is a description of Happiness that won a prize: 'Happiness is wanting nothing and knowing it.' For ourselves we will say: Happiness is health of heart.

The first division of our little sermon shall be:

(*a*) *Happiness is inside of you.*

'Oh!' a boy says, 'how glad I should be, how happy, if father would buy me a cricket bat—one with a proper cane-splice.' 'Oh!' another says, 'I should be happy if my father would buy me a watch. All for my own.' 'Yes,' a girl says, 'if I could only have a pair of boots like those in that shop, or a ribbon like Lucy's, I should be quite happy.' Don't, don't grow up with the idea that happiness is in the things you can buy for your own. A man who had three millions every year was not happy, and a famous German who had many beautiful things and was very clever, said that in all his seventy-five years he had not had one month of true happiness.

Can you learn these lines:

> In your hearts are the birds and the sunshine,
> In your thoughts the brooklets flow.

Happiness is inside of you.

The second division is:

(*b*) *To keep happiness you must give it away.*

'Oh no! that can't be right'—yes—it is. Byron said that happiness was born a twin—by which he meant that if you would keep happiness you must halve it.

Once upon a time there lived a king, who had one son. This boy had everything he wished for—toys of many kinds—a fine yacht to steam round the palace lake—a pony (my!—wouldn't you like to have a pony?), and I don't know what besides, and yet he was unhappy. With sad eyes he used to wander about the palace and the park. The king—his father—was troubled, and went to see a wise old man, and said, 'Can you tell me how it is that my son is not happy? I buy him all he wants: he has friends, toys, a yacht, a pony, and yet he is miserable.'

The wise old man took a piece of paper and wrote on it, with something that looked like water. Folding the paper he gave it to the king, saying, 'At eight o'clock to-night, when it will be dark, take a lighted candle and hold this paper between the light and your eyes, and you will then read what I have written, in ink that looked like water.' Evening came, and, in a large room of the palace, the king held the paper before a lighted candle. Out upon the paper there came, clearly, these words, 'The secret of happiness is to do a little kindness to someone every day.' If you would keep happiness you must give it away.

'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' That is the text.

On Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites.

By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.

II.

Jazer (Is 16[8])—properly *Ya'zer*—is mentioned several times besides in the Old Testament; but not in such a way as to fix its site precisely. It belonged to Gad (Nu 32[35], Jos 13[25],[1] 2 S 24[5] [2]), and was on the border of the Ammonites (Nu 21[24],—at least if, as is probable, *Ya'zer* (יעזר) should be read for *strong* (עז); see Gray, *Numbers*, p. 297).

[1] Where 'their border was,' means 'their territory included.'

[2] Read with LXX 'began from' for 'pitched in'; and render then, with RVm, 'toward' for the ungrammatical 'of.'

The map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, follow the P.E.F. map, mentioned in the last article, in placing Jazer about 16 miles E.N.E. of the N.E. corner of the Dead Sea, a little N.E. of el-'Al (Ele'aleh, Is 16[9]); G. A. Smith does not venture to locate it. Why is Jazer placed so confidently here? The *Survey of E. Palestine* (p. 91) will inform us. Simply because there is a place there called 'Beit-*zera'*'; and the consonants in *zera'* are the same as three of those in Ya'zer, only 'transposed, as in other cases, so as to give a modern meaning

to the word.' The reason is hardly more satisfactory than that for the identification of Heisa with Luḥith. Eusebius, indeed, tells us (264. 98–265. 5) that Yazer was a town, 10 or (212. 27) 8 Roman miles W. of Philadelphia (Rabbath Ammon, now *ʿAmmān*), and 15 R. miles from Heshbon: a large stream, he adds, rose from it, and fell into the Jordan. These distances would point to a place, a little W. of Ajbêhât (the ancient Jogbehah), in the W. Ezrak (see G. A. Smith's map), some 14 miles N. of Beit-zeraʿ. The *Onomasticon*, however, 'is not a safe guide': but there ought surely to be better grounds for rejecting its testimony than those alleged in the present instance. It is true, however, that Eusebius' statement does occasion some difficulty. There does not seem to be in W. Ezrak, at least so far as it has been explored, any ruins or modern place that would satisfy Eusebius' description. Hence Merrill and others[1] have identified Yaʿzer with Ṣār,—to judge from the ruins, a place anciently of some importance,—7 miles W. of ʿAmmān, and 10 miles due N. of Heshbon (see Smith's map; and a description in Merrill's art. JAZER in *D.B.*). Ṣār stands on a hill: in the valley below, about 1 mile to the N.W., is the spring ʿAin eṣ-Ṣir, the waters of which combine with those of a number of streams flowing down from the N. and N.W. to form the Wādy Ṣir, which runs down through a well-watered, beautifully wooded valley to the S.W.; on the S. of Ṣār, other streams arise to form the Wādy esh-Shīta, which, also flowing down to the S.W., soon becomes the Wādy Bahhath: this, before long, unites with W. Ṣir to form W. Kefrein, a large stream which ultimately falls into the Jordan, about 2 miles N. of the Dead Sea.[2] The distances of Ṣār from ʿAmmān and Heshbon are not much less than those given by Eusebius for Jaʿzer; and one of the streams just described might be very fairly identified with the one mentioned by him: but, as already pointed out in the *Survey* (p. 153 f.), the names *Ṣār* and Yaʿzer can have no connexion; and the phonetic differences between them constitute a fatal objection to their identification.[3]

