In the pool the rise was not so great as on the actual sea shore (as is usual): it was 1 foot 8 inches more than last autumn.

**Barometer:** April 14th, Jerusalem (1.45 p.m.) 27.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>1.45 p.m.</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
<td>30.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>4.30 a.m.</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>'Ain Feshkhah</td>
<td>9.15 a.m.</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thermometer:** April 14th, Jericho (7 p.m.) 66.2 °F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
<td>66.2 °F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>4.30 a.m.</td>
<td>61.7 °F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>'Ain Feshkhah</td>
<td>10.15 a.m.</td>
<td>73.4 °F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temperature of the 'Ain en-Nahr at the Pool 81.5 °F. This temperature was taken by putting the bulb of a very long thermometer high up in the actual source, and is quite probably the regular temperature, summer and winter, if the observation is made in this way.

---

**NOTES AND QUERIES.**

1. *The Gezer Calendar Inscription: A Correction.*—I have recently had an opportunity of examining the cast of the tablet bearing this inscription. I saw clearly at the first glance that the final letter of the first line is ⃠. I, therefore, withdraw my suggestion, based on an examination of the photograph, that the letter might possibly be ⃠. Those were right who even in the photograph discerned ⃠. Since the second letter of the next line is ⃠, the first letter in that line can scarcely be anything but ⃠, though the letter is badly formed.

For the rest I have nothing to modify beyond what I said in my notes in the *Quarterly Statement* for July, 1909, pp. 189-193. It seems to me no more probable now than then that the much disputed sign that occurs five times is ⃠: it is ⃠.


---

2. *Kh. Adasch and Gibeah of Saul.*—From Dr. Mackenzie's timely report about Adasch (Quarterly Statement, p. 99), two things seem probable. (1) That the older name of Beit Lidge is not due to any
chasm or even steep rock in the neighbouring valley, and (2) that
the site was inhabited in Christian times, as shown by the Byzantine
remains. Error, however, seems to creep in, when it is added:
"The inevitable conclusion was that Adaseh could not possibly be
Gibeah, for the very simple reason that, so far as the data were
concerned, it was not a pre-Christian site."

If for Ramah, Geba and Anathoth, their modern names have
long secured a favourable reception as proving them to be Biblical
sites, without the existence of one old tomb there being named in
Memoirs, Vol. III, or even one scrap of Jewish pottery, being
produced as a passport, why must the sister hill of Adaseh fail to be
Gibeah, because at the afternoon visit in February no scrap of
Jewish pottery was detected among the (Byzantine) remains at
Adaseh?

That patient digging would finally turn up some sherd of
Joshua's or Phinehas's time at each of the four places named above
seems to me certain, because the position of three is admitted and
that of the fourth is possible at Adaseh only, unless the ordinary
form of Hebrew expression is set aside. By the time Beth-Shemesh
has been clean swept, even an old shovel will, I suspect, be good
enough to prove that Gibeah of Saul was at Adaseh; and that its
Khurbet was the site of the bamah (high place) of "the hill of God,"
of Saul's tamarisk tree, and of Rizpah's rock.
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