

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

The Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, by M. Brodrick, Author of *Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archaeology*, Editor of *Murray's Revised Handbook for Palestine and Syria*, etc., etc. (London: John Murray, 1908.)

In her preface Miss Brodrick explains that her book is "the substance of lectures delivered at various times and in many places other than the United Kingdom." It would certainly be a matter for regret if the result of so much careful reading and enquiry had been allowed to pass away with no more record than may befall a lecture, for Miss Brodrick has written a most interesting book, and has brought together much evidence and many facts—always naming her authority—and has subjected these to careful analysis from a new and valuable point of view. This point of view is chiefly "legal," an examination of all the incidents which culminated in the Crucifixion, with the object of testing their legality according to Jewish law under the Roman domination of the period. A secondary object is to show why his Jewish enemies pursued Jesus with such relentless and unscrupulous ferocity.

This task Miss Brodrick has undertaken and carried out with all reverence, and with wide and impartial study.

The narrative of the four Gospels is the basis of her enquiry; whilst in examining the legal questions she has recourse to various Hebrew as well as Roman authorities, and in every case a definite reference is given. This it is which gives added value to the work, for we have the source of every statement. Having thus stated Miss Brodrick's object and methods we may turn to her procedure. She follows the narrative of the Gospels, stopping from time to time to comment on the incidents preceding the arrest of Jesus: how "the rulers" tried to excite the populace to arrest Him, or even to stone Him; how the illegality of their attempt is pointed out by Nicodemus: "Doth our law judge any man before it first hear from himself and know what he doeth?" And then she quotes from the Mishna the principles of Jewish law: "The witnesses themselves must arrest the prisoner, and formulate in public and upon solemn

“oath, their reason for so doing.” Again, later, she points out how Caiaphas, “the degenerate high-priest and the friend of Pontius Pilate,” had openly advocated the putting to death of Jesus, and this even before any charge was formulated, and before his arrest and trial.

Proceeding to the arrest itself, Miss Brodrick shows, again from the Mishna, how contrary to Jewish law were the steps taken and the circumstances in which it occurred. It must suffice here to mention one: “Arrest after sunset was illegal.” On the same principle the writer follows the details of the tragedy step by step: exposes the personal and worldly motives of His persecutors; shows how they tried to obtain His conviction by the Roman authority in order to avoid being themselves convicted of illegality, and failed; how it was after His acquittal by Pontius Pilate that the latter gave way under the threat of a charge of disloyalty to Caesar.

It should be noted that Miss Brodrick carefully avoids reliance on Christian writers, who of necessity would approach the subject with some prejudice. She goes direct to the Talmud and to the most trustworthy of the writers on Hebrew law, and the limitations to which it was subject under the Roman domination. Where Roman law is concerned, she carefully discriminates between Roman law as concerning Roman citizens on the one hand, as affecting colonials, and as applied to the inhabitants of conquered countries such as Palestine, on the other. She has some very interesting remarks on the subject of the punishment of Crucifixion as practised at different periods, and she also insists on the absence of any evidence that the Crucifixion of the Saviour took place *on a hill*. Prof. R. A. S. Macalister called attention to this question when still engaged upon his excavations at Gezer some few years ago.

Finally, in a few sensible words she touches on the vexed question of the site of the Holy Sepulchre (than which there is perhaps no better example of the tendency of humanity to seek some form of idolatry). Miss Brodrick’s concluding words are: “My own belief is that the knowledge of the sacred places has been lost, and will remain so for ever.”

J. D. C.

In the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vol. XXXV, Part III, Mr. Legge contributes a paper, “New Light on Sequence-dating,” wherein he criticises adversely some of the criteria for the dating of pottery in Egypt. In particular, he gives reasons for

