

The military and other requirements are thus fulfilled by the site in question in a manner not possible under other circumstances.

Finally, we obtained yesterday a confirmation for which I had hardly hoped. The name El Meshárif had been already obtained as applicable to certain points along the ridge, but the unhesitating verdict of more than half a dozen witnesses separately interrogated during our ride pointed to the ridge immediately over which the Nablus road passes as being the exact point to which this title, meaning "the look-out," and identical with the Greek *σκοπος*, applied.

It seems to me, therefore, impossible to dispute the identification, which is of value, because seven furlongs, measured from the centre of the plateau, reaches exactly to the large masonry discovered by Captain Wilson and supposed to be part of the third wall, thus militating against the modern idea which would on the north confine ancient Jerusalem to the narrow limits of the modern town.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.

NOTE.—I learn that M. Ganneau had already obtained this name for the same spot in 1870.

THE SHAPIRA COLLECTION.

THE following correspondence appeared in the *Athenæum* of Jan. 24 and March 7 of the present year. It is reproduced here, by kind permission of the Editor, in order that our readers who have already read the first announcements of these forgeries in earlier reports, may be informed of the exposures that have been made.

"JERUSALEM, Dec 29, 1873.

"Before detailing the results obtained on the spot in the elucidation of this question, I may be permitted to record the fact that my opinion on the subject was formed at the outset, and has never varied. The first papers printed in Germany on the subject of this inscribed pottery produced upon me the immediate impression that it was the work of a forger, while the drawings sent to London, and shown to me, served to confirm this first impression. Nevertheless, my judgment being based on indirect, and, so to speak, personal proofs, I did not think myself justified in pronouncing my opinion publicly, although several times invited to do so. Before the verdict of scientific authority so considerable as that of Germany, I thought it wise to reserve an opinion which might have seemed rash, or even inspired by a sentiment of jealousy or envy. I had, however, several opportunities of speaking confidentially to members of the Palestine Fund Committee, who can bear witness to my assertions. I had even gone so far as to point out *à priori*, and without any information, the probable forger—the author of the mystification. The event has proved me right. The name of the person

very soon figured in the official Reports (which accompanied and authenticated many of the specimens) as the principal agent employed by M. Shapira, whose good faith, I hasten to say at once, I have no intention of suspecting, and who appears, so far as I have gone, to be the first dupe, and not the accomplice, of this colossal deception. The forger in question, as I have always said, is Selim el Gari, a painter by trade, to whom the habit of daubing bad Neobyzantine pictures for Greek pilgrims has imparted a certain readiness and skill. I had to do with him at the commencement of the Moabite Stone business. He had copied a few lines from the original seen by him at Diban, and I have always carefully kept this copy, which was rough but faithful, and which at least enabled me to detect from the very first, in the fantastic inscriptions of the Shapira Collection, the characteristic and peculiar manner in which our artist sees, understands, and designs the Moabite letters; among other things, there being a certain manner of drawing the *mim* peculiar to him, which, coupled with other facts of the same kind, enabled me to recognise his workmanship with as much readiness as one recognises a man's handwriting.

"In addition to this, the examination of the inscriptions was, according to me, amply sufficient to show that they were apocryphal. How to explain, for instance, that hundreds of texts found in Moab written in characters sensibly similar (much too similar) to those of the *stèle* of Mesa should be completely unintelligible? For it is impossible to receive as serious translations certain unfortunate attempts made in Germany and England to make sense of these inscriptions—attempts often contradictory, which have served to show, not only the ingenuity and erudition of their authors, but the impossibility of translating texts, supposed, from the alleged circumstances of the 'finds,' and their palæographic appearance, to be contemporaneous with the Moabite Stone.

"At the date, then, of my leaving France, my mind was perfectly made up on the question, although I had as yet communicated my opinion only to certain scholars of France and England who did me the honour of asking it. I knew beforehand what I should find at Jerusalem, when I proposed to bring to light the whole of this tangled business, and to find material proofs of what, hitherto, I had only advanced with great reserve.

