

where the sun's ray can fall on it, you will see the ray both on the prism and on the opposite wall spread out into all the colours of the rainbow, and in the exact order of the rainbow's hues. What do these colours tell you? They tell you that the white light of the far-distant sun is composed of such colours. The ray has travelled from the sun to the earth, and the prism has decomposed it and manifested its wonders. Now far back in history lived Jesus Christ the Sun of Righteousness, and if you would know the *kind* of life He lived and the order of it,—His work and words and suffering; His death, resurrection, and ascension,—and what it was all for, look into the pages of the Gospel story, and be sure that the narrative concerning these matters is true, for behold they are the record of those who were there and saw them, or, as Luke says, 'They delivered them unto us which from the beginning were eye-witnesses of the word.'

Whithorn.

DONALD M. HENRY.

THE Orinoco, at its mouth, is fifty miles wide. This mighty river is formed from many smaller rivers, each a river in itself. At midstream, where river and sea join, an observer cannot see the bank on either side. Strong, deep, irresistible, this mighty volume of water flows into the Atlantic Ocean. Two hundred miles out at sea the sailors on the passing ships can drop their buckets over the ship's side and draw water pure and fresh as it left the Andes. Not even the forces of the Atlantic Ocean can destroy the sweetness of the water even at a distance of two hundred

miles at sea. Amid the disintegrating forces of the world Christianity has retained its sweetness and power. The cumulative evidence of the Gospels is as yet unbroken.

Contin Manse.

A. C. MACLEAN.

FOR REFERENCE.

- Arnold (T.), Sermons, iv. 236, 243.
 Bruce (A. B.), Training of the Twelve, 41.
 Buckland (A. R.), Words of Help, 43.
 Drummond (R. J.), Faith's Perplexities, 25.
 Gibbon (B. J.), Visionaries, 81.
 Harris (H.), Short Sermons, 29.
 Henson (H. H.), Value of the Bible, 69.
 Kirkpatrick (A. F.), Divine Library of the O.T., 51.
 Lindesie (A.), Gospel of Grace, 1.
 Maurice (F. D.), Kingdom of Heaven, 1.
 Raleigh (A.), Way to the City, 305.
 Rashdall (H.), Doctrine and Development, 58.
 Sanday (W.), Inspiration, 277.
 Smith (J.), Integrity of Scripture.
 Spurgeon (T.), Down to the Sea, 157.
 White (E.), On Certainty in Religion, 3.
Christian World Pulpit, xviii. 289 (White).
 " " xxxvii. 268 (Patrick).
 " " lxiii. 56.
Church of England Pulpit, lv. 147.
Critical Questions, 29.
Keswick Week (1900), 135.
Studies for the Pulpit, i. 514.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., OXFORD.

The Study of Sumerian.

THE study of Sumerian, I am glad to say, seems once more to be attracting the attention of Assyriologists. A considerable part of the literature of Babylonia which has come down to us is in the old language of the country, and our knowledge of the language is still extremely imperfect. Thanks to the deciphering genius of Amiaud, and, more especially, Thureau Dangin, the general sense of the inscriptions of the early Sumerian princes is known, and translations of them can be given which are approximately correct. But we are still far from possessing what may be called a philological acquaintance with the language in which they are written; even the reading of the ideographs in which it is expressed is often unknown. For years I have been preaching the

doctrine that before trying to settle the linguistic position of Sumerian, or, much more, the phonetic distinctions of its sibilants and dentals, we should endeavour to ascertain how its words were pronounced and what its grammar was actually like. Three books which have been published almost simultaneously in English, French, and German go to show that the younger generation of Assyriologists is again beginning to resume the work that still remains pretty much as it was left by the older generation some thirty years ago.

