

NOTES ON THE JULY "QUARTERLY STATEMENT."

I.—By Colonel C. R. CONDER, LL.D.

Jar-handles.—I do not see it suggested that the figure on these handles is a rude scarabæus, such as is found in Babylonia as well as in Egypt. Comparing the letters with those of the Moabite stone, Siloam text, and Hasmonean coins, it seems impossible to regard the texts as being as late as the second century B.C., or as early as the seventh, and a date about 500 B.C. would probably suit best. The letters on the jar-handle from Tell-es-Sâfi are all, however, later than the rest, and probably belong to the second century B.C. To attribute the Siloam text to a late date seems to me increasingly difficult, when we consider the *vau* in these texts: to say nothing of the evidence afforded by the Beni Hezir tomb, the texts of the Galilean synagogues, of Phœnicia, Palmyra, and of Babylonia in the fifth century B.C. The fact that towns appear clearly to be mentioned, coupled with the absence of the article before the word *Melec*, might perhaps be best explained by reference to local deities rather than to any king. It is not clear why the property of kings of Hebron, Ziph, and Socho should be found at another place. We know that deities were often named after towns, *e.g.*, "Istar of Arbela," "Set of Sarpina," &c., and local Molochs may thus have been invoked to safeguard the vessels. Some of the accompanying seals, &c., resemble the later Phœnician remains; and Egyptian influence continued in Phœnicia to at least the third century B.C., and is indeed then more marked than in earlier times. Even the occurrence of the name of Thothmes III, badly copied, is not evidence of very early date, for the Phœnicians used to put his name (also badly copied) on glass of a much later age. While, therefore, there is much to show a period earlier than that of the Hasmoneans, great caution should, I think, be observed in suggesting that remains as early as the fifteenth century B.C. have been discovered. The alphabet was not then in use, as we may deduce from the Lachish discoveries. In the present case no cuneiform tablets occur, such as would prove the real antiquity of the site. The circular vault in the ruins is probably of Roman, or Byzantine, date; and the statuettes from Tell-es-Sâfi also appear to be very late—perhaps of the second century A.D.

The Cubit (p. 228).—The smaller cubit, used for measurement of vessels, &c., is that to which I have referred as about $13\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The building cubit was not of necessity of the same length in all ages, any more than were the Jewish weights (which also differed locally in the second century A.D. in Galilee and in Jerusalem), but the measurements of Herod's Temple, and of the Galilean synagogues, seem to me to agree with Talmudic statements in indicating a cubit of about 16 inches, as used at all events in later times. The actual measurements of specimens of Egyptian cubits show variations, and great accuracy may perhaps never

have been attained in either weight or measure, while gradual changes almost certainly occurred.

The Twelve Stones (p. 273).—It certainly was not my intention to suggest that these were erected on Gerizim. It is a Samaritan tradition, but probably without foundation.

The Gibeon Miracle (p. 270).—I do not think the paper quoted at all exhaustive. It does not deal with all the Hebrew words used in the passage. Nor do I see much difference, from an astronomical point of view, between "stopping" and "tarrying" of the sun or moon.

II.—By Professor CLERMONT-GANNEAU, LL.D.

Tell es-Sâfi (p. 190).—For the two Welys and the presumed date of their construction *cp.*, in addition to Rey (not Key), the observations of Guérin ("Judée II," p. 91), which go back to 1863. The locality figures upon the mosaic map of Madeba, under the suggestive Greek name of *Saphitha* (see my "Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale," vol. ii, p. 170), a name which proves that it was still flourishing during the Byzantine period.

Statues (p. 196).—As far as I can judge from the inadequate engraving, the fragments of the statues rather recall the Greco-Cypriote style.

Mediæval Tooling of the Crusaders (p. 193).—I am glad to see that Dr. Bliss takes the law of "mediæval toolings," which I discovered and formulated in 1874, and which forms a safe and valuable diagnosis of stones cut by the Crusaders, more seriously than did his former collaborator, Mr. Dickie. The fact that he has ascertained its existence in the constructions of Tell-es-Sâfi ("the dressed stones all showed signs of the fine diagonal Crusading chiselling") is a remarkable verification of this law, since history informs us that the Crusaders had raised their fortress *Blanche Garde* at the very Tell-es-Sâfi. I think I may predict that if Dr. Bliss will examine the blocks in question more closely, he will in addition discover, at least upon some of them, *masons' marks* borrowed from the Latin alphabet or the current mediæval symbolism of the West.

