

the vulgar pronunciation of the name of the modern Bethel (Hosea iv. 15; v. 8; x. 5).

Whether this last passage can be considered as conclusive appears to me doubtful in face of the extreme improbability of the establishment of a place of worship by Jeroboam beyond the bounds of his own kingdom, but it is certain that a district of desert east of the Bethel of Benjamin was called Bethaven (Joshua xviii. 12) probably meaning "the empty place," as being uninhabited, and it is also certain that a town so-called existed near Bethel (xviii. 12) and distinct from it (1 Sam. xiii. 5; xiv. 23); this place Major Wilson places at *Khürbet An*. Hosea, however, refers to Bethel itself.

The question appears to me worthy of consideration by Biblical students as tending to throw a new light on the history of Israel.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.

NOTES ON ARCHITECTURE IN PALESTINE.

THE different rate of progress which has been observed in architectural style in various countries renders it very important that any building of unknown date should be compared with examples of known date which exist in the same country and were erected by the same nation. The notes in the Memoir to the Map are more than half devoted to the description of ruined buildings. Many of these are dated, and I propose to abstract all that I have been able to collect of value as throwing light on the question of the dates of those which possess any marked architectural features.

Palestine may be said to have had five building epochs. First, the Jewish period before the nation became subject to the western powers of Greece and Rome; secondly, the period when Jewish architecture was influenced by that of the western nations, which might conveniently, if not very exactly, be entitled the Herodian epoch; thirdly, the Byzantine period; fourthly, the Crusading; and lastly, the Saracenic. These may be considered separately.

I.—JEWISH ARCHITECTURE.

It is not a new remark, but it is an important one to keep in memory, that the Jews were not a great building people. At one of the first meetings of the Fund (July 23rd, 1866), Mr. Layard, M.P., warned the subscribers that "they could not expect such important results as had attended the investigations in Assyria and Babylon." The explorations have fully justified this dictum, for whilst topographical discoveries of the highest interest are obtained, and the illustration of

the Bible most fully carried out, no great archæological finds like those in Assyria have ever been made in Palestine outside Jerusalem. There is only one building which has been thought worthy of notice in the Bible—Solomon's Temple; of this we find the foundations, but even this was the work of foreign masons obtained from Hiram king of Tyre. The Jews were forbidden to produce sculptured images, and they were evidently not an inscribing race, or inscriptions would occur on the fine sepulchral monuments of the country, which is scarcely ever the case. The Temple of Jerusalem was their one central building, the pride of the nation, and their supreme architectural effort. That we have found, and no other building remains to be found, as far as we have any indication in Scripture.

On the other hand, many passages may be adduced to show that the Jewish ordinary architecture was, on the whole, much what is now the natural style of the country.

Thus we may point to the rapid overthrow of the Canaanite cities by Joshua, to Joab's proposal to draw a whole town into the river, to Samson's destruction of a house supported on two pillars, to the removal of the roof of a building in order to lower the sick of the palsy, and to many other indications which show that the buildings were neither large nor very solidly constructed.

In the time of Saul the people are found living in caves just as they still do in parts of the country where protection is most needed. In the account of the siege of Megiddo by Thothmes III., the defeated army is said to have been dragged up the walls of the town by those inside, who let down their cloaks from above; evidently the town walls were not very lofty.

The names used for cities in the Bible include "fenced cities," which were surrounded with stone walls (1 Kings xv. 22) and unwalled hamlets (*Perezoth*). The former may be thought to have resembled some of the Galilean villages which were walled round by the great native family of the Zeidaniyîn, and which have houses built against the walls, just as Rahab's house at Jericho was built.

Of these ancient towns nothing seems now left beyond what is cut in the rock. If we remember the repeated overthrow of almost every important place in successive invasions, the violent action of weather, and the fact that these buildings were erected two or three thousand years ago, it is surely unreasonable to expect to find much else remaining. In Palestine a building of the sixth century, or five hundred years earlier than the Norman conquest, is looked upon as quite modern and uninteresting.

