

Now and then in our own day something like the angel-face is seen on man. It is sometimes visible during life. It may be seen in those few of God's people who have 'the mind of the Spirit' in every chamber and corner of their hearts. 'The beauty of the Lord our God' is upon them. The lion-like and yet loving face of the great Dr. Chalmers seemed often to be surrounded with a nimbus, or luminous cloud, when he was engaged in preaching, and even sometimes when he was on his way to the pulpit. The countenance of Dr. John Ker, when he rose from his knees after praying at a sickbed, was not seldom seen to shine as with a heavenly radiance. I have read also of a young missionary in China who was called 'Mr. Glory-face,' because he had so much of the light of God shining on his countenance.—C. JERDAN.

THE portrait of a man is generally the portrait of his face; you may have a full-length portrait sometimes, especially if a lord mayor wishes to exhibit his robes, or a master of foxhounds to show his boots; but these accessories can be put in by inferior hands, the great artist concentrates his efforts upon the face. I may throw in a remark which was made to me by one of the chief portrait-painters of our own day. I told him that I had heard a person remark that when his pictures came to be looked at in future centuries, men would say, How handsome our

ancestors were! To which the artist replied, 'I assure you honestly that I have never yet succeeded in committing to canvas one-half the beauty which I have seen in any face that I have ever painted.'—HARVEY GOODWIN.

THE human face alone of all faces is capable of increasing in dignity, and even in beauty, with age. The great number of years which belong to human life is in itself a fact to be taken into account in comparing man with beast; but this is not the point upon which I am now dwelling; I am referring to the fact that old men, and old women too, have sometimes beauty which is quite distinct from that of youth, and which, so far as I know, has no parallel in the lower levels of life.—HARVEY GOODWIN.

#### FOR REFERENCE.

- Jerdan (C.), *For the Lambs of the Flock*, 200.  
 Ker (J.), *Sermons*, 1st series, 170.  
 Knox-Little (W. J.), *Manchester Sermons*, 215.  
 Pusey (E. B.), *Sermons*, 75.  
 Thomas (J.), *Sermons*, iii. 67.  
 Raleigh (A.), *The Little Sanctuary*, 295.  
 Vaughan (C. J.), *The Church of the First Days*, i. 225.  
 Woodford (J. R.), *Sermons on Subjects from the New Testament*, 92.  
 Wright (D.), *The Power of an Endless Life*, 226.

## Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

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

### A New Inscription from Sidon.

M. BERGER has lately presented an interesting and important memoir to the French Academy. It deals with some remarkable Phoenician inscriptions which have been found on the foundation stones of the temple of Eshmûn at Sidon. The ruins are a little to the north-east of the northern gate of the town, and not far from the cemeteries in which the tombs of the Sidonian kings, Eshmunazar and Tabnit, have been discovered. The discovery was made accidentally in 1900; since then the site has been systematically worked under the direction of the Turkish Government, and another inscription has been found.

M. Berger shows convincingly that the inscriptions—of which two are now in Paris—are genuine, even though forged copies of them may be in the market. They all repeat the same text, with a few unimportant variations, and, what is most curious, were never intended to be seen, being

inscribed on the inner faces of blocks of stone, against which other blocks were laid. We are reminded of the Siloam inscription, which too was similarly concealed from view.

The text has been put together by M. Berger from the various copies of it which have been brought to light. His reading of it is as follows: 'King Bodastart, king of the Sidonians, grandson of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians in Sidon of the Sea, [and] of the High Heavens [הַמָּרְאֵם רַמֶּם], the land of the Reshephs, [even] Sidon which governs its children, Sidon the sovereign: he has built what belongs to this temple for his god Eshmûn, the holy sovereign.' I should myself prefer to divide the words a little differently in one place, and translate 'the land of Resheph of Sidon.' 'The High Heavens' is the name of a locality, and corresponds with a similar expression on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar. From the inscription of Eshmunazar we learn that Sidon was divided into two quarters: Sidon of the Sea

and Sidon of the Mountain. With the phrase 'Sidon the sovereign' (*שׁוֹרֵךְ*), M. Berger compares Is 23<sup>8</sup>, where the merchants of Tyre are called *sârim*, while in Ezek 28<sup>14</sup> Tyre is said to be 'the anointed cherub.'

The temple of Eshmûn, which Bodastart claims to have built, was really founded by Eshmunazar, as we learn from the inscription on his sarcophagus. Bodastart consequently can only have restored or added to it. As he does not give the name of his father, it would seem that the latter could never have been king, and M. Berger is doubtless right in believing that Bodastart was the successor of Eshmunazar II., the son of Tabnit and Ummastoret, and the grandson of Eshmunazar I. This finally disposes of the theory of M. Clermont-Ganneau, according to which the dynasty of Eshmunazar reigned over Tyre in the interval between Abdalonymos, 330 B.C., and Philoklês, 280 B.C., the period being too short for four kings and three generations, more especially as we know that Eshmunazar II. reigned fourteen years. We must, therefore, fall back upon the older view, which refers the dynasty to the Persian epoch. Indeed, as M. Berger remarks, the Egyptianizing influence displayed in the anthropoid form of the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar would not be very intelligible in the Greek period, when Greek fashions had been adopted in Phoenicia. The same conclusion is also indicated by the discovery of the handle of a sistrum with the cartouches of Amasis among the ruins of the temple of Eshmûn.<sup>1</sup>

### The Sumerian Origin of the First Account of the Creation in Genesis.

Dr. Radau has published an interesting little book on *The Creation-Story of Genesis I.* (Chicago, 1902), in which he claims to have shown that it was derived, in the first instance, from the Babylonian Epic of the Creation, with its account of the conflict between Merodach and the dragon of chaos, and ultimately from a Sumerian source, in which the Creation was represented as a natural

<sup>1</sup> An article upon the inscriptions has also been published by Professor Torrey in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xxiii. 1. pp. 156 sqq. (1902), but the materials at his disposal were more imperfect than those which lay before M. Berger. Professor Torrey has, however, succeeded in making out the greater part of the text, and in anticipating the French scholar in many of his conclusions.

process of generation. The Babylonian derivation of the biblical narrative is indubitable; so also is the elimination from the latter of the polytheistic elements in the Babylonian story, while there is just as little doubt that the Babylonian story itself goes back to a Sumerian origin. What Dr. Radau specially claims to have done is to have disentangled the elements that have gone to the making of each, and to have assigned to each version the characteristics peculiar to it.

