A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

GEOGRAPHICAL GAINS FROM TEXTUAL
CRITICISM.

AN extremely interesting but obscure description of the
route of an Assyrian invader of South Palestine is given in
Isaiah x. 27 (end)–32. By whom it was written is not known
with any certainty. The plays on the place-names remind
us of Micah i. 10–16, the textual difficulties of which I
have already sought to mitigate.[1] I venture to attempt a
restoration of the text of the passage in Isaiah.[2]

בָּא עַל־עִיַּת	¹ עָלָה מַפֵּץ מִצָּפוֹן
לְמִכְמָשׁ יַפְקִיד כֵּלָיו	² עָבַר בְּמִגְרוֹן
גֶּבַע מָלוֹן לָמוֹ	³ עָבְרוּ מַעְבָּרָה
גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל נָסָה	⁴ חָרְדָה הָרָמָה
הַקְשִׁיבִי אֶלְעָשָׂה	⁵ צַהֲלִי קוֹלֵךְ בֵּית־גִּלְגָּל
עֻנֵּית עֲנָתוֹת	⁶ * * * *
יֹשְׁבֵי בַחֻרִים הֵעִיזוּ	⁷ נָדְדָה רְמֹנָה
יֹנֵף יָדוֹ	⁸ יַעֲמוֹד בְּגִבְעַת אֱלֹהִים

1 The Hammer comes up from the north : he falls upon
    Aiath ;
2 He passes through Migron ; at Michmash he lays up
    his baggage ;
3 They go through the pass ; Geba is their place of
    bivouac ;
4 Ramah is terror-stricken ; Saul's Gibeah flees.
5 Shriek, O Beth-gilgal ; listen, O Elasah :
6 *   *   *   * ; thou art humbled, O Anathoth.

---

[1] *Jewish Quarterly Review*, x. [July, 1898], pp. 565 ff.
[2] Without adequate notes (from want of space) it will be given in the
Addenda to the Hebrew edition of Isaiah in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old
Testament*.

⁷ Rimmonah takes to flight ; the inhabitants of Bahurim
gather their goods to flee.

⁸ He halts on the sacred Gibeah, shaking his (clenched)
fist.

Line 1*a*. Robertson Smith in 1885 proposed עָלָה מִצָּפוֹן
שֹׁדֵד, " the Destroyer comes up from the north " (*Journal of
Philology*, xiii. 62 ff.). The material provided by the
Massoretic text is מִפְּנֵי שָׁמֵן. Either of these words might be
a corrupt fragment of מִצָּפוֹן. But the metre requires three
words, and it is open to us to conjecture that בִי comes out
of an illegible צ. Nebuchadnezzar is called the hammer of
the nations in Jeremiah li. 20 ; cf. also Nahum ii. 2 [1],
where perhaps מֵפִיץ (A.V. " he that dasheth in pieces ")
should be מַפֵּץ, " a hammer." Aiath is probably the same
as Ai, which was near the modern Dêr Divân, but where,
is uncertain (Bädeker's *Palestine*, ed. 2, p. 119). From
Bethel to Dêr Divân is a straight road.

Line 2. Migron seems to correspond to the ruins at
Makrun, north of Michmash, on the road to Ai. Those
who go from Michmash to Bethel " ascend towards the
north to the table-land along the east side of a narrow but
deep valley which runs into the Wady Suweinît. At the
point where we obtain a view of the valley there are
several rock-tombs on the west slope, above which lies the
ruins of Makrûn, the ancient Migron (Isa. x. 28)." So
Bädeker, *i.e.* the late Prof. Socin, who edited the book.

Line 3. The pass is no doubt the deep defile of the Wady
Suweinît. Geba is the modern Jeba', which commands
the pass of Michmash. For לָנוּ, " to us," we should read
לָמוֹ, " to them "—an easy change.

Line 4. Ramah is er-Râm ; Saul's Gibeah Tell el-Fûl, a
fine conical hill with an extensive view, four miles north of
Jerusalem.

Line 5*a*. The text gives בַּת־גַּלִּים, " O community of

Gallim." Gallim can only mean "heaps" (of stones);
the sense "springs" could only be justified by Canticles
iv. 12, where, however, גַּל should be גַּן, "garden" (so
Budde). Considering, however, that a place called Beth-
gilgal is mentioned in Nehemiah xii. 29, in connection with
Geba and Azmaveth, and a place called Geliloth, and also
Gilgal, on the border between Benjamin and Judah
(Josh. xviii. 17; xv. 7), it is reasonable to suppose that
some circle of prehistoric stones is meant, near which a
village or town had sprung up, and to assume Geliloth, or,
better, (Beth) Gilgal to be the name written by the pro-
phet. Either name would be more distinct and distinctive
than the common reading Gallim, "heaps." Probably the
prophet or poet means the place which is called Beth-gilgal
in Nehemiah, and Geliloth "which fronts the ascent of
Adummim" (i.e. the Tel'at ed-dam, which rises above the
khân of the Good Samaritan on the way to Jericho), in
Joshua xviii. 17.