[1] The identification, I believe, was first proposed by Seetzen, *Reisen*, 1854, i. 398 (either Ṣir, or Kh. eṣ-Ṣireh, above ʿAin eṣ-Ṣir, to the N.W.).

[2] See, for the particulars, Merrill, *East of Jordan*, pp. 405–7; the P.E.F. *Survey of E. Palestine*, p. 153, with the map in the pocket; and Guy Le Strange, in Schumacher's *Across the Jordan*, p. 311, 312.

[3] Kampffmeyer (*Z.D.P.V.* xv. (1892), 24; cf. xvi. 43, Still, as Dr. Gray remarks (*Numbers*, p. 298), the '*site* of Ṣār does tolerably suit the data of Eusebius'; if, therefore, it is adopted provisionally,—pending a more thorough exploration of W. Ezrak,—it must be clearly understood that the identification is *conjectural*, and that it is made, not *because of* the resemblance of 'Ṣār' to 'Yaʿzer,' but *in spite of* there being no real connexion between them. It ought thus in no case to be marked on a map without a (?). Laurence Oliphant, in his *Land of Gilead*, 1880 (p. 233), observing that Jajuz, the name of a place 5 miles N. of ʿAmmān, 'seems to have a certain similarity (!) with Jazer,' proposes this as its site. But this identification has nothing to recommend it. It is true, there appear to be a spring and stream sufficiently near to satisfy Eusebius' statements: but the stream flows, not into the Jordan, but into the Jabbok; the distances are altogether different from those given by Eusebius, and the name resembles Jaʿzer as little as Ṣār does. Indeed, Oliphant himself thinks that if it will not do for Jaʿzer, it will at least suit Jahaz! But we cannot identify two names merely because they both begin with *Ja* and have a *z* in them.

Let us now take some examples from the other side of Jordan. Let us suppose that the intelligent reader desires to find the places assigned in Jos $15^{33\text{-}36}$ to the *shephēlah*, or 'lowland,' of Judah; and let us see what help his maps give him.

1 and 2. 'Eshtā'ōl and Ẓorʿah. The name Ẓorʿah is still preserved in *Ẓurʿa*, a place 14 miles due W. of Jerusalem: so there is no difficulty about its site. Eshta'ol is often mentioned beside it in the history of Samson; and though *'Eshuaʿ*, the name of a place about a mile N.E. of it, is 'far in sound from אשתאול' (G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 218 *n.*), yet the situation suits. Still, one certainly wishes that the 'tradition' that the place was once called *'Eshu'al* or *'Eshtu'al* (Smith, 219; Buhl, 195) could be confirmed. The site is accepted in *H.G.* 218 only with 'perhaps.'

3. 'Ashnah. In the P.E.F. map, mentioned

referred to by Buhl), in one of his interesting and scholarly articles on the ancient place-names of Palestine, compared phonetically with their modern equivalents, says that he has in his collections no instance of the change of ז into ص, except in the equally uncertain case of the suggested identification of *Muraṣṣaṣ* with Meroz. (Ewing, in accepting this in *D.B.*, *s.v.*, is obviously unconscious of any phonetic difficulty; Moore's objections are thus better 'justified' than he imagines.)

above, marked with a (?) at the village of Ḥasan, about a mile N. of Ẓor'ah. In G. A. Smith's map (both the one of Judah in *H.G.*, and the large map), the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, placed at Ḥasan *without* a (?).

