

Cydoessa, a town noticed by Josephus as near Paneas, is evidently the modern *Kadeisa*.

Gitta, the native place of Simon Magus (Justin Martyr, Apolog. ii.) is generally supposed to be the modern *Kuriet Jit*, but it may much more properly be placed at *Jett*, the Gath of the lists of Thothmes III. All that is known of Gitta is that it was a Samaritan town, which would fit with the proposed site.

The following is a rough conspectus of our present information of topography in Palestine:—

Biblical sites 420 known .. 160 unknown .. 580 total.

Talmudic sites 240 ,, .. 110 ,, .. 350 ,,

Early Christian sites.. 370 ,, .. 30 ,, .. 400 ,,

Many of the unknown sites lie beyond the bounds at present surveyed.

C. R. C.

CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH TRADITIONS.

THE question of the value to be attached to traditions concerning Biblical sites is one of so great importance that many readers will be interested in knowing what bearing the Survey of Palestine has upon it. The following remarks are intended to illustrate the value in various cases of the early and mediæval writings, both Christian and Jewish, in instances which have not been touched by general controversy, but from which we may draw deductions to guide us in the more important questions, especially as regards Jerusalem topography.

Whatever may be the history of the early Christian Church in Palestine, and the continuity of its traditions, it cannot be denied that from a literary point of view there is a break between the New Testament writings and the earliest pilgrimages of nearly 200 years. We find, indeed, in the writings of Justin Martyr (circ. 150 A.D.) a reference to the grotto of Bethlehem, but the earliest account of the sacred places of Palestine is the Jerusalem Itinerary (A.D. 333), composed by the anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux, who visited the city just at the time of the building of Constantine's Basilica.

That the Christians were in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries spread through the whole country the Survey abundantly testifies: from the deserts of Beersheba to the slopes of Hermon we have come across innumerable convents and churches which cannot be dated later than this period. The nomenclature of the country bears witness to the existence of flourishing communities, charitable convents, and holy Christian sites, in every part, and the titles given to many ruins show the fate they finally underwent in perishing by fire.

It was during this time (A.D. 420) that St. Jerome came to Palestine and commenced in the dark grotto at Bethlehem his translation of the

Bible. He was, as is well known, one of the few fathers of that period who were acquainted with Hebrew; and it would appear also that he understood the Aramaic, which was, as he informs us, in his day the language of the natives. To him we owe the first attempt at a Bible dictionary, in his enlarged translation of the Onomasticon of Eusebius. The work contains some 400 places in Western Palestine, defined with sufficient exactitude to allow of their being still recognised. The study of this work leads, as I have often had occasion to remark in former papers, to two very clear conclusions.

1st. That St. Jerome's knowledge of the country was most intimate and accurate. That he had traversed almost the whole of Palestine, and had been able to note the direction and distances of places so exactly that they measure sometimes to a few hundred yards on the map. This, probably, was because the milestones on the great Roman roads were still in use.

2nd. That similarity of name was considered sufficient reason for identifying a Scriptural with a then existing site without any very careful examination into the question whether the position was geographically satisfactory. It follows that although the identification is often correct, Jerome's opinion cannot of itself be considered authoritative, unless supported by other considerations.

In order to clearly establish this statement it will be well to give the most striking instances in which accurate information has been combined with inaccurate conclusions; but in justice to the memory of the great man whose work we are now able thus to criticise, it must be remembered that the number of instances in which he has enabled us to preserve undoubted traces of the Scriptural nomenclature equals, if it does not surpass, these instances of error.

In the Onomasticon we find Adullam fixed as ten Roman miles east of Eleutheropolis, or about the position of the new site at '*Aidelmâ*, but this is coupled with the extraordinary statement, "which also is Eglon" (a city known to exist at '*Ajlân*, eighteen miles south-west, at a site which is mentioned by Jerome under the name *Agla*, and actually suggested as identical with Beth Hogla, now known to be '*Ain Hajleh*, in the Jordan valley, or quite on the opposite side of Palestine). The origin of this mistake as to Eglon has been explained by M. Ganneau in his paper on Adullam.

