

## THE SURVEY OF WESTERN PALESTINE.

THE writer gladly accepts the invitation of the Editor of the EXPOSITOR to express his judgment of the results of the labours of the English Palestine Exploration Society. He thinks it right however, in the following pages, not only to acknowledge the unquestionably great services which have been rendered by the work of this Society, but also to set forth clearly the imperfections and shortcomings, which are in part to be ascribed to the method adopted. A general review of the publications of the English Palestine Society is all the more appropriate now that its activity has extended over twenty years.

With the history of the Survey it may fairly be assumed that our readers are already acquainted. It is sufficient to recall names like those of Wilson, Warren, Drake, Conder and Kitchener. While the first of these distinguished themselves chiefly in connexion with the first expedition sent out by the Society, and in the excavations in Jerusalem (1867), it has, thanks to the indefatigable energy of the last-named engineers, been practicable in seven years not only to carry to completion the great task of the trigonometrical survey of Palestine west of the Jordan, but also to publish the results. Not less cordial recognition is due to the men who, like Besant for example, have in England devoted much time and strength to make these achievements possible.

A series of sumptuous publications has been put forth in this period of twenty years, works which I here need only to mention, such as *The Recovery*, and *Our Work in Palestine*.

Since April, 1, 1869, the Society has had in the *Quarterly Statements*, its own organ. The crown of these publications is, naturally, the great map in twenty-six sheets, and the seven volumes of accompanying Memoirs. To the volume which treats of Jerusalem belongs an atlas with many plans. Maps on a reduced scale have also been published,—a map for the Geography of the Old Testament, and one of Palestine in the New Testament Times. Other works have at least been supported by the patronage of the Society, and put within the reach of its members. Of these I would name in the first place the excellent Introduction of Trelawney Saunders; only in the second rank, various works of Conder. Most recently we have Hull's book on the Geology of the regions adjacent to Palestine on its southern border.

The map with the Memoirs is beyond question the most important of the works hitherto published. That in it an immense advance has been made is self-evident. Any one who will compare the new map with the older ones, for example with Van de Velde, will see at once that we now have a map of Palestine west of the Jordan, which might well take its place beside many of the General Staff maps of European countries. Of course the exact triangulation conducted by engineers could not fail to give very different results from what had previously been set down on maps of Palestine. Yet some of the differences between the new map and the last large map of those regions which has appeared—that of Guérin—are certainly striking. Guérin's trustworthiness is apparent from the whole way in which he gives account of his journey. Throughout he describes only places and ruins which he had himself visited. If we compare, for example, what appears on Sheet II. of the English map, somewhat south of the point where the Litānī (or el-Kāsimiye) bends to the west, we see at once that the position of "et Taiyibeh," (G. "Thayibeh") rela-

tively to "Deir es Suriân," (G. "Deir Sirian") "Kh. Râj" and "'Alman" (G. "Kh. Radj" and "Kh. A'lmin") is widely different on the two maps. The question also arises at once, whether "Deir Sira," which on Guérin's map is inserted west of "A'tchit" (*Survey*, "'Atshis" west of "et Taiyibeh"), really exists, since it is not on the English map. As a rule the latter has naturally a far larger number of names, yet the cases in which Guérin gives data not found in it are not altogether rare, and are worth closer investigation. A further point of superiority in Guérin is the distinctness of the lettering on his map. The illegibility of many names on the English map results indeed from the character of the process employed in its production — photozincography — and was scarcely to be avoided. The reduced special edition illustrating the natural drainage and the mountain ranges, which is beautifully clear and compact, is to be regarded as a peculiarly valuable supplement to the great map.

The seven volumes of the *Memoirs* form the necessary commentary to the map. It will be readily understood that these also contain an extraordinary amount of new material; especially to be mentioned are the detail plans which are contained in them. The notes made on the spot by Conder and Kitchener, found chiefly in the three volumes treating of the twenty-six sheets, contain many apt remarks, and fresh, telling descriptions. This text has been enlarged, partly from the *Statements*, partly from other works, such as Conder's *Tent Work*, and Guérin's great *Description*. It appears to us, indeed, that in this particular the Editors have done rather more than necessary. Renan's *Phénicie* is a book which every one who means to study Northern Palestine must have at hand; Robinson's and Guérin's works are indispensable to every student of the geography of Palestine. If, on the other hand, the aim were a formal Geographical Encyclopædia, at least an

immensely greater number of references should have been given than is at present the case.

