

the emblems found on the brass plate obtained by M. Peretie from Palmyra (and which resemble closely the emblems found at Bavian over the king's head) are also identical with symbols on the Tomb of Hossi, or in the hieroglyphic text from Sakkarah, figured by Perrot, which appears also to be very ancient. One of the emblems of Bavian is also identical with one frequent on the Hamath and Jerabis inscriptions; but the Bavian, with other Babylonian emblems, appear to symbolise the planets rather than to form inscriptions. Herodotus (II, 91 and 102) gives a curious account of a mark on the columns of Sesostris (now recognised by Professor Sayce as Hittite monuments), which the historian regarded as indicating derision of effeminate enemies. It seems possible that this mark is recognisable in the oval ring of the Hamathite inscriptions.

These remarks are offered with much diffidence, because it is possible that such comparisons have already been made by the learned authorities who have studied the Hamath inscriptions. It is, however, possible that a careful comparison of the Egyptian and Hittite symbols, by a scholar thoroughly conversant with hieroglyphics, might lead to interesting results, and if a cursory comparison leads to the identification of ten symbols as more or less intimately connected, longer study might, perhaps, give more definite indications. The Egyptians, like the Hittites, were an Asiatic people. They seem to have brought their system ready made with them when they entered the delta, and there is thus no *prima facie* improbability in a common origin having existed for Hittite and Egyptian characters.

C. R. C.

THE NORTH BORDER OF ZEBULON.

THE north boundary of Zebulon is one of the most difficult to draw of all the tribe borders. The southern line has been greatly elucidated by the Survey identifications of Nehallal, Sarid, Maralah, and Abez. On the north side the line has been indicated by the new sites for Hannathon, Neiel, Achshaph, and Beth Dagon, but it will be found (see "Handbook to the Bible," p. 268, 3rd edition) that Dabbasheth remains unknown. The verse in which this name occurs reads thus:—

"And their border went up towards the sea (or west) and (to) Mar'alah, and reached to Dabbasheth, and reached to the river (Nakhal) in face of Jokneam" (Josh. xix, 11).

It seems quite possible to understand that Dabbasheth is here mentioned as at the opposite extremity to the Kishon, or river facing Jokneam, and in this case it is to be sought on the north border. The latter is described in two verses of the same chapter (verses 14 and 27) as running from Hannathon (Kefr 'Anân) to the Valley of Jiphthah-el ("opened by God"), and again as going from Beth Dagon east to Zebulon (apparently, as in Josephus, also 2 "Wars," xviii, 9; 3 "Wars," iii, 1, a town), and to the Valley

of Jiphthah-el towards the north of Beth Emek and Neiel, and going out on the left (*i.e.*, north) of Cabul. This description is not easy to follow, but it seems at length to be explained by the following seven identifications, three of which I proposed before 1879, and two new, but agreeing in a most remarkable manner with the rest. The list reads thus:—

Beth Dagon	<i>Tell D'aák</i> , C.R.C.
Cabul	<i>Kabál</i> .
Neiel	<i>Y'anín</i> , C.R.C.
Beth Emek	<i>'Amka</i> .
Dabbasheth	<i>Dabsheh</i> , C.R.C.
Zebulon	<i>Neby Sebelán</i> , C.R.C.
Hannathou	<i>Kefr 'Anáa</i> , C.R.C.

The new proposals are Dabbasheth and Zebulon, and no question can arise as to the exactness of the reproduction in the Arabic of the older name. The line is one which would not be expected, but its correctness is shown by the way in which it fits together details which have hitherto appeared irreconcilable. Thus, for instance, Beth Emek is so far north of Achshaph and Cabul, if placed at 'Amka, that it seemed hopeless so to identify it in spite of the identity of name, while Zebulon at Neby Sebelán is also north of Ramah of Naphtali, and Dabbasheth at Dabsheh (though evidently the names are identical) seemed equally out of place.

