





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





*From the First*

DR PIEROTTI AND HIS ASSAILANTS:

OR

A DEFENCE

OF

“JERUSALEM EXPLORED.”

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

DR PIEROTTI AND HIS ASSAILANTS :

OR

A DEFENCE

OF

“JERUSALEM EXPLORED.”

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF A PAPER, READ BEFORE THE  
OXFORD ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY AT THEIR  
ANNUAL MEETING JUNE 6, 1864,  
AND NOW PUBLISHED BY THEIR REQUEST ;

BY

THE REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D.

SENIOR FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,  
AUTHOR OF "THE HOLY CITY."

*WITH AN APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS.*

LONDON: BELL AND DALDY.  
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.

1864.





## DEDICATORY.

---

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE  
OXFORD ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.

MR PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,

ALLOW me, in the first instance, to express to you the very great satisfaction which I feel in availing myself of the opportunity which your kindness has afforded me of laying before your Society and, through your Society, before the Public in general, a plain statement of my views on the great Pierotti controversy, which occupied so large a space in the columns of the leading Journal some two or three months ago, until it was brought to a premature close by the necessary absence of Dr Pierotti from England, which has been prolonged far beyond the time he had anticipated.

Your invitation, conveyed to me through your Secretary,—entirely unsolicited by me, as you know,—is backed by the consideration that “as Dr Pierotti was first introduced to the English Public through the medium of our Society, there might be a fitness in giving an opportunity for a defence of him against his assailants before the

same tribunal." I at once admit the propriety, so kindly and delicately suggested, and beg permission to add, that, as there is no Court of competent jurisdiction in the country to which I would more confidently submit any question in which I was myself personally concerned, so there is none before which I should more gladly plead the cause of a client than that which I am now addressing; because I know of none that, with quite a sufficient amount of artistic and professional knowledge and experience, is so likely to combine with a sound and impartial, as well as a practised critical judgment upon the merits of the question, a nice sense of honour and a due regard to the laws of literary controversy—which will be found to be no less essential qualifications for the Jury in this *Case*; which would indeed have been submitted to a regular legal decision had not Counsel declared some otherwise libellous letters to be protected by the technical plea of "privileged communications."

Before you, Gentlemen, I shall at least be exempt even from the odious and unworthy suspicion of dishonestly tampering with my authorities, forging my documents, falsifying my evidence, and bribing my witnesses, in order "to make the worse appear the better cause," and to bolster up a case that I know to be hopelessly bad.

If I may venture to anticipate your verdict, it will be this: That my friend, whose cause I have undertaken to advocate before you, is more sinned

against than sinning: for I am not going to ask you to acquit him of all error, or even of all carelessness, in the preparation of his great work.

“Quid quisque vitet, nunquam homini satis  
Cautum est in horas.”

Even Mr Fergusson, with the experienced aid of two most competent assistants, could not guard against a “horrid mistake” of the Admiralty engravers. All that I maintain is that Dr Pierotti’s, or, his artist’s blunders, whatever they may be, should no more discredit his labours than *e.g.* Mr Catherwood’s bad Plan of the City, for which he was responsible, *plus* the “horrid mistake” in his Plan of the Haram, for which he was not responsible, should vitiate the authority of his most accurate survey of the Mosk enclosure. As to the value of *Jerusalem Explored* as an authority, either confirmatory of our previous knowledge, or supplying additional materials for future research, the Lectures which were given before this Society by Dr Pierotti two years ago, (the substance of which is embodied in his book) were too highly appreciated by you to leave any doubt on that point; and indeed I may appeal to Mr Fergusson and Mr Grove themselves as quite unexceptionable witnesses to this fact.

Mr Fergusson, when not swayed by prejudice, can see that the precise agreement of two independent artists in the delineation of the same object, is a conclusive proof of the truthfulness of both. In his *Notes on the Site of the Holy Sepul-*

*chre*, &c., published in 1861, he wrote as follows: "Mr Carl Haag, the well-known artist, has made a careful drawing of the aisle of the Dome of the Rock. As good luck would have it, he chose the identical point of view from which Mr Catherwood made the drawing engraved as the Frontispiece of my book. So similar are the two drawings that I believe any jury would give me a verdict if I complained against Mr Haag for plagiarism. But the fact is, I believe, that he did not know of the existence of Mr Catherwood's drawing when he made his, and the coincidence speaks volumes for the conscientious truthfulness of both artists," (p. 20). I cannot understand why the argument is not quite as good when Dr Pierotti is in question.

The extreme care with which the photographic illustrations have been transferred to stone is witnessed by Mr Grove, in his second letter to the *Times*, [Appendix, No. xiv.] He had tested their agreement very closely, and truly says it is "a great tribute to the accuracy of Messrs Day's lithographers,"—and therefore, by consequence, to the value of the book; which I have no doubt will hold its place (notwithstanding all that has been done, and will be done, to ruin its credit) as an authority on Jerusalem Topography, when other Essays and Notes, containing perhaps more original views and speculations on the same subject, put forward, it must be admitted, with far greater confidence, are consigned to oblivion.

## DEFENCE OF "JERUSALEM EXPLORED."

## INTRODUCTORY.

IN order chiefly that the most important contribution that has yet appeared to the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem, and to the Illustration of its Sacred Archæology, may not be entirely discredited; in order also that a hard-working and intelligent foreigner may not have to complain that his wearisome toil of many anxious years has been entirely wasted and thrown away among us, without one testimony to its value, one word of hearty gratitude for its results; in order, lastly, that the most remarkable example of literary or professional persecution that ever came under my notice, may not pass unrecorded, I am induced, very reluctantly, somewhat tardily, and sorely against my better judgment, to enter into this controversy between Dr Pierotti and his assailants, knowing from past experience to what I expose myself by so doing: for all who have taken part in these discussions are perfectly well aware that this question of Jerusalem Topography is one of a class in which no measure is kept by any of the disputants in the controversy, whatever side they may adopt. Lying scarcely within the verge of theological subjects, it seems to exasperate and exacerbate the *odium theologicum* more than any other topic of discussion; and

men, who on other subjects can argue with temper and moderation, with candour and courtesy and consideration, seem to "have lost their nature" when they came within the range of this exciting controversy. I by no means profess to form an exception to this rule. I have exchanged many hard blows in my time in doing battle for the Holy Places, and have endeavoured—always, I trust, within the legitimate bounds of honourable warfare—to give as good as I received. But of all who have entered the lists in this quarrel I must ever regard the author of *Jerusalem Explored* as the most unfortunate; for I am fully persuaded that the head and front of his offending, the provocation of all others which has drawn down upon his devoted head the indignation of a small but powerful party of Jerusalem theorists, is simply this; that he has had the singular forbearance to abstain from noticing in his book Mr Fergusson's peculiar theory of the Constantinian origin of the Dome of the Rock, and has passed over with like discreet reticence, as he vainly thought, other original notions of the same author, which few who have studied the subject can trust themselves to discuss with entire moderation of temper and language.

To this, far more than to any demerits or defects in the book itself—which I am not going to dissemble—is to be ascribed that vehemence of disparagement and exuberance of vituperation which characterise some of the communications which will be found in the Appendix. But I shall be very much disappointed in my estimate of the English character, which so vaunts itself on its candour and love of fair play, if the attempt to crush Dr Pierotti, and to ruin the credit of his book—successful as it has been for the time—does not ultimately recoil upon the aggressors.

I will only add for myself that, I hope in my zeal for my unfortunate friend not to forget the prior claims of truth. What I advance in his defence shall be *bona fide*, and to the best of my knowledge and belief; and

where I think him wrong, I shall say so. If in so doing I may appear to weaken or betray his cause, I do not think I shall really do so. In any case, I shall be acting upon the two good old principles, that "honesty is the best policy," and that "you must do as you'd be done by."

## I. PRELIMINARY AND PERSONAL.

It cannot be supposed that I was an indifferent spectator of the controversy, which was carried on in the *Times* some months ago, between Messrs Fergusson, Grove, and Tipping on one side, and Dr Pierotti and Messrs Bell and Daldy on the other. Not only did the interest which I have long taken in the questions discussed in *Jerusalem Explored* commend the discussion to my serious consideration: I was further personally interested in the author of that work, and in a certain manner responsible for him to his Publishers and others to whom I had introduced him; so as to feel that I had a very close private concern in the charges which were brought against him, and which affected not merely his professional skill and knowledge, but his credit as a man of honour and his character as a gentleman.

If I took no part in the newspaper controversy it was partly because I felt that it was impossible to do justice to the subject within such limits as the columns of the *Times* could afford, during the session of Parliament; but mainly because I had a very strong repugnance to come into collision with one at least of Dr Pierotti's assailants, of whose method of controversy I have had some experience many years ago. Very pressing engagements prevented me from entering at once upon such a full examination of the questions at issue as the importance of the subject and the interests at stake appeared to me to demand, and it is only now that I find myself at liberty

to record the results of my investigations into the charges of plagiarism and incompetency which have been so freely urged against Dr Pierotti, in a quarter best calculated to damage his reputation in the eyes of the world.

As Dr Pierotti has, in the Preface to his work, explained, in too flattering terms, the part which I have had in its publication, I feel it to be due to myself to record in very few words the history of my connection with him and his labours.

It was at the commencement of the year 1862 that I first learnt from Miss Beaufort, now Lady Strangford, the nature and extent of Dr Pierotti's researches into the topography and antiquities of Jerusalem. He was then in Paris, endeavouring to make arrangements for the publication of his Album, in which he had collected the results of his investigations during a sojourn of seven years in the Holy City. I soon opened communications with him; first through the kind intervention of Miss Beaufort, afterwards by direct correspondence; and the result was that in February, 1862, he paid me a visit at Cambridge. Here a more detailed account of his investigations and the sight of his plans and drawings, soon convinced me that his discoveries were far the most important that had yet been made for the elucidation of some of the most vexed questions relating to the topography of ancient Jerusalem; particularly to the site of the Temple and the arrangement of its Courts. I thought that Mr Fergusson would feel a lively interest in these new discoveries, and very few days after Dr Pierotti's arrival I invited Mr Fergusson to meet him. I knew that Professor Willis would fully appreciate the importance of these investigations—confirming as they did in a very remarkable manner some of his most ingenious and original theories—and introduced Dr Pierotti to him, as well as to many other friends in the Universities and elsewhere. I was further the medium of his communications to the Architectural Societies of



Oxford and Cambridge; to the Institute of British Architects; to the Architectural Museum at South Kensington, and to other learned Societies. In all this, I was actuated, I believe, solely by my conviction of the importance of his discoveries and by confidence in his good faith and capacity, and not by any special satisfaction in the accidental confirmation of some of my own views: for I had soon learnt that Dr Pierotti and myself were as much at variance on some of the most important points in the archaeology of Jerusalem as was possible, consistently with the admission of the same historical basis and the same topographical data. In truth, while gratefully recognising the importance of the new facts brought to light by him, I found that I was almost always unable to accept his deductions and conclusions. It may have been on this account that I strongly urged him to publish to the world only the processes and results of his original discoveries, so as to furnish materials for others to work upon in the further investigation of this important and interesting subject; but, as he had collected a vast mass of documentary evidence, in illustration of the history and topography of Jerusalem, and had given much time and thought to the study, I was not surprised to find that he was bent on producing a more ambitious and elaborate work. What part I took in the editing that work has been stated by the author in the Preface, and is well known to Mr Bonney, the Translator, and to Mr Mayor, the University Librarian. It was strictly confined to revising the proof-sheets and correcting such palpable errors, clerical and typographical, as my local knowledge and long acquaintance with the subject enabled me to detect at a glance. I did not, of course, attempt to modify the statements of the author, even where most opposed to my own theories, for the obvious reason that the book was avowedly designed to represent Dr Pierotti's speculations, not mine; and he had shewn himself so sensitive of any suspicion of the originality of his topographical hypotheses,

and so fearful lest he should be thought to have borrowed anything from me, that I considered the only safe course was to avoid discussion of differences until after the publication of his book.

## II. MR FERGUSSON AND DR PIEROTTI.

### Charge 1. *Section of the Dome, &c.*

*Jerusalem Explored* was published at the end of January or the beginning of February this year. On the 15th of February Mr Fergusson addressed to Messrs Bell and Daldy, the publishers, a letter which is given in full in the Appendix<sup>1</sup>; in which he charged Dr Pierotti 1st, with having in Plate XXVII. "copied literally and without acknowledgment the Section of the Dome of the Rock, engraved in his work on the Topography of Jerusalem, from a Drawing by Messrs Catherwood and Arundale;" 2ndly, with not having hesitated, "without saying one word about it, to alter all the arches in Mr Arundale's drawing into acutely pointed arches, *which they are not;*" and he "insists that Signor Pierotti should acknowledge, in the first instance, that the Section in question was copied from the drawing of Messrs Catherwood and Arundale, and secondly, that he was not justified in making the alterations he has done." He concludes, as follows: "I request therefore that you will procure me this acknowledgment in a form that I may publish. If this is not forthcoming very shortly, I shall be obliged to apply to the Court of Chancery for an Injunction to restrain you from publishing what is an infringement of my copyright, and a libel on the memory of two honourable men; or, if I fail there, I must appeal for justice

<sup>1</sup> Document, No. I.

to the public, and if forced to this, I shall have a great deal to say about other plates in the work, which have been appropriated with as little regard to fair dealing as has been the case with Plate XXVII."

To this the Publishers replied<sup>1</sup> on February 22, after communicating with Dr Pierotti, that "he himself made the measurements and drawings in the Mosque of Omar upon which his Section is formed, and constructed his Section years before he knew of the existence of your book:" that "these original measurements and drawings are now in his hands and shall be produced at our counting-house to you for your inspection, if you desire it, on receiving two days' notice," consequently that, "Signor Pierotti cannot comply with your request," &c.

These drawings and measurements were contained in a small quarto note-book, which I had seen at Cambridge soon after Dr Pierotti's arrival in England; the leaves of which had been clumsily fastened together with gum, in order, as he explained to me at the time, to prevent the drawings from being copied; as he had suffered much from the unauthorised and unacknowledged appropriation of his labours. They consisted, 1st, of a very rough outline sketch of the Dome of the Rock, with all the vertical measures pencilled upon it, and letters of reference to the details of the ornamentation; 2ndly, of a more careful drawing of the same Section with the various ornaments slightly sketched in, and the timber framework of the roof carefully drawn; 3rdly, of a ground-plan of the building, with all the measures requisite to give the horizontal dimensions of the Mosk; 4thly, of the details of the lower story of the building very exquisitely drawn in pencil; and 5thly, of the details of all the ornamentation referred to in the rough outline (No. 1), evidently drawn by the same skilful hand as No. 4. All the measures were in French *metres*. This

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. III.

book was examined by Mr Fergusson and a friend on the 26th of February; and on the 29th of the same month he wrote again to the Publishers<sup>1</sup> "to reiterate, more emphatically than before, that the Section of the Dome of the Rock is a literal copy of his plate, and to express his astonishment that any one should venture to dispute so self-evident a fact"—"that the two Sections are identical in every detail and every relative proportion." As to the note-book which he had seen on the 26th he writes: "I assert unhesitatingly that these details were not drawn by Pierotti at all...and the presumption was that they were drawn within the last fortnight after the receipt of my letter of the 15th."

Then follow a number of other charges confirmatory of this original accusation, to which I at present confine myself.

This then was Mr Fergusson's hypothesis, that Dr Pierotti having appropriated with modifications the exquisitely finished Section constructed by Messrs Catherwood and Arundale, and being called to account for the piracy by Mr Fergusson, worked back that highly finished drawing to its rudimentary elements in this old note-book, translating the English scale of feet into French *metres*, in order to refute the charge!

Happily it is quite unnecessary to examine the credibility of this surmise, as there is direct evidence that the Section published by Dr Pierotti, which formed the substance of Mr Fergusson's charge, had been constructed exclusively from those pencil drawings which Mr Fergusson conjectures to have been prepared after his letter of February 15.

M. Turpin, a young French artist, employed by Dr Pierotti to prepare this Section for the lithographer, declares<sup>2</sup> that "when I first became acquainted with Signor Pierotti in June 1862, and was engaged by this gentleman

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. IV.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Document, No. VI.

as a draughtsman, all the drawings I had to copy were all Dr Pierotti's originals, and I am positively certain that they were drawn by himself." And then, after pointing out the discrepancies between the two Sections, he adds: "Now I have explained to you what I know, and am ready to swear that I never used any other drawings but Dr Pierotti's own."