"One of my earliest cares, therefore, on arriving here was to visit the new collection of M. Shapira, at present in course of formation, and intended to join its elder sister in the Museum of Berlin. It was not without trouble that I obtained the necessary authorisation; and it was only through the good offices of Mr. Drake that I was enabled to overcome the scruples of the owner, who believed me, I do not know why, animated by some hostile sentiment. I visited the famous collection in company with Mr. Drake, and in presence of M. Shapira himself. It is composed of statues and vases, covered with inscriptions, supposed to be Moabite, lavished in suspicious profusion. The figures are rudely formed, and yet betray the hand of a modern. It is quite sufficient to

compare them with the statues, certainly rough, but authentic, of Cyprus, to see immediately the difference between a work simple and rudimentary, but spontaneous and sincere, and that of a modern Arab reproducing mechanically models more or less disfigured. I at once recognised, in these models of badly baked earth, the manner and style of our artist, of whom I already possess certain drawings, which I propose to publish with his copy of the Moabite Stone, for the edification of the learned.

“Not only the form of the objects, but the material itself of which they are made, cry aloud, ‘Apocryphal!’ The clay is absolutely identical with that used now by the Jerusalem potters; it is hardly baked at all, and yet you will observe under the faces of the little discs of properly-baked clay with which some of the vases were full, and which are taken for coins and *tesseræ*, the mark of the threads of the linen on which the soft plate had been laid in order to be cut into circles. I have also seen on some of the specimens the famous deposits of saltpetre, which play so great a part in the question, and which have been produced by the partisans of authenticity as proofs of their extreme antiquity. These saltpetre deposits are only superficial, and must have been obtained, as I have always said, by plunging the things in a solution of nitre. If in some of these specimens which I have not seen the saltpetre has penetrated through the whole mass, it is because the clay was still less baked and the bath was longer prolonged.

“In short, I did not see, in the whole collection, *one single object which could be regarded as genuine*, so that I remarked to Drake when we came out, ‘There is only one thing authentic in all that we have seen, the live ostrich the Arabs have brought here with the pottery. And as to the pottery itself, it only remains for us to find who is the potter that made it.’ My opinion is, and always has been, that the collections of M. Shapira, all derived from the same source, are false from beginning to end,—not only the inscribed pottery, but also that which has no letters on it, and is like the other in form and material.

“The preceding may be regarded as furnishing no sufficient proof. Accordingly, since my arrival here, I have been looking about for arguments more positive and material, and for palpable proofs. Convinced that the pottery was the work of Selim el Gari, and that it was made at Jerusalem, I took measures to surprise him, *la main dans le sac*. It was evident to me that Selim himself made the statues; as to the vases, he might either make them himself, or cause them to be made by a professional potter, adding, for his own part, the inscriptions intended to make them valuable; in either case he must have recourse to a potter, in order to get his things baked in a proper oven. Starting with this certainty, I looked about among the potters of Jerusalem, five or six in all, and very soon found out the whole truth.

“The first piece of information, which put me in the right track, was given me by a certain Abd el Bagi, surnamed Abu Mansura, a journeyman now in the employ of the potter Hadj Khalil el Malhi, whose shop

is between the Spanish Consulate and the Damascus Gate. This man, whom I questioned with the greatest care, for fear of his discovering the object of my curiosity, told me that he had once worked for a certain Selim el Gari, *who made statues and vases in earthenware (terre cuite) with writings*, but that he had left off working for him for some time. In order not to awaken suspicions, I did not press my questions any further, but confined myself to asking him if he knew to what potter Selim now sent his vessels to be baked. Abu Mansura indicated a potter by name Bakir el Masry, to whom I then went. This information was not correct. Bakir, whose name and accent indicate his Egyptian origin, had never worked for Selim, but he had, and still has, in his service a young apprentice, Hassan ibn el Bitar, who has for a long time worked at the pottery of Ahmed 'Alawiye, at the present time employed by Selim, whose shop is between the Mawlaiyeh and the Damascus Gate.

“What follows is the exact narrative which I took from the mouth of Hassan, always being very careful to let him speak, without suggesting anything by injudicious questioning:—

“Hassan entered into the service of Bakir about four months ago: he was formerly apprenticed to Ahmed, with another boy named Khalil, son of Saïd the barber, and Abu Mansura, journeyman.

“Selim el Gari got soft clay of Ahmed, made out of it, at his own house, statues of men, dogs, and women, with noses, hands, feet, and breasts, the whole covered with writings: he also made little discs of clay like *sahitout* (pieces of money): then he sent them to Ahmed's to be baked. Ahmed also made vases for him in turn, and Selim wrote letters on them.

