

related to the Sem people, but after the slaves of the Sem people had leave to accompany the expedition, the "people" alone are named, and the name of Sem is dropped.

Thus have I done my best with one and a half pages out of five, exclusive of the title page. There is more in this papyrus of the very highest interest. Among other things, I feel called upon with great regret to say that Dr. Brugsch has done harm by circulating his account from this papyrus of the Shasu people passing from Edom into Egypt. My translation of the passage [is now 25 years old, and will be found in my "Exodus Papyri," p. 183. Dr. Brugsch begins with "we have carried into effect." There is possibly a "we," but nothing about "carrying into effect." In fact the papyrus is a confession throughout of the weakness of the Egyptians before the Shasu. Dr. Brugsch goes on "from the land of Edom." There is no word signifying "from." "Through the fortress." There is no word signifying "through." "To the city Pithom, etc., situated in the land of Thuku." Dr. Brugsch in his own book of "Foreign Geography," plate xvi, gives us his own map of Palestine showing that Thuku was in Edom. How, then, could the Shasu pass from Edom to Thuku, which is in Edom?

DUNBAR J. HEATH.

Esher, Surrey.

MEGIDDO.

MEGIDDO has thrice to do with horses and chariots, in the case of Sisera, Ahaziah, and Josiah, but its connection with Mujedda, three miles south-west of Bethshean, is merely a mare's-nest.

This identification put forward in *Quarterly Statement*, 1877, p. 13, repeated in "Tent Work," but apparently abandoned in his "Handbook," is once more revived (1881, p. 87) by Lieutenant Conder, when, on returning from the slaughter of Abu Gheith, with the head of Beth Aphrah in his hand (my overlooking of the *li* in *Beth li Aphrah* I can only explain on the principle "humanum est errare"), he finds a Jonathan ready to embrace his theory (1880, p. 224).

It is best to repel this advance at once, and without delay fight out the topographical battle of Megiddo, before more allies come up.

We propose to show (1) that Megiddo was near Taanach (now Taanuk), and (2) that the only feature near Taanach answering to *the waters of Megiddo* are the streams near Lejjun. If these points be proved, then it is *certain* that Megiddo was situated *at or close to* Lejjun (as proposed by D. Robinson), and not at Mujedda.

(1). That Megiddo was near Taanach is somewhat probable from Joshua xii, 21; xvii, 11; 1 Kings iv, 12; 1 Chron. vii, 29; where the two names occur in juxtaposition. As however Judges i, 27, is against us, we turn for certainty to Judges v, 19-21: "The kings came and fought in (=near)

Taanach, by (=near) the waters of Megiddo." These words evidently describe a *battle*, and not a campaign. Therefore, as the kings fought near both these places, it is obvious that they must have been near one another. Thus (it seems to me) our first point is already fully made out.

But suppose for a moment that Megiddo was not near Taanach, but at Mujedda. Then we have to believe that Barak and his ten thousand, armed with staves and ox-goads, or at the best with bows and slings, fought along a line of nearly sixteen miles, while most of the Canaanites must have galloped up the valley of Jezreel, before they could be swept away by the Kishon. The whole supposition is supremely ridiculous. The *known* site of Taanach so afflicts Lieutenant Conder's theory, that he has to put a gloss on this reference to it, offering these alternatives (1877, p. 15). "The words 'in Taanach' must either be taken to be a district name applying to all the plain, of which Taanach was the capital, or it must be translated to its meaning 'sandy soil.'" No doubt "in Taanach" does describe that part of the plain which was near Taanach, but certainly not the *whole breadth* of the plain as far as the northern hills, under which Lieutenant Conder thinks the battle took place; while, again, as Taanach is five times (above, and Judges i, 27), connected with Megiddo, it is an inadmissible throwing of dust to take the word differently in the *sixth* instance. The vagueness too of describing the plain near Tabor as *by* or (Lieutenant Conder) *above* the waters of Mujedda is certainly not like the precision of topographical notices in the Bible; but on this point Lieutenant Conder offers no comment. Barak's battle, however, would not be more real than that of the Titans if its site were just *at the foot of Tabor*, thirteen miles from Taanach, and sixteen from Megiddo, if placed *at Mujedda*; while, again, the last place is fifteen miles from Taanuk. The italicized positions are obviously at variance with Judges v, 19—21; indeed, they are quite impossible, and the theory arises from an initial error as to the right position of the Kishon in Judges iv, 7, 13; v, 21.

This Lieutenant Conder fixes at "a place called *el Mujahit'eh*, where there is an extensive chain of pools and springs about three miles west of the foot of Mount Tabor." He thinks also that the above passages require this position; that Josephus confirms it in "Ant.," v, 5, 3; "Barak camped at Mount Tabor . . . Sisera met them, and pitched not far from the enemy." (In Josephus, however, *not far* may mean anything); that "the advantage obtained by Barak in his impetuous descent from the mountain on the enemy in the plain is evident;" that had the battle taken place at Taanach, he "would have had to come the whole width of the great plain, and would have attacked from low ground the enemy on the spurs of the hills, far away from the main bed of the Kishon." He also adds (1881, p. 88), "It is an assumption which contradicts Scripture that the stream from Lejjun is the ancient Kishon."

Here are several errors, one of which must be pointed out.

