

hint in the Old Testament or elsewhere that between 734 and 722 anything happened which would have led Isaiah to imagine that his country *had actually recovered independence*.

R. H. KENNETT.

FOUR AND SEVEN AS DIVINE TITLES.

THE following conclusions were reached after an investigation of the meaning of the name *Ḳiriath-Arba'*, which is stated (Gen. xxiii 2, xxxv 27; Joshua xiv 15, xv 13, 54, xx 7, xxi 11 all P; Judges i 10 R^p) to have been the ancient name of Hebron. In the main they have already been anticipated by Prof. Winckler¹; but since I fail to find even a bare allusion to such an explanation in recent works which deal with the interpretation of *Ḳiriath-Arba'*, it seems worth while to state the arguments which appear to me to offer a practical demonstration of the meaning of this name, as also of others.

Ignoring, as we may do, the conjecture of the priestly writer that *Arba'* was 'the greatest man among the *'Anaqim*' (Joshua xiv 15), or 'the father of *'Anaq*' (Joshua xv 13, xxi 11),² we naturally interpret *Ḳiriath Arba'* as 'City of Four'. Modern commentators exhibit a unanimity in explaining this enigmatic title as Tetrapolis, fourfold city, or city of four kindred or confederate tribes. Dr Skinner, in his recent commentary on Genesis, even goes so far as to say that 'the name means "four cities"'. Such an explanation is purely conjectural, and lacks the support of a particle of evidence. I cannot help thinking that, in adopting it, scholars have been influenced consciously or unconsciously, by the possibility that the name Hebron may denote 'league' or 'association'. Yet the fact that the city formerly called *Ḳiriath Arba'* was afterwards renamed Hebron should tell in favour of diversity, rather than similarity, of meaning in the two names.

In thinking over the problem, the first idea that occurred to me was a comparison of the Assyrian *Arbela* between the Upper and the Lower

¹ *Geschichte Israels* ii pp. 39 ff.

² Prof. Moore has shewn that the original text in each of these passages was probably 'the metropolis (*DN*) of *'Anaq*', which was altered owing to later misunderstanding: *Judges* p. 25.

(*J. T. S.* ix pp. 321 ff); firstly that 'the Yahwe of Abraham was originally connected with the deity Sin', and secondly (as witnessed by the antiquity of the names *Ḳiriath 'Arba*, *Beer Sheba*'), and their association with the Patriarchs), that this Deity was known and worshipped in Canaan prior to the settlement there of the tribes of Israel.

C. F. BURNEY.

ASTRONOMICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

In the *Journal of Philology* xxix (1903) pp. 100-118, I discussed the date of the crucifixion from the point of view of technical and astronomical chronology. A discussion of the same question, partly based on my article, was contributed by Dr Bacon under the title of *Lucan versus Johannine Chronology* to the *Expositor*, Seventh Series iii (1907) pp. 206-220. In both articles it is maintained that the beginning of each Jewish month was determined empirically, and both articles depend on calculations, made by me, of the first appearance of the moon in every month which can possibly be regarded as the month of the crucifixion. In my article I expressed regret that there was no table in existence, shewing the depression of the sun below the horizon at moonset, or the altitude of the moon above the horizon at sunset, necessary to render the moon visible to the naked eye, and, in the absence of exact data, I fell back upon a vague rule given by Hevelius. Since then I have made an investigation of seventy observations of the visibility or invisibility of the young moon, made for the most part by Julius Schmidt at Athens and published in August Mommsen's *Chronologie* (1883) pp. 69-80. My discussion of these observations will be found in *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* lxx (1910) pp. 527-531. In this paper I found that the conditions of visibility may be expressed in terms of the difference in true azimuth and true altitude of the sun and moon at sunset, and I tabulated my conclusion as follows:—

True Difference in Azimuth at Sunset.	Minimum True Altitude of Moon at Sunset to be visible same evening.
0	0
0	12.0
5	11.9
10	11.4
15	11.0
20	10.0
23	7.7