To supplement these three volumes comes the fourth, containing the Name List. Important and valuable as the alphabetical enumeration of the proper names on each sheet is, we cannot but regret that this material was not worked into the first three volumes, with a general index at the end. The latter was explicitly promised, and would materially enhance the value of the whole, by saving much tiresome searching. Practical considerations may have led the committee of the Exploration Fund to adopt their present decidedly inconvenient distribution of the material, but we should greatly deplore it if the idea of a general index were given up. Without such an index the *Memoirs* are a handsome work for the library table, but not easy for a scholar to use.

In the volumes of which we have already spoken, the contents of the earlier *Statements*—now, in part, out of print—have been incorporated. So, too, the volume which is devoted to Jerusalem, is a recapitulation of earlier publications. Of the articles reprinted from the *Statements* in this volume, as well as in that entitled *Special Papers*, some might perhaps without loss have been omitted or abridged; a number of others might have been much more thoroughly recast. It would have been well, for example, to insert an entirely new article on the Siloam inscription. But we shall not quarrel with what has been done. As the *Quarterly Statements* have but a limited circulation, particularly abroad, we may now make up our minds to procure the whole, although, for private purchasers, it is undoubtedly very costly. Here again it might be asked whether, by abridgment and economy of space, it might not have been possible to produce a work of less external magnificence? Twenty guineas is for many scholars who would be glad to occupy themselves with Palestine studies,

far too high a price; by which I do not mean to say that the work in its present form is too dear at that price.

The volume which, we must frankly confess, is to us the least satisfactory, is that one of the Memoirs which yet remains to be mentioned—upon the Fauna and Flora of Palestine. Instead of this we should have expected a comprehensive treatise on the Physical Geography of Palestine in general, such as naturally belongs to a work which marks the end of a period in the history of Palestine Exploration. Even if the detailed Report upon the Geology had to be reserved for a future occasion, a thorough preliminary sketch would have been valuable. Still more do we miss the whole subject of Climatology, which belongs to the department of Natural History, and upon which Chaplin furnished, in the *Statements* for 1883, one of the best articles which has ever appeared in that magazine. The chapter on Water Supply should also have found a place here, for the meagre remarks upon this subject which are found in *Special Papers*, p. 196, are hardly of a scientific character.

Apart from the really very pretty pictures of certain animals, which particularly recommend this volume also for the drawing-room table, there is perhaps some new matter in Tristram's treatise on the Fauna; unfortunately almost all the Hebrew and Arabic names are deformed by errors in the printing or the writing, and the difficulties which in many cases stand in the way of a Biblical Zoology are not perceived. According to the competent judgment of a professional botanist at our side, the list of plants is a compilation, such as a layman in botany might make, principally from Boissier's *Flora Orientalis*, with the help of some other lists, especially for the monocotyledons, which had not yet appeared in Boissier. It is all carefully done, but is without any particular value, inasmuch as in the case of new and newly distinguished forms no

exact characteristic description is given; frequently even the habitat is missing (*e.g.* p. 210, No. 36; 211, No. 40). Notes of interrogation without the name of the species (*cf.* p. 441, No. 13; 442, No. 19, 23) should be dropped entirely. An inaccuracy of a different kind is the introduction of the same plant under two different names; so, for example, *Scirpus holoschaenus*, p. 438, No. 18, and *Scirpus Australis*, *ibid.* No. 22, are quite synonymous, or at least cannot properly be introduced as two varieties, with two or three entirely different ones between them. It would have much more adequately corresponded to the aim of the work if, instead of this catalogue, there had been given a selection of characteristic forms, with physiognomic and biological descriptions, and a diagnostic of *new* forms, prepared by a professional botanist; finally, a more thorough treatise on the botanical geography of Palestine in general.

It is undoubtedly true that the Memoirs, even in their present form, contain much that is good, and that, by reason of the new material which they afford, they will continue for decades to be the standard work from which Palestine research must set out. The criticisms we make are meant, on the one hand, to express our regret that the work is not still better, and on the other, to indicate the directions in which it seems to us essential that the task should be taken in hand again. This applies especially to what follows.

