ON THE SITE OF AI.

I have long felt insuperable difficulty in accepting as the site of Ai the spot known as et Tel. The fact that it is due south of Beîtin, or Bethel, seems to me quite decisive against it. Mr. Birch, in the July Quarterly Statement, while advocating another southern site, quotes the authority of Jahn to show that orientals call any wind an east wind that blows from any point on the eastern side of a meridian. But I fail to see the bearing of this on the question. We have to do with geographical statements of a very distinct nature (Gen. xii. 8; Josh. vii. 2) — statements expressly intended to make themselves intelligible. And it is important to observe that the historical writers of the Old Testament do not as a matter of fact use the term "east," in the loose popular sense above mentioned. The utmost latitude we can assume in interpreting their designations of this and the three other cardinal points of the compass must be, I think, limited to within four points, right or left. May I venture to plead for another site to be identified with the Ai of Abraham and Joshua, and to examine the case for Rammon, the "Rock Rimmon" of Judges xx. and xxi.?

(1) Of course there is at the outset the obvious objection of the total difference of name. But is this fatal? Dean Stanley (as quoted with approval by Lieutenant Kitchener in the January Quarterly Statement) did not hold such an objection decisive against Michmash.

Indeed I am not sure that a different name has not been occasionally a veil to obscure what lies before our very eyes; and I may just refer in passing to Mr. Birch's exhaustive article on the identification of Nob (Jan., 1877) as a parallel instance to the present identification of Ai.

(2) We must observe that the two names Ai and the Rock Rimmon are not contemporaneous, or used by the same writer. The two Rimmons of Joshua are unquestionably distinct from the modern Rammon and the Rock Rimmon. The latter appears in the last two chapters of the Book of Judges, some time after the utter destruction of Ai, but while Phineas, the son of Eleazar was still alive (xx. 28).

(3) The name of Ai, "a heap of ruins," was one not unlikely to be dropped. There were many spots with the same name. Dean Stanley mentions three ("Sinai and Palestine," p. 119, note 4), and there was one beyond the Jordan (Jer. xlix. 3). And in modern times we know of Haiyan, Haiyeh, and Haiy, hereabouts (Lieut. Kitchener, April
number). After the conquest, moreover, there would be many a "Ruined Heap," and perhaps the nation would gladly lay aside the memory of that one which was the scene of their first defeat and of an inglorious victory. The name of the "Pomegranate Rock" would readily offer itself to describe the spot.

(4) It is in favour of this view also that the name Ai no more appears in history, and very doubtfully, if at all (Isa. x. 28) in prophecy, until the times of the restoration, when man's knowledge was derived from books, not from tradition or usage, and antiquarian research was the fashion of the age.

Thus far I have been trying to anticipate some of the principal objections to the view. May I now point out how exactly it meets the requirements of the narrative?

(1) It is due east from Beithin, and thus corresponds exactly to the description in Gen. xii. 8; Josh. vii. 2; as well as Josh. viii. 9, to be referred to by-and-by.

(2) In Josh. xii. 9, Ai is described as beside (Heb. גָּ֣ךְ) Bethel. "The idea is that of near distance, of being just off from, the prope abesse ab . . . aliquà re." (Gesenius, Gram. p. 220).

(3) In Josh. vii. 2 it is beside (Heb. נִ֖גֶּמֶּשׁ) Bethaven. This indication is of little value until we know where Beth-aven was. But, taking it as identified with Deir Diwiln, the description is sufficiently near. But the passage should probably be rendered thus: "And Joshua sent men from Jericho to Ai, which, together with Bethaven, is on the east side of Bethel." The Vatican Septuagint omits the clause, "beside Bethaven," altogether.

(4) The identification of Ai with Rummon renders the narrative of the capture of the place very clear and intelligible. The Israelites are encamped in the "plain" of the Jordan, the נָֽ֖נָּר of viii. 14, and close by Jericho, vii. 2.

An army about to attack Rummon would probably make its way along the road which runs from Ain Duk to et Taiyibeh, and so make its appearance on the north of the threatened place. Now we find (viii. 11) that Joshua did lead his main army to a camp on "the north side of Ai, with a valley (Heb. עֵֽרְבָּה, ravine) between them and Ai. The Septuagint reads, "and as they were going they came opposite the city on the east," a clause which is strikingly in harmony with the supposed route. The ravine may be identified with the upper part of Wady Rubeyeh, the encampment being about south south-east of et Taiyibeh.

During the night Joshua had prepared his ambush, which (v. 9) "abode between Bethel and Ai, on the west side of Ai." Exactly so situated we find a wady above the Wady Es Sik, and in continuation of it, under the names of Wady El Muteh and Wady El Ain. Here they were bidden, while scattering themselves as far as necessary for concealment, not to go far from the city (v. 4).
For this ambush must do the work of destruction. The main army came forth only to show themselves, and then by a feigned retreat to challenge the people of Ai to a second pursuit.

As soon, then, as the latter perceived that the Israelites were gone by the way they came, into the midst of the valley (Heb. פֶּלֶט, v. 13), the wide lower land over which they had passed, they started in pursuit. There was a feint of battle "before the plain" (Heb. נֵסְעֵי בַּקְדָּשׁ), in immediate sight of the open expanse of the low lands by the Jordan. The Israelites made as if they were again beaten, and fled by the way of the "wilderness." The sequel is well known, and further details have little to bear upon our present question. Ai was made "an heap (Heb. יָם) for ever, even a desolation unto this day." And if Rummon be the spot, its very name is gone.

I fear this article is too long already, and designedly omit, on this account, the discussion of any further collateral and incidental questions.

T. H. Guest.

ON THE SITE OF KIRJATH-JEARIM.

The exact position of Kirjath-jearim is of great importance for the right understanding of several Biblical narratives. Fortunately we have several statements as to its position relatively to known places. Thus Jud. xviii. 12 tells that it lay east of Beth-shemesh; and from 1 Sam. vi. 21, vii. 1, we learn that in relation to that same place it lay "up," and was on, or by, a hill (Gibeon). These indications lead us to look for it at the head of the great valley of Surar, in which Beth-shemesh lies.

Chesalon (Kesla) lies up eastward from Beth-shemesh, and we know from Josh. xv. 10 that Kirjath-jearim must be sought still farther east, or south-east.

Again, Psa. cxxxii. 6, though obscure, manifestly implies that the ark while at Kirjath-jearim, or when on its way thence to Sion (2 Sam. vi.), was near Bethlehem Ephratah.

Further, the description in Josh xv. 8-10 of the boundary of Judah tells us that it ran up from the ravine of Hinnom to the top of the mountain lying west of that ravine and at the north end of the valley of Rephaim; that thence it reached along from the top of the ridge to the fountain of the water of Nephtoah, and went out to the cities of Mount Ephron, and reached to Kirjath-jearim, whence the border curved westward to Mount Seir, and passed over to the north shoulder of Har Jearim, which is Chesalon.

Of this boundary line the extremities, Hinnom and Kesla, are known.

A curious feature of it appears in Josh. xviii. 15, where the southern boundary of Benjamin (and northern of Judah), while traced from the west eastwards, is said to go from Kirjath-jearim westward. The cities