

cook. The name Selamanes occurs in inscriptions from Syria as that of a deity. See "C.I.Gr.," iii, 4449-4451. The form "Salamanes" is given by Waddington, No. 2147, as that of an ordinary name.

THE SITE OF THE TEMPLE.

By Lieut.-Colonel C. M. WATSON, C.M.G., R.E.

IN the *Quarterly Statement* for April, at p. 170, there are some observations by Lieut.-Colonel Conder upon my article on "The Site of the Temple," which appeared in the *January Statement*. Any remarks by Colonel Conder respecting Jerusalem are deserving of the most careful consideration, as he has devoted so much of his life to the Holy Land and all connected with it, and it is a satisfaction to find that in the main he seems entirely to concur with what I wrote concerning the probable arrangement of the Temple buildings.

But to some of his observations I cannot agree, and, therefore, think it desirable, as briefly as possible, to give my reasons for differing from his conclusions.

And, first, as regards the length of the cubit which was probably used in laying out the Temple and its courts. Colonel Conder remarks that "Colonel Watson admits that a cubit of 16 inches would give better results than one of 18 inches." Now, I certainly do not admit such a supposition, nor do I think that the words used in my article can be read to imply this. What I did say was as follows:—"After reading all I could respecting this question, it appears to me that the cubit used was that of about 18 inches. Possibly it was rather less, say 17·7 inches, but this is not certainly proved, and I have adopted a cubit of 18 inches in making the plan. A somewhat smaller cubit would perhaps have given slightly more satisfactory results, but that of 18 inches is good enough for practical purposes, and has the advantage of easy reduction to measures that are given in feet." It must be remembered that the cubit used in the construction of the Temple was one of six hand-breadths, and I do not think any cubit of six hand-breadths was as small as 16 inches.

I am well aware that Colonel Conder believes that the cubit used was one of 16 inches, and I have read much that he has written to prove this. To me, however, his arguments are not convincing. Take, for example, the article on "Linear Measures," at p. 57 of his "Handbook to the Bible." He first states that the cubit was equal to the fourth part of the height of a man, or to the length of the forearm to the end of the longest finger. The cubit was divided into six palms, or hand-breadths, and the palm into four finger-breadths. He then goes on to say that the finger-breadth, according to the "Sephora Torah," was equal to two barleycorns laid endways, or the width of seven barleycorns laid side by side. This

would evidently make the cubit equal to $6 \times 4 \times 7 = 168$ barleycorns laid side by side, so that if the cubit was, as supposed by Colonel Conder, 16 inches in length, it is evident that 10·5 barleycorns would go to an inch. Now, I certainly do not think that any barleycorns are so small as this would imply. The ordinary barley in England averages seven grains to the inch, but the grains of barley in the East are rather smaller. Mahmoud Pasha el Falaki, who devoted much study to the length of the different cubits in use in Egypt, found that the average length of the religious cubit of the Arabs, which consists of six hand-breadths, each of four finger-breadths, each of six barleycorns, was '4886 metres, *i.e.*, 19·136 inches, which gives 7·5 barleycorns to the inch. I doubt whether there is any barley, of which the grains are smaller than eight to the inch, which would make the cubit referred to by Colonel Conder 21 inches and not 16 inches in length. But it is rather curious that the tract, "Sephor Torah," upon which he bases his argument, states that seven barleycorns laid side by side are equal in length to two barleycorns placed lengthwise, making one barleycorn in length equal to 3·5 in breadth, a comparative measurement for which I cannot find justification. His other arguments in favour of a cubit of six hand-breadths being 16 inches in length appear to be equally inconclusive. Without going into details, which would take too long for this note, I would say that it is probable that the approximate length of each of the three different cubits was :—

Cubit of 7 hand-breadths	20·65 inches.
" 6 "	17·70 "
" 5 "	14·75 "

Of course I may be wrong and should only be too glad to hear of some further light upon the subject. It is one upon which it is not safe to dogmatise. Whatever the length of the cubit may be, however, it does not affect Plan No. 1, published with my article, and only to a small extent Plan No. 2.

The next criticism that Colonel Conder makes is that I have shown the levels of the courts rather too low. For instance, that I have given the level of the Court of the Priests at 2,431, whereas he says that there is a rock level of 2,432 within the area, and he refers in proof of his view to the list of rock-levels published in the Jerusalem volume of the "Memoirs," at p. 277. In this list No. 2 level is 2,432, and is described as a point 100 feet east of the highest part of the Sakhrāh. Now, the highest point is towards the west side of the Sakhrāh, but even if we measure from the centre of the rock it will be found that a point 100 feet east of it comes not on the Court of the Priests, but under the floor of the Porch, which was at a level of about 2,440 feet. There is another level, No. 8, given as 2,432, but this is outside the Court of the Priests to the north, while a third level, No. 10, given as 2,433, is outside the Court of the Priests to the west. I am unable to find any level greater than 2,431 within the limits laid down for the court on the plan.

Colonel Conder also objects to my level, 2,416, for the Court of the Women, on the ground that there is a rock level 2,420 within that area. Here, too, I am in a difficulty in identifying the exact point he refers to. There is a level of 2,420 on the list already referred to (No. 7), stated to be 120 feet south of the south-east corner of the platform of the Dome of the Rock, but this is outside the Court of the Women to the south. There are also levels of 2,421 (No. 4), 2,423 (No. 5), and 2,419 (No. 6), but these are all outside the limits of the Court of the Women, as I have suggested it, to the north. It appears to me, therefore, that though I should be very sorry to assert that the levels, as given in my plans, are certainly right, Colonel Conder's criticisms are not proof that they are wrong.

The next point in his observations is that I spoke of the "Middoth" as the authority for the exact distances to the boundaries of the Mountain of the House. I am obliged to him for pointing this out. It was an error in writing, as I was quite aware that these distances are not in the "Middoth," but in the later work, "Tosephoth Yom Tob." But as he accepts these measurements as probably correct, and has adopted them in his small plan of the Temple given in the "Handbook to the Bible," we are not much at variance on this point. With his plan I am well acquainted, but it is on too small a scale, and gives too little detail to be of much use in studying the question, or in following the description of the Temple buildings given in his Handbook. To arrive at any satisfactory result in such a case it is quite necessary to work on a much larger scale than he has done, and I would like to take this opportunity of remarking that the plans as I worked them are very much larger than the reproductions published in the *Quarterly Statement*, as I plotted the Temple itself on a scale of $\frac{1}{144}$, and the courts on a scale of $\frac{1}{500}$.

Colonel Conder seems rather surprised that I did not refer to what he has written, but the fact is that I purposely avoided consulting his books or any other modern authorities in preparing the plans, which were based altogether on the description in the "Mishna," as translated by Dr. Chaplin, and in Josephus. The translations made by Dr. Chaplin appeared in the *Quarterly Statements* for 1885, 1886, and 1887, and I join with Colonel Conder in strongly recommending them to the attention of subscribers to the Palestine Fund. If Dr. Chaplin could spare time to republish these translations in a separate volume he would confer a great benefit on all who are interested in the Temple of Jerusalem.

In conclusion I would repeat that the plans which accompanied my article can only be regarded as tentative, and I would be very much obliged for any criticism upon them. I would mention that some interesting communications have already reached me with regard to them.