If, however, the reader will take Sheet I of the reduced map, or Sheets III, IV, V of the large map, he will, I think, soon become convinced of the exactitude with which the north boundary of Zebulon may now be laid down. It begins (on Sheet V) at the Belus river, which is the Shihor Libnath, or "river of glass" (Josh. xix, 26), mentioned as the south boundary of Asher. It is true that great confusion has arisen because some have placed Shihor Libnath much further south, led by the context, "and to Carmel westwards;"¹ but the best authorities agree that the Belus—the traditional site of the discovery of glass—is the true Shihor Libnath. Immediately east of its course is Tell D'aák, which represents Beth Dagon, just as 'Ain Dúk represents the Dagon near Jericho, and thence we must draw the line "towards the daybreak" at the foot of the low hills north of Cabul, or Kábúl. Two miles north and rather east of this latter is Y'anín, which preserves all the radicals of Han Neiel with the change of the last L into N (as Beitin for Bethel, &c., &c.), and we thus reach the mouth of the gorge where Wády Sh'aib flows out west to meet Wády esh Shághúr coming from the north.

Turning now to Sheet III, we find a long spur running up northwards from Wády esh Shághúr towards the Kul'at et Tufaniyeh, or "Flood

¹ Apparently Carmel ha Yamah would mean properly "the western Carmel," or Carmel of the Sea, perhaps to distinguish it from Carmel in the tribe of Judah. I have, however, pointed out (see volume of "Special Papers," p. 229) that the Samaritans apply the name Carmel to the shore as far as Acre. The "Samaritan Chronicle" speaks of the frontier of Carmel as far as Accho.

Castle," which must retain some curious legend not yet collected. We have now to take into consideration the towns of Asher, which tribe here marches with Zebulon, and these include the following :—

Helkath	<i>Yerka.</i>
Hali	<i>'Alia, C.R.C.</i>
Beten	—
Achshaph	<i>Kefr Yastf, C.R.C.</i>
Alammelech	—
Amad	<i>El 'Amad, C.R.C.</i>
Misheal	<i>in Wady Maisleh, C.R.C.</i>
Beth Emek	<i>'Amka.</i>

This list serves to confine our line on the westward side in a most definite manner, although Beten ("The Knoll") and Alammelech (God-King) are, unfortunately, still unknown. El B'aneh has been thought to represent the first, and is not absolutely forbidden by the line proposed (see N. f. Sheet III), which may have run up the hill by it. Alammelech was probably near Amad, far from the border, and as the Melek in question is very probably the Melkarth of Tyre, there may very likely be some reminiscence of the site in Wâdy M'ashûk, "Valley of the man beloved by women," which is the modern name (Neby M'ashûk) under which Melkarth now appears at Tyre (see Vol. III of "Memoirs," Appendix).

The general result of these considerations is the determination of the towns of Asher as lying in the plain or in the low hills, not more than 1,200 feet above the sea, whereas our boundary line, ascending northwards from Neiel (Y'anîn), is running on the high ridge about 500 feet above the Shephelah of Asher, and east of all the towns of that tribe. Skirting along the edge of the mountain district it passes Yanûh (Janahah), and reaches the ruin of Dabsheh, 2,060 feet above the sea (Sheet III, lat. 33°, long. 35° 15'). At this point we are looking down on the slopes which descend northwards into the great ravine of Wâdy el Kurn, and it is therefore quite natural that the border should pass east from this point. Thus, Dabbasheth, according to the new identification, stands exactly at the north-west corner of the tribe, and is therefore most appropriately mentioned as a border point in the earlier and more general description of the line.

From this point to Hannathon, which was at the north-east corner of the tribe line, we have only two names mentioned to guide us, but these are quite sufficient.

