

last for lack of provisions. Possibly Cistern No. 7, another large reservoir, was also used by the garrison.

After the hill had been cut down and the surrounding walls of the Temple enclosure were built by Herod, the surface appears to have been levelled and no trace of the Acra remained. The object of its existence ceased when the new fortress, afterwards called Antonia, was built north of the Temple. Nothing then remained but the name, which, as Josephus informs us, was still applied to the slope of the hill outside the Temple enclosure.

I would observe that in the plans, Contour 2369 and those below it are the same in both plans, the alteration commencing above Contour 2369.

It would be satisfactory if some of the Members of the Fund who take an interest in the matter would state their objections to the proposed site.

## THE EROTIC GRAFFITO IN THE TOMB OF APOLLOPHANES OF MARISSA.

BY R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A.

OF the manifold details of interest which the tomb of Apollophanes of Marissa, at Beit Jibrin, presents, one of the most remarkable is the graffito scratched on the right hand jamb of the entrance to the painted chamber.

It has been discussed by Père Lagrange, in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1902, p. 501); by Dr. Thiersch, in *The Marissa Tombs* (p. 57); and by Dr. Peters, at p. 75 of the same work. Each of these scholars takes a different view regarding the character and purport of the inscription. Père Lagrange considers it as a deceased wife's address to her living husband: Dr. Peters' theory is somewhat similar, but he supposes the persons involved to be lovers rather than husband and wife, and regards the inscription as being cast in dialogue form. Dr. Thiersch considers the graffito to be erotic rather than funerary, and translates it as the address of a *hetaira* to her lover.

Of the transcription there can be no doubt, though the character is not easy to read. Père Lagrange's copy, as is natural in a first

ΟΥΚ ΕΧΩ ΤΙΣ ΟΙΚΕΘΩ Η ΤΙ ΧΑΡΙΩΤΗΚΑ ΤΑ ΚΣΙΜΑΙ ΛΕΟΤΕΡΟΥΣ ΕΜΕΤΑΦΙΛΟΥΣΑ

ΑΛΛΑ ΑΙΤΗΡΑ ΦΡΟΝΙΤΗΝ ΕΓΑΤΑΧΩΡΩΣ ΤΙΣΟΥ ΤΟΙΜΑΤΙΟΥ ΕΡΕΧΤΡΑ ΚΣΙΤΩ

ΑΔΕΓΜΕΡΑΦΟΤΡΙΧΩΣ ΟΙΔΕΙ ΚΑΤΑΛΙΓΩ ΕΡΧΩΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΛΗΤΕΡΑ ΕΣΟΤΙ ΧΟΙΛΗ

ΜΗΡΟΥΣ ΤΟΙΧΟΥ ΦΟΦΟ ΕΓΓΑΓΕΤΑΙ ΑΑΑΔΑ ΤΗ ΕΥΡΕΥΜΑΛΙ ΚΣΙΤΩ

THE GRAFFITO IN THE TOMB OF APOLLOPHANES (Reduced 1/2).

copy of a difficult inscription, contains some slight divergencies, but the transcript given in *The Marissa Tombs* may be safely accepted:—

Οὐκ ἔχω τί σοι πάθω ἢ τί χαρίσωμαι κατακεῖμαι μεθ' ἑτέρου σέ  
μέγα φιλούσα.

Ἄλλὰ ναί τὴν Ἀφροδίτην μέγα τι χαίρω ὅτι σοῦ το ἱμάτιον  
ἐνέχυρα κείται.

Ἄλλ' ἔγω μὲν ἀποτρέχω σοὶ δε καταλίπω εὐρυχωρίην πολλήν·  
πράσσε ὅτι βούλη.

Μὴ κρούε τὸν τοίχον, ψόφος ἐγγείνεται· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν θυρῶν  
νεύμασι κείται.