“It was Hassan and his fellow-apprentice Khalil who were charged with carrying the things from Selim's house to the shop, and *vice versa*. The first time Selim himself took him to his house to make him know it; he was then staying in the street called *Harat el Djonwalidé*, near the Latin Patriarchate. He has since moved, and has gone to the street *Agabat el Battikh*, near the Spanish Consulate.

“Hassan has only been once in the latter house. Selim at first addressed himself to the potter, Hadj Khalil el Malhi, but could not come to terms with him.

“Selim, after having shown his house to Hassan, gave him two *bechliks*: for every journey he made he gave him one *bechlik*, or a *bechlik* and a half, sometimes two. To the workman, Abu Mansura, he gave one or two *mejelies*, and to Ahmed, a sum much larger (a pound, if I remember right).

“The journeys were made between the *Maghreb* and the *Icha*; that is to say, in the three or four hours which follow sunset: Hassan, for his part, carried the things under an *abayè*, hiding them as much as possible, as he had been instructed. He even asserts that he left Ahmed in order not to continue an occupation which made him fearful of being arrested by the patrol.

“Not only were the objects minutely counted, but if any one got broken, the very smallest fragments were carefully picked up. Selim gave, one day, two piastres to a boy who picked up a *sahrtout* in clay that Hassan had dropped.

“Once they gave Hassan to carry a large statuette, still hot, which burned his hands, his chest, and his arms.

“When he brought the things to Selim, he saw him on many occasions dip them into a caldron *filled with water*; one night Hassan himself, at the request of Selim, drew water from the cistern to fill the caldron. Selim left them to soak for some time, and then took them out to dry: he said that it was to make them grow old.’

“I insist particularly on the *spontaneous* character of this narrative, which I have purposely reproduced in its own simple and methodless style; it contains details which cannot have been invented, and the exactness and veracity of which I have been able to establish by other means. I believe it conclusive: it is notably instructive as to the process adopted by Selim in order to impregnate his things with that *couche* of saltpetre which was to be their brevet of authenticity. I think that we can henceforth, with these elements of information, consider the matter as settled.

“C. CLERMONT-GANNEAU.”

NOTE.—In printing the above extract from M. Ganneau’s letter, it will perhaps be well to state the line of action taken up by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund from the first announcement of the “find.” It is to Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake that the Committee owed their first sketches and copies of the jars, idols, and inscriptions. Other copies were very kindly sent by Dr. Chaplin. On Lieut. Conder’s arrival in Jerusalem, he made careful water-colour sketches of the more important objects; but the figures and vases failed to carry with them, to the eyes of English archæologists, any evidence of their genuineness. Still, as nothing but copies had been sent home, opinion was withheld until specimens could be seen and handled. With the inscriptions it was different. Mr. Vaux, himself a member of the Executive Committee, at once declared, without hesitation, that these were, one and all, forgeries. Acting chiefly on his opinion, the soundness of which is now clearly established, the Committee refused to have anything to do with the collection. Meantime, fresh intelligence arrived. Two German travellers, with M. Shapira, had dug up similar fragments of vessels themselves in Moab. New specimens came in freely. It was reported that whole camel-loads of pottery were habitually transported to Damascus to be broken up; pamphlets were written on the inscriptions; and then the German Government, buying the whole of the first collection, gave a stimulus to the production of a second, which has since been proceeding rapidly. Against this evidence were to be placed the facts that recent travellers had found nothing similar in Moab; that the American survey party in Moab had positive assurance from all quarters that

nothing ever had been found; that Mr. Wright, of Damascus, had disproved the camel-load story; and that the English archæologists refused to be convinced.

“JERUSALEM, *Feb. 11, 1874.*

“I had noticed, as I thought, a difference in style between the later inscribed and the earlier uninscribed pottery, but my suspicions had never taken a definite form till early in November. I then received accounts from some Bedawin, who said that the ‘written jars’ were made at Jerusalem, and thence transported to Moab, buried there, and shown to Mr. Shapira as found among ruins or in caves. This information I privately transmitted to the Palestine Exploration Fund, on the 11th of the same month. On the 24th of December my inquiries resulted in a statement voluntarily made by a potter, one Haj ‘Abd el Baki,* with whom I had been in communication since the end of November, of which the following is a translation:—

“‘Since more than a year, Selim and his father the chandler used to come over to me and ask me to make for them large and small pots, and to take from me clay, and make it into images, and write upon them, and bring them to me to bake for them, and they called them “Antika,” and they used to make of it hundreds of different objects; such as birds, and heads, and images, and hands, and spoons, and such like: and I baked them and returned them to them, and they gave me a bakshish, and asked me not to mention it to anybody; they never left with me any piece, however small, but delivered them to me counting them, and received them back in the same manner.