Another striking instance is Jerome's identification of Ajalon as being three miles east of Bethel, evidently the modern '*Alia*; for he admits that the Jews in his time considered Ajalon to be situate at a village called Alus, "not far from Nicopolis"—evidently the modern '*Yalô*, now generally accepted as representing Ajalon. This error is also remarkable because Jerome knew of the position of the upper and nether Bethhoron, which renders his site for Ajalon quite inadmissible.

The ideas formed of the position of the tribe boundaries must have been very vague, for Jerome places Gibeah of Benjamin, or of Saul, which he confuses with Gibeah Phineas (now '*Awertah*), between Beth-

lehem and Eleutheropolis, evidently at the modern *Jeb'a*, whereas the proximity of Michmash and Ramah, both of which he identifies correctly, should have suggested quite a different direction.

Again, in speaking of Neiel (now *Ya'nín*), on the boundary of Asher and Zebulon, he suggests *Betocænea*, which, as I have shown previously, must be the modern '*Antn*, in the territory of Manasseh. And again, he makes the same place to be Bethanoth of Naphtali, speaking with even greater certainty.

Anob, a city close to Debir, in the extreme south of the hills of Judah, is transported by the Onomasticon to the neighbourhood of the low hills at *Beit Nûba*. Jerome hesitates between this site and that of '*Annâbeh*, a little farther north. Anob was fixed by the Survey at '*Anâb*, close to *edh Dhâherîyeh* (proposed by me as identical with Debir).

Beth Arbel was the farthest northern limit of Palestine, and is to be sought north of Tyre and Sidon; yet Jerome would place it in the great plain, nine miles from Legio, evidently the modern '*Arûbôneh*, on the boundary between Galilee and Samaria. Anim, a town in the Negéb, is supposed by Jerome to be situate at "the terebinth," now called "Abraham's house," north of Hebron. Yet the site now accepted as that of Anim, the modern *el Ghûwein*, is fixed with considerable precision in the Onomasticon, and the fact that there were two sites, "the upper" and "the lower," which are both still in existence, is noted, but one of these he supposes to be Anob, which he had already fixed in another position; whilst he would seem to place a second Anim at the upper site, which he notices as entirely Christian in its population, Ain, the city of Simeon, also supposed to be *Bethemin*, two miles from "the terebinth," evidently the modern *Beit 'Ainûn*, far away from the territory of Simeon.

It is clear from the account given in Joshua xv. that the Valley of Achor, where Achan was stoned, lay south of Jericho, probably being the present *Wâdy Kelt*, but Jerome notes the existence of the name north of Jericho. His identification of Ebal and Gerizim as being in the same neighbourhood has been enlarged upon in a former paper (*Quarterly Statement*, October, 1876).

A few other important errors may still be added, including the supposition that Emmaus Nicopolis was the Emmaus of the Gospel, and that Makkedah was eight miles east of Eleutheropolis, or in the hills of Judea. It is also inexplicable how Jerome can suppose Engannim of Judah to have been close to Bethel, yet he places it there evidently at the modern '*Ain Kânia*. Gedor, again, a town in the hills near Hebron, he supposes to be Gedrus, which from the distances given is evidently the present *Jedtreh*, not far from Gezer and Ekron in the plains, and probably identical with the ancient Gederah of Judah.

From this weight of testimony there is no escape. It shows clearly that the Christian writers of the fifth century were treating of a country strange to them, and of a topography which had been at least partially lost. Though the greatest scholar, and perhaps one of the ablest men

of his time, St. Jerome was evidently puzzled in regard to the whole question of the ancient topography, and unable to settle many important points in spite of a complete acquaintance with the country as then existing.

In the Onomasticon we see tradition not made, but in the process of making. The method by which the early fathers endeavoured to arrive at an understanding of Scripture geography was apparently not far different from that employed by modern writers; the miraculous discovery of sacred sites dates later, and has no place in the writings of Jerome, and the main difference which we detect is that when a father of the church jumped at a conclusion not strictly warranted by his facts, his opinion was generally adopted without being subject to the very strict criticism of our day.

