

A photograph is seldom a trustworthy basis for the reading of an incised inscription, and Prof. Lidzbarski admits that his is "not very clear."

Prof. Lidzbarski's reading of the first word מדיה is interesting although, after having again examined the original, I am more inclined to regard the first word as a bad attempt to write what appears clearly as the second.

The letters of the first word are much smaller than those of the second, the largest being about 3 centimetres high, while in the second we have 5 centimetres; the letters are also crowded together, occupying a space of about $7\frac{1}{2}$ centimetres, while the second word, having the same number of letters, occupies over 12 centimetres. The first and last letters in both words are unquestionably the same.

Note by Dr. Buchanan Gray.

The Editor has kindly allowed me to see Dr. Spoer's note. I have little to add to what I wrote in the January number of the *Quarterly Statement* (pp. 41-43). I there pointed out that the word in the larger characters can only be read מרתה; and a reference back to the drawing on p. 42 will confirm what Dr. Spoer says as to the difference in size of the letters of the two names. The faint line in the letter drawn by Dr. Spoer was not conspicuous in the squeezes submitted to me; its presence does not make the letter any more like י; and I remain of the opinion that the two words are probably the same—that in the smaller characters being ill cut.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

The Philistines, their History and Civilization. The Schweich Lectures, 1911. By Prof. R. A. S. Macalister, M.A., F.S.A. (Oxford University Press, 1914. 3s. net.)

This is an expansion of a course of three lectures delivered under the Schweich Fund in 1911 before the British Academy. It provides in a convenient and very readable form all that is known

of the Philistines; it draws upon Biblical sources, upon monumental and archaeological evidence, and it furnishes the completest extant survey of this mysterious people. Written with all the author's charm of style, and enhanced with eleven excellent illustrations, the book is sure of a warm welcome among all who are interested in the subject. Prof. Macalister, it may be said at the outset, manifests a very decided predilection for the people whose name has somewhat unflattering suggestions for us, and one of the most interesting features of his book is his strenuous endeavour to show how much we owe to the Philistines, and how sadly they have been misaligned. Certainly, one was not prepared to credit them with any notable achievements in the history of ancient civilization, and Prof. Macalister's warm and ingenious pleading on their behalf will repay careful study.

A few minute points may be noticed in passing. Although it is difficult, as he observes, to accept the view that the name Philistine means "stranger" or the like (p. 2 *seq.*), the analogy of the term "Welsh," usually regarded as derived from an old-English word meaning "foreign," would refute the suggestion that a people will not adopt such a term when applied to itself by others.

Very hazardous, though none the less ingenious, is the observation that the name of Samson's father Manoah resembles the name Minos (p. 46). But scarcely a page that has not some suggestion, indicative of wide reading and resourcefulness. Not a little novel is the view that Sisera was of Philistine kinship while, on the other hand, it will be rather surprising to some to find that Delilah and Goliath no longer retain the traditional nationality. It should, however, be borne in mind that these views do not depend upon the external monumental or archaeological evidence which, in truth, is very largely neutral or non-committal. They rest upon an internal criticism of all the data, and it is necessary to distinguish between unimpeachable and irrefragable data—archaeological and other—and the views, theories, and conclusions which arise in the effort to present a clear summary of the "facts." What the external evidence has to say is here carefully and completely put forth, and no one can read these pages without realizing how many important questions the new evidence raises. In particular, the chapter on the culture of the Philistines should be especially noticed, for whether or no we agree with Prof. Macalister in all his conclusions, there is no doubt that the Philistines are associated with a period of transition which

was of supreme importance for the history of ancient civilization. "The settlement of the Philistines in Palestine falls in that period of fog, as we may call it, when the iron culture succeeds the bronze in the Eastern Mediterranean. Recent excavations have given us a clear-cut picture of the development of civilization during the bronze age . . . Then a cloud seems to settle down on the world, through which we can dimly perceive scenes of turmoil, and the shifting of nations. When the mist rolls away it is as though a new world is before us. We see new powers on earth, new gods in heaven: new styles of architecture, new methods of warfare: the alphabet has been invented, and above all, iron has become the metal of which the chief implements are made. Crete and the great days of Egypt belong to the past; the glorious days of classical Greece are the goal before us. The chief interest of the Philistines lies in this, that their history falls almost entirely within this period of obscurity, when the iron age of Europe was in its birth-throes" (p. 114 *seq.*)

Archaeology of the Old Testament: Was the Old Testament written in Hebrew? By Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A. (London: Scott, 1913, price 5s. net.)

