

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

firman—the Megiddo staff was almost always over a hundred, and sometimes numbered as many as a hundred and eighty-five.¹

In discussing the results of their work, as compared with those of Gezer, we may consider first the resemblances, and secondly the contrasts. The materials for such comparisons, of course, are still necessarily incomplete, as the discoveries of neither excavation have been fully published. Like our own *Quarterly Statement*, the *Mittheilungen* of the *Deutscher Palästina-Verein* do not profess to give more than an outline for the periodical information of the supporters of the institution: and even if we personally possessed knowledge regarding the results of the excavation which was not contained in Dr. Schumacher's reports, it would naturally not be proper to make use of it in any way.

The first thing that strikes the reader of Dr. Schumacher's reports, or a visitor to his excavations, is the general similarity between the remains discovered by him and those unearthed at Gezer. The pits are intersected at both places by successive strata of rude walls, laid out, as it would appear, without the slightest regard to convenience of plan or architectural symmetry, and built of rough hammer-dressed stones set in mud.

Among the houses at Megiddo, just as at Gezer, appear baking ovens (at least there seems to be one in the middle of the fine photograph, *M.D.P.V.*, 1905, p. 6); olive presses (the illustration, *ib.*, 1904, p. 49, represents part of an olive press; an exactly similar stone was found built into a wall at Gezer); pottery; rude human figures; and other objects to which many parallels could be produced from the Gezer finds.

So far not much of the pottery has been published, so that it is as yet premature to institute elaborate comparisons between the fictile vessels of the two sites. The jar (*M.D.P.V.*, 1904, p. 54) associated with an infant interment, is exactly like those found at Gezer in the same connexion, and is a typical example of the "Late Pre-Israelite" period, if for the present I may be allowed to retain a term I now regard as objectionable. On the other hand, the vessels illustrated (*ib.*, 1904, p. 50) are curiously different from any associated with infant burials at either Tell el-Hesi or Gezer; they are comparable more with vessels of the so-called Israelite period, and as a matter of fact were not found at a greater depth

¹ *Mittheilungen des Deutscher Palästina-Vereins*, 1905, p. 1.

than two metres (*ib.*, p. 49). This is a very interesting contribution to the problem of these jar-buried infants.

It is becoming increasingly clear that we must carefully distinguish between two classes of jar-buried infants. The first class are sacrifices, to which we may safely assign those found in the high place at Gezer (especially those which display marks of fire on the bones) and those found in the corners of houses, when these are fully developed. There is another class of infant burial, however, of which some specimens were found at Gezer, and at least one (*M.D.P.V.*, 1905, p. 11) at Megiddo: I refer to still-born and premature births. I am informed that it is still the custom of the fellahin of Egypt to dispose of such by burying them under the floors of houses (quite possibly this is a survival of a traditional immolation of child victims). At Gezer both undeveloped and developed infants were found in house walls and corners, the latter generally with a more elaborate deposit of food-vessels, showing that both the original custom and its probable modification were practised.

Especially interesting in this connexion is the example of a foundation sacrifice at the corner of a large tower (*M.D.P.V.*, 1905, p. 10). This was evidently very similar to the sacrificed woman illustrated in the *Quarterly Statement* (1904, p. 17), differing chiefly in the age of the victim; at Gezer she was aged and rheumatic, at Megiddo about fifteen years. These and other examples show that no age or either sex exempted a person from the chance of being chosen as a foundation sacrifice if other circumstances led to his or her selection.

