

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

UNDERGROUND JERUSALEM.

Underground Jerusalem: Discoveries on the Hill of Ophel (1909–1911).

By H. V. (of the École Biblique et Archéologique in Jerusalem).
4to. Lond., 1911. 7s. 6d. net. Field Office, Bream's Buildings,
E.C.

The book now published under this title gives the archaeological results of an expedition, the original objects of which need not be discussed. It suffices to say that from the time when its members gave access and encouragement to the learned author their excavations began to have value for the archaeology of Jerusalem; and all those who have any knowledge of the subject will agree that to no man more competent or more scrupulous could such opportunity have been afforded than to Père Vincent of the École Biblique et Archéologique in Jerusalem. The most interesting results concern the Siloam Tunnel. It must not be supposed by the reader that this is a recent discovery. It was known to the seventeenth century writer, Quaresimus; Robinson measured its length in April, 1838; Barclay and Wilson both visited it; and Warren surveyed it in December, 1867. The plan is included in his published survey.

The famous "Siloam Inscription" describing the making of the tunnel from the two ends was discovered in 1880. In November, 1881, Conder, accompanied by Mantell and the late Mr. Armstrong, revisited the tunnel, and, recognising its importance in view of the decipherment of the inscription, repeated his visit later in the same month. He reported that little more could be done until the accumulated *débris* could be cleared out, but the water was lowered with the object of more careful search, and he again measured the length.

Warren's survey has been used for the purposes of the expedition under consideration—both plan and complete section of the Siloam Tunnel. Indeed Plan V is a reproduction of these, and one must remark that in all the plans the distinction between what had already been surveyed by the Palestine Exploration Fund, and such of the small branch tunnels as were opened and surveyed by this

recent expedition, is not made sufficiently clear. The reader who has not already informed himself on the subject would be apt to suppose that much more was due to the expedition now described than is, in fact, the case. It must also be noted that the references from the text to the plans are difficult to follow.

It is in connection with the above-named record of *how* the tunnel was made, that evidence as to its antiquity becomes important; and what archaeologists will value in this memoir of the recent excavations is the accurate representation of the pottery found. There are, at the end of the book, ten plates illustrating this, three of them being coloured plates, and the examples shown are sufficient for an expert to form his opinion as to the periods they represent.

In the third and final chapter the author sums up his deductions from what he has seen. In these he seems to write more freely, and the last ten pages of the book are, to any ordinary reader, the most interesting. In the opening chapter Père Vincent deploras certain "misunderstandings" as to the objects of these explorers. If they have been misunderstood they have themselves only to blame. When a party of strangers arrive who, having obtained permission through some unusual channel, set to work in profound secrecy, surround themselves with mystery, those who know anything of the East will feel no surprise that their objects were mistrusted. They were fortunate in making a friend of the author.

J. D. C.

In the *Transactions of the Canadian Institute* (Toronto, 1910), Vol. IX, Part 1, Mr. J. P. McMurrich deals with the legend of the "Resurrection Bone," which is worth noticing in these pages as an excellent example of the diversity of factors that can go to build up a belief. In the anatomical works of the seventeenth century mention is made of the *os luz* or "resurrection bone," a bone which could not be injured, and out of which a new individual would be formed. Old Rabbinical tradition knows of the bone *luz* which is also called "the deceitful Bethuel," and Mr. McMurrich points to "Bethuel the Aramaean" (Gen. xxv, 20), and conjectures a confusion of "Aramaean" with *rammai*, "deceiver," and of Bethuel with Bethel otherwise known as Luz. He notes in passing that Bethel-Luz was taken by the betrayal of the entrance, "we have the idea of deceit," and draws attention to the city in the land of the Hittites founded by the betrayer (Judges i, 25 *seq.*). Of *this* Luz

there is a legend in the Talmud (*Sotah*, fol. 46), that it was so powerful that neither Sennacherib nor Nebuchadnezzar could destroy it, "even the Angel of Death has no power to enter it, but the old men in it when their minds become weakened go outside the wall to die." Hence, by another confusion, the origin of the name Luz as applied to the bone. Old opinion varied as to which bone was meant, but the foundation for the notion lies, it is argued, in Psalms xxxiv, 20: "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken." The latter half can be rendered: "one of them is not broken," and this is the translation found in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and also in Wycliffe's version. "Here, then, was a statement in the sacred text of an indestructible bone existing in the human body, and this was sufficient warrant for the Rabbinical belief in its existence, and a nucleus for the legend which Hebrew mysticism elaborated."

In the *Mittheilungen u. Nachrichten d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1911, No. 2, Dr. Hölscher gives an account of the ostraka found at Samaria by the American excavators (see *Q.S.*, April, 1911, pp. 79-83). Many of the Hebrew forms of the proper names are cited and Dr. Hölscher draws attention to some characteristics of the types. Twice the divine name (in the form יי) is the first element, and six times the second element of the names. In בעלאזכר and בעלאזכר Dr. Hölscher would see the feminine equivalent of Baal, although in the former case it is possible to assume an abbreviation such as recurs also in the name עבדא. The place-names mentioned are Shechem and apparently אוא, חצרת, אוא, סק, יצת, חצרת, אוא, שפתן and קצה.