It is the indubitable merit of the Exploration Society to have made of Palestine research a new special branch of science, and, so far as can be inferred from the liberal contributions of money for its purposes, to have roused a great interest in it. In this very general interest, however, plainly lies a great danger. We German scholars may be accused of being heavy and unpractical, but we are in general of the opinion that a science, if it is to flourish as it ought, needs a right long time, and that it will in the end

be all the more vigorous the longer it remains, so to speak, under ground, in the esoteric circle of special students. In Germany we are still, as regards the geography of Palestine, in this happy period of development. The consequence is that Palestine studies are cultivated by men who are quite as well aware as the English investigators of the close connection of this specialty with the scientific interpretation of the Bible, but who have at the same time the historical, critical, and philological preparation which is necessary to successful labour. It is, in our view, an essential point that Palestine research remain in the closest contact with these other branches of study. This must indeed make it difficult suddenly to achieve important results; and, in fact, it is our conviction that in this field we are by no means as far advanced as it would appear from the *Memoirs*, *Quarterly Statements*, the works of Conder, etc. Of the latter, we refer here particularly to the *Tent Work*, *Handbook for the Bible*, and the recently published *Primer*. In all these the matter is essentially the same; and the more popular the form, the greater the assurance and positiveness with which it is inculcated. We must frankly confess that before these books could pass with us for scientific, we must first have the proofs for the historical presumptions on which they rest.

We have a right to demand that a scholar who writes on the Geography of Palestine, shall first have made himself thoroughly familiar with the problems and results of Old Testament criticism. Only then can he form a judgment concerning the real history of Israel. In our opinion, at least, it is unjustifiable to assume without further investigation that the list of stations in the wandering in the wilderness is the work of Moses; or the statistics of the division of the land, of Joshua. One who writes on these subjects has first of all to show his warrant for ignoring all the results of modern criticism. Conder has

justly called attention to the fact that the description of the boundaries of Ephraim is essentially different from that of the boundaries of Judah, and of the northern tribes. The key to the solution of this enigma is given by criticism, which proves that the accounts come from different sources. In our view an Old Testament map with the tribal boundaries, such as the Palestine Exploration Fund has published, cannot be constructed; inasmuch as, in the first place, the boundaries of the several tribes in many cases run into one another, and were constantly changing; but above all, because the ideal division of the land is sharply to be distinguished from actual possession. To this ideal division belong the data concerning the Levitical cities, which we have in only one,—and that in our judgment a very late—source. The right with which the Levitical cities are introduced into the Old Testament map, and indeed for a very early period, must first be demonstrated. So also in regard to the Moriah question, now so much discussed in the Statements, we miss all acquaintance with the critical literature, and indeed with recent German studies altogether.

Naturally I have no intention of pressing our ideas upon men who do not share our historical and critical views, or who have never concerned themselves with these questions; on the other hand, it is our duty to enter protest against historical conclusions which are drawn from that sort of Palestine geography, to point out other possibilities, and to demand that the controversy be carried on with scientific arguments. Otherwise, English Palestine research, by its apologetic tendency, runs the risk of failing to secure recognition as a complete international science.

*Non omnia possumus omnes*, is certainly true in this case. We have gratefully acknowledged that rich materials have been made accessible to us by the Exploration Fund; let us hope that its receipts may enable it to carry out many more



surveys, detailed investigations, and excavations! Only let us express the wish that the discussion concerning these materials may be conducted in a more critical, that is, in a more scientific way than heretofore. No one can fairly demand of an engineer, however expert in his profession, that he shall be acquainted with the scientific problems of Old Testament study, for example, or in the historical field in general. It cannot but make a very painful impression on a serious German scholar when Conder, following a prevailing fashion, instructs Sunday-school scholars, in his *Primer*, that the earliest inhabitants of Canaan were Turanians (p. 31), and that the Accadians were akin to the Mongols. In his *Tent Work* (I. 43) he returns to the long since abandoned idea that the Nestorians are descendants of the Ten Tribes. He knows that the Phœnicians came from Mesopotamia (*sic*), and so on. The question concerning the origin and settlements of the Canaanites is naturally treated in all these and similar books—for example, in Henderson's *Handbook for Bible Classes*—without the slightest idea of the more recent investigations; the difficult and controverted question of the relation between the Hittites in the south and those in the north of Palestine, appears quite simple; the Amorites are always, following I believe an etymology of Ewald's, the Highlanders, whereas, in fact, it is the name in a particular document for the Canaanites in general. In these matters much might have been learned from German books, such *e.g.* as Riehm's *Biblisches Handwörterbuch*. In matters pertaining to later history, errors also occur. That: "Who was Neby Saleh? is a question still to be answered" (*Special Papers*, p. 268), is in a certain sense true; it should however have been mentioned, that the person under consideration appears in the Koran; and that Sheikh Sh'aib (*sic*) is not merely "the native name of Jethro," but the name in the Koran. Recently it has

become the fashion to translate Bir Eyyüb by Joab's well. Against this is not only the fact that Eyyüb is in the Koran the name for Job, but especially the passage in Mujir ad dīn, which can be referred to in the translation of Sauvaire, p. 189.