But according to the article in *D.B.* (Conder), *E.B.*, and Steuernagel, in his Comm. on Jos. (1900), unidentified; and by G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 202 *n.* 1, included (implicitly) among the sites 'not properly identified.' And when we learn (P.E.F. *Name-Lists*, p. 305) that 'Ḥasan' commemorates the name of an Arab pilgrim, it dawns upon us that Smith's statement is not in excess of the truth.

In the case of this place, there are thus two contradictions, each in one and the same book: in both *H.G.* and *D.B.* the map marks it, without any indication of uncertainty; the text says that the site is unknown!

4. Zanoah; no doubt *Zanu'*, 3½ miles S. of Ẓor'ah. On the ע for נ see Kampffmeyer, xv. 25 f.

5. 'En-gannim. *D.B.* and *E.B.* both state that it was identified by Clermont-Ganneau[1] with *Umm-Jinā*, 2 miles S.W. of Ẓor'ah, but without apparently endorsing the identification. It 'might perhaps be' Umm-Jinā, says Buhl (p. 194 f.). Placed there in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, and Murray's map. In the map of Judah in *E.B.* marked there also, but (N.B.) with (??) attached. Any one who reads Clermont-Ganneau's own discussion of the site must surely see that the grounds for the identification are very conjectural. Whatever *Jinā* may mean (Clermont-Ganneau says the *Jinns*), it has no connexion with *gannim* (gardens).

6. Tappuaḥ. Site unknown (Armstrong, Steuernagel, and Wilson, in *D.B.*, *s.v.*), and not marked on the maps. Said in *H.G.* 202 *n.* 1 to be in the W. el-'Afranj. But is not the *Tuffuḥ* in this valley, 4 miles W. of Hebron, rather the Beth-tappuaḥ of Jos 15[53], in the 'hill-country'?

7. 'Enām. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at *Khurbet W. 'Alîn*, or the Ruins of Wady 'Alîn, 2 miles slightly W. of N. of Zanoah.[2] Located here by Conder in *Handbook to the Bible* (1879), p. 410. But in Murray's *Dict. of the Bible* (1909), the same writer locates it in an entirely different situation, at '*Kefr 'Ana*, 6 miles N.W. of Sorek,' and 7 miles W.N.W. of Ẓor'ah; and in *D.B.* iii. 648, at '*Ain 'Ainah* (which I cannot find). Placed at Kh. W. 'Alîn, but *without* the (?), in the map of Judah in *H.G.*, in Murray's map, and in the *D.B.* map. But in the *text* of *H.G.* 202 *n.* 'Enām is said to be 'not properly identified,' and it is omitted in Smith's large wall-map. Steuernagel says that the site is unknown. In *D.B.* and *E.B.*, *s.v.*, nothing more definite is said than that (see Gn 38[14]) 'Enām was between 'Adullam and the Timnah of Gn 38[13]. This, however, will have been (notice *went up*, *goeth up*, in Gn 28[12. 13]) the Timnah (now *Tibna*),[3] 4 miles N.E. of 'Aid el-mâ, and 5 miles S.E. of Kh. Wady 'Alîn; so that, if this be 'Enām, and (see below) '*Aid el-mâ* 'Adullam, it will have been anything but 'between' 'Adullam and Timnah. The uncertainty in the site of 'Enām must be obvious. Yet the maps in *H.G.* and *D.B.*, and Murray's map, all mark it as certain.

8. Yarmuth. No doubt *Yarmuk*, 1 mile S. of Zanoah. Cf., on the *k*, Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 45.

9. 'Adullam. Clermont-Ganneau in 1871 discovered, 4 miles S.E. of Yarmuk, a ruined site called '*Aid el-mâ*, which he conjectured to represent the Biblical 'Adullam—the ancient name having been transformed by a 'popular etymology' (Buhl, 193; *P.E.F.Q.St.* 1875, 177). The identification is conjectural, but the situation would suit; and it has been generally accepted. But it ought not to be marked on a map without a (?). It is not marked at all in the map of Judah in *E.B.* Cf. *H.G.* 229 f.

10. Socoh. No doubt *'esh-Shuweike*—a *diminutive* form (Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 66)—2 miles S. of Yarmuk.

11. 'Azēḳah. Not in the P.E.F. map. In G. A. Smith's map, *D.B.* map, and Murray's map, marked at *Zakariyā*, 2 miles S.W. of Zanoah. But in *D.B.*, *s.v.* (Conder), no identification is proposed; and *H.G.* 202 *n.* says, 'not properly identified.' We have thus two other instances of the text and the map in one and the same volume contradicting each other.

