

I have no book at hand containing the names of the bishops from his diocese who accompanied him to Ephesus, but suggest that the list may include the name of the Archbishop or Metropolitan of Damascus.

Lastly, as the courts, etc., included within the precincts of the Great Church of St. John at Damascus were very extensive, it seems probable that several copies of this important sanctuary-notice were put up in different places, and there is reason to hope that complete ones may yet be discovered. *In sha Allah.*

There are still rights of asylum connected with the Mosque of the Omayyades at Damascus. I am told that last year when a fanatic struck a tourist it was not till the offender *had been enticed* out of the precincts that the police felt that they could arrest him; and some years ago, when a company of Turkish soldiers just returned from Yemen were ordered to get ready to go to Macedonia, they mutinied and rushed into the Mosque, where they remained till they had received their arrears of pay, etc. During this time the notables and other Moslems, sympathizing with them, sent provisions, bedding, etc. for their use, and took their part against the military authorities, who had finally to grant all that was asked.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF AIN-RIMMON WITH AIN-URTĀS (ARTĀS).

By PHILIP J. BALDENSPERGER.

As a rule, names of places have changed very little in the "Immovable East," and especially in the southern part of Palestine, unless some important event has led to a change for political purposes, or to commemorate special events. As soon as Jerusalem was conquered by David, Zion was called the "City of David" (2 Sam. v, 9), and by extension the whole town was thus known in his reign. Other cases are Luz, changed into Bethel (Gen. xxxv, 6 and 15) and Kirjath-Arba into Hebron (Josh. xv, 13). Why should such an important spring as Ain-Urtās or Artās never be mentioned, especially when we consider how near it was to

Jerusalem? Undoubtedly, because the name has been changed without any special mention of the fact, as in the above-named cases; and I have several arguments for the view that Ain-Artās and Ain-Rimmon are one and the same place.

When Joshua had to divide the land among the more powerful tribes, they knew very little of the geographical position of different towns, and may have called upon native Canaanites to furnish a list of names for every region, which were copied again later on when some tribe claimed their part. On this occasion, three men of each tribe were chosen (Josh. xviii, 6 and 9). Since I believe that these Hebrews spoke an entirely different dialect or language, we cannot be astonished if mistakes slipped in here and there when the orthography of names was not yet established.

In the first part of the inheritance of Judah, thirty-eight names are mentioned, separated by the conjunction "and," though the addition gives only twenty-nine cities with their villages. Probably the copyists, knowing the country and the language imperfectly, added ך to every double name: thus Kedesh *and* Hazor; Hazor *and* Hadathah; Kirjath *and* Hezron which is Hazor; Iim *and* Azem; Ain *and* Rimmon: where it ought to read Kedesh-Hazor, Hazor-Hadathah, Kirjath-Hazor, Iim-Azem, Ain-Rimmon.

To recompense Simeon, towns "within the inheritance of Judah's lot" (Josh. xix, 9) were taken, and the copyist says again here Ain, Rimmon, and Ether and Ashan, four cities and their villages (Josh. xix, 7), which in a parallel passage are rectified into "Etam and Ain, Rimmon and Tochen and Ashan," five cities (1 Chron. iv, 32). These cities were only imperfectly identified as of minor importance and because the tribe of Simeon's lot was supposed to be necessarily south of Judah, as would be seen later, when in course of time the country was better known to the Jewish inhabitants. The older grouping was put aside when the returning Jews of the Captivity asked for a portion to live in. Nehemiah mentions the cities of Judah (Simeon had ceased to exist as a tribe) "between Beersheba and the valley of Hinnom" (Neh. xi, 30) and groups them often very far apart but writing correctly Ain-Rimmon without the conjunction "and" (Neh. xi, 29).

As a shepherd boy, David came here almost daily "to the green pastures, beside the still-waters," in contrast to the wild Valley of Tochen. As soon as "King Solomon" was on the throne, he embellished the environs, comparing his beloved to the sealed

fountain and the "inclosed gardens" (whence the mediaeval "Hortus Conclusus") with the pomegranate gardens (Cant. iv, 13), and pomegranates continued to grow here till they were destroyed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Bedouin incursions and by new culture. But when Rauwolff visited the "Horto Solomonis prope Bethleëmam" in 1576, pomegranates were still thriving.

A more positive argument in favour of Ain-Urtās as Ain-Rimmon can be found in Zechariah's vision of the elevated plain around Jerusalem ready for judgment day: "All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem, and it shall be lifted up, and inhabited in her place" (Zech. xiv, 10). If we take Jerusalem as a centre, the distance north to Geba is about the same as south to Ain-Rimmon, the most appropriate proof.

The grouping of the cities in 1 Chron. iv, 32—Etam and Ain-Rimmon and Tochen and Ashan—is also in favour of Ain-Rimmon being Artās. Ether or Etam is certainly the Khurbet el-Khokh near Ain-Atan; Ain-Rimmon is Artās itself; Tochen must be looked for in the Wādy et-Tawahēn, the valley below Artās towards Kharētūn, and Ashan may be Khurbet Shenneh, south of Tekoa.

The Crusaders called the place Artais: this may be a corruption of Hortus and Fardass (Farādis) combined. Why the old name of Ain-Rimmon did not survive is perhaps on account of the centuries of strife, and the continuous destruction of its inhabitants. The Christian inhabitants of Hortus from 1099 to 1188 had very likely forgotten the old name, and when they were exterminated the Crusading name alone remained, modernized into the present Arabic Urtās or Artās (ارطاس).

A NOVEL THEORY OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

BY THE REV. D. LEE PITCAIRN, M.A.

IN an article in the *Q.S.* of January, 1912, an apparently quite novel theory of the traditional Holy Sepulchre is put forward. The author accounts for the church standing within the walls of the city by the explanation that it was not intended to cover the actual cave, but to be a memorial tomb. This theory may be suggested