

preferred by Dr. Haupt: "(There has been) counted a mina, a shekel, and a half mina."¹

The plain interpretation of the words is quite distinct from their mystical meaning, which Daniel solely was competent to supply. The mental route by which he arrived at his rendering has given rise to much literature. Dr. Barton considers Daniel read the words as Babylonian ones, *Mani manū šiklu uparsi*, which, omitting one *mene*, would, in its shortest possible sense, run: "Number, weigh, divide," or Persian.²

For the final word Daniel utilises both its significations. *Manū* may have borne the sense of completion, of summing up of an enumeration, and thus Daniel uses that synonym for his version of the warning, if so the two *menes* are correct.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

Two more volumes have been published by the Babylonian section of the University Museum, Pennsylvania University. Of these, Vol. VII, by Dr. Ungnad, contains "Babylonian Letters of the Hammurapi Period." These add to our knowledge of the conditions of the age of the great Hammurabi—or, as his name is now spelt, Hammurapi—the Babylonian monarch who is famous for the most ancient code of laws in the world, and who is commonly identified with the Amraphel of Gen. xiv. Dr. Ungnad gives translations of some of the letters, and calls attention to their value for the light they throw both on Babylonian philology and the general circumstances of the period—the prominent part taken by women being specially noticeable. Vol. X, No. 1, contains the "Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man," by Dr. Stephen Langdon, Reader of Assyriology, Oxford. In discussing these most interesting tablets (for a synopsis of which see the next paragraph) he observes that: "Beyond all doubt the Nippurian school of Sumerian theology originally regarded man as having been created from clay by the great mother-goddess." The

¹ See the weight in the British Museum inscribed פֶּרֶשׁ, and Stanley Cook, *Aramaic Glossary*, 99.

² See *American Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVIII, 1898, p. 70.

priests of Eridu, on the other hand, had another doctrine of the Creation, and it becomes evident that different views prevailed, and were re-shaped under national and priestly influence. A curious point is the connexion between the Biblical Eve (*Hawwah*), whose name can be translated "serpent," and the serpent-character of the Babylonian mother-goddess. Moreover, "the type of mother-goddess, who became the special patron of child-birth, retains special connection with this Ophidian character" (p. 37). Dr. Langdon makes a very close investigation of the Biblical and Babylonian data, and is at pains to point out the evident desire of the writers to inculcate theological, religious, and ethical truths in the myths. This is often forgotten, and it is a timely reminder that the complete meaning of the old myths has not been found, though the more external aspects have been recognised, identified, and explained. Dr. Langdon remarks: "The tablet which forms the subject of this volume proves the profundity of their [*i.e.*, 'the theologians of Nippur'] thinking in the region of ethics and philosophy. We venture to think that no document has yet been recovered from the ruins of the past to which such a volume of influence can be traced [upon] our own civilization for the immense period of four thousand years. The great Hebrew documents which propound the harassing problem of the origin of human sorrows, would have been impossible without the pious and scholarly teaching of these pre-Semitic poets of Nippur. And we all realize, perhaps too little, the incalculable influence which these Hebrew masterpieces have exercised upon the ethical and religious mentality of a considerable portion of the human race."

Mr. Langdon is still continuing his studies of the Sumerian legend, and in the January number of the *Expository Times*, gives a corrected rendering of the Nippur tablets. He says: "Naturally, conservative scholars will be loath to accept an ancient source which so thoroughly defends the results of higher criticism on the Book of Genesis. The Nippurian poem places the Fall after the Flood, and thus agrees with the scheme of the Priestly document in Genesis. It follows an ancient Babylonian tradition which is based upon the belief that mankind lived in Paradise many millenniums before the Flood, a catastrophe sent by the gods to destroy mankind because they had become sinful. From this universal catastrophe the mother-goddess, who had in the beginning created men from clay, saved a certain Tagtug [the prototype of the Hebrew Noah]. He,

however, found the earth inhospitable, for Paradise had passed away and he was forced to toil, wherefore he became a gardener. He still possessed freedom from disease and extreme longevity, but he brought upon mankind bodily infirmity by eating from the cassia plant, thus disobeying the commandments of Enki, his god, commandments which had been communicated to him by the great mother-goddess. She thereupon curses this man and takes from him his ancient longevity. In sorrow for his hard lot the gods send eight divine patrons to aid mankind in pasturing his flocks, cultivating the vine, and regulating society."