12. Sha'araim. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at the ruined site *Sha'îreh*, 3½ miles E.S.E. of Zanoah. In the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, marked at *Sha'îreh*, but *without* the (?). Not marked in either of G. A. Smith's maps; and according to *H.G.* 202 *n.* 'not properly identified.' In *D.B.*, *s.v.* (Wilson), no identification accepted.

[1] *Archæol. Researches in Palestine* (P.E.F.) ii. 207 f.

[2] In either both the 1 in. and ½ in. to the mile maps of Palestine, or in G. A. Smith's map, Zanoah must be incorrectly located; in the former it is slightly *East* of S. of Kh. W. 'Alîn, in the latter it is considerably *West* of S. of it.

[3] And not the Timnah of Samson (Jg 14[1], etc.), which was 4 miles W. of Kh. W. 'Alîn, and far *lower* than 'Aid el-mâ.

13. 'Adithaim. Unknown (*D.B.*, *E.B.*), and, so far as I can discover, not shown on the maps. In the P.E.F. *Memoirs*, ii. (1882) 322, identified by Conder with *Ḥaditheh*, 3 miles E. of Lydda; but in *D.B.* i. (1898), *s.v.*, the same writer says that the site is unknown! The contradiction, like those in regard to 'Enām, throws light on the value of some of these supposed 'identifications.'

14. Gedērah. Marked in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, Murray's map, and *D.B.* map at *Jedireh*, 4½ miles N.N.W. of Ẓor'ah. This seems much more probable than the more distant *Ḳutra* —which, moreover, does not agree phonetically[1]— 13 miles W.N.W. of Ẓor'ah, in the maritime plain, apparently preferred in *E.B.*

15. Gedērothaim. The subscription mentions only *fourteen* cities, so no doubt there is here some textual error. The name may, for instance, be a corrupt repetition of *Gedērah*, or an error for גדרתיה (LXX), 'its sheep-folds.'

A map in which, out of fourteen names taken at random, the sites of five are in the highest degree questionable and uncertain, cannot be said to attain a high standard of accuracy. I have often, besides, also noticed sites confidently assigned on the current maps of Palestine, which, upon looking into the grounds upon which they rest, I have found to be equally problematical: in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. 332 f., I gave a list of nearly thirty such sites of places mentioned in the Book of Judges.[2] I have little doubt that many other equally doubtful sites could be found. A map ought to be trustworthy: it is of little real use if no less well-known site marked upon it can be relied upon until hours have been spent in searching out the grounds on which it depends, and ascertaining whether they are sufficient. The only English maps of Palestine which, so far as I have examined them, can be implicitly relied upon are those in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. If I may say so without presumption, even G. A. Smith's map needs some revision; Murray's map and the *D.B.* map need not revision merely, but drastic expurgation. These maps are admirably designed and engraved; but what chartographer, however skilful he may be in the technique of his own profession, can estimate the grounds — philological, critical, historical, or exegetical — upon which, in cases where the *name* has not been unambiguously preserved, the probability of a proposed identification depends? It is to be feared that the authorities of the P.E.F. are responsible in some measure for the confusion; and that the map-makers who have adopted their identifications have not sufficiently considered that, however highly qualified a man may be to survey and describe a *modern* country, he is not on this account equally qualified to estimate the grounds for the identification of a given modern site with an *ancient* place. And when Murray's map and the *D.B.* map are both stated to be 'according to Palestine Exploration Survey,' this is incorrect, and asserts for the map an authority which it does not possess. All that the 'Palestine Exploration Survey' has done is to determine the configuration and sites of the *modern country*,—and, as every one knows, it has done this work most admirably; but it is no function of a 'survey' to determine what *ancient* places any of these sites represent. In some cases the identity of the modern with the ancient site depends upon a well-established, continuous historical tradition; in other cases it depends upon a probable, or, it may be, a very improbable, conjecture; but in none of these cases is the identity, whether real or imaginary, a matter which falls within the scope of a 'survey'; and the confidence which the details of the 'survey' rightly command cannot be claimed for the many hypothetical, and often questionable, identifications with which these maps are crowded. There are cases, also, as noticed above, in which these maps do the P.E.F. map the injustice of adopting from it ancient sites *without* the (?) by which the compilers of that map have guarded themselves. This is a practice deserving strong reprobation. It surely must be evident that for the construction of a map of Palestine including ancient sites, the professional map-maker needs a competent scholar at his side, to advise him what proposed 'identifications' deserve to be accepted by him. Murray's map is a convenient one, as it is handy in size, and shows the elevations (which are important for the history);

[1] The equation, writes Kampffmeyer, *Z.D.M.G.* xvi. (1893) p. 31, is 'recht zweifelhaft.'

