

NOTES ON PERROT AND CHIPIEZ'S "HISTOIRE
DE L'ART."

VOL. IV.—SARDINIA, JUDEA, AND ASIA MINOR.

THE influence of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund is seen by its reproduction in such books as the above. MM. Perrot and Chipiez have added a volume to their valuable set of books on Ancient Art, in which a large amount of information and many plates are derived from the Memoirs of the Palestine Survey, and from such works as the "Recovery of Jerusalem," "Heth and Moab," &c. As this book will no doubt be much read by those who have followed the Palestine Exploration Fund work, I venture to put down a few notes which occur to me in reading it.

Page 180. The plan of the Royal Quarries given in the Jerusalem volume Portfolio seems to be forgotten, only the rough sketch in the *Quarterly Statement* being noticed.

Page 185. Nothing is said in speaking of the dressing of the Haram stones of the peculiar criss-cross tooling which is found on them and at Hebron, but not on other drafted masonry—*e.g.*, Baalbek and 'Arák el Emír. This tooling is distinctive.

Page 197. The Golden Gate is here supposed to have been named by a mistranslation of the Greek (Acts iii, 3), "Beautiful Gate." Tradition has, however, always placed the latter on the west side of the Haram, where it is noticed by many mediæval writers.

Page 199. I do not understand why Dr. Chaplin's statement as to the "Stone of Foundation" is called "quite a gratuitous conjecture." The Mishnah is regarded by M. Perrot as of considerable authority, and the Mishnah says distinctly that the Stone of Foundation was visible in the Holy of Holies of Herod's Temple. The passage, 1 Kings vi, 15, does not contradict this, since it refers to Solomon's Temple.

Page 208. M. Perrot seems to think that the central part of the east and west Haram walls may be as old as Solomon, but it appears certain that at least all the east wall is of one period to the Golden Gate. He also speaks of the north-east angle, apparently overlooking the fact that, as far as we know, there is no ancient corner at this point.

Page 211. The unpublished drawings of the Palace of Hyrcanus which I prepared in 1883 show that the style was not purely Greek. The central pillars had most remarkable capitals, more like Egyptian style than any other; but, as far as I know, unique.

Page 214. M. Perrot speaks of *three* ancient Gateways on the west Haram wall as now known, but including that of Tank, No. xxx, there are four.

Page 226. It is matter of opinion whether Ezekiel's description should be applied to Solomon's Temple. M. Perrot's plan is not unlike that in the Speaker's Commentary, but to me it seems doubtful if the Temple of Solomon had as many cloisters as that described by Ezekiel. The

Rabbinical writers certainly held that Ezekiel's Temple never existed, though in some particulars its plan was carried out by Herod.

Page 239. The Mishnah can hardly be said to be much later than Josephus, and seems to have founded its description on the accounts of eye-witnesses of the Herodian temple.

Page 273. The wall discovered by De Vogtié east of the Cathedral of the Holy Sepulchre cannot be considered as old as the Haram masonry. The stones are quite differently dressed, and the wall appears to have belonged to the Basilica of Constantine.

Page 277. I do not understand on what grounds M. Perrot refers drafted masonry to Solomon. We do not know of its use in Phœnicia before the Greek age, and it may have been introduced into Palestine during that age.

Page 284-5. It is much to be regretted, I think, that the fanciful restorations of Jewish tombs by Cassas should be reproduced. They resemble no known monument existing in Palestine, and seem to be entirely impossible.

Page 305-6. It would have been well perhaps to have referred to the discoveries of Lenormant as to the meaning and derivation of the word *Cherub*, which is purely Semitic, and has nothing probably to do with the Aryan Gryps.

Page 308. The coin attributed to Jaddua bears no name or date. It is usually thought to belong to the coinage of Simon the Hasmonean, and it is not known that Jaddua struck any coins.

Page 334. I am unable to trace any authority for the restoration of Solomon's brazen altar with steps, which were not allowed by the Law.

Page 340. Pierotti is not a very good authority to quote as to Hebron. There is no allusion to the account of the Hebron mosque as explored when the Royal Princes visited the same, when it was shown that there is a double chamber under the floor, not in two storeys, but on one level.

Page 349. The Tomb at Tibneh, once thought to be Joshua's, belongs, I should say, to the Greek period.

Page 350. The cornice of the so-called "Egyptian tomb" appears to have just the same profile as that of the tombs of Absalom and Zechariah. It should be noted also that a similar profile occurs on the inner side of the Hebron Haram wall at the top. It seems clear that this profile was in use among the Jews of the Herodian age, and is only remotely connected with Egypt.

Page 354. I venture to differ as to the supposed ancient Hebrew text on the same monument. I carefully examined the marks in question, and have copied them (see Jerusalem Volume of "Memoirs"). I do not think they are letters at all, nor does there seem any clear indication that the door has been made higher at a later period. I believe the monument in question to date about the Christian era.

Page 361. M. Guérin's views as to the supposed Tomb of the Maccabees were not supported by further exploration. The monument appears to be a Byzantine Christian building, as shown by M. Clermont-Ganneau.

Page 364. It is hardly possible to suppose the tombs south of Wady Rababy to be very ancient, as a rule. Many are Christian, and one of the most important dates from the eighth century.