This, I apprehend, is decisive as to the originality of Dr Pierotti's Section of the Dome of the Rock; at least it disposes effectually of the theory of his having prepared the sketches in the note-book with a view to rebut Mr Fergusson's charge of plagiarism.

I have not trusted to my own judgment to determine whether the elements which I have mentioned as contained in Dr Pierotti's note-book, were sufficient for the construction of such a Section as that which he has published in his work. I have submitted them to some of the most eminent men in the profession, who entertain no doubt that they are; and, as a crucial test, I have had a Section prepared from this note-book alone, by a skilful architectural draughtsman, who knew no particulars of the controversy between Dr Pierotti and his assailants, nor had seen Mr Arundale's Section. The result is precisely what I had anticipated: close agreement with Dr Pierotti's published Plan, and consequently such divergence from Mr Arundale's in matters of minute detail as would be natural, almost unavoidable, in two different plans of the same building, both executed with extreme accuracy; and I cannot help feeling that the friends and admirers of Messrs Catherwood and Arundale, among whom I may be allowed to reckon myself, have cause to complain that Mr Fergusson, while professing great jealousy for their memory, has allowed prejudice so to warp his judgment, that instead of magnifying and exalting their labours (as he had every right to do) by this new evidence to the wonderful care with which they were executed, under circumstances of no little difficulty

and danger, has endeavoured to destroy this independent testimony to their value by his attack upon Dr Pierotti's originality. And it is worthy of remark, that in the particular instance in which he complains of Dr Pierotti for altering Mr Arundale's drawing, he has himself furnished conclusive evidence that it needed correction; since it gives not the slightest indication of the pointed arch. He has (says Mr Fergusson) altered "all the arches in Mr Arundale's drawing into acutely pointed arches, *which they are not.*" Yet it is distinctly stated by Mr Fergusson himself, that "all the arches throughout the building are more or less pointed;" and when, startled by this phenomenon, he appealed to Mr Arundale for corroboration, he received for answer: "The arches under the dome, and those of the aisle are both *slightly* pointed, so much so that when reduced in the Section, it would scarcely be evident, but would be very apparent when viewed in perspective." [Essay &c. p. 112.]

Mr Fergusson is hard to please. When Dr Pierotti agrees with him, he sins by plagiarism; where he differs, he sins still more heinously by unauthorized alteration, and must acknowledge both under pain of an Injunction!

It is only necessary to add under this head, that the Section of the Dome of the Rock, to which Mr Fergusson refers as seen by him in my rooms, and on which he mainly relies for his proof of Dr Pierotti's incapacity as a draughtsman, was not Dr Pierotti's at all, but was made by a Turkish engineer, Assaad Effendi, by whom it was presented to Dr Pierotti in 1855, and preserved in his album as a curiosity, until he presented it to the Queen of Spain on his visit to that country in 1862-3.

### Charge 2. *Entablature in the Mosk.*

In addition to the charge contained in Mr Fergusson's first letter to Messrs Bell and Daldy, of Feb. 15, two new definite charges are advanced in his second letter of

Feb. 29<sup>1</sup>, which must now be examined. The capital of the Pillar and part of the entablature in the Dome of the Rock (Plate XXIX. fig. 2*a*), was claimed by Mr Fergusson, and admitted by the Publishers to be engraved from a tracing of a drawing in Mr Fergusson's book (p. 104). Yet Mr Fergusson admits that he had seen in Dr Pierotti's note-book the same capital and entablature "pencilled in by the same hand which drew the other details in the book," and which he describes as "exquisitely pencilled by a most accomplished architectural draughtsman, better in this respect than even Arundale, and I do not know half-a-dozen men in England who could do them as well." He indeed "asserts unhesitatingly that these details were not drawn by Pierotti at all:" and of course attaches no kind of credit to Dr Pierotti's positive assurance that every pencilling in the book was made by himself. But Mr Fergusson is bound to find some satisfactory explanation, on his theory, for one phenomenon which he has not recorded. The pencilling in the note-book, while precisely corresponding in all other respects with Mr Fergusson's, differs from it in this important particular: that the relative parts of the drawing are reversed in the note-book; *i.e.* the entablature, which is placed on the right of the capital in both the engravings, is on the left in the note-book; and the soffit, which is placed above the entablature in the former, is drawn on the left side of it in the latter.

What then is Mr Fergusson's presumption? It is this: that Dr Pierotti, in order to meet the charge of plagiarism, instructed his artist to copy the drawing from Mr Fergusson's book, with these alterations, which do not correspond with his own published view, and then attempted to pass it off as the original of his drawing! This would be almost as clumsy a fabrication as the reduction of the finished Section to its elements, and the hypothesis is disposed of by the same testimony. The

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. IV.

truth is that Dr Pierotti, having an original drawing of his own "exquisitely pencilled," was induced by some inexplicable fatality to adopt Mr Fergusson's arrangement in preference to his own, and to save himself the trouble of reversing his own drawing chose rather to trace Mr Fergusson's: an act of inconceivable folly, had he known with whom he had to deal, for which Mr Fergusson has exacted a somewhat heavy penalty.

### Charge 3. *Plan of the Haram.*

More serious is the accusation relating to the Plan of the Haram, Plate XI. of *Jerusalem Explored*, contained in Mr Fergusson's second Letter. "I assert," writes Mr Fergusson, "that it is a reduction of a Plan which I constructed from Catherwood's original documents in my possession, with the assistance of Mr Croucher. That Plan was afterwards engraved by the Admiralty, and a copy of it left by Captain Washington with Pierotti at Jerusalem in 1860. When I held up Pierotti's 'own plan' at Cambridge, against the light with my own, they were found to be as identical as the section of the Mosque."

I do not remember that Mr Fergusson had a copy of the Admiralty Plan when he was examining Dr Pierotti's Plan in my rooms at Cambridge: but, however this may have been, he is certainly in error as to his method of comparing them: for as Dr Pierotti's Plan was mounted on dark calico, and Mr Fergusson's is printed on stout paper, such a comparison would have baffled Lynceus himself.

More plausible are the arguments for the identity of the two plans derived (1) from their agreement in the details of the buildings about the north-west angle of the Haram; which Mr Fergusson states that he supplied conjecturally, as Mr Catherwood's survey was defective in this part: and (2) from the repetition of an error of Mr Cather-



wood's Plan in that of Dr Pierotti;—the “Admiralty engraver having made a horrid mistake in the South Wall, which was not in the original.”

Unfortunately Dr Pierotti's original Plan of the Haram, which was seen by Mr Fergusson at Cambridge, has been presented to the King of Spain: but several photographs were taken from it, from one of which the Plate in *Jerusalem Explored* was drawn; and I am bound to say that the clumsiness and roughness of execution in the lithograph does scanty justice to the neatness and finish of Dr Pierotti's original.

A comparison of this Plan with that prepared by Mr Fergusson shews (1) that the details of the buildings in the north-west angle are so far from being identical, that Dr Pierotti has given careful detail, where Mr Fergusson has given mere tentative outline, supplied, he says, by conjecture, but probably not altogether unaided by the best plans to which he had access:—(2) that while both Plans shew a distortion in the South wall of the Haram, the distortion is not the same in both; that in Mr Fergusson's being, as he tells us, the effect of a “horrid mistake” of the engraver, that of Dr Pierotti the result of design; a correct representation, as he maintains, of the effects of clumsy repairs of an ancient wall.

But the fact is that all such suspicions, were they far better supported than they are by evidence of identity—even in error—vanish altogether before the mass of proof which I have in my possession that Dr Pierotti had not only abundant opportunities for surveying the City and Haram, but also ample capacity and will to avail himself of them. Mr Fergusson does but beg the question *more suo* when he denies him both.

A brief account of Dr Pierotti's various professional employments in Jerusalem between 1855 and 1861 will be found in the Appendix<sup>1</sup>, and I happily had rescued from

<sup>1</sup> Document, No. XXII.

destruction many *débris* of his labours long before I had any notion of the good service they might do him in this controversy. Devotedly attached as I am to the stones and the dust of the Holy City, I begged of him the fragments of soiled and tattered plans which he would ruthlessly have destroyed, after they had served his purpose. Among these is a plan of the Christian Quarter of the City, to the scale of  $\frac{3}{2500}$  full size, coloured so as to shew the proprietorship of every house in the Quarter; and another of the entire city and suburbs on a scale of  $\frac{1}{2500}$  full size, similarly coloured. This last is dated June 1859, and in it are found the details of the buildings in the N.W. precincts of the Haram, identical with those in his published Plate, and all the main features of the whole plan of the Haram; which however he had further opportunities of verifying and correcting, up to the time of his leaving Jerusalem in 1861.

There is, I submit, some presumption in all this that his Plan of the Haram was not traced from Mr Fergusson's Admiralty Plan in 1860. He certainly was under no necessity to be beholden to any one.

It is only necessary to add that the copy of the Admiralty Plan of the Haram was not "left with Signor Pierotti" by Captain Washington in 1860. He had it in his possession one night; made such corrections on it as he could in the limited time, by Captain Washington's request, and returned it to him the following morning. This Plan, with Dr Pierotti's manuscript corrections, is doubtless still in Captain Washington's possession. Dr Pierotti's original Plan, from a reduction of which that in his book is engraved, had not only been completed, but had been seen by Lady Strangford<sup>1</sup> and others long before Dr Pierotti knew of the existence of the Admiralty Plan; and the undoubted discrepancies between this detailed Plan of the Haram Enclosure, and that exhibited in

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. IX. See below, p. 24.

the Plan of the City, are accounted for by the fact that, after the publication of the latter, he had increased opportunities of correcting the former.

It will be necessary now, before dismissing Mr Fergusson, to notice two paragraphs in his letter to the *Times*, dated March 22.

(1) "As Signor Pierotti reserves his defence against the principal charges contained in Mr Grove's letter, pending the legal proceedings which he assumes I am about to commence against him, allow me to assure him that he has nothing to fear from me in that respect.

"When I first saw his work I wrote to the publishers demanding that Signor Pierotti should acknowledge what he had borrowed from me, and when, to my astonishment, he replied denying the loan altogether, I wrote back somewhat indignantly, and ending with a vague threat which might be interpreted as meaning legal proceedings or anything else."

Mr Fergusson's memory must have failed him. The "vague threat" at the conclusion of his second letter to Messrs Bell and Daldy, can only be interpreted by the language of the first, which is certainly definite enough. "If this [acknowledgement] is not forthcoming very shortly, I shall be obliged to apply to the Court of Chancery for an Injunction to restrain you from publishing what is an infringement of my copyright," &c.

(2) "There is nothing whatever in the work which can have any real bearing on any of the disputed points of the topography of Jerusalem. There is nothing, indeed, that is new or valuable, except some 13 pages devoted to the underground watercourse of the place, and these so absolutely confirm all I have ever written regarding the site of the Temple and of the Holy Places that I, at least, for one, have no desire to throw stones at Signor Pierotti."

These two statements are, I believe, about equally correct. To deny the importance of Dr Pierotti's discoveries in their bearing on disputed points of the topography, I should have been disposed to ascribe to prejudice, but for the assurance that immediately follows that

prejudice would be entirely misplaced, as Dr Pierotti's discoveries "absolutely confirm all that" Mr Fergusson "has written regarding the site of the Temple and of the Holy Places."

This is no place to examine the bearing of Dr Pierotti's discoveries on the moot points of Jerusalem topography. I have already expressed my opinion, which I deliberately repeat, that they are the most important of all that have been hitherto published.

I may however be allowed to express my inability to comprehend how the discovery of a cesspool under the sacred Rock of the Moslems, connected with an elaborate system of aqueducts, cisterns, and sewers, can in any way confirm the theory of Mr Fergusson that this Rock contained the Holy Sepulchre, or that the building which enshrines it is a Constantinian structure.

I have indeed such confidence in the ingenuity of Mr Fergusson as to believe that he will prove this to his own satisfaction. To me the facts brought to light by Dr Pierotti are nothing short of a demonstration of Professor Willis's most original and happy conjecture, that the sacred Rock of the Moslems was the site of the Jewish altar. And what adds to the value of this confirmation is this; that at the time when Dr Pierotti made these wonderful discoveries, he was wholly ignorant of Professor Willis's hypothesis. He arrived by a process of induction at the conclusion to which Professor Willis had been guided by that faculty of intuition, for which he is so remarkable. As Mr Fergusson has staked his professional reputation upon an opposite theory, it is not perhaps to be expected that he should duly appreciate the evidence which, if admitted, must force him to abandon it: but it must be regretted that he has not shewn more consideration for those who, at the cost of no little labour and expense, are engaged in furnishing the evidence. Dr Pierotti has certainly fared worse at his hands even than others, and unhappily is not in a position to be in-

different to his attacks and their consequences. He may be excused, however, for declining to submit his cause to the arbitration of a tribunal, of which all he knows is, that Mr Fergusson is its Secretary; whose *animus* towards this unconscious ally of his Constantinian theory of the Architecture of the Dome of the Rock, was sufficiently indicated on the occasion when I read his interesting paper before the Institute of British Architects, on which Mr Fergusson was pleased to comment in a tone of contumely and contempt, which it certainly did not deserve.

### III. MR GROVE AND DR PIEROTTI.

In proceeding to notice Mr Grove's charges against Dr Pierotti I wish to speak with all respect of a gentleman to whose courtesy I am indebted for a sight of the photographs and drawings on which he grounded his accusations of plagiarism, and with whom I have already privately exchanged communications on the subject in a frank and friendly spirit, which I shall do my best to maintain in this public arena. He already knows my mind on the whole subject; and although I have not kept copies of my letters to him, I am sure the following is an accurate statement of what I wrote; for my impressions have never undergone any change. I admit then that there was *prima facie* ground of suspicion against Dr Pierotti, of having made an unauthorised use of the labours of his predecessors without acknowledgment. But I am quite convinced that he has not borrowed from others so largely as he was supposed to have done, and that he could not honestly have made the admissions which Mr Fergusson demanded of him under pain of an Injunction: consequently, I regard the charge of inaccuracy as more damaging to his credit than that of plagiarism; and, on the whole, I think that Dr Pierotti has had very hard measure.

Now, I do not complain of Mr Grove for having attacked the book in a letter to the *Times*, signed with his own name. No one who can gain admission to the columns of the *Times* ought to be satisfied with a less publicity for any subject which he deems worthy of attention; and anonymous criticism is ever liable to abuse, from the danger of which the course adopted by Mr Grove is free. Neither do I think there was anything in the contents, or in the tone, of his first letter which was not within the limits of fair and honourable criticism.

But I do think he was dealing hard measure to the author when he availed himself of the accident of his position as Secretary of the Crystal Palace, to organise an exhibition of Dr Pierotti's "plagiarisms" under that roof, and announced in the *Times* that he had done so. I cannot consider this legitimate; because no author who had a spark of self-respect could regard such a measure as otherwise than a flagrant insult, which must of course preclude him from an opportunity of self-defence.

Still more abhorrent to my notions of the laws of literary controversy was the attempt to damage Dr Pierotti's credit by the revival of a charge of fifteen years' standing, gravely affecting his moral character; of which neither I nor any of those to whom I had introduced him had the remotest suspicion. I will do Mr Grove the credit to believe that the first intimation which reached him of that charge came to him unsought. But the authenticated copy of the sentence, procured from the Italian War-Office, together with the English translation attested by a Notary Public under his hand and seal, now in Mr Grove's possession, too surely prove how eagerly the scent was followed up.

Further, I can hardly believe that the visit of Mr Grove to Paris, in company with Mr Fergusson, in the month of April, immediately after obtaining possession of this damning document, was entirely without reference to this controversy. I know that my friend, M. de Sauley, whom

they saw on the 13th of April, considered that the design of their visit was to collect information hostile to Dr Pierotti, and that their inquiries were not confined to his literary character, but bore also upon his private life. All this does not approve itself to my mind as legitimate warfare, and I deeply regret that Mr Grove has adopted it. I know indeed that he has hitherto exercised so much forbearance as not to publish the document; but I know also that the facts have been industriously circulated in the Clubs and in Societies where they would most damage the book and discredit the author. This is what I ventured at the outset to call "persecution."