rejecting the view that the black-topped red pot is the earliest type of Egyptian ceramics. Dr. MacIver in the account of his first expedition to Nubia (*Areika*, 1909) states that he found the same pots made by the women in the villages south of Aswān, and, "except for their greater thickness, they were indistinguishable from the polished red bowls found in cemeteries of the Nagada type." Mr. Legge goes on to quote the account of the process by which the lustrous black border to the red was produced. It is suggested that the making of black-topped red pottery was essentially a Nubian art. Finally, Mr. Legge refers to Dr. Naville's article on "Primitive Pottery in Egypt" (*L'Anthropologie*, XXIII, 1912, pp. 313-320), where he points out that the weekly market at el-Arabāt was full of hand-made pottery of different forms which, he was told, was the work of the women. On visiting the neighbouring village of Beni Mansūr he found that the pots were not only different from, but made on a system different from, those of Girgeh which is not very far off. From this and other facts it is inferred that the shape and even the material of pots in Egypt, now as always, change, not with time but with locality. "The one true classification of Egyptian pottery," it is stated, "is the classification by locality, which studies that which is made in each spot, and the modifications which the industry may have undergone in that locality. Formerly, as now, the potter of Edfu made his pots without troubling himself much as to what the denizen of Thebes or Memphis was making. What governed his work was what he had himself learned, or the suggestions of local circumstances, and the tastes and customs of the spot." Mr. Legge's article thus raises an exceedingly interesting question which has its analogies outside archaeology. For example, the effort has been made to establish a sequence in the development or evolution of thought from primitive and rudimentary forms onwards; and, as is well known, this desire to find an orderly and genetic evolution in beliefs and customs has exercised a very profound influence upon modern research. But here, too, one is constantly finding, first, that the apparently rudimentary features will persist in the most unexpected places and forms; and, second, that it is obvious that at any given place or time we may expect to find notable differences of culture and civilization accompanying notable mental and psychical differences among the inhabitants. That is to say, the villager and the townsman, and the poet and the peasant, can manifest differences of such a sort that did we not know the circumstances, it might be

easy to make the mistake of supposing that the differences represented relatively lower and relatively higher steps in the long ascent of the evolution of thought and custom. Thus, for example, crude magico-religious ideas found among some of the outlying parts of Western Europe are of a sort that, if we were ignorant of their source, we might feel tempted to guess that they came from some savage country or represented some early stage in the history of thought. Examples of this kind would speedily convince one that attention must be paid, not to solitary phenomena by themselves, but to the whole context in which they are found; and clearly this holds good when the phenomena are pieces of pottery. The sequence of pottery, like the theory of evolution, justifies itself by the way in which it assists further enquiry. Both are obviously complicated by any disturbing features, and at first seem to be overturned; but, on further enquiry, it seems evident that a reconciliation can be found. It is quite true that there is a development from age to age, and it is equally true that at any period there will be striking differences between the highest and the lowest, or between the most advanced and the most rudimentary of types.

An article on San Savino at Piacenza by Mr. A. Kingsley Porter (*American Journal of Archaeology*, XVI, 1912, No. 4, pp. 495 *sqq.*) may be mentioned here because of his remarks upon a mosaic which represents the works of the twelve months of the year. February is depicted as pruning the vine, June is busily engaged in hoeing, July reaps the grain, September picks grapes, etc. The inscriptions are taken from the old poem of Ausonius. It is natural to recall the Old Gezer Inscription (*Q.S.*, 1909), with its references to the months of sowing, cutting flax, barley-harvest, general harvest (?), (vine-) pruning, summer fruits, etc.—the interpretation is in some cases disputed. The custom of representing the months topically is a very ancient one, and Mr. Porter has collected a number of interesting details.

The same number gives publicity to a letter from Prof. Ronzevalle of the University of St. Joseph in Beirut *apropos* of forgeries. Among his remarks we read: "Damas est un centre de fabrication lapidaire, comme Homs, de fabrication monétaire, Sidon, de céramique, et Tyr, de glyptique."

