

and Syria have undergone, and their connection with the advent of man. Such an expectation, we venture to think, will not have been disappointed on the perusal of "Egypt and Syria." The book is essentially popular in style, and written for all classes of readers, and as it gives the results of personal observation made during a short tour through Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, it necessarily brings before our notice many localities belonging both to sacred and secular history, such as the position of the land of Goshen, the conditions of the passage of the Red Sea (Yam Suph) by the Israelites, the site of Calvary, and the Holy Sepulchre, and of the Cities of the Plain. We may not agree in all of Sir William Dawson's conclusions, but the reasoning by which they are supported is deserving of careful consideration. But of all the subjects with which the author deals, probably the most interesting and novel are those connected with the physical history of the Nile Valley and the Delta, and the first appearance of man therein. The author identifies the partial submergence of the land at the close of the "second continental period" of post-Tertiary history as that of the Biblical Deluge, and the appearance of man in Egypt, wandering from his Eastern home, was probably at the time when the land had emerged. His first settlements were in the Nile Valley, not the Delta, which was formed by a natural process of "warping," and as the expanse of alluvial material spread northwards, primitive man followed in the wake, connecting the alluvial flats into arable land. The latter pages of the book are devoted to the consideration of the conditions under which prehistoric and historic man existed in Syria and the district of the Lebanon to some extent contemporaneously with his appearance in Egypt, and they conclude with pointing out the responsibilities of British and American Christians towards the populations of Syria and Egypt with a view to their advancement in the path of Christianity and civilization.

E. H.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN JUDAH AND BENJAMIN.

IN the *Quarterly Statement* for 1884, page 242, Captain Conder, R.E., made some comments on and asks a number of questions about my paper headed "Boundary between Judah and Benjamin," which appeared in the *Quarterly Statement* for 1884, page 181 and onward.

I neither dare nor wish to enter into a controversy with such a master on these subjects as Captain Conder is known to be, but would simply give some explanations and answers to his questions.

Captain Conder says that, "in some details I agree with the views of General Gordon, whilst in others I reproduce a former paper." This is quite true. General Gordon supplied me not only with the ideas, but also with some of his own drawings and written notes,¹ and expressed a wish

¹ A great number, most of them in form of letters to me.

that I should publish them under my own name. As to "reproduction," I would remark that on page 110 of the *Statement* for 1883 appears a paper handed in by me on "Saul's Journey," in which paper Rachel's tomb is mentioned as being on the boundary of Benjamin; and when treating of the "boundary" I certainly mention this fraction again when speaking of the whole. It seems to me, however, that neither of these points has anything to do with the question as to whether my statements are right or wrong.

I now come to the queries.

Why does "Stone of Bohan" mean "white-striped?"

I answer, that as Mons. Ganneau and others take "Bohan" to be not the name of a man, but to signify "a thumb," applying the term to the form of a rock on the western mountains near the Dead Sea, but which rock considered with regard to the boundary is situated too far southwards, I also took Bohan in a somewhat similar sense, but as meaning white-striped, or rather white-spotted, and a derivative of "bohak," which I took to be from the same root as "Bohan," and this more especially as the rocks thereabouts really are spotted with divers colours. I may have been wrong in this assertion, and, after all, I am inclined to the opinion that "Bohan" is the name of a man, a son of Reuben, who either performed some memorable action or died here, and whose name was afterwards applied to a rock generally known, so that it could be spoken of as a recognised point on the border-line. If so, the term must have been given to the rock or stone during the stay of the people at Gilgal.

2. Why does "Bueimat" mean "door of death," as the word means "little owls?"

A. The name "Valley of Achor" means "Valley of Trouble or Great Sorrow." Here Achan, the "troubler" of Israel, and his family were executed. Death and sorrow are always connected, and the owl has always been looked upon (with rare exceptions) as a bird of ill-omen—a harbinger of mourning and death. Hence the term "Valley of Owls" is a very appropriate term for a spot having such melancholy associations as the Valley of Achor. I termed it "gate of death," mentally contrasting it with the references in Isaiah lxx, 10 and Hosea ii, 15, where it is predicted that it will be changed into "a door of hope"—in Arabic, "bab er raja." Though the derivation I gave might be grammatically wrong, the idea was certainly correct.