And now the reader will be prepared to apply to me the proverb, "Save me from my friends," and to think that I have as effectually gibbeted the author of *Jerusalem Explored* as Mr Fergusson and his other assailants could desire. I accept all the consequences of my indiscretion, because I share with all those who have known Dr Pierotti intimately the conviction that he is incapable of the dishonourable act which is laid to his charge; and that, consequently, the revision of his sentence by a court-martial, which he has now obtained—after repeatedly declining the offer of influential friends to procure a pardon, which would have been a virtual acknowledgment of guilt—will issue in his acquittal. In this case Mr Grove will have done him excellent service.

Meanwhile he is entitled to an answer to his literary charges, to which I now proceed in the order in which he has numbered them<sup>1</sup>.

Charges 1 and 2. *Photographs of the "Golden Gate"  
and of the "Wailing Place of the Jews."*

Mr Grove maintains that Plates XVIII. and XXII. are taken respectively from photographs of Mr Robertson and

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. VII.

Mr Graham, and in his second letter to the *Times* he includes in the same count with the former, Plates VII. XV. XVI. XVII. and XX., as all taken from Robertson's Photographs, published by Gambart. As this charge is virtually admitted by Dr Pierotti, in his reply to Mr Grove<sup>1</sup>, it will only be necessary to examine what he advances in extenuation of the plagiarism; and I think it will be admitted by every candid mind that his plea, confirmed as it is in every particular by Messrs Day and Son<sup>2</sup>, does very materially weaken the force of the accusation; particularly when it is considered that the photographs in question were not protected by the law of copyright, and might be reproduced by any one who chose to be at the cost of printing them, whether as photographs or engravings. Undoubtedly the name of the photographers ought to have been put to them, though Mr Fergusson—as is obvious from his numerous illustrated works—does not consider this rule of universal obligation, but often satisfies himself with the indefinite form, “from a Photograph,” which may mean by himself or by any other. I do not think that it would have been right of Dr Pierotti to substitute his own name, simply on the ground that he had photographs of his own of the same views, which he might have used had he not been able to substitute these, which he considered more satisfactory: and, indeed, I told him repeatedly that he could not appropriate the photographs of Robertson at all; as I was under the erroneous impression that they were protected by the Copyright Act.

With regard to the great majority of the Views, they were to all intents and purposes his; and he was entitled, according to the universally acknowledged rules of the profession—by which, of course, he must be tried—to affix his own name to them; for I learn from friends who

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XI.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XII.



have had their *cartes de visite* taken by the most distinguished photographers in London or Paris, that the artist himself, whose name is printed on every impression, has nothing whatever to do with the process, except the *posing* of the figure; and I am informed by eminent architects that any plan or design prepared under their directions, or executed in their office, is as much entitled to bear their name as though it had been executed by their own hand; although they may not so much as have taken a single measure nor have put in a single line. I am not justifying the practice; I am merely stating what it is:—and that, more in vindication of Messrs Day and Son than of Dr Pierotti; who on being asked by them what inscription the photographs should bear, told them distinctly that they had not been taken by himself, but were his property. He suggested for the inscription, “Drawn from a photograph belonging to E. Pierotti,” which would have applied equally to those which he borrowed from Robertson and to those which were executed for himself, and have been equivalent to Mr Fergusson’s “from a photograph;” whereas, the form of inscription adopted by Messrs Day under these instructions was warranted in the case of the latter but not of the former.

Now, when to these considerations is added another which is contained in a Letter of Mrs Finn to Lady Strangford<sup>1</sup>, I cannot doubt that all who can carry themselves indifferently in this controversy will feel with me that the involuntary error of Dr Pierotti has been very needlessly exaggerated by Mr Grove.

It seems that the proprietorship in the photographs, taken at Jerusalem by the three artists named by Mrs Finn, was not very accurately defined; and it is very possible that in the interchange of professional services between Messrs Robertson, Graham, and Diness, the last-named may really have claimed a title to those of the two

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. X.

former, and so have passed them off on Dr Pierotti among those which he had taken by his order.

Charges 3 and 4. *Vaults and Section of El-Aksa.*

The two charges, relating to the Vaults of El-Aksa, will be considered when I come to speak of Mr Tipping's counts in this bill of indictment against Dr Pierotti; but this is the proper place to notice Mr Grove's charge of inaccuracy, in "the double range of clerestory windows in the west wall" of the Mosk, as shewn in Dr Pierotti's Section, Plate XXIV. He says, "none such exist there, and none are shewn in the [exterior] view of the Mosque, Plate XXI."

The error here is wholly Mr Grove's. For, in the first place, the arches in the lower range are not windows at all, but simply openings into the side aisle; and, in the next place, the arches of the upper range, which were really the clerestory windows, have been blocked without, for some cause which I cannot explain; but it is a satisfaction to be able to point to the corresponding windows on the opposite, *i.e.* the east, side—which are still open, and may be seen in any photograph of the building taken from the Mount of Olives—in evidence of the existence of those on the west side; which is further attested in the rough section of Ali Bey (Vol. II. p. 216), as also in the extremely accurate one given by the Count de Vogüé, in his magnificent work on the Haram esh-Sherif now in the course of publication (*Temple de Jérusalem*, Part I. Plate XXXI.), both of which shew the same side of the Mosk as is seen in Dr Pierotti's Section.

Charges 5 and 6. *Section of the Kubbet es-Sakharah; and Entablature.*

These are identical with Mr Fergusson's Charges I and 2, which have been fully considered above, and need not therefore detain us.

Charge 7. *Capital of a Column.*

Dr Pierotti has copied one capital (B) of the three in Plate XXIV. from Mr Fergusson's book, (p. 109). *Jerusalem Explored* contains upwards of 20 capitals never before published to my knowledge; the originality of which is not questioned. One, easily accessible and perfectly well known, which moreover the author had in his own collection, he preferred taking from Mr Fergusson, in order to simplify his labour. Is this a very heinous offence?

Charge 8. *Tombs of Absalom and Zacharias.*

These I believe to be, as Mr Grove says, copied by Dr Pierotti (Plate LXI.) from the Atlas of M. de Sauley's *Voyage* (Planches XXXVIII., XL., XLIII.), and this unquestionably ought not to have been done without permission or without acknowledgment: although M. de Sauley himself, while with characteristic generosity he refuses to recognize the plagiarism, and indeed sets himself to disprove it, says distinctly, in his letter to Dr Pierotti, "if you had copied it, you had a perfect right to do so."

Charge 9. *Plan of the Haram esh-Sherif.*

This charge is identical in all its details with Mr Fergusson's accusation 3, already considered; and I need only here express my regret that Mr Grove should have repeated the very incorrect statement of Mr Fergusson concerning the buildings outside the Mosk Enclosure at the N. W. angle. Here happily is a question on which all who care to do so may satisfy themselves. But I may add to what I have stated in reply to Mr Fergusson (p. 14), that I have since found among my archives another Plan of the City, beautifully drawn by Dr Pierotti (bearing date

August, 1860), in which all the buildings in that quarter are given, quite as much in detail (though on a smaller scale) as in his special Plan of the Haram Enclosure; with regard to which Plan I may now add the testimony of Lady Strangford, which will be found in a letter to Dr Pierotti, which is given in the Appendix<sup>1</sup>: "We had not been a week in Jerusalem before you kindly brought us your admirable Plan of the whole Haram esh-Sherif to see, as well as the huge plan of Jerusalem as it is. Of course I cannot trust my memory as to whether there are any slight differences between them and the reduced copies in your book. *I do not believe that there are.* I know that with five months' constant study of both . . . we never could detect the slightest flaw in either."

Now, since the Plan published in the book was reduced from the larger one by photography, there is not of course the slightest difference; and, as Lady Strangford and her sister arrived in Jerusalem in 1859, and Captain Washington not till October, 1860, it is impossible that the original of the Plan of the Haram given in *Jerusalem Explored* could have been copied from the Admiralty Plan.

Charge 10. *Discrepancies between the Plans of the City and of the Haram.*

This too has been already explained in replying to Mr Fergusson's third Charge, and nothing need be added but this: that all who are acquainted with the modern history of Jerusalem cartography know too well the extreme difficulty of obtaining accurate results, even under the most favourable circumstances. Mr Catherwood's Plan of the City, which was far in advance of anything that had been published before, was utterly untrustworthy even as regards the principal streets of the city. The

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. IX.

trigonometrical Survey of our own Ordnance Officers, published with my *Holy City*, while minutely accurate in the complicated network of streets, has introduced an original and utterly inexplicable blunder in the western wall of the Haram. Such differences as those that may be discovered by minute and unfriendly scrutiny between the general plan of the City and the detailed plan of the Haram, in *Jerusalem Explored*, are almost unavoidable, if they were to be entirely independent; and all that can be said is, that they are fully compensated for by the general accuracy of both; on which point none are better qualified to speak than M. de Sauley and Captain Gelis, whose letters are given in the Appendix. Thus much may be extracted from them here; and I quote them with the greater pleasure because they reflect quite as much credit on my friend M. de Sauley as on Dr Pierotti, and shew him to be entirely free from that miserable, narrow-minded, intolerant, professional jealousy which occasions so much injury to the cause of truth and justice at home and abroad. Thus he writes to Dr Pierotti, under date, Paris, April 28, 1864<sup>1</sup>: “Your plans are, I hesitate not to say distinctly, the best we have had up to this time—I speak of the Plans of the city of Jerusalem, and of the Haram ech-Cherif. Certainly they exhibit a few small inaccuracies of detail, but they are of very small importance in respect to the eminent service which you have rendered us in surveying so exactly, with the small resources at your disposal, such important localities. I ought to tell you that, during the execution of our topographical labours, completed scarcely three months since, not a single day passed without Captain Gelis and myself having had the pleasure of proving and proclaiming the excellence of this double work. It is to you, my dear friend, that we owe the knowledge of the fragments of the second wall of the Jerusalem of the kings of Juda; and I remember that

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XX.

when I presented, in your name, to the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, your beautiful Plan of the city, I did not fail to call attention to the importance of the discoveries you had been so fortunate as to make behind the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is to you again that we owe our earliest information of the subterraneous channels, designed to carry off the sewage of the Temple. Those subterraneous conduits I recovered in the excavations which I lately made at the South of the Haram-ech-Cherif, and the proof of their existence is a fact of the utmost importance."

Not less decided is the testimony of Captain Gelis, of the French Etat Major, attached to the Depot of War, the friend and travelling companion of M. de Sauley, officially attached to his Expedition<sup>1</sup>, dated Paris, April 16, 1864.

"I seize this opportunity to compliment you particularly on your Plan of Jerusalem. In my quality of Topographer, I could appreciate all its merit, and it is quite certain that it is the most complete and the most correct plan of that locality. I carefully preserve the engraved copy which you were so good as to give me on my first visit to Jerusalem in 1861. I have used it much and have not hesitated to adopt from it much of the detail, for the execution of my great Plan, intended to accompany the work of M. de Sauley....My first visit to Jerusalem in 1861 was too short to allow me to judge of your beautiful Plan and Sections of the Haram-ech-Cherif, which you were then drawing; but this time I could appreciate their importance and estimate that the trouble to which you were then putting yourself had been crowned with success."

I have now done with Mr Grove's first letter to the *Times*; and I cannot but hope that he will himself feel on reading the above extracts, how favourably the kindly

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XXI.

words of the two large-hearted Frenchmen contrast with what he has himself written on the subject; for I must maintain that, if all his charges had been true in their worst sense, there was still a sufficient residuum of original matter, both in the text and in the Plates of *Jerusalem Explored*, to deserve a word at least of acknowledgment from one who can appreciate, as Mr Grove can, the importance of their bearing on the subjects of common interest to us both. But he has allowed an amiable feeling, I am willing to believe, of loyalty for his friend Mr Fergusson, to degenerate into a blind partizanship for his theory, involving a very grievous injustice to Dr Pierotti; for indeed the opening words of his second letter prove too plainly, as does the whole tenor of it, the *animus* of his attack.

On this second letter<sup>1</sup> very few words will suffice; for it is in fact little more than a reiteration of the charges of plagiarism of the photographs which Dr Pierotti had admitted, emphasised with a statement which never ought to have been made after reading Dr Pierotti's letter; in which he had distinctly denied that he had placed the photographs in the lithographer's hands "as his own productions." That denial was corroborated by Messrs Day and Sons, whose letter, I am glad to see, bears the same date as Mr Grove's second letter; so that he could not have seen it when he repeated the libel. But then he ought to have been satisfied with Dr Pierotti's declaration, and not have given him the lie direct.

I admit at once that, in this second letter, Mr Grove has hit the real blots of *Jerusalem Explored*, viz. the careless reduction of the plans or of the scales, or both, in Plates II. and XI. and the unfortunate plan and views of the Holy Sepulchre in Plates XXXIV. and XXXV. They are obviously the first loose and hasty essays at a survey, done soon after the author's arrival in Jerusalem, and

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XIV.

never subsequently corrected or revised; probably on account of the greater interest which he took in other researches. They never ought to have been published, and ought now to be cancelled, and recalled.

#### IV. MR TIPPING AND DR PIEROTTI.

In proceeding to notice Mr Tipping's charges against Dr Pierotti, I must acknowledge my obligations to that gentleman, both on public and on private grounds. His beautiful pictorial illustrations to Dr Traill's translation of Josephus are by far the most valuable contribution to sacred topography in that kind that has yet appeared; not even excepting the splendid photographic works of Messrs Robertson, Graham, and Frith; and I can myself testify, from personal knowledge, to the general fidelity and accuracy of nearly all his representations. In particular, I can bear witness to the wonderful reality with which he has invested his views of the Vaulted Substructions of El-Aksa, which are here in question; as it was through his courtesy, and under his guidance, that I had access to them (the only part of the Haram to which I obtained admission), not, to be sure, in a very dignified manner, but through a hole in the wall. He had frequently visited them before, and although it was always a service of danger, yet he contrived in his successive stealthy visits, to make a complete series of perspective drawings, which together with a plan and section, are embodied in the volumes. There is nothing omitted that either the artist or the archæologist could desiderate in them.

Mr Tipping, I must further admit, exercised great forbearance in not denouncing the supposed plagiarism until he was almost forced to do so. Mr Grove, among his other charges, had taxed Dr Pierotti with borrowing the two drawings in Plate xxv. from Mr Tipping. It was not



until Mr Tyrwhitt had come forward to rebut this charge<sup>1</sup> that Mr Tipping entered the lists<sup>2</sup>; although convinced from the first, as it seems, that an unauthorised and unacknowledged use had been made of his labours by the author of *Jerusalem Explored*. His language then might have been more courteous, but his self-restraint contrasts so favourably with Mr Fergusson's violence and precipitation, that I am disposed to regard his attack in a very different light, and am not without hope that I may convince him that his suspicions against Dr Pierotti are not well founded.

I own again that there was apparent ground for suspicion, in the first instance; for, familiar as I was with Mr Tipping's drawings, I could not but be struck with the great general resemblance of Dr Pierotti's to them when I first saw them: and at once expressed it to him. It was then I found that he was not so much as acquainted with Mr Tipping's drawings, or with the book that contained them. In fact, I doubt whether even now he has seen the two drawings which he is charged with copying; for it happened, singularly enough, that they had been taken out of my copy of Traill's *Josephus* (which he afterwards borrowed of me) for the purpose of making two large lecture-drawings, and have never been replaced.

The case then is one of "mistaken identity,"—if I may venture so to apply the term; with the like of which, I presume, every architect or artist of wide experience must be familiar. One of the most eminent men in the former profession has told me of a case in which an old pupil of his own published some drawings and details from foreign cathedrals, from his original sketches, but so precisely similar to those which his master had made many years before, that he could have felt confident they were made from his drawings, had he not known the contrary.

Not that there is actually such close similarity between

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XV.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Documents, Nos. XVII. XIX.

Mr Tipping's prints and Dr Pierotti's lithographs; as is indeed admitted: but then, as in the case of the substitution of pointed arches for round in the Dome of the Rock, the differences are supposed—not to disprove—but to aggravate the guilt of the plagiarism!