Page 378. M. Perrot does me the honour to reproduce seven of my drawings of dolmens, but he does not refer to the curious stone circles in Moab called *Hadr*, which are as important as the other rude stone monuments discovered by my party in 1881-2. It is also curious that in speaking of the ancient fortresses of Palestine, M. Perrot never once describes any of the Tells, which are among the most important of ancient remains in Palestine, some of which have been excavated by the Palestine Exploration Fund explorers, and a great many others described.

Page 383. It is perhaps doubtful if the great foundation stones under the walls of Justinian's fortress on Gerizim are the oldest remains on the summit. The sacred rock seems to me to be the really ancient centre on the mountain, resembling the "earth fast" stones which, like the dolmens, were altars among the Celts. The cup hollow in this rock is very remarkable. The Samaritans say it marks the site of the Laver of Joshua's Temple on the mountain, but it is perhaps an old libation hollow like many found in Syria and in Europe.

Page 407. The proposed restoration of the Temple and Palace of Solomon by Stade shows by its contour that foundations of 40 feet in depth would be required. This is due chiefly to the Temple being too far west, the Sakhrah being made the site of the Altar. If as in my proposed restoration of Herod's Temple the Sakhrah is placed in the Holy of Holies, it will be found that only 2 or 3 feet of foundation are required anywhere.

Page 409. M. Perrot says Solomon's throne "would hardly have been noticed" at Tyre, Babylon, Nineveh, or Memphis. Yet Sennacherib thought Hezekiah's ivory throne worthy of notice in his historical tablet.

Page 434. The sketch of the pottery goddess of Gezer from a drawing by C. F. T. Drake, has been idealised by the artist. It may be true that the pictures of the Palestine Exploration Fund Memoirs are "mediocre" compared with his beautiful sketches, but the first thing desirable in archæological drawings is faithful representation. Mr. Drake's picture was faithful and complete.

Page 441. There is evidence in Phœnician inscriptions and in monumental town names that Chemosh was not exclusively a Moabite deity.

Page 450. The sketches of the Moabite pottery are slight. The Palestine Exploration Fund possesses a collection of water-colour drawings and photographs of them. I may be allowed to note that these objects were discovered or produced just at the time when I first went out to Palestine in 1872, and though I reported fully on them, I did not consider myself competent to pronounce on their character, since I had not that "long experience" with which M. Perrot has done me the honour to credit me. As to the Shapira MS., it was first denounced by Neubauer, then simultaneously (to a day) by M. Clermont-Ganneau and by myself. I do not even now feel certain that some genuine articles may not have given the idea

of the pottery figures to the forgers, and this view was held by others also.

Page 455. Mr. Baker Greene's view as to the meaning of the names Melek Safa and Melek Set seems to me very probable in face of the numerous inscriptions on which the name Melek, or Moloch, appears in conjunction with other names of deities. Set also we know to have been a name for a deity of Egypt and of the Hittites.

Page 460. The collections at No. 1, Adam Street, and at South Kensington, show that it was hardly the case that the English explorers "did not take the trouble" to collect ancient glass found in the excavations.

Page 465. The idea that the cartouche *Yutah Mâlek* represents the King of Judah, hardly agrees with the fact that it belongs to a purely geographical list, and has the determinative of place. It represents rather the town Jehud (el Yehûdfyeh).

Page 494. The discovery of a well-formed hare on the lion of Marash shows that I was right in supposing this hieroglyphic to have been used in the Syrian hieroglyphs. The Egyptian figure of the hare represents the rising sun.

Page 504. M. Perrot does not see "how Captain Conder can deny" that the Egyptian picture of Kadesh gives the idea of a lake. His own picture seems to show that the Lake of Kades (or Homs) cannot be intended. There are bridges over it from both sides, and if the site were in a lake at Tell el Baheirah, these would have been each $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile long. The Hittites might have tried to drive across the stream which surrounds the site where the name Kades is still found, as they are shown doing in the picture. They would not have tried to drive to a town a mile away in the water. The only reason adduced why Tell el Baheirah should be the site of Kadesh is the existence of the lake. I have shown that the lake was formed by building the Roman dam. The site where the ancient name is found is the proper site to examine. I do not think there is any indication that there was a town of importance on Tell el Baheirah, nor do I see any sound reason for supposing it to be the site of Kadesh.

In a note on p. 806, M. Perrot, however, is induced by M. Ary Renan to look more favourably on my view as to Kadesh. I do not think, however, it is correct to speak of the island in the lake as so very small, although it is absent from M. Perrot's reproduction of my sketch Survey of the Lake. The argument as to the lake being formed by the barrage I put forward in 1881, and published in "Heth and Moab." M. Perrot seems to have overlooked this and other arguments, which he attributes to M. Ary Renan, who visited the spot in 1886. It is surely a mistake to say that Robinson placed Kadesh on the Tell el Baheirah, for Robinson apparently knew nothing about Kadesh. He did not visit the lake, and he says he did not know why Abu el Feda called it Kedes ("Later Biblical Researches," p. 549).

A good deal that M. Perrot has written may perhaps be reconsidered in connection with the reading of the so-called Hittite texts.

C. R. C.