A special feature of the *American Journal of Archaeology* is its very elaborate series of "Archaeological Discussions," being

summaries of original articles, chiefly in current publications. From the same number as the above we quote the following reference to a most interesting article by E. Hahn on "Life in the Stone Age" (in the *Zeit. f. Ethnologie*, XLIII, 1911, pp. 821-840). The writer "calls attention to certain phases of prehistoric housekeeping which must have existed, but of which practically all traces have disappeared. Primitive man was not exclusively dependent on hunting; grass seeds, fruits, nuts, and roots entered into his economy at the start. The Stone Age was really a wood age, for stone utensils were mounted in wood: wooden hoes, ploughs, and arrows preceded those in which stone and metal were used. Fire was used to make troughs and boats, to fell trees, to clear away underbrush and forests, to parch grain, in cooking with hot stones, even before pots and kettles were invented. Sand was used to prevent fire from burning floors, decks of ships, etc. Huts and boats and utensils, even, were made of bark. Leather must have been used for sails, boats, clothing, bags, pails, ropes, and kettles for cooking with hot stones (*cf.* Herod. IV, 61). The fermentation of corn, roots, and vegetables in pits must have been discovered very early as a means of preservation; all of these things point to a long history of slow progress from the wildness of the earliest men to the relatively high civilization of our ancestors of the Stone Age."

We learn also, in the same journal, that a pamphlet has been prepared for the use of the German Engineers of the Bagdad Railway, to enable them to utilize their opportunities for scientific observations not connected with their work, in the countries in which they are stationed. Three sections have appeared—on geography, topography, and archaeology—and already some results have accrued. Sections on the geology and fauna of the region are also planned.

An interesting attempt is made by S. Funk (*Memnon*, V, pp. 206-211) to show that the Talmud contains a number of ancient traditions that date from the times of the Aegean civilization. These refer to the "provinces of the sea" and "cities of the sea," and to imported wares, such as costly woods, stuffs, garments and clay stamps.

In the *Mittheilungen* of the German Oriental Society, XVII (1912), pp. 237-326, Prof. W. M. Müller gives reasons for believing that the Egyptians at an early date became acquainted with the Babylonian cuneiform writing, and that through it arose the so-called syllabic method of writing in Egypt.

Prof. Vincent (*Memnon*, VI, 1912, pp. 88-124) discusses the various names applied to Jerusalem, and argues that that of the city itself most probably means "foundation of Shalem."

An effort is made by Dr. Weinheimer (in the *Zeitschrift d. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, LXVI, 1912, pp. 365-388) to show that the Hebrews and Israelites were distinguished both by writers of the Old Testament and in the Egyptian inscriptions; in his view, the conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews corresponds with the invasion of the Habiru in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (fifteenth century B.C.) and the entrance of the Israelites occurred about two centuries later.

Prof. Guthe, in the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, Vol. XXXVI, heft 2, 1913, discusses the identification of Kirjath-Jearim. The two current identifications are *Kh. 'Erma*, supported especially by the late Colonel Conder, and *Karyet el-'Ineb*, which is the more popular one. Prof. Guthe, who in the past had somewhat hesitatingly adopted the former, now proposes an entirely new one, *el-Kubebe*. He relies more especially upon the statement of Eusebius that "Kariathiareim" lay on the road from Aelia (Jerusalem) to Diospolis (Lydda). After a detailed consideration of the ancient routes and the distances, he finds a site to the west of *el-Kubebe*, a district which, as he notes, is rich in extensive ruins. The rest of the article is devoted to a discussion of the bearing of the new identification upon the Biblical references. In the same number Dr. Richard Hartmann begins a valuable discussion of the materials for the historical topography of *Palaestina Tertia*. Dr. Schumacher gives a report, with many illustrations, of his archaeological work east of the Jordan, with more particular description of the important neighbourhood of *el-Makkarin* and *Tell ej-Jamūd*. Finally, passing over a brief account of divorce and remarriage among the Mohammedans, we must mention the most informing article by Dr. Hans Fischer on Palestinian cartography and geography, with a new edition of the map by Guthe and himself, first published in 1890. Dr. Fischer gives a careful survey of the maps and other contributions to the subject, and devotes careful attention to the noteworthy fluctuations of the Dead Sea.