The vertical wall *e.g.* in Plate xxv., fig. 1,—supposed by Mr Grove to be a misinterpretation of Mr Tipping's print, by the draughtsman who transferred it to stone for Dr Pierotti's book;—the shaft and capital in figure 2 of the same Plate, “which shews all the marks of venerable age” in Mr Tipping's view, “perfectly renovated, shaft and capital, without a flaw or blemish,” in *Jerusalem Explored*;—“the lights and shadows exactly reversed;”—panelled stones instead of bevelled;—an arch indicated by Dr Pierotti, not by Mr Tipping,—and so following: These divergences one might have supposed amply sufficient to establish the originality and independence of Dr Pierotti's drawings, even if the agreement, in all other respects, had been so precise as to prove—as Mr Tipping tauntingly suggests,—“that he had placed the legs of his sketching-stool in the very holes left by his twenty years ago.”

But a careful comparison of Dr Pierotti's original drawings with the published prints of Mr Tipping reveals many more discrepancies, and so furnishes additional proofs of the originality of the former. I mention a few, which may be tested even in the lithographs, albeit Messrs Day's artist has taken, as their manner is, certain liberties, particularly with the *chiaro oscuro*, to give effect to the picture, which have softened down the differences.

And first, it will be seen at a glance that, in figure 1, the vaulted passage in Mr Tipping's drawing is considerably wider in proportion to its height than in Dr Pierotti's: and this may be proved by actual measurement, for while in the former the height is to the width as 55 to 100, in the latter it is as 71 to 100<sup>1</sup>: and it is somewhat singular

<sup>1</sup> *i. e.* measuring from the crown of the arched roof to the floor vertically, and between the piers and the wall horizontally. I am indebted to

that Mr Tipping's own plans prove, that while neither of them is correct, Dr Pierotti's is nearer the truth than his, the width according to the plan being 18, and the height not less than 17 feet.

Again, the last four arches which are in true perspective in Mr Tipping's drawing are in false perspective in Dr Pierotti's.

Further, the piers supporting the arches are not nearly so massive in Dr Pierotti's drawing as they are in Mr Tipping's; and while four of the arched spaces on the right can be seen through in the former, three at the most stand clear in the latter.

But the nicest and most critical point of difference remains to be mentioned. It relates to the perspective lines; a comparison of which in the two drawings proves to demonstration that the one is not copied from the other; and that while the two were taken from as nearly the same spot as possible, they were not taken *in the same posture*, the artist in the one case standing, in the other sitting at his work. It is just that difference and no more, which may be detected; and ought not to have escaped an artist's eye in comparing the views. It is especially remarkable in the direction of the joints between the ranges of massive stones, on the left of the gallery, viewed with reference to the small window in the distance. The line of sight is clearly lower in Mr Tipping's than in Dr Pierotti's view.

In proceeding to compare figure No. 2, in the same Plate xxv., with the corresponding view from Mr Tipping's pencil, the same divergence of the perspective lines is even more evident. It is owing probably to the same cause, though it may of course be that while in one the perspective is correct, it is wrong in the other. But, in any case,

a clever amateur artist for this and several other points of contrast, which, however, I have carefully tested myself. They are even more obvious in Dr Pierotti's original sketch.

it proves all that I use it to establish : viz., that one is not a copy of the other.

The differences of the monolithic (?) column and its capital in the two drawings have already been pointed out in Mr Grove's language. Nothing can be more striking. But I suppose that, according to the process of cross reasoning to which Dr Pierotti has been so often subjected, this not only proves but aggravates his offence. Yet his own account of the matter is simple enough and satisfactorily accounts for the differences. He had himself, it seems, scraped the plaister off the pillar and otherwise renovated it, and in that state he drew it. Since that, the churchwardens of the Mosk—their existence is proved by the fact—have “renovated it with whitewash;” though not by Dr Pierotti's directions; and in this state it was drawn by Mr St John Tyrwhitt in March 1862, and, about the same time, or still more recently, by the Count de Vogüé [Plate IV. of *Le Temple de Jérusalem*], whose drawing of this column much more closely resembles Dr Pierotti's than Mr Tipping's;—a proof I suppose, according to the new logic, that he too copied the latter! It is curious that Dr Pierotti's assailants should find such difficulty in grasping so palpable a truism as the first axiom of Euclid, that “things which are equal to the same are equal to one another,” or should refuse to apply it to lines and curves and geometrical figures. They even reverse it when it suits their purpose; and read—“things that are unlike the same are identical with one another”!

## V. CONCLUSION.

I believe now that I have gone through all the charges of the triumvirate of assailants, except one or two trumpery, captious objections, which will be found more than sufficiently answered in Dr Pierotti's own letter in the

Appendix<sup>1</sup>. It has, no doubt, been a very irksome task; but it has produced one good effect upon myself. It has convinced me more fully than I was before aware, not only how very frivolous, but how extremely ungenerous or even malevolent, this attack upon Dr Pierotti has been. I will not trust myself to enlarge upon this; for I am on the charmed ground of Jerusalem topography, the dangers of which to controversialists I indicated at the outset, by way of a remembrancer to myself: and I fear too that, if I were to denounce the treatment he has met with as it deserves, I should scarcely confine myself to "parliamentary language," and might possibly incur even a worse penalty than a Vice-Chancellor's Injunction.

I conclude with a brief recapitulation of the case, as it appears on the evidence which I have now laid before you, and shall be quite content that your verdict should modify or correct any expressions which may appear too partial to Dr Pierotti, as I am not ashamed to own to a strong bias in his favour.

I. I apprehend then (1) that the original charge against Dr Pierotti of having appropriated Mr Arundale's Section of the Dome of the Rock, falls to the ground before the decisive proof of originality contained in his note-book which you have now seen; and a minute comparison of the two engravings reveals many points of difference which further establish their mutual independence; (2) that the Plan of the Haram esh-Sherif, which Dr Pierotti was charged with copying from Mr Catherwood's Survey, as published by the Admiralty, and (3) his two drawings of the Substructions of El-Aksa, supposed to be copied from Mr Tipping, have also been proved to be original and independent drawings, both by external and internal evidence.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Document, No. XI.

II. What he has really borrowed, are (1) some six or eight photographic illustrations from Mr Robertson and others, which were public property; but to which his name was put without his authority; (2) some details of tombs, contained in one plate, from three Plans of M. de Saulcy; (3) two Capitals from Mr Fergusson's Essay, which he actually had in his own collection.

One line in the Preface to explain Messrs Day's misinterpretation of his directions; one word of acknowledgment to M. de Saulcy and Mr Fergusson, was all that the most rigorous laws of literary etiquette demanded; and I deeply regret an omission which has given such advantage to his adversaries; but I cannot admit that the oversight very seriously affects either the literary value of *Jerusalem Explored*, or the moral character of its Author.

N.B. The Note-Book, Plans, and other documents referred to in this paper, were exhibited before the Society; and I shall be happy to exhibit them to any persons interested in the question.

G. W.

## APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS.

No. I.

MR FERGUSSON to Messrs BELL and DALDY.

20, LANGHAM PLACE,  
15th February, 1864.

*Messrs Bell and Daldy, Publishers, 186, Fleet Street.*

SIRS,

I have just seen a copy of Signor Pierotti's work on Jerusalem published by you, and find that in Plate XXVII. he has copied literally and without any acknowledgment the Section of the Dome of the Rock engraved for my work on the *Topography of Jerusalem*, from a drawing by Messrs. Catherwood and Arundale.

As I was perfectly well aware that Signor Pierotti could not draw himself, I was prepared to find that his work should be made up of waifs and strays of other men's labours, and I do not know that I would have objected to being put under contribution, as I have in this and other Plates of his work, had the loan been duly acknowledged. But what I do most distinctly object to is, that Signor Pierotti has taken the unwarrantable liberty of altering the Plate he was copying in order to suit his own views, and this to an extent wholly unjustifiable.

The Section in question was made with the utmost care by Messrs. Catherwood and Arundale, who had access to the building to an extent which neither Signor Pierotti nor any other European ever had. They were allowed to erect scaffolding and place ladders wherever they pleased, and measured and drew every detail with the most minute and painstaking accuracy, as their original drawings in my possession amply testify.

Both these gentlemen were most accomplished draftsmen, and their published works illustrating buildings in both hemispheres, have since that time stood the test of being compared with photographs without failing in a single instance however

minute, and no one has ever called in question their accuracy or truthfulness till this instance.

On the other hand, Signor Pierotti probably never made a measurement in the building, and his want of ability to make such a Section is amply illustrated by some of the drawings you have published for him, and which to say the least of them are worse than any drawings of their class which have been published in England for many a long day.

Notwithstanding this, Signor Pierotti has not hesitated, without saying one word about it, to alter all the Arches in Mr Arundale's drawing into acutely pointed Arches, *which they are not*. The extent to which they are pointed is clearly stated by Mr Arundale in his letter published page 112 of my Work, and the Section as published by me is a true and faithful representation of the building in question. Besides the truthfulness of the original draftsmen, there are ample means of proving this if necessary.

Under these circumstances, I feel that I should be wanting in respect to the memory of my late friends, if I did not insist that Signor Pierotti should acknowledge, in the first instance, that the Section in question was copied from the drawing of Messrs. Catherwood and Arundale, and secondly, that he was not justified in making the alterations he has done.

I request therefore that you will procure me this acknowledgment in a form that I may publish. If this is not forthcoming very shortly, I shall be obliged to apply to the Court of Chancery for an Injunction to restrain you from publishing what is an infringement of my Copyright, and a libel on the memory of two honourable men; or if I fail there, I must appeal for justice to the public, and if forced to this, I shall have a great deal to say about other Plates in the work, which have been appropriated with as little regard to fair dealing as has been the case with Plate xxvii.

I am, Sirs,

Your obedient Servant,

JAS. FERGUSSON.

P.S. In reply to your note of the 12th instant, I can only say that I have not the smallest possible recollection of having ever authorized Signor Pierotti, or any one else, to put down my name as a subscriber, and do not believe I ever did so. After I had seen his drawings at Cambridge, I saw what sort of thing his work was to be. I never had the smallest intention of becoming a purchaser.



## No. II.

Mr FERGUSSON to Messrs BELL and DALDY.

20, LANGHAM PLACE,

*Feb.* 22, 1864.

SIRS,

Unless I hear from you in the course of to-day or to-morrow in reply to my letter of the 15th instant, I shall assume that you do not find it convenient to meet its allegations, and shall act accordingly. Remaining meanwhile,

Your obedient Servant,

JAS. FERGUSSON.

This letter was crossed by the following.

## Nó. III.

Messrs BELL and DALDY to Mr FERGUSSON.

186, FLEET STREET,

*Feb.* 22, 1864.

SIR,

Your letter of the 15th instant has been submitted to Sig. Pierotti, and in reply to your charge that Plate xxvii. in his work has been "copied literally and without acknowledgement from the Section of the Dome of the Rock engraved for your work on the Topography of Jerusalem from a drawing by Messrs Catherwood and Arundale," we are authorized by the Signor to inform you that he himself made the measurements and drawings in the Mosque of Omar upon which his Section is founded, and constructed his Section years before he knew of the existence of your book. These original measurements and drawings are now in his hands, and will be produced at our counting-house to you for your satisfaction if you desire it, on receiving two days' notice.

Under these circumstances Signor Pierotti cannot comply with your request, and acknowledge that the Section in question was copied from the drawing of Messrs Catherwood and Arundale.

We remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

BELL &amp; DALDY.

## No. IV.

Mr FERGUSSON to Messrs BELL and DALDY.

20, LANGHAM PLACE,  
29th February, 1864.

*Messrs. Bell and Daldy, 186, Fleet Street.*

DEAR SIRS,

Having called at your office on Friday last to inspect the drawings of Signor Pierotti, which you proposed in your letter of the 22nd inst. to submit to me, and having carefully examined them, I now beg leave to reiterate more emphatically than before, that the section of the Dome of the Rock published by you in Plate XXVII. of his "Jerusalem Explored," is a literal copy from my plate, and to express my astonishment that any one should venture to dispute so self-evident a fact.

Before proceeding to state my reasons for this conclusion, allow me to premise that I have no complaint to make personally against your conduct towards me; you have met me fairly and openly, and submitted to me the data as you received them from Signor Pierotti, and I have no reason to doubt but that you considered them as genuine and authentic; but this does not alter the fact that you may have been deceived, nor relieve you from the consequences of your infringement of my copyright.

First, then, the two Sections are absolutely identical in every detail and every relative proportion. It is true Pierotti's has been slightly shrunk in the process of copying, and the scale is so carelessly applied as to make the dimensions of the octagon 177 feet, whereas the true width is 166, and there is of course the alteration of the round arches into pointed, which I am prepared to prove is unjustifiable.

I am, as you are aware, tolerably familiar with the history of architectural drawings, and I assert unhesitatingly that there is no published instance of any two draftsmen acting independently ever producing two sections of the same building so exactly similar as these two, even supposing they had the same opportunities and the same skill.

With regard to opportunities, you are perhaps not aware that Messrs Catherwood and Arundale were allowed—on the plea of repairing the Mosque for the Egyptian government—to erect

scaffolding in the interior and to place ladders wherever they pleased; they consequently were able to apply the foot rule and measuring tape to every part and every detail. Signor Pierotti, on the other hand, never put up a ladder in the interior, and does not pretend to have done so. He admits (page 86) that he is dependent for his information regarding the interior on De Vogüé who never saw it, and who, like Pierotti, derived his knowledge of it wholly from my works.

With regard to skill, as I said before in my letter of the 15th inst., Catherwood and Arundale were both accomplished draftsmen. I have seen Pierotti's drawings, and can only characterize them as childish. None of his were produced on Friday, but there are some six plates in the collection of 63 you have published in his name, which are either wholly or in great part his. I allude to plates 24, 34, 35, 39, 46, and 63. Those, though very much improved by the lithographer since I saw the originals, are worse than any specimens of their class which I am acquainted with, and as inferior to the section of the Mosque in skill and exactness as it is possible they could be.

I make these assertions the more confidently, because shortly after Pierotti's arrival in this country the Rev. George Williams invited me to Cambridge to see his drawings. He was then living with Mr Williams, and in his rooms I was shewn what I was told were all the drawings he had brought home. Among these was a section of the Dome of the Rock—the building in question. It was so unlike the building in form and scale, and the details were so badly drawn, that familiar as I was with Arundale's drawing, I would not have recognized it as representing the same building, if I had [not] been told it was so. It was in fact such a drawing as a school-boy with an architectural turn draws at the end of his copy-book, and gets his ears boxed for his pains. That drawing was not produced on Friday, but I challenge its production. Many have seen it besides myself, and its publication would settle the question at once.

Having seen this, I was not the least surprised when Pierotti called on me one day in Langham Place, and asked my permission to copy the section of the Mosque from my work. I had seen enough of him to be on my guard, and answered that if he would write me a letter stating exactly what he wanted, I would give him a written answer and there would then be no mistake. The result has proved that my suspicions were not unfounded, though the precautions I proposed taking have not been sufficient to guard my property from misappropriation.

With regard to the drawings of the details of the Mosque, which in conformity with the promise contained in your letter

of the 22nd inst. you submitted to me on Friday last, I admit that they were in a book which Pierotti may have used at Jerusalem; but as three-fourths of its leaves were carefully sealed up, there were no certain means of ascertaining this. But I assert unhesitatingly that these details were not drawn by Pierotti at all. They were exquisitely pencilled by a most accomplished architectural draftsman; better in this respect than even Arundale, and I do not know half-a-dozen men in England who could do them as well. Except the iron grille, of which I know nothing, there was not one of them that was not in my Section, but there is a great deal in my Section that was not there, and there was nothing that a clever draftsman might not in a morning make up from the Section in question. The presumption is that they were drawn within the last fortnight after the receipt of my letter of the 15th, but this is immaterial.

Among other proofs of this assertion, I refer you to the drawing of the Capital of the pillar in the Mosque engraved by Pierotti in his plate 29, fig. 2a. This was pencilled in by the same hand which drew the other details in the book. Yet on referring to the drawing from which it was engraved, it was found—and I think you admitted—that it was a tracing from the drawing, page 104 of my book, and there is not a shadow of a doubt but that it is so. But besides this, I am sufficiently familiar with Pierotti's work and with the art of drawing in general, to be able to assert most unhesitatingly that the pencillings were not done by him.

