

St. John says in his Epistle, is the eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested to us (1 John i. 2).

2. The manifestation and consequent communication to us is *through the flesh*—i.e., through the true human nature which He took, and in which all His action toward us and for us has been accomplished.

3. We have participation in the Son of God come in the flesh, and in all that He did in the flesh for us, *by faith*—i.e., by spiritual acts of coming and believing.

This coming and believing is not a single act, but a *continuous habit*, as is the support of physical life by food. And so Christ is to us not only the source of life, but the *bread of life*—i.e., its *constant supply and support*.

The apprehension, appropriation, and assimilation of Christ by faith is a spiritual eating and drinking which makes us participants of His flesh and blood, His human nature, and all that through it He does for us, and shows to us, and gives to us, and is to us.



ART. II.—CHALDEAN PRINCES ON THE THRONE OF BABYLON (ISAIAH XIII. 19).

II.

IN the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* for May 6, 1884, Dr. Pinches published a facsimile of a tablet of unbaked clay from Babylon, to which reference has already been made as the Second Dynastic Tablet, and of which Professor Sayce has given a translation in "Records of the Past," New Series, vol. i., pp. 15-19. This tablet, in virtue of its contents, is so important as to merit a very careful description. It consists of four columns of cuneiform writing, two on the obverse and two on the reverse, the top of one side forming the bottom of the other. Although considerable portions at the top of Cols. I. and II., and at the bottom of Cols. III. and IV., are broken away, there are two things which enable us to determine the original size of the tablet, and so to get at the length of the columns and the number of lines in each. In the first place, the peculiar shape of the tablet, the obverse being flat and the reverse curved, enables us to fix on the thickest part as the middle point. Then the first remaining line of Col. I., which reads: "11 Kings" [of the dynasty of Babylon, etc.], shows that eleven lines have been broken off, whilst the size of the writing enables us to calculate the space occupied by

these lines, and so to get the distance from the middle point to the top of Col. I., which is found to be $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The tablet, then, must have been 5 inches long, and the size of the writing allows for thirty-two lines in each column. Also supposing Col. IV. to have been filled up with writing, this tablet when entire must have contained a complete list of the Babylonian dynasties from the dynasty of Khammurabi, under which Babylon became the seat of empire, down to the time of the Persian Sovereigns.¹ In its present condition, however, the tablet commences with the summary of the dynasty of Khammurabi, given in Col. I. 12, and closes at Col. IV. 22 with the name of Kandulanu—*i.e.*, Assurbanipal of Assyria, the predecessor of Nabopolassar on the throne of Babylon.

The first period of Chaldean rule over Babylon is covered by Dynasty IV. on the tablet, the dynasty of Isin, which consisted of eleven Kings, and lasted probably 132 years.² Only four royal names of this dynasty survive on the tablet, the first and last being mere fragments;³ but three others have been recovered from Assyrian sources, and the whole seven have been arranged by Professor Rogers as follows:⁴

1. Marduk—
2.)
3.) Four unknown Kings.
4.)
5.)
6. Nabû-kudurri-utsur (Nebuchadnezzar I.).
7. Bel-nadin-akhe.
8. Marduk-nadin-akhe.
9. Marduk-akhe-irba.
10. Marduk-shapik-zer-mati.
11. Nabû-shum—

With respect to the above Kings, Nebuchadnezzar I., the conqueror of the Kassites, was a contemporary of Asshur-rish-ishi, King of Assyria.⁵ Bel-nadin-akhe is known from an inscription on a boundary-stone. His rule appears to have extended over "the Country of the Sea."⁶ Marduk-nadin-

¹ It may have closed with Cyrus or Cambyses, or possibly a little earlier, to allow room for the name of the owner to be affixed at the end.

² This is the most approved reading, *not* seventy-two, as given in R.P., N.S., vol. i., p. 17.

³ See Col. II. 30, and Col. IV. 8.

⁴ See Roger's History, vol. i., p. 342.

⁵ See "The Synchronous History of Assyria and Babylonia," R.P., N.S., vol. iv., p. 30.

