

water-towers (including 'Ain Eyûb) exist immediately to the east. The name means the "Dyer's Spring." (See the notice in the "Princes' Tour in the Holy Land.")

In the Talmud (Tal. Jer. Ekha, ii, 2, v Midrash) a certain Migdol Tzeboya is mentioned, and according to Neubauer was on the Sea of Galilee (Geog. Tal., p. 218), this name meaning "tower of the dyers." (מגדל צבעיא) is identical with the Arabic Tâbjhah. Twenty-four weavers' shops stood at this place. Perhaps this may explain the curious water-towers found both at 'Ain Tâbjhah and near Mejdél. They may have been used as wells in which to steep the stuffs while being dyed, and this explains the name "Tower of Dyers." They clearly were not connected with aqueducts, though a short mill lade led from the great reservoir on the spot, which is probably only about a century old, and built by the Zeidân family.

C. R. C.

KADESH BARNEA.

A SCHOLARLY work by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull has just been published in America respecting the site of this city. I hope I shall not be considered contentious if I take exception to the conclusions of the author, though supported with much care and candour, and shared by many explorers and scholars who have preceded him. There is much that is most valuable in the book, but when we find that Seir and Mount Hor are moved to the west of the Arabah, and that 'Ain Kadis is shown much further east than on preceding plans, it seems that permanent harm might result from leaving it to be supposed that the question of Kadesh was finally settled.

Taking the questions which I would wish to raise as they occur in the book, I would first note:—

Page 93, *Seir* = Es Seer. This looks well in its English garb, but we must ask first what is the spelling of the Arabic. The Hebrew is שַׁעִיר, of which the proper Arabic equivalent is *Shar*, a word in use with same meaning as the Hebrew, viz., "shaggy." In spite of the authorities quoted it seems that Seer, or Sir, or SIRR is the common Arabic geographical term found all over Palestine meaning a "route" or "highway," unless it be spelt with *Sad*, in which case it means a sheepfold, or if it be really SIRR it means "gravelly." Until it be shown to contain the guttural of the Hebrew, it cannot be considered to represent Seir, especially as it should begin with *Shin*, not with *Sin* or *Sad*. The distinction made between a Country of Seir and Mount Seir (p. 85) does not seem to be well founded, though necessary to the theory which would find a Seir at Seer independent of Mount Seir, the rugged chain east of the Arabah. Kasr es Sir (p. 94) would mean probably "the sheepfold tower," and as is so often the case among the Bedawîn, the region round

may probably have been named from this ruin. (Compare Sheet XV of Survey of Palestine.)

Page 101, *Edom*. It is no doubt the case that Idumæa was a name applied to the country even as far north as Hebron about the Christian era, but the name Edom or "red" must surely have applied to the red sandstone country, and not to the white chalk plateau of the Tih.

Page 124, *Rekem*. I fail to find anything to support the view that there were two Rekems, one at Petra, one at 'Ain Kadis. All the authorities agree that Petra was called Rekem, and the Jews appear most clearly to have believed that Kadesh Barnea was at or near Petra. The second Rekem seems only necessary to the theory of 'Ain Kadis being Kadesh Barnea.

Page 127, *Hor ha Har*. No reference is given in note, and it seems to me very clear that the references in Numbers xxxiv, 7, 8, are to a Mount Hor in the Lebanon, not to the mountain in Edom. I have tried to show elsewhere that we should probably read Hor ha Khar, "Mountain of the Phœnicians," the change of ה and ח being very slight.

Page 130, *Hor*. Dr. Trumbull says that Josephus does not suggest a particle of evidence in favour of his assertion that Mount Hor was near Petra. I would venture to suggest that he does not agree as to where Jerusalem was, or even as to Sinai. The Mount Hor now shown is that which Josephus believed in, and probably it was as well known as Sinai or any other famous mountain (Carmel, Tabor, Hermon, etc.) which are undoubted, though we have little but tradition in some cases to rely on. Dr. Trumbull accepts the usual Sinai, but the site of that mountain does not rest on any more secure basis than does the traditional site of Mount Hor—both are too famous ever to have been lost. In the case of Mount Hor we have in fact that "consent of tradition" (Jewish, Christian, and Moslem) which, as I tried to show in "Tent Work," is generally indicative of continuous preservation of an ancient site. The position in the border of Edom is quite in accordance with the usual understanding of the desert geography, and the new proposed situation at Jebel Madurah seems far too arbitrary to upset the consensus of tradition and opinion in the matter.

