

by the Druze, apparently because their system is partly based on Platonism, and partly on the Bactrian Buddhism which is connected with Platonism. The Druze doctrine as to our Lord is clearly Gnostic, regarding the Eternal Christ as a true Deity, but Jesus as "the Rival," or enemy of Hamza. The true Christ was not crucified, they say, but the body of Jesus was stolen and hidden after his crucifixion by the true Christ in order to prepare men for the preaching of His religion. "The Being who has created the universe" is the Rival, answering exactly to the Demiurge of the Gnostics. Hakim Bi Amrhi is a reverent substitute for Bi Amr Allah. Ismail is Ismail the sixth Imam, also a historic personage. "What they are aspiring after" means the Imâmat answering to the Buddhist Bodisatwah. The Catechism represents a fairly high stage of initiation, but not apparently the highest, which ends in a negation of all dogmas. It would require many pages to explain thoroughly the Druze system, and the utility of the inquiry is not great. All the elements can be recognised either in Buddhism, or in the Gnosticism described by Irenæus. I have written a full paper on the subject, which may perhaps find its proper place in the "Inquiry" now set on foot by the Palestine Exploration Fund Committee.

Zephathah.—The ingenious suggestion of Mr. Flecker does not seem to me necessary, because Wâdy Sâfieh, which I some time ago proposed as the Valley of Zephathah, passes quite close to Mareshah. Objection could well be raised to Tell es Sâfi as being too far away, but this does not apply to the great valley called Wâdy Sâfieh, up which runs one of the high roads to Hebron. No one who knows Hebrew or Arabic would identify Zeita and Zephathah, which have only the T in common, and not as a radical in Zephathah.

NOTES ON "ACROSS JORDAN."

THIS is a very interesting account of part of the Haurân, and contains much good work. A few notes occur in reading it. The Arabic names in some cases might be translated, and the transliteration in some cases does not quite agree with the original lettering; but these are minor points. *Ain el Ekseir* ("Spring of the little house or tower"). *'Ain Esfeira* I should propose to render "the yellowish spring." It should probably not be spelt with *Te*. *Ain Janna*, evidently an old *En Gannim*, "Spring of the garden." *El 'Ajamy*, "the Persian," a common word used to denote any stranger from the East. *El 'Araj*: I have ascertained that this word, which is very common, means the "the ascent," not "the lame." The former meaning may be supported from Lane's Dictionary.

Dâkah is a word meaning a "tract" of land. *Deir el Leyyeh*, evidently a corruption (like *Deir et Mus*, for "Monastery of Amos"), meaning "Monastery of Elijah." *El Emshiyadât*, "the white-washed," from *Shîd*, chalk, used for whitewash; "the sublime" is not very applicable. *Jillin* is probably

an old Gallim ("springs"), as it is near a great stream. The word *Rubud* appears to mean a "lurking place" or "lair," and occurs also in Hebrew. *Kefr es Samir* is interesting, as showing Samaritan extension towards Damascus. We know that in the seventh century the Samaritans were widely spread over Syria. *El Mezeirib*, "the Channels." The word *Mezrab*, of which this is a diminutive form, is very common, meaning a place irrigated and producing vegetables. *Náb*, evidently an ancient Nob. *Na'aeiméh*, "the garden." The word occurs near Jericho. *Nukrah*, as in the case of Râs en Nakûrah, I think is used in the Aramaic meaning of "hollowed out" or "cavernous." *Rasm el Haurah*, "the heap of chalk." *Tawahin el Mughr*, "Mills of the caves," a common collective form from the root Ghâr. *'Ameidân*, an irregular form from 'Amdd, a "pillar." *Tullâl Kanaan*: It is interesting to know if this is certain. The word Kanân means "ridges," and has been confused by some writers with the Hebrew word Canaan. *Et Tireh*: This is spelt with the wrong T. I believe I was the first to explain the Aramaic origin of the word, the meaning of which, "the fort," is lost among the modern Syrians. *Shukeiyf* means "little cliffs," that being the local explanation of the word, which is very common. *'Uleika*, also a common valley name, seems to mean "overhanging." The hermit's caves in inaccessible cliffs are called M'allakah. *Wely*, though used to mean a shrine, really means a "favoured person," i.e., the Saint himself.

Khudr does not mean a "a Moslem saint's tomb;" probably this is only an apparent mistake, as El Khudr, the mysterious "green one," who was sought by Alexander of the two horns, is well enough known.