What has been said is meant especially to show what direction the historical geographical investigation must take in order to escape such mistakes. In passing, it may be observed that the turning to account of the Arabic literature on the history and geography of Palestine, as the admirable articles of Gildemeister, in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina Vereins* show, promises much valuable information, and seems to us more important than the efforts, now so much in favour, to make something out of the very corrupt lists of places in Palestine handed down by the Egyptians. In the former case we are on firm ground!

One who, like the Reviewer, has spent a considerable time in the East, is naturally inclined to transfer the present state of things, as regards customs and language, to the ancient times, and to illustrate the latter by the former. In this endeavour there lies, as we know, a great danger; for upon a deeper study it is plain that even in the East the conditions have not remained as constant as at first glance it may seem to the observer. From this point of view the dogma which has come into vogue since the famous article of Ganneau (cf. *Special Papers*, p. 315), and is repeated in all popular publications, that the modern Fellahs represent the Canaanite population, must be rejected or at least greatly limited. In Egypt, indeed, as the type of the Fellahs proves, Egyptian blood has maintained itself; in other countries, for example in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, greater changes have probably occurred, and there is no evidence that the ethnographical character of the modern Fellahs of Palestine is connected

with that of the Canaanites. At least, the arguments for this view seem to us extremely weak. The geographical names of places may have passed down from one population to another. That they have been well preserved and handed down does not compel us to wider conclusions. The language of the Fellahs, at most, indicates that a certain influence of the Aramaic on the modern Arabic dialect may be traced; the assertion (*Special Papers*, p. 256), "the stock of the Fellah language is apparently Aramaic, as it was in the fourth (?) century," is simply to be taken back as erroneous, and rests upon lack of knowledge of the Aramaic and Arabic dialects.

Precisely similar is the case with the often repeated assertion "that there is a basis of polytheistic faith which most probably dates back to pre-Israelitic times." Aside from the fact that the sites of the modern Mohammedan saint-worship upon the hill tops may have been ancient sacred places, it would be just as easy to find the same "basis of polytheistic faith" in Christianity and Judaism, as among the peasants of Palestine. A sifting of the traditions such as Goldzieher has prepared the way for in a noteworthy article (*Rev. de l'Hist. des Religions*, t. ii. No. 6), leads, especially when the Arabic travels in Palestine are taken into consideration, to the recognition of the fact, that like causes have like effects, and that Islam, by various influences, has been pushed on to the saint-worship into which it has fallen—a worship as different from the old idolatry as is the catholic image-worship. The doctrine of descent, therefore, which is current in all the works cited above—that the Moslim saint-worship is derived from the Canaanites, must be rejected, as much as the unfounded assertion of Conder (*Special Papers*, p. 258), that the Beduin are "heathen and moon worshippers, as in the time of Mohammed."

Precisely because a certain dependence on authority fills

a large place in the whole investigation as it is at present carried on in England, it is high time to combat it; otherwise, a great number of results which we deem extremely doubtful will pass over into all popular works. This dependence on authority has, as is easily comprehensible, a particular weakness for the later Jewish tradition. "What a learned rabbi in Jerusalem communicated to me" on this or that point (cf. *e.g. Statements*, 1873, p. 16), I should not without precaution believe, inasmuch as I should not have unqualified confidence in his method of research. The same doubt attaches to the frequent citation of passages from the Mishna and Talmud. Whether the men who set down in these works their opinions about the geography of Palestine, followed a genuine tradition—which may certainly have existed—must in each several case be carefully investigated. When, for example, in the *Memoirs*, the limits of the Shephela are fixed according to the Talmud, it is first of all requisite that the data of the Bible itself on this point be minutely examined. When, since Selah Merrill's book, Succoth is identified with Deir Allah, because the Talmud identifies Succoth with "Ter'ala," the first question is whether this is not a mere guess. The Talmudic identification of Tirzah—sought with so much pains!—with Tir'an, must certainly be given up.

