

the rock and natural ground is visible, and there is nowhere any trace of a theatre, so it cannot have been on the north side. Towards the west one would look first for it. But hitherto no trace has been found, although the ground became, in the time of my stay here, cultivated, and made into gardens, and houses were built, etc., yet nothing of the kind was found. So we were obliged to look for it on the south side. That no trace of such an important and large building was found, some writers have taken it as a proof that the notice of Josephus is apocryphal—telling more than Herod really did—which is contradicted by my discoveries, and everything in favour of my site, except the words used by Josephus, when it positively means “*plain*,” as my site is some distance from the plain (the largest plain in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem) and situated between the hills.

But one must remember that on a hill-side such an amphitheatre was much more easy to be made, and with much less expense than on level ground. Even the expression Amphi-theatre of Josephus seems to indicate this, as generally they were—though not always—but in most cases erected on hill-slopes, at least in all towns where hills were near enough; so I think Herod would follow also in this the Roman custom. And thus may the words used by Josephus, and generally translated “in the plain,” have also the meaning—in the field—as we can see it was so in other instances; and when so used, then all things agree.

C. SCHICK.

REMARKS ON HERR SCHICK'S REPORT.

North Aqueduct.—The possibility of this going to Bireh was discussed while I was in Palestine. All the country has been examined frequently, but no traces of aqueduct found. It is a very rocky country, and the channel is pretty certain to have been seen on the surface had it existed. The survey party always looked out for and traced many aqueducts. I believe Mr. Schick's formed view to be correct: that the water was collected from surface channels near Jeremiah's Grotto.

No. 1 and No. 3 Tanks.—I do not understand how Mr. Schick has ascertained that “all is rock,” and that the continuation northwards is “untenable.” All the visible rock has been examined, but unless the platform has been removed and the wall and houses north of the platform pulled down, it is impossible that any facts can have been discovered to prove this statement. The remarks made do not seem to me sufficient to contradict the known fact that cistern No. 3 is closed on the north by a masonry wall.

Tombs near Golden Gate.—It is quite possible these may be Christian, but they might be Moslem if east and west, or might be burial places of

the numerous persons slain in the enclosures by the Crusaders, and other conquerors.

South of Ecce Homo Arch.—Is all this space now built over? If so, it is much to be regretted.

North Side 1st Wall.—Very likely the scarp is as far south as Mr. Schick supposes.

South Side 1st Wall.—The tracing east of the Protestant cemetery and the tracing of the aqueduct west of Pool of Siloam, are two of the most hopeful bits of work left to be done.

C. R. C.

THE TOWER OF EDAR.

I do not recollect, at this moment, whether Conder recognised and recovered this most interesting site which we meet once in the Bible text, and once marginally.

In Genesis xxxv, after the touching account of Rachel's death and roadside burial, we read that Israel, journeying Hebronwards (v. 21), "spread his tent beyond the tower of Edar." The LXX drop this verse altogether, and Josephus makes no allusion to it, probably on account of the incident mentioned in v. 22. In Micah iv, 8, we read: "And thou, O tower of the flock (Edar, marginally), the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

Now, why should "the kingdom," and what kingdom, come to this stronghold of the daughter of Zion—Jerusalem?

Further, St. Luke describes the apparition of "the angel of the Lord" to the humble "shepherds abiding in the field" near Bethlehem. Why should they be selected for this high honour, and why should the first words of John the Baptist, recognising the Messiah, be "Behold the Lamb of God," and what has all this to do with the "tower of the flock," Edar? Dr. Edersheim, in his delightful work, "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah" (vol. i, p. 186), gives us the answer: "That the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem, was a settled conviction. Equally so was the belief that He was to be revealed from Migdal Eder, 'the tower of the flock.' This Migdal Eder¹ was not the watch tower for the

¹ According to Jerome it was 1,000 paces from Bethlehem. Smith's Dictionary *in re.* R. F. H.

According to Monks at Bethlehem it was in a valley half an hour eastward from Bethlehem. Robinson, vol. ii, p. 160.—R. F. H.