

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

A book of remembrance was written and laid in the Temple. Their names were enrolled in a register, and on the day when Jehovah took stock of His property, He would regard them as His.

The prophet is not only encouraging the proselytes; he is also condemning the spirit which led men to think that no matter how a man sought to serve God; his service was vain if he was not an Israelite; and the Israelite would be safe even in

his godlessness. Over against this the prophet teaches that God regards all who serve Him as a part of His property, His peculiar treasure. The true distinction to be drawn is not between the Israelite and the non-Israelite, but between the righteous and the wicked. The difference that really counts is 'between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not.'

The Dynasties of Sumer and Akkad.

By S. LANGDON, M.A., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

EARLY Babylonian chronology is being slowly but surely established by means of cuneiform records. The subject excites peculiar interest, not only because it is the framework of the history of a great civilization, but because of its direct bearing upon the traditional chronology of the Old Testament. The Nippur collection in Philadelphia has furnished most of the material for the reconstruction of the legendary and authentic dynasties from the Flood to the period of the kings of Isin (2357-2132 B.C.). The most remarkable tablet was found by Dr. Poebel in 1913, and published as No. 2 of his *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (1914). This large tablet carried six columns of about forty lines each on both obverse and reverse. Only about one-quarter of the text is preserved. Written in the reign of the eleventh king of Isin, about the middle of the 23rd century, it preserved the historical reconstruction of the scholars of the great temple school at Nippur. From the Flood to the period of writing eleven different cities had been the seats of Sumerian or Semitic kings. Kish, in Akkad, near Babylon, had been the capitol four times; Erech, in Sumer, five times; Ur, in Sumer, three times; and the following cities were each the capitol of Sumer and Akkad, once in the long period of the conflict between Sumerian and Semite: Awan (or Awak), east of the Tigris; Hamazi, in the same region; Adab, in Sumer; Ma-er, an old Sumerian settlement on the middle Euphrates and later an Amorite capitol; Akšak, later called Opis, on the Tigris at the mouth of the river Adhem; Agade, near Sippar; Gutium (a land); and Isin, of unknown location, on the Euphrates

north of Nippur. The names of these eleven cities have been restored by a remarkable discovery just published by Dr. Legrain, Curator of the Babylonian Collection in the University Museum, Philadelphia. He has found a fragment from the upper middle section of a six-column tablet duplicate of the Poebel tablet with many peculiarities of its own. A good photograph and translation have been given in the *Museum Journal*, December 1920, a copy of which reached me this day (January 18). The photograph is so excellent that one is able to control the translation and to make an estimate of the lost portions, so that Babylonian chronology can now be reconstructed with small margin of uncertainty back to a period considerably before 4000.

The Poebel tablet begins with two long legendary dynasties, the first at Kish, which was Semitic, and the second at Erech, which was Sumerian. The names of the kings are incomplete. The years of the reigns vary from 1200 to 100 years. These fabulous reigns belong to the era of legend, but they cannot be dismissed entirely from real history. The third post-diluvian kingdom was again Sumerian, and ruled at Ur. It contained only four kings, and the names of the last two, which were defective on the larger tablet, are restored by the new tablet. Then followed a dynasty at Awan of three kings. Their names are broken from both tablets. It is obvious that the next dynasty returned to Ur, since the only place left for the insertion of the second of the three kingdoms of Ur is at the end of column 1 on the Legrain tablet. It contained four kings who ruled 108

years, as we know from the totals on a dynastic list. The new tablet has the astounding statement that the kingdom was now obtained by Kish, where six kings ruled 3792 years. It had been supposed that the first kingdom of Ur, to which the chroniclers assigned four kings and the modest total of 171 years, belonged to authentic history. But here comes a later kingdom with six kings whose reigns average more than 600 years. The photograph shows that Legrain's reading is correct. The three kings of Awan reigned 356 years.