It would no doubt be very desirable if we were able to identify all the names of places in Palestine which have been preserved to us. That in this direction, since the time when Robinson and Van de Velde, so to speak, took off the cream, much has been accomplished by the explorations of the Fund, we certainly should not deny. It will be the common task of exegetes more and more to sift these identifications; to separate the certain from the probable, the probable from the doubtful, and the doubtful from those—surely no small part of the whole!—of which nothing can be made. With all recognition of recent

achievements, we must say that the boundaries between the above named classes have not always been definitely enough maintained. In many cases we agree with the criticism which Mühlau—who in *Gesenius Wörterbuch*, and his articles in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, is thoroughly master of the recent geographical literature—has, often tacitly, exercised.

It is true that correct opinion must gradually develop out of discussion, but we must always bear in mind that the latter, in so difficult a field, in which often historical, critical and exegetical questions must be taken into consideration, will not progress rapidly, but only by slow degrees, and that nothing has a more injurious effect than premature popularizing. The Committee of the Fund have repeatedly explained that the individual authors were alone responsible for their identifications; and in the *Memoirs* certain "suggestions" are rightly expressly designated as such. In many cases, however, the Fund appears to me—and indeed by the very publication of the Old and New Testament maps—to have contributed to the currency of uncertain identifications.

When Conder in the *Handbook* maintains that of 840 names of places in the Bible more than two-thirds have already been identified, and in the *Memoirs* (*Special Papers*, p. 255) triumphantly announces that of the 600 ancient names of places in Western Palestine, already "all but about 150 new sites have been fixed with more or less accuracy" by the Survey, he, judged by our standard, estimates the certainty of the more recent results decidedly too high. It is now, since the Map and the Name List have appeared, easier than it was before to find a resemblance in sound between the old name we are seeking and a modern one; but in the same way the danger of deceiving ourselves has increased. A number of identifications rest upon purely external resemblance of sound,

sometimes not so much between the Hebrew name and the Arabic, as between the latter and the "Authorized Version." As examples of such improved combinations I name:—

הֹסָה Hōsāh, Joshua xix. 29 = عَزِيَّة "Ezziyah" (only "suggested" by Conder, *Memoirs*, I. 51).

הַנַּתָּוֹן Hannāt'ōn, Joshua xix. 14 = كَفْر عَمَان Kefr 'Anān, *Memoirs*, I. 205.

נְעִיֵּל Ne'ī'ēl, "Neiel," Joshua xix. 27. "The similarity of its name suggests its identification with Y'anān, يعنين." *Memoirs*, I. 286. Name List, 113. On the Old Test. Map it is identified with Tell en-Nahal, تل النهل.

כֶּפֶר הַעַמּוֹנִי Kefar ha-'ammōnī. "Chephar Haamonai, Joshua xviii. 24. It is probably the ruin (كفر حانا) north of Bethel, etc." (*Memoirs*, I. p. 299.)

Of this sort are very many identifications, not only in the *Memoirs*, but in other works. When, for example, Conder (*Tent Work*, I. 108) says: "This name Teiāsīr (تياصير), so Name List, p. 208), I suppose to be Tirzah (תִּרְצָה). It contains the exact letters of the Hebrew word, though the two last radicals are interchanged in position, etc." there is a possibility that the identification is right. The two words however are not so nearly identical as is represented. In fact Tirzah has been sought by some, since Robinson, in Tellūsa, by others elsewhere. In reality nothing can be positively made out about it.

Naturally with such a method of turning out identifications there will be a great deal of mere guessing in different directions. For a while one locality, then another, passes for the place which must at all cost be discovered, as though the most precious part of our Christianity depended upon it. Accordingly in the last volumes of the *Statements* the interminable vexed questions, whether Emmaus is to be looked for in Khamasa or Artās; where the place was to which the scapegoat was sent forth; where the nameless

city of Saul's journey lay, have been treated with extraordinary partiality. These and similar fruitless discussions, in which we really cannot discover the ultimate end of Palestine research, would disturb us very little, if it were not that in consequence of them dogmas establish themselves which can hardly be uprooted again. Among such we count for example the following:—