As I hinted in my last letter, that there were other drawings in the same predicament as the section, and you challenged me to point them out, I will name the plan of the Haram Area, Plate XI. of Pierotti's work. I assert that it is a reduction of a plan which I constructed from Catherwood's original documents in my possession, with the assistance of Mr Croucher. That plan was afterwards engraved by the Admiralty, and a copy of it left by Captain Washington with Pierotti at Jerusalem in 1860. When I held up Pierotti's "own plan" at Cambridge against the light with my own, they were found to be as identical as the section of the Mosque.

But besides this, I may mention that about the north-west angle Catherwood's details failed us, and I finished it, with some other parts, according to the best of my ability. I am quite open to any compliment as to my knowledge of Jerusalem, but I do not pretend to measure details at that distance; but all my suggestions re-appear in Pierotti's plan. More than this, the Admiralty engraver has made a horrid mistake in the south wall, not in my original. The mistake appears in Pierotti's. Yet this Plan he puts forward as entirely his own,

though it differs in many essential particulars from that engraved by him on his own Plates II. and III.

What are mainly his are the underground water-courses, though even most of these appear on a plan of Dr Barclay's, which came into my possession in 1858. These having been protracted on a perfectly correct plan may be near enough truth to be reasoned upon. I hope they are so, for they confirm my views of the site of the Temple and of the Holy Places in a manner most satisfactory and conclusive, and I may add that I hail such discoveries as he has really made with enthusiasm and delight. They are all that was wanted to complete the cycle of proof of my views in this matter.

Of course it is not my business to reclaim for Messrs Robertson and Beato, Mr James Graham and others, the copyright in their photographs, which Pierotti has appropriated with as little ceremony as he has my plates; nor to point out, in this letter at least, those plates which he has literally copied from the works of De Sauley, De Vogüé, Mr Tipping and others. You will I presume hear from these gentlemen on the subject. All I can say is, that when every one claims his own, our Jackdaw will be left with very few of the fine feathers with which he has attempted to parade himself before an admiring public.

In conclusion then I repeat, for the reasons above given, and for as many more which I could give if these are not sufficient, that the section of the Dome of the Rock engraved on Plate xxvii. of Pierotti's work is a literal copy of my Plate 1, and consequently an infringement of my copyright; and I insist that Pierotti shall acknowledge it to be so and apologise for taking it, as well as for altering the arches. If he does not do this, and immediately, I shall take such steps as I may consider most expedient to vindicate my rights.

Awaiting an early reply, I remain,

Dear Sirs,

Your obedient Servant,

JAS. FERGUSSON.

No. Va.

Mr FERGUSSON to Messrs BELL and DALDY.

LANGHAM PLACE,

*March 7, 1864.*

DEAR SIRs,

Unless I hear from you within the next twenty-four hours in reply to my letter of the 29th ult., I shall presume you have no answer to give, and shall act accordingly.

Yours,

JAS. FERGUSSON.

No. Vb.

Messrs BELL and DALDY to Mr FERGUSSON.

186, FLEET STREET,

*March 7, 1864.*

DEAR SIR,

We wait for Signor Pierotti's reply respecting your last letter. We expect it to-morrow.

Yours truly,

BELL &amp; DALDY.

No. Vc.

Messrs BELL and DALDY to Mr FERGUSSON.

186, FLEET STREET,

*March 8th, 1864.*

SIR,

We are instructed by Signor Pierotti to say that he declines to reply to the calumnies which you have written against him in your letter of the 29th, and that he has placed both your letters in the hands of his Solicitor for his advice.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

BELL &amp; DALDY.

## No. VI.

M. TURPIN to Messrs BELL and DALDY.

EDWARD STREET, PORTMAN SQUARE,  
March, 1864.

SIRS,

I hereby declare that when I first became acquainted with Signor Pierotti, in June 1862, and was engaged by that gentleman as a draughtsman, all the drawings I had to copy were all Dr Pierotti's originals, and I am positively as certain that they were drawn by himself; and having in hand to day Mr Fergusson's print and Dr Pierotti's, I am ready to point out all the differences between those two prints.

As for the whole height, it is the same on both sides, but as for the width there are many differences which are as follows.

		Feet.		Feet.
From O to P	Dr Pierotti	198,	Mr Fergusson	186.
“ Q to R	“	86,	“	82.
“ S to T	“	25,	“	24.
“ U to V	“	41,	“	40.

And now in the interior of the Dome there is not a measure alike, and the ornamentations are almost similar; in the ornament E there is something different in the flowers and in the kind of vases, which in Signor Pierotti's drawings have no handles, which exist in Mr Fergusson's.

Signor Pierotti's ornamented windows in E and arches in T are ogive and in Mr Fergusson's they are half circle.

The form in the roof differs, and Mr Fergusson committed certainly an error in shewing the roof-work one inch thicker than it is according to Dr Pierotti's.

There are no steps underneath the vault in Dr Pierotti's, and they exist in Mr Fergusson's.

Now, Sirs, I have explained to you what I know, and am ready to swear that I never used any other drawings but Dr Pierotti's.

I am, Sirs,

Your obedient Servant,

C. TURPIN.

## No. VII.

Mr GROVE to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—In examining the elaborate and handsome work of Signor Pierotti, *Jerusalem Explored*, I have been struck with several things which appear to me to require explanation from the author, and which I take the opportunity of bringing to his notice through the medium of your columns, since, unless they are cleared up, they cannot fail to throw an air of discredit over the entire work.

1. The View of the Golden Gate, Plate XVIII., though it bears at its foot the words “E. Pierotti photo. & delt.,” is obviously lithographed from the photograph in the set taken by Robertson and Beato in 1856, and published by Gambart. Not only is the point of view exactly the same, but Mr Pierotti’s lithograph contains the same three identical figures with Mr Robertson’s photograph, in the same identical positions.

2. The same may be said of Plate XXII., “Wailing Place of the Jews,” which is taken, figure and all, from a photograph by Mr Graham (No. 45), now on view in his collection at the Crystal Palace. This plate also bears the words “E. Pierotti photo. & delt.”

3. Plate xxv., fig. 1, “Underground Works of the Mosque El Aksa,” is obviously copied from the plate of Mr Tipping, “Vaulted Passage beneath the Aksa,” in *Traill’s Josephus*, p. xxiii. But the draughtsman, in transferring the view to stone, has made the curious mistake of substituting a vertical wall, in the foreground above the arch, for what in the original is a mere enlargement of the vault. A glance at Mr Pierotti’s own section (Plate XXIV.) will show that a vertical wall is impossible at this place, as impossible as the flood of sunlight which the draughtsman has introduced in the foreground of the view.

4. Fig. 2 of Plate xxv. is again copied from Mr Tipping’s print in the same work (p. xiv.), “Vaulted Hall beneath the Aksa;” only the large column, which, in Mr Tipping’s print, shows all the marks of venerable age which we should expect from its ancient date and from Mr. Tipping’s well-known minute accuracy, in Signor Pierotti’s plate appears perfectly renovated, shaft and capital, without a flaw or a blemish. The “bevilled” stones in the right-hand corner are intelligible in



Mr Tipping's print; in Pierotti's the lights and shadows are exactly reversed. Before leaving these I may remark that the section on Plate xxiv. is inconsistent with fig. 2, Plate xxv., since in the former the waggon-vaulting runs through to the outside wall (on the left) while the view shows that the last two bays are domed. The upper part of this section further shows a double range of clerestory windows in the west wall. None such exist there, and none are shown in the view of the Mosque, Plate xxi.

5. It is impossible to doubt that fig. 1, Plate xxvii., is taken from the section in Mr Fergusson's *Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem*, p. 104. Above the ground-line the two are identical, except that the arches in Mr Fergusson's are round and in Mr Pierotti's pointed, and the agreement in such a mass of small ornamentation appears to me too minute to be the result of coincidence; yet this plate bears the words, "E. Pierotti, mest. & delt."

6. In another case, Plate xxix., fig. 2, Mr Pierotti's example is a facsimile in every respect (size included) of Mr Fergusson's woodcut on page 104. No one who compares the two (witness the unfinished tree-ornament on the frieze next the capital, or the soffit of the modillion at the top) can hesitate to pronounce the one a tracing of the other.

7. The capital, Plate xxiv. B, is also curiously identical in size and every other respect with that given at page 109 of Fergusson; and yet this plate also purports to be both measured and drawn by Mr Pierotti.

8. The details of the (so-called) Tombs of Absalom and Zacharias, Plate lxi., figs. 1, 2, 3, and 5, are identical in size and other respects with those in the 4th. "Atlas" of plates which accompanies De Sauley's *Voyage*—viz., in Plates xxxviii., xl., and xlii. thereof. In one case only (the upper portion of the Tomb of Absalom) the drawing has been reversed to suit the lower portion. Plate lxi., again, like those already noticed, bears the words, "E. Pierotti, delt."

9. Plate xi., Plan of the Haram esh-Sherif, purports, as before, to be both measured and drawn by the author; but on examining the south wall, I find that it contains a bend inwards which does not really exist there, but is due to an error which I will endeavour to explain. In the year 1856 Mr Fergusson and I employed an engineering draughtsman (Mr J. S. Croucher, now practising in London) to make a plan of the Haram area from the measured and figured sketches of Messrs Catherwood and Arundale, which Mr Fergusson had acquired from Mr Catherwood, jun. The plan was made to a scale of 40 feet to an inch, and is still in the possession of Mr Fergusson. When it was finished, Captain Washington, the late Hydrographer of

the Admiralty, asked permission to have it lithographed, which we readily granted. In lithographing it the south wall was by some means distorted; and it is a curious fact that this distortion is exactly followed in Signor Pierotti's plate.

It is also curious to observe that the few buildings adjacent to the west wall, which in the Admiralty plan are given in detail, are given in detail by Pierotti; while all the other crowded habitations in the same neighbourhood are left without indication. The inference seems inevitable that to a great extent Plate XI. is a mere reduction of the Admiralty plan.

10. There is a discrepancy between Plate XI. and Plate III. in the direction of the "Bazaar of the Haram" (Plate XI., 59), and the "Ancient Bridge." In Plate III. they both leave the wall at an oblique angle, sloping towards the south. In Plate XI. this is altered as far as the Bazaar is concerned, and it is drawn at right angles to the wall, as in the Admiralty plan; but the "Ancient Bridge," which does not appear on the Admiralty plan, remains as it was.

Here I stop. I could enumerate several other things of the same kind, and I may possibly do so at a future time; but I have said enough now to show the existence of such inaccuracies, discrepancies, and plagiarisms, as must go far to destroy all confidence in the book and its author unless they can be satisfactorily explained. This, in justice to himself, to the numerous subscribers to a work of such costliness and pretension, and to all who are interested in the questions which form the subject of his book, I submit that Mr Pierotti is bound to do.

Your obedient servant,

G. GROVE.

SYDENHAM, *March 4.*

No. VIII.

Dr PIEROTTI to the TIMES.

CAMBRIDGE, *March 8, 1864.*

SIR,

I have this morning seen for the first time the letter of Mr Grove, published in your columns on Monday last, in which he requests me to explain certain difficulties in my work, entitled *Jerusalem Explored*. I am certainly in a position to comply with his request; but as I shall probably be forced to

vindicate the originality and accuracy of the drawings in this work in a manner more full and complete than would be admissible in your columns, I content myself at present with giving an emphatic denial to the insinuations and assertions of Mr Grove.

Your obedient Servant,

ERMETE PIEROTTI.

No. IX.

LADY STRANGFORD to Dr PIEROTTI.

58, CUMBERLAND STREET,  
March 7, 1864.

MY DEAR SIGNOR PIEROTTI,

It is very pleasant to me to answer your letter and all your questions, recalling as they do the happy days we spent in Jerusalem, where we owed so much to your companionship, and where your peculiar position afforded us so many facilities beyond those of ordinary travellers. Some time has now elapsed since we left Syria: but I do not think either my sister or myself have forgotten the smallest particular of what happened to us, and of what we saw and heard during the five months we spent there.

We were living, as you will remember, in the same house with you for the first two months of our stay—and, after watching your laborious studies for some time, it was with great delight that we examined again and again your books of sketches—of architectural detail and of various spots—in and about Jerusalem (also of Hebron, &c.).

We saw then some of the *innumerable* measurements, done with minute accuracy, of the whole of the Haram esch-Scherif and the Mosque of Omar. I cannot say that we ever *saw* you taking any measurements beyond very rough ones, as they were, I know, always done in the early morning—and although you took many, I know, while we were in Jerusalem, you had already measured the whole place long before we arrived there. If we had doubted your word, we could not have doubted both Sooraya Pasha (the Governor of Jerusalem) and M. de Barrère, the French Consul, who spoke so constantly of your indefatigable labours in these matters. With both these men you were as intimate as if they had been brothers or near relations: with the Scheik Dauef, the Scheik of the Mosque, I can vouch for the

freedom with which you talked to him, and for the respect and friendship he seemed to bear you. I remember well how we all joked together that last morning visit we paid to the Mosque, when we picked up some bits of mosaic, and he said we were welcome to anything for your sake, and that your friends would do no harm, and might come often, for that you had the run of the Mosque and measured and drew (all which he acted in imitation) and never did any harm to anything. And I know as well as I know anything how you used to enter the Mosque and the Haram at any hour of the day or night, whenever you pleased, without asking anyone's leave; and how much respect in every way all the soldiers, guards, and attendants at the gates and within the walls, used to pay you.

From the quantity I have seen I am sure the numbers of points and details that you have drawn with your own hand in Jerusalem must be enormous. I only wish that all those who have stolen from you had acknowledged the theft.

You were always most foolishly good-natured in showing your drawings and letting them be copied. You will remember how the great book of M. ———— arrived while we were there, and how vexed and angry M. de Barrère was, for your sake, at the number of drawings of details he had stolen from you with only a very slight acknowledgement in a foot note. I remember it well, as I had already myself with your permission, made tracings of all or most of the sketches he had taken, and of course I recognized them at once. I have these and some others still by me; their accuracy I used to test by taking the drawings on the spots—and you may remember correcting some little errors of indistinctness in my drawings both in the Mosque of the Ascension and in the Convent of S. Helena.

We had not been a week in Jerusalem before you kindly brought us your admirable plan of the whole Haram esch-Scherif to see, as well as the huge Plan of Jerusalem as it is. Of course I cannot trust my memory as to whether there are any slight differences between them and the reduced copies in your book—I do not believe that there are. I know that with five months' constant study of both (and I appeal to M. de Barrère and others as to how carefully and laboriously we did study them), we never could detect the slightest flaw in either.

But here I must interrupt myself, as I wish to state most distinctly this fact: that it was not until some time *after we* had used your plans and studied them that we lent you a copy of Mr Fergusson's book—and that up till that moment you had never heard of his existence or of his book, or of his opinions. It was not easy to make you understand his theory, so strange did it seem to one who only knew Jerusalem from its own

stones, and who had then, as I very well know, *read no books whatever on Jerusalem but his Italian Bible and Josephus.*

Mr Diness was employed *by you* and *paid by you* to make the photographs in your book and a vast number of others. Of course a very large number were taken from the very same spots as those taken by other persons. I remember asking you to take care that he should take some precisely similar to photographs lent to me by Mrs Finn—some of them, I know, were by Mr James Graham—but I do not remember which or by whom the others were done. We saw Diness photographing for you fifty times in the Haram and all about the place. I also asked you to have some photographs *copied* by Diness—as, unless a photograph is registered, any one has a perfect right to do so, and to make use of it as they please.

Your large “Album” was a collection of sketches in and about Jerusalem. I do not call you much of an artist, but your architectural drawings are *good*: by which I mean that if they are not pretty, they are quite accurate.

I know that you paid a good deal of money to those who helped you in messages, in actual examinations, in measurements, &c. &c. and in baksheesh of all kinds. I know that you were on this account frequently in difficulty, financially. And I know too, that although your good friend Sooraya Pasha engaged to pay you very fair sums for the work you executed for him, you got more promises than piastres; and that when M. de Barrère remonstrated again and again with the Pasha upon his not paying you, the Pasha used to say he really was so hard up himself that he could not: and if M. de Barrère had not occasionally assisted you a little, I do not know how you would have lived. And this was always a source of anxiety to us, especially when we saw your ceaseless, untiring activity, and the amount of work you got through, often and often when the pain of your wounds, and the illnesses consequent on them, rendered you totally unfit for work.