⁶ See "Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek," Band iv., SS. 64-67.

akhe was a contemporary of Tiglathpileser I. of Assyria.¹ The location of Marduk-akhe-irba is, according to Rogers, exceedingly doubtful; nevertheless he takes this to be the King part of whose name appears on Col. III. 6, and the length of whose reign is there given as "1 year and 6 months." Marduk-shapik-zer-mati, sometimes read Marduk-shapik-kullat, was a contemporary of Assur-bel-kala of Assyria, the son of Tiglathpileser I. He appears to have lost his crown at the hands of Ramman-apal-iddina, a person of humble birth, who, nevertheless, married his daughter to the Assyrian King.² The arguments for the Chaldean origin of this dynasty are threefold. In the first place, all the Kings have one of the elements "Marduk" and "Nabû" in their names³ (the significance of which will be presently explained), but not so the usurper Ramman-apal-iddina. Secondly, Nebuchadnezzar I., in his inscription (Col. I. 2), calls himself *tsi-it Babilî*, "the offspring of Babylon," a term which, as we shall see, points to his being a Chaldean. Lastly, the fact of the usurper Ramman-apal-iddina being able, despite his low origin, to make such a good marriage for his daughter may be explained by the consideration that it was to the interest of Assyria that Babylon should be wrested from the Kaldi.

The dynasty of Isin, according to Rogers, commenced *circa* 1206 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar I. being the sixth King. Some authorities, however, look upon this monarch as the founder of the dynasty, in which case we must place its commencement about 1140 B.C.⁴ If, then, our supposition be correct that this was a Chaldean dynasty, Chaldean Princes must have been sitting on the throne of Babylon as early as 1206 B.C., or at least 1140 B.C. Taking the later date, and placing the exodus of Israel in 1335 B.C.,⁵ it will be seen that "Ur of the Chaldees" may well have been in the hands of that people at the time when Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

The second period during which Chaldean Princes were seated on the throne of Babylon is covered by the last two dynasties remaining on the tablet, viz., the eighth and ninth. The so-called Eighth Dynasty begins at Col. III. 19, and closes at Col. IV. 6. On Col. III. lines 19 and 20 are partly legible, and the rest is broken away. Still, we can see that this

¹ See "The Synchronous History," R.P., N.S., vol. iv., p. 30.

² See *ibid.*, p. 31.

³ Practically so, since in the case of Bel-nadin-appe Bel=Marduk.

⁴ See "A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians," p. 156, by Professor Goodspeed. London, 1903.

⁵ See "The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia," p. 307, by Professor T. G. Pinches. London, 1902.

dynasty must have occupied 20 lines—viz., 14 lines on Col. III. + 6 lines on Col. IV. This allows for the names of nineteen Kings and a summary. The summary is very briefly given in Col. IV. 6, "31 Dynasty of Babylon," and must evidently be read "31 years," and *not* "31 Kings." The reason for this is twofold. First, as we have seen, there is not room for thirty-one Kings, only for nineteen.¹ In the next place, as C. P. Tiele points out, throughout the tablet the number of years is always specified without the addition of *shamati* "years;"² whilst, on the other hand, the number of Kings is never without the addition of *sharrani* "Kings."³ Reading, then, Col. IV. 6 as "31 [*years*] Dynasty of Babylon," we see that it can only refer to the five Kings whose names occupy the first five lines of that column. Hence it is clear that the last fourteen lines of Col. III. must have contained another dynasty of thirteen Kings, with a closing summary. Let us call this Dynasty VIIIA. Then the short dynasty of five Kings at the top of Col. IV. will be VIIIb. I propose to show that both of these dynasties were composed of Chaldean Kings.

The names of the Kings of Dynasty VIIIA., though broken away from the lower part of Col. II., have nevertheless been recovered in no less than eight instances, and their chronological sequence determined by means of the Assyrian historical records.⁴ The order of these Kings is as follows :

Nabû-kin-aplu,
 Erba-Marduk,
 Shamash-mudammiq,
 Nabû-shum-yukin I.,
 Nabû-apal-iddina,
 Marduk-nadin-shumu,
 Marduk-balatsu-iqbi,
 Bau-akhi-iddina,

and it will be seen at a glance that six out of these eight monarchs have "Marduk" or "Nabû" as an element in their names; this is an indication, as stated above, that the dynasty before us is a Chaldean one, although it would be too sweeping an assertion to affirm that every King of

¹ Sayce reads "21 Kings" instead of 31 in "Ancient History of Babylonia," p. xi; and as the curved reverse side of the tablet gives a little more room, this might seem a possible reading; but Tiele's reasoning is decisive against it.