In consequence of Ganneau's discovery "Zehwele=Zohelath," 'En Rōgel is now generally identified with the Well of the Virgin, and even Schick had recently to take a sharp reproof, because he was not yet acquainted with the new dogma (cf. *Quarterly Statements*, 1885, p. 20), on which occasion Conder gave a fine new etymology of Rōgel. We believe it best for many reasons to remain more conservative, and to abide by the old combination with Bir Eyyüb. So again topographical reasons are opposed to the, at present, favourite identification of Khūrbet 'Erma with Kiryath Ye'arim. That the ancient 'Ai has finally been found in Khūrbet Hai or Hayyān is to us by no means evident. Most recently it is claimed that the word corresponding to בְּאֵר לְחַי רָאִי, Genesis xvi. 14, has been found in "Moilāhhi"—which, however, Conder himself doubts (*Statements*, 1885, p. 23). On the other hand he holds firmly to the traditional Tomb of Rachel, by which means he obtains a false centre for many other identifications. To the excellent discussion of this subject by Mühlau (cf. Riehm, p. 1263b.) it is now to be added that Schick's discovery of a Tomb of Rachel (*Zeitschr. des d. Pal. Ver.*, IV. 248), is a confirmation of the opinion that the Tomb of Rachel cannot originally have been shown south of Jerusalem, as is indeed manifest of itself from 1 Sam. x. 2 and Jer. xxxi. 15. In most recent works (cf. Henderson, p. 67) the identification of Adullam with "'Aid el-Mâ" or "'Aid el-Mī'eh" (*Memoirs*, III. 361), after Ganneau, obtains. This also appears to us to be one of the questions about

which nothing can be determined; certainly not with the arguments which have been adduced, and we are glad to see that recently (*Quarterly Statements*, 1884, p. 61 ff.) opposition to it has again appeared. The same thing is true of the identification of Megiddo with Mujedda' (Memoirs, II. 90-99), which indeed Conder himself treats as doubtful, but which nevertheless begins to pass over into other books. In our opinion Megiddo must be looked for on the Great Plain.

One of the gravest errors, to mention this also briefly, appears to us to be the assertion now quite prevalent in English works (comp. Henderson, p. 59; Conder, *Primer*, p. 39, and others), that the so-called Pentapolis lay at the northern end of the Dead Sea. The reasons for placing Zoar in the Ghor es Safiyeh are quite incontrovertible. Only false interpretations of passages like Genesis xiii. 10 and others, and groundless identifications (Zoar = مشاعور; Gomorrah = 'Amriyeh), can have led to this extraordinary modern hypothesis. Let us hear, for example, the philological lucubration of Conder (*Tent Work*, II. 16) "Zeboim (זְבוֹיִם) means hyenas" (unfortunately Gesenius, who thought himself bound to etymologise every proper name, is responsible for this) "and is identical with the Arabic Duba'. Now the cliff just above the plain, near the site of Roman Jericho, is called Shakh ed Duba'—lair of the hyena, but the title is Hebrew, not Arabic—Shakh being a word not found in the Arabic dictionary.<sup>1</sup> Might not Zeboim, I would ask, have stood here?" If any one has a curiosity to see more, he may read Henderson, p. 59, who also has a combination with Zeeb (זֵבִי!), and teaches us that "Zeboim (or the two Zeebs?) is apparently derived from the name of the wolf"!

The excess of etymologising may be characterised as a

<sup>1</sup> Palmer was however so fortunate as to find an Arabic etymology (Name List, p. 350), "Staling of the hyena."



capital fault of recent Palestine research. As lately vigorous contradiction has rightly been aroused, in this regard, against Gesenius' Lexicon, so, only with sharper emphasis, must a veto be put upon the conclusions which are so often drawn from the etymology of names of places. When Conder, for example (*Special Papers*, p. 256), says: "'Ain el Jem'aîn means apparently 'Spring of two troops,' and its position suggests it to be the well Harod, where Gideon divided the men who lapped from the rest," one finds the reference, to say the very least, exceedingly far-fetched; still more suspicious are references like this in regard to Jisr el-Mujami'a: "It is noticeable that this name may have some connexion with the 'Bridge of the Gatherer' over which the Persians believed the dead to pass, as noticed in the Zend Avesta." So a Neby Heyis is at once "probably" brought into connexion with Ahijah, a Neby Na'mân with Micah, a Neby Turfini with a Teraphim sanctuary, a Neby Leimun (!) with Lemuel (*Special Papers*, p. 268). Such combinations are found also in the Name List, e.g. p. 10, Neby Mâshûk with Melkarth; p. 9, Sheikh or Neby Kâsim with Cadmus, and many more—combinations such as in Germany Sepp in Munich (cf. Name List, p. 1) alone makes, without convincing any one but himself of their trustworthiness.