Time, weather, and the hand of man have left of the Jewish cities only the great mound on which the modern houses stand, but there are indications that the power and energy of the old inhabitants far surpassed that of their descendants. The town (which stands almost invariably on the old site, as far as we can judge from name and the position of the water supply and cemetery), is often surrounded with a

scarp of rock artificially cut. The most wonderful of these scarps is that at the south-west corner of Jerusalem, where a carefully worked wall of rock, 50 feet high, is traced for over 150 yards. Similar scarps on a smaller scale are not uncommon throughout the country.

The second indication of an ancient site is the existence of rock-cut reservoirs and cisterns. The bell-mouthed cisterns occur so constantly near and in connection with Jewish tombs that it seems natural to ascribe them to Jewish workmen, though they have no marks of date which will fix them so early.

Still more important are the rock-cut tombs which generally serve to show that the site is unchanged, for they are cut on the hill-side opposite the modern village or ruined site, and hardly ever are found within or beneath the ruins. The rock-cut tombs may be conveniently divided into three classes—1. *Kokim* tombs. 2. *Loculus* tombs. 3. Sunk tombs. The two first classes seem to be of Jewish origin, but the third will be noticed later.

The *Kokim* tombs are those which have parallel tunnels running in, three or four side by side, from the walls of a rectangular chamber. The bodies lay with their feet towards the chamber, and stone pillows for raising the heads are often found at the farther end. The *Kokim* vary in number from one or two up to fifteen or twenty, and are of various lengths, from 3 or 4 feet to 7 feet. There is no system of orientation, and the entrance-door is in the face of the cliff, the chamber within being directed according to the lie of the rock.

This kind of tomb is certainly the most ancient in the country, for the *Kokim* are sometimes destroyed in enlarging the tomb on a different system. There are also instances of tombs in which the old outer chamber has *Kokim*, the inner or late chambers *loculi*, but the reverse has not been found. There are cases of a transition style, in which an arched recess has been cut, and two bodies laid beneath it, side by side, the feet pointing to the chamber.

These tombs were used by the Jews. Over one we found a Hebrew inscription; over another, the representation of the golden candlestick; others are sacred to the modern Jews as the tombs of their ancestors; and if further proof were required, the description of a tomb in the Talmud might be adduced.

As regards their date, they are earlier than the *loculus* tombs, because they have been afterwards enlarged on that system. They are therefore earlier than the Christian era, but how much earlier there is as yet no evidence to show.

One further relic of Jewish architecture must be noticed—the vineyard towers. These buildings are generally about 15 feet square outside, and the same in height. The walls are of unhewn blocks, 4 or 5 feet long; the roof, supported on a buttress, is of slabs 7 or 8 feet long. These solid and rude buildings occur near rock-cut wine-presses and ancient tombs, and appear to be referred to in Scripture (Mark xii. 1),

II.—HERODIAN PERIOD.

Although the conservative portion of the race set its face against the ways of the heathen, the influence of Greece and of Rome penetrated into Palestine about the time of Christ. The great works of Herod at Cæsarea, Samaria, Ascalon, Antipatris, Jerusalem, and Herodium, described by Josephus, were conceived in imitation of Roman art. These buildings have, however, almost entirely disappeared.

At Cæsarea, excavation might recover entirely the theatre and the temple, the sites of which we found and planned in 1873. The two magnificent aqueducts on the north are no doubt also of this date, and these have been traced and carefully described.

At Samaria, the columns still stand in place, without their capitals, but the superstructure has disappeared. These pillars are of no great size, being only 11 feet high and 2 feet diameter.

At Ascalon, the Crusaders seem to have uprooted Herod's colonnades, and to have used the shafts in the walls of the town as thoroughbonds.

At Antipatris, nothing remains above the surface. At Herodium, there are buildings of moderate masonry, well cut, but in no way remarkable for grandeur or beauty. At Masada, all that can be ascribed to Herod is of rude workmanship, and the masonry of no great size,

Thus it is only at Jerusalem and at Hebron that the megalithic masonry occurs with the peculiar draft and dressing of the stones, the like of which is not found elsewhere in Palestine. This is ascribed by M. Du Vogüé, in the case of Jerusalem, to Herod, and Mr. Fergusson dates the walls of the Hebron Haram to the same epoch. The peculiarities of style in the two monuments are the same, and even the pilasters of the Hebron Haram occur, as I found in 1873, on the walls of the Haram at Jerusalem.