Père Lagrange's translation, founded on a copy with the slight differences just mentioned,<sup>1</sup> is as follows: *Je ne puis plus ni souffrir pour toi, ni t'être agréable; je suis couchée avec tant d'autres, t'ayant gardé mon amour. Mais, par Aphrodite, je me réjouis fort que tu sois en état de te vêtir. Car pour moi je m'en vais, mais je te laisse une large aisance. Fais donc ce que tu voudras. Ne heurte pas le mur, cela ferait du bruit, et il te suffit d'un signe à travers les portes.*

Dr. Thiersch thus renders: *There is nought that I may do [suffer] for thee or wherein I may please thee: I lie with another though loving thee dearly. But, by Aphrodite, of one thing I am very glad: that thy cloak lieth in pawn. But I run away and to thee I leave behind plenty of free room [complete freedom?]. Do what thou wilt. Do not strike the wall; that does but make a noise, but through the doors. It lieth in nods [by signs we communicate with one another; let that be our agreement].*

Dr. Peters looks upon the penultimate word νεύμασι as a transliteration of a Semitic word inadvertently introduced by a Semitic writer into the Greek he was composing. He therefore translates it by "sleep" [נרם], and this translation is the pivot on which his rendering of the inscription turns. He regards it as being cast in the form of a dialogue between the mourner (A), the deceased (B), and a comment by the mourner's friends (C). The translation runs thus: A. *There is nought that I may do for thee or wherein I may please thee?* B. *I lie with another (Death) though loving thee greatly.* A. *But, by Aphrodite, of one thing I am very glad, that thy*

<sup>1</sup> ἑτέρονης [σ]ε for ἑτέρου σέ in line I; καὶ for ναί, ἐν ἐχυρῶ for ἐνέχυρα in line II; πράσσεο τι for πράσσε ὅτι in line III; ἐπει νέται for ἐγγείνεται, νεῦμα σ' ἱκείται for νεύμασι κείται in line IV.

*cloak remaineth as a pledge. B. But I run away and to thee I leave behind free room a plenty. Do what thou wilt. C. Do not strike the wall, that does but make a noise. Through the doors she lieth in sleep.*

Though very ingenious and not without a certain poetic suggestiveness, the last rendering fails, in my opinion, to command acceptance for three reasons. In the first place, the suggested treatment of *νεύματα* seems over-strained and improbable. Secondly, the contrasting force of *ἀλλὰ* in the last line is missed; and thirdly, there are not now and never were, "doors" between the place where the inscription is cut and the graves in the tomb. Such doors are, however, required by the sense put on the inscription by Dr. Peters. Of the other translations I need only say that though they are accurate so far as a rendering of the Greek words goes, they have, at least so it appears to me, an element of incoherence that does not seem likely.

If the reader will examine the accompanying facsimile (which has been traced from a rubbing) he will notice a peculiarity the importance of which has, I venture to think, been missed by those who have essayed to deal with this inscription. The first line is cut fairly straight and horizontal, in bold and well-formed characters. The other lines are more cramped, and drop downward towards the right-hand end. There is nothing in the nature of the place of the inscription which compelled the engraver of the graffito thus to vary the direction of the lines of writing—for instance, there is no obstacle between the right-hand ends of lines I and II that had to be avoided when the second line was being scratched. I think that had the engraver cut all four lines at the same time, she would have written them more uniformly. The general appearance of the graffito at once suggests that the second line was not scratched at the same time as the first.

If we examine the letters more minutely, we can, I think, see justification for going further, and regarding line II as the work of a different hand altogether. Though the style of formation of the letters is the same, they differ greatly in detail. The loops of **Δ** are on the whole narrower; the vertical of **Γ** turns backward at the bottom; the capital **Λ** is used in line I, the uncial (**λ**) in line II. The **Ο** is more uniformly small in line II, and the tips of **ω** in line I show a tendency to diverge, in II to converge. These points of contrast seem to me sufficient to suggest that line II is the response to line I. Obviously the inference at once negatives the theory that a funerary

inscription is in question; we have to deal with a pair of lovers, who scribble messages to one another at the place of meeting.

Let us now analyse line III. Sense and probability would lead us to infer that it is the work of the woman, and I think the handwriting bears out the inference. At first sight it certainly looks more like the cramped, badly aligned writing of the man; but I think this is to be explained by unconscious imitation—just as (if a homely simile may be admitted) a peculiar signature in a hotel register may sometimes be observed to influence the style of the half-dozen signatures that follow it, quite independently of the volition of their writers. Let us go through the points of contrast already established. The size of the loops of Δ is not very conclusive in this case, but Γ reappears again without its turn; the uncial λ still persists in ΔλλΔ, no doubt under the influence of the same word immediately above, but the capital Λ reasserts itself in πόλλη later on in the line; the large Ο reappears, especially in βούλη, and so does the divergent Ω.