The new tablet places the kingdom of Ḥamazi after this long kingdom of Kish. It had but one king whose name ended in . . . *mi-iš*, and the Poebel tablet assigns only 7 years to his reign.¹ The period of authentic history has now been reached, and it is disturbing to find the fabulous figures 3792 years assigned to the preceding kingdom of Kish. There is obviously something wrong about the scribe's addition of the figures for the six kings of the second Kish dynasty. Amazing errors of this kind recur in chronological tablets, and it may well be that the sign for 3600 should be suppressed, leaving 192 years for this period. All available dynastic tablets for the reconstruction of the dynasty which succeeded Ḥamazi fail us at this point. Here I place the third dynasty of Kish, to which belonged the kings Mesilim, Urzaged, Lugaltarsi, and Enbi-Ašdar, reconstructed in my *History of Sumer* (in press) from the inscriptions. The next dynasty would be the second kingdom of Erech, to which belong Eñšagkušanna, Lugalkigubnidudu, and Lugalkisalsi. Legrain's tablet at the end of Obverse II. and at the top of Obverse III. is to be restored by these two kingdoms. We now reach the kingdom of Adab on this tablet, which states that it consisted of only one king, Lugal-anni-mundu.² The tablet assigns 90 years to his reign. Here the chronicler's inaccuracy can be proven, for the inscriptions from Adab mention at least two more kings, Lugaldalu and Mebasi. The probability is that the scribe knew the length of the dynasty but

not all of its kings, and assigned the whole period to one. Lugalannimundu is the only king of Adab yet found on Nippur tablets.

The new tablet contains the surprising entry of a dynasty at Ma-er, which followed on that of Adab. The statuette of an old Sumerian king of Ma-er named [. . .] Babbar was already known. The tablet has the name of the founder of this kingdom, *Dingir-gid* and his son [. . .]gi, and I estimate that the tablet could spare space for about four kings of Ma-er. They appear to have been Sumerians, and not until the age of Sargon of Agade do Semitic names appear at Ma-er. The tablet now continued with the kingdom of Akšak, re-named Opis in Cassite times. The names and the terms of the six kings of Akšak are known from the important dynastic tablet published by Scheil, which begins here. Legrain's tablet agrees with the Scheil tablet in assigning 99 years to the period. Both tablets make the fourth Kish dynasty the successor of the Akšak kingdom. Scheil's tablet has an incredible entry about a woman wine merchant, Azag-Bau, who is said to have made secure the foundation of Kish, and to have reigned 100 years! But the Legrain tablet, with more probability, has it that Puzur-Sin, the son of Azag-Bau, was the first king, and ruled 25 years. The Scheil tablet makes Puzur-Sin the second ruler, and also assigns 25 years to him. To Ur-Ilbaba, the next king, the Scheil tablet assigns 6 years, and the new chronicle apparently 80! where it breaks away. The 100 years assigned to the queen Azag-Bau are not entirely mythical. An omen text says that 'she ruled the land,' and she is placed by later chronologists among the famous rulers of early times. It is certain that a very long period must be assigned to her either as a real ruler or as queen-regent. From the new tablet it is to be inferred that she was queen-regent, and that the 100 years assigned to her must partially drop out of our chronology. Scheil's tablet, including her as a ruler, gives eight kings for the fourth Kish dynasty, and 586 years as the total, whereas the total of the terms actually given is only 192, and that includes the doubtful 100 of Azag-Bau. The Legrain tablet makes up for lost figures by increasing 6 to 80(?) for Ur-Ilbaba, but it then breaks away, and we are abandoned to conjecture. I suggest that 192 years be regarded as the actual duration of this period, that Azag-Bau was queen-regent for her son and grandson, and that she

¹ This statement depends upon whether my conjecture for the last sign of Poebel, No. 2, Rev. II., is correct. I propose to read *šag Ḥa-ma-zi* in that passage. The whole passage would then read: 'Altogether one king, he ruled seven years. Once in Ḥamazi.'

² On two duplicate inscriptions the name is written *Lugal-an-ni-mu-un-du*, Poebel, *B.E.* vi.² No. 130, Obv. 2, and *Lugal-an-na-mu-un-dū*, *P.B.S.* v. 75, col. i. 3.

actually ruled for a short time at the beginning of the kingdom.