[2] The rock of 'Eṭām (Jg 15[8]), for instance, was a place to which Samson 'went down' from Timnah (v.[6]; cf. 14[1. 5]); but Beit-'Aṭab, 5 miles E. of Zanoah, the favourite site for 'Eṭām on the maps (but not in the map in *H.G.*, and in the wall-map only with a ?) is some 1200 feet *above* it! (cf. *H.G.* 222). The ups and downs of the Shephēlah country are vividly reflected in the stories of Samson; and here, as elsewhere in the O.T., the 'went up' and 'came down' should always be carefully noted by the reader. Cf. *H.G.* chap. x.

but it is full of pitfalls for the unwary, and must always be used with extreme caution. The map in Buhl's *Geographie* (1896) contains, unfortunately, only modern sites. A critical map of Palestine, on a convenient scale, and containing only those ancient sites which are either certain or reasonably probable, is still, as it was in 1892 (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiii. 460), a desideratum of Biblical students. Let us hope that some adequately qualified scholar will come forward and produce it.

Contributions and Comments.

The Muhammadan 'Corner.'

ALTHOUGH the word 'corner' in the commercial sense is of United States origin, the thing which it denotes is of immemorial antiquity. A primitive example of it which will occur to every one is that of Joseph in Egypt. In the East this operation is confined to foodstuffs, the demand for other commodities not being sufficiently stringent, and it is forbidden by the law of Islām. It is thus defined in the *Tenbīh al-Ghāfilīn* (*Warning to the Negligent*) of Samarqandi (d. 1003 A.D.):

'Cornering (*ḥukrah*) means buying provisions in a town and holding them without selling, although the people require them. This is to form a corner, and it is forbidden. But if the grain be the produce of one's own estate, or be imported from another town, this is not a corner. Still, if public necessity require it, the grain must be sold. Should the owner refuse to sell he becomes guilty of evil intention towards the Muslims and of want of consideration for them. He must then be forced to sell, and if he refuse he must be scourged and punished, and even then he may not sell at his own price, but at the market rate. For even the Apostle of God said, I do not fix prices, but he who fixes prices is God.'

This regulation is founded on traditional sayings of Muhammad such as the following:—He who makes a corner in grain is a sinner: He who corners foodstuffs for a period of forty days has done with God, and God has done with him: The importer shall be blessed, but the cornerer is cursed,—the 'importer' being defined as the merchant who purchases foodstuffs with the intention of selling them, and imports them to his own locality and sells them. Muhammad is also reported to have warned one of his disciples not to apprentice his son to a grain merchant, on the ground that it were better for him to meet death whilst engaged in drinking wine, or in some other crime, than to meet it just after he happened to have cornered grain for forty nights. Malik ibn Anas (d. 795 A.D.) mentions in the *Muwaṭṭa* that Omar and Othmān, the second and third khalifs, also prohibited corners in food.

These recommendations of Muhammad and his followers were far from remaining a dead letter. One of the officials of the Muslim municipality is the *moḥtasib*, whose duty it is to regulate the price of commodities, and in times of scarcity to find out hidden stores of grain and bring them to the market. The Egyptian Government frequently imported corn from Syria to counteract the effects of a low Nile, and if that failed to bring down prices, the grain speculators were flogged until they sold their supplies at the government rate. The *moḥtasib* himself, however, was sometimes interested in the trade. This was the case at Medina when Burckhardt visited it (*Travels in Arabia*, vol. ii. p. 248 f.). The whole subject is treated in the *Hedaya* of Marghīnāni (d. 1197 A.H.), English translation by Charles Hamilton, 2nd ed. p. 605 ff.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow.

Stephen Langton's Death.

I.

I WROTE *re* this query to my friend the Rev. Charles Woodruff, at the Dean and Chapter Library, Canterbury, who replies this morning: 'I don't know that I shall be able to settle the question as to the date of Archbishop Langton's death from our records. The Monastic Registers do not begin so early as 1228, though we have any number of earlier charters, and of course it might be possible to fix the date from them, though it may take time to find out.'

RICHARD COOKE.

Maidstone.