Whether such a minute analysis is possible with our present materials may be questioned. Dr. Radau, for instance, believes that the division of the work of Creation into a period of six or seven days is due to the biblical writers; a recent discovery of Mr. King, however, seems to indicate that it already characterized the Babylonian account. There was, moreover, no uniform Sumerian system of cosmology; the Sumerian conception of Creation differed in different parts of the country. As Dr. Radau very rightly observes, the story of it which we possess must have originated at Eridu. There only could the idea have grown up of the watery chaos out of which all things have come, and of a creation of the earth by planting reeds in the water and so forming a bed or island of silt. The cosmological system of an inland city like Nippur would necessarily have been different from that which was taught at Eridu.

In the story current at Eridu Dr. Radau finds the immediate ancestor of that of the first chapter of Genesis. According to his view, the Hebrew writer was not only acquainted with it, but must have deliberately rejected the later Babylonian version in favour of it. Hence the omission in his account of the struggle between the powers of light and darkness. As in the Sumerian story, so too in Genesis, the Creation is a process of evolution rather than the result of the victory of order over anarchy.

Such a view seems to me to presuppose the acquaintance of the biblical author, not only with the cuneiform tablets of Babylonia, but also with the Sumerian language. Personally, I am quite ready to admit the presupposition, but it must be remembered that there are no proofs of it and that the Phoenician cosmologies, of which Dr. Radau has taken no notice, go rather to show that the scriptural account was not derived directly from Babylonian literature, but indirectly

through the domestication of Babylonian cosmological conceptions in Palestine. At the same time, it cannot be denied that the mythological and polytheistic elements in the Babylonian version have been intentionally excluded by the author of the Book of Genesis. Sufficient traces of them have been allowed to remain to show that they were well known to him; but that is all. The biblical Creator is the God of the whole universe, who brooks no rival at His side, and for whom matter is as the clay in the potter's hands. The fact makes strongly for the view that the Babylonian story of the Creation lay before the author in a literary form. But was this the original Babylonian form or a Palestinian version of it? The answer to this question will largely depend upon whether or not we can find evidences in the Hebrew of a translation from a cuneiform text.

Dr. Radau assumes that Merodach was unknown in Babylonia before the age of the dynasty of Khammurabi. Until Babylon, however, is thoroughly excavated, it is unsafe to assume anything of the kind. We still know very little of the earlier history of Babylonia, and practically nothing of the earlier history of Babylon itself. It is quite possible that the story of the conflict between Merodach and the powers of darkness goes back to the days when Sumerians and Semites were struggling for the supremacy, or even to the still older time when the culture of Eridu was being evolved out of the contact of its inhabitants with the sailors and merchants of other lands.

There are several new points and observations in Dr. Radau's book which are worthy of note. The creation of light on the first day, in the biblical narrative, is explained by the fact that the Babylonian demiurge, brought forth by Tiamât at the beginning of the world, was the god of light. Equally noteworthy is the suggestion that the Hebrew Shaddai, in the title El-Shaddai, represents an Assyrian *saduâ*, 'the two mountains,' so that El-Shaddai would be the equivalent of the Babylonian En-lil, 'the god of the upper and lower mountain or heaven and earth.' And a satis-

tory explanation is given at last why, in Gn 1<sup>16</sup>, we read of 'two great lights' instead of the sun and moon. The sun and moon were Babylonian deities, and their names were accordingly avoided by the monotheistic writer of Genesis. For the same reason 'the stars' take the place of Istar, the goddess of the evening and morning stars. Dr. Radau also draws attention to the fact that, whereas in Babylonia the moon-god took precedence of the sun-god, in Genesis the sun is called 'the greater light.' He points out very truly that as chaos preceded the present world of order, according to the Babylonian cosmology, so the night, which was governed by the moon-god, would naturally precede the day. In Canaan, on the other hand, the sun-god stood at the head of the pantheon. It further follows that 'if the day began with the evening or night, the year must have begun with the winter, and the beginning of the year could not have been the 21st of March (the 1st Nisan), but must have been the 21st of September (the 1st Tishri).'

Dr. Radau displays a wide acquaintance with the early Babylonian inscriptions, as well as with the divinities of Sumerian belief. Here and there, however, as is inevitable in researches of this kind, his conclusions would be disputed by other Assyriologists. I cannot, for instance, accept his translation of the fifth line of the Assyrian Epic of Creation: '[Tiamât] their waters in one had joined together.' The verb *ikhiqû* is intransitive, not transitive, as is made clear by other passages in which it occurs (e.g. *W.A.I.* iii. 60. 48), and the correct rendering would be: 'their waters were joined [more literally, embosomed] together in one place.' We thus have a parallel to Gn 1<sup>9</sup>, though in the biblical account the gathering together of the waters 'unto one place' is the work of the second day. It is probable that a similar idea is contained in the Sumerian Story of the Creation, where it is said (l. 11) that there was a *rada* in 'the sea,' in which the creator planted bundles of reeds that caught the silt and so formed dry land. The exact meaning of *rada* is, however, still unknown.