

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.

„ „ Jericho (7 p.m.) 30.69.

„ 15th, „ (4.30 a.m.) 30.7.

„ „ 'Ain Feshkhah (9.15 a.m.) 31.1.

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

„ 15th, „ (4.30 a.m.) 61.7.

„ „ 'Ain Feshkhah (10.15 a.m.) 73.4.

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 \aleph . I, therefore, withdraw my suggestion, based on an examination of the photograph, that the letter might possibly be \beth . Those were right who even in the photograph discerned \aleph . Since the second letter of the next line is γ , the first letter in that line can scarcely be anything but \aleph , 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 \beth : it is \aleph .

REV. G. B. GRAY, D.D., D.Litt.

2. *Kh. Adaseh and Gibeah of Saul.*—From Dr. Mackenzie's timely report about Adaseh (*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 Phinchas'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.

REV. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.
