

the monuments at Jerablus we have the vase, the altar, jar, or basket, boots, horse's foot and quiver, the remaining character appears to be a harp, which does not occur.

In my account of the seals in the possession of S. Tommassini, of Aleppo, which appeared in the "Athenæum" of March, 1880, I pointed out how in one seal the Phœnician artist had turned a cuneiform character, meaning name or signature, into a *tree*, and worked it into the field of his tent. It is possible that we may have here a conventionalised representation which once was an inscription.

I must now conclude these notes, but if by them I have raised an interest in this valuable tablet, I shall be amply rewarded, and I hope that a careful photograph or a cast may be accessible to students, and that thus points now obscure may be cleared up. There are many matters I feel that students of Phœnician and Egyptian mythology can throw more light than I have been able to gather from the records of Assyria, on this—Story of Death.

W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN.

---

### KADESH ON ORONTES.

THE report of Lieutenant Conder, R.E., on Kadesh, in the July *Quarterly Statement* (pp. 163 *et seq.*), is full of very interesting and valuable matter, for which all students of Hittite and Egyptian affairs owe him hearty thanks. But I cannot agree with him in identifying Tell Neby Mendeh (or Mindau, Mindoh, *Burton*; Mindow, *Porter*) as the site of the Hittite Kadesh, however the name may be found there. As Lieutenant Conder has mentioned, I took pains to collate all attainable Egyptian information for him before he left England, and I have since studied the matter again, and have given some results in a paper read November 1st, to the Society of Biblical Archæology. Now I will try to put the question clearly in the light of the Egyptian records, which are remarkably concordant, both in narrative and picture.

The celebrated battle-scene described by the court poet Pentaur is given twice on the walls of the Ramesseum. On the *second* pylon (Rosellini, M.R. cix, cx, Lepsius, "Denkm.," vol. iii, 164) the Orontes flows from the left into a lake which curves upwards, and at the top turns to the right, where the doubly-moated Kadesh stands on an island, with a bridge above and below, the *lower being south*, for the force of the Kheta, shewn there, crossed the *southern* moat to attack the brigade of Ra, as the narrative tells us. Below the river is a straight embanked canal, running right across the picture. The *first* pylon ("Denkm.," vol. iii, 157-160) agrees in these particulars, and we have to the left the important addition of the point where the canal flows out of the river on its *east side*, running north-east. In both Kadesh must be at the north-east end of the lake, which is at least five times as long as the island where the fortified Kadesh stands. In the enormous battle-piece of Abusimbel the Orontes flows similarly into the

lake (which, however, lies straighter in the line of the river-course); the island is at the lower end of the lake on its north-east side, and the river runs on, taking a decided curve, and then straightening its course once more. Here, likewise, are the Kheta troops across the *south* moat. But the parallel canal is only to be *inferred* from the movements of the Kheta and Egyptian troops, as I have shown in my paper.

Now all the precise statements of the records agree with the evidence afforded by the course of the canal in showing the position of the Egyptian tableau relatively to the points of the compass, and the inference is that the island-fortress stands at the north-east end of the lake, forming apparently (as I suggested to Lieutenant Conder) "a part of the great engineering works at the northern and lower end of the long lake, which included the great dyke, heading up the waters of the Orontes, by which the lake was artificially formed."

I cannot but identify this considerable lake, flowing north-easterly, with the present lake of Homs.

Lieutenant Conder would have it represent a mill-pool 50 yards across, to the south-east of the Tell, 400 yards long, but I think this quite a "disproportioned thought."

Nor will Tell Neby Mendeh suit in anywise the strategic conditions of the story. "The mound is remarkably conspicuous from all sides." We agree as to the route of the Pharaoh along the valley of the Eleutherus (Nahr el Kebir). "The Pharaoh crossed a ridge (400 or 500 feet above the lake) and descended into the plains north-west of (Lieutenant Conder's) Kadesh, near the southern shores of the Hittite lake," and consequently in *full view* of the great *ambuscade* of thousands of the allies posted (as we are told) to the north-west of Kadesh. This is precisely contrary to the Egyptian account, which makes the Pharaoh advance from the south, and fall heedless into the trap. On the other hand, if the great ambuscade were laid in the lower land to the north-west of the great dyke, where the chimney-tops of Saddeh are below the level of the lake (so much does the ground fall off), the Pharaoh might well have been lured by the spies into the most perilous security, while the Kheta king's chariots sped away on the other side of the lake, crossed the ford to the south-west of its higher end, and cut the Pharaoh from his supports, for their camp (we are told) was "on the heights to the *south* of Kadesh." Then the brigade of Ra, forming the south-eastward column, would be crushed on *that* side of the lake by the flank attack of the forces thrown across the southern moat of Kadesh; while Rameses with his body-guard was at bay, completely surrounded by the line of the Hittite chariots, on the opposite or north-west side of the lake. These are the details so well represented by the relief-pictures of the Egyptian walls.

