

Lebanon which is always stormy in many parts throughout the year, which is very high at the peak, in descent at the foot of the mountain was found the town Apueta, in which dwell Moors and Christians. Then having passed through a certain large valley and forests we arrived at the city of Balech where are most ancient monuments and a castle or royal house. Many say it was built by King Solomon concerning which scripture says "Edificavit sibi Salomon domum in Saltu Libanii." In that place are long and huge stone columns around the house in great number, so thick that three (11) men cannot embrace one.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

IN the *American Journal of Philology*, xlvi, 1, the most interesting feature is undoubtedly an article by Dr. A. H. Sayce on the decipherment of the Lydian language. That our veteran scholar should undertake this task is only proper, in view of his valuable work in decipherment, and the fact that his *flair* for problems of this sort is unequalled. The fortunate discovery of a Lydian-Aramaic bilingual at Sardes by the American excavators, the hints hidden away in Hesychius and other ancient writers, and a critical knowledge of the languages and archaeology of Asia Minor, combine to produce in his hands results which, if they are not always conclusive, at least advance our knowledge of Lydian. Dr. Sayce argues that Lydian is very closely related to the Hittite language of Boghazkeui; on the other hand, contrary to what one would expect there is no genetic relationship between it and Etruscan. The article is full of careful argument and illustrative material, and throws much light upon our knowledge of Asia Minor.

The March issue of *Art and Archaeology* is sub-titled "The Prehistoric World." It begins with Les Eyzies, "capital of the prehistoric world" (with splendid photographs), and passes from a discussion of prehistoric flints to a description of "the oldest jewelry in the world" from the same district. Egypt next claims

attention—the temples of Abu Simbel with the wonderful colossi. The ancient basilicas of Carthage and the early Christian ruins of North Africa are briefly surveyed—all in all a most interesting and well-got-up number.

The Philadelphia *Museum Journal*, December, 1924, contains a description by Mr. C. L. Woolley of last season's excavations at Tell el-Obeid. One of the most famous discoveries was the remains of a series of reliefs in copper representing young bulls, &c. The most interesting of these was a fine scene of pastoral life—two men milking cows, seated, as is still the custom with some Mesopotamian tribes, under the cow's tail¹; in front stand calves, muzzled so that they cannot touch the milk; men are seen straining and storing what is probably clarified butter, others are engaged in other operations, illustrating the dairy work of the old Sumerians. The reliefs belong to the latter part of the Third Millennium B.C., and are part of the decorations of the temple of Nin-Khursag, a goddess who was supposed to have taken part in the work of creation. It is conjectured that the cow was, as elsewhere, a symbol of fertility, and since for a primitive pastoral people cow's milk is a staple diet, it is not surprising that dairy operations should play a prominent part in the religion and, therefore, in the temple decorations. In other words, we have a "dairy-religion," a very ancient prototype of what has been found among the Todas of India and the Baganda natives of Africa.

The March number of the *Bulletin of the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art* contains, *inter alia*, a concise survey of the collection of some 450 Oriental seal-stones in the Museum. Here Mr. H. H. von der Osten comments on the importance of these glyptic objects for our knowledge of the cultural and political life of the ancient East, and the way in which they can be said to mirror the external and internal history of the centuries from the early Sumerians to the Sassanians. The old seal-cylinders, the origin of which is unknown, were supplanted about the VIIth century B.C. by the Assyrian cone seals. The old scenes, especially of the Gilgamesh myth, and the fight with the animals, are now conventionalized; and, just as Assyrian mythical ideas replace the earlier Babylonian, and Bel-Marduk overcomes the demon chaos, so, later, in the Persian period, the god Ahuramazda is represented triumphing over the evil

¹ Cf., The milking scene, *Rev. Bibl.*, 1916, p. 140.

power, and when we reach the IIIrd century A.D. the *motifs* are still the same, though the garments are Sassanian. From "Sassanian art the motive came to Byzantium as a textile design; and from there farther into Europe, where we find it sometimes in mediaeval art, together with many other old oriental motives." Hittite influence shows itself in the female figures, the fertility goddess, and the thunderbolt symbol of the god of the thunder-storm. "Characteristic of the Hittites is the manner in which they filled the ground with symbols or ornaments, as also the *guilloche* or interlacing pattern." The sacred tree is also regarded by Mr. von Osten as a Hittite motive.

