L. W. King's copy in his *Chronicles concerning early Bab. Kings*, vol. ii. pp. 143 and 145.

The Resurrecting Energy of God.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., LOGIEPERT.

'The exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the might of his strength which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead . . . and (raised) you, when ye were dead in trespasses and sins.'—EPI I¹⁹. 2¹.

THE power of God which energized and operated in Christ in raising Him from the dead—that, and nothing less, is the power which energizes and operates in men as often as they are raised from the death of trespasses and sins. Such, it would seem, is the message of these words of St. Paul. To realize the significance of this message, let us see the lie of the Apostle's thought.

I.

In this letter 'to the Ephesians'—a circular letter or encyclical written from Rome to Ephesus

and other Churches of Asia Minor—Paul dwells, to begin with, on the great fundamental truths of the gospel, the gospel of the revelation of 'the mystery of the Christ,' as he is fond of calling it, with a view to leading the members of the several congregations to a deeper and larger knowledge of the purposes of God in grace. The letter opens with a great outburst of wondering adoration and praise. As Paul gets up to the heights and, with widened horizon, surveys the revelation of the mercy and grace of God in Christ, at once in its beginnings, in its course, and in its contemplated end or issue, he can but give expression to his feelings in a great and grand doxology of holy exultation: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in the heavenlies in Christ' (1³).