² Except, indeed, in the case of a *single* year. See Col. II. 21, 22, 27, and Col. III. 6.

³ See "Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte," Teil I., S. 105, footnote.

⁴ See Dr. Paul Rost in "Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft," 1897, Heft ii.

Babylon whose name contains the name of one of those deities must be a Chaldean, seeing that even in the Kassite dynasty we meet with Marduk-apal-iddina, the son of Meli-Shipak (= "man of Merodach").¹ Agreeable, however, to the supposition that the above six Kings are Chaldeans is the fact that there is good reason for thinking that the remaining two, Shamash-mudammîq and Bau-akhi-iddina, whose names do not contain those elements, were usurpers. Thus, with respect to Shamash-mudammîq, "The Synchronous History of Assyria and Babylonia" informs us that he was slain by Nabû-shum-yukin, his successor on the throne.² If, therefore, we assume the latter to have been a Chaldean, the probability would be that the former was a usurper. So, too, in the case of Bau-akhi-iddina. When he first comes before us in the inscription of Shamshi-Rammanu, King of Assyria, he appears as the vassal of Marduk-balatsu-iqbi, his predecessor on the throne of Babylon; and this latter King, from the Kaldi forming the first of his auxiliaries, may be presumed to have been a Chaldean, as we have already seen. Ban-akhi-iddina, therefore, in whatever way he secured the throne, whether through the fickleness of the Babylonians or the interposition of the Assyrians, as far as the dynasty is concerned must be regarded as a usurper.

With reference to the other Kings of this dynasty, we possess a long mercantile inscription of Nabû-kin-aplu, from which it may be gathered that he sat on the throne of Babylon shortly after the time of Uras-kudurri-utsur, the second monarch of Dynasty VI., whose reign terminated only six years and three months before the commencement of Dynasty VIIIA., and that he had reigned at least twenty-four years at the time when the inscription was written.³ This has led Dr. P. Rost to regard him as the first monarch of Dynasty VIIIA., who, according to the same authority, reigned thirty-six years.⁴ The position of Erba-Marduk is somewhat uncertain. Rost regards him as one of about six (?) kings, whom he supposes to have reigned during the interval between Nabû-kin-aplu and Shamash-mudammîq. The Chaldean origin of this King is certified by the fact that Merodach-baladan claims him as an ancestor.⁵ Nabû-shum-yukin is a name that occurs again as that of the second and fifth Kings

¹ See R.P., N.S., vol. i., p. 33.

² See *ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 32.

³ See "Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek," Band iv., SS. 82-93, where the name Uras-kudurri-utsur is given as Ninip-kudurri-utsur.

⁴ Pinches' reading in Col. IV. 19 of the tablet is "13 years." See R.P., N.S., vol. i., p. 17.

⁵ See the inscription of Merodach-baladan, Col. II. 43.

in Dynasty VIII^B. In a cuneiform text published by Mr. S. A. Strong in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1892, vol. xxiv., p. 350, mention is made of a King of Babylon bearing this name, who is further styled "the son of Dakuri," from whence it may be inferred that he was the Prince of the Chaldean State of Bit-Dakuri. Evidence is thus adduced that either this Nabû-shum-yukin, or his namesakes in Dynasty VIII^B., were Chaldeans. Turning next to Nabû-apal-iddina and his son Marduk-nadin-shumu, we observe that it was the defeat of the former by Assur-natsir-pal which, as noticed above, overwhelmed with terror the country of Kaldu, thus arguing a racial connection between these two monarchs and the Kaldi. Thus, to sum up the evidence, we may safely say that there is a strong probability that Dynasty VIII^A. was a Chaldean dynasty.

Passing now to Dynasty VIII^B., which occupies the first six lines of Col. IV., it will be seen that the evidence for its Chaldean origin is equally strong. This dynasty is given on the tablet as follows :

COLUMN IV.

1.
2. Nabû-shum-yukin for . . . (years).
3. Nabû-[natsir] for [14] (years).
4. Nabû-nadin-zeri his son for 2 (years).
5. Nabû-shum-yukin his son for 1 month and 12 days.
6. The 31 (years) of the dynasty of Babylon.

