

as real movement, *e.g.*, "the sun went down." Many are familiar with the misleading appearance of the full moon rushing behind a cloud, when really the cloud passes over the moon. Further in the Bible the sun is said "to go down," when it disappears for the day, *e.g.* (Jer. xv, 9), "Her sun is gone down, while it was yet day," and Amos viii, 9, "I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." This parallelism shows that "going down" simply implies "disappearing for the day." How otherwise could the sun go *down* at *noon*? "Standing still" is apparently the opposite to "going up" (1 Sam. xiv, 9), and "going down" (Josh. x, 13). So in this passage the words, "And the sun stood still and the moon stayed," simply mean, according to the Biblical usage, that, in the tempest, the black clouds never obscured the disk of the sun or the moon; or, more briefly, that the sun, instead of apparently rushing behind the clouds, "stayed in the midst of heaven and hastened not to go down about a whole day." As with the hail and darkness in Egypt, so now the Lord fought for Israel in sending and guiding the storm, for destruction to the Amorites, but for safety and light to Israel, but not by any unnecessary and useless prolongation of one day into two.

---

"ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCHES IN PALESTINE,  
1873-1874," VOL. I.

By the Rev. Canon DALTON, C.M.G.

WE have all been reading with very great interest and admiration vol. i of M. Clermont-Ganneau's "Archæological Researches in Palestine in 1873-4," the most recent and, from some points of view, one of the most valuable and suggestive publications ever issued by the Palestine Exploration Fund, replete as is its every page with scholarly and trustworthy information. There are two minor points referred to in that work on which I should much like to venture to ask his further opinion.

The first regards the large plate opposite p. 144, which represents "a capital of white marble in one of the minarets of the Haram esh-Sherif at Jerusalem." M. Clermont-Ganneau does "not think that one can see in it anything else than the

Presentation of Jesus in the Temple" (p. 146). Should I be overbold to suggest that perhaps the sculptor intended to represent St. Veronica, with her veil or napkin, coming out of her house to meet our Lord with His cross as He passes by? The head of the chief figure is gone, but the nimbus with the cross within it shows unmistakably that this was the head of our Lord. M. Clermont-Ganneau allows so much, but thinks that the nimbus surrounded His head as a child sitting on His Virgin Mother's right arm. But there appears scarcely room on the sculpture for two heads so close together, His and hers; and no trace of the child's body is manifest. The nimbus, too, looks altogether out of proportion to the size of a child, but quite suitable for that of a man. The head was naturally turned towards the left, so that a portion of the beard would have been in front of the right shoulder. The figure, moreover, is clothed in a chasuble: our Lord but not our Lady is often so depicted. The attitude of the figure seems also that of one "stooping" rather than "sitting" (p. 146): stooping, I imagine, beneath the burden of the cross, the end of which is apparently intended to be represented as protruding above the nimbus. The second figure, which I take to be that of St. Veronica, has "the legs slightly bent, and stretches both arms forward parallel to one another. Over the forearms there hangs a piece of linen or cloth with many folds" (p. 145); this would be her veil or napkin, which she is presenting to, or receiving back with reverence from our Lord, and so holding as not to disturb the impression of His face she recognises thereon. The third figure behind I take to be that of Simon of Cyrene upbearing the greater weight of the cross after Jesus.

The legend of St. Veronica will be conveniently found in "Felix Fabri," vol. i, pp. 443, 444 (Pilgrims' Text Society). The house shown as hers was in the Via Dolorosa, nearer to Calvary than the Prætorium (the Haram Barracks). Simon of Cyrene was reported to have met the procession at the cross roads (where the road into the city from the country on the north crosses the Via Dolorosa as it runs from east to west), in fact, at the stage just before it reached St. Veronica's house. Hence he would be fittingly introduced on this sculpture, if it were one of a series. "Two other capitals (p. 150) placed in the same minaret, show the greatest possible likeness to this one," and M. Clermont-Ganneau thinks they are "repetitions of this same scene of the Presentation."

I am rather inclined to imagine that they represent other two "Stations of the cross." The chief figure would be the same in each, and the group surrounding somewhat similar. The distance of the present position of these capitals in the minaret from the position they may possibly have once occupied in the Via Dolorosa is no greater than from the site which M. Clermont-Ganneau identifies as that of the Chapel of the Presentation, in fact one portion of the Via Dolorosa is nearer. All that he says (pp. 152 to 165) of the Chapel of the Presentation is most interesting and valuable, and is not at all impugned, if these three capitals in the minaret never belonged to it, or if, having belonged to it or the *Templum Domini*, they represent scenes of the Passion, and not that of the Presentation repeated several times.