I cannot but think them quite in accordance with the supposition which places Kadesh at the north-east outfall of the lake over its great dyke, and not reconcilable with the theory of Lieutenant Conder that Tell Neby Mendeh is the Hittite Kadesh. It seems to me that if any Tell now standing should be Kadesh, Tell Koteineh (Katani of Arrowsmith, Kattinieze of Rey), by

the south-east end of the great dyke is far more likely. Here, or from the dyke hard by, Lieutenant Conder tells us "the flat basaltic slopes on the right *concealed the path by which Rameses approached.*" Here, perhaps, the moated stronghold might have stood, and the moats may long since have been filled and dried. Here and in the lower levels "behind Kadesh the wicked," the deadly ambush may have been laid. All this would perfectly accord with the narratives and tableaux alike, and I venture to urge a very careful attention to this spot and to the dyke itself, for I think with Professor Porter that "the Hittites seem to have been the original founders of that great embankment."

One word more. I thought at first, in view of the Egyptian records, that Kadesh must have stood on the *western* side of the Orontes. But I now see that the expression "Pharaoh had placed himself to the north of the town of Kadesh, on the west side of the river Arunatha," must apply to the Pharaoh, not to the town, which is clearly shown to be on the east side of the river or its lake. The *name* "Kadesh" seems to have wandered like "Koteineh," shown in Lieutenant Conder's sketch-map some three miles from the *Tell Koteineh*.

If we can by combined effort of explorers and students clear up this matter, and put the pick-axe into the true spot, I am quite sure that no one will rejoice more heartily than that excellent and now celebrated officer of the splendid corps of Royal Engineers, Lieutenant Conder.

HENRY GEORGE TOMKINS.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE,

November 7th, 1881.

P.S.—I think it important to notice two points in the remarks of the Rev. W. Wright on my paper read before the Society of Biblical Archaeology.

I. Mr. Wright "had no doubt that in the poem of Pentaur two lakes were referred to—the little lake of Kadesh, around which the battle was fought, and 'the lake of the land of the Amorites,' namely, the Bahr el Hums, in the vicinity of which a part of the Egyptian army must have been when the battle began."

But it is really doubtful whether any *lake* is mentioned in the *text*; and in the battle-pieces there is manifestly only *one*, at the north-east end of which stands Kadesh.

II. Mr. Wright remarks: "It was easy to overcome distance on a map, but supposing the crossing place at each end of the lake to have been eight or ten miles apart, the Khita chariots must have gone careering round a circuit of forty or fifty miles or more during the battle."

This is a misapprehension. The tableaux show two *simultaneous* movements of Hittite chariotry in opposite directions to meet and form a circuit. The lake of Homs is 6 miles long, says Lieutenant Conder, and 2 miles broad.

Now the more extensive of these movements need not have covered more ground than 12 miles round the south-west end, and the other

movement 5 or 6 miles round the north-east end of the lake. An hour and a half would accomplish both together, the *aggregate* being 17 or 18 miles instead of "40 or 50 or more."

Moreover, these movements were *before*, and not "during the battle," and they were deliberately planned beforehand, with plenty of time for their accomplishment at leisure.

I believe that if Mr. Wright had studied the evidence of the monuments and maps his impressions would have been very different. My object is to have these brought fairly to bear upon a survey of the ground, especially taking account of the levels for 5 or 6 miles round the lake of Homs.

H. G. T.

---

### THE ROCK RIMMON.

It seems from the last *Quarterly Statement* that Lieutenant Conder recently went down in the harvest time to the Rock Rimmon, into the cave of the six hundred, and stumbled over some startling conclusions.

I do not wish, like the Philistines, to rob his threshing-floor in Lehi (Hebr. belehi), but I should like in the strength of a Samson to beat out his gleanings with the *inquisitorial* rod, and to winnow the wheat with the *critical* fan, so that the chaff may be driven away by the wind of *sound* opinion. I will not discuss the meaning of Rimmon, as I can afford to leave it untranslated in Judges xx; 1 Sam. xiv, 2 (where A. V. has "pomegranate") but will pass on to the following points given in *Quarterly Statement*, 1881, p. 247, as the results of careful examination.

- (a.) The Rock Rimmon was at the present village of Rummôn.
- (b.) The site of the latter "could not be more correctly described than by the term *Sel'a*."
- (c.) "The Hebrew word (*sela*) has not the meaning of precipice."
- (d.) The surviving Benjamites did not take refuge among the precipices of Wâdy Suweinf, east of Jeb'a, and so could not have hidden themselves in the cave called Mughâret el Jai.
- (e.) The cave "will not hold the number of fugitives mentioned in the story."
- (f.) "The name Rimmon no longer occurs in the vicinity."

The question of the true position of the Rock Rimmon has frequently been touched upon in these pages, viz.: 1879, pp. 103, 112-129, 170; 1880, pp. 106, 173, 236.

To sift the matter thoroughly, I will take the ears gleaned by Lieutenant Conder, one by one.

*Sela*.—This is a word against which several wrong identifications are dashed to pieces. I have stated (1879, p. 127) that "*sela*" always means a precipitous rock, *i.e.*, a cliff . . . height alone does not entitle to the