

abundant water; around were scattered basins and troughs of hewn stones—some entire, others broken in the middle, or to such an extent as to be entirely unfit for use—in many forms, round, square, and rectangular. I cannot but believe that these upright stones are veritable dolmens connected with early Phœnician worship.”

The expedition remained in Moab till the end of August. A base line, five miles long, from ten to fifteen miles from Hesban, was measured, and nearly five hundred square miles of the country triangulated. Long despatches have been received on the work and are promised for the next *Statement*.

The above is a brief account of the contents of the American *Statement*. Lieutenant Steever returned to New York in the autumn of last year, but we learn from the secretary that the sum of 60,000 dollars has been raised, and that a new expedition is about to start thus provided with nearly three years' funds in advance. We wish the American Society every possible success.

THE SHAPIRA COLLECTION.

It was not to be expected that the evidences unearthed by M. Ganneau and Mr. Drake as to the real character of a large part, if not all, of this collection, should have passed unchallenged. We published in the April *Quarterly Statement*, together with the confessions of the old man Abd el Baki and the apprentice Hassan ibn el Bitâr, a letter from Mr. Shapira, stating that he, with Pastor Weser, had found seven vases with inscriptions. These inscriptions have not been copied and sent to England, like the preceding. Lieut. Conder wrote also on March 19th, giving an account of an expedition which paid a visit to Moab, unaccompanied by Mr. Shapira. They found no vases with inscriptions, nor any but Roman pottery. On the other hand, the Arabs of Arâk el Emir produced more than forty pieces of pottery resembling the Shapira Collection.

On April 4th Pastor Weser wrote a letter to the *Athenæum* giving his arguments why the pottery should be considered genuine. In this he states that he had made three journeys to Moab. In the first, not being guided by Selim—he does not state the name of his guide—he found twelve pieces of pottery, plaster with inscriptions, and broken pieces of figures. In the second, Selim el Kari guided him to a spot where he found seven vases with inscriptions; in the third, which was that mentioned by Lieut. Conder, he bought pieces not inscribed.

He further states that the potteries had all been searched, but nothing suspicious was found.

Selim's house was also searched, but no proof of forgery found. This, with the preceding, was after M. Ganneau's second letter to the *Athenæum*.

An article called “Chauvinism in Archæology,” written by Professor

Schlottmann, was published in the *Nord Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of April 12th. As this took the form of a personal attack on M. Clermont-Ganneau we do not reproduce any portion of it.

On March 30, 1874, the following letter from M. Ganneau appeared in the *Athenæum*. The Committee of the Fund publish this, in justice to their officers, and by the kind permission of the proprietors of the *Athenæum*, but they can in future publish only *new facts* in the affair.

JERUSALEM, March 30, 1874.

I think that I have amply shown, in my second letter on the pseudo-Moabite pottery (*Athenæum*, March 7, 1874), that we may consider the method of defence set up by the principal culprit as equivalent to a confession, and that to the bundle of proofs already published I might add the avowal, so to speak, of the accused. Selim, not calculating the force of the weapon he was wielding, has struck himself.

I only return to the subject to open the eyes of those persons who are not yet shaken in their sanguine convictions. These persons admit two things:—

1. That Selim, the principal agent, has imprudently lied in accusing me of a stupid machination.

2. That, nevertheless, he did not fabricate the pottery picked up on his own indications.

We may ask, first, how to explain Selim's lie, perfectly useless to himself. As he did not hesitate before this invention, we must hold him morally capable of a material as well as a verbal imposture.

But, it may be argued, "there is a great difference between moral possibility and material execution. We grant that Selim has given the measure of his sincerity by the absurd accusation which he raised against you. He is, further, a fellow whom we have ourselves always mistrusted. Still, it is absolutely impossible to conceive that an Arab should have invented these figures and vases covered with Moabite inscriptions."*

I have heard this objection made and repeated by many persons here, who attached great importance to it, and said that if Selim was really the author of these objects he ought to be the first professor in the world, and that the poor devil has neither the necessary talents nor the knowledge to devise and execute a whole collection of ceramic art and a *corpus* of inscriptions.

First of all, I call attention to the rudeness of the things, from the artistic point of view. One does not require to be a great sculptor to fashion these infantine figures, in which their most ardent partisans, like Mr. Dunbar Heath, can only praise the "style and type of gro-

* My own opinion is, that Selim fashioned the objects and made the inscriptions, and that he only had recourse to the potters for the preparation and baking of the vases. I have never been tempted, for my own part, to address the potters to see if I could obtain anything similar to those said to have come from Moab. If any attempt has been made in this direction, I am a stranger to it, knowing beforehand that it would be useless.

tesque uncouthness all their own." Moreover, the inscriptions with which they are covered, in "Moabite characters," are untranslatable save by some *savants* more courageous than fortunate, to whom we owe versions, entirely contradictory, of a small number of these texts.