It is scarcely to be expected that the reliability of tradition would increase with the lapse of time. The period between the early centuries of church history and the Crusades was one of trouble in Palestine. From the era of the Hegira down to 1100 A.D., the opportunities of studying the geography of the country were few and small. The early travellers, Arculphus and Willibald in the eighth, and St. Bernhard in the ninth century, followed nearly the same route, and treat principally of the more important sites which it is not proposed now to touch on. One thing only is very remarkable, namely, the gradual increase in the number of sacred places; Arculphus only notices about half a dozen sites in Jerusalem, but St. Bernhard, little more than a century later, mentions nearly twenty, and Sœwulf in 1102 adds many more. In crusading times there were upwards of twenty churches in Jerusalem, all supposed to mark sacred spots; but the only one which can claim an antiquity at all equal to that of the church of the Anastasis, appears to be that of the Tomb of the Virgin, in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

With the advent of the Crusaders we enter upon a new era, and upon a traditional topography of a new and entirely different character. There is now no doubt that we deal with men entirely strange to the country, and very ill acquainted with the contents of the Bible.

It is here for the first time that we meet with undoubted instances of *transference of tradition*, and as this question has an important bearing on many disputed points, some instances may be of value.

The best known instance of such transference relates to the site of the martyrdom of St. Stephen. A very early tradition fixed this on the north side of Jerusalem, outside the Damascus Gate, and near the spot where the ruins of the crusading Asnerie have lately been recovered; as late as the time of Sœwulf (1102 A.D.) the site was unchanged, and William of Tyre still places it north of the city; but St. Stephen's Gate is now shown on the east of Jerusalem.

More important places were in the same way transferred to new sites, and the most remarkable case is that of Capernaum. To Jerome, Arculphus, Willibald, and other early travellers, Capernaum was known as situated on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, but in 1160 A.D.,

Benjamin of Tudela places it at a site which he calls Kefr Thancum between Haifa and Cæsarea. I have already shown (*Quarterly Statement*, Jan. 1876) that the distances given by him fix this site at the modern *Kefr Lam*, which is probably thus a corruption of *Kefer Nam* or *Capernaum*. Kefr Thancum is probably the Kefar Tanhum of the Talmud, a name somewhat resembling the Talmudic Kefar Nahum, which seems undoubtedly to be identical with Capernaum. As early, however, as the time of Jerome the H had been changed to 'ain in this word, for he translates Capernaum "villa pulcherrima" (NAUM), instead of "town of consolation" (NAHUM).

We find the same site for Capernaum again noticed in the Itinerary of Richard I. with circumstances which still further serve to fix it as situate at Kefr Lam, for the king, after halting there, proceeds to the "house of narrow ways," evidently situate at the point south of the village, where a rocky passage has been cut through to give a communication between the plain and the shore separated by a sandstone ridge. Further on in the same narrative we find Maon mentioned among the castles in the maritime plain destroyed in 1191 A.D. by Salâdin, and Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela informs us that Maon was the same place as Capernaum. The remains of a fine crusading fortress are still visible in the modern village of Kefr Lam.

This site thus furnishes us with a double instance of transference. Maon was known to be close to Carmel, the city of Judah, where Nabal lived, the true site (*Mān*) was well known to Jerome, who carefully distinguishes between the town of Nabal (now *Kürmül*) south of Hebron and Mount Carmel, where Elijah offered his sacrifice. This distinction was unknown to the Crusaders who, being only acquainted with the mountain, were forced to transfer the site of Maon a distance of nearly one hundred miles, to a place in the vicinity of Mount Carmel.

Tyre and Sarepta, in like manner, were transferred southwards to the very same neighbourhood. Sarepta is correctly placed in the Onomasticon in the neighbourhood of Sidon "by the public road," evidently at the real site of the modern *Sürfend*, and Tyre was known to William of Tyre, who was bishop there for many years. Yet this author, in company with other mediæval writers, speaks of "ancient Tyre" as a site south of Caïpha and seemingly the modern *'Athlit*, the crusading Castellum Perigrinorum. This curious mistake necessitated two others. Porphyryon was a town near Tyre, and is accordingly placed by William of Tyre at Caïpha, which was supposed by the Crusaders to have taken its name from Caiaphas the high priest, or from Cephas, the second name of St. Peter. Sarepta also was to be sought near Tyre, and we still find a second village called *Sürfend* immediately north of *Kefr Lam*.