With every good wish for your success and health,

I remain,

Yours very truly,

EMILY A. STRANGFORD.

P.S. I have read my Sister's letter, and rather than make a repetition of her statements, in which I fully concur, I desire to subscribe my name to them also.

ROSA E. BEAUFORT.

## No. X.

MRS FINN to LADY STRANGFORD.

LONDON, *March 8, 1864.*

MY DEAR LADY STRANGFORD,

You will I know be interested in the following little histories which will help to explain the difficulty as to the Plates in Signor Pierotti's Jerusalem Explored. I perceive that in the *Times* and elsewhere exception is taken to that work, on the grounds that some of the Plates are the same as Photographs taken by Mr James Graham and Mr Robertson.

Immediately in glancing at Signor Pierotti's plates the similarity of some of them to Mr James Graham's struck me, and having lived in Jerusalem during the time that all the Pictures in question were taken, I was able to account for the fact by circumstances which came to my own knowledge.

In the early days of Photography, the Rev. G. Bridges being in Jerusalem, instructed me in the mysteries of what was then Talbot-type. I possess some of his views taken in 1849, 1850.

My friend Miss Sterry sent me a complete Photographic Apparatus, in the hope that by either producing pictures myself, or teaching others to do so, we might contribute to the relief of poor Jews in Jerusalem.

This was mentioned to Mr James Graham when he was on his way to Jerusalem in 1853, and was, I believe one reason which determined him to acquire the Photographic Art. I am now staying with the very friends who mentioned that matter to Mr Graham.

Ill health, and a variety of other work prevented me from pursuing Photography myself, but I was deeply interested in the work of Mr James Graham (part of whose unrivalled collection may now be seen at the Crystal Palace) and in the generous manner in which that friend turned his beautiful art to account in many ways, for the relief of distress among the Jewish poor of Jerusalem.

In course of time Mr Graham instructed Mr Mendel J. Diness (a Hebrew Christian) in the art, believing that it would enable him to maintain his family in Jerusalem.

While taking his own Photographs, Mr Graham had Mr Diness frequently with him, and the likeness of Mr Diness occurs in Mr Graham's "Wailing Place." It also occurs in the same view taken by Mr Diness, which appears in Signor Pierotti's work.

Mr Diness afterwards was in the habit of taking views from the points so admirably selected by Mr Graham and to which he had directed his pupil's attention.

It at once occurred to me on seeing Signor Pierotti's Plates that they were from the Photographs of Mr Diness, and hence the identity with Mr Graham's.

Another little history may explain how some of those Plates being from Mr Diness's Photographs come to be identical with those taken by Mr Robertson, who came to Jerusalem after the Crimean war.

Mr Diness knew the interest I took in his work and success. His first instrument was the one sent me by Miss Sterry, which Mr Graham had bought for him from me.

Mr Diness came to me one day (some time after Mr Graham had left Jerusalem) in grief and trouble, and told me that his means of livelihood by sale of Photographs, had been most seriously injured; that Mr Robertson had consigned quantities of views identical with his own, to Mr Bergheim for sale; that Mr Bergheim being a banker, and a near relation of both the hotel-keepers (Hauser and Rosenthal) could always obtain the first access to travellers, for sale of Photographs; that he could not compete with this, and being thereby prevented from supporting his family as before, must leave Jerusalem; that he felt the more grieved because when Mr Robertson came to Jerusalem he had become acquainted with him (Mr Diness) as a Photographer; that Mr Robertson had sought his aid, and that Mr Diness had given it, taking him to all his own best points of view (and at the right time of day, &c.) on the *express* promise that none of Mr Robertson's Photographs should be sent to Jerusalem for sale.

This was the account given me by Mr Diness, who afterwards left Jerusalem in search of maintenance and education for his children. I think that some of Signor Pierotti's Plates may therefore be identical with some Photographs, not only of Mr Graham, but with some of Mr Robertson's, but that Mr Robertson's were not taken first, nor the originals of Signor Pierotti's Plates.

I may also say, that before leaving Jerusalem Mr Diness gave me (in 1860) six stereoscopic views taken by him in the interior of the Haram esh-Sherif, in one of which occurs the portrait of Signor Pierotti. These were taken while Signor Pierotti was engaged in his survey of the Sacred Enclosure.

I remain, my dear Lady Strangford,

Ever yours,

ELIZABETH ANNE FINN.

## No. XI.

Dr PIEROTTI to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—As no legal action has yet been taken, and as it is injurious to me to remain longer under the imputations which have been made against me by Mr Grove in the letter which appeared in your columns on the 7th inst., I propose to answer that part of it which does not touch upon questions that are likely to be raised in a court of law. In these questions I am instructed to reserve my full defence for the present, but I undertake to give it hereafter, with your permission, in your columns, if my dispute with Mr Fergusson is not settled before a legal tribunal.

Mr Grove's letter resolves itself into a general charge that I have taken the measurements, drawings, and photographs of other persons, and have appropriated without acknowledgement the credit of their labours; that I have put the words "Pierotti menst.," "delint." and "photograph." when I had not made these measurements, drawings, or photographs myself.

My reply is that I did make the measurements and drawings myself, and that I did not direct the inscription which now appears upon the photographic views; that I did not know, and do not now know, that I was wrong in accepting the inscription which was placed upon them by the lithographer. Messrs Day and Son inquired of me what inscription should be placed upon them. I told them that the photographs were not taken by me, but were my property, and they must put such an inscription as would give the right idea. They put the inscription which is now there, and it appears to be the usual practice where the artist is employed to make the photographs, and does not stipulate that his name should be given.

With reference to charges 1 and 2 it has been universally known to my friends that my photographs were taken for me by Mr Diness with the right of publication; and I can affirm that in no instance have I given a representation of a photographic object or view of which I have not had a photograph made for my own use, or presented to me, or that is not common property.

In reproducing these, I have in some cases put into the hands of the artist drawings of details of my own, where I wished to bring out architectural features, and Mr Robertson's



photographs, where I considered them clearer than my own. It is open to me as well as to any one else to use them thus, and they have been previously used in like manner elsewhere.

In the "Jews' Wailing Place," I have always believed, and still believe, that the figure is my own, and it has been recognized frequently as mine by my friends. When it was taken I accompanied Mr Diness, and we fixed upon the point of view, and I stationed myself against the wall in the attitude represented in the plate, and in a few days Mr Diness sent me the copies I required.

The third charge is, that I have copied Mr Tipping's plate of the underground works of the Mosque El Aska. I reply that there are three witnesses now living who saw me make the drawing on the spot. Their names and addresses are forthcoming if needful, and the drawings were seen by many persons on my arrival in England, before I had seen Mr Tipping's views. Mr Grove points out that the wall is made vertical, instead of vaulted. This is an error on the part of the lithographer, who indicates broadly what I had left obscure. He also remarks that there is a flood of light which is impossible. I reply that there is a doorway through which abundance of light may be admitted when the door is opened.

The fourth charge is that I have copied another view of Mr Tipping's, but that, instead of giving the column and capital with all the marks of venerable age, I have represented it as perfectly renovated. My reply is, that though I profess to be a skilful draughtsman of plans and architectural details, I do not profess to be skilful in picturesque drawing, and that my object was to give a restoration of the capital, which had not before, to my knowledge, been figured correctly in detail. Mr Grove is not aware that I was permitted by the Pasha to direct the cleaning of this monolith, and I was thus enabled to make out with something like precision the character of the details. It was afterwards "renovated" by whitewash, though not by my directions.

In making the stones rusticated [panelled] instead of bevelled the lithographic artist has misunderstood my drawing.

Mr Grove also states that in Plate xxiv. I represent a double row of windows, which do not appear in the exterior view. He is again mistaken; one of these is a row of interior openings; the other a blind arcade, as described in page 80 of my book, and of course they do not appear in the exterior view.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh charges refer to plates said by Mr Grove to be copied from Mr Fergusson's. These are the points upon which, for the reasons above mentioned, I am advised to reserve my full reply; I content myself for the

present by stating that I had frequent access to the Mosque of Omar; that I had ample opportunities and means of taking measurements and drawing details, that I had the use of scaffolding which had been erected for repairs, and free use of ladders; and that my original plans and drawings were made long before I knew of the existence of Mr Fergusson's work, and are ready to be produced, with abundant evidence in support of my assertion, when the right time arrives.

Lest it be made a charge against me, I may as well say that there is an error in the printed description of Plate xxiv., which I have only just discovered. The capital B was not found by me; only A and C.

The eighth charge is that I have copied the details of the Tomb of Absalom from M. de Saulcy's book. My description (page 180 of my book) shows that I have examined it minutely. I have been on the top of it, and have had a thousand opportunities of taking the profile of it. Moreover, my drawings were all submitted to M. de Saulcy in 1861, and to his friendly offices I am indebted for permission to dedicate my work to the Emperor of the French.

The ninth charge is that I have copied the plan of the Haram es-Sherif constructed by Mr Fergusson, Mr Grove, and Mr Croucher from measurements made by Messrs Arundale and Catherwood, and it is cited as a proof of this that I have copied an error made by the engraver, who has distorted the south wall, and that this distortion is exactly reproduced in my plan. I reply that Mr Grove is again mistaken. The error in the Admiralty plan is a very grave one. Though the south wall in my plan is not a right line, it is not a distortion like that in the Admiralty plan, and I have represented it as it really is. I have tested this by using the plumb line from above, and I account for it in a manner which tells against the theories of Mr Fergusson. This wall has been rebuilt and repaired in the various epochs of Herod, Justinian, the Saracens, and the Crusaders, and, moreover, it has been shaken by an earthquake. The foundations are of the time of Solomon, and are in a right line, but not the walls above, more especially behind the constructions of the Mosque El Aksa and the buildings running towards the east. That the wall has been rebuilt is proved by history, by the material, and by the fact that an inscription is built into the wall upside down, as described in page 69 of my book.

Mr Grove remarks that the few buildings which appear in the Admiralty plan appear also in mine. My reply is that I measured them, and give them correctly, and they differ in some respects from those in the Admiralty plan. Mine appear also in my plan of Jerusalem, constructed in 1857, and pub-

lished in 1859. If Mr Grove will examine the two plans carefully, he will see that mine differs in the angles, in dimensions, and in several other particulars.

The tenth charge is that there is a difference between the angle of the bazaar as figured in the plan of the Haram (Plate XI.) and the plan of the city (Plate III.). I am aware of this. My original plan of the city was constructed in 1857, when I had not had the opportunity of entering the houses in the neighbourhood of the bazaar, so as to take the angles, and in reducing my large plan the discrepancy was perpetuated. The angle at which I have placed the bazaar is not, however, a right angle, as in the Admiralty plan, and I am sure that mine is correct.

The ancient bridge is in its proper direction, the road indicated by Mr Fergusson is not.

I may add that in October, 1860, Captain Washington, of the Admiralty, was in Jerusalem, and hearing, I presume, that I knew something about the Temple area, he asked me to examine the Admiralty plan and to point out any errors that I could discover in it. I had it in my possession for one night, and made such corrections as I could in the limited time, and returned it to him the next morning.

Though I cannot thank Mr Grove for the feeling which has prompted his letter, I thank him for the opportunity which he has afforded me of showing that I have done some real work in examining the localities and antiquities of Jerusalem, and that I have not gathered my knowledge merely from books or from hearsay, or at a distance from the spot, but that I have worked patiently and energetically at the cost of health and substance, with but little hope of reward; but I shall be amply repaid if a British public will attach to the facts and statements in my work the importance which I conscientiously believe they deserve.

Your obedient servant,

ERMETE PIEROTTI.

LONDON, *March 18.*

No. XII.

Messrs DAY and SON to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—We see that Signor Pierotti mentions our name in his letter of to-day with reference to the name attached to the views in his book.

We have turned to the instructions given to us by Signor Pierotti.

In a letter dated the 19th of June, 1863, we find his instructions in French, which we read thus:—"Under the views taken by photography you can put, 'Drawn from a photograph belonging to E. Pierotti.' If this is too long you can make it shorter; but try to express this idea. I did not take the views myself, nor am I a photographer, but the views belong to me. With this information you can arrange the matter yourselves."

We adopted the inscription which is used, under the above instructions.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

DAY & SON.

6, GATE-STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN-FIELDS, *March 22.*

### No. XIII.

Mr FERGUSSON to the *TIMES*.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—As Signor Pierotti reserves his defence against the principal charges contained in Mr Grove's letter, pending the legal proceedings which he assumes I am about to commence against him, allow me to assure him that he has nothing to fear from me in that respect.

When I first saw his work I wrote to the publishers demanding that Signor Pierotti should acknowledge what he had borrowed from me, and when, to my astonishment, he replied denying the loan altogether, I wrote back somewhat indignantly, and ending with a vague threat which might be interpreted as meaning legal proceedings or anything else.

Since then a more careful examination of his work, and hearing the opinions of others regarding it, have convinced me that it is not worth my while to trouble myself any further about the matter. There is nothing whatever in the work which can have any real bearing on any of the disputed points of the topography of Jerusalem. There is nothing, indeed, that is new or valuable, except some 13 pages devoted to the underground watercourse of the place, and these so absolutely confirm all I have ever written regarding the site of the Temple and of the Holy Places that I, at least, for one, have no desire to

throw stones at Signor Pierotti. In the meanwhile, however, by first copying my plates and then denying what is self-evident to every one who examines them, he has done himself infinitely more injury than the misappropriation can possibly do me harm.

If Signor Pierotti wishes it, the question between him and myself can very easily be settled without recourse to legal proceedings. I have in my possession the original sketches of Messrs Catherwood and Arundale, from which the Section which I assert he has copied in his Plate xxvii. was constructed, and the Capitals, Plates xxiv. B and xxix. A, were drawn. I have also Catherwood's original survey of the Haram Area, on a scale of 10 feet to 1 inch, from which the Admiralty plan was reduced, and which I also assert he has copied, in so far as the buildings above ground are concerned, in his Plate xi. These I am prepared to submit to the Council of the Institute of British Architects, or any other equally competent and impartial body of arbitrators that may be named, and to abide by their decision. Assertion and counter-assertion in the columns of a newspaper will hardly settle the points in dispute, because those who read have not generally the materials on which to form an independent opinion on such a question as this. This deficiency can easily be supplied by such a tribunal as I suggest; and if Signor Pierotti will only produce a drawing of his own which he showed to me in Mr Williams's rooms at Cambridge, and which he called a Section of the Mosque of Omar (the building in question), I will undertake to say it will not take the arbitrators five minutes to arrive at their decision.

I have not alluded to any of the other points raised in Mr Grove's letter, having no doubt but that he can establish all these and a great many more if he chooses. I have confined myself strictly to what concerns myself individually, and remain, yours, &c.,

JAS. FERGUSSON.

20, LANGHAM PLACE, *March 22.*

No. XIV.

MR GROVE to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—I have no reason to be dissatisfied with M. Pierotti's letter in your paper of to-day. With the exception of the clerestory windows in the Aksa (sec. 4 of my former letter),

he has confirmed, or granted by his silence, everything that I advanced. He omits all mention of Plate XVIII., in which the three identical figures occur. He admits that he has used Mr Robertson's photographs "where he considered them clearer than his own;" while at the same time he throws on Messrs Day and Son the responsibility of an inscription which purports to be what it is not. He admits that his plate of the underground works of the Aksa is erroneous; that the capital, B, on Plate XXIV. was not found by him, and that the discrepancies I pointed out between the plans on Plate III. and Plate XI. do exist. He virtually admits that I am right in my inference that the details of the so-called tombs of Absolom and St James are copied from De Sauley; for, although he states that he has examined the former minutely, and "had a thousand opportunities of taking the profile of it," he avoids affirming that the drawings in the book are his own, and not what I stated them to be—copies from De Sauley. The questions of the Section of the Dome of the Rock and of the Haram esh-Sherif I leave him to settle with Mr Fergusson, whose peculiar province he admits them to be.