We now come to the most important contribution concerning the problem of early chronology. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, repeatedly states that Narām-Sin was the son of Sargon, and reigned 3200 years before 553 B.C., or 3753 B.C. All the kingdoms which we have been reviewing preceded the kingdom of Agade, founded by Sargon, who began to reign nearly a century before Narām-Sin. Sargon would then be placed about 3850 B.C., and it would be possible to retrace actual history by dead reckoning back to 6000 B.C. Nabonidus has been generally discredited alike by archæology, epigraphy, and contemporaneous records. Bricks of Sargon and Narām-Sin are found at Adab and Nippur, almost immediately below the pavements of Ur-Engur (2474). The measurements of the Legrain tablet prove that there is just enough space between the end of Reverse III., where the Gutium kingdom (successor of the kingdom of Agade) ends, and the fragmentary lines of Reverse IV. (dynasty of Isin), to place the lost fifth kingdom of Erech and the four kings of the last kingdom of Ur. It is wholly impossible to account for a break of 1000 years between Gutium and Isin at the end of Reverse III. and the top of Reverse IV., where the Isin dynasty begins. The size of this tablet is fixed not only by comparison with the Poebel tablet, but by those breaks which can be filled in from reliable sources. Nabonidus is definitely discredited and charged with an error of 1000 years.

After the fourth kingdom of Kish, followed the third kingdom of Erech, with one king, Lugalzaggisi, who falls in the break at the top of Reverse I. on the Legrain tablet. We now learn that the famous Sargon of Agade was originally a cup-bearer of Ur-Ilbaba, who reigned 79 years before Sargon at Kish. The probability is that Ur-Ilbaba had been deified, and that Sargon served in this cult at Kish in his youth. The office of cup-bearer was purely a religious one, wherefore we are bound to infer that Sargon served in a cult, and not as a servant of the living king. The sources enable us to fill up the entire break between the end of Obverse IV. and Reverse I., thus permitting an almost exact reconstruction of the size of the tablet, a fact which has been of greatest value in the discussion of the Nabonidus dates. With the Reverse of the new tablet we now learn that Rimush was the son of

Sargon, and succeeded his father to the throne. Sargon is credited with the long reign of 55 years. Rimush reigned 15 years. The tablet then gives as the third king, Maništesu, and then [. . .] *Ri-]mu-uš*, which Legrain restores, 'son of Rimush.' This restoration is confirmed by a new join to the Legrain tablet. Now there is a long inscription of a king of Agade, in which he endowed the temple of the sun-god at Sippar,¹ and in which he is described as the son of Sargon. This inscription, however, is almost certainly to be assigned to Manishtusu, for it records the conquest of Anshan and Shirišum in terms identical with an inscription of Manishtusu at Nippur.² I suggest that the scribe of the cruciform monument meant grandson of Sargon when he described Manishtusu as 'son' of Sargon. In the same way Narām-Sin, who was really the great-grandson of Sargon, became in tradition the son of Sargon. According to Legrain's new join, which he has been good enough to send me (April 6), Manishtusu reigned 7 years, and his son Narām-Sin 56 years. Legrain's new join seems to omit Imi, and spells the name of Igi as I-ki-[ki] (?). The Scheil tablet assigns 197 years to the empire of Agade, which was succeeded by the short fourth kingdom of Erech, five kings and 26 years in all. These belong, in the break at the top of Legrain's tablet Reverse II., where the text continues with the kingdom of Agade. From this text and the inscriptions the names of ten of the twenty-one kings of the Gutium period can be restored. The period of 125 years ended with *Tirikān*, and was followed by the fifth kingdom of Erech, whose founder was Utuḥegal. This kingdom is now the only unknown factor in our knowledge of the dynastic lists before Ur-Engur, whose date is fairly certain (2474). Since the four kings of Ur are to be placed at the end of the break on Legrain Reverse III. and the top of Reverse IV. there is space for about three names here. I assign 50 years to the last kingdom of Erech and the period between the dynasty of Gutium and Ur-Engur.