Dr. Vincent Brummer, a pupil of Professor Hommel—whose inspiration is clearly visible in his pupil's work—has published a very valuable investigation into the formation of the Sumerian verb (*Die Sumerischen Verbal-Afformative nach den ältesten Keilinschriften*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1905). He has confined himself to the

inscriptions of the pre-Semitic period, putting aside altogether the bilingual texts and lexical tablets in which Semitic influence and even Semitic misconceptions are too often apparent. The suffixes of the verb are conveniently divided into prefixes, verbal determinatives, infixes and postfixes, one of the principal postfixes being the substantive verb *am*. Among the infixes, Dr. Brummer assigns a causative signification to *ta*, as I already did in 1870 in the article in which the foundations of Sumerian grammar were first laid. The verbal determinatives I should be inclined to omit altogether; they are either the objects of the verb, or merely graphic determinatives which were not intended to be pronounced.

Here, of course, I cannot enter into grammatical details; it is sufficient to say that Dr. Brummer's analysis of the Sumerian verb is an important contribution to our knowledge of the ancient language of Chaldæa. In an Appendix he points out that one of the distinguishing features of the language was the position of the object before the verb with which latter the sentence ended. In this respect Sumerian stands in marked contrast to the Semitic languages, and the similar syntactical construction in Assyro-Babylonian must be due to Sumerian influence. Another Appendix discusses the relation between the two Sumerian dialects, called by the native lexicographers the Eme-sal, or 'Woman's language,' and the 'Emeku,' which I have lately discovered should be read Eme-lakhkha and rendered 'the enchanter's language.' As Dr. Brummer shows, the inscriptions of Uru-duggina of Lagas make it clear that both were in use at the same period, and that neither of them display the characteristics of Neo-Sumerian, as we find them in the bilingual tablets or the texts of the Khammurabi age, such as the postposition of the verbal prefixes or the use of the suffix *-is* in the third person plural of the verb. The last I believe to have been borrowed from Elam.

On a larger scale than Dr. Brummer's is the new work of Professor Dyneley Prince, *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905),—of which the first part has just appeared, containing the letters A to E. The Lexicon is preceded by a grammatical Introduction, in which the phonology of Sumerian is dealt with very fully, as well as the pronominal and verbal systems. In his analysis of the verbal system Professor

Prince occupies the same ground as Dr. Brummer, only more comprehensively, as he includes in his survey both the older Sumerian and the bilingual texts. This grammatical Introduction is not the least valuable part of the book; the materials have been collected and arranged in a masterly way, and the work will form the starting-point for all future researches in the same direction.

Professor Prince believes that the verbal prefixes in Sumerian all had an indeterminate meaning, and could therefore be employed for all three persons alike. In this, however, I cannot agree with him, and should give a different explanation of many of his examples. Thus *è-a-ga-ba-gub* is literally, 'may one stand in the house,' though the Assyrian translation, in accordance with the very different usage of Semitic grammar, has the first person. In other cases I believe that different suffixes are represented by the same sign, and that we must, for instance, distinguish *mu*, which denotes the first person, from the tense-suffix *wu*. It must be remembered that there is, properly speaking, no verb in Sumerian; it remained a noun to the last, and though the Assyrian translator renders a form like *aba-ni-kesda* by 'bind it also,' it is literally 'may there be the binding of it.'

The Lexicon is an undertaking which has long been needed, but Assyriologists have hitherto shrunk from the labour and research involved in its compilation. I regret only that Professor Prince has adopted Professor Delitzsch's theory of the origin of the cuneiform characters, which I believe to be absolutely and radically wrong. What we call cuneiform is really a cursive script standing to the primitive pictographs from which it has been evolved in the relation in which demotic, rather than the hieratic, stands to the Egyptian hieroglyphs. Thanks mainly to M. de Morgan's excavations at Susa, the primitive pictographs are now being recovered, and we are beginning to know something about the way in which the pictographs came to assume their cursive forms. A most illuminating article on the subject has recently been published by M. de Morgan in the *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, xxvii. 3-4, which should be read not only by Assyriologists, but also by every one who is interested in the history of writing. Most of the explanations of the characters given by Professor Prince, after Delitzsch, must be corrected; *bar*,