In the *Revue Biblique*, April, 1913, R. P. Abel continues his articles (with illustrations) on the exploration of the Jordan Valley. §8 deals with the district from Beisān to the West Far'a; §9 continues to Fasa'il and the fortress of the Alexandreion; and §10 takes us to

the Dead Sea. The same writer contributes a description of a tomb with Jewish ossuaries recently discovered to the north of Jerusalem. The graffiti are in Hebrew, Palmyrene, and Greek; the names themselves are in some cases Roman. We have, for example, Africanus, Africana, Epictetus, Catulla. Father Abel points out that the names fall into three classes, these are: first, the names characteristically Jewish; secondly, some seem to be Palmyrene, and he cites passages from the Talmud to show that Palmyrenes could be admitted as proselytes; finally, the Graeco-Roman names may, perhaps, have been those of Jews who lived in the Diaspora, and whose bones had been brought home for burial.

The July number of the *Revue Biblique* contains the commencement of a useful study by Father Dhorme of "le langue de Canaan." Here he deals with the verbal forms on the basis of the data supplied by the Amarna Letters. R. P. R. Savignac furnishes some notes on a journey from Suez to Sinai and Petra (February). He tells of the disastrous drought and of the sufferings caused, illustrating, at the same time, the tendency of the unfortunate Bedouin to turn to the borders of Egypt when in distress. The description of the neighbourhood of Rueil el-Ebeirig—hazardously identified by Palmer with Kibroth-Hattaavah—is interesting for a number of Nabatean graffiti. At Petra the opportunity was taken to verify the two Nabatean inscriptions recently published by Dr. Dalman. Father Savignac justly draws attention to the fact that the longer of the two is written in characters far more like the older square Hebrew (as in the ossuaries) than Nabatean. This fact is very noteworthy and it might be added that the difficult Petra inscription in Lidzbarski, *Handbuch*, 451 [a], Cooke, p. 241, No. 94, may probably be recognised as dialectical (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, XVI, 1904, p. 284). Father Vincent contributes one of his elaborate archaeological reviews, which, as is usually the case, is a most valuable appendix to the book reviewed. This time it is the great work on Jericho by Prof. Sellin and Prof. Watzinger, the official account of the German excavations to which the *Q.S.* has referred in the past (*e.g.*, 1910, pp. 54-68). Two points call for special attention. First, the great outer wall which has hitherto been classed as "Canaanite" is now attributed by the excavators in the main to the ninth century. Father Vincent subjects their arguments to a close scrutiny and confesses himself unmoved. The second, like the first,

involves problems of date: it is the new situation caused by the recent discoveries of pottery in Susa, by the circumstance that Palestine may well have been influenced by the brilliant development of ceramics in Susa at about the commencement of the third millenium B.C. Thus, the hand seems to be pointing, not to pre-historic and historic Egypt, not to the Aegean, but to a specifically Oriental phase in the East. It is, of course, too early to dogmatize, but there is a certain new tendency to look away from Aegean or Mycenaean influence. In view of this new turn in the history of the problems of Palestinian archaeology, the present reviewer ventures to quote at length from a paper on "Palestine Excavations and the History of Israel," read at a congress five years ago and printed in *The Expositor*, August, 1909, pp. 97 *sqq.* The passage, though lengthy, at least crystallizes a definite theory:—

"The position of Palestine would lead us to look to the north for all non-Egyptian influence, and it is precisely there and in the later Hittite empire centring at Boghaz-Keui that Babylonian influence continues to be found. Thus, although Palestine archaeology has Babylonian and even Elamite analogies, one must take into account our present scanty knowledge of the archaeology of North Syria, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, and it is possible that any *specific* traces of Babylonian culture which may be found in early Palestine entered indirectly from the north long [I would now omit the 'long'] after the great dynasty of Khammurabi had been overthrown.¹ As a matter of fact, Prof. J. L. Myres has shown that the early pottery development in Palestine is to be associated with North Syria and Cappadocia (*Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1903, pp. 367 *seq.*). This is confirmed by Prof. Sayce, and Prof. Breasted, in his *History of Egypt* (pp. 188, 262), very naturally connects this feature with the prominence of the northern powers in Palestine.