(Signed) “‘EL HAJ ABD EL BAKI.’

“‘At the request of Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake, I hereby certify that the foregoing statement was read over to Haj ‘Abd el Baki el fawakhiri in my presence, who declared that it was his own, and that he fully confirmed it.

“‘British Consulate, *Dec. 24, 1874.*

(Signed) “‘NOEL TEMPLE MOORE, *Consul.*’

“No one who has, as I have, seen almost every object in the collection, will, I think, fail to admit the differences observable between the earliest and the latest. Among the former, few were inscribed; and among the latter it is just the contrary; the later pottery differs, too, in texture from the earliest. The theory which seems to me most probable is, that having sold a genuine lot of antique earthenware to M. Shapira, the forger then proceeded to dupe this energetic collector, of whose honesty and good faith in the matter I have no doubt.

* M. Ganneau spells this name Bagi, and that of Selim el Kari, Gari.

“ I cannot see why so much stress is laid on the fact, that some of the *tesserae* have the impression of linen (or as it rather seemed to me of rough-grained wood) at the bottom, for every one must be well aware that marks as fine, or even finer, such as the lines in finger prints, are found in pottery, whose antiquity is undisputed, if it has been preserved under favourable circumstances. I think also, that if M. Ganneau had seen the former collection, he would not have stated that, ‘ if in some specimens which I have not seen, the saltpetre has penetrated through the whole mass, it is because the clay was still less baked and the bath was longer prolonged.’ I distinctly remember one of the early jars, made of good red pottery, being destroyed by the efflorescence of salt, and consequent flaking off of the outer coats, in a manner similar to that which may be seen in the case of some undoubtedly genuine terracottas found in Palestine, and now in my possession. . . . At present, I fear the genuine and the forged are inextricably mixed up in the Berlin Museum, unless some competent archaeologists are able to separate them. I may add that immediately on receipt of the news communicated in the columns of the *Athenæum*, Dr. Kersten, Acting Consul-General for Prussia, proceeded with Pastor Weser, the Lutheran Minister here, who accompanied Shapira to Moab, and searched Selim el Kari’s house throughout, but did not succeed in finding any evidence to confirm the charge laid to his door.

“ C. F. TYRWHITT DRAKE, F.R.G.S.”

“ JERUSALEM, Feb. 19, 1874.

“ Since my letter of the 12th inst., an unofficial inquiry, to which I was invited, has been held at the German Consulate, by Pastor Weser and Mr. Dinsberg, to try and find out the truth of the statements made by the potters to M. Ganneau, and mentioned in his letter of Dec. 29, 1873, in the *Athenæum* of Jan. 24, 1874.

“ The result of this inquiry, which extended over four days, is most unsatisfactory. The old man, ‘ Abd el Baki, declared for three days that he knew nothing of the matter, and that he never made the declaration (published in my former letter) in the English Consulate, though when the document was shown him he acknowledged the signature. The boy, Hasan ibn el Bitar, at first declared the story he told to M. Ganneau to be in all respects true; he then, after two such declarations, changed his tactics, and asserted that M. Ganneau had taught it him. The other potters denied all knowledge of the matter. On the last day M. Ganneau was present, and an arrangement seems to have been made among the potters. ‘ Abd el Baki and Hasan both swore roundly that they had been taught their story by M. Ganneau, and Selim el Kari completed the attack by saying that he had been offered £100 by that gentleman if he would confess that he and Mr. Shapira forged the

pottery. After such contradictory statements and varying evidence it was both useless and impossible to proceed further with the case.

"The conviction rests unchanged in my own mind, that the declaration made to me on December 24 by 'Abd el Baki is the truth. It is now, however, utterly impossible to estimate the extent of the forgeries. The seeming combination and pre-arrangement of testimony among the potters show that the forgers (for there are probably more than one) have spared no pains to hide the truth, in which they have succeeded but too well. The manner of their attack on M. Ganneau seems to me to point to their guilt, now impossible to prove, though it seems not unlikely that a few months' patient inquiry would have served to settle and define the extent of it.

