

NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *The supposed "Hittite Deity"* (see *Q.S.*, 1922, p. 179).—By the courtesy of Mr. Raffaeli in sending fresh impressions of his antique glass paste signet, I have been able to devote some further study to the design. This only tends to confirm the previous opinion that the two figures portrayed are derived from Greek art. The larger is represented as seated upon a four-legged throne, with the right arm extended, and supported by a long staff, or sceptre. The smaller figure has the left arm raised, and the finger in its mouth—the usual conventional attitude employed to express the childish innocence of Horus. The group is, therefore, designed to show Isis and Horus. The attitude of Horus is ultimately derived from the conventional Egyptian representation of a child; but the larger figure is distinctly Greek, and therefore the whole must be referred to the Greek period.

An enlarged copy of the inscription has been made, as it appears to my own eye, from the impressions furnished. The strokes on the glass paste have been roughly cut with a lapidary's wheel; and it must be confessed that the epigraphy is strange and peculiar. The first and last characters may be intended for $\Gamma . . . \text{L}$; although, in some lights, the first has the appearance of an N . This may possibly be due to a crack across the face of the stone. The portion which Mr. Raffaeli takes to be a Γ is more likely to be two separate characters, the first of which has the aspect of a A ; the whole group appears to be an illiterate imitation of an inscription, made for someone who would be satisfied with the appearance of a signet, without knowing or caring for exactitude.

E. J. PILCHER.

November 8th, 1922.

2. *The water-supply of Tel Aviv (Jaffa)*.—Mr. S. Folkowsky, of Tel Aviv (Jaffa), writing on December 1st, points out an error in a quotation made in the article on "The New Health Service in Palestine," in the October issue of the *Quarterly Statement*.

On p. 153 occurs the statement (quoted from the "Annual Report," p. 56) that all the piped town-water supplies of Palestine including Tel Aviv "are inadequate, incomplete and unsatisfactory," and that "the Jerusalem supply, installed by the army in 1918, is by far the best" To this Mr. Folkowsky replies that "the following is a comparison of the actual facts:—

NAME OF TOWN :	JERUSALEM.	TEL AVIV.
Number of inhabitants... ..	60,000	12,000
Length of pipes	—	13,500 metres
Total daily supply	150,000 gallons	660,000 gallons
Average daily supply per each inhabitant	2.5 gallons	55 gallons
Cost of water per family per year	£18	£3

"In Tel Aviv, all the water comes from wells constructed and operated by the township, and the pipes are carried into the houses and are directly connected with the kitchens, bathrooms and lavatories."

In Jerusalem, however, according to the statement in the Director of Health's report, "house connections for the poorer inhabitants are impossible on account of the prohibitive cost of the water (£18 per annum), and in any case a supply of less than 150,000 gallons daily for a city of over 60,000 inhabitants allows only of street standard pipes and a few connections to hospitals, orphanages and similar institutions and to the more wealthy houses The bulk of the Jerusalem drinking water . . . still comes from its 6,600 privately-owned rain-water cisterns" (see *Q.S.*, p. 153).

Mr. Folkowsky concludes: "I venture to hope that in the light of the foregoing explanations, readers of the *Quarterly Statement* will agree with me that between the water-supply of Jerusalem and that of Tel Aviv, it is the latter that deserves to be called 'by far the best.'"