Throughout the excavation in many different buildings and levels Dr. Schumacher has found small erect pillar-stones, singly or in rows. These are carefully squared in section, and stand about 3 feet high. Very similar groups and rows (not yet published) were found from time to time at Gezer, though none were so extensive as the group figured *M.D.P.V.*, 1905, pp. 20, 21, and none had the Old-Hebrew masons' marks which give a unique interest to this alignment. Dr. Schumacher seems to regard these as *massêbôth* or sacred pillar-stones, and I myself felt inclined to consider the Gezer specimens in the same light, especially when, as in one case, they formed a row of three standing in the centre of an enclosure not unlike that shown in *M.D.P.V.*, 1904, p. 46. But while abstaining carefully in this paper from controversy, which would be out of

place, I may perhaps venture to record a doubt as to whether these carefully tooled stones are, after all, any more than the lowest stones of ordinary pillars supporting the roof of an ordinary house. In a subject of so much doubtfulness, and where so far there is such a dearth of material from which to deduce facts, there can be little more recorded than personal opinions and impressions, and I am bound to say that my own personal impression would be, that the fact of a stone being tooled and squared is an argument *against* its being considered a sacred pillar-stone. The prohibition against tooling the stones of an altar in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx, 25), and the prejudice against the use of iron tools in sacred buildings at even the comparatively late Solomonic period (1 Kings vi, 7), are here in point. No doubt there is a contrary argument in the building figured in *M.D.P.V.*, 1904, p. 46, which, with its altar and other sacrificial furniture, certainly seems to be a temple of some sort; but it may be, after all, that the squared pillar-stones running in a row down the centre are nothing but the bases of columns supporting the roof. It would to me appear more likely that if these were *masséboth* in connexion with this sanctuary, that they would be *outside* the adytum, like Jachin and Boaz at the temple of Solomon.

This criticism, let me repeat, is merely intended as an expression of personal opinion and conjecture, and is not put forward with the least thought of cavilling at or detracting from the value of Dr. Schumacher's work, results, or deductions.

A clay vat, resembling Dr. Schumacher's (*M.D.P.V.*, 1905, p. 23), but much shallower, was found at Gezer, sunk in a plaster floor, as were also many mills, such as that shown in the photograph on the following page. Dr. Schumacher, by the way, is to be congratulated on securing the latter interesting photograph. I have myself long returned to the view that the method shown was the proper way of holding the rubbing-stone, not the reverse way that at one time I suggested.

Let us now turn to the points of contrast between the results of the two excavations.

There are two classes of antiquities that may be unearthed at any site. There are first the objects connected with daily life, cult, warfare, and other common elements; such objects may be expected indifferently in any given mound in the country. There are also objects directly connected with or produced by historical

events happening in the site under examination; clearly these cannot be looked for elsewhere.

Consequently we may leave out of account such Gezerite "finds" as the Castle of Simon Maccabaeus, which could exist at Gezer only and nowhere else, in contrasting the discoveries at the sites now under discussion. If we exclude these, we are left with the cave-dwellers and their remains, the immense row of unhewn *masséboth*, the double *stone* city walls (at Megiddo the city walls appear to be, to a considerable degree, of brick), the late Assyrian contract tablets, and the extensive evidences of Egyptian influence which have been found at Gezer, and not yet, to judge from the published reports, at Megiddo.

On the other hand, the Megiddo excavation has produced some discoveries to which Gezer has, so far, no parallel to show. Chief among these is the now famous jasper seal bearing the name of Jeroboam, which is, of course, one of the most striking archaeological "finds" of recent years in Palestine. Dr. E. Kautzsch has treated of this discovery exhaustively in *M.D.P.V.*, 1904, pp. 1-14, and facsimiles have been published in various periodicals, among others our own *Quarterly Statement*, 1904, p. 287.

The remarkable vaulted room, illustrated by a photograph (*M.D.P.V.*, 1905, p. 14), has also no perfect counterpart at Gezer; it corroborates my conclusion that the southern brick gateway of Gezer was vaulted in a similar way, but as yet nothing in even a partially complete state of preservation has been found analogous to this. The curious Egyptian object (*M.D.P.V.*, 1904, p. 55) is also unique so far as Palestine is concerned. The evidently Cypriote statuette (*ib.*, 1905, p. 23) is unlike anything found at Gezer, though some similar but inferior fragments were discovered in the rubbish-heap at Tell eš-Šāfi.

Both excavations agree in the main lesson to be drawn from them: Palestine is *not*, archaeologically, a poverty stricken country. The discoveries that have been made are an indication that greater discoveries may yet be expected, if proper support be accorded to the societies undertaking the work of excavation.