Perhaps to this epoch we may also ascribe some of the aqueducts which bring water down the Kelt valley to the foot of the hills, where the Jericho of Herod seems to have stood. The Aqueduct of Pontius Pilate, 41 miles long, is of the same kind of masonry—small and rudely hewn, but laid in excellent mortar; and this would point to the great reservoirs called Solomon's Pools, which form part of the same system, and resemble the aqueducts in masonry, being also dated as the work of Pontius Pilate.

We have also to consider at this date the Galilean synagogues. That at Arbela is said by Samuel Bar Simson (1210 A.D.) to have been built by Rabbi Nitai, who lived about 200 B.C. Rabbi Simeon Bar Jochai lived about 120 A.D., and he built twenty-four synagogues, including those at Kefr Birim, el Jish, and Meirûn (where he was buried). Four other synagogues visited by Major Wilson at Tell Hum, Kerazeh, Nebartain, and Umm el 'Amed, may very probably be ascribed to this builder, as they closely resemble in style the three dated examples; and the synagogue at Taiyibeh, with the one on Carmel, and perhaps the

ruin at Balata, might serve to swell the number. The conclusion thus arrived at historically agrees with the judgment of architects, founded on a study of the architectural style, fixing these synagogues as of the second century of our era.*

The tombs belonging to this second Jewish epoch are far more ambitious works of art than the *kokim* tombs. They have facades covered with decoration of a peculiar kind, a rude copy of classic mouldings with details entirely original. There is generally a portico with a frieze above, supported by pillars cut in the rock with Ionic or Corinthian capitals. Within, the chamber is sometimes ornamented, and has an arched recess with a sort of rock-cut sarcophagus or *loculus* beneath, the body lying parallel to the side of the chamber. If Robinson's argument be allowed, we have a dated example of this style at Jerusalem, in the tomb of Helena, queen of Adiabene, which belongs to the first century of our era. This agrees with the conclusion at which architects have arrived by study of the style, and the curious admixture of classic and native ideas cannot well be ascribed to any other period.

The rolling stone is found almost invariably with the *loculus*, not with the *koka*. This agrees with its use in the time of our Lord, and the fact that the Holy Sepulchre must have been a *loculus* tomb. The only inscriptions which can be certainly ascribed to the same period are the Hebrew inscription over one of the Jerusalem tombs, and a Greek one consisting of only the word "Parthenes," which occurs at Sheikh Ibrik, in a cemetery of tombs with *kokim* enlarged later with *loculi*.

There are several other methods of closing the entrances of the tombs: stone doors with pivots, doors with a bar across, doors which slide down from above, and doors of masonry carefully built up, as though intended never to be opened. The rolling stone was perhaps a late invention, remarkable for its simplicity. It may be described as a stone like a cheese on end, rolling in a deep groove in front of the entrance; the groove generally inclined, so that unless wedged up the stone ran down across the doorway. In order to open the tomb it had to be rolled up hill.

III.—BYZANTINE PERIOD.

Advancing to late times, we come to the most important building epoch in the country. From the year 326 A.D., when Helena visited Palestine, down to 636 A.D., when Jerusalem fell into the hands of Omar, a Christian invasion of the country was carried out. Jerome speaks of "the great multitude of the brethren and the bands of monks," and mentions a town full of Christians almost as far south as Beersheba. It is therefore natural that we should find the country covered with the remains of Byzantine monasteries and chapels.

We possess two dated examples during this period—the Basilica of Constantine at Bethlehem of the fourth century, and the fortress of

* See Major Wilson's "Notes on Jewish Synagogues in Galilee," *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1869, p. 37.

Justinian round Zeno's church on Gerizim in the sixth. The Bethlehem Basilica serves to show the plan on which a church was built at that time, with an atrium, narthex, basilica, transept, and apse; the character of the pillar capitals is also important, and the fact that they support not arches but a straight entablature.