Thus Maon, from the extreme south of Palestine, Capernaum from the east, and Tyre and Sarepta from the north, were all brought within a few miles of one another; and as the Castellum Perigrinorum was the principal landing-place for pilgrims, one is tempted to suppose that

motives of expediency had something to do in the matter, as neither Capernaum nor Maon lay in country then held by the Crusaders, and as the pilgrims would naturally be anxious to visit sites of so much interest.

Instances of such confusions may be multiplied indefinitely. Thus the crusading maritime fortrees of Arsuf, the ancient Apollonia, was supposed to represent Ashero Antipatris, and even Ashdod, the true sites of which were all known to Eusebius and Jerome, all at considerable distances apart.

Benjamin of Tudela places Keilah of Judah, a city west of Hebron, at Caco (now *Kakûn*), some sixty miles from the real site, now *Kilah*, which seems to have been known to Jerome.

Nob, the city of the priests, was apparently unknown to Jerome, who confuses it with Nobah (Judg. viii. 11), but to the Crusaders it was pointed out as identical with Betenoble (*Beit Nûba*), in a situation quite irreconcilable with the requirements of the Scripture narratives.

Two still more glaring errors are to be found in William of Tyre, who places Gath at Ibelin, now *Yebnah*, the ancient Jabneel, whilst he identifies *Beit Jibrin* with Beersheba, explaining its modern name to mean "house of Gabriel." There is still in *Beit Jibrin* a sacred place called *Mûkam en Neby Jibrîl*, "station of the Prophet Gabriel," close to the remains of a crusading church, but this interpretation and the consequent connection with Gabriel are evidently late, for the older form of the name found in the Talmud is Beto-Gabra. Both Beersheba and Gath were known and fixed at their true sites in the time of Jerome.

In conclusion, we find at this period the site of Adullam transferred to its present position (*Mûghâret M'asa*) from the true situation known to Eusebius.

It is evident, therefore, that a broad distinction must be made between the statements of the early Christian writers and the wild guesses of the mediæval chroniclers.

The question of Jewish mediæval writings is one entirely apart from that as yet treated, and as we have already seen, the Jews in the time of Jerome knew the real site of Ajalon, though their hatred of the Samaritans induced them to transfer those of Ebal and Gerizim to the neighbourhood of Jericho. It must be remembered that we have in their case to deal with an indigenous population which never entirely lost its hold on the country, and with a tradition in which there is no break. In the Talmud we get not a traditional but an actual topography; and in the travels of Jewish pilgrims we find a thorough acquaintance with Talmudic characters and topography, which gives to their statements a reality and value not possessed by Christian chronicles.

Immediately after the fall of Bether (120 A.D.) the Sanhedrim fixed its seat at Jamina, and afterwards successively at Ausha (*Hûsheh*, C. R. C.) Shafaram (*Shefa 'Amer*), Beth Shearim, Sepphoris, and Tiberias. By

200 A.D. Rabbi Judah, the saint, had committed the Mishna to writing, closing the list of the doctors called Tanaim; by 300 A.D. the Jerusalem Talmud was complete, and by 500 A.D. the Talmud of Babylon was finished by the last of the Amoraim. Thus we have an unbroken series of writers till after the date of Jerome, and their casual references to places and natural features are of the highest value because only incidentally introduced.

