

THE EDINBURGH REVIEWER ON THE TALMUD.

IN the July number of the *Edinburgh Review*, the author of the paper on the Talmud remarks on my version of the "Tract on the Measurements of the Temple" (see *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for 1872*, p. 12), that it is translated with "less than absolute accuracy."

The instance given to prove this observation is that "the translator has provided the guards of the Temple with cushions."

It is the author of the Mishna, and *not the translator*, who has done so. If the reviewer be acquainted with the Hebrew language he must know that the word (כסוּרִי) means "his cushion" or "pillow." And though Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh says afterwards that "his garments (כְּנֵרֵי) were burned" yet the explanation is obvious. The drowsy Levite reclined in his clothes, which became his cushion, and when he was found sleeping they were set on fire by the captain of the watch.

JOSEPH BARCLAY.

ASHKELON.

THE following letter, by the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, will be read with interest. It has been despatched to the Society's explorers in Palestine, in the hope that the questions raised by Professor Pusey may receive a satisfactory solution:—

DEAR MR. GROVE,—Thank you very much for your reply. I had, perhaps, better say what my ground is for thinking that the Ascalon of the Crusades cannot be the Philistine Ashkelon.

You have yourself, I see (*Dict. of Bible*, Jabneel), drawn attention to the Maiumas of Gaza and Ascalon, and Jamnia. There were also two Azotus', one by the sea (see Reland, page 215). The three, then, Gaza, Jabneel, Ashdod, were inland; and were, I suppose, like Athens, purposely so built for fear of pirates. Even Gaza, which was nearest, was (it appears from Soz., v. 3) distinct in boundary from its Maiumas. They had fields (ἀγροί) belonging to each, having altars between them.

The probability, on the ground of its having a port, and from the three other cases, is that Ascalon itself was inland. Ascalon and its Maiumas must have been distinct cities, since the bishop of each signed a synodical letter inserted in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536, as also the Bishop of Gaza and Maiumas Gazæ. (It is in col. 1163, 1164 of the *Conc. T. v. ed. Colet.*) But it is so well-known a rule that there cannot be two bishops of one town, that when Julian had annexed the Maiumas Gazæ to Gaza, the Bishop of Gaza on a subsequent vacancy in the episcopate of the Maiumas claimed that its clergy should on this ground be subject to him, though it was locally distinct. The provincial council refused it, because the civil privileges had been