The fortress on Gerizim is of value as giving a dated example of drafted masonry, and this drafted masonry is found in all the innumerable Byzantine buildings which have been planned during the course of the Survey. It is very important to note the difference between this masonry and that at Jerusalem; the draft is deeper and broader, irregularly cut, and finished with an entirely different dressing. It has too often been assumed that drafted masonry is always of Jewish origin, because the Temple stones are drafted. It is impossible to suppose that in every case where a monastery was built ancient foundations or old drafted stones were found and used up. The only natural explanation is that the masons in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries were in the habit of drafting their masonry, and this is borne out by the fact that in a great many cases the stones have evidently been cut to fit the place in which they stand in the walls.

A second important feature of this style is the character of the arching. Semicircular arches are used, and the keystone is narrow, whilst the haunch stones are broad. This is also the case in the tunnel vaulting of the buildings (as in the church of St. John at Beit Jibrin, for instance).

If, as appears almost certain, this kind of arch is peculiar in Palestine to the Byzantine period, then the roofs of the double passage in the Haram, of the two great Tanks No. 1 and No. 3, and of the Twin Pools, are all of this period, as they all have round arches with the narrow keystone.

Another peculiarity by which Byzantine buildings may be known, is that a large and heavy lintel, generally having the cross upon it, once existed above every door. The weight in many cases is really taken by a low relieving arch above, but the lintel seems to have been used invariably, and is often all that remains to show the site of a large building. The lintels sometimes have inscriptions on them, as at Khoreisa, where we found a Greek text, "This is the gate of the Lord, the righteous shall enter in."

This construction, a lintel with a low relieving arch, may also be observed at Jerusalem at the double gateway, and the supposed date again agrees with that of the vaulting of the passage within. The lintel in this case is, however, probably older than the arch above, as it is drafted like the wall below it.

It may be here noted that the peculiarity of the Byzantine arch is not found in the arching of the Dome of the Rock. The arches in that building are indeed round, but the voussoirs are all of one breadth, and in appearance they approach nearer to the arches used in the earlier Crusading churches, as hereafter to be described.

The question of the kind of tomb used in the Byzantine period is not a very easy one. The *rock-sunk tomb*, to be described later, occurs near a Byzantine monastery, but the kind of tomb most frequent near such sites is the *loculus* tomb. At Shefa 'Amr is a tomb of this kind, elaborately ornamented with a Greek inscription and crosses which are cut on bosses, so that they must evidently be part of the original design. At *Bel'ah* we found a *loculus* tomb inscribed "One God alone," with a date 332 A.D. At *Deir Serûr*, a fine Byzantine site, probably the ancient Sozuza—an episcopal town in the fifth century—is a cemetery of *loculus* tombs. There are crosses cut on the walls of tombs of every class, but very rudely, and they seem to be due to hermits who have lived in the sepulchres. At Jerusalem, however, there is a tomb with a *loculus* and crosses in red paint, with the Λ and Ω either side. Nor must we forget the tombs in the so-called Hinnom valley with inscriptions, "The excellent monument, the tomb of Amarulph of Germany," and "The monument of various persons of the Holy Zion from Rome," proving that Christian pilgrims—for the cross occurs in the inscriptions—were buried in *loculus* tombs.

The Jews cannot be supposed to have shared their cemeteries with the Christians, and the tombs in many cases were certainly not old Jewish tombs used again by Christians, but special sepulchres hewn in Byzantine times.

The only method by which it seems that the Jewish *loculus* tombs can be distinguished when inscriptions do not exist, is by the existence of *kokim* tombs in the same cemetery. The Christian *loculus* tombs occur by themselves, and are never enlargements of older *kokim* tombs.

IV.—CRUSADING RUINS.