In the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vol. XXXVII, Part 7, Prof. Sayce writes on Adam and Sargon in the Land of the Hittites. A tablet discovered early in 1914 by the German excavators at Tel el-Amarna, contains a legend of the celebrated Babylonian monarch Sargon of Akkad, describing his successful invasion of a distant country, separated from the rest of the world by a "barrier" of trackless rivers and mountains. This was the land of the Hittites in Eastern Asia Minor. One of the objects of the story was to give an account of the introduction of the vine from Armenia, etc., into Babylonia. The legend records that Sargon was not the first to traverse the road which took him beyond the ocean-barrier to the mountains of the north; he had been preceded by "Adamu," the hero whose name is otherwise read Adapa. "Adamu was according to one story the first man, and he had brought death into the world. It is evident that he is the Biblical Adam, but in the Babylonian legend he seems to be confounded with Noah, who brought the vine from the Armenian highlands, and was the first to make wine." In Vol. XXXVIII, Part 1, Prof. Sayce suggests that the "Land of Nod" (Gen. iv, 16) is to be identified with Nidu, *i.e.*, Dilmun, on the shore of the Persian Gulf to the south-east of the "Edin" or "plain" of Babylonia. Now, Cain protests that he is being driven from the *ādāmāh*, "the soil" of Eden or Babylonia, and would become "a fugitive and a vagabond." But, on the contrary, he built a city and one of his descendants was an artificer in bronze and iron. Hence Prof. Sayce conjectures that the Hebrew words (*nā' wānād*) represent an original Assyrian *nū'u ū nidu*, meaning "a weakling and a castaway." He goes on to discuss various points in the account of the site of the garden of Eden and in the genealogy of Cain.

Dr. Alan H. Gardiner writes (Vol. XXXVII, 7, and Vol. XXXVIII, 2) on "Some Personifications," a subject of considerable interest for the development of early religious thought. It seems that the Egyptian *Hike'*, which means "magical arts," "mysterious ways of achieving things," actually becomes deified: the god *Hike'* is simply a personification of the word "magic." He publishes a hitherto unedited funerary text of the Middle Kingdom, the purpose of which was to enable a dead man to assume the form of this god. "That magic should have been regarded as the attribute of a deity and *a fortiori* as itself a deity, destroys at one blow the theories of those who discern a fundamental distinction between what is religious and what is magical. The Egyptians themselves looked upon magic as that mysterious power which deep knowledge and learning could implant either in gods or in men; and since there was a strong tendency to construe all power as the effort of some sentient being, it is natural that *hike'* when considered alone and apart from any person who might chance to possess it, should have been externalized in the form of a separate personality. It remains only to explain why that personality should have been considered of a divine, and not of a human kind; this is due simply to the fact that the gods, in the eyes of the Egyptians, were merely beings like themselves in nature but differing through their majesty and power, qualities directly correlated with their remoteness and intangibility."

In Vol. XXXVIII, Part II, Dr. Gardiner proceeds to show that not only was *Hike'* an attribute of the Sun-god, *Rē'*, created by him to be the instrument of his omnipotent will, but there were two other similar deities: *Hu*, "authoritative utterance," and *Sia'*, "understanding," who were also associated with *Rē'*. Wherever, in fact, *Hu* and *Sia'* appear as attributes of kingship, it is by virtue of the old legend which tells how *Rē'* on emerging from the Nūn [or primordial waters], invented "utterance" and "understanding" to aid him in his creation and governance of the world.