It will be seen that the chronology before 2474 is now placed on a foundation approaching certainty. The degree of uncertainty is not great, although the date of departure (2474) for the reconstruction is still disputed, some wishing to reduce the figure

¹ See King, 'The Cruciform Monument of Manishtusu, *Revue d'Assyriologie*.

² Poebel, *P.B.S.* iv. 205.

by more than a century. Accepting 2474 as the date of the founding of the last empire of Ur, I have reconstructed the outline of ancient history in the table appended to this paper. Operating with most conservative figures, we are bound to begin authentic history in Mesopotamia as early as 5000 B.C., when the Semite was already in the land. The period of earlier Sumerian migration and occupation is left to conjecture.

Kish (first kingdom), semi-mythical, about 21 kings.
 Erech (first kingdom), semi-mythical, about 11 kings.
 Ur (first kingdom), 4316-4145 (171).
 Awan, 4145-4045 (100)? Dynastic tablet, 356!
 Ur (second kingdom), 4045-3937 (108).

Kish (second kingdom, 6 kings), 3937-3745 (192!). (Dynastic tablet, 3792 years for this kingdom).

Uamazi, 3745-3738 (7).

Kish (third kingdom), 3738-3588 (150). *Mesilim*, etc.

Erech (second kingdom), 3588-3358 (130).

Adab, 3358-3268 (90).

Ma-cr, 3268-3188 (80).

Akšak, 3188-3089 (99). *Ur-Ninū*.

Kish (fourth kingdom), 3089-2897 (192). *Entemena*, etc.

Erech (third kingdom), 2897-2872 (25).

Agade, 2872-2675 (197).

Erech (fourth kingdom), 2675-2649 (26).

Gutum, 2649-2524 (125).

Erech (fifth kingdom), 2524-2474 (50).

Ur (third kingdom), 2474-2357 (117).

Isin, 2357-2132 (225).

First Babylonian Dynasty, 2225-1926 (299).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Heart Satisfied.

'One . . . whose heart the Lord opened.'—Ac 16¹⁴.

ONE can never look into the eyes of a little Indian girl and not feel that there is a wonderful something behind them. It is a hungry look—a look that says, 'I want love, and I want to know.'

A missionary in India tells of a little village girl who came to her after an open-air meeting and said that she was a Christian. She was taken to live at the mission station and there she was given the name of Star. She and the lady missionary became great friends. Love came as a charm to Star. It opened her eyes so that she could see God; it opened her lips too, and she could not keep from telling her friend all that was in her heart.

Almost a year after the open-air meeting at which Star confessed herself a Christian, they were together at a camp-meeting in a tent. The air was stifling, and when it was over they wandered out together to get cooled. Hand in hand they walked about over the great sandy plain on which their tents were pitched. The wonder of the night with all its solemn grandeur broke in upon the mind of the Indian girl like the sense of a great Presence. When at last they lay down on the

sand and had been quite silent for some time Star spoke.

'Amma,' she said softly, 'this reminds me of the night I first spoke with God.' It was with the little Indian girl as with Abraham when God spoke to him as a man speaketh to his friend.

Then Star went on to tell how when she used to look at her hands and feet she kept asking herself, 'Who made me? Was it Siva the great God of India?' She asked her father too; he did not seem to know, and tried to put her off. At last she decided on a plan by which she was sure she could find out. She had a very trying temper, and was so overbearing that other children could not be induced to play with her. To go round all the gods she knew, and find out which of them could change her disposition would, she felt sure, lead her in time to the god who had made her.

So she prayed to Siva. 'O heavenly Siva, hear me! Change my disposition that other children may love me and wish to play with me.' No change came. And in despair she went away into the jungle and laid her head on the ground and cried for help to come. And still she wondered who made her. 'Who am I?' 'Why was I made?' she asked every one who would listen, and her people began to think her strange. She was a sensitive child and made up her mind she would never ask questions again, but she thought all the more.