The Talmudic topography is that of Palestine as actually then existing, but instances of *identifications* do occur, notably in commenting on the list of the towns of Naphtali and Zebulon which are identified as follows:—

| | |
|--|--|
| Josh. xix. 33. | Tal. Jer. Megilla, 70a. |
| Heleph | = Heleph. |
| Allon } | = Aialin, ^(1, 15) |
| Bezaanaim } (<i>Bessûm</i> , C. R. C.) .. | = Agia Kadesh. |
| Adami (<i>ed Dâmeh</i>) | = Damim (<i>Damûn</i>). |
| Nekeb (<i>Nakib</i> , C. R. C.) | = Zedatha. |
| Jabneel | = Kaphar Jamah. |
| Lakum | = Lekim. |
| Josh. xix. 15. | |
| Kattath | = Katunith (<i>Kateineh</i>). |
| Nehallal | = Mahlul (<i>M'alûl</i>). |
| Shimron | = Simunieh (<i>Sammûnieh</i>). |
| Idalah (<i>ed Dâlieh</i> , C. R. C.) ..? | = Hiriâh. |
| Bethlehem (<i>B. Lahm</i>) | = Bethlehem Zeriah. |
| Josh. xix. 35. | |
| Ziddim | = Kaphar Hitia ^(near J. 355) (<i>Hattin</i>). |
| Zer | (near) Desmikâh Lah. |
| Hammath (<i>el Hûmmâm</i>) | = Hamatha. |
| Rakkath (<i>Tuberiyeh</i>) | = Tiberias (<i>Tuberiyeh</i>). |
| Chinnereth (<i>Bett Jenn</i>) | = Genezar. |

This comparison is of value as showing that many sites had been lost even to the Jews as early as 300 A.D., and that the nomenclature had undergone a change, for many of the identifications here enumerated are to all appearance correct, though others are seemingly wrong.

Passing on to the Jewish mediæval travellers we find statements fully in accordance with those of the Talmud. Thus, R. Samuel Bar Simson states that the synagogue of Arbela was built by R. Nitai, and in the Mishna we find Arbela noticed as the native place of R. Nitai, who lived about 200 B.C.

The Jews of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries visited Palestine chiefly on account of the tombs of their ancestors. Hence, in their writings we find constant notice of the tombs of many worthies both of Biblical and also of later times, and most of these sites remain to the present day. They also give the names of the builders of various synagogues, and there seems no reason to doubt the accuracy of their

statements. Thus we learn that no less than twenty-four synagogues, mostly in Galilee, were built by R. Simeon bar Jochai about 120 A.D., among which were those at Kefr Birim, at el Jish, and at Meirun, probably the ones visited by Major Wilson, as this date agrees with the opinion formed by architects as to the character of the work. Two others are noticed at Sasa and Tiria which have still to be discovered, and it is not impossible that others of the known synagogues are to be attributed to the same founder.

As regards the tombs the Jewish information appears also to be reliable. Thus at Gath-Hepher, which he identifies correctly, Isaac Chelo mentions the tomb of Jonas now visible in the centre of the village. It is remarkable, however, that Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, a little earlier, places Gath-Hepher at Caipha.

The tombs of Joseph at Balata, near Shechem, and of Hillel and Shammai at Meirun, are still shown as described by these mediæval Jewish pilgrims; the sepulchre of Samson at Zoreah, is no doubt the present *Mukâm of Sheikh Samit*, and it will in all probability prove equally easy to recover the numerous sepulchres in Upper and Lower Galilee mentioned in these itineraries, many of which are of considerable interest.

The deductions which it appears to me may safely be drawn from the facts detailed in the foregoing pages, are simple:—

1st. As regards early Christian topography, and especially that of the Onomasticon, the authority of the writers is not sufficient when unsupported by other evidences to establish the identity of a Scriptural site.

2nd. Crusading topography subsequent to 1100 A.D., is so hopelessly obscured by the ignorance of priests and pilgrims alike, and by the continual transference of sites from their true place known by the early Christians into new positions, quite irreconcilable with the requirements of the original narrative, that it must be considered entirely valueless in fixing the real sites.

3rd. The mediæval Jewish pilgrims appear, as a rule, to have had a much more accurate knowledge both of the country and of the Bible, their assertions are borne out by existing remains, and are in accordance with the Scriptural narrative, and the indications contained in their writings frequently appear to be of the greatest value.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.

27th October, 1876.

SAUL'S JOURNEY TO ZUPH.

1 Sam. ix. and x.

THE wanderings of the hero "who, seeking asses, found a kingdom," form one of the most curious puzzles in Scriptural topography, for the starting-point is unknown, the point to which he returned doubtful, and