

was not to Shiloh, where the Tabernacle was, but to Mizpah that Samuel gathered all Israel and drew water and poured it out before the Lord and prayed to the Lord for them. Perhaps the answer to such an enquiry is, that he placed his monument where the ark of God had once stood. We are taught in the second book of the Chronicles (viii, 11) that a place whereunto the ark of the Lord had come was regarded as holy, and what more natural, after the signal deliverance which had been experienced, than that the great ruler and guide of the nation should erect "the stone of help" upon the spot once sanctified by the sacred emblem of the Divine strength? Josephus tells us the stone was called *ισχυρος*, "the stone of strength." In Psalm lxxviii, 61, we have "and delivered *his strength* (*i.e.*, the ark) into captivity;" and again in 2 Chron. vi, 41, "arise, O Lord God, into Thy resting place, Thou and the *ark of Thy strength*;" in the Septuagint *ἡ κιβωτος της ισχυρος σου*. If the memorial came to be called in late times by its Greek name, it is not impossible that in *Ikka*, a word the derivation of which no one seems to know, we have a corruption of *ischuros*, like 'Amwas of Emmaus, Nablus of Neapolis. I have heard the place called Beit Iska, and a Mohammedan Sheikh once told me that that is the right name. The point is not of importance. The tendency of the Arabs to transpose consonants is well known.

It would seem that this idea of Ebenezer having marked the place on which the ark was once set misled Eusebius and his translator into supposing that the monument occupied the spot to which the Philistines brought back the ark. It is needless to say that there is no indication of this in the Bible; and it may reasonably be supposed that if Samuel had erected his trophy at Bethshemesh, or in the field of Joshua the Bethshemite, the narrative would have said so.

I have often questioned with myself whether these struggles with the Philistines did not (as some seem to suppose) take place nearer to the Philistine frontier than Neby Samwil and Beit Ikka are. But I find no confirmation of this suggestion in the sacred text. Other important battles against the same foes took place still further in the heart of the Israelite country, as at Michmash and on Mount Gilboa.

THOMAS CHAPLIN, M.D.

NOTE.

Dr. Chaplin having kindly sent me the proof of his paper on Ebenezer, I have only one or two remarks to offer on the subject.

I do not hold it to be proved that Deir Abân is Ebenezer, but, as I have pointed out in the "Memoirs," Deir Abân is the place which Jerome supposed to be Ebenezer. It is quite possible that Jerome was wrong in this as in other cases. The site of Mizpah is uncertain, as it may be either at Neby Samwil or perhaps at Shâfât. The identity of Shen and Deir Yasin seems to me doubtful, because names with Deir preceding are usually of Christian origin. 'Ain Kârim is, I believe, the Biblical Beth

Haccerem, but it might be Beth Car also. On two occasions I have searched the country south of Neby Samwil, hoping to find some monument such as Ebenezer, but we never found anything of the kind. I agree with Dr. Chaplin, however, in thinking that the distance from Deir Abân to Shiloh is an objection to the 4th century traditional site.

C. R. C.

ANTIOCH IN 1051 A.D.

IN a recent number of the *Quarterly Statement* (April, 1888, p. 66) Mr. Greville Chester has given an interesting account of the extant ruins of Antioch. The modern Turkish town, which Mr. Greville Chester visited during the autumn of last year, has preserved but few remains of the old Byzantine capital of the East. Earthquakes, for which the territory of Antioch has always been ill-famed, have thrown down most of the ancient buildings, and, for the rest, the Turks have destroyed the great city walls and carried off the stones of both temples and churches to build into their hovels.

Of the great Christian city, while still in the hands of the Greeks, and prior to the Arab conquest and the subsequent Latin occupation, so few records have come down to us that I have thought the following account, written during this early period by the Physician Ibn Butlân, may be worthy of publication.

During the centuries that succeeded the first Arab conquest Antioch, more even than the other great towns of Syria, suffered by the fortunes of war. Previous to that epoch, though sacked by the Persian Chosroes, Sapor, in A.D. 260, she had remained, without rival, the Eastern capital of the Byzantine Cæsars. In 635, however, Antioch shared the fate of all other places in Northern Syria, and fell into the hands of the all-conquering Arabs; but, unlike the cities and territories to the south, Antioch, together with Adana, Tarsus, and Mopsuestia, was retaken before thirty years had elapsed by the army of Nicephorus Phocas (A.H. 353, A.D. 964).¹ During the next hundred and twenty years (A.D. 964 to 1084) Antioch remained to the Byzantines, resisting all the attacks of the Muslims, and it was during the latter part of this period that the city was visited by Ibn Butlân.

In 1084 the citadel was at last betrayed into the hands of Sulaïmân ibn Kutlimish, the Saljûk Sultan of Iconium. Fourteen years later, however, Antioch was retaken by the first Crusading armies, in 1098, after a siege which had lasted nine months, and which had been characterised by many extraordinary and miraculous events. Antioch then remained a Christian principality for the next hundred and eighty years, but in the end, after the Franks had been driven out of all the remainder of Syria, this last stronghold, too, fell (1268 A.D.) before the arms of the Egyptian Sultan Baibars, and it has since remained in the hands of the Muslims.

¹ See Gibbon, ch. lii, end.