This premised, I go on to prove that Selim *knows how to draw well enough, and that he has a sufficient knowledge of the Moabite character to be the author of the pottery.* He is a painter by trade, and daubs canvas with religious subjects for Greek pilgrims.

Here, for instance, is a fac-simile drawing, made by his own hand, under my eyes, and in my house, five years ago, when he first entered into negotiations with me about the Moabite Stone. It is a sketch drawn from memory, and representing a statue of Lot's wife, which he pretended to have seen three or four hours' distance from Dhiban, on



the shores of the Dead Sea. A woman bears a child on her shoulder in Arab fashion; in the right hand she holds a jar. On this scrap of paper that I have exhumed from my portfolios are, besides, a study of a camel, extremely simple, and the commencement of my own portrait (!).

Certainly, I do not say that Selim's *chef-d'œuvre* would have the same success as my friend Holman Hunt's "Shadow of Death," if exhibited in Bond Street; but it proves that he understands drawing well enough to model those "Moabite" statues, which would not be out of their place among the gingerbread figures at a fair.

So much for the artistic side. Pass now to the inscriptions. In my first pamphlet on the Moabite Stone (1870), I mentioned, among other things which aided me in restoring the mutilated text, a copy of several

lines of the inscription executed by an Arab of the city, who had seen the original before its destruction. This Arab was Selim el Gari.

In fact, towards the end of 1869, I received from him, then in the land of Moab, through M. Bergheim, a copy containing three lines in Moabite character, with a sketch of the stone, its dimensions, and certain words in Arabic, of which the following is a translation:— "This is only one line of the lines, of which there are forty. It is among the ruins of . . . (word effaced). It is five palms long, and three broad."

The name of Dhiban had been purposely obliterated; I do not know by whom, or why. But as my attention had been some time before called to this monument, it was not difficult for me to guess the name effaced.

Later on, Selim returned to Jerusalem, came to me, and gave me a copy of a much larger part of the inscription (lines 13-20) of which, before, he had only sent me a part.

This copy, made from left to right, and with no indications of lines, was accurate enough to be of considerable use. I verified it by aid of

7X+Y. 49W+.X 4789+Y: X 7999. WY. 732
 476761716X9W9. 06074. X4. XH 4Y6. W4
 4. 26. 4W X 4ZYIX4 H WXYI W4H 740 YHW

my squeezes and fragments, and it served to correct many of my readings. It will be given among other materials in the definitive treatise which I propose to publish on the Moabite Stone when I have time and the means.

Meanwhile, here is the photographic reproduction of the first copy which M. Bergheim handed to me open, the identity of which he can, necessary, certify.

The characters which represent lines 13, 14, and 15, are copied with exactness sufficient to permit one to recognise the Moabite letters.

The practised and adroit hand which traced them is perfectly capable of drawing those which cover the trans-Jordanic pottery.

More than this, the document shows us remarkable similarities in the pseudo-Moabite pottery, similarities of a *personal* character, which reveal the same individuality.

For instance, all the *mims* (*m*) in the monument of Mesha are invariably drawn in the same style, five zigzag strokes, the fifth of which has a long tail. Now Selim's copies, made from the original, show us the

min several times drawn in a variation of form essentially peculiar to Selim, and not existing *at all* in the original.

Very well, *this arbitrary form is found again* in the inscriptions of the Shapira Collection.

Unfortunately, I have not with me copies of the suspected inscriptions to multiply these instructive resemblances; but I am so convinced that others might be made, that I shall not hesitate to extract from Selim's two copies all the characters interpreted by him after his own fashion, and differing from the original. And I doubt not that we shall thus discover the origin of the characteristic variants, so extremely improbable, of the incriminated texts.

To sum up: neglecting all the proofs which I have collected in any preceding reports, setting aside the decisive conclusions drawn from the critical character of the inscriptions, we may henceforth consider it established about the man,—

1. That he has no scruples of conscience.
2. That he is artistically capable of executing such rude pottery as that of the Shapira Collection.
3. That he is familiar with the Moabite letters, having had occasion to copy a great number of them (250) from an original monument.
4. That on the pseudo-Moabite inscriptions is found one, and perhaps more than one, letter, in a curious form which does not exist on the monument of Mesha, but which does exist in Selim's own copies of this monument.

The idea of fabricating imitations of antiquity, and especially of important monuments, the discovery of which has produced a sensation in Europe, is an idea which naturally arises in the fertile brain of an Arab, always in search of some new method of turning to advantage Western curiosity.

The monument of Mesha has called forth a whole generation of Moabite pottery, which increases and multiplies in astonishing proportions. In the same way, a "find" that I had the good fortune to make, the stone from the Temple of Jerusalem, has suggested an analogous combination to persons engaged in this special industry. I join to this report the photograph of a false "Stone from the Temple," engraved on stone with a care and patience worthy of a better fate. I have the happiness of possessing this precious specimen of Jerusalem cunning. There is no necessity for me to point out the curious faults with which it is crowded. These are evident to every practised eye.

