

the Arabs of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries of our era had before their eyes both the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Dome of the Rock, two perfectly distinct buildings, one Christian, one Muslim, totally distinct in position, in plan, and in purpose.

After giving a long description of the great Omeyyad Mosque at Damascus, Mukaddasi has the following remarks:—

"Now one day I said, speaking to my father's brother, "O my Uncle, verily it was not well of the Khalif Al Walid to expend so much of the wealth of the Muslims on the Mosque at Damascus. Had he expended the same on making roads, or for Caravanserais, or in the restoration of the Fortresses, it would have been more fitting and more excellent of him." But my uncle said to me in answer, "O, my little son, you have not understanding! Verily Al Walid was right, and he was prompted to do a worthy work. For he beheld Syria to be a country that had long been occupied by the Christians, and he noted herein the beautiful churches still belonging to them, so enchantingly fair, and renowned for their splendour; even as are the Kumamah (the Church of the Holy Sepulchre) and the Churches by Lydda and Edessa. So he sought to build for the Muslims a Mosque that should prevent their regarding these, and that should be unique and a wonder to the world. And in like manner is it not evident how the Khalif 'Abd al Malik, noting the greatness of the Dome of the Kumamah and its magnificence, was moved lest it should dazzle the minds of the Muslims, and hence erected, above the Rock, the Dome which now is seen there?"

NOTES FROM THE *QUARTERLY STATEMENTS*, 1886-7.

October, 1886.

Page 170. Holes in dolmens and menhirs also are well known to archæologists. There is a known case where good faith has been sworn by joining hands through the hole in a menhir. Cup hollows also occur surrounded by circular trenches cut on flat rocks on hill-tops. These might contain rain-water, dew, or libations such as were commonly poured on rocks, as mentioned in the Old Testament. The account in the Zendavesta of the ceremony of purifying after contact with a dead body suggests an explanation of these hollows and circles. The man to be purified, we there read, used to pass from circle to circle and was sprinkled with water and *gomez* (the sacred Persian mixture) from the holes. The holes and the circles round them were made for the purpose according to measurements detailed in the Vendidad.

Page 173. The capital found at Ascalon is evidently Byzantine. Brickwork like that at Ascalon occurs in the Byzantine walls at Constantinople about Justinian's time. I found similar brickwork also in the ruins of Kadesh, near Tell Neby Mendeh.

Page 185. The Arab marriage custom here noted is interesting in connection with the survival of "Marriage by Capture," which Sir J. Lubbock and other antiquaries believe to be traceable in many countries.

Page 198. The investigations of the supposed second aqueduct to the Virgin's Pool do not seem to have led to the proof of its existence, nor do I think it at all likely that a second aqueduct would have been cut, as there could not have been any apparent use for it. The wall in Shaft B does not seem to have belonged to an aqueduct. Shaft A produced no results. Shaft C showed a surface channel of which there used to be many on this hill, but it is not shown to have gone to the Virgin's Pool. The idea that the roof of the existing Siloam tunnel is not of rock, but of slabs, with "hardly a joint visible," does not seem to me tenable. I examined the roof carefully throughout, and believe it to be entirely of live rock. It is never flat, as it would be if of covering slabs. Boys may have been employed to excavate the narrowest part, but in this the roof is, I think, most certainly rock-cut. Perhaps Mr. Schick may be able to go and see for himself.

I think it would be very useful to continue excavations along the aqueduct which leads westwards from the Pool of Siloam. Its end has not yet been traced, and it may lead to some pool now hidden, perhaps the "Dragon Well" of Nehemiah. Ancient mediæval maps—correctly or not—show such a reservoir.

Page 200. The derivation of Tell es Safi from Saph is interesting. Safi is, however, spelt with *Sad* and Saph with *Samech*, though, as I have before said, the S sounds in Syrian Arabic are not entirely distinguished, and moreover, Saph is probably not a Semitic word.

Page 204. I thoroughly agree with Rev. H. G. Tomkins as to the survival of old Pagan names of deities in the modern town and village nomenclature of Palestine, but great caution is necessary in such an inquiry. I doubt if any *Deir*, or "monastery," preserves a really old name (though we have of course *Deir B'al*). *Deir Tammeis* may be a corruption of the Latin Thomas, and it is remarkable that Tammuz (spelt with *Zain*, be it observed, *not* with S) is a name never found on Phœnician texts, although the Phœnicians worshipped Tammuz. The fact is, the word is not Semitic.

As to Sutech, Chabas ("Voyage d'un Égyptien," p. 344) denies that Set was ever so named. However this be, the word Sutuh (سطح) does not

seem properly to represent Sutech, and it is a very common word for a piece of flat ground. We must content ourselves with Neby Shit for Set, I think, and I should be disposed to confine the inquiry *entirely to Villages and Ruins*. The names of the natural features of Palestine, as a rule, are modern. As a contribution I would suggest that *Bidieh*, a place the name of which long puzzled me, is named from Bed, or Beda, a Phœnician god well known from inscriptions. Salchah also (Deut. iii, 10) may be named from the god Silek.