Here the name of the first King is wanting, whilst the name and length of reign of the third King, the Nabonassar of the classical writers, can be filled in from the Babylonian Chronicle. It will be noticed, further, that all the names contain the element Nabû, and that the last three Kings are in the direct succession of father and son. But the chief evidence as to the Chaldean origin of the dynasty is to be found in the name given to it in the summary, "*The dynasty of Babylon.*" This is a name which appears twice again on the tablet and in this same column, viz., in lines 15 and 18. In line 15 it is applied to Bel-ebush (Bel-ibni), in line 18 to Mushezib-Marduk. These two Kings reigned at Babylon in the time of Sennacherib. The former is described by him on the Bellino Cylinder as Bel-ibni, the son of the chief of the builders, *of the offspring of Babylon.*"¹ The latter he expressly calls "*Shuzub the Chal-*

¹ See the Bellino Cylinder, line 13, *Bel-ibni (amelu) rab bani pir'u Bâbili*. The words *rab bani* ("chief of the builders") were formerly read syllabically, KAL-DA ("a Chaldean"), but this reading is now disallowed. With *pir'u Bâbili* compare *tsi-it Bâbili* in the inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I. referred to above.

dean."¹ It appears, then, from the case of this Shuzub that by "the dynasty of Babylon," and the parallel expression "the offspring of Babylon," we are to understand a Chaldean dynasty.² It would seem as though these Chaldean Princes considered themselves Babylonians *par excellence*. Compare the language of the prophet Ezekiel, when speaking of the Princes and nobles of the time of Nebuchadnezzar—"the *Babylonians*, the land of whose nativity is Chaldaea."³

Let us now proceed to an examination of the next dynasty on the tablet, the so-called Ninth Dynasty, which was of a very mixed nature, a medley of Chaldean and Assyrian Kings with one, or possibly two, native Babylonians. Here, by way of making the eye help the mind, I will print the names of the Assyrian Kings in capital letters, and those of the Chaldean Princes in italics. The list will then run as follows:

Yukin-zer, of the dynasty of Shashi, for three years.

PULU (Tiglathpileser III.), for two years.

ULULÁ (Shalmaneser IV.), of the dynasty of Tinu, for five years.

Marduk-apal-iddina (Merodach-baladan), of the dynasty of the Country of the Sea, for twelve years.

SHAR-UKIN (Sargon), for five years.

SIN-AKHE-ERBA (Sennacherib, son of Sargon), of the dynasty of Khabi the Greater, for two years.

Marduk-zakir-shumu, the son of Arad, for one month.

Marduk-apal-iddina (Merodach-baladan), a soldier of Khabi, for six months.

Bel-ibni (Belibush), of the dynasty of Babylon, for three years.

ASSUR-NADIN-SHUMU (son of Sennacherib), of the dynasty of Khabi the Greater, for six years.

Nergal-ushezib ("Shuzub of Babylon"), for one year.

Mushezib-Marduk ("Shuzub the Chaldean"), of the dynasty of Babylon, for four years.

SIN-AKHE-ERBA (Sennacherib), for eight years.

ASSUR-AKHE-IDDINA (Esarhaddon), for twelve years.

¹ See the Taylor Cylinder, Col. V. 8, *Shu-zu-bu (amelu) Kal-da-ai*; also Col. III. 45.

² On another tablet, given in R.P., N.S., vol. i., p. 13, this name, "The dynasty of Babylon," is given to the first of the Babylonian dynasties, which, as stated above, Hommel has shown to be of Arabian origin. My argument is that in the tablet before us the expression is used consistently throughout, and being found in one instance to denote a Chaldean Prince, must have the same meaning in the other two cases. This is the more likely since the interval of time between Dynasty VIII B. and the two Kings mentioned in Col. IV., lines 15 and 18, was so short.

³ Ezek. xxiii. 15, R.V., margin.

SHAMASH-SHUMA-YUKIN (younger son of Esarhaddon),
for twenty years.

KANDALANU (Assur-bani-pal, elder son of Esarhaddon), for
twenty-two years.