The following table of dates, compiled from various sources, will be valuable as the foundation of the study of Crusading work in Palestine:—

Jerusalem taken by Godfrey	1099
Toron (<i>Tibnin</i>) built	1104
Church on Tabor	1110
Montreal, east of Jordan	1115
St. Marie Latine in Jerusalem	1120
Tyre taken, a period of peace begins	1124
The Church of the Holy Sepulchre built	1130
The Castle of Ernuald	1134
The fortress of Gibelin (<i>B. Jibrin</i>)	1134
The Monastery of Bethany	1138
The Hospital and St. Marie La Grande	1140
Blanche Garde (<i>T. es Sâfi</i>) and Ibelin (<i>Yebna</i>) ..	1144
The church at <i>Bireh</i>	1146
Mirabel (<i>Râs el 'Ain</i>) built before	1149
Nablus, the Hospital	1156

St. Samuel (<i>Neby Samwîl</i>)	1157
Darum (<i>Deir el Belâh</i>)	1170
Beauvoir (<i>Kaukab el Hawa</i>)	1182
Nazareth, the Church	1185
Saladin takes Jerusalem	1187
Ascalon, Plans, Capernaum, Galatia (rebuilt) ..	1190
Castel Pelegrino (<i>'Athlît</i>)	1218
Cæsarea	1218
Saida	1227
Cæsarea restored	1251
Bibars destroys Cæsarea	1269
Acre taken from the Christians	1291

From this outline of the best dated specimens an idea of the progressive style of the Gothic work in Palestine may be obtained. The question has been fully treated by competent authorities, and I only propose to add a few notes of practical utility.

The whole building period is confined to about sixty years, with the exception of the towns along the coast. The most ancient buildings are the frontier fortresses and the churches round Jerusalem; the latest are the thirteenth-century erections in the neighbourhood of Acre, the last Christian stronghold in Palestine.

In the earliest specimens, as in the Hospital at Jerusalem, we find the semicircular arch used, and the heavy mouldings approach the Byzantine style. In the Convent of St. Marie la Grande we have a beautiful window (Photo. No. 16, Lieut. Kitchener's set), with mouldings which approach the English "dog-tooth" of Early English work, but the arch is here slightly pointed. Even as late as the latter half of the twelfth century the round arch is occasionally in use, as at the Church of Samaria. At Beit Jibrin we have remains of the Church of St. Gabriel, a Crusading structure, dating probably about 1134 A.D. (Photo. No. 29, Lieut. Kitchener's set). In this the arches are slightly pointed, but the heavy pillars and cornice have a Byzantine appearance. In most of the earlier Crusading churches marble capitals in imitation of Corinthian style occur, and in some cases there seems no possibility of their being derived from any older building. The fact that some half-dozen are found in one building all exactly alike (as at Beit Jibrin) induces one to conclude that this kind of capital was sculptured by the twelfth century masons, and not, as in the case of Saracenic buildings, stolen from some other ruined structure.

As we advance, the character of the architecture gradually changes, the heaviness of proportion disappears, beautiful clustered columns take the place of heavy pillars, and ribbed groins are introduced. In the thirteenth century we find the pointed arch exclusively in use, with voussoirs, sometimes an odd sometimes an even number. The Corinthian capital disappears, and is succeeded by an endless variety of form, from the smooth-leaved "crochets" of Samaria, to the deeply-serrated

leaves at *Bireh*. The beauty of the later churches far surpasses that of the clumsier buildings of the earlier period.

There are two other points of great importance to note in Crusading sites. One is the character of the masonry, the other is that of the inscriptions. Either of these is sufficient to class a ruin without the discovery of pointed arches.

M. Ganneau was, I believe, the first to call attention to the *diagonal* dressing on the stones as distinctive of Crusading work. It is not so much that this dressing is the only one which they used, but that the diagonal dressing is not to be found on earlier work. Care is, however, very requisite in this examination, because the Saracenic masons also used this dressing, though their work being rougher, it is generally possible to recognise it.

The use of a toothed chisel is still common in Palestine, and this instrument may be driven over the surface in any direction, so that in a wall of twelfth-century work the stones will be found dressed at every angle, but always in parallel lines.