Prof. Sayce, in the *Expository Times* for November, contributes a short article on the remarkable Aramaic papyri from the Jewish colony at Elephantinē, some of which were published a few years ago, but now reappear together with the rest under the competent editorship of Prof. Sachau. To the fact, now familiar, that these Jews possessed a temple and cultus of some importance and were in close touch with their brethren in Palestine, comes the extremely interesting knowledge that they were acquainted with the romance of Ahikar, the Achiacharus of the Book of Tobit. Besides this, there are fragments of an Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription of Darius I, in which this monarch gives an account of himself. The version is apparently based upon the Assyrian, and it is one of the

romances of Oriental scholarship that the great trilingual inscription at Behistun, which gave the first key to the decipherment of Assyrian, should after so many years be supplemented by Aramaic papyri which prove the accuracy of this decipherment. Prof. Sayce also points out that, although the colony worshipped the national god, "the puritanic intolerance of a Jeremiah was neither understood nor apparently even dreamed of." Among the numerous personal names are Anath and Bethel—deities—"and Prof. Sachau may be right in thinking that shrines or altars of these deities stood in the neighbourhood of the Temple." It may be pointed out that Bethel, as the name of a deity, recurs in the time of Artaxerxes I in Bit-ili-nuri and in the earlier *ביתאילדלני* (CIS II, 54). The idea of treating the *abode* of a deity as a god finds a parallel in the similar treatment of the deity's *throne* in the Nabataean inscriptions, and recalls the relationship between the goddess Ashirat, or Ashirta, and the *ashērah* or tree-stump. As Prof. Sayce recognises, these papyri cannot be ignored for their bearing upon Old Testament problems, and he himself points out their significance for the study of Jewish orthodoxy. "The post-Exilic exclusiveness of Yahweh-worship was due to a combination of the prophetic teaching with the influence of Zoroastrianism and opposition to Babylonian polytheism, and certain of the post-Exilic Psalms are evidence that even in post-Exilic Jerusalem it was long in becoming a matter of orthodoxy."

In the *Journal Asiatique*, 1910-1911, M. R. Weill subjects the traditions of the Hyksos Period to a new and thorough investigation. Instead of combining the data of all ages and sources into some novel version, he devotes himself to a comparison of the historical and traditional evidence, in order to trace the impression which the period made upon subsequent writers. He notes the frequent theme of a state of disorder in Egypt and the artificiality of historical composition. In discussing the fragments of Manetho, preserved by Josephus, he thinks that the combination of the Egyptian traditions with the account of the Exodus is apparently due to artificial endeavours on the one side to belittle and on the other to enhance the recollection of this event. There is what he calls an "anti-Semite" version of the Exodus opposed to a "philo-Semite," and he ingeniously traces the development of the various *motifs* of which they appear to be constituted. His articles are

an interesting contribution to the traditions linking Egypt of the Hyksos Age with the Old Testament and will, we hope, be published in book form.

As a reaction against the tendency to see Babylonia and Babylonian influence almost everywhere in the old Oriental fields, a welcome must be extended to Prof. Albert T. Clay's *Amurru: the Home of the Northern Semites* (Philadelphia, 1909). It bears as sub-title "A Study showing that the Religion and Culture of Israel are Not of Babylonian Origin." The first part of the book, after a general introduction, is devoted to the argument that specific Babylonian influence is not necessarily to be found in the account of Creation, the Deluge, etc., and that the culture of the Babylonian Semites originated or was developed in *Amurru* (that is, Syria and Palestine) before it was carried into Babylonia. The second part deals with *Amurru* in the cuneiform inscriptions. Here the effort is made to substantiate the western origin of many of the well-known Babylonian deities. A series of appendices treats of Ur of the Chaldees, and the names Jerusalem, Sargon, Nin-ib, and Yahweh. Although it is difficult to follow Prof. Clay in all his arguments, he at least succeeds in impressing upon the reader that the assumption that Babylonia is responsible for *all* the culture of Palestine and Syria is untenable. That Prof. Clay is fully aware of the importance of Babylonia for these countries is well set forth in his book *Light on the Old Testament from Babel* (1907); it is the exaggeration of the claims made for Babylonia against which he contends, and he combines with it an interesting theory of the prominence of the culture of *Amurru* which repays closer study. Some considerations, upon which he does not touch, certainly suggest that the Old Testament implies the existence of a body of thought and practice which find analogies among the Phoenicians, or in Asia Minor, rather than in Babylonia, and if this be so, the theory he proposes might be indirectly strengthened.

S. A. COOK.