"CHAS. F. TYRWHITT DRAKE, F.R.G.S."

To the Editor of the "*Athenæum*."

"JERUSALEM, Feb. 19, 1874.

"Allow me to inform those of your readers who have perused M. Ganneau's letter concerning the above subject, that the evidence adduced therein is just now being sifted on the spot by four gentlemen of the highest character, one of whom is an Englishman; and, although the Minutes of the Proceedings are not yet in my hands, I am warranted in telling you that all the witnesses on whom M. Ganneau relies have been found utterly worthless.

"I, for myself, have not given any credence either to their former testimony or to their present statements levelled against M. Ganneau; but the investigators have, by a severe cross-examination of several days' duration, not only of the witnesses themselves, but also of many other persons to whom attention was drawn in the course of the inquiry as being connected with the pottery trade, not been able to produce the *slightest evidence against the genuineness of my collection*, nor has the sudden search of Selim, the suspected forger's house, brought anything to light to warrant the accusation.

"Moreover, it has proved impossible, in spite of many attempts, to obtain from any of the potteries here any work resembling the Moabite pottery; whilst, on the other hand, during a visit to Moab, which I paid some two months ago, together with the Rev. H. Wcser, seven more vases with inscriptions were found by us which, from the place and the circumstances under which they were dug out, must unquestionably be genuine.

"I hope, with your permission, to give you, by-and-by, a detailed and complete refutation of the charges brought against the genuineness of my collection.

"M. W. SHAPIRA."

“JERUSALEM, Feb. 17, 1874.

“That part of my report on this subject which appeared in the *Athenæum* of Jan. 24 has not been received here, as might have been expected, without producing considerable disturbance. I did not conceal from myself the probable consequences of doing what I considered, and still consider, my duty.

“M. Weser, a German clergyman, who takes a very peculiar interest in the affair, instituted, immediately on the news of my letter reaching Jerusalem, a personal inquiry into the facts that I had revealed. I was not made acquainted with this inquiry at its commencement, and it was only two days ago that he wrote inviting me to hear the new declarations of certain persons named in my report—declarations presenting ‘essential differences’ to those obtained by myself. I had no reason for refusing this gentleman, whom I had not the pleasure of knowing, the means of carrying to its end an examination which he had undertaken of his own accord, and which he told me, on the occasion of his visit, was to preserve a *strictly private character*. Perhaps it would have been more correct if he had addressed himself to me from the commencement. However, this little irregularity could easily be overlooked, after receiving his verbal explanations, and I proposed a meeting at the temporary residence of my friends and neighbours, Lieut. Conder and Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake. I went there with M. Lecomte. Pastor Weser was accompanied by two of his fellow-countrymen, one of whom served as Arabic interpreter.

“The apprentice Hassan ibn el Bitar, whose declaration you have had already, was brought forward, and declared, *in my presence and on his oath*, that having been brought to my house, I had *locked him up, beaten him, and threatened him with death*, to force him to repeat the lesson which I had taught him.

“After him, we heard another potter, Abd el Bagi, called Abu Mansoura, of whom Mr. Drake had previously obtained a deposition, written before the English Consul, certified by him, and containing similar revelations to those of Hassan on the ceramic proceedings of Selim. The new witness swore by Allah and the triple divorce that I had sought him out and told him that he must repeat, *word for word*, all that he said and signed later on before the Consul.

“Baker el Masry next affirmed, also on oath, that Hassan, on coming away from me, had told him exactly what precedes.

“Another potter, Ahmed el ‘Alamiyé, deposed in the most energetic manner, and on the most sacred oaths, that all the declarations related above were the exact truth, that he absolutely did not know Selim, and had never worked for any one of that name.

“To crown the whole, they brought the hero himself, Selim el Gari, who, as I am informed, had been arrested and imprisoned up to that moment at the German Consulate.

“Selim, after having protested his entire innocence, turned to me with an oratorical gesture, which was not without dignity, and began to

apostrophize me with vehemence. Thereupon, one of the German gentlemen, who served as interpreter to Pastor Weser, interrupted him sharply, and told him to be quiet.

“Surprised at the eagerness with which his silence was commanded, and not suspecting the intention, probably charitable, which animated the interruption, I insisted on Selim being allowed to finish his discourse, and ordered him myself to speak at full liberty.