It cannot be too often said that the fellah dialect is peculiar, and much nearer to Aramaic than to Nahu Arabic. I notice that Professor Palmer has sometimes altered my translation of the names to make them accord more with Arabic, but in some of these cases I am quite certain that the meaning which I attached originally is that which the fellahin give to the word. Professor Palmer had never lived for any length of time among the fellahin, and the language of the Arabs with whom he was familiar differs in many respects from that of the peasantry.

Page 22. Further observation as to the Feddân seems to be required. It is stated to consist of two yokes in Western Palestine. I never heard of this before, as I always understood the Feddân to be one yoke everywhere.

Page 45. *Arkâb er Rahwah* certainly means "the wide ridge." It cannot represent Argob, which in Arabic would be Arjib or Rujib.

Page 50. The curious cone may perhaps be a religious emblem (or lingam) as in Phœnicia.

Pages 64-65. The dolmens on platforms and with surrounding circles are very interesting. I found them also in the Jordan valley with such circles, perhaps representing the prototype of a cromlech.

Page 84. The figure on this page appears to represent the Phœnician Eshmun or Esculapius.

Page 132. The Mêdany, if correctly spelt, is a curious form of the word *Mâdhneh*, meaning "Place of hearing," and being the usual name of the

prayer towers which we call Minarets—properly *Menârah*, "Place of fire," a beacon or lighthouse. The woodcutter seems to forget, by the way he shows the grass, that this is a tower 60 feet high.

Page 197. *The Makâm Eyub* is a Christian shrine. Pilgrimages to the place occurred in Byzantine times, and the monastery is said to have been built in the third century by Amr, the Jefnide chief. The Greek inscription over the Church door does not seem to have been recopied. The old *menhîr* is no doubt much earlier than the monastery, but the legend of Job, like many other Bible stories, as localised in Palestine, may possibly be of Christian origin. The Ebionites settled very early in this district, and converted the Arabs. It is difficult to see what Tell el Khammân can have to do with Teman, a word usually represented by Tibneh in Arabic. As to Beidar Uz, the form suggests the origin of the name to be Greek. Uz in Hebrew would in Arabic become 'Aûs or 'Aûd, the latter being the name of a Nabathean and Arab deity. There is a Tibneh in Gilead, but there are many reasons for supposing that the real Land of Uz may probably have been near Petra. It is difficult also to understand why Nâwa is connected with Noah, as the Hebrew word ends with a strong guttural represented by the last radical of the Arabic Nûh for Noah. Nâwa might come from the Greek Noe, but hardly from the Hebrew Noah. Nôoy Sâm, mentioned on the same page, is found also in Philistia, and appears to be Shem. The Biblical traditions of Palestine require to be very cautiously treated, as Christians were settled and were teaching the Arabs in Syria from the second to the seventh century, and even later, and again in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and from the fifteenth century down to our own times. I have already pointed out one certain case in the Jordan valley of a monkish legend preserved by Bedawîn.

The inscriptions appear to have been copied with care, though occasionally similar letters have been mistaken. The texts are chiefly funerary. The long text (p. 134) from Ed Dr'ah contains the date 158, probably of the era of Bostra, making the year 264 A.D.; it contains the title Autocrator, the names of Galienus, of Isidorus, Bassus Marcus Antoninus, Zenodorus, Ælius Torinus, and Sabinus also occur. The two texts from the Wely Neby Sâm bear no Christian emblems, but it is not impossible that they may be Christian, since monasteries were built by the Beni Ghassan in the second century in the Haurân. The first is funerary, the tomb apparently of a certain Phædrus, who is said to enjoy "eternal life in heaven." The second seems to contain the name Dosetheas. Another text from Sheikh S'ad has the date 65, or 171 A.D. Another from Zeizûn has the name Lucius Antoninus. Two others from Zeizûn are said to be Christian, but bear no Christian emblems. The first has the date 80, that is to say, 186 A.D., and contains the name of Zeizûn itself in the form ΖΙΖΙΟΥΣ, the other mentions a certain Epiarch Antoninus. These texts, therefore, like many others already collected, belong to the time of the later Antonines, and of the Syrian Emperors, down to the days of Palmyrene supremacy. I have not yet been able to compare them with Waddington or De Vogüè.

There seems to be no impossibility in the suggestion that Zeizûn represents Capitolias as far as position is concerned.

No translation is given of the Arabic text from Ed Dr'ah, though presumably the meaning was clear to the copyist. "In the name of God the merciful, the pitiful renewed this Minaret (Menârah) the ruler of the pilgrimage, Daud Ibn, Othman Ibn . . . the humble before God Most High in the reign of the Emîr Aly, son of Shahl. . . . Selim the Kâdy; may both his hands be made strong (or healthy). In the year seventy and seven hundred" (1369 A.D.). Probably Daud was in charge of the Haj to Mecca, then as now passing yearly through the Haurân.