'stone,' for example, is not a 'combination' of *za*, but was originally the picture of a cut stone; *erin*, 'the cedar tree,' has nothing to do with *sig*, 'wool,' and *nun*, 'great,' but is the picture of a tree; *bur* is not a 'gunated' *ninda*, but the picture of a stone vase; *en* is no 'combination' of *nun* and *ku*, but actually appears in an inscription of Ur-Enlil under the pictorial form of an arm grasping a weapon. In some cases, where the pictorial forms occur on early Babylonian monuments, Professor Prince finds that the Delitzschian theory fails him, and he frankly admits that he 'cannot explain' the character. The ideograph, however, which denotes 'backward' is merely a picture of a man's posteriors, while that which denotes a 'beer-jug' is the picture of a jug with painted bands round its neck. Perhaps one of the most curious examples of ingenious perversity is the character *ul*, which the Delitzschian theory explains as the ideograph of 'bull' 'with the specializing prefix *u*.' A tablet in the possession of Dr. Scheil shows that it is really descended from the picture of an oil-jar with its clay-sealing.

The worst of the Delitzschian theory is that it has obscured two important facts. On the one hand, the Sumerian scribes, like other inventors of pictographic systems of writing, made large use of 'determinatives' which were never intended to be pronounced; on the other hand, as in Egyptian demotic, different pictographs came to be represented by the same character in the cursive or cuneiform script. Professor Prince is at times sorely exercised to explain the connexion between the ideas expressed by the same cuneiform character, but which do not seem to have much to do with one another. As a matter of fact, the connexion is due to the accidental coalescence in the cursive script of hieroglyphs which were originally distinct.

The third book on my list is the first volume of a most useful publication by Professor Fossey, who has just been appointed Oppert's successor at the Collège de France. He calls it a *Contribution au Dictionnaire Sumerien assyrien* (Paris: Leroux, 1905), but it really consists of an exhaustive list of the phonetic values and ideographic significations of Assyrian characters contained in the lexical tablets published by the British Museum or elsewhere since the appearance of the monumental work of Brünnow. The volume is beauti-

fully printed, and is a pleasure to read. A study of it brings one fact into full relief: the most complete of the lexical tablets must belong to a very late age indeed—some of them, indeed, are dated in the reign of Artaxerxes,—and the compilers of them must have set out with the purpose of recording every possible value that at any time or in any document had been attached to an ideograph. Many of the meanings assigned to the ideographs rest upon pure misconceptions or upon that fancy for the rebus which played an equally prominent part in the use of the Egyptian hieroglyphs in the Roman age.

The Name of Adam.

I will conclude this somewhat technical series of reviews by drawing attention to one of the entries in Professor Fossey's work which ought to be of interest to Biblical scholars. According to the legends of Eridu—'the good city' near which the Babylonian garden of Eden was situated—the name of the first man was one which has hitherto been read Adapa. Several years ago I suggested that the name might really be Adamu, basing the suggestion on the fact that at Dilmun the character *pa* seems to have had the value of *mua*. Now my suggestion has been unexpectedly verified. One of the glosses published by Professor Fossey states that the character had the ideographic meaning of 'man,'—a fact already known to us from the early Babylonian texts,—and that with this meaning it possessed the phonetic value of *mu* in the EME-TENA or 'language of the commonalty.' As one of the principles which governed the transcription of names and words in Sumerian was the selection of characters to express their sounds which also expressed or harmonized with their sense, the last syllable of a name like that of *Ada-mu*, the first man, would naturally be represented by an ideograph which not only had the phonetic value of *mu*, but also signified 'man.' Henceforward, therefore, we must transcribe the name of the first man of Babylonian tradition, not A-da-pa, but A-da-mu. Adamu has been found by M. Thureau Dangin used as a proper name in tablets from Tello, of the age of Sargon of Akkad (*Tablettes Chaldéennes inédites*, p. 7), and Professor Delitzsch quotes a bilingual text in which *Adam* is interpreted 'man.' It was, I believe, a word borrowed from Sumerian. In Sumerian *adam* signified

generically 'animal' and specifically 'man'; thus a list of slaves published by Dr. Scheil is dated in 'the year when Rim-Anum the king (conquered) the land of . . . bi and its inhabitants' (*a-dam-bi*).¹ In the table of the antediluvian kings of Babylon given by Berossus, 'Alorus of