Dr. Trumbull supposes Madurah to be a form of Moseroth (מוסרת), remarking that D and S are convertible in Eastern speech. I do not think this is the case. The soft T and the soft S (*Te* and *Sin*) are convertible, and so are the soft D or Dh and Z (*Dhal*, *Dal*, *Zain*), but I do not recall any instance where D and S are convertible. Dr. Trumbull is surprised (p. 228) that I should suggest Madurah to be the same as Adar, which he appears to consider (p. 280) to be spelt with the guttural *Ain*. In Joshua (xv, 3), however, it is spelt אדר, which is distinct from the Eder (עדר) of another passage (xv, 21). The *Mim* being a servile letter, Madurah if spelt מדרה, which one is led to suppose is the case from Robinson's transliteration, might well be the same as Adar. The site of Eder may perhaps be at the ruin 'Adar, near Gaza.

"Kadessa" (p. 136). It would be worth while to examine this vicinity

carefully, in order to find whether the name Kadessa, reported by Berton, really exists, or was only manufactured for his benefit. No effort seems lately to have been made to discover this.

Page 170, *et seq.* Judging from the Arabic, the word Rekem would seem to mean "variegated," perhaps from the bright colours of the Petra sandstones. (See Freytag, *Lex.*) The word Kerm (p. 174), spelt with the *Kofh*, generally means a tree stump.

Page 211, "Zephath." The radical meaning of this name in Hebrew and Arabic is the same, "to be clear," "bright," "conspicuous," "shining." The identity of Zephath and Sufâh can hardly be doubted by any who consider the roots whence the two words originate. The suggestion of Sebeita or Sebâta for Zephath has always seemed to me to argue a want of scholarship on the part of Rowlands. The Arabic name seems to be from the root Sebt, "rest," which has not a single letter in common with the root whence Zephath originates. Philologically at least (and I think geographically as well) Robinson's suggestion is preferable to that of Rowlands, because it is radically sound, and the other radically unsound. There was a Zephathah near Mareshab (2 Chron., xiv, 10), which as I have before pointed out survives at the ruin Safieh, a word from the same root as Safah.

Page 212, "Hagar's Well" at Moilâhhi, depends on a tradition of the Beit Hajar. We ought to be informed how this latter name is spelt, whether with *He* or with the guttural. In the latter case it would simply mean "House of Stone," while Moilâhhi is probably a vulgar Bedâwi pronunciation like other words with a supernumerary *Wau*, and means "salt." If a tradition of Hagar does here exist, it is not free from suspicion of monkish origin, and the same may be said of 'Ain Kadis, for not only have Christian remains been found in this desert, with Arab traditions of Christian settlements, but we also know from Jerome and from Antoninus Martyr of hermitages and monasteries in various parts of the Tih.

"Hezron," page 228. Dr. Trumbull has omitted to notice what appears to me to be a strong argument, which, as far as I know, I was the first to suggest in the identification of Hezron. He does not himself find this name anywhere in the desert, yet all good maps show the Hadîreh hill west of Wâdy el Yemen. The proper Arabic equivalent of Hazor

הַצֶּרֶת, is Hadîreh (حصيرة), which has the same meaning, "enclosure;"

and the Arabic *Dâd* is one of the two proper equivalents of the Hebrew *Tzadi*. It is strange that Dr. Trumbull should have been quite silent as to this suggestion, which if it be correct settles the Kadesh Barnea question for ever. As to the meaning of Hazor and Hazerim, we found in 1881 that the word Mahder (radically the same) is applied by the Arabs beyond Jordan to the ancient stone circles in at least one case; perhaps such circles exist at Jebel Hadîreh. The thorn enclosures would be called Sir (see p. 281), and the Hazors seem probably to have been old cromlechs or circles, funereal or of religious use.

Page 276. *Hawy*, usually rendered "winds," will be found to be

derived from a word meaning a gorge or precipice, which fits well in the case of Kaukab el Hawa, and in other instances.

Page 278. The opinion of Levy and other epigraphic authorities is generally supposed to have settled the date of the Sinaitic inscriptions as not earlier than the 4th century.

Page 283. 'Ain el Qadayrât appears to be spelt with a *Dad* by mistake. There is no such root in common Arabic, and the root meaning "omnipotence," is spelt with a *Dal*.

Page 289. The suggestion of 'Ain Qasaymeh for Kaisam (קיסם) is free from philological objection, but Dr. Trumbull should consider Neubauer's curious explanation of the Targum, reading Kaisam for Azmon. The suggestion Qadayrat for Adar is objectionable, because Adar is spelt with *Aleph* and *Dal*, while according to Dr. Trumbull Qadayrat is spelt with a *Dad*; in which case the Hebrew would be not אדר, but קצר. All these suggestions seem to be far too vague to carry conviction; and Qasaymeh probably means "division," or "halving," as the Arabs say. There seems no real reason for rejecting the Arab legend of a Christian boundary at this point (see p. 291), as the district once had a Christian population. The word Azmon is most likely to survive in Arabic in the form 'Atmeh.

