

NOTES ON THE "QUARTERLY STATEMENT" FOR
OCTOBER, 1895.

I.—By Professor CLERMONT-GANNEAU.

P. 319. It is very desirable that the Latin *graffito* discovered by Professor Kennedy on the base of a pilaster near the gate in the neighbourhood of the Protestant cemetery should be published.

P. 329. It is to be regretted that they did not think of pouring liquid plaster into the cavities left in the bed of lime by the dead bodies anciently placed there. The countenance of the dead person could then have been restored by means of a true mould. It is desirable that in future, in case of similar discoveries, this simple operation may be carried out.

P. 332. The old opinion which places the Corea of Josephus at Kariût, and Archelaüs at Karâwâ, ought to be abandoned. Karâwâ, as Sir Charles Warren¹ recognised in 1876, and as Gildemeister has since abundantly demonstrated, is certainly Corea. To convince one's self of this it is enough to peruse attentively the description of the march of Vespasian: the Roman General *descends* (*καταβâs*) from Neapolis to Corea: but the altitude of Kariût is 170 m. above that of Nâblus. Moreover, the object of Vespasian was to effect a junction with the army corps which operated in Perea under the orders of Trajan, to march upon Jericho²; the junction in the plain of the Ghôr was quite indicated. Pompey also had before followed the valley of the Ghôr in passing by Pella, Scythopolis, and Corea.³ I may add that Karâwâ represents the Neel Keraba of the life of St. Sabas, where one of the lauras of the region of the Jordan was established. It may be remarked, in passing, that the inscription discovered by the survey party near there is not, as supposed, in archaic Hebrew characters, but in Samaritan characters, as is also the inscription of Umm Zeinât on Carmel.

P. 334. *The Stoppage of the Jordan.*—I am happy to see that the summary of my ideas on this subject, so ably presented to the English public by my friend Colonel Watson, has already attracted the attention of the critic. I would call to mind, however, that it was only a summary, and that, after having succeeded in introducing this new datum into this important problem of exegesis, I studied it at full length and under all its aspects in 1892 and 1893 in a series of lectures at the Collège of France and in several communications to the Institute. I will explain it fully in Vol. II of my "*Études d'Archéologie Orientale*," now in course of publication. May I be allowed to say here, once for all, that of the number of exegetical and very complicated questions which my theory raises, I have treated in the greatest detail that of Adam, to which Canon Dalton

¹ "Underground Jerusalem," p. 253.

² Josephus "Wars," iv, 8, 1.

³ *Ibid.* "Antiq.," xiv, 3, 4.

and Mr. Stevenson allude, particularly the literal comparison of the Hebrew text with the Greek version of Josh. iii, 16. It would take too long to develop my views on this point here. I will limit myself to saying that the question is still much more complicated than these attempts at exegesis, perhaps a little hasty and based on a mere cursory view of a system, which is not yet known in its entirety, would make us believe. It is thus, for instance, that I arrive at the conclusion that our town of Adam-Dámieh is in reality mentioned again—and always with Zarethan—in a distorted passage where its existence has not been suspected, 1 Kings vii, 46 (and likewise in the parallel passage, still more distorted, of 2 Chron. iv, 17) :—

"And he cast them, במעבה (בעבי) האדמה, in the clay ground between Succoth and Zarethan." I propose the very paleographic correction: במעבר (ה)אדמה, "at the ford of Adamah." But I cannot engage in this discussion here. I beg only that before any definite judgment is passed on my ideas I may be permitted to explain them fully.

P. 338. Mr. Birch reproaches me with having doubted, after many others, the identity of Khureitún and the Cave of Adullam. I refer him to Tobler. Without desiring to go to the bottom of the topographical question and to examine to what point Mr. Birch's onomastic comparison of Khureitún and Etam can be received, I permit myself to remark that one at least of his objections against the etymology of Khureitún = *Χαρίτων* has not the force which he attributes to it. He considers that if it referred to a holy personage the name ought to be Mar Khureitún; but *Mar* is not so necessary as he appears to believe in this kind of toponymes; for instance, Deir Dosi (Theodosius), Kh. Biar Lúka (Luke), Deir Murkos (Mark), Deir Bulos (Paul), Deir Sem'an (Simeon), Deir Futros (Peter), Deir Hanna (John), Deir Aiyub, &c.

Pages 349 and 353. The Nabatean inscriptions copied by Mr. Ewing, as also the preceding ones, pp. 57 and 157, are unedited. I have been able to decipher some words, but squeezes will be indispensable, the copies given being too imperfect.

P. 350, No. 174. Instead of Ζεὺς Ἀφαθηνε(ὺς) προκοπὴν Ἀρχελάφ Ἰουλίος would it not be better to read: Ζεὺ Σαφαθηνέ! προκοπὴν Ἀρχελάφ Ἰουλίον. "Zeus Saphathenian (accord), benefit to Archelaus, son of Joulíos." The vocative accounts for this elliptical form. The last *v* of Ἰουλίον is supplied by the copy, very defective as to the rest, of Mr. Löytved, which I published in 1884. The topical surname of Zeus, *Saphathenos*, obtained by this reading has a true Semitic physiognomy. It is, perhaps, connected with some locality named *Sapha* or *Saphath*, or more probably with a region the name of which may be preserved in that of *Safa*, north-east of Bostra.