Hebrew-Phœnician Stamp on Jar-handle (p. 198).—The second name must, I think, be read *Yehokal*, not *Yehohel*, *Yoel*; *Yehokal*, in spite of what Professor Sayce says (p. 212), is a Hebrew name of perfectly good formation and found in the Bible (Jer. xxxvii, 3). The first word, רפתי, however, may be the true reading,¹ is certainly a proper name, not a substantive or even an ethnical name. I have already made known several archaic Hebrew seals, with two proper names in immediate juxtaposition.

Gath (p. 204).—The hypothesis of the possible identity of Gath and Beit Jibrin is not new. It has been long ago put forward by Hitzig. Although now completely discredited, I think it nevertheless deserves to

¹ The *resh*, somewhat doubtful, is to be verified by the original.

be reconsidered. I have treated the question in detail in the part of my "Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale" that is now in the press (vol. iii, 18th livr., p. 273).

Handles of jars with Hebrew-Phœnician stamps (p. 204).—It is remarkable to see that this congeneric *ensemble*, which at the present day is considerable and supplied by Jerusalem, Tell Zakariya, and Tell es-Sâfi, can be divided into two groups, characterised, the one by the symbol of the Egyptian *scarab*, the other by the symbol of the *winged disc*, which is equally Egyptian. We may ask whether these different symbols do not correspond to differences in the origin of the jars; perhaps they are marks peculiar to different kings, or rather factory marks distinguishing the different royal pottery manufactories where the jars were made.

Inscription from Palmyra (p. 269).—The reading ספרא רומני ("a Roman reckoning"), not to mention philological objections, does not seem materially possible, according to the facsimile. We know, besides, from a Nabathæan inscription ("Corpus Inscr. Semit. II," No. 161), how this idea was expressed in Aramaic Syrian במנין ארהומיני¹ ("according to the computation of the Romans"). We see from this how far the authentic expression is removed from the proposed reading.

The Hypogæum of the Kings of Judah (p. 273).—The process of boring, extolled by Mr. Birch, for the purpose of directly reaching the sepulchral chambers of the royal hypogæum, has been already and expressly indicated by myself in the extensive study I have devoted to the question, as he will be able to convince himself if he will consult vol. ii of my "Recueil d'Arch. Orient.," p. 292, in the Palestine Exploration Fund Library. My words are:—"At the same time one might perhaps try to recognise and reach directly the cavities of the hypogæum by boring holes in the rock, with the aid of appropriate appliances. In this case I would recommend borings along the strip between the parallels ZH and XX."²

PARIS, July 16th, 1899.

III.—By Professor LUCIEN GAUTIER.

(1.)

P. 198. Dr. Bliss says, concerning the word יהוהאל (line 7 from below):—" . . . the combination of יהוה (Jahveh) with other words in a proper name is common. The meaning of the name is thus: 'Jehovah is God.' So far Dr. Bliss is quite right. But he adds: "As an example of a proper name of similar composition we may cite Jehiel — 'Jehovah liveth.'" This comparison is not exact. Jehiel (= "God liveth," not "Jehovah liveth") does not contain the name

¹ The true reading, which had escaped Professor Sachau, has been settled for me in "Recueil d'Arch. Orient.," vol. i, p. 67.

² Lines marked on my plan.

Jahveh, and is composed of the name *El* with the verb יהוה (not יהו). The name יהוה contains both Jahveh and El, and similar are: (a) אליהו, which has the same meaning; (b) names like אביאל, "God is father"; (c) names like יהונדב. The question whether the frequent name יהוה is a contraction of יהוה is not settled; it might be a participle of יהוה (*cp.* Baudissin, "Studien," I, p. 223).

(2.)

P. 210. Professor Sayce remarks (line 9 from below):—"It is curious that we invariably find למלך instead of להמלך with the definite article." There is certainly something very curious, even striking and surprising here, not in the inscription however, but in the Professor's remark. Has the learned Assyriologist forgotten the elementary and well-known rule of Hebrew grammar, rule with only a dozen exceptions in the whole Old Testament, that when the prepositions ב and ל and the particle ה are prefixed to a noun with the definite article, the ה of the article disappears, and its vowel is placed under the prefix, the first consonant of the word remaining with *dagesh forte, explicitum* or *implicitum*? The four consonants למלך can be read as well *lammelek* as *lemelek* (as well *with* as *without* the article). The consequences drawn by Professor Sayce from an imaginary fact are therefore entirely without foundation. Former experience, concerning the Siloam inscription, ought to make one cautious with regard to suppositions about Phœnician language in Hebrew inscriptions (*cp. Quarterly Statement*, 1881, pp. 72 and 144).

GENEVA.