The *Liverpool Annals of Art and Archaeology*, xi, No. 4, is almost wholly devoted to a further account of the Oxford excavations in Nubia by Prof. L. Griffith. Mr. J. P. Droop reviews Mr. H. Frankfort's important study of the early potteries of Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt.

In the April number of the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, of special interest, are the articles and reviews dealing directly, or indirectly, with the thorny subject of the identification of ancient geographical names. In these Messrs. Albright, Mayer and Garstang, Sidney Smith and H. R. Hall are involved. A typical issue is the legitimacy of identifying ancient and modern names without sufficient attention to the known or probable development of each name. Apart from identifications which need not be doubted, the fact that, starting from the same evidence, different scholars draw very different maps, is a concrete proof of the extent to which unanimity is at present so frequently impossible. Still, unless identifications were hazarded, and pretty freely, there would be no criticisms and no advance of knowledge; and these articles are a valuable contribution to what one may call the methodology of the subject. The chief fact that emerges is that dogmatism is out of place; all sorts of remarkable changes are known to occur in the history of place-names, but this is no excuse for postulating other remarkable changes unless each step can be justified independently. To most of us it is mystifying to find that such a name as Zaparaššaš must *not* be identified with Ptolemy's Zoparissus (p. 29, v. 5), but that Siyanta should be the same as Xanthus (p. 21). It is very interesting indeed that according to Messrs. Mayer and Garstang (p. 26) old Hittite

names have not infrequently reappeared after the classical period "during which they had been officially submerged"; although experience of Palestinian nomenclature warns one that the modern name does not necessarily represent precisely the same site as the ancient one. But it is still mystifying when the identification Lablani-Lebanon is according to one authority out of the question (p. 22), whereas another (p. 28, n. 5) tolerates it. One general principle stands out, namely, the necessity of discovering some conclusive starting-point, some acid test for the more problematical arguments; though even here there may be an "unlucky start" which will spoil the rest of an argument (*e.g.*, p. 29, n. 5, already referred to), or the starting-point, *e.g.*, the situation of Kizzuwadna (p. 32 sq.), will be keenly disputed.

Here it is apropos to refer to Mr. Herbert Loewe's discussion of the name Ophir (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, April, p. 503), a good example of the way in which the ground can be cleared by preliminary philological research.

In the February *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Dr. Albright gives another of his valuable accounts of trips in Palestine, with a brief summary of the results of his topographical researches. He identifies Sāris with "Mount Seir" of Josh. xv, 10, but suggests that Sōrēs in the Greek text represents another site, Sōbā (*i.e.*, following essentially the Vatican MS.). He notes the strong position of Šar'ah, Zorah, associated as it is with that doughty hero Samson: "The ridge of hills upon which Zorah is perched, in a very strong natural position, projects into the plain like a bastion, against which the Philistine onslaughts broke, like waves against a promontory." It was a natural refuge for the Hebrews of the plains when threatened by the sea-coast foe. He rejects the identification of the Valley of Sorek with the Wady Šarar, preferring the Wady Suriḫ (as already in the *Ency. Biblica*, col. 4741). It forms the easiest approach from the west, so that the betrayal of Samson by Delilah "was tantamount to the surrender of the whole mountain bastion of Zorah to the Philistines." Khirbet Mukenna', visited for the second time, is identified with the biblical Eltekeh. "The potsherds found this time included numerous fragments of Philistine metopic craters with tilted horizontal loop-handles, just as last spring, and ring-burnished ware of the first and second phases of

the Early Iron Age (*i.e.*, XIIth to VIIIth centuries B.C.).” He confirms Father Abel’s identification of Khirbet Siḥān, 2½ hours from Gaza, with the Seana of the Mosaic of Madeha; the ruins were found to be covered with Byzantine and early Arabic pottery. Tell el-Ḥesi was visited, for the third time, and Dr. Albright maintains his conviction that the site “is certainly not the important Jewish town of Lachish, but probably represents Eglon, the name of which has survived in the neighbouring Byzantine and early Arab village site of Khirbet ‘Aglān.” The fine mound above ‘Arāk el-Menshiyeh is an impressive site which he would propose to identify with Gath; the pottery belongs to the first and second phases of the Early Iron Age, but none was found of the Persian or Hellenistic Age, and he points out that the fact that Gath disappears from history after the eighth century, favours the identification.