A far safer indication of Crusading work lies in the masons' marks. No other buildings but those of the twelfth century and thirteenth century in Palestine have masons' marks. These marks are finely cut on the best dressed stones of interiors, and vary in size from an inch to two or three in length. They include every letter of the alphabet except D G Q and X, with various geometrical signs. The same mark is found in buildings separated by the entire length of the country; the marks have no reference to the position of the stone in the building, but seem rather to be those distinctive of the workmen employed. Some buildings have a great variety, others have the same often repeated. As a rule, the larger buildings seem to have a greater number of different marks, the smaller fewer, showing that a larger number of masons were employed on the more important buildings. There is no impossibility in matter of date in the view that each mark is distinctive of one man, for the thirteenth-century marks, though similar, are not identical with those of the twelfth century buildings. The collections of these marks are given in the Memoir to the Map.*

The above remarks apply to the masonry of interiors. The exteriors are of much more massive ashlar. In the case of the fortresses, the stones are almost invariably drafted. The only exceptions are the

* The diagonal dressing of the stones is characteristic, as Professor Hayter Lewis remarks, of Norman work in England, as is also the comparatively small size of the masonry. The toothed chisel was used, he says, in England and France in the thirteenth century—rarely before. The church of St. Marie la Grande (1140) has masonry dressed with this kind of chisel. The size of the stones is from 1 foot to 2 feet in length, and 1½ feet in height. Almost all the Crusading masonry is small, excepting that of the exterior of the fortresses, the drafted stones being 2 feet high, and from 2½ to 5 or 6 feet in length, as at *'Athlit* (1218 A. D.) and *Kaukab el Hawa* (1180 A. D.)—C. R. C.

thirteenth-century works, which have sloping scarps of small masonry. This drafted masonry differs both from the Jewish and from the Byzantine in having a rustic boss to the stone, which projects sometimes a foot from the draft. I found instances in which the draft had diagonal dressing at Sôba and Kolôniah.

These exteriors have nearly all at various times been ascribed to the Phœnicians, yet we know that in many cases the sites chosen by the Crusaders were entirely new ones, where no old city had stood. The use of this rustic masonry in the middle ages is not peculiar to Palestine, and not only is the diagonal dressing found on the drafts, but the pointed archways of gateways are in some cases of drafted masonry exactly similar to that of the walls. It is thus clear that these stones were quarried by the Crusaders and cut with a draft; and the presumption, when a drafted stone with a rustic boss is found, is, that it was cut by a twelfth-century mason, who would have used such a draft, and not by the Phœnicians, whom we do not know to have made use of such masonry. I have, indeed, not seen a single piece of masonry in Palestine which could be ascribed to the Phœnicians, and historically, I believe, we do not know of their territory having extended beyond Phœnicia proper.

The question of inscriptions is also of great importance. At Bethlehem we have the dated example of the Mosaics which were erected in 1169 A.D. by the emperor Manuel Comnenos. In the inscriptions of these Mosaics we have various peculiarities distinctive of the time. The shoes of the letters, the peculiar forms of U, M, and N, the contractions used, the accents, and the smaller size of the vowels, which are placed above the line, are all distinctive. It is important to notice these indications in the case of the numerous frescoes on the walls of various Crusading monasteries of the Jordan valley and in those of the chapels on the Mount Quarantania. These frescoes are thus shown to belong to the twelfth century, and not, as has been supposed by former travellers, to the fourth or fifth.

Lastly, we come to the question, how the Crusaders buried their dead. Wherever rock-cut tombs are found near Crusading ruins (as, for instance, at Mejdél Yâba), they belong to the kind called "Rock Sunk." A shaft some 7 feet long and 3 feet wide is sunk 5 or 6 feet in the flat surface of the rock; on either side an arched recess is cut back, and thus two bodies lie, one each side of the shaft, parallel to each other, and to the length direction of the shaft.

We have no indication that this form of tomb is Jewish. The natives of the country say that such cemeteries are Frank cemeteries, and the tomb seems fitted for the reception of a man and his wife. In Jerusalem such a tomb has been found to contain leaden coffins with crosses on them. At another site we found an inscription with crosses cut at the back of one of the *oculi*. It runs thus—+ MIMOPIN + FEΩPTIO. The form of the letters, the barbarous Greek, and the small size of the vowels, seem to point to a twelfth-century origin for the text. The only

question which remains doubtful is as to whether this kind of tomb was used also in the fifth century, but there is no evidence of any kind to carry it back to the Jews. It does not occur at the really ancient sites, but only in connection with Christian ruins; and as we know the tombs used in former eras, we may perhaps safely ascribe the "Sunk Tomb" to the Crusaders.