Line 5b. לישה (E.V. Laishah) is presumably the same
as לישׁ (Laish); cf. 1 Samuel xxv. 44, and 2 Samuel iii. 15.
No such place-name, however, as Laish is known in Benja-
min, and no such personal name as Laish occurs anywhere,
except in the two passages referred to; it is, on the whole,
probable that in both Samuel and Isaiah לישׁ, or לישׁה,
is a corruption of אֶלְעָשָׂה (God has made), and that in
Isaiah reference is made, not to the Eleasa of 1 Macca-
bees ix. 5 (represented by the modern Il'asâ), but to the
spot represented by the village el-'Isâwiyeh, towards
Anathoth (which Bädeker, p. 117, wrongly identifies with
Nob). This is new, but, I believe, true. For the personal
name Elasah, see 1 Chronicles ii. 39 f., viii. 37, ix. 43;
Ezra x. 22; Jeremiah xxix. 3.

Line 6. The עֲנִיָּה of the text can hardly be right. We
may either read עֲנִיָּה (Pesh., Lowth, Ewald, Cheyne
[formerly], Duhm, etc.), or (since half a line seems to

have fallen out) read עֲנָת, as proposed here, or with Grätz we may read עֲנָנְיָה, which is the name of a place in Benjamin, Nehemiah xi. 32.

Line 7. מַדְמֵנָה (Madmenah) should mean "dung-heap" —a most improbable name, even after we have duly assimilated the fact that heaps of very mixed origin are to be seen at the entrance to Arab villages (see Delitzsch, *Job*, pp. 62 f.). Almost certainly we should read רִמֹּנָה; compare דמנה, Joshua xxi. 35, on which Dillmann remarks that we should probably read רִמֹּנָה (see 1 Chron. vi. 62). All similar names, such as Madmen (Jer. xlviii. 2, from נִמְרִים, Nimrim), Madmannah, are beyond reasonable doubt corrupt. The Rimmonah meant was not "the rock Rimmon" of Judges xx. 45, but nearer to Jerusalem. There were doubtless not a few places in Palestine called Rimmon, or Rimmonah. הַגֵּבִים, "the trenches," is also an improbable name. Read בַּחֻרִים, Bahurim, which was most probably not the same as Almon (now *Almît*), as most moderns have held, in deference to the Targum, but near Jerusalem on the old road to Jericho (see Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 176; Grove, *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, ed. i., 162*a*). ה and ג, ר and ה are liable to confusion; transposition accounts for the rest of the process by which בחרים has become הגבים.

Line 8 is largely made up of corrupt dittograms and glosses. עוד is a fragment of יַעֲמוֹד. לעמד is a corruption of a dittographed יעמד. בנב is a corrupt fragment of בְּגִבְעַת אֱלֹהִים. גבעת ירושלם represents בִּגְבַ[עַת]. An overwise scribe inferred from the context that mount Zion must be meant, though the phrase גבעת ירוש׳, "hill of Jerusalem," nowhere else occurs. בית in בית־ציון is a corrupt fragment of גבעת. Later students conjectured בת, and attached ציון to it, thus producing the familiar phrase "the daughter (= people) of Zion"; to this phrase הר was prefixed to clear up the meaning of the unfamiliar

(corrupt) phrase, " the hill of Jerusalem." היום still re-
mains unaccounted for.   It is a corrupt fragment of אלהים.
It is a curious collection of errors, to which, however, there
are many parallels, especially in the Psalter.

Probably the above re-examination of a much-debated
passage will further illustrate the criticism which experi-
ence forced from me, and not any captiousness towards
Prof. H. P. Smith, on the remark that conjectural emen-
dation " should not be put in the same class with
emendation on the basis of evidence, even the evidence of
a version."   A conjectural emendation may, at any rate in
many cases, have better evidence than an emendation
based on a version.   Conjectural emendation is an art
which requires to be slowly and painfully learned, like any
other art ; and I think that experience shows that con-
jectural emendation based on evidence can remove not a
few serious difficulties which have hindered the due ap-
preciation of some parts of the literary records of
revelation.

T. K. Cheyne.