On all the above matters I am sorry to say that I retain my former unfavourable opinion. Nay, more, my distrust has been considerably strengthened by a more minute study of the work. Not only do I still believe that Plates XVIII. and XXII. are copied from the photographs I named, but I find that no less than five other views (Plates VII., XV., XVI., XVII., and XX.) are identical, as far as the buildings go, with those of Robertson. The distances, vertical, horizontal, and diagonal (in any direction) are absolutely the same. The shadows fall at the same angle to a hair's breadth, the light strikes the same points and edges, the tufts of weeds do not vary in a leaf or a tendril. Any one can try this for himself by taking a pair of compasses in hand. To the accuracy of Messrs Day's lithographers this is a great tribute; but what does it say for the man who placed them in their hands as his own productions?

How can such similarities have occurred? That M. Pierotti should have chosen the same point of view to an inch as Mr Tipping did seventeen years before him to take the two views under the Aksa is startling; but that separate photographs of seven spots should be taken at a considerable interval of time in which not only should the camera be placed at exactly the same point, but the sun should be at precisely the same height, and the weeds have stopped their growth in the interval, would be a coincidence almost beyond the power of conception. In photography, if anywhere, it is true that *les choses ne se répètent pas*. But it is not necessary after M. Pierotti's admissions to say anything more on the subject of these photographs.

This question is of minor importance compared with the discrepancies and anomalies of the plates themselves. How is it that after all M. Pierotti's boasted opportunities of "making out with precision" the details of the capital of the monolith, he has given (on Plates xxv. and xxix.) two representations of it which differ essentially both in proportions and in the character of the sculpture? How is the discordance to be accounted for between the walls of the Haram on Plates II. and XI., in both form and dimensions—the latter amounting to as much as 70 ft. in one length? How are the astounding discordances between the plan of the Church of the Resurrection (xxxiv.), the section of the Sepulchre on the same plate, the view thereof on Plate xxxv., fig. 1, and the photographic views (xxxii. xxxiii.) to be explained? Take only one instance. The principal door of the church, which on the photograph (and in reality) is 10 ft. wide, is shown on the plan as 2; and the plan is full of anomalies of the same description, patent to every one who is accustomed to examine such documents. Is it to such a plan as this that M. Pierotti would point as a proof that he is a "skilful draughtsman of plans and architectural details"? I do not wish to be rude, but such drawings as this plan and as the little views on Plate xxxv. would disgrace a three months' pupil in any architect's office. How is the right-hand wall in Plate xxxviii. to be explained? The whole of the bottom is in the same plane, so is the whole of the top, and yet the portion nearest the spectator contains a large projection which would throw it completely forward.

I may appear to attach undue importance to the subject, but when a costly work is put forth, like the present one, as "a simple and strict record of facts" (Preface, p. ix.), and when its contents are held up *in terrorem* to previous investigators in the same field (*Ib.*, p. vii.), and when on examination the plates of this work turn out to be either copies of photographs and views which have been in our hands for years before, or, where original, so full of discordances and absurdities as to destroy all confidence in them, it is surely not unbecoming to challenge such pretensions.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

G. GROVE.

SYDENHAM, *March 22.*

P.S.—Since writing the foregoing I have seen Mr Fergusson's letter of the 22nd, and beg leave to express my entire concurrence in his proposal to lay the whole subject before the Council of the Institute of Architects, or some equally com-

petent referees. It is the only way in which so complex a question can be decided, and it is, moreover, the only course left open to M. Pierotti, or to his highly respectable publishers. In the meantime I have placed M. Pierotti's book, the photographs of Robertson and Graham, and the works of Tipping and De Saulcy in a room adjoining my office in the Crystal Palace, where they are open to the inspection of any one who will apply to me.

No. XV.

MR TYRWHITT to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—I am not personally acquainted with M. Pierotti, and have only looked rather hastily over the illustrations of his book. Besides this, I have only a popular knowledge of architecture, and have no right or intention whatever of interfering between him and Mr Grove.

But on one point I can speak in M. Pierotti's favour; and on that only my testimony is worth something. Not many travellers have seen, and very few have drawn, the monolith column in the vaults under El Aksa (Fig. 2, in M. Pierotti's xxvth Plate). I saw and drew it in March, 1862. It had then just been whitewashed, as he mentions in his letter of to-day. But, on looking at his lithograph and my sketch, I must say that I think his is a very good restoration, which could not have been made except from an original sketch on the spot.

Mr Grove, if I remember, disputes the originality of this illustration from the facts of there being—1. A vertical wall on the right, which he, rightly enough, says has no business there. No more it has, but there it was on the spot in 1862, and there it is in my sketch-book. 2. A "burst of light" behind the spectator shining into the subterranean passage. The light really does come in there pretty strongly. It was strong enough when I was there to draw accurately by in bad weather. Some stones may have probably been removed from the outside since Mr Tipping's drawings were made.

As I say, I venture to say so much on this point only because original sketches of the place are very rare.

M. Pierotti's character for ability, integrity, and great industry were very high at Jerusalem when I was there last, in



March, 1862; and his labours and discoveries were then and there thought of great importance by both French and English.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

R. ST JOHN TYRWHITT,

*Christ Church, Oxford.*

31, BEAUMONT STREET, OXFORD,  
*March 22.*

No. XVI.

Messrs BELL and DALDY to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—As publishers of the work *Jerusalem Explored*, will you allow us the space to say that Signor Pierotti has been summoned to Paris, where it is probable that he will be detained for some days?

His answer to Mr Fergusson's proposal must, therefore, be deferred until his return.

We are, Sir, yours obediently,

BELL & DALDY.

186, FLEET STREET,  
*March 23.*

No. XVII.

Mr TIPPING to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—Mr R. St John Tyrwhitt having chivalrously brought his recent *souvenirs* to the rescue of Mr Pierotti, stating that Pierotti is right and Tipping wrong, I am very reluctantly compelled to have recourse to your columns, for this crypt under the Aksa artistically belongs to me.

Mr Tyrwhitt will forgive my saying that he does not even understand Mr Grove's argument. The "straight-wall" is in figure 1 of Plate xxv. and not in figure 2. Before entering the lists with an antagonist of Mr Grove's calibre he must do more

than look over hastily the work in question. I assert that this vertical outside wall in light did not and does not exist.

The view is taken from the north end of a long vaulted passage, with the draughtsman's back to the door of access from the Haram enclosure. Twenty-three years ago, when this sketch was taken, it was a position of some peril, for I was there by stealth. I assert that Pierotti's draughtsman has misunderstood the vagueness of my plate taken from a drawing rapidly thrown in, and in the dark, and turned a vault into a vertical wall.

But in fig. 2 I find the crowning proof of the assistance which my plates in Traill's *Josephus* have had the honour of rendering to Signor Pierotti. On the top of the steps, between the monolith and the pilaster dividing the two vaulted passages, the lithographer has chalked in a hard black archway. *Such does not exist*; but my engraver, wishing I suspect, to get depth, has indicated an arched shadow, which my original drawing does not authorize, and which has fairly entrapped my copyist.

Being a subscriber to Mr Pierotti's pretentious work, it is somewhat comical, after paying four guineas, to find that one has been supplying part of the materials; for, after carefully examining my original drawings, the plates from them, and Signor Pierotti's corresponding views, the proofs of "copy" are so numerous and so flagrant that, to all gainsayers, I must say with Orgon to Madame Pernelle,

"C'est tenir un propos de sens bien dépourvu;  
 "Je l'ai vu, dis-je—vu de mes propres yeux—vu,  
 "Ce qu'on appelle vu."

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

WM. TIPPING.

BRASTED PARK, SEVENOAKS, *March 24.*

No. XVIII.

Messrs BELL and DALDY to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—In Signor Pierotti's absence we think it right to reply to Mr Tipping's letter, as the answer may be found in his book without reference to himself.

Mr Tipping's first remark has already been met in Signor Pierotti's former letter.

Mr Tipping asserts, in the second place, as a crowning proof of the assistance which his plate has given to Signor Pierotti, that the lithographer has chalked in a hard black archway, which he emphatically says does not exist; but that his engraver, wishing, he suspects, to get depth, has indicated an arched shadow, and that Signor Pierotti has been entrapped.

This happens to be a proof that Signor Pierotti's drawing is his own, for it does not exist in Mr Tipping's plate, but there really is an arch in the wall. If Mr Tipping had turned only to the next plate he would have seen it distinctly marked in the section of the same building, and it is described in the letterpress opposite as a walled-up door.

The volume of letterpress describes minutely the underground works of the Mosque el Aksa, and at page 85 this arch is mentioned. There is a Mohammedan tradition that it is the entrance to an underground passage leading to the tomb of David.

Mr Tipping's visit appears to have been a hasty one. This would account for his not seeing the arch. He should, however, have used the caution which he so strongly recommends to Mr Tyrwhitt before making the charge.

We are, Sir, your obedient Servants,

BELL & DALDY.

186, FLEET STREET, *March 26.*

No. XIX.

MR TIPPING to the TIMES.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

SIR,—You and your readers must by this time be heartily tired of Signor Pierotti and his critics. I modestly crave a small and final space.

If Messrs Bell and Daldy, publishers, with a well-earned reputation for taste, are content to plead that the black archway in question, far recessed in the vault, and so lofty that, higher than the wall, it runs into the arch of the vault, so drawn as to appear to face the spectator, represents a low aperture "four feet high, just before reaching the steps" (*Pierotti*, page 84), I have not a word to say, except that such a defence of accuracy if addressed to me would elicit an ejaculation as to my friends no less pious than unflattering.

I had, of course, noticed the little doorway in Pierotti's section, but to connect this with the archway in the view requires an elasticity of imagination to which I make no pretension.

A mere amateur draughtsman, I ought to be the last to complain of Pierotti, for in both his views he has placed the legs of his sketching stool in the very holes left by mine 20 years ago; and, except that his light comes from the side opposed to the one whence it can possibly come, his details, where understood by his lithographer, prove me to be fabulously accurate. I regret that I can't leave the "*tu quoque*" so neatly edged in by Messrs B. and D. wholly undisturbed.

I discovered, thanks to a deaf and dumb boy, a small dark hole through some excrescencient Moslem buildings, leading into this said crypt entrance; crawled into it at least a dozen times; spent many hours in it, drawing; took in the clerk of the works of the then incipient Anglican church to lend a hand with the measuring tape (see section in Traill's *Josephus*); but the View i., Plate xxv., made by me at the far end of the vault, 230 feet from my hole of exit, with my back to the door, ready to be pounced upon by one of the guardian blacks of the Haram, was certainly dashed in with that prudential haste so grateful to Messrs Bell and Daldy, for I had no "open sesame," like the Pasha's engineer, and, ever poking and prying about this forbidden spot, was the *bête noire* of this black gentry, one of whom once fired at me.

But why all this fuss? My originals, not very hasty, are on Mr Grove's long table in the Crystal Palace, open to Messrs B. and D. and all the world besides. Let Mr Pierotti convince some of us who partake of the infirmity of St Thomas by exhibiting in like fashion the original fruits of his unequalled opportunities.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

W. M. TIPPING.

BRASTED PARK, SEVENOAKS, *March 29.*

No. XX.

M. de SAULCY to Dr PIEROTTI.

PARIS, 28 *Avril*, 1864.

MON CHER PIEROTTI,

J'ai étudié avec la plus grande attention le beau livre que vous venez de publier sur Jérusalem, et je viens suivant le désir que vous m'avez temoigné vous dire ce que j'en pense.

Vos plans sont, je ne crains pas de le dire hautement, ce que nous avons eu de mieux jusqu'ici; je veux parler des plans de la ville de Jérusalem et du Haram-ech-cherif.

Il s'y trouve bien quelques petites inexactitudes de détail; mais elles sont de fort peu d'importance, en égard au service éminent que vous nous avez rendu en levant aussi exactement avec les faibles ressources dont vous disposiez, des localités aussi illustres.

Je dois vous déclarer que pendant l'exécution de nos travaux topographiques achevés il y a trois mois à peine, il ne s'est pas passé un seul jour où le Capt<sup>ne</sup>. Gelis et moi n'ayons eu le plaisir de constater et de proclamer la bonté de ce double travail. C'est à vous, mon cher ami, que nous devons la connaissance des fragments de la seconde enceinte de la Jérusalem des rois de Juda, et je me souviens que lorsque je presentai en votre nom à l'académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, votre beau plan de la ville, je ne manquai pas de faire ressortir l'importance des découvertes que vous aviez eu le bonheur de faire derrière l'église du St Sépulture. C'est à vous encore que nous devons les premières notions que nous ayons possédées sur les canaux souterrains destinés à évacuer les eaux de lavage du temple. Ces souterrains je les ai retrouvés dans les fouilles que je viens d'exécuter au sud du Haram-ech-cherif. Et la constatation de leur existence est un fait capital.

Maintenant je viens à un point plus délicat. On vous a accusé d'avoir copié trait pour trait des planches de mon atlas. On a eu tort de le faire, je vous le dis du fond de ma conscience: s'il était vrai que vous m'eussiez copié, vous seriez d'abord parfaitement dans votre droit, vu qu'un dessein publié, devient la propriété de tous. En ce cas donc je vous aurais remercié de m'avoir copié, parceque vous eussiez ainsi rendu un témoignage de l'exactitude de mes desseins, mais il y a plus! La seule chose que vous ayez imitée, (je ne dis pas copiée, et vous allez voir pourquoi,) c'est la disposition des profils pour économiser la place. En faisant cela vous avez eu parfaitement raison, quant à m'avoir copié cela est si peu vrai que vous avez commis une inexactitude que je n'avais pas commise; je veux parler de la dissemblance constante des patères placées entre les triglyphes du tombeau d'Absalom. Sur votre dessein les patères sont identiques; sur le mien et sur le monument lui-même, je vous le déclare, mon cher Pierotti, ces patères sont toutes d'un profil différent. Mettons donc de côté, je vous en prie, cette accusation que je repousse pour votre compte, de toutes mes forces.

En résumé, avec les moyens les plus restreints, mais avec une persévérance et un courage que rien ne pouvait abattre, vous avez pendant de longues années d'exil, recueilli les matériaux du livre que vous vouliez publier. Ce livre, je l'ai sous

la main, je l'ai attentivement feuilleté, et je déclare que c'est un beau et bon livre. Sur bien des points d'appréciation nous pouvons différer d'avis; sur ces points l'un de nous deux se trompe de bonne foi; lequel des deux est-ce? Je n'en sais rien, l'avenir nous l'apprendra, ce qui est certain c'est qu'il n'y a que ceux qui ne font rien, qui ne se trompent jamais. Mille amitiés.

F. DE SAULCY.

No. XXI.

CAPTAIN GELIS to Dr PIEROTTI.

MINISTÈRE DE LA GUERRE, PARIS,  
*Le 16 Avril, 1864.*

CHER MONSIEUR,

Je vous remercie d'avoir songé à me communiquer votre beau travail sur Jérusalem. Rien ne pouvait m'être plus agréable que la confirmation de l'idée que je m'étais faite en Palestine du soin et de la conscience apportée à cette étude.

Je saisis cette occasion pour vous complimenter particulièrement sur votre plan de Jérusalem. En ma qualité de topographe j'ai pu apprécier tout son mérite et c'est bien certainement ce qui a été fait de plus complet et de plus juste en cette matière. Je conserve précieusement l'exemplaire gravé que vous avez bien voulu me donner à mon premier voyage à Jerusalem en 1861. Il m'a servi beaucoup et je n'ai pas hésité à en adopter beaucoup de détails pour l'exécution de mon grand plan destiné à l'ouvrage de M. de Sauley. Vous savez que la question archéologique n'est pas mon fait et que je me tiens à l'écart de toute discussion de ce genre; néanmoins il m'est difficile de ne pas rendre hommage à l'empressement et à la complaisance que vous avez mise en 1861 à m'initier à cette partie de la science dont la ville sainte offre tant de documents. Vous m'avez fait alors comprendre les différentes enceintes de la ville, la seconde principalement dont vous veniez alors de découvrir des indices vraisemblables, en cela je ne fais que m'acquitter envers vous d'un devoir que chaque officier Français, Pélerin de Jérusalem, se ferait un plaisir d'accomplir. Nous n'avons eu tous qu'à vous louer de votre complaisance et de votre courtoisie, et votre concours nous a été d'autant plus précieux dans notre pèlerinage que la considération dont vous jouissiez et la notoriété de vos travaux topographiques et autres

vous mettaient mieux que personne à même de nous servir de guide.