3. "Why should an ordinary boundary cairn of the Arabs be the heap of stones the Israelites placed over Achan? The cairn is called Esh Shemalieh—'northern'—which has nothing to do with Achan."

A. There are a great many such "ordinary boundary cairns of the Arabs" not at all marked on the large Palestine Exploration Fund's map, with the exception of two, which must be remarkable for some reason, most likely for their size, as otherwise they would not have been entered. One is called "the northern," the other "the southern." These appear to be modern names given to describe their situation. Now we know from Joshua vii, 26, that the Israelites raised a large heap of stones over Achan.

We at no time find any mention made of its having been removed, nor was the land there cultivated, and we may therefore boldly conclude that it must still be there; and as Achan was stoned in a valley, if such a heap is discovered in a valley which may safely be recognised as the Valley of Achor, other circumstances not being in any manner contradictory to such an identification, it may be inferred that this is the heap sought for. The southern cairn cannot be the one, as it is situated on a hill, and not in the valley as the northern one is, namely, in the valley with the gloomy name; and therefore I conclude that the northern cairn is Achan's heap, and find that this identification suits very well all the requisitions of the boundary line.

4. "The idea that Khirbet Soma is Beth Shemesh implies two errors: first, that Soma cannot be Beth Samys, as this is found in Hizmeh, the Hebrew Agmaveth."

I would answer to this, If Hizmeh be the Hebrew Agmaveth, as I think it is, how can it at the same time be Beth Samys? Two different names generally mean two different objects as well; and then what was Khirbet Soma if not Beth Samys?

"Secondly," according to Captain Conder, "Soma being spelt with an Ain has nothing to do with Beth Samys," &c.

I humbly wish to state that, according to my ear, the name is pronounced by the natives in such a way that it must be spelt in a manner which makes it remarkably like Samy, and therefore it may well be Beth Samys or Beth Shemesh.

5. "Why is En-Rogel placed at Bir Eyub? This is not the general belief of students."

A. I follow Robinson's and the German school of students, and have, I believe, the right of my opinions, as I find that it was the general belief of English students as well till M. Clermont-Ganneau believed that he had discovered the stone Zoheleth at Siloam, and therefore identified the Virgin's Fount with En-Rogel, though, according to 2 Kings i, 9, En-Rogel cannot have been nearer the town than Bir Eyub, but that it is probable that Adonijah held his supper and prepared his revolt rather further down, for Josephus ("Ant.," IX, x, 4) says that a place called Eroge (which I believe to be synonymous with En-Rogel) at an earthquake a piece broke off the western mountain and located itself against the eastern mountain. This must also have been at some distance south of Bir Eyub (or En-Rogel), and therefore if the latter is to be considered as the same with Siloam and the Virgin's Fount, Josephus would have had to say that "a piece broke off from the town," whereas he says distinctly that it was outside the town. By taking Bir Eyub to be En-Rogel we avoid all these difficulties.

6. Why is Lifta identified with Nephtoah?

A. Because it can thus be identified both on "topographical" and "philological" grounds. The boundary lines passed through it, as the names of all the places mentioned in the Septuagint as well as our modern Bible versions prove. Then also we have numerous examples of the

change of consonants (especially of the liquids *l, m, n, r*) in ancient names. Thus Jezreel is now called "Zerin;" here final *l* has become *n*. Again, it is an undeniable fact that Bethel was in the days of the Bordeaux pilgrim (A.D. 333) called Bethar, whereas it is now known as Beitin. Here we have *l* becoming first *r*, then *n*. Even at the present day the lower class of natives are constantly interchanging these liquids. American is pronounced "Melican," and the well-known village near Nicopolis (now Amwas) is called by some Latrûn, by others Ratlûn.