Dr. Naville's book belongs to the "Library of Historic Theology," edited by the Rev. W. C. Piercy, and deals with questions of great interest for Biblical students. "The title of this book," the author candidly admits, "does not agree exactly at first sight with its contents, which turn entirely on the question of language, and in which I have attempted to show that the books of the Old Testament, as we know them, in their present Hebrew form, are not in the original language written by their authors. This question, which seems purely literary, is, however, archaeological in its origin . . ." The learned writer proceeds to refer to the Amarna letters (written in Assyrian) and to the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, and ultimately ventures the very revolutionary view that the Old Testament was not written in Hebrew. The subject is of sufficient importance to merit an exhaustive enquiry, and Dr. Naville's arguments deserve careful attention. Although the use of cuneiform (Assyrian) in Palestine is thoroughly vouched for, and may have continued to a relatively late period, the Amarna letters themselves show that a "Canaanite," or early form of Hebrew language, prevailed in the fourteenth century B.C., the Moabite

inscription proves the use of the old "Canaanite" script and of a dialect closely akin to Hebrew, in the ninth century, and Dr. Naville is required, not to prove the *likelihood* that the Old Testament was written in cuneiform, but to produce evidence which demands that conclusion. Consequently the repeated assumption that everything points to the use of cuneiform in the composition of the sacred writings is not very impressive, and soon becomes jejune (*e.g.*, p. 204). One looks for facts and for evidence which would refute the ordinary accepted view.

Dr. Naville is rather vague on the introduction of the Hebrew and the later "square Hebrew" script, and when he says: "most Semitic scholars admit that the first Canaanite inscriptions are of the time of David or Solomon," he does not give his authority for this surprising and sweeping view. Nor is it quite safe to rely entirely upon the traditions of the changes ascribed to Ezra. Finally, even if we grant all Dr. Naville's contentions, it would still be difficult to see how his theories are enough "to shake considerably, I even might say to destroy, the confidence in results which the critics have attained . . ." (p. 24). To judge from this and other references to Old Testament criticism (*e.g.*, p. vii *seq.*) Dr. Naville has been somewhat misinformed touching the methods and principles of modern Old Testament study. His own suggestion that the early chapters of Genesis were written on tablets and that this might explain the looseness of connexion, the repetition and the absence of proportion (p. 31) is very ingenious, and might seem to offer a better explanation of internal literary intricacies than could any "literary-critical" theory. On the other hand, it does not answer the actual data, and it should not be forgotten that an explanation of the extant phenomena is more necessary than a gratuitous hypothesis that refers properly to an alleged earlier form.

It is more pleasing to note the care taken to record actual external evidence which illustrates the Bible, and Dr. Naville has collected many little details which usefully elucidate important features. The strength of his book lies here and not in his interesting speculations; though it must be remembered that it is because the Old Testament presents so many difficult problems, that resort must be had to speculation, conjecture and hypothesis. Where all students of the Bible are in agreement is in the recognition that external evidence, and especially archaeology, is exercising a profound influence upon our conceptions of the Old Testament.

Where they are at variance is as regards methods and principles, and divers conclusions and hypotheses of greater or less significance. One is glad, therefore, to welcome this contribution from a veteran scholar famous for his Egyptological work; for though the present reviewer does not happen to agree with its main thesis, it is always necessary to note other points of view and the objections brought against positions that seem sound. Only by the patient attention to conflicting positions can there be real progress in the study of the Bible.