An article on "Pygmy-legends in Jewish Literature," by Dr. Solomon Hurwitz of New York (published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1916), touches upon some of the facts of Palestinian excavation. Pygmy-races are still to be found; the skeletal remains of earlier periods of civilization seem to show that such races existed in various parts of Europe during neolithic times;

and finally a still greater amount of evidence lies embedded in the literary deposits of former generations in the form of myth, legend, fairy-tale, and folk-lore. The paper treats the subject under three headings: (a) The legend about the Gammādīm and the pygmy-race of the Caphtōrim; (b) Legends about individuals of dwarfed stature; and (c) Greek legends in Rabbinic literature. Of these the first alone concerns us. The notion that the Biblical writers knew of the existence of a race of pygmies rests upon an old interpretation of the word Gammādīm in Ezek. xxvii, 11, the assumption being that it is connected with a root "to contract, curtail," or (on another view) with the noun *gōmed*, "a cubit." Tradition, moreover, identified the Gammādīm with the Cappadocians, with whom in turn the Caphtōrim were commonly equated. The old Midrash *Genesis Rabba*, xxxvii, 5, commenting on Gen. x, 14, would seem to regard the Pathrusim and Casluhim as two bodies, of pirates and pygmies respectively, who stole one another's wives, with the result that there arose the Philistines and Caphtōrim, who are respectively giants and dwarfs! What lies underneath these fancies? Apparently the attempt to reconcile two conflicting traditions transmitted from remote antiquity concerning the Philistines—the one that they belonged to a giant race (*cf.* the story of Goliath), and the other of a race of pygmies, known as Caphtōrim, also said to be the progenitors of the Philistines. Dr. Hurwitz points out that "the problem of the tall non-Semitic autochthons of Palestine has, to a large extent, been solved by the late archaeological excavations which have brought to light traces of tall non-Semitic races in various parts of Palestine in prehistoric periods of human culture." As for the pygmy race of Rabbinic tradition, the author feels himself at a loss, and can only suggest the evidence furnished by the remains of the curious non-Semitic race of troglodytes who appear to have lived in Gezer in neolithic times (about 2500 B.C.), and who, though not dwarfs, were, considerably below the average stature. The suggestion has difficulties (pointed out in a letter from Prof. R. A. S. Macalister himself, *ib.*, p. 349, note 38), but Dr. Hurwitz urges the view that the later Caphtōrim settled over the very graves of the former troglodytes, and "it is not altogether unlikely that stories of the large discrepancies in the height of several autochthonous races—a fact very striking to the primitive mind—should cling to the localities wherein these indigenous races originally dwelt, long after their extinction." In this way, then, we may explain the

appearance of giants and dwarfs in connexion with Philistine aborigines in the folk-lore of the early Hebrews.

In the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. XIX, No. 3, Mr. S. B. Murray, Junr., discusses the date of the great temple of Baal at Palmyra. He finds that there are four periods of architectural activity. To the first, not later than the end of the first century B.C., belong the temple cella and peristyle. Second, not later than 21 A.D., the rearrangement of the cella, addition of door in peristyle, and the building of the peribolas. Third, perhaps 174 A.D., the rebuilding of the west wall of the peribolos. To this, or perhaps to a fourth period under Aurelian, belong the exedrae in the temple cella. The latter are the only remains that can be assigned to this last period. Aurelian's letter to Bassus expressly states what he desired, "*templum—ad eam formam—quae fuit, reddi.*" Such repairs as he made then must have consisted chiefly in setting up what had been thrown down in the sack of the city. Mr. Murray's argument is that the peribolos was erected most probably at the time when the change in the temple cella was made, and a door placed between two columns of the peristyle; and special emphasis is laid upon the mouldings of the door: "The jambs, beginning on the inside, are decorated with three fasciae, each bordered by a fillet. The inner fascia is carved with a continuous laurel or olive leaf ornament, the next with a grape-vine, a large leaf alternating with a huge bunch of grapes. The third has branches of a plant not easily identified. Outside of these comes first a cyma recta with the leaf and dart, then an egg and dart on an ovolo, and, finally, an anthemion on a cavetto. Now, such a combination of Greek and oriental *motifs* is characteristic of only one architectural period in Syria: the period in which were built the temples at Suwēda and those of Ba'al Samīn and Dūsharā at Si'. These are examples from the Haurān, it is true, but it must not be forgotten that after 85 B.C., when the Nabataeans defeated Antiochus XII, they took possession of Damascus and Coele-Syria. Now Palmyra is equally distant from Antioch and from the Hauran, it is therefore not surprising to find traces of this Southern influence at this time in the midst of all that the city must have drawn from the Syrian capital. The great door of the Dūsharā temple at Si'—almost purely oriental in its ornament—has just such naturalistic forms as this peristyle door of the temple of Ba'al. On the archivolt above the door occurs much the same