V.—SARACENIC BUILDERS.

A few words only in conclusion are required. The Saracenic buildings are fortresses, khans, and mosques; they are thus easily distinguishable, except in the matter of the fortresses. In this question we must be guided principally by the masonry. A building with masons' marks cannot be ascribed to the Saracens, for their dated buildings (as in the White Mosque at Ramleh) have no such marks. The large drafted masonry of exteriors is, again, never found in buildings of Saracenic origin.

The work of the Moslem conquerors of Palestine was destructive rather than constructive. We have Saladin's walls of Jerusalem either repairing or replacing the Crusading work. We have the great mosque of Ramleh, and a few more such edifices, but the buildings of this class are not numerous. Christian churches were converted into mosques, Christian strongholds were patched up, and almost the only native work, excepting the khans, consists of the small fortresses in Galilee built by the famous native family of Zeidâniyîn. Thus the fifth epoch is not by any means so important as the two which preceded it.

The value of these architectural notes will lie in the application of the observations to sites of unknown date and origin, which may be judged of from the following distinctive marks:—

1st. To distinguish a Jewish site, the presence of tombs with *Kokim* is almost indispensable, and the great mounds with rock scarps, cisterns, and pools are almost the only other indications.

2nd. Later Jewish work may be recognised by the florid character of its ornamentation, combining the classic with native ideas of art. The finer tombs with *loculi*, and the synagogues with their peculiar double pillars at the corners of the cloisters, are to be ascribed to this period.

3rd. Byzantine buildings may be distinguished by lintel stones with crosses, by round arches with a narrow keystone, by irregularly drafted masonry, and by the architectural details of capitals and cornices.

4th. Crusading buildings are known by masons' marks, by the diagonal dressing of the stones, by the character of the written inscriptions, by the rustic masonry of the exteriors, and by the clustered columns and pointed arches.

5th. Saracenic buildings are known by the small and less finely-cut masonry, without masons' marks; by the pointed arches, and by the comparative timidity of the low relief in ornamental designs as contrasted with the bold sculpture of the Crusaders.

The deductions which are to be obtained from an archæological examination of Palestine seem to me to be—

1st. The Jews were not a great building people. Fine buildings of Jewish origin are not to be looked for, nor does the Bible lead to the expectation that they will be found. They were not an inscribing people; and it is not probable that many important inscriptions will be found in Palestine dating back to Bible times.

2nd. The influence of the Western nations is to be noticed in later Jewish buildings, which date back only as far as the Herodian period, or about the time of Christ.

3rd. The great buildings of the country are to be ascribed to the Byzantine and Crusading Christian epochs.

4th. The study of archæology in Palestine, by excavation or otherwise, is not likely to bring to light very much of value with respect to the illustration of the Bible. The work which is really of importance is that in which the Fund is now engaged, namely, the examination of the topography of the land: from this we may expect, and have obtained, results of the highest importance, as illustrating the accuracy and consistency of the Bible history; and thus the discovery of even the most obscure of Bible towns, and its identification by the recovery of the ancient name radically unchanged, together with the examination of the natural features of the ground, and of the ways and customs of the peasant population, are studies of infinitely more valuable character than the costly attempt to explore by excavation, with results which, though of antiquarian interest, have no bearing on Bible questions.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R. E.

The above notes are necessarily rather brief and general, but for those who wish for further information a perfect mine exists in the Memoir from which these are extracted. The size and dressing of masonry was always noted in every ruin, with the character of the mortar and all other points to which attention had been called by architects in the papers given to me before leaving England. Mouldings of capitals, cornice, and bases were measured with the greatest accuracy possible, and sketches of tracery made. Photographs of buildings and of architectural details were taken when possible, and to these notes I must refer those who wish for further information.

17th November, 1877.

NOTE.—A paper on the actual measurements of various places described by Josephus, such as Cæsarea, Masada, &c., is under consideration.