Line IV seems to introduce us to a third actor in the drama, distinguished by his angular M's, peculiar R-like K's and T-like Γ's, with the horizontal stroke passing backward behind the vertical. I think we cannot be far wrong in treating this as a comment scribbled by a person who discovered the love-dialogue, and whose interference frightened the lovers and prevented their continuing their romantic visits to the tomb of Apollophanes. The sense of this line, though very obscure, points in the same direction.

Let us now see what was the contents of this lovers' dialogue. As the gender of φιλοῦσα shows, it was commenced by the woman. Not improbably (as Dr. Thiersch suggests) the unfinished tomb was a favourite trysting-place; in any case, she wrote this message where her lover might reasonably be expected to find it—

*I can neither suffer aught for thee, nor give thee pleasure; I lie with another, loving thee dearly.*

I cannot see on what grounds Dr. Thiersch says, positively, "the ἕτερος of the inscription is clearly not the husband of the writer" (*The Marissa Tombs*, p. 58), nor is there any obvious reason of regarding her as a *hetaira*. The most reasonable interpretation for the inscription is surely that it is a dismissal from a woman to her former lover, not because she has ceased to love him, but because she has somehow been forced into an unwilling marriage with another.

In due time the man discovered the inscription, and responded as follows :—

*But, by Aphrodite, I rejoice greatly at one thing, that thy cloak lies as security.*

This dark saying no doubt refers to some circumstance in the previous relations of the lovers of which we know nothing. We cannot therefore expect it to be fully intelligible ; but we can hardly go far wrong if we suppose the “cloak” to have been a love-token or keepsake given to the man in former days, and retained by him in spite of the woman’s marriage.

In the woman’s answer she repeats the dismissal more definitely :—

*But I run away, and leave thee plenty of wide room : do what thou wilt.*

Evidently she contrasts her cloak, which remains in the lover’s hands, with herself, who has gone from him, and assures him that, so far as she is concerned, he is not bound in any way.

How far the dialogue might have gone on, and to what interesting developments it might have been led, it is impossible to say, for at this point it was discovered and interrupted by the inevitable scoffer, who scribbled :—

*Don’t rap the wall, it breeds disturbance. But it lies in nods through the doors.*

The chief difficulty of this line is the word *κείται*, which, however translated, cannot yield satisfactory sense. I think the reason for the choice of the word is to be sought in the external form of the graffito, on which I shall have something to say presently. The writer wished to find a rhyme to *ἐγγείνεται* ; his eye caught *κείται* at the end of line II, and he could think of no better word. As to the *τοιχος*, two interpretations have occurred to me as possible. One, which is of course pure conjecture and rather far-fetched, is to the effect that the lovers occupied adjacent houses, and had endeavoured to communicate by actual raps on the partition wall, and that the writer of line IV knew of it, and advised them not to attract attention by such a proceeding. The other explanation, which, perhaps, is also a little strained, but is probably more natural than the first, is to treat *τοιχος* as the wall of the tomb on which the lovers were scribbling, and the advice not to “rap on the wall” as equivalent to “do not write on the wall.” The *ψοφος* in this case is not the actual noise of rapping, but the disturbance which would result

should this clandestine correspondence become generally known. As to *νεύμασι κείται*, though the sense is badly expressed, it is fairly clear that the writer intends to advise the lovers to be contented with nodding at one another through open doors whenever the opportunity might arise.

This little fragment of Palestinian romance may therefore be freely rendered thus :—

- A. Naught can I do for thee ; I, another's, though loving thee dearly.  
 B. Yet am I glad for this, that mine thy token remaineth.  
 A. Nevertheless, *I* am gone: thou art free, so do as thou wilt.  
 C. Lest they hear thee, rap the wall no more :  
 Nod at one another through the door.

A few words must now be said on the literary form of the graffito. Père Lagrange speaks of it as a poetic composition ; Messrs. Thiersch and Peters admit having originally regarded it as such, but seem to have changed their views, on the grounds that it conforms to no known canons of Greek verse composition. But one or two indications (besides the arrangement of long and short lines, referred to by the authors of *The Marissa Tombs*) seem to show that a metrical form is intended ; there are signs that the authors were struggling throughout with the exigencies of verse composition. Such are, perhaps, the plural *ἐνέχυρα* in apposition to the singular *ἰμάτιον*, the use of the rare word *ἐγγείνεται*, and, as already mentioned, the second *κείται*. Moreover, the rather obvious periodical recurrence of a termination resembling a hexameter ending (with a tribach substituted for the dactyl) makes a metrical intention a certainty. Each line of the inscription is capable of being divided into two verses, and they yield the following metrical analysis :—