grape-vine *motif*, and this is found again on the inner jamb of the door of the temple of Baal Samin at Sir'. All this, as Mr. Murray points out, tends to confirm his theory that the alterations of the cella of the temple of Ba'al took place at the same time as the building of the peribolos, that is, about the beginning of the first century A.D.

Of special interest for the earlier archaeological periods is an article in the same journal by L. D. Caskey on "A chryselephantine Statuette of the Cretan Snake-goddess." It is carved in ivory, richly decorated with gold, and stands about $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches in height; it is in the characteristic style, the goddess wearing the usual elaborate headdress, tight-fitting jacket cut very low, and a full skirt with five pleated founces. In each hand she grasps a gold snake. Like other Cretan ivory figures, the statuette is a wonderfully vigorous example of ancient art; the delicate carving is of the finest, and the effect is most realistic. The date probably falls within the limits of the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. It is disputed whether, after all, the object—and others like it—have any religious significance. Dr. Thiersch, for example, proposed to call them snake charmers, introduced into Crete from Egypt, and to be placed on a par with the acrobats, male and female, who performed feats with wild bulls for the entertainment of Minoan lords and ladies. The connection of snakes with the cult of the Minoan goddess is abundantly proved by Cretan discoveries. The rude, half aniconic image of a goddess rising from a cylindrical base, found at Prinias, and the similar idol discovered in the shrine at Gournia, have snakes twined about them. The evidence in general points to a religious interpretation. If some are purely human, "they are perhaps best regarded as priestesses who performed magical rites with snakes in honour of the deity, and this chryselephantine statuette, which is by far the best of the series, has the best claim to be regarded as a representation of the central figure of the cult."

Another article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* should be noticed for its bearing on the geometrical patterns in old Palestinian pottery. Two colossal Athenian geometric or "Dipylon" vases are described and discussed by Miss Gisela M. A. Richter; they are probably of the eighth century B.C., and the endeavour is made to distinguish the designs which the artist invented and those which were adopted from his predecessors. As regards the *origin*

of these designs: "It has always been felt that the geometric style cannot be satisfactorily explained as a logical development out of Minoan or Mycenaean art . . . they are too different in essentials for one to be derived directly from the other. The theory that the Dorians brought the geometric style with them from their northern habitations has been mostly given up, the other explanation being now generally accepted, that the post-Mycenaean geometric style is a continuation of the primitive pre-Mycenaean geometric technique, which, though temporarily swamped by the superior Minoan and Mycenaean art, never wholly disappeared, but went on concurrently as a 'peasant style.' Viewed as a development of the primitive geometric art under the influence of Mycenaean art, from which it borrowed, among other things, its superior technique, the Dipylon style becomes perfectly comprehensible." In an analysis of the ornaments it is shown that, "many of the motives used by the post-Mycenaean geometric artist were already in use in primitive geometric times. Of these some can be found also in Mycenaean pottery, while others were not employed by the Mycenaean, but came to light again in the later geometric art. On the other hand, some motives employed by the post-Mycenaean geometric artist are taken directly from Mycenaean art, and have no previous geometric history." For example, the Swastika used in the primitive geometric art, but not in Mycenaean times, now reappears, while the meander comes in as a novelty, and continues its great popularity during classical times. "The employment of birds and ibexes merely as ornaments, with no reference to the scenes in which they are placed, is also peculiar to the Dipylon style. In Minoan and Mycenaean art, birds and ibexes of course occur, but they are there drawn much more naturalistically, and are not reduced to mere decorative ornaments." Though many of the ornaments, taken singly, can be traced back to early times, "the systematizing of such ornaments into elaborate designs and the evolution thereby of a new distinctive style was, of course, entirely new." Though the same ornaments are again and again repeated, the artist shows great ingenuity in the almost infinite combinations he devised. "His chief fault was his strongly developed *horror vacui* which made him overcrowd his surfaces with irrelevant material, and thus present a confused picture." His treatment of the figured scenes is obviously crude, but the introduction on these vases of the representation of human beings is of importance to the