As to the position of the Kishon. Since Sisera's army was gathered to the river Kishon, and the battle was fought near Taanach, it is clear that the main watercourse in the plain below Taanuk *must* be the brook

Kishon in Judges iv, v. For if Sisera had encamped at el Mujahiyeh, he must have turned southwards, and Barak must have passed him, to fight near Taanach; a thing utterly absurd, as Barak was on Tabor. Thus, "the assumption which contradicts Scripture" is really Lieutenant Conder's own.

My notion of the battle is this:—

From Tabor, Barak descended *on foot* (as is emphatically stated) to the valley (*Emek*) between Tabor and Endor. The watchmen of Sisera in Taanach (or in Megiddo) must have spied afar off "the advance of the ten thousand" rustics over the great plain (*Bikath Megiddo*). The little army, without shield and spear, seemed marching to sure destruction; meanwhile Sisera was not slow to seize the opportunity, little thinking that he was about to fall into his own trap. Leaving his encampment at the foot of the hills, he hastily crossed the Kishon with his nine hundred chariots and vast host, marshalled in Hamitic array (like the Egyptians and Zulus), in an extended line, and soon the long wings of the dragon had enclosed Barak's little flock of kids. Escape now seemed impossible, yet not to faith. The battle began; but suddenly the clouds poured out water, "the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon the house" of Canaan, "and it fell, and great was the fall of it." At once the horses and chariots moved heavily in the viscous mud; soon the whole plain was a quagmire; before long the recently dry watercourse became a foaming torrent, sweeping away the terrified Canaanites that tried to ford it; while the rest of the enemy, fleeing in a north easterly direction, were pursued by the fleet hinds of Naphtali (Gen. xlix, 21; Judges iv, 6), and overtaken and scattered near Endor, whereupon Sisera alighted down off his chariot and fled away *on his feet*.

The passages in Judges and Psalm lxxxiii, relating to the brook Kishon, thus seem to be in perfect agreement with the natural meaning of the words, "then fought the kings of Canaan in Taanach by the waters of Megiddo," and we conclude that *our first point is proved viz., Megiddo was near Taanach.*

(2). The waters of Megiddo were the streams near Lejjun. On reference to the Great Map we find four miles N.N.W. of Taanak abundant perennial streams flowing from the hills near Lejjun.

These are the nearest to Taanuk, and to find the next we must go five miles further, to Wâdy el Kûsab, which is nine miles from Taanuk. As Sisera would hardly need so extended an encampment, we have at once to admit that *the waters of Megiddo* were the copious streams rising in the neighbourhood of Lejjun, which or near which was the famous city of Megiddo. I well remember how six years ago here, in the high luxuriant grass, revelled our mules and Selim's ill-starred ass, destined on the morrow to be half buried in Bikath-Megiddo's mud, and how the spiteful miller spoilt his morning meal. Worse things, however, than these happened, not far off, to Sisera thirty centuries ago.

In support of Mujedda, Lieutenant Conder quotes Ahaziah's flight.

Without giving an opinion on the position of "Beth-hag-gan," "Maaleh Gur," and Ibleam, I would point out that even if Ahaziah fled northwards towards en N'atrah, he might afterwards, under cover of night, reach Megiddo (near Lejjun) as easily as Mujedda.

His object seems to have been, not to get to Jerusalem, but to the nearest place of refuge, and afterwards (as we learn from 2 Chron. xxii, 9) "they caught him (for he was *hid in Samaria*) and brought him to Jehu." Thus it is probable that the words "he died *there*," (2 Kings ix, 27), ought to be translated "he died *then*," *i.e.*, at that time, when Jehu cut off the house of Ahab.

The Bible does not state by what road Necho approached Megiddo. I am not sure, however, that to march up the Jordan valley would not be more exhausting than "to toil over the *hostile* mountains of Ephraim," *hostile* only by an oversight, as Josiah's power reached even unto Naphtali (2 Chron. xxxiv, 6).

It is very satisfactory to find that the *great* plain near Taanuk is after all "the valley (*Bikah*) of Megiddo," as the uniform meaning of the word *Bikah* is hereby preserved. The next step is to admit that "Baalgad in the valley (*Bikah*) of Lebanon" (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7) must be *Ba'albek* in *el Buka'a*.

The Jordan valley east of Mujedda seems to me hardly worthy to be called a *Bikah*, and if it were, it ought to be called the *Bikah of Bethshean* and not of Mujedda.

If one had to point out on the map where Barak fought, I should say *el Afuleh* or the *Birket el Fuleh*, just west of it, which is marked as "marsh in winter." Here Sisera's host would be shut in between the confluents of the Kishon. This spot is six miles from Taanach, and four from the waters of Megiddo, which distances I hope are not too great to be covered by the Hebrew *li*; but if they are, then the battle must be placed still nearer to Taanuk.

Until it is agreed what is *the* correct translation of the Mohar's adventures, it seems premature to attach any weight to them in this matter.

W. F. BIRCH.

HIDING PLACES IN CANAAN.

II. GIDEON'S WINE-PRESS AT OPHRAH.

OPHRAH of the Abi-ezrites was certainly in *western* Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 1-6), although Josephus speaks of Gideon's preparing to cross the Jordan ("Ant.," v, vi, 3) in order to attack the Midianites in the valley of Jezreel.

Lieutenant Conder in his "Handbook" states that this Ophrah is "probably the present village Ferâta, near Shechem, the old name of which was Ophrah (Samaritan Chronicle)." Happily the identification of Gideon's famous city need not rest on this insufficient evidence, as