Thus the mixed nature of this dynasty is seen at a glance, and also the fact that it is almost entirely composed of Assyrian and Chaldean Kings, the only exceptions being Marduk-zakir-shumu, of whom we know nothing, and Nergal-ushezib, a nominee of the King of Elam, who was doubtless a Babylonian, since Sennacherib calls him "Shuzub of Babylon." With regard to some of the other names, Yukinzer, the *Xιζικρος* of Ptolemy, was, as we have seen, the Chaldean Prince of Bit-Amakkan. The names Pulu, the Pul of 2 Kings xv. 19, and Ululâ, "he of the month of August," stand respectively for Tiglathpileser III. of Assyria and his son Shalmaneser IV., and argue, possibly, some previous connection of these Sovereigns with Babylon. Merodach-baladan was twice on the throne of Babylon, for twelve years during the reign of Sargon, and then again for six months in the earlier part of Sennacherib's reign. On the second occasion he is styled on the tablet "a soldier of Khabi," whence it might be thought that we have here to do with a different person, were it not that the inscriptions of Sennacherib present him to us as the Chaldean Prince of Bit-Yakin.¹ The Chaldean origin of Bel-ibni and Mushezib-Marduk, as we have seen above, is vouched for by the description "of the dynasty of Babylon," and the fact that the latter is expressly called a Chaldean by Sennacherib.

The above list shows that during Sennacherib's reign over Assyria no less than seven different Kings sat on the throne of Babylon. This arose from an unfortunate attempt on the part of that monarch to govern Babylon by deputy, which was more than the proud spirit of the Babylonians could endure. Hence the reign of Sennacherib was one long series of struggles, in which Babylon sought the help of the Chaldeans against the might of Assyria. These struggles were terminated by the great battle of Khaluli, in which Mushezib-Marduk was assisted by the Chaldean States, Bit-Adini, Bit-Amukkan, Bit-Shilani, and Bit-Shahalli, and also by Nabû-shum-ishkun, the son of Merodach-baladan, and by the Elamites, the constant allies of the Kaldi. Sennacherib, who on the Taylor Cylinder describes the battle at great length, claims a brilliant victory; nevertheless, he does not appear to have felt safe till he had gone the length of utterly destroying Babylon itself. The result of these harsh measures

¹ See the Taylor Cylinder, Col. III. 50, 51.

was, no doubt, to throw the Babylonians more and more into the arms of the Kaldi, and to inspire them with an undying hatred of Assyria. Esarhaddon, the rebuildler of Babylon, strove hard to undo the ill-effects of his father's policy, but unhappily, at the close of his reign, he fell into his father's mistake, assigning Assyria to his elder son Assur-bani-pal, and appointing his younger son Shamash-shum-yukin to be sub-King of Babylon. For awhile, indeed, this ill-judged plan seems to have worked well, despite the fact that proud Babylon was again placed in a position of dependence. But when Assur-bani-pal, intoxicated with his successes, began to show an increasingly arrogant spirit towards his brother, and to treat him as a mere prefect, Shamash-shum-yukin, now in full sympathy with his restless Babylonian subjects, entered into an alliance with the Chaldeans, the Arameans, and the Arabian tribes. Amongst his allies were the States of Bit-Dakuri and Bit-Amukkan, along with Nabû-bel-zikri, the grandson of Merodach-baladan. The struggle of Khaluli was thus repeated, and with the same result. After experiencing the horrors of a famine, Babylon was taken, and the brutal conqueror exults in the fact that he had butchered the inhabitants on the very spot where his grandfather Sennacherib had committed similar atrocities.¹ But these acts of savage ferocity brought their own retribution with them. The Babylonians, thoroughly sickened with the brutalities of Assyrian rule, were thrown into entire sympathy with the Kaldi, and on the death of Assur-bani-pal, beholding Assyria weakened by those very struggles which had raised her to the height of military glory, appear quietly to have asserted their own independence under a Chaldean King—to wit Nabopolassar, the founder of the New Empire.

CHARLES BOUTFLOWER.

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—MISSION VILLAGES IN SOUTH INDIA.

THE writer of the following pages will ask the reader's attention to the above subject on the following grounds: First, that he believes he is able to approach it with as unbiassed a mind as can usually be expected, and to view it from a different point to that from which the interesting reports of our missionaries are generally written. Secondly, that he was able to devote three weeks instead of the usual three days which the traveller generally allots to the inspec-

¹ See the *Annals of Assurbanipal*, Col. iv. 71.