Here is a piece of work a good deal harder than the kneading of a little clay. It is a *tour de force* which, although it failed, seems at first more improbable than the exploits of Selim. It was, like Selim's work, executed by the same man whom I had employed about the original. This genius tried to sell the false stone to several amateurs in the city, and would perhaps have succeeded, if I had not, being warned by a squeeze sent to me at Constantinople, given the alarm at Jerusalem. It was a pity; for the potter, Selim, would have had in the

stone-cutters, Messrs. **** & Co., a redoubtable rival; and the mason's chisel would, perhaps, in the end, have triumphed over the potter's tool in a contest where European credulity was the stake.

The failure of this attempt depended on the forger's desire to make an inscription capable of translation, a point where all archæological forgeries fail. That is the reason why the Moabite pots, offspring of a prudent sire, are mute. They are entrenched in their character as incapable of translation for fear of crying their imposture aloud in opening their mouths.

ΟΕΝΑΛΛΟΓΒΙΗΒΣΙΤΟ.
 ΕΒΕΣΟΑΗΝΤΟΣΤΟΥΛΙΕ
 ΝΤΟΙΕΦΟΓΙΥΟΚΤΟΙΚΧ
 ΗΒΟΛΟΥΟΣΛΑΝΗ
 ΦΟΗΕΛΤΡΙΑΟΣΕΣ
 ΤΑΙΔΙ ΒΛΟΛΟ
 ΟΕΙΝΟΑΝΑΤΟΝΣ

The forger of the "Stone from the Temple" understood that, but too late. It is, perhaps, due to this change of sentiment that a great block, reputed to be from Siloam, has appeared. It is covered with Greek characters like that of the pretended "stone," but having no signification at all. The ruse succeeded, and the enigmatic inscription, having piqued the curiosity of a worthy and learned man, was bought by him. I could quote many examples of this kind, which throw a new light on the manufacture of "antiques," &c., for exportation which goes on at Jerusalem. Many a time since my first arrival here have I been offered copies of inscriptions notoriously false. Sometimes simplicity went so far as to ask specimens of the character which I should expect to find: a little more and I should be able to command my inscriptions.

Suffice it only to mention that I have only recently been offered, for ten francs, the very seal of "*David, servant of Jehovah,*" engraved in hard stone in Hebrew-Phœnician letters, a little fantastic but quite legible. And some time ago I was offered a stone covered with characters newly cut, something between Hebrew and Himyaritic! I expect soon to have the tables of the Law and the yellow Phœnician book containing the correspondence of Hiram and Solomon.

C. CLERMONT-GANNEAU.

The following figures on the collection will be interesting. They have been furnished by the Rev. J. Niel:—

The first collection contains 911 pieces, of which 465 bear inscriptions.

The second collection contains 493 pieces, of which 60 only are inscribed.

The third collection contains 410 pieces, of which 68 are inscribed.

The proportion, therefore, of inscribed to uninscribed pieces drops suddenly from 50 per cent. to 12 per cent.

THE STATUE OF HADRIAN PLACED IN THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM.

(Reprinted from the "*Athenæum*" by kind permission of the proprietors.)

JERUSALEM, Feb. 28, 1874.

A DONKEY-DRIVER of Jerusalem, who carries stones into the city for building purposes, picked up, some months ago, among the fallen blocks of a dry-stone wall, a marble head of natural size, which is probably an historical relic of great interest. I made him point out to me the exact position of his discovery. It is on the edge of the old Nablous road, thirty metres north of the Tombs of the Kings—that is, some minutes' walk from the Damascus Gate. The head, which now belongs to an effendi of the town, is that of a man. The beard is short and curly; the hair is abundant, with thick locks which cover a portion of the forehead. He bears a crown of laurels, the two branches of which are attached to a medallion, on which is engraved very distinctly in cameo an eagle, symbol of sovereign power.

The expression of the face from some points of view has a certain harshness; the eyes, the pupils of which are indicated by the sculptor, are looking upwards; the end of the nose is broken; and some portions of the face, especially the right eyebrow, have suffered. The whole back part of the head has been long since broken.

The style is entirely Roman; the workmanship is far from being faultless; but the effect of the whole is striking and imposing.

We have in this head clearly a portrait, and not a vulgar type. The mutilation of the nose, although slight, makes the identity of the personage at first difficult to distinguish. As I have not here the necessary works of reference to determine the question, I hesitated for some time between several hypotheses which presented themselves. I have now, after mature consideration, come back to my first impression, and I believe that we have in this head no other than that of the Emperor Hadrian. This is also the opinion of a man of great learning, the Archimandrite of the Russian Mission at Jerusalem. I think that this view will be admitted in Europe by savants competent to judge, and by all those who are in a position to submit it to a verification impossible here.

The finding of a head of Hadrian at Jerusalem is undeniably interesting; but were it not for certain peculiar circumstances which give it an historical value, it might be nothing but a mere curiosity.

Every one knows the last and terrible insurrection of the Jews, under the command of Barcochebas, "Son of the Star," which Hadrian had so