But before we follow these etymologies further we must again, and at more length, turn our attention to the volume which contains the Name List. This list, collected by Conder and revised by the late Prof. Palmer, contains about 10,000 names. Palmer himself complains that the spelling of the names upon the map was fixed before he began his work, and that no more exact transcription—distinguishing e.g. between *من* and *مش*; *مت* and *ط*; *ك* and *ق*; *ح* and *ه* was adopted. The assistance which Drake was able to give in the collection of the names could not prevent mistakes from creeping in; as indeed it often happened that

members of the Survey, who manifestly were not Arabic scholars, repeated the names which they had gathered to the scribe Kassatly, instead of his collecting them from the lips of the guides and natives and afterwards writing them down in Arabic characters. Palmer, therefore, rightly directs attention to the necessity of a future revision of the names. In such a revision the transcription, particularly, would have to be changed in more than one point. The list of the most common place-appellatives, which is printed in front of the map, and again, *Memoirs*, I. 42, proves that the author or authors of it had, unfortunately, no knowledge of Arabic grammar. As plural of "Bâb" is given "Buwâb," which is an altogether different word; of "birke," "burâk" instead of *burak*; as plural of *tell*, "tellûl." "Khûrbeh" and "Kûryeh" are said "before a vowel," to become "Khûrbet" and "Kûryet," a remark which betrays complete ignorance of the nature of an annexation, or a *status constructus*. The feminine ending is written sometimes with *eh*, as in *Lûbieh*; sometimes with *ah*, e.g. *Fûwârah*; sometimes with *a*, e.g. *Tubarîya*; again with *ey* or *y*, e.g. *Memoirs*, I. 221, *Kulunsawey*, Name List *Kulunsawy*; sometimes even with *ê*, as in *Deir el Kubbeî*; occasionally even with *at*, e.g. *'Ain Furâwîyat*. The designation of long and short vowels is decidedly defective—a long vowel has been consistently employed in the transcription wherever a *و*, or *و* stands in a word, without regard to the cases in which these letters have the power of consonants, or, for our ear, mark a diphthong; e.g. *Deir*, *Jemâin*, *rûeihîneh*, *Sûweid*. Much more care should have been taken, too, in regard to the position of *ع* before or after a vowel. How is *Sh'arîb*, for example, to be pronounced?

In the Name List, Palmer has indeed made many improvements, and the Arabic text there given is, as far as it is trustworthy, an important help in the correction of the

names on the map. Unfortunately it was deemed necessary to find an etymology for all the proper nouns contained in the book, that is, to translate them. That very many of these proper names have a "descriptive character," is indeed self-evident. If it was thought best not to leave it to the student to hunt up such often occurring names in the dictionary, a short list of them might perhaps have been published to save trouble and to explain vulgar forms. In this way, in the first place, many repetitions would have been avoided, and secondly, only those proper names would have been translated which ought to be translated. As has been already said, the etymologising of proper names has at present fallen into deserved discredit; so many causes, such as passage from one language to another, popular etymologies, and so forth, are at work to make the oldest forms, which alone could profitably be etymologised, unrecognisable. Uncertain etymologies do more harm than good. Now, of the etymologies offered in the Name List, there are many which are not only uncertain, but judged from a stricter lexical standpoint, absolutely incorrect. We do not mean in saying this to detract anything from the merits of the late Prof. Palmer, whose practical knowledge of the language may have been considerable. The fact is, however, that very many of his etymologies are lugged in by the ears. Moreover, the derivations which were obtained from the guides, or natives who were familiar with the language of the people, are not distinguished from those which are made up by the help of the dictionary of classical Arabic. Now our dictionaries, translations of the original Arabic dictionaries, are notoriously of such a character that it is very easy to find any meaning you please, but very difficult to decide whether it actually occurs in the language. Frequently the etymologies in the Name List are simply brought into connexion with an Arabic root, without regard to the question whether

the *form* of the word which is to be explained is really found in the language or not. Examples of this are, page 1, the explanation of 'Ain el Aleiliyat "the spring of successive draughts or torrents, but it is probably a proper name," compare page 2, "'Ain el Mällîyeh, the spring of successive draughts or irrigations." Page 1 "'Ain Furâwîyat (*sic*) perhaps from فورة (why so derived?) in the sense of wasteland" (a very doubtful meaning). 'Ain el Hubeishîyeh, "The spring of the Abyssinian." Taking at random another page, say page 19, we find there the following erroneous, or at least wholly uncertain translations: *Shaib*, old man; *Hôwâsh* (*sic*) حواش fenced enclosure; *Meitûn*, p.n. from ميت dead; *Bir es Sâkfeh* (الساقفة) the roofed over well, On page 20, *Deir Kantâr* (قنطار) is translated "Convent of Arches." Is *Kantâr* possibly taken as plural of *kant ara*?