Ma première visite à Jérusalem en 1861 a été de trop courte durée pour me permettre de juger votre beau plan et les coupes du Haram-esh-Sheriff que vous dessiniez alors, mais cette fois-ci j'ai pu en apprécier l'importance et estimer que les peines que vous vous donniez alors étaient couronnées de succès.

Je suis vraiment heureux, cher Monsieur, d'avoir une occasion favorable pour vous témoigner mes sentiments d'affectueuse considération, et vous engager, en cas échéant à employer à votre service les dispositions bienveillantes de votre très reconnaissant et dévoué,

G. GELIS,

*Cap<sup>m</sup>. de l'État-Major, attaché au Dépôt de la Guerre.*

## No. XXII.

### ACCOUNT OF DR PIEROTTI'S PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENTS IN JERUSALEM.

1854.

Arrived in Jerusalem, was employed by the Franciscans to make a Plan of Jerusalem from some ancient "topographies" with which they furnished me. I copied them without verifying them, and afterwards found the plan very bad, and regretted that the Franciscans had published it at Florence with my name.

1855.

Assisted Assaad Effendi, Architect-Engineer of the Government, in restoring the aqueduct of Solomon which conveys water from Etham to Jerusalem. Assaad Effendi would not introduce me into the Haram-esh-Sherif; but lent me a Plan of the Haram and Sections of Kubbet-es-Sakhara and of the Mosque Aksa, which I copied, but afterwards found to be completely erroneous. Employed by the Austrian Consul to make a plan of the ground on which now stands the Austrian Hospice: and superintended the building of the foundations; made also a plan of the Hebrew Hospital, called Rothschild's, and its neighbourhood; and planned repairs which were in part executed. I also made some trigonometrical surveys with

geodetic instruments existing in the Latin convent—and with some others of my own.

1856.

Made plans of particular parts in Jerusalem, and published a plan of the Church of the Sepulchre, a Panorama of Jerusalem, and a façade of the Sepulchre, from photographs which I had acquired from Mr Diness. The Archduke Maximilian accepted from me at Jerusalem a plan of the Sepulchre, and employed me to design an altar which he wished to erect in the chapel of the Invention of the Cross. Kiamil Pasha begged me to measure the ground belonging to St Mary the Great and to the Knights of St John. Made a plan and presented it to him. Also directed the works preparatory to the building of the Austrian Hospice, and examined the repairs which the Government had ordered in the sewers. During this year I had already placed in an album several plans, sections, and photographs of Jerusalem, of which last I had acquired part from Mr Diness, and others had been given me by Padre Andrea, a Franciscan amateur in photography.

1857.

M. de Barrère, the French Consul, employed me in measuring the Church of St Anne and all the neighbouring ground, and ordered me to make a plan, sections, and levels on a large scale, which I did. My work was sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. M. Boris de Mansouroff arrived, charged by the Russian Government to enquire into the means of establishing a Russian Ecclesiastical Mission. For him I executed the following works :

1st, a plan of part of Jerusalem from the Gate of Jaffa to the end of the ground of St Mary the Great, and thence to the Damascus Gate, marking minutely the property of the various religious communities, and especially that of the convents.

2ndly. In other parts of the city, surveys and plans of the Greek, Latin, and Armenian property.

3rdly. Drew up a statistical account of the population of the city, and particularly of the religious of the various rites.

4thly. Calculated the number of Pilgrims for the last decade.

5thly. Employed Mr Diness to take a number of photographic views, which remained my property.

6thly. Finally, made an exact report of the religious, moral, and physical state of the population, which was forwarded to Petersburg and approved; and assisted the Government in



planning the establishment of the Mission, and was named Architect-Inspector of the Russian works. In the course of the year I completed a Plan of the city, which was not exact, because I had not yet been able to measure the interior of the Haram; but had already entered it with Sooraya Pasha, and having *stepped* it in some directions had perceived that the plan of Assaad Effendi was incorrect. I made in 1857 many plans for different individuals. I had acquired the confidence of Sooraya Pasha, and towards the close of the year had obtained permission to enter the Mosque.

## 1858.

The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission under Monsignor Cyril, Bishop of Melitopolis, arrived at Jerusalem. Employed in finding in the interior of the city sites for Russian Establishments, and in making plans and designs. Particularly made a minute design of the part of the city from the Gate of Damascus to the South, meeting the Via Dolorosa and following it eastward to the Gate of St Stephen, and thence again to the Gate of Damascus. Towards the end of 1858 M. de Mansoureff arrived again in company with the first Russian Consul. Made many new plans of particular localities, which gave me new materials for correcting my plan of Jerusalem and enriching my album, and especially with works in the interior of the Haram, which I now had liberty to enter whenever I chose; and I was able to use the scaffoldings, ladders, and cords placed there by Assaad Effendi, who was employed in repairing the outside and inside of the Kubbet-es-Sakhara and the adjacent parts. I was thus enabled conveniently to take the dimensions in size and height of the Mosques and other parts of the Haram-esh-Sherif. I corrected my Plan of the city, and, at the request of many, I sent it to Paris to be engraved by Erhard and published.

In Nov. 1858 Assaad Effendi left Jerusalem, and Sooraya Pasha begged me to undertake his functions, which I did thankfully, as I was thus enabled to penetrate into all the spots reserved to Mussulmen only, and to make studies even in the houses of the Turks near the Haram more conveniently than before—to make excavations, verify cisterns, to examine all foundations which were made in the city, and to make new plans of details, and thus I succeeded in correcting my Plan of Jerusalem.

## 1859.

Early in 1859 finished the triangulization of a vast *terreno* situated outside the N.W. of the city, now containing the

Russian establishments; also accomplished a detailed Plan of the *Perimetro* of the Church of the Resurrection and its appendages for the Russians.

In April made again for the Russians a Plan of Jerusalem on a large scale, marking the property of all the religious communities, and certainly not omitting the Haram-esh-Sherif and its details.

In May was employed by the Pasha to inspect all the waters of Jerusalem, and specially the aqueduct of Solomon, and also in making plans of ancient houses around the Haram-esh-Sherif which he wished to have restored. Also perfected my plan of the city, and a large one of the Haram-esh-Sherif, with all the designs which are now contained in my work. At the same time I again explored the souterrains, and made excavations, measurements, and observations everywhere. Towards the end of 1859 I became acquainted with the Miss Beauforts. And at the end of that year I obtained from Sooraya Pasha permission to take Mr Diness into the interior of the Haram, when he took various views for me, while I made repairs for the Government, and continued my studies.

1860.

From the beginning of the year was occupied in arranging my labours for publication. Was employed as architect in directing the constructions of the *Daughters of Sion*, and in that locality obtained many precious materials. In 1860 Capt. Washington of the English Admiralty came to Jerusalem. I shewed him my labours, which he appreciated, since he asked me to correct for him a Plan of the Haram-esh-Sherif.

1861.

Many French officers of the Syrian expedition came to Jerusalem: was their guide and interpreter in many excursions, and did the same for M. Ernest Renan, and many other distinguished French travellers. They all encouraged me to come to Paris to publish my work, and on the 1st of August, 1861, I left Palestine for Paris.

DR PIEROTTI AND HIS ASSAILANTS:

OR

A DEFENCE

OF

“JERUSALEM EXPLORED.”

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

# DR PIEROTTI AND HIS ASSAILANTS :

OR

## A DEFENCE

OF

### “JERUSALEM EXPLORED.”

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF A PAPER, READ BEFORE THE  
OXFORD ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY AT THEIR  
ANNUAL MEETING JUNE 6, 1864,  
AND NOW PUBLISHED BY THEIR REQUEST ;

BY

THE REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D.

SENIOR FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,  
AUTHOR OF “THE HOLY CITY.”

*WITH AN APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS.*

LONDON: BELL AND DALDY.  
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.

1864.



## DEDICATORY.

---

TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE  
OXFORD ARCHITECTURAL SOCIETY.

MR PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,

ALLOW me, in the first instance, to express to you the very great satisfaction which I feel in availing myself of the opportunity which your kindness has afforded me of laying before your Society and, through your Society, before the Public in general, a plain statement of my views on the great Pierotti controversy, which occupied so large a space in the columns of the leading Journal some two or three months ago, until it was brought to a premature close by the necessary absence of Dr Pierotti from England, which has been prolonged far beyond the time he had anticipated.

Your invitation, conveyed to me through your Secretary,—entirely unsolicited by me, as you know,—is backed by the consideration that “as Dr Pierotti was first introduced to the English Public through the medium of our Society, there might be a fitness in giving an opportunity for a defence of him against his assailants before the

same tribunal." I at once admit the propriety, so kindly and delicately suggested, and beg permission to add, that, as there is no Court of competent jurisdiction in the country to which I would more confidently submit any question in which I was myself personally concerned, so there is none before which I should more gladly plead the cause of a client than that which I am now addressing; because I know of none that, with quite a sufficient amount of artistic and professional knowledge and experience, is so likely to combine with a sound and impartial, as well as a practised critical judgment upon the merits of the question, a nice sense of honour and a due regard to the laws of literary controversy—which will be found to be no less essential qualifications for the Jury in this *Case*; which would indeed have been submitted to a regular legal decision had not Counsel declared some otherwise libellous letters to be protected by the technical plea of "privileged communications."

Before you, Gentlemen, I shall at least be exempt even from the odious and unworthy suspicion of dishonestly tampering with my authorities, forging my documents, falsifying my evidence, and bribing my witnesses, in order "to make the worse appear the better cause," and to bolster up a case that I know to be hopelessly bad.

If I may venture to anticipate your verdict, it will be this: That my friend, whose cause I have undertaken to advocate before you, is more sinned



against than sinning : for I am not going to ask you to acquit him of all error, or even of all carelessness, in the preparation of his great work.

“Quid quisque vitet, nunquam homini satis  
Cautum est in horas.”

Even Mr Fergusson, with the experienced aid of two most competent assistants, could not guard against a “horrid mistake” of the Admiralty engravers. All that I maintain is that Dr Pierotti’s, or, his artist’s blunders, whatever they may be, should no more discredit his labours than *e.g.* Mr Catherwood’s bad Plan of the City, for which he was responsible, *plus* the “horrid mistake” in his Plan of the Haram, for which he was not responsible, should vitiate the authority of his most accurate survey of the Mosk enclosure. As to the value of *Jerusalem Explored* as an authority, either confirmatory of our previous knowledge, or supplying additional materials for future research, the Lectures which were given before this Society by Dr Pierotti two years ago, (the substance of which is embodied in his book) were too highly appreciated by you to leave any doubt on that point; and indeed I may appeal to Mr Fergusson and Mr Grove themselves as quite unexceptionable witnesses to this fact.

Mr Fergusson, when not swayed by prejudice, can see that the precise agreement of two independent artists in the delineation of the same object, is a conclusive proof of the truthfulness of both. In his *Notes on the Site of the Holy Sepul-*

*chre*, &c., published in 1861, he wrote as follows: "Mr Carl Haag, the well-known artist, has made a careful drawing of the aisle of the Dome of the Rock. As good luck would have it, he chose the identical point of view from which Mr Catherwood made the drawing engraved as the Frontispiece of my book. So similar are the two drawings that I believe any jury would give me a verdict if I complained against Mr Haag for plagiarism. But the fact is, I believe, that he did not know of the existence of Mr Catherwood's drawing when he made his, and the coincidence speaks volumes for the conscientious truthfulness of both artists," (p. 20). I cannot understand why the argument is not quite as good when Dr Pierotti is in question.

The extreme care with which the photographic illustrations have been transferred to stone is witnessed by Mr Grove, in his second letter to the *Times*, [Appendix, No. xiv.] He had tested their agreement very closely, and truly says it is "a great tribute to the accuracy of Messrs Day's lithographers,"—and therefore, by consequence, to the value of the book; which I have no doubt will hold its place (notwithstanding all that has been done, and will be done, to ruin its credit) as an authority on Jerusalem Topography, when other Essays and Notes, containing perhaps more original views and speculations on the same subject, put forward, it must be admitted, with far greater confidence, are consigned to oblivion.

In Two Vols., imperial 4to., £5. 5s.

## JERUSALEM EXPLORED:

BEING A DESCRIPTION OF THE ANCIENT AND  
MODERN CITY,

WITH UPWARDS OF ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS,  
Consisting of Views, Ground-plans, and Sections.

By ERMETE PIEROTTI,

*Doctor of Mathematics, Architect-Engineer to His Excellency Soorraya Pasha of  
Jerusalem, and Architect of the Holy Land.*

TRANSLATED BY THE REV. T. G. BONNEY, M.A.,  
*Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.*

---

“M. Pierotti, whose handsome volumes of text and plates are at length before us, enjoyed advantages, which no other explorer has had, in investigating the topography of Jerusalem. Instead of being a passing visitor, hurrying through the work in a few weeks or days, he has been employed for eight years in excavating and removing the rubbish of so many centuries and so many sieges. Moreover, he has been doing this, not as a private person, but under the protection and sanction of the Pasha of Jerusalem, who gave M. Pierotti rank and official position, by appointing him Honorary Government Architect and Engineer. Even with the countenance of the Pasha, he met with many obstacles; and was unable to settle many points which seemed to lie invitingly within his reach. But the advantage of that favour must have been considerable, in a place where Moslem jealousy is still so strong. M. Pierotti tells us that in publishing his work he has been greatly helped by English scholars, especially by one whose name will ever be connected with the topography of the Holy City. That M. Pierotti has been able to publish his book in England is due, he says, to the Rev. George Williams, who invited him to Cambridge, and aided him to the utmost in preparing it for publication. The author's Italian Manuscript was translated by Mr Bonney, of St John's, and another Fellow of the same Society, Mr Taylor, translated the notes; and the work in going through the press had the benefit of the revision of Mr Williams, and Mr Mayor of St John's. It is beautifully printed at the Cambridge Press, and is accompanied with a volume of lithographed plates, of views drawn from photographs, and of plans and sections.

“M. Pierotti holds the undoubted genuineness of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre: and his views of the topography of the city are such as to confirm that belief.

“M. Pierotti's investigations in the vaults and sewers, with which Jerusalem and the Temple Mount are honeycombed, brought to light a variety of curious points.”—*Guardian*.

“After the many works which have been published in this country on Jerusalem, both by authors who have visited the Holy City and those who have not, giving us their investigations and theories, we have here presented to us by an Italian Engineer, a magnificently got up work, in which we have the result of his studies on the spot during eight years. This is enough to stamp the work with a practical value which but few modern books of the kind pretend to. \* \* \* The invaluable part of Sig. Pierotti’s work is decidedly the plans, which even surpass in accuracy and satisfactory information his sections and other illustrations of the subject.”—*Building News*.

“Dr Pierotti’s ground-plans and sections are invaluable. For instance, there are parallel plans of Ancient and Modern Jerusalem, more full and more carefully laid down than any we have before seen. With the disputes about the several walls of the ancient city we have no intention of troubling our readers. The most curious discovery made by Dr Pierotti is that of a complete system of watercourses beneath the area of the Temple. Below the cave or cistern in the rock under the Mosque of Omar he found a lower reservoir connected by a conduit with the watercourses above mentioned. Professor Willis predicted long ago, we believe, that the drains would some day be found by which the blood of the victims slain at the altar of the Temple was removed. This discovery has now been made; and we need not point out that the existence of these subterranean channels not only disproves Mr Fergusson’s hypothesis that the Dome of the Rock is the original Church of the Sepulchre, but establishes the counter assertion that the rock in question is the site of the altar of the Temple of Solomon.

\* \* \* \* \*

“By far the most interesting part of Dr Pierotti’s book is his account of his subterranean explorations in the *Havam-es-Shereef*; but it is far too long for quotation. He found immense cisterns under the north part of the Temple area, which communicate with the excavated chambers below the “rock” of the Mosque of Omar. The flow of water of these cisterns (which were fed by the aqueduct from Etham) was used for cleansing the conduit of blood beneath the altar of burnt-offering. Other channels were found which served the same purpose for the “place of the ashes,” deriving their supply, it is supposed, from the pool of Bethesda. The exits of these drains were in the valley of the Kidron.”—*Saturday Review*.