"The pottery in general reveals certain well-defined influences or affinities which allow us to divide the archaeological history of Palestine into periods. The earliest indigenous culture is followed by a long series of phases: Mycenaean or Aegean, Phoenician, Cypriote, older and later Greek, until we reach the Seleucid Age with Rhodian jar-handles, Roman tesserae, etc. Indeed, later comes

¹ See the writer's *Religion of Ancient Palestine*, pp. 106-113, and Father Dhorme's statement on the Northern ("Hittite") element in Palestine history before and about 1400 B.C. (*Rev. Biblique*, Jan. 1909, pp. 61 *sqq.*).

an Arab ware closely resembling the older painted pottery of ten or more centuries previously. It is rather remarkable that it should be the *Aegean* ware which inaugurates this series. This pottery has been associated with that of Keft, or Crete, the Biblical Caphtor, the traditional home of the Philistines. Its introduction has been ascribed to Aegean invasions—to the Philistines themselves; and certainly, noteworthy archaeological phenomena always demand some explanation in the history. But there has sometimes been a failure to distinguish true Aegean ware from that of Cappadocian or northern affinities; and this complicates the problem, because Asia Minor in turn shows some clear traces of Aegean influence from outside. Consequently, only when archaeology has correctly separated Aegean from ordinary Asia Minor pottery, can we ask whether its presence presupposes any dominating historical events. It is to be observed that the specific Aegean ware appears to be of the lower or sub-Mycenaeic type; it comes at the close of the Cretan civilization. Similarly in Cyprus, whose earlier culture-affinities are with Cilicia and Cappadocia, Aegean art appears to reach the island in a mature, not to say decadent stage (Myres, *Classical Review*, 1896, p. 352). Moreover, on the one side, is the fact that the movements in the Aegean basin, especially in the time of Ramses III (when the Philistines are first mentioned), were accompanied by movements on land from the north. On the other side, neither Egyptian evidence nor the internal situation at the death of Ramses III [viz., in the Papyrus Harris] proves that any sweeping changes had occurred. If the true Aegean pottery really implies the presence of a new people, it is remarkable that it is only in the pottery that the invaders leave their traces

“ Although the archaeological and historical evidence at present is distinctly incomplete, so far as it goes it does not point to any predominating influences from Babylonia or the Aegean. But the lines converge upon the north where we have an area fully exposed to those two cultures, and the geographical and political relations between Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia make the north the most natural source of all the culture which was neither indigeneous nor Egyptian. The other phases point to the north: Syria, Phoenicia, or to the sea-ports and their trade with Greece. Even the Arab ware of the Christian period, whose resemblance to the old painted pottery has been mentioned, recalls the theory of the Mesopotamian origin of the Ghassanid culture [see *Q.S.*, 1906, pp. 76 *seq.*]. More-

over, when, as at Gezer, a unique culture manifested itself, the analogies were with Lydia, Caria, and with Cyprus of the early iron age [*Q.S.*, 1907, pp. 240 *sqq.*], and iron itself probably entered under the influence of the northern peoples, perhaps about 1000 B.C."

S. A. C.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *Right of Sanctuary at Damascus.*—An incident has quite recently occurred which may possibly be of interest to the readers of the *Quarterly Statement* as another illustration, besides those mentioned on p. 200 of the number for October, 1912, proving the survival and maintenance at the present day of the ancient rights of Sanctuary connected with the Great Mosque of the Ommayyades at Damascus.

A few days ago a battalion of Redifs, drawn for garrison duty from the Nebk district, on hearing on the one hand of the conclusion of peace, and on the other that their villages and threshing-floors had been, or were in danger of being raided by the Bedouin, demanded that they should be allowed to return to their homes in order to protect their families and their property. Their demand meeting with a refusal, they seized their rifles and rushed in a body into the Mosque, placed sentinels at the gates, and declared their intention to remain there, under the protection of Neby Yahya (St. John the Baptist, whose head is popularly supposed to be buried beneath the domed shrine in the transept), and threatened that, if driven to desperation, they would furnish themselves with food by raiding the bazaars. On this occasion again, as on that I reported from hearsay in my notes for October, 1912, already referred to, they received the support and help of influential sheikhs and others, and obtained what they had asked for. The incident is noticed in the *Mäqtäbbäs* for June 21st, 1913, and other local papers; and I am glad to be able to report it as a case which has come under my own personal notice.

Damascus, *June 27th*, 1913.

J. E. HANAUER.