I am convinced that several of my derivations which Professor Palmer cut out in editing my name lists will stand fire in connection with this

inquiry, and are more likely to be right than derivations from dictionary Arabic. Others of my derivations which Professor Palmer adopted have the same tendency. I hope to have time to investigate this interesting question further, and have referred to it in "Syrian Stone Lore," p. 32.

January, 1887.

Page 35. The inscriptions here figured are in the Karmathian character.

Page 37. As to Hippos, see Neubauer's "Geography of the Talmud" (1868), p. 239, where he suggests that the Semitic name was Susitha. In this connection it seems to me that it would be interesting to inquire whether the Greek nomenclature of Palestine generally was, not always *original*, but represented a translation in some cases of the Semitic. This seems to have been the case at Eleutheropolis, or the "city of free men," as we see from Jerome. Beth Gubrin was the "city of heroes," and these heroes were supposed to have been *Horim*, or Horites, because of the caves; but the later translation of Horim was "free men," and hence the Greek. This is not a speculation of my own, but can be shown from the ancient notices of the place.

Page 48. In support of Professor H. Lewis's views as to the original Aksa, I may note that I saw what I took to be foundations of pillars east of the present east wall of the Mosque on the surface. It would be worth while to have these examined and planned. I believe I once had some measurements, but cannot find them.

Page 55. The new tomb at Kolonieh is very interesting, but I doubt if it can be as old as the third century. The forms of the letters in the text suggest a somewhat later date.

Page 57. The reason why I do not write again as to the "City of David" is that my views were published in 1878, "Handbook to the Bible," pp. 336-340. I have seen nothing to make me alter my views in any substantial degree. I never claimed that the "City of David" was a term equivalent to Jerusalem generally, but only that it meant—as one would naturally suppose—the City of David's time. Fifteen years of controversy have shown me that the result always is that the disputants retain their opinions, and of course there could be no controversy if there was nothing to be said on one side.

I would beg leave, however, to remark that we should perhaps make a distinction between the various Biblical books in treating the question. It is universally allowed that the Books of Samuel are older than Kings, and that Chronicles belong to the time of Ezra at earliest. Is it certain that the words City of David are used always with the same meaning?

I have never denied that a Royal Palace and a Royal Burial-place on Ophel existed, and it would be interesting to find traces of the latter, which excavation might lead us to. I doubt, however, if David, Solomon, and the more famous kings were buried here. "The field of burial of the Kings," "The Garden of Uzzah," near Solomon's Palace on Ophel, was, I

think, a different place from the "Tombs of the Kings of Israel," into which we know unworthy kings were denied admission. Yet this "field of burial" was, in a sense, the "Sepulchres of David" since the unworthy kings were his descendants.

We know that Solomon's palace was *not* in the City of David; and we know that Millo, a place round which a wall was built, *was* in the City of David. The Greek renders Millo by Akra, and I think there is no doubt whatever that Akra was where Sir C. Warren places it, viz., west of the Temple: therefore the City of David was west of the Temple. I cannot see how we can get out of this, and in such case my site for the tombs of the Great Kings becomes possible. I only differ from Sir C. Warren in supposing that the Upper City also should be included in the name City of David, as well as its synonym Zion—which by the bye has lately been thought to be also a synonym of Jebus ("the sunny" = "the dry").

The Book of Chronicles does not say that the wall of Manasseh was built "round" the City of David. It says, on the contrary, "outside" the City of David. The result of the theory which places David's capital on the little narrow sloping spur of Ophel dominated by the natural fortress of the Upper City which has a deep natural fosse all round it is that the names Zion, Millo, Ophel, City of David, and Akra, are all crowded into this little slope, and the rest of the site of Jerusalem is left without any ancient nomenclature. Now to me it seems unimportant where the words City of David are written on the map, so long as it is agreed that the Upper City formed the main part of David's capital. It is the express opinion of Josephus that this was the case, and I agree in thinking with Sir C. Warren that the modern understanding of the incidental reference in Nehemiah is not enough to upset the opinion of Josephus. This is the really important question, Was David's capital a city or only a little village on Ophel? and my contention in this respect seems to be admitted at all events by H. B. S. W. Jebus is described as a strongly fortified town, standing a siege and confident of its impregnability. No engineer, I think, would be able to agree that a fortress could have stood on Ophel south of the Temple, seeing that it was commanded by the Upper City. The proximity of Ophel to the Spring of Gihon seems to have no bearing on the question, as I have before pointed out, because fortresses in Palestine are often far away from the nearest spring. Moreover, it is quite possible that the Hammâm esh Shefa may have been running in David's time above ground. As to the aqueduct to the "west side of the City of David," that, I think, has at last been discovered running from Siloam along the south slope of the Upper City westwards, and it ought to be followed to its end.

C. R. CONDER.

Note.—Plato distinguishes three forms of human thought—Fancy, Opinion, and Knowledge (see Menon, 99). Fancy is represented by Pilgrim diaries, Opinion by the controversies, but Knowledge by the results of exploration.