

## NOTICES OF FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS.

*Revue Biblique*, Jan., 1906. Prof. Clermont-Ganneau contributes a note on a Samaritan inscription from Gaza. The evidence goes to show that there seems to have been a Samaritan synagogue at Gaza, the foundation of which probably dates from the time of Ptolemy I, Soter (322-285 B.C.). From Eusebius (*de Mart. Palaest.*, viii, 9) it appears that the colony was still flourishing in the sixteenth century A.D. Other Samaritan colonies were settled in the neighbouring villages, at Jabneh and Ashkelon, and in the latter town, Benjamin of Tudela, in his visit in the twelfth century, found 300 families. The Samaritan inscription referred to comprises Exod. xx, verses 2, 3, and half of verse 4, and is preceded by the words "in the name of Yahweh."

An account is also given of fragmentary Greek inscriptions, one of which appears to belong to an imperial rescript from Beersheba, which was fully discussed by Prof. Ganneau in the *Q.S.*, 1902, pp. 268 *sqq.*

M. Vincent begins a series of studies on the old Canaanite cities on the basis of the excavations by the Palestine Exploration Fund and other societies. It is the first attempt to combine the results of archæological research in order to estimate its bearings upon ancient conditions and life from the earliest times down to the fifth century B.C. After a brief introductory section, M. Vincent briefly sketches the course of recent excavation with typical views of the mounds which have been selected. The stratification and chronology of the ruins are next discussed, and the importance of pottery as a criterion of date is forcibly and rightly emphasised. It is shown how the value of evidence is largely cumulative, and that the archæologist must conduct his investigations upon a number of independent lines (architecture, funereal deposits, &c.), all of which have developed in an orderly manner, and by independently supporting one another, give security to his results. Accordingly, conclusions based entirely upon ceramic remains may be found to be endorsed by the evidence drawn from a totally distinct field, and the provisional dates which

are determined by his knowledge of their development may be absolutely fixed by the happy discovery of epigraphical evidence, the most notable examples of which are the Assyrian inscriptions of the Tell-el-Amarna class (fifteenth century) found at Lachish and Taanach, and the later business documents unearthed at Gezer. By laborious comparative study, points of contact with outside civilisations can be recovered (*e.g.*, with the *Ægean* culture), and there again the independent results, as regards dates, are found to agree with the equally independent results of the Palestinian excavator. M. Vincent has observed the difficulty of fixing upon a satisfactory terminology for the different Palestinian epochs, and instead of early pre-Israelite, later pre-Israelite, Jewish and Seleucid, he suggests the terms, Indigenous, Canaanite, Israelite, and Jewish-Hellenic. After an interesting discussion of the limits to be assigned to these epochs, he devotes a section to the *situation* of the Canaanite cities, an extremely important study, which is treated in a thoroughly scholarly and scientific manner.

P. Jaussen, writing on the sacrificial rites of the nomads to the east of the Dead Sea, collects a number of interesting customs, many of which are of very great value for the study of comparative religion. For example, when a new tent is set up for a fresh family, custom demands that a sheep shall be sacrificed to obtain the favour of the "possessor of the place." The tent-pole is anointed with the blood, and thenceforth the *genius loci* is believed to be appeased. Under one form or another this sacrifice, essentially allied to the widespread foundation-sacrifice, is found to prevail, and is illustrated by several slightly differing customs varying according to the character of the tribe. Other sacrificial rites are practised in connection with marriage negotiations. An interesting example is afforded by the "sacrifice of repudiation." On the one hand, the custom prevails in Egypt (and elsewhere) that the repudiated wife can only be taken again by her husband after she has been married to another husband and formally divorced by him. The nomadic Arabs, on the other hand, allow the husband to reclaim his divorced wife without this necessity, but demand the sacrifice of a victim which renders the re-marriage perfectly valid. Among the various other customs which P. Jaussen describes in his valuable paper, we can only mention four more: The sacrifice after a successful *razzia* in honour of an ancestor or illustrious tribal warrior; the sacrifice after a dream; the ritual to be observed when a stranger is received

as a member of a tribe ; and the "sacrifice of satisfaction," which consists in carrying out a vow or promise made by a tribal ancestor or some noted forefather.