To supplement what is said in the *Q.S.*, p. 101 sq., touching the ruins on the south of the Dead Sea, reference should be made to the article in the July issue of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1924, consisting of a report on the geology of the Dead Sea by Mr. A. E. Day, an article by Father Mallon on the flint implements and megalithic monuments, and another by Messrs. Kyle and Albright on the chief results of the expedition.

Professor Macalister in an address on “the Present and Future of Archaeology in Ireland” (Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, Jan. 27), does not fail to draw upon his Palestinian experiences. Talking of the “working of the human mind and the strange universal brotherhood of mankind,” he observes that he has heard from a gypsy in Jerusalem the very story that has been dictated to another collector in a cottage in Connemara. The fact is worth recording here. There are some motifs which turn up all the world over, and whether or not they have migrated—and generally it is impossible to trace their wanderings—the way in which they are preserved proves how naturally they must have appealed, and what universal human interests and impulses they must have answered. There are more elaborate and more detailed stories which recur in different parts of the world, and such is the identity of detail that it is simplest to suppose that they must have been carried from one to the other, although here again it is difficult if not impossible to point to the circumstances of the journeyings.

Students of folk-lore and religion, and no less those who study the spread and distribution of the data of archaeological anthropology—pottery types and patterns, weapons, games, &c.—are only too well aware of the difficult problems which here confront them. Facile theories of common origins, or of prehistoric migrations have at least the merit of cutting the knots, but more cautious workers will be chiefly anxious to collect and test the more accessible and dependable data and build up their knowledge of what is known. Here is a field upon which there is opening enough for *trained* minds. Efforts are being made to make the comparative study of human activities more scientific; rival theories and ethnological schools contend; there are great voluminous works on the methodology of comparative religion, and other comparative studies; and we stand between far-reaching theories of the greatest significance for our knowledge of history and of the ebb and flow of culture, on the one side, and on the other, the patient collection of attested facts, such as the curious identity adduced by Prof. Macalister. The closer the relationship the more natural is it to assume common origin and migration—until a case turns up like the one to which he refers.

Far-reaching questions of the origin of the Semites, the origin of the Amorites, and (as arising out of these) the origin of some portion of biblical lore have been reopened by Prof. Clay's persistent and fascinating studies on the antiquity of the Amorites, and the importance of their land as the centre from which all Semitic civilizations radiated. For some 15 years he has been steadily hammering away at his theories which, if sound, will force a drastic reconsideration of the simpler views which have become familiar. His theories have met with considerable opposition; that they can be accepted as they stand the present writer, for one, would not agree, but they are to be welcomed as proving that certain theories of the Arabian origin of the Semites and of the Babylonian origin of Semitic culture are not to be taken for granted. In the March issue of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Prof. G. A. Barton takes up the challenge, not in any carping spirit of criticism, but pointing out that the problems connected with the history of early civilization are so complicated, the evidence so scattered, and the different fields of research and types of enquiry so multifarious that no worker can expect to be familiar with all that is relevant to his problem, and that clear and thorough-going discussion alone will banish error and bring us to the truth. The questions at issue are

at bottom two: (1) The validity of the evidence for the antiquity and importance of the Amorites, and (2) the necessity of departing from the accustomed view that Arabia is the cradle-land of the Semites. Here I, for my part, am prepared to take an intermediate position. In the first place, we are so apt to be dazzled by the great empires of Babylonia and Assyria, of Hittites and of Egyptians, that we forget the smaller powers, *e.g.*, Urartu (or Armenia) which for some time was so powerful a rival to Assyria. We forget the far-reaching spheres of influence which at one time or another have been associated with Nabataeans and with Palmyrenes, and the evidence for considerable political and cultural entities such as Edom and Damascus. At certain times, at least, there was an important Amorite power, and we know enough of the ancient east to realise that everywhere there was a certain autonomy and individuality, even where, as in the case of Israel and Moab, or Israel and Phoenicia, there was much in common. We must not start, at least, with the assumption that the Amorites were one with the other peoples of the old Semitic lands; for example, as Prof. Barton agrees, among the Amorites we find a type of name which is distinct from that in Babylonia (p. 37). Further, we must avoid the exaggeration of supposing that everything Babylonian came either from pre-Semitic (Sumerian and earlier) natives of the land or from the earliest offshoots from Arabia. Prof. Barton holds that the Amorites were Semites who, *c.* 2800 B.C., began to pour out from the Arabian homeland; a thousand years later the Canaanites began to pour out, and *c.* 1400–1300 they were followed by the Aramaeans. This is part of a very familiar theory of Semitic origins which, largely on the basis of philological evidence, looks for the common ancestry of Hamites and Semites in Arabia or in north-east Africa.