As regards Argob, the Targum of Jonathan translates it Tarakuna, which explains the usual identification with Trachonitis—the Lejja. Reland, however, suggests a connection with the Talmudic Ragaba, now the village of Rujib, north of the Jabbok, which I visited in 1882, and found to be evidently an ancient site. The Havoth Jair villages were in Argob, and this region is said to have been in Bashan (1 Kings iv, 13). So that although Ragaba would be within the kingdom of Og, it seems perhaps too far south for Argob, but it cannot be certainly said that Reland is wrong, for Bashan included Batanea, now El Butein, nearly as far south as Regueb or Ragaba. There is no apparent notice of a *town* of Argob in the Bible.

While speaking of the towns of this district I may note a new identification. Maked (1 Macc. v, 26), also called Maged (verse 36), was in Gilead. I think it may clearly be the ruin El Mejed near 'Ammân, which is described in my "Memoirs of the Eastern Survey."

Page 54. The curious loopholes in the corridors at Beit Akkâr may be compared with a similar arrangement at El Khashm, near the Roman theatre of Majumas at the south end of Carmel.

Page 56. Mr. Schumacher falls back on the old idea that dolmens are sepulchral monuments. I think, however, that the observations taken of some seven hundred examples in Moab preclude the possibility of such a view. In the present instance (see p. 152) the theory necessitates the very improbable conclusion that bodies were laid uncovered to rot on the surface of the ground, the head thrust under a stone, and the rest of the corpse exposed.

Now it can be shown clearly that from the earliest times in Syria the method of burial aimed at *hiding the corpse*, under a great tumulus perhaps, but generally deep down in a trench at the bottom of a rocky shaft. The idea of erecting a conspicuous funereal monument is a late idea. In Syria it does not appear before about 300 B.C., and the Hebrews and Phœnicians, like Kafirs and other early tribes, endeavoured to conceal the whereabouts of the body, as did the Egyptians also in their earliest tombs. The Romans in the second century built tomb towers containing heavy sarcophagi, but even sarcophagi before the Christian era were placed in subterranean tombs. The Babylonians used vaults, and indeed it is clear that for ordinary sanitary reasons it would have been impossible for any people to conceive so foolish an idea as that of burial in free standing

dolmens, leaving the corpse to rot above ground and liable to the attacks of wild animals. We know for certain that the Syrian dolmens were not covered over with mounds, and did not stand over excavated graves. It seems, therefore, quite impossible that they can have been sepulchres, while they are noticed in the Talmud as altars, and still are used as such.

The monument drawn on page 152 resembles other known examples of the *Markulim* or Menhir and altar shrine, which we can trace as late as the second century A.D., and also very early in Phœnicia.

As regards the conclusions (p. 65), they will be of value if they are founded on tabulated results of numerous observations. As they stand they do not agree with the observations which I have tabulated in Moab. I have found, after careful comparison, no law of orientation in the dolmen fields I explored, though very many dolmens were parallel to each other. The size of these dolmens is not equal to that of the splendid specimens at El Maslubiyeh. The holes in the side stones have been found in other cases in Syria.

The Greek masons' marks from Ed Dr'ah are interesting. Similar marks occur on the masonry at Baalbek.

The golden candlesticks from lintels at Nâwa may possibly be Christian, for the Ebionites were a very Judaizing sect, and long dwelt in this region.

I cannot find any authority for the statement (p. 209) that there was another Ashtaroth mentioned in the Bible, and distinct from Ashtaroth Karnaim. Reland believes only one such town to have existed, and the Jews and Samaritans only believed in one such city. Ashtaroth Karnaim was named not from any physical feature as here suggested, but from the two horns of the crescent. Istar is called in Akkadian "the lady of the horned face." I think that Ashtaroth Karnaim may best be placed at Tell 'Ashterah, where the name remains unchanged, and not at Tell Ash'ary, a name which represents the Hebrew Seir rather than Ashtaroth. The indications of position are so vague that no objection on this account can be taken to Tell 'Ashterah.

Page 220. I would finally ask why are the Ahseiniyeh rendered "foxes?" Hasein, meaning "goodly," is a proper name. The fox is called Abu el Husein, but this means "father of the fortress," that is to say, the fox's hole. The proper name of the fox is Thaleb.

These remarks are not intended as captious criticism of a useful book. Positive statements have, however, a tendency to reappear in other works unless they are called in question, and the advance of knowledge is thus delayed. We are still suffering in archæology from many old errors which have passed into received opinions without having any solid foundation in fact. Perhaps some of these notes may be found useful in a second edition of "Across Jordan."

C. R. C.