7. "Ephron and Ephraim are certainly not the same in Hebrew."

A. I may have been mistaken in this assertion, but certainly not in the point I wished to prove. North of the road between Kulonieh and Kustal there exists a Khirbet Farhan. It is marked in the second edition of Van de Velde's map, but does not appear on that of the Palestine Exploration Fund. I have been told that this name is identical with Ephron, Joshua xv, 9, and therefore when we read that the boundary line "went out to the cities of Mount Ephron," the mountain on which Kulonieh is situated is evidently meant, and besides Kulonieh the cities would, I presume, be Beit Talma, Beth Misse, Farhan, and Kustul, all situated on one and the same mount.

8. "Ikbala is a Crusading convent, and nothing else."

A. This I allow; but though I attach no importance to the *ruins*, I do to the place itself and to its name, for as at the present day there is a fountain watering some gardens there, so also as far and even further back than the conquest of the land by Joshua there must have been something here. Later on we find mention in connection with Kirjath Jearim (which Robinson and others locate at Abu Ghosh) of a place called "Baalab," and we may conjecture with a good deal of probability that it is the same as the place referred to, though the Crusader's convent may have borne another name. Again, the word Ikbala may be translated as "place of meeting," "place of reception," or "place of delivering or handing over." This evidently refers to some important event, possibly the story of the ark of the covenant, possibly the meeting of the disciples, in the same way as during the Middle Ages Abu Ghosh was considered to be Anathoth.

Thus far on Captain Conder's questions.

Following the boundary line we now reach Kirjath Jearim, which Robinson and others identify with Abu Ghosh, is still being called Kiryet, though no longer Jearim but Anab. Captain Conder brings forward another identification, viz., Khirbet "Erma," about two hours further south. Here the wood Kirjath is missing, and I am besides told that the word "Erma" has nothing to do with Jearim, and comes from another root (namely, ערם in Hebrew, and عرم in Arabic), and means a heap of wheat on the threshing-floor (compare Ruth iii, 7, and Jeremiah i, 20, and not from וער = יער which is the root of Jearim, which means a rocky mountain slope covered with forest. As Khirbet Erma has exactly

the form of a heap of wheat, the site already being a conical hill and the ruin shaped up to a point at the summit thus—



it is quite clear is a modern one, taken from its form and having nothing to do with Kirjath Jearim. So I find no reason for giving up Kiryet el Anab as Kirjath Jearim, the more so as I find the continuation of the boundary line testifying to this. To the above I may add that from Saris it went on to Mount Jearim and then to Kesla. It is remarkable that just on this rocky mountain slope there still exists small forests or groves, which are considered sacred to some saint or ancient deity of the country. No one dares fell a tree or take a seed from these groves, hence they have been preserved till the present day. This would indicate that even in Joshua's time they existed already and were points mentioned on the boundary line.

C. SCHICK.

YOMA, OR THE DAY OF ATONEMENT—*continued.*

CHAPTER VI.

1. THE two goats of the day of atonement were commanded to be both alike in appearance¹ and in height and in price;² also in being purchased both together. But even if they were not alike they were lawful. If one were purchased to-day and one to-morrow they were lawful. Did one of them die; if it died before the lot had been cast he took a fellow for the other, and if it died after the lot had been cast he brought another pair, and cast the lot upon them afresh. If that for the Lord died³ he said, "let that upon which the lot for the Lord comes up stand in its stead," and if that for Azazel died, "let that upon which the lot for Azazel comes up

¹ Both of them white, or both of them black.

² For three scriptures are written (Levit. xvi, 5, 7, and 8): "And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids;" "And he shall take the two goats;" "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats." And since by שְׁעִירִים is understood two [goats], why are we taught to say two, two, two (three times), but because they should be alike in appearance, in height, and in price?

³ Thus it is explained: if that for the Lord died, he said, let that upon which the lot for the Lord falls stand in its stead; and if that for Azazel died, he said, let that upon which, &c.