On the other hand, while no one doubts that from time to time Arabia has sent up its surplus population northwards, the linguistic argument is unsafe. The fact that Egyptian and Semitic languages have many important features in common does not prove that they (and therefore Hamites and Semites) sprang from a single stock. At the present day, Amharic presents itself as a strangely mixed language, part Semitic, part African; and it shows us the sort of process that actually can happen when one language comes into contact with another. In contrast to this, it is *theory* which explains Egypto-Semitic parallels as due to a common stock, a theory

which to those who hold it seems best to explain the facts. But the case of Amharic shows that the linguistic features of Egyptian and Semitic do not necessarily demand such a theory. The truth is that when we are dealing with problems of many millennia ago, and our evidence is very variously distributed in space and time, our tendency is to frame hypotheses as simple as possible, whereas whenever we have abundant evidence (as *e.g.* in Amharic, Arabic and African languages) the factors are seen to be extremely complex.

The sort of complicated history that we find in later times would account for what we find as far back as we can reach; and the more we try to understand the facts in those periods which are known, the less complex and intricate will seem the theories which best explain the fragmentary facts of the distant past. Archaeological data are taking us back beyond our earliest linguistic and historical evidence; they point us to intercommunication and even to a certain similarity of culture over a very large area, embracing both Egypt and south-west Asia. The language of Egypt—*whatever it was primarily*—could thereby become more Semitic than it had been, or, indeed, Egyptian could be a language, the result of two such widely different parents as is the Amharic of to-day. We have to ask ourselves: What do we suppose was the language and culture of Egypt before even pre-history throws light upon the land? And what do we conceive the Semitic lands to have been before the Semites made their appearance? Once we try to visualize the ordinary theories we see how lacking they are in trained historical imagination. In any event, the more we know of these areas throughout their lengthy history the more do we come to perceive that those groups of facts which we are trying to investigate, though they seem to form clear-cut unities, are often the children of many parents, and there is something to be said for the view that we should not speak of "Semites" but only of Semitic languages, and that Babylonians, Phoenicians, Israelites and others, were strangely mixed, both as regards ancestry and culture. That this is so as regards Israel, has been urged by Dr. Salaman in the *Quarterly Statement* itself.

Father Power contributes a useful review of Father Orfali's recent study of the ruins of Capernaum (*Biblica*, March, pp. 106 sqq.), in which he seeks to draw the line between the rival views of Watzinger and Orfali, touching their date. While Orfali is convinced

that the synagogue is substantially that built by the Centurion of the Gospel, Watzinger pleads for a later date, the end of the second or beginning of the third century. Watzinger argues that all the Galilaean synagogues represent a late and debased type of Hellenic architecture; that they belong to the age when, as we know from historical sources, various favours were being received by the Jews; that, in fact, Roman aid and Roman architects account for the many striking similarities between the synagogues and pagan temples and other edifices in the immediate neighbourhood. This will also explain why the synagogue of Capernaum was not built in the highest part of the city, and also why the ornamentation consists of features contrary to Jewish religion. Orfali, on the other hand, thinks that these irregularities point to the age of Herod Antipas when the Galilaean Jews were much less strict than they were later; and whereas Watzinger lays stress on *particular* architectural features (*e.g.*, the Syrian arch resting on twisted Corinthian columns, and other details identical with those in the Trachonitis and Hauran), Orfali has no difficulty in showing that the *general* dispositions are older, but (in Father Power's opinion) does not do justice to the more detailed arguments for later date advanced by Watzinger. The historical evidence clearly suggests that the favour shown to the Jews by Severus and Caracalla (193-217 A.D.) had important results, and Galilaean rabbis were actually condemned by some Talmudic writers for their unpatriotic loyalty to Rome. In fact, the old prophecies about Cyrus and prophecies of the practical interest of foreign nations in the religion and cult of the Jews were, in a sense, receiving a fresh fulfilment. On Watzinger's view the recipients of royal bounty were obliged to tolerate the objectionable elements of the ornamentation, but at an early opportunity they defaced the animals, though not without leaving traces behind, as we see to-day. The arguments, it will be seen, are of great interest, for when Phoenician builders constructed the temple of Solomon, are we to suppose that the numerous features of ornamentation and of temple furniture, which find perfect analogies among the surrounding peoples, were intelligible to the Israelites? From what we learn of the history of the Temple, and of the nature of the religion against which the reforming prophets inveighed, we may suppose that these features were neither unintelligible to, nor repudiated by, the people as a whole. But we have to raise the question, and it is an important one for our ideas of early Judaean religion. And further,