P. 353, No. 183. Already known by the much better copies of Wetzstein, Porter, and Waddington (No. 2286). The transcription proposed here requires to be modified and completed at several points.

P. 354, No. 186. Since about two years I have been in possession of a

good squeeze of the inscription of Seffûrieh, which admits of a more satisfactory decipherment. This difficult inscription is very interesting. I hope to publish it shortly. The personage is a *Scholasticus*, son of Aetios.

Below are a few brief remarks upon the other inscriptions collected by Mr. Ewing in the Hauran and published in previous numbers of the *Quarterly Statement* :—

Nos. 6 and 30. I have before shown ("Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale," I, p. 8, *et seq.*) that the era of Damascus is no other than that of the Seleucids, but with a different point of departure for the commencement of the year—the vernal equinox instead of the 1st of October. It is indeed a difference of the calendar rather than of the era.

No. 9. Published by me (*op cit.*, p. 5, No. 3).

No. 13. Ἀβδαλουαρου should perhaps read Ἀβδαδου(σ)αρου, Abdadusares, "servant of Dusares" (*cf.* עבדדושרא in the Nabatean inscriptions of Sinai).

No. 22. Perhaps Γαφαρα.

No. 35, l. 3. [M]άλχος?

No. 46. φιλω[γαίου]? as in Nos. 39 and 40.

No. 55. Γαυτου = son of Gautos, Nabatean proper name already known, in place of [ε]αυτου; appears in the inscriptions of Sinai and of Mada'in Sâleh under the form עוּתוּ.

No. 61. θεῶ Μαλειθάθου is not a god called Maleichathou, but the god adored by the person called Maleichathos. Examples of this form are numerous in the Greek epigraphy of the Hauran, and it recurs in the Nabatean inscriptions.

Ἄδσοσ is a Nabatean proper name widely spread (אוסו Ausou, "a gift"), which has nothing to do with Ἴησοῦσ.

No. 77. At the commencement of line 2 read : أشهد "I testify" or "testify" (imperative).

No. 78, l. 1. Perhaps the known formulæ ΧΜΓ? Add the date : ἔτ(ους) κζ', "the year 27," inscribed in the ear of the cartouche, and probably to be completed like No. 79, as [τ]κζ' = 327.

No. 79A. Read Βαγράθουσ instead of Βαγραθοουσ; the last character, whatever it may be, should be put to the commencement of the patronymic which follows, which may perhaps be restored as Σελουανου = Σιλουανου, Silvanus.

No. 89. Already published by me (*op cit.*, p. 11, No. 8).

Nos. 102 and 103. The characters are certainly Arabic.

No. 153. A word is needed to designate the edifice; perhaps ναου at the end of line 2 (?)

No. 157. This is No. 2291 of Waddington. It should be read : . . . Jovis, G. Jul(ius) [Maxi]mus vet(e)ran(us), qui sub ambos militavit, fecit.

II.—By Lieut.-Colonel CONDER, R.E., D.C.L.

P. 297 (October, 1895). The question as to the rock on the traditional Calvary is only one of a foot or two, as the cave beneath has a rock roof, but I examined the rock above in 1882, and it appeared to me to be live rock, and not a stone.

P. 316. There is no account of Herod's having built a wall on the south side of Jerusalem. Josephus speaks of the wall here as that of the earliest period.

P. 335. I do not remember the suggestion of Khūrbet el Hamreh for Adam. In my published works I have adhered to the usual identification of Adam at *Ed Damieh*, the ferry near Kerāwa. This would agree with the proposed reading taken from the Septuagint. The site of the mediæval stoppage of the river was thus exactly the same as in the time of Joshua.

Tell es Sarn is a printer's error for *Tell Sarem*. I think the site of Zaretan is doubtful. It was apparently near Succoth.

P. 338. The proposed reading, *Khur Eitun*, "cave of Etam," is inadmissible, since خريتون is not comparable with חור עיטם. Mr. Birch also overlooks the fact that there is a ruined Monastery of St. Chariton not far from the cave in question. (See "Memoirs," vol. iii.)

WEYMOUTH, October 13th, 1895.

"ADAM, THAT IS BESIDE KERIAT," JOSH. III, 16.

By W. E. STEVENSON, Esq.

Too much caution in leaving the Hebrew for the Septuagint is a fault on the right side, so my suggestion, in *Quarterly Statement* for October, to strike out Zarethan in the above passage was made with considerable diffidence. But a point has since occurred to me which, taken together with the other evidence, places the matter beyond all reasonable doubt. We must certainly substitute קרית for צרתן, and identify the two places mentioned with the Damieh and Kerawa of Colonel Watson's quotation from Nowairi.

In considering the קרית (*καριατ*) of the Septuagint translator as a corruption, I had to fall back on the last refuge in a textual inquiry, a scribe's causeless and unexplained mistake. But—and this is what had escaped my notice—if קרית be taken as the original reading, explanation is possible of a corruption into צרתן. For the two last letters of the preceding מצד would suggest the change from קר to צר. The