As uncertain, even misleading, as a considerable part of the Arabic etymologies, are many etymologies from the other Semitic dialects. On page 2 we read, under *Shidghâth*, شدغيث, "cf. Heb. שדה, fields surrounding a city, and עת Phœn. for עמת, a vale;" p. 6, Hebrew דבשה, a hill; p. 37, under *Nimûr* it is asserted that "it also signifies running water" (unfortunately from Gesenius!); p. 153, the *hapax legomenon* צִבְרִים (2 Kings x. 8) must figure as a common name for "heaps"; and we are taught that תַּעֲנַנָּה means "sandy." It would lead us much too far if we were to give here more than single proof passages for our critical observations.

Conder's etymologies are naturally much wilder than Palmer's; for example, *Special Papers*, p. 264, *Dûhy*, general; *Mirwân*, enslaved; *Jamî'a el Yetaim*, the mosque of the servants of God in Shiloh. The Hebrew proper names, too, are etymologised "according to the best authorities." We learn from them, *e.g.* that the name Shem (שֵׁם) means dark or brown (*Primer*, p. 30). It is the same thing with Henderson, who, for example, in regard to the Jordan

thinks that "it may be doubtful if the origin is not rather from the natural imitation of the sound of a river." That the Amorites always figure as "highlanders," the Hivites as "living in villages or towns," or as "midlanders," we can forgive, for, unhappily, such etymologies still haunt us even in Germany—compare for example Gesenius, **עֲדָלָם** righteousness of the people, for **עַדְלָ עִם** !! Let us leave such juggling to the Orientals; it has been, as everybody knows, from the beginning a favourite pursuit of the Arabs and the Jews.

It is too bad, though, when this kind of philological diletantism, as so often happens, sets itself to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Thus W. F. Birch recently (*Quart. Statements*, 1884, p. 67) instead of this same **מַעֲרַת עֲדָלָם** would read **מַעֲרַת עֲדָלָם**, and appealing to Prov. xxii. 28, xxiii. 10, "old landmark," translates, Cave of Eternity, *i.e.* "the Old Cave, whose fame has been handed down from generations past." We should greatly regret it if, as there seem to be some indications, the *Quarterly Statements*, instead of furnishing us new material, should yield to the disposition to solve exegetical problems.

We will not withhold from our readers a specimen of exegesis from another book. Henderson, p. 53, says: "It is not possible to look at many of the 'trilithons' (*i.e.* three stones) forming dolmens, such especially as stand like gateways to 'circles' and have charms attached to the passing through them, without having the suggestion presented that we have here a dim remembrance of the first altar by the gate of Paradise—at Babel toward the sun-rising (Genesis xxviii. 17)." How Henderson understands the passage of Genesis which he quotes, is to us wholly incomprehensible.

From what has been said certain conclusions follow.

1. The work laid before us by the Exploration Fund is indeed, through the abundance of the new material con-

tained in it, exceedingly valuable; but in more than one respect cannot be regarded as final, and is decidedly in need of revision.

2. Especially in the so-called Results of the Survey—particularly on the Old Testament map—there is urgent need of a searching discrimination between the tenable and the untenable, otherwise much that is only vague conjecture will find its way into popular writings as well established fact.

3. Not only with reference to the identifications, but especially to the philological conclusions and etymologies, much more care and the assistance of thorough professional scholars is urgently demanded.

I have written *sine ira et studio*, thinking that, as I have been for many years a subscriber, or rather a member of the English Society, I ought to express my mind frankly. In the welfare of the Society I am deeply interested, and deem it my duty to warn it against false paths. I cannot, however, enter into a further discussion of the points I have raised. If I had included all the things which I have noted, I would have to write a book. I must beg, however, that one thing must be kept in mind: if in the preceding pages blame seems to outweigh praise, it is in part lack of space which has prevented me from enlarging properly upon my cheerful recognition of the many things which have been accomplished. My judgment that much might have been, and still may be, improved, does not in the least diminish my gratitude to the men who, in the interest of this cause, have spent and still spend time, pains, and means.

Tübingen, May, 1885.

A. SOCIN.

---