when some centuries later, the Jews enjoyed the favour of the Persian kings, and were able to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, it is easy to imagine that there were qualifying and modifying clauses which would no more be acceptable to the Jews than the irregularities in the synagogue architecture and ornamentation would be to the stricter Galilaean Jews. This point, too, is of importance, because the very conciliatory policy of the Persian kings and their readiness to recognize the religion of the Jews—and no less the religion of other peoples—would mean a tolerance and benevolence too tolerant and too compromising for strictly monotheistic sons of Israel. Another important point well brought out by Father Orfali concerns the orientation of synagogues and the position of the *Tēbhah* or Ark (of the Law). Practically all synagogues have the front entrance facing Jerusalem, and the worshippers faced both it and the *Tēbhah*; but later, the back of the building faced Jerusalem, and the *Tēbhah* was placed inside the back wall, corresponding to the position of the Holy of Holies in the Temple, so that once more the worshippers faced both. This change is supposed to be due to the application of the rule of orientation in prayer to public worship, though the date is unknown.

In the same issue of *Biblica* Father Alexis Mallon summarizes the Fund's work at Jerusalem. Summaries are also given of the excavations in Babylonia and Egypt. Also, Prof. Schaumberger begins a discussion of the strange writing found by Sir Flinders Petrie some years ago (in 1904-5) at the mines of Serabit el-Khadem in the Sinaitic peninsula. The characters in question are partly Egyptian and partly unknown, and they are commonly regarded as a link between the familiar Phoenician script (with its Greek offshoot) and the ancestral Egyptian hieroglyphs. A group of four signs read as *ba'alath* (lady or mistress) forms the starting-point of decipherment, but beyond this there is little unanimity. Dr. Cowley has, however, cleverly recognized the name of Tanit, otherwise well known as the goddess of Carthage, and Eisler has conjectured that she represents the Egyptian Hathor. More astonishing, though distinctly precarious, is Grimme's decipherment of one of the inscriptions as the work of Hatshepsut-Moses, chief of the miners . . . And more than this—the fifth line is taken to read: "Thou wast kind, thou hast drawn me out of the Nile . . ." It is only right to say that Prof. Schaumberger views this with caution;

for although there is no *a priori* reason why *a* Moses, or *the* Moses of the Exodus should not have been among the toilers at the mines of the Sinaitic peninsula, the facsimiles of the inscriptions and of this one in particular must be more closely studied before it can be even conjectured that at last an inscription of his has been discovered. The history of epigraphy should warn us to be cautious. It was somewhere about 1850 that the Rev. Charles Forster claimed that the more recent Sinaitic inscriptions—now known to consist of salutations and the like of the first few centuries A.D.—were the work of the Israelities during their wanderings in the wilderness! Along these lines he published a number of extremely topical translations, thus affording food for the jibe (in 1898) that with a brilliant exception the abundant writings in English on Semitic inscriptions were “the” unimportant essays of dilettante Reverend gentlemen (*Reverends*). Bearing this not wholly undeserved criticism in mind, we may prefer to wait until more adequate evidence is accessible. In any event these inscriptions are a most important contribution to the problem of the Phoenician alphabet, though it is disputed whether on archaeological and other grounds they belong to *c.* 1500 B.C. or should be some centuries earlier.

Meanwhile the problem of the alphabet has again come to the front through the happy discovery by the French at Byblus of a Phoenician inscription which is very confidently dated the XIIIth century B.C. M. Montet’s eminently successful work at this ancient Phoenician city has brought him the warmest congratulations, so novel and in many respects so far-reaching have been his “finds.” But the Phoenician inscription has provided the greatest surprise of all, and it has already been the subject of quite a small literature; we hope to return to it in a later issue.

S. A. COOK.