“‘M. Ganneau,’ he went on, ‘meeting me two months ago in the street of the Christians, under the Arch, near the Greek convent, told me that he would give me a hundred pounds if I would affirm that the Shapira pottery was false, and was fabricated by Shapira and myself.’

“In all these depositions there is a remarkable and striking unanimity. Summed up, they amount to this:—*M. Ganneau, by laying traps, by blows, threats of death, promises, bribery, and other measures not to be confessed, has obtained, or tried to obtain, lying evidence to prove the falseness of the Shapira antiquities.*

“The matter, put thus clearly, admits of only one way of looking at it:—(1) Either I have devised this black plot. (2) Or these men are either hardened scoundrels, or else poor devils telling their story from fear or interest, and under pressure of the kind that they pretend me to have exercised on them.

“I do not know which alternative Pastor Weser and his countrymen have decided on adopting, not having wished to insult them by asking, and supposing that this absurd accusation would refute itself by its very enormity.

“Let us put aside personal feelings. In admitting the first hypothesis the matter would be settled; and not only at the bar of public opinion, but in the courts of justice, would my conduct be arraigned. But even then one would have to consider: (1) the reasons which would have urged the adoption of a line of conduct so dangerous, and, so to say, so clumsy; (2) the reasons why these worthy Arabs did not accuse me at once,—why they commence, as Pastor Weser loyally informed me, the one (Hassan) by repeating *twice* purely and simply the confession taken down by me; the other (Abd el Bagi) by *absolutely denying* his written deposition placed in the hands of Mr. Drake; and, lastly, the reasons why they have suddenly turned round, like one man, and denied their contradictory statements, in order to accuse me, *with common accord*, of the most unlikely conduct that could be imagined.

“If, on the contrary, their story be taken for what it is worth, we find ourselves facing the second hypothesis, which may be considered under two different aspects:—

“(1) Either these people lie by an instinctive movement of self-defence natural to Arabs when they think they are threatened; or, which is more probable, considering their suspicious unanimity, in obedience to an order given by the only man among them really compromised; and they now deny entirely the truth they made no difficulty about confessing six weeks before.

“(2) Or else they lie to-day, as they lied six weeks ago; and we have no more right to believe what they said then, to Drake and to me, than what they say now.

“In the former case the conclusion is clear: it is what I have exposed in my report, and which I maintain still—*the pottery that I have seen, with all like it, is false.*

“In the second case, I should have made myself the echo of a calumny in setting down inconsiderately imputations invented at pleasure. But, then, how to explain that these arbitrary imputations contain details presenting the most strange coincidences with all that we know already of the affair, the persons, and the things mixed up?

“How, for example, could the young apprentice Hassan, who, I repeat, related the facts perfectly simply, *without being guided by any leading questions*, know the name, the profession, and the successive residences of Selim? How could he, spontaneously, describe the little *tessere* of clay (sahtout), the statues of men, dogs (*sic*), and women, the vessels covered with writing, &c., if he had never seen them? How, on the other hand, could the workman interrogated by Mr. Drake have given him separately information entirely agreeing with that of Hassan? The only reply is, that what these people said then was true, or that I have, in fact, organised the fantastic conspiracy that they now bring to light. Lastly, and not the least argument, if I had been the dupe of a lie, Selim would be innocent: now if Selim is innocent, his *rôle* is perfectly simple; strong in his cause, he has only to deny. Why have recourse to the expedient, desperate in its audacity, of accusing the very man who hoped to unmask him of trying to corrupt him? Either he tells the truth, and the pottery is authentic, or he lies in accusing me, and the pottery is as false as his allegations. He has bound himself to one of these conclusions indissolubly, and with his own hand. To myself, this clumsy calumny seems as good as a confession. Those who do me the honour of supposing me incapable of the basest, the most odious, and at the same time the most stupid machination, may say with me—*habemus confitentem reum.*

“To sum up, we have returned to our *point de départ*; but our journey has not been in vain. We have, on the way, eliminated the possibility of error; we have brought ourselves face to face with a dilemma. Either I am myself an illustrious impostor,—or the pseudo-Moabite pottery must be definitely banished from that scientific domain into which it should never have been allowed to enter.

“CHARLES CLERMONT-GANNEAU.”
