

seems to me very possible ; but Tell 'Arâd is hardly in the hills, as Mr. Tomkins seems to say, being in an open plateau.

As regards Mr. Birch's papers it is not necessary for me to say much. If he attaches any value to the size of Sarum, he should measure its area on the Ordnance Survey map. I may note, however, that Dr. Schliemann in Troja gives us a city of Priam of 40 acres, and a later Iliion of about 100 acres. Surely Troy was a less important place than Jerusalem.

The hypothetical second aqueduct from the Virgin's Fountain to Siloam has left no known traces of its existence. A curious point in Mr. Birch's plan is that he apparently joins it on to an existing channel in such a way as to show that the water must run just the opposite way to that in the real existing water channel, which leads *from* the Pool of Siloam to the gardens in the Kedron.

I believe that the fact which has originated the idea of a second aqueduct is that a short tunnel has been found in the rock just north of the dam which closes the old Pool below the modern Pool of Siloam. This tunnel I have seen and entered. Its lowest part is considerably higher than any part of the Siloam tunnel, and it runs rapidly up hill. If it was ever more than a drain it was probably the end of the surface channels which existed on Ophel in 1872, but which are now destroyed in quarrying. The level precludes the idea that it can have any connection with the Virgin's Fountain.

C. R. C.

---

#### NOTES FROM THE JULY QUARTERLY STATEMENT.

*Prof. Hull's Paper.*—I am glad to find the general views suggested in "Tent Work in Palestine," and in my paper on the Exodus (1883), receive confirmation by a skilled geologist. I may note that the level of the sandstone east of the Dead Sea was determined by us in 1882 over a considerable distance, which, together with other observations, will be found noted in my "Memoirs."

*Dolmen in Bashan.*—This is described in the last *Quarterly Statement* as a large example, but neither in height nor in size of capstone does it at all approach the finest Moabite examples.

*Prof. Sayce on Jerusalem.*—I had not gathered from the sketch that the Temple-hill was supposed to be occupied by a town in Solomon's time, nor do I know any passage in ancient writings which would support such a theory.

*Kadesh.*—It should not be forgotten that there are objections which have seemed to many fatal to the identification of Kadesh Barnea at 'Ain Kades, which Dr. Trumbull appears to consider proven. I have read Dr. Clay Trumbull's book carefully ; it contains much valuable information, but as he finds himself obliged to move Mount Hor and Mount Seir

from east to west of the Arabah, it is clear that he sees the difficulty arising from 'Ain Kades being so far west.

*Herr Schick's Paper.*—In some details this agrees with the views of General Gordon; in others it reproduces a former paper by the same writer. There are several points in the paper which seem to require reconsideration. Why must the Stone of Bohan be "white striped?" A confusion seems here to have occurred. Why does Bueimât mean "door of death" (Bâb el Mant)? According to the Arabs it means "little owls." Why should an ordinary boundary cairn of the Arabs be "the heap of stones the Israelites placed over Achan?" The cairn is called Esh Shemaliyeh, "northern," which has nothing to do with Achan. The idea that Beth Samys, Shemesh, and Som'a are the same place was originated by General Gordon, but contains two errors. First, Beth Samys is well known to be the present Hizmeh, the Hebrew Azmaveth; secondly, Som'a ("the heap," spelt with an 'Ain) has no connection at all with either Shemesh or Samys. There are several unfortunate misprints in this part of the paper.

Why is En Rogel placed at Bir Eyûb? This is not the general belief of students. Why is Lifta "with good reason" identified with Nephtoah? There are many objections to such a view, philological and topographical. Ephron and Ephraim are certainly not the same in Hebrew, the first having a guttural Ain. The name Kubbet Rahil I could never recover at Herr Schick's site. Ikbâla is a Crusading convent, and, as far as I could find, nothing else.

*Mr. Birch on Akra.*—As regards this paper I have only a few words to say. My statement as to Mr. Fergusson's view regarding Akra was duly verified by reference to the map which accompanies his account of Ancient Jerusalem, published about 1847.

Mr. Birch is, no doubt, aware that many authorities consider that two Akras are intended in various passages, one being the hill of the lower city, the other the Antonia fort; and as Akra is only a Greek term meaning apparently a fortress (as in the Acropolis of Athens), there seems no reason why the Hebrew Baris (Birah) may not be in some cases so translated. The LXX reads Akra for Millo. As regards the tomb of Uzziah, there is more than one difficulty in reconciling the accounts in Kings and Chronicles, but my argument is that the "City of David" was another name for Jerusalem generally. When Ophel came to be inhabited the name may be supposed to have included Ophel, but this is quite a different matter to confining ancient Jerusalem to the insignificant space south of the Temple. Mr. Birch himself quotes passages from the LXX which agree entirely with the supposition that the terms Zion and City of David are synonymous with Jerusalem generally.

As regards the note from the Tosiphta quoted by Mr. Birch, I think it is clear from the context that R. Akiba was not referring to a known fact, but constructing a theory. If bones had remained in the tombs under the city, Jerusalem would have been impure. "Hence it is shown," argues the Rabbi, that some underground passage must have existed whereby the

tombs were cleared. R. Akiba was supporting his unsound theory as to purity by a bold invention as to underground passages, being forced to admit that the Royal Tomb was (as all men knew) inside the city. This kind of argument is not yet extinct, but R. Akiba's passage had no more existence in fact than Mr. Birch's second Siloam aqueduct. As to the long passage from Gibeon, I have only to say that I do not think the authors of the Pascal Chronicle knew more about the Tomb of David than we do. I do not see how Mr. Birch has proved my references to be unverified, although Mr. Fergusson's view as to Akra are not the same in his various books on Jerusalem.

C. R. C.

---

## EMMAUS.

### I.

THE identification of Urtâs with Emmaus seems to be accepted in some quarters as "proved beyond cavil or doubt" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 62). At the risk of being classed among "cavillers," I venture to give reasons for entirely dissenting from the proposed identification. In *Quarterly Statement*, 1879, p. 105, I endeavoured fairly to summarise the evidence for the several claimants to represent Emmaus. There is given there a quotation from Lightfoot, who proposed to identify Etham with Emmaus, not only anticipating Mrs. Finn's proposal, but giving another, and I think more plausible, support for it than she has done. My objections are—

(1) There is no evidence to show that "the bath" Mrs. Finn writes of is of the age she assumes—that it was old enough, not to say important enough, to give its name to a place known to Luke and Josephus.

(2) The existence of a bath, or baths, in a valley down which flows abundance of water is not, *primâ facie*, a thing so special as to explain the distinctive name of a village. If every place is to be recognised as a possible "Emmaus" where the name "Hammâm" is found, we shall have plenty to choose from. Is this different from the place noted in "Memoirs," iii, p. 94, thus?—"Hummâm Suleimân—an old pool, now filled up, with fine masonry walls, and some pillar shafts lying in it. It is in the valley below Urtâs." "An aqueduct from it is said by the natives to have supplied Birket el Hummâm at Jebel Fureidis." Here are two spots at which the name occurs in this same valley. And see the "Memoirs" *passim*.

(3) Etham has transmitted its name from the days of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 6), and is still known as 'Ain 'Atan. What evidence is there that it ever was "superseded after the days of Solomon by that of 'Paradise?'" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 58.) If the evidence of the natives is of value on the point, the name is still "Hummâm Suleimân," and with Urtâs preserves the memory of Solomon's gardens and pools uninterruptedly.

(4) Josephus knew the site of Solomon's gardens (8 "Ant.," vii, 3), and tells us "they were at Etham about 50 furlongs distant from Jerusalem."