history of Greek pottery ; for, once introduced, they occupied more and more the attention of Greek painters.

Here it is not out of place to point out the general value of the principles of archaeological investigation for other questions where the interpretation of evidence is involved. Two different strata or periods of archaeology may have various distinctive points of contact,—*e.g.*, in the preceding case, the use of geometrical patterns—but there will be differences, equally obvious, due partly to the fact that the circumstances and conditions will be different. We can find the same process in the history of languages. There will be certain features and developments which will find a very close parallel in other periods, such that, although we are dealing with different languages or dialects, there are some very significant resemblances or parallels. Some good examples of this can be seen in the lengthy history of the Semitic languages, where certain dialectical vicissitudes correspond exactly to the sort of vicissitudes which must have occurred—and in some cases clearly did occur—in the earliest stages of the history of this branch. If we try and express the processes by means of symbols, we may say that there can be similar features and developments, *A, B, C*, etc., and *a, b, c*, etc., such that each pair, *A* and *a*, etc., have points of resemblance, and the general development *A, B, C*, etc., is analogous to *a, b, c*; but there will be at the same time very obvious differences, due to the fact that *A* and *a* belong to independent conditions, and that the latter may well be influenced by intervening conditions, *e.g.*, *D, E, F*, etc. So it is that classical Arabic approximately represents the old primitive Semitic ancestor, although in itself it is far more complex and rich than the postulated ancestor, and is obviously influenced by earlier historical conditions. In the same way, the conditions of any rudimentary or simple society of to-day will be simpler, and sociologically earlier, than those of an earlier though more advanced community; just as the Old Babylonian Code of Hammurapi (*c.* 2100 B.C.) is more “advanced” than the Mosaic, owing to the different sociological conditions. Bearing this in mind, then, we see that an example of some simple, rudimentary or elementary feature does not *in itself and by itself* prove an early date; everything will depend on the surrounding conditions—the “context”—the circumstances which allow us to distinguish more carefully the “early” in an early context from the “primitive” analogue in an advanced context. Thus archaeology brings to light important

principles which are of great significance for other departments; and although the argument may strike the reader as being rather pedantic and academical, it seemed necessary to outline it because it bears upon so many controversial questions.

It does not follow that any piece of geometrical pattern *must* belong to some one particular period; and in the same way, it does not follow that because, let us say, some chapters in Genesis represent a simple life that they *must* belong to a pre-Mosaic age. In each case it is unsafe to rely upon any single or isolated datum. It is also useful to observe the interesting fact that the Greek artist of the "Dipylon style" was apparently "going back" to the past! On the other hand, his art stands at the head of a long line of representations in Greek ceramics. To some of his contemporaries, the geometric style might have seemed a retrograde step: was he not going back to that beyond which art had already evolved? was he not "putting the clock back?"—and so forth. The moral is obvious. The appearance of any tendency or feature which has apparent or evident parallels in some past age will always seem to suggest a return to that age. But this does not necessarily follow. A "reversion" may be simply a "re-assertion." Time and fuller examination alone will show. At all events, archaeology teaches us this lesson, that all our data or phenomena need clear and careful analysis, lest we judge them in the light of other phenomena with which they share only some one—perhaps accidental or unessential—feature. Other interesting points are raised by a consideration of the principles of archaeological research; but the above is enough to show, first, how easily we can be misled by facile theories of development or evolution; and, secondly, how readily we estimate whole phenomena on the basis of some particular constituent element which happens to reappear, or which finds some parallel in some other context with which we are familiar.

S. A. C.