As regards the Exodus route, there is little in Dr. Trumbull's careful paper which will be new to readers of Brugsch, Tomkins, &c. The question of the wall *Shur*, and of the *Yam Suph*, is treated with great clearness and force, and leads to conclusions which will intine be generally accepted.

It is to be regretted, however, that sufficient notice has not been taken of the facts (both geological and engineering), which leave it indisputable that the level of the Red Sea has been changing, and that the Isthmus of Suez has been growing broader within historic times. The existence of a Nile branch down Wâdy Tameilûb, which is important in this connection, is also not noticed. As to Brugsch's idea (p. 327 *et seq.*), that Khetam חטם and Etham איתם are the same, I can only say I agree with Professor Robertson Smith in regarding this as very doubtful. It seems far more probable that the Atuma of the story of Saneha is Etham, and not as generally supposed Edom. The Egyptian sign \ominus may be read as *D*, but is most often *T*.

Page 331. "The fortress of Kanaan has not been identified." This seems to be written before Dr. Trumbull had seen my paper on the subject, as my suggestion of Kana'an, a large ruin near Hebron, met with hearty acceptance from Mr. Tomkins.

Special attention should be called to the deduction from Exod. x, 19, which Mr. Trumbull brings forward as showing the direction of the *Yam Suph*. The rationalistic explanation of the pillar of cloud and of fire which seems suggested on p. 397 is also very interesting.

The map requires a word of notice, for it is not clear why 'Ain Kadis is there shown much further east in longitude than is the case on Palmer's map or Holland's map. The result of moving Mount Seir and Mount Hor westwards, and Kadis east, is to bring them much nearer together, but

the site of 'Ain Kadis is still too far west to suit the requirements of the case. Generally speaking, one feels that the evidence has been rather twisted in favour of 'Ain Kadis, though Dr. Trumbull has striven to be impartial and candid.

The omission of any notice of Hadireh, and several minor errors above pointed out, seems to spoil the completeness of the work.

Robinson's site at 'Ain Weibeh is conjectural. Perhaps Kadesh may yet be found in the vicinity of Jebel Madurah, where Berton claims to have found the name. The name Wâdy Fikreh, or the "cloven valley," at this place might have some connection with the rock cloven at Kadesh. It has been established that an 'Ain Kadis does really exist further west, but it is not established that this is the site of En Mishpat. It may be either a monkish site, for the monks were not careful as to the biblical requirement of their sites; or it may indicate that the name Kadesh applied to a large tract, but the Scripture narrative seems clearly to point to a site for Kadesh Barnea close to the Arabah.

The excursus on Set, though interesting, is not novel, and it seems hardly worth while to have revived the suggestion that Set was connected with the Assyrian word Sed, and the Hebrew Shedim, meaning "powerful." Set is more probably connected with Thoth, as meaning a "pillar" or "stone," for both Set and Thoth were pillar gods and gods of darkness, night, and the moon, and the determinative accompanying the name Set in hieroglyphics is a stone.

The route of the Exodus as laid down by Dr. Trumbull seems to be a mean between three views—those of Brugsch and the traditional, together with that resulting from the latest observations and discoveries. Surely however the wanderings are as meaningless as they well could be, extending from Ism'ailieh to Tell Hîr, and back again west of the Bitter Lakes, to cross the sea at Suez. The view which seems destined to survive is that which discards the old traditional Baal Zephon at Jebel Attakah, and makes the crossing to have occurred near Ism'ailieh. Bir Mejdal, East of El Jesr, is a relic of the name Migdol, and the name of Baal Zephon may perhaps survive in Birket Balah. The old sites near Suez rest on no sound basis, and the fact that the head of the Gulf of Suez was once much further north is now fairly well established.

C. R. C.

ROUND MOUNT CARMEL.

Haifa, 29th November.

THE confusion which the Crusading nomenclature has introduced into the identification of sites, is nowhere, as Captain Conder has shown, more curiously illustrated than in Haifa and its neighbourhood.

The tradition, first suggested by William of Tyre, that Porphyriion was identical with Haifa, is still firmly clung to by the monks of Carmel, and both Reland and Sepp identify the ruins in the neighbourhood of that town with Porphyriion, basing their arguments, however, upon other than Crusading tradition: the latter admitting that while one Porphyriion