Οὐχ ἔ|χῶ τῖ| σοῖ πα|θῶ ἦ| τῖ χάρι|σῶμαι  
 Κατά|κειμαι| μέθ' ἔτερ|οῦ σε| μέγα φι|λοῦσα  
 Ἄλλα| ναῖ τῆν| Ἄφρο|διτην| μέγα τῖ| χαῖρω  
 Ὅτι| σοῦ τῶ| ἱμά|τιον ἐν|ἐχῦρα| κείται  
 Ἄλλ' ἔ|γῶ μέν| ἀπότρῆχ|ῶ σοῖ| δε κατά|λιπῶ  
 Εὐρῶ|χῶρι|ῆν πολ|λήν προ|σσε ὅτι| βούλη

Leaving the last line alone for the present, we see that the lovers' dialogue is cast in a trochaic metre, with six feet in every verse. The normal scheme seems to be

- ∨ | - ∨ | - ∨ | -- | ∨ ∨ ∨ | --

though except the first no line exactly conforms to it. The fifth comes nearest of the remainder, substituting a tribrach for the third trochee. A spondee is substituted for the second trochee in lines 2 and 3. For the third trochee line 2 (as well as 5) has a tribrach, line 6 a spondee. In most of the lines the fourth foot is a spondee, but a trochee (line 2) or a tribrach (line 4) seems admissible. The termination in a tribrach and spondee (or trochee) is invariable. In lines 2 and 4 *κατα-* and *ᾶτι* are probably to be scanned as trochees, as have also the first two syllables of *Ἀφροδίτην*. It is most likely that the false quantities, like the hiatus in lines 1 and 6, are due to the writers' want of skill in verse composition.

The last line is as difficult to scan as to construe. It is in a different metre from the rest—another indication that it is by a different hand:—

Μῆ κροῦ|ἔ τῶν| τοιχοῦν| ψῶφῶς| ἐγγει|νέται  
 Ἄλλᾳ δι|ᾶ τῶν| θῦρῶν| νεῦμᾶσι| κεῖται| ∨ -

I can guess only that this is a feeble attempt at a couple of Iambic trimeters. The first (if we might assume an outrageous false quantity, *ψοφῶς*) would fall into the scheme of this metrical form. The second seems to have a couple of anapaests—one of them in an inadmissible place—and has a foot short. The author of this line may well have been, as Dr. Peters supposes, a Semite with an imperfect ear for Greek metres and a scanty vocabulary; this would account for the obscurity of his diction. The protagonists in the drama had certainly a better command of Greek, and may well have been native Greek speakers.

There is another graffito, practically impossible to read with any certainty, on the opposite jamb. It contains the name of Myron and Kalypso, and it has been suggested that these are the lovers who wrote the inscription under discussion. I spent a long time over this graffito, the total result of which was the following not very satisfactory conclusions—first, that the transcript given by Drs. Thiersch and Peters, which is also that of Père Lagrange, is



very doubtful; secondly, that if wrong, I could not see how to set it right; and, thirdly, that there is no reason to suppose that it has anything to do with the lovers' dialogue.

I owe acknowledgments to my friend Prof. Ridgeway for allowing me, while preparing this paper, to consult him, and for some valuable hints.

---

---

### GEZER AND MEGIDDO.

By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A.

It has happened that the excavating work of the Palestine Exploration Fund has hitherto been confined to Jerusalem and the southern parts of Palestine, and till quite recently no attempt had been made to conduct a systematic exploration of any site in the northern regions of the country. The German and Austrian Societies, by their excavations at Megiddo and Taanach respectively, have filled this gap, and it becomes an interesting question to decide to what extent the results, so far as they have been published, are comparable with those of our own work. In the present paper we shall devote ourselves to a comparison of the Gezer excavations with those of Megiddo, and in a future article shall deal in the same way with the Austrian work at Taanach.

And first let me indicate a point of contrast wherein the German excavations compare favourably with those of the British Society. Thanks largely to the enlightened munificence of His Majesty the Emperor William, Dr. Schumacher has evidently had ample funds at his disposal, and has been able to employ a far larger number of workmen than was in the power of the representative of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The one donation of the German Emperor was considerably greater than the total possible annual outlay of our Society. In consequence, while the Gezer works could never employ more than eighty labourers—except just towards the end, when, by making heavy drafts on the reserve funds, I engaged about ten or twelve more in order to finish some important parts of the work before the termination of the