¹ *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, xx. p. 65. Dr. Pinches notices that in the bilingual story of the Creation

Babylon' takes the place of Adamu of Eridu, but it is significant that the third and fourth kings are Amelon, *i.e.* Amelu, 'the man,' of Pantibibla or Sippara, and Ammenon, *i.e.* Ummanu, 'the craftsman,' of Chaldæa, who correspond with the Biblical Enos, 'man,' and Cainan, 'smith.'

we have in the Sumerian (line 9): *uru nu-dim a-dam nu-mun-ya*, 'a city was not built, a man was not made to stand upright.'

Gifts of Healing.

BY THE REV. PERCY DEARMER, M.A., LONDON.

II.

The Healing Works of the Apostles.

THE disciples, then, like their Master, did works of healing, and they did them in His name. One case of failure is mentioned; and Christ attributed the failure to their little faith. ('Why could not we cast it out? . . . Because of your little faith,' Mt 17^{19, 20}; cf. Mk 9²³, 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.') The Twelve were expressly sent out with the double object of preaching the Kingdom and healing the sick (Lk 9²; cf. Mt 10⁸, and also 10¹ where the description of their powers is made as wide as possible, 'unclean spirits . . . all manner of disease, and all manner of sickness'). St. Mark alone tells us that unction was the method of healing employed (6¹³, 'and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them'). In the *Acts*, however, there is no mention of unction, though healing is described on twelve occasions (if we include the raising of Dorcas and of Eutychus), of which five refer to numbers of people (*viz.* the shadow of Peter, 5¹⁵; Philip in Samaria, 8⁷ and 8¹³; St. Paul's 'special miracles,' 19¹¹; and his works at Melita, 28⁹. In two cases the healing was by Word (if we include the raising of Dorcas, 9⁴⁰; the other is the cripple at Lystra, 14¹⁰); in two others the use of the name of Christ is mentioned (at the Gate Beautiful, 3⁶; the maid with the spirit of divination, 16¹⁸); in two others prayer and the laying on of hands (Ananias and Saul, 9¹⁰⁻¹⁹; the father of Publius, 28⁸); in the case of Eutychus we are told that St. Paul embraced him (20¹⁰). In 5¹⁵ the people believed

that the shadow of St. Peter healed the sick; in 19¹² healing powers is transmitted from St. Paul by what a later age would have called relics—'unto the sick were carried away from his body handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them.' The case of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful is remarkable, because (in contrast with the cripple in 14⁹, who 'had faith to be made whole') the patient had no expectation of recovery, and only looked to receive an alms (3^{3, 5}), and St. Peter attributes the cure to his own faith, or to a collective faith in Christ ('by faith in his name hath his name made this man strong,' 3¹⁶). With this may be compared the prayer that follows (4^{29, 30}): 'Grant unto thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness, while thou stretchest forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done through the name of thy holy Servant Jesus.' Such was the disciples' own description of their works of spiritual healing.

In the Epistles of St. Paul the power of healing is definitely attributed to the Holy Spirit, and it is taken for granted that the gift of healing was possessed by some only, and not by all. ('And to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit,' 1 Co 12⁹; 'Have all gifts of healings?' 12³⁰; 'He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you,' Gal 3⁵.) It is especially remarkable that St. Paul recognizes a unity between spiritual, psychical, and physical things (*e.g.* 1 Th 5²³, 'May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire'), and assumes the interaction of spiritual and physical power. He distinctly attributes bad physical effects to a faithless reception of the