*Jerusalem*: Jan., 1906. P. J. Germer-Durand writes on the praetorium of Pilate and the house of Caiaphas after St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and contests the traditional view which places them near the Cœnaculum. The evidence upon which he relies is the thirteenth and sixteenth Catechism, and with this accords the testimony of the Bordeaux Pilgrim.

An interesting excerpt is given in the same number from the *Energie Française* on the relative positions of France and Germany in Palestine. The rapid progress of the latter is noted, and its political significance does not pass without comment.

*Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale*, Tome vii, Livraisons 8-12. In section 11 Prof. Clermont-Ganneau discusses some of the problematical names in the account of the pilgrimage of Benjamin of Tudela (see *Q.S.*, 1894, pp. 288 *sqq.*). In connection with this, reference may be made to the text and translation which M. Marcus Adler is contributing to the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. Equally suggestive is the study on the pilgrimage of Louis de Rochechouart (1461), which is discussed in section 12 ; the importance of mediæval evidence for the geography and antiquities of the East merits the fullest recognition. In an inscription from 'Ammân (Rabbath-Ammon) recently published by the Fathers Savignac and Abel, allusion is made to the *Heracleion*, a festival of Heracles which is to be associated with the circumstance that this name is connected with Philadelphia (the classical name of 'Amman) on its coins. In this Heracles, as Prof. Ganneau observes (section 14), we are doubtless to recognise the equivalent of the biblical Milcom, and, proceeding on these lines, he points out that there is numismatic evidence for the existence of a goddess Asteria, also at 'Ammân. He is tempted to suggest, therefore, that Asteria is a Greek adaptation of Astarte, the female companion of Milcom, and recalls the tradition given by Stephen of Byzantium that Rabbath Ammon was once called Astarte. In addition to this, it is at least curious that an Asteria should be known as the mother of Heracles ; the goddesses, as he remarks, could be the mother, wife, or even the daughter of the male deity—a fluctuation which Robertson Smith has investigated and explained in the *Kinship and Marriage*. According to another legend, Asteria is said

to have been changed into a quail ( $\delta\rho\tauυ\xi$ ), and the part played by this bird in the stories of Zeus, Latona, and Asteria has always been a problem ; it is ingeniously conjectured that the stories have originated from a philological confusion with the Hebrew *kōrē*, “the partridge,” on the supposition that Heracles-Melkart (מלך) was taken to be connected with קָרְתָ (= קָרָא) : the ornithological knowledge of the ancients was not above reproach.

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *The Acra*.—The new site for the Acra proposed by Sir Charles Watson will stimulate interest in Jerusalem excavations. Josephus, through his statements, at variance with the Bible and 1 Maccabees, has long perplexed topographers. But to try to collocate the Acra on any site once higher than the top of Moriah is to attempt a hopeless task, meet only for Sisyphus.

As objections to the new site are invited, let me tender some remarks. Six conclusions are given as the basis for the site. In No. 3 (*Quarterly Statement*, p. 52) it is implied that the stronghold of Zion was *distinct* from the City of David, while in 5 it is asserted that “the site of these fortresses (named in 4 as the stronghold of Zion, or the Acra of the period of the Maccabees) was *between* the Temple and the City of David.” Similarly, in 6, “it (the site of Acra) was north of the City of David.”

In the annexed references, however, the Bible states that David (2 Sam. v, 9) and the people (1 Chron. xi, 7) called the stronghold the City of David, while 1 Maccab. i, 33, adds that “Then builded they the City of David with a great wall . . . . and made it a stronghold (Acra) for them.”

If these statements do not tally with Josephus, then so much the worse for that arch-errormonger.

That the stronghold of Zion was the City of David and the Acra of Maccabees seems indisputable. If to save the face of Josephus the City of David be located on the new site (then, as supposed, higher than Moriah), how would this agree with 1 Kings viii, 1, “bring up the ark . . . . out of the City of David, which is Zion,” into the Temple. We should expect to read *bring down*.

Rev. W. F. BIRCH.