If we turn to Sheet IV, lat. 33°, we at once find, some two miles east of the sheet line, Neby Sebelân, which is a village enclosing the supposed Tomb of Zebulon, son of Jacob. We find also a long valley head, draining northwards from the ridge of Jebel Heider, and forming the true course of Wâdy el Kurn. This is one of the most considerable valleys in Galilee, well fitted to form a natural boundary line between two tribes. As regards these two places, I propose to recognise in Neby Sebelân not only (as I proposed in 1877) the town of Zebulon mentioned by Josephus, but also

the Zebulon of the passage in Joshua (xix, 27), which it seems almost impossible to consider as referring to the tribe boundary simply. Indeed, so much has this been felt, that some have proposed 'Abellin as the site of Zebulon—an idea which hopelessly confuses all the topography, and which has philologically a great objection.

The identification of Zebulon leads us to suppose that Wâdy el Kurn is the valley called Jiphthah-el in the Bible, and the great precipices along its course, especially north of Dabbasheth, might well account for the name "Cloven by God;" but no remains of the old title seem recognisable, and this is the case in other instances, as I have had occasion often to point out. Shihor-Libnath, Mejarkon, Elah, Cherith, Kedron, and many other famous valleys of the Bible, are now known by other names, and in the case of Sorek and Jezreel, the Hebrew title adheres, not to the valley, but to the town whence perhaps the valley was named, just as the modern Wâdys are named from the villages.

Having thus far followed the line of important natural features, we are now able to finish our tracing without any difficulty to Hannathon (Kefr 'Anân); for Râmeh (Sheet IV, O. f.) is in all probability Ramath of Naphtali (Josh. xix, 35), and must therefore be excluded north of our boundary. It is clear, then, that we leave the high mountains of upper Galilee, and descend into the flat plain of the Shaghûr, following the foot of the southern slopes of the great Jebel Heider ridge.

If the reader will refer to my "Handbook of the Bible" (Map No. 5, p. 252, and p. 269), he will find that great doubt existed as to the borders of Asher, Naphtali, and Zebulon, and as to the place where these three tribes marched. Having fixed Hannathon and Neiel, it seemed natural to join these two points by a line along Wâdy Shâghûr, which seemed evidently to be the proper Jiphthah-el. But our knowledge is now extended by the discovery of Dabbasheth and of Zebulon, and we are thus able to recognise the old identification of Beth Emek as a true one, and to draw the line more accurately than before, but without changing a single previous identification save that of Jiphthah-el, which was merely a conjecture.

It has not been thought necessary to swell this paper by discussing the east and south borders of Zebulon (the western being the sea, and therefore unnoticed in the Bible). It may be noted that the Survey has indicated Hannathon, Nehallal, and Sarid, all very important points, while Neah is very probably *B'aineh*, which allows of the line being drawn from the Kishon to Tabor, and so north without any hesitation to Kefr 'Anân, thus coinciding with the natural lines of the country throughout the whole course. Dr. Grove's suggestion of Kefr Kenna for Kazin also appears to be confirmed by these investigations.

The new boundary gives another instance of the laws observable in the case of those traced for other tribes (*cf.* "Handbook," p. 270).

It is clear that the towns selected for notice in Joshua xix are so selected because they define the tribe boundaries. It is clear that the great natural features—valleys, watersheds, prominent spurs—are the real old tribe boundaries, just as they are the boundaries of the existing

divisions of the various districts. I have always felt, however, that this border of Zebulun was the one least certainly traced, for though the Survey suggestions for the territory of Naphtali, of Benjamin, of Dan, and of Ephraim, contain many striking novelties, they have been sifted much more completely than that now described, and they seem to me to have stood the test. The reader is invited to trace the present line on the map, and to form his own judgment as to the border of Zebulun, and he will find that the Survey identifications have cast equal light on every other border of the twelve tribes.

In the present case there are sixteen identifications on which the border line depends, and out of these only two of minor importance remain very doubtful. Out of the sixteen, ten are due to the Survey of Palestine, and were unknown to Robinson, Grove, or any other pre-survey authority. This instance alone seems, therefore, to indicate how much we have gained, from a Biblical point of view, by surveying the Holy Land.