In the *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (Liverpool University), Vol. VI, No. 3, Mr. L. Woolley deals with Hittite burial customs. He distinguishes six periods: the Neolithic, the Early Bronze, a Transition period, Middle Hittite, and (in the Iron age) a twofold Late Hittite period, and finally the Persian. He finds no sudden break in continuity at the beginning of the Hittite; but, earlier, the Bronze age is distinguished by different burial customs and by new types of pottery. The first date is the Hittite invasion of Babylon about 1750 B.C.; and the latter part of the Bronze age should fall within the Hittite period just as the first is excluded from it: "Unfortunately, we find from the beginning of the Bronze age to its end a steady uniform development in which there occurs no sudden outcrop of markedly new types such as should signalize the advent of an alien period." It is suggested, therefore, that the intruding Hittites were so small a ruling caste as to have but little effect upon the country as a whole. Now, when we come to the late period our dates are Sargon's capture of Carchemish in 718 and that by Nebuchadrezzar in 605. But there is a wholesale change in burial customs in this period: "We find urn burials containing cremated bodies, accompanied by weapons and implements of iron . . . and by numerous bronze fibulae of Cypro-Asiatic type . . . we find imported Cypriote and Greek island pottery . . . with these are imported Egyptian amulets and scarabs, cylinder seals of Hittite manufacture and conoid paste seals which show the intrusion of the Phoenician element." On the basis of the archaeological data, Mr. Woolley concludes: "We must suppose an influx, a peaceful invasion of Carchemish and North Syria, perhaps at the beginning of the eleventh century, by a people who wrote and spoke Hittite, who brought with them iron weapons, whose civilization was in many respects closely bound up with that which

we find in Cyprus and on the mainland of Asia Minor, while in other respects it seems to have had connections further north”

In the same number Dr. Garstang discusses “the Sun-god[*dess*] of Arenna,” a question of importance for Hittite religion and for conceptions of the solar deity in ancient Oriental religions. In a short paper on “the winged deity and other sculptures of Malatia,” he raises further questions relating to the Hittite pantheon. Finally, Dr. Seligmann gives “a note on the magico-religious aspect of iron-working in Southern Kordofan.” The point lies in the existence of religious ideas encircling the expert who works iron. The craft is hereditary and the man is looked upon as one with special knowledge; every year a sacrifice is offered in order “to bless the iron,” *i.e.*, to produce a successful smelting year. The evidence is interesting because in various parts of the world things which are valuable or necessary for life are commonly wrapped up with beliefs and practices of a religious or semi-religious character.

In the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. XVIII, among the abstracts of papers we have a suggestive hint for the classification of the data of religions (p. 78). Prof. Rose, of McGill University, criticising the loose use of such terms as *daimon*, *numen*, etc., proposes a fourfold logical division: (a) fetishes, hardly animistic, consisting of objects temporarily or permanently sacred; (b) *genius-daimones*, where the material object is no longer of primary importance; (c) class-daimones (class of objects or of natural phenomena, projections and abstractions); and finally (d) “individualized” daimones, which are little short of actual deities. From the same journal we have a reference (p. 93) to a Roman sarcophagus recently found between Jerusalem and Nablus at Turmus Aya. “It represents a youthful Bacchus with Pan and Silenus escorted by a band of satyrs, and the four Seasons. The last-mentioned are winged figures wearing the chlamys and carrying various appropriate objects. Below appear Earth and her children, and Ocean upon whose waves is a boat holding a man. This sarcophagus resembles closely one in the Louvre, and proves that the stonecutters took their patterns from books and that the same scene might be reproduced in any part of the empire.”

We have been favoured with Vols. 36–38 of the *Mitteilungen* of the Royal German Archaeological Institute (1911–13). The volumes belong to the Athenian department of the institute, but some of the

articles are of great interest, if not value, to the student of Oriental archaeology. Among these mention may be made of Weinrich's study of Θεοὶ ἐπήκοοι (Vol. XXXVII, 1912, pp. 1-68). These are "gods that give ear." The idea is expressed in such Hebrew names as Ishmael, Shemaiah, and in the place-name Eshtemoa, and was naturally associated with the god of the worshipper, whether Semitic, Egyptian, Greek, or Roman. From a survey of the Greek data Weinrich infers that among the Greeks the prevalence of the epithet was due to Oriental influence (p. 25). The article may be commended to the notice of students of (late) Oriental and Greek religion. In Vol. XXXVIII, p. 29 *seq.*, N. I. Giannopoulos publishes two curious prehistoric seals. Kahrstedt, in the same volume (pp. 148-186), discusses the Cyclade-culture, important for the archaeological history of the Levant. Dr. Brassloff (*ib.*, pp. 203 *seq.*) discusses some marital laws in the old Gortyn Tables, pointing to archaic family conditions which find a parallel among the Hebrews and the Egyptians. Fr. von Bissing (239 *seq.*) treats of Egyptian bronze and copper figures of the Middle Kingdom, among them the curious one of "Moses, the son of Ebdu, the shepherd," which he would place in the first half of the XVIIIth dynasty.

S. A. C.