My second question regards the Roman inscription near Bettir, figured on p. 465. It may appear somewhat presumptuous to attempt to form any judgment without having seen the original. But from the plate one would imagine the top portions of the stone to have perished, as the tooled edging runs only on the other three sides. The letter that follows the M in the first line (if one may trust the engraving) is clearly P, there is a space for TI, and then one seems to detect BVS. I think the last four letters on that line are SVIS. The second and third lines contain the names of the Centurions, Martius (with a prænomen and cognomen that are quite indecipherable), and Victor or Victorinus (the rest of whose name has perished). Hence it would appear that these two centurions and vexillaries of the fifth and eleventh legions put in order at their mutual expense this little spring and water-course for the benefit of the flocks and people living on the land that each centurion had been settled upon and occupied continuous one to the other, and that they recorded the same by the side of the fountain (as pictured on p. 464) in case of any dispute hereafter arising as to whom the water belonged. "A dedication to the Great Gods of Rome and to Victory," as suggested on p. 466, seems rather out of place in such a position, and the letters have to be somewhat tortured to yield the names of the deities required. The first line of the inscription, now destroyed, would contain some such words as "*Hoc opus faciendum curaverunt,*" or "*Hunc fontem aperuerunt,*" either in full or abbreviated form. Be this as it may, the value, both historical and topographical, of the inscription is in no way affected; it shows that vexillaries of the two legions

named were here, though the date with the names of the Emperor and consuls of the year that probably was in the lower two lines has irretrievably perished.

---

NOTE BY PROFESSOR CLERMONT-GANNEAU.

I have read with much interest Canon Dalton's remarks on the capital in the Haram, and on the inscription at Bettir. They appear to me to deserve serious attention; nevertheless, I feel great hesitation in recognising on this capital the representation of St. Veronica presenting her veil to Christ. One would have expected to find in such a representation remains at least of the cross carried either by Jesus or by Simon the Cyrenian, and I can scarcely believe that the sort of rosette above His head represents the end of one of the branches of this instrument of punishment. However, the original capital, which must still be in existence at Jerusalem, ought to be examined more closely, and it would be a good thing to bestow also a closer study upon the other capitals in the minaret than I am able to afford. Dr. Bliss and Mr. Macalister might do this when opportunity offers, and also have good photographs taken of each of them. That which adds to my doubt is the arrangement of the linen upon the arms of the figure supposed to be St. Veronica. It forms a deep hollow as if meant to contain something. As to the localisation of the legend of St. Veronica and her house, one must not lose sight of the fact that this is of a relatively recent date, in any case subsequent to the Crusades. Perhaps a fresh and more complete examination of the other capitals in the minaret would allow the question to be decided one way or the other. Anyhow, it is a good thing that Canon Dalton's suggestion should be put on record and taken into consideration.

As to the inscription from Bettir, it is very probable that it refers to some work undertaken in connection with the construction of the watercourse or of the fountain, under the direction of the two centurions, but more probably at the expense of the inhabitants of the place rather than at that of the centurions. I doubt whether the two *vexillationes* would have corresponded to distinct and contiguous properties. I would rather believe in the existence at Bettir of one *single* Roman garrison formed of two detachments borrowed respectively from the fifth and eleventh legions. In spite of the appearance of the engraving on p. 465

(where the tooled frame on the top part of the stone is represented as wanting), I think that I can remember that the squeeze of which the engraving is a reproduction took in the whole of the field of the *cartouche* as shown on p. 464; and therefore there is no room to suppose that [another or first line ever existed that has now disappeared. I will try to find the squeeze and verify this important fact.

---

## THE JAR-HANDLES DISCOVERED BY DR. BLISS.

By the Rev. Professor A. H. SAYCE.

THE jar-handle discovered at Tell Zakariya with the figure of a winged beetle shows that Professor Clermont-Ganneau and Colonel Conder were right in their explanation of the symbol. Unfortunately the artistic history of the winged scarab has not yet been studied; the two-winged beetle is found on a scarab of Antef IV, of the eleventh dynasty (Petrie, "Historical Scarabs," 159). The four-winged beetle probably originated in the same age and under the same influences as the four-winged solar disk. One, with the head of Horus, is represented in Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 240, but it is not stated whether the scarab on which it occurs was found at Nimroud or at Arban; if at Nimroud, it would be older than 606 B.C.

The place-name mentioned by Dr. Bliss (*Quarterly Statement* for January, p. 13) as beginning with the letters *kheth* and *beth*, is Hebron.

The "stamp" (No. 3) discovered at Tell es-Sâfi represents a well-known type of Egyptian scarab of the thirteenth to sixteenth dynasty period. It belongs, therefore, to the Hyksos age, or to the period immediately preceding it.

The seal-cylinder (No. V) is North Syrian. The two figures on either side of the sacred tree are the equivalents of the winged genii of the later Assyrian sculptures.

DAHABIA ISTAR, *February 9th*, 1900.

---