C. R. C.

NOTES.

THE following remarks as to the last *Statement* may be worth noting.

1st. *Numbers of Israel*.—On p. 99, the writer, C. M. W., has made a curious mistake. He computes the space occupied by the Israelites, supposing their numbers to be 600,000, but this was the number of the men (Exod. xiv, 37); the children, women, and others are to be added; and if the writer of the passage is following the usual Oriental fashion of numbering only the men able to bear arms, the whole host would have been about three millions, but at least the number must be doubled.

2nd. *North Boundary of Palestine*.—One or two objections may be noted. *Shebrāh* is spelt with a cheth at the end (see the lists of Robinson, &c.), and is thus radically different from *Sibraim* (see p. 103), without mentioning that the Samech becomes Sin instead of Shin in Arabic. *Kureitein* (p. 104), is not derived from Kir, but from Kuryeh, the Hebrew Kirjath, and is an Arabic dual form. It appears to me quite clear that the Hauran of Ezekiel is the modern district of Hauran, which the writer denies; but this is perhaps a matter of opinion only. It is, however, not correct to say that Berothah is undoubtedly Beirūt, for this has been disputed on very good grounds, and is still an open question. The suggestion of *Juneh* for Hazar Enan is also not satisfactory, for the J is the Hebrew Gimel, and although the Ain and Gimel are known to be interchanged occasionally, there are three possible sites for Hazar Enan which do not necessitate so violent a conversion of sound. The situation of *Juneh* seems to me inadmissible for Hazar Enan, and I hope to prove that the Mount Hor

which existed north of Palestine was the Lebanon inhabited by the *Khar*, or Phœnicians.

Siloam, p. 105.—A misconception seems here to arise, as there is certainly but one aqueduct from the Virgin's Fountain to Siloam, viz., that known to Gesenius, Robinson, and all later writers.

Tomb of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 109.—It seems to have escaped notice that these have been found by the Surveyors in Shechem, where Jerome also knew them, though the Samaritans have a different belief (see "Memoirs," vol. ii, pp. 218, 220).

Rachel's Tomb.—Herr Schick says (p. 111) that the tomb north of Kustul is sometimes called Kubbet Rahel. I have asked on the spot more than once, but never was able to confirm this view. But even if it were the case, this site could not possibly represent the Tomb of Rachael, which is specially mentioned as near Ephrath (Gen. xxxv, 16). This position agrees exactly with the border of Judah according to the line which I have proposed ("Handbook to Bible," p. 258).

C. R. C.

THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

WHILST studying Canon Scarth's article on "The Route of the Exodus," together with the four papers on the same subject that appeared in the last *Quarterly Statement*, and Brugsch Bey's statement of his theory, I have been forcibly reminded of the well-known story of the two knights riding from opposite directions, and disputing about a certain shield that was suspended between them, which was silver on the one side and golden on the other. The antagonists on the vexed question of the Route of the Exodus seem to me to represent these knights, and I have worked out a theory which tends greatly to harmonise the various routes proposed by Brugsch Bey, Captain Conder, Canon Scarth, and other authorities, by showing the Yam Suph to present a different aspect according to the side from which it is viewed, like the shield in the allegory.

A year or two ago, when standing on the shore of the Red Sea near Suez, I felt my heart thrill within me at the thought that my feet were pressing the very spot whence the children of Israel passed over dry-shod. I then held the view which I had embraced with unquestioning faith in the days of childhood; but I have since become convinced of the physical impossibility of the Red Sea being driven back at this point by the east wind.

Unless, therefore, we are prepared to translate the Hebrew words rendered "east wind" in our Authorised Version as simply a "contrary wind," we must, I think, give up the formerly received identification of the crossing-place of the Israelites; but we are not thereby called upon to cease calling the Red Sea the Yam Suph.