

"I would, therefore, for the information of those who are anxious to know the *truth* on the subject, positively declare that the Moabite Stone was rounded off at the lower end in exactly the same manner as at the upper end. I could not possibly be deceived on the subject, as I saw the stone in the daytime, with both my eyes open, and drew a sketch of it, not after some weeks from recollection, but at the time and on the spot, as I still have it in my sketch-book. An exact copy of it was published in the *Illustrated London News*. As regards the measure, I could not give it with the greatest exactness, as I took it by the span, and subsequently ascertained it approximately in feet and inches.

"If the 'restored Moabite Stone' presents a square form at the bottom, this is no proof that my sketch is incorrect, but simply that there is some mistake in the restoration of the monument; and there is not the least doubt that, if properly restored, it will have an oblong shape at the lower end exactly in the same manner as at the upper end. I am sure that scholars who take an interest in this most valuable monument of antiquity will be glad to get as many reliable particulars about the same as possible, and, besides, it seems that the question of round or square shape may in some manner affect the inscription (at least, the two or three lower lines) itself, and thus has become of some importance."

SAMARITAN TOPOGRAPHY.

1. THE SAMARITAN BOOK OF JOSHUA.
2. THE SAMARITAN CHRONICLE.

A MINUTE inspection of the topography of the Book of Joshua, and of the Old Testament generally, leads to the striking discovery that the information concerning that part of Palestine occupied by Ephraim and the half tribe of Manasseh is extremely fragmentary as compared with that relating to other portions of the country.

A few words will be sufficient to make this clear.

(1) In the first place, we have no account of the conquest of this part of the land. The first eight chapters of the book record the taking of Jericho, and of the eastern hills as far as Bethel, and Ai near Bethel; the building of an altar on Ebal follows immediately in the Hebrew text (Josh. viii. 30), without explanation as to the history of the conquest of this part of the land.

In the Septuagint version, however, the order is here different, and the first verses of the next chapter (Josh. ix. 1, 2) precede the account of the ceremonies at Shechem. Thus the destruction of Ai is in this order followed by the general description: "When all the kings which were on this side Jordan, in the hills, and in the Shephelah, and in all the coasts of the great sea over against Lebanon . . . heard, They gathered themselves together to fight with Joshua and with Israel with one accord." The erection of the altar on Ebal then follows.

Even in this order the account is extremely short and general as compared with the detailed history of the campaigns which follow; the first in the south, including the siege and taking of seven cities, and the next in the north, recording the invasion of Galilee and the defeat of the league of six kings of Northern Palestine.

The Book of Joshua itself contains no indication that Mount Ebal was near Shechem, but in Dent. xi. 30 we find the two mountains defined as being "in the champaign (*Arabah*, generally rendered "desert") over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh." The plain or oak of Moreh, famous in the history of Abraham, is connected with Shechem in the expression, "Unto the place of Shechem, unto the plains of Moreh" (Gen. xi. 6). Josephus, in a more definite manner, places the two mountains at Shechem (*Ant.* iv. 8. 44), defining the situation of the altar as "not far from the city of Shechem, which is between the two mountains, that of Gerizim, situate on the right hand, and that of Ebal on the left."

Thus there is no reasonable doubt as to the position of these mountains; yet in the fourth century we find Jerome writing (*Onom.* s.v. *Gebal*):—

"A mountain in the promised land where, by order of Moses, an altar was built. There are near (*juxta*) Jericho two mountains close together looking towards one another, one of which is called Gerizim, the other Ebal. Nevertheless, the Samaritans say that these two mountains were near Neapolis (*Shechem*), but they err enormously (*sed vehementer errant*), for they are some distance apart, nor could the voices of those blessing and cursing be heard, which is said to have been the case in Scripture."

And again, under the head *Golgal*, Jerome makes a note: "Near which the mountains *Garizin* and *Gebal* are recorded to have been situate. But *Galgal* is a place near Jericho. Therefore the Samaritans err who desire to point out the mountains of *Garizin* and *Gebal* near Neapolis, when Scripture bears witness that they were near *Galgal*."

It is probable that the two points referred to by Jerome are the prominent peaks now called *Túweil el 'Akabeh* and *Nuseib 'Aweishtréh* (i.e., "the monument of the tribes"), either side of the road from Jericho to Jerusalem along *Wády Kelt*. It appears, however, that this was merely a hearsay report, probably obtained by Jerome from Jews who had not forgotten their old animosity to their Samaritan rivals.

(2) To return to the subject more directly under consideration, the next point of importance to notice is that out of the list of thirty-one royal cities (*Josh.* xii.) only one can be identified with certainty as being in Samaria, namely, *Tirzah*, the last of the list. The first sixteen are all in Judah and Benjamin. No. 17, *Tappuah*, as following *Mak-kedah*, is probably one of the two towns of that name situate in Judah. No. 18, *Hepher*, is unknown, but may perhaps be the *Hepher* of the *Talmud*, in Galilee. No. 19, *Aphek*, is either in Judah or in Galilee.

No. 20, Lasharon, seems identified as being the modern *Sáróna*, in the 'Ard el Hümma, or Lower Galilee, and the subsequent names to No. 30 inclusive are in Galilee, or close to the shore, within the confines of Judæa.

Thus only one remains, namely, Tirzah, or Thirsa. According to the LXX. version, and according to the later Talmudic writers, the Thirza of the Bible was not in Samaria, but was a place called Tir'an (probably the modern Tor'an, in Galilee. (See Midrash Shir-hash-Shirim, vi.) The Targum also on 1 Kings xiv. 17 reads Tir'aita for Tirzah. It can scarce be doubted that something is wanting in this list of royal towns when we consider that Samaria, roughly speaking, occupied about a third of the area of Palestine, and contained towns such as Shechem (which is mentioned in the Book of Joshua as a city of refuge), Thebez, Arumah, En Tappuah, and Zereda, which we should naturally expect to have been equal in importance to those of Judæa or Galilee.

(3) Proceeding to the account of the tribe boundaries, we find the definition of that of Manasseh entirely omitted. The south boundary of Ephraim is the north limit of Benjamin, and can be very distinctly traced, though every name has not as yet been recovered. The division between Ephraim and Manasseh is defined by only three points, namely, the brook Kanah (*W. Kanah*), Asher-ham-michmethah (*'Asíreh*, C.R.C.), and Tanath Shiloh (the ruin of *T'ana* according to Vandavelde). The north boundary of Manasseh is entirely unknown, though we may gather from the possessions of Issachar and Zebulon that it was almost identical with the north boundary of Samaria. There is a striking contrast between this very deficient account and the extremely detailed description of the boundaries of Judah and Benjamin, and of the northern tribes.

(4) We further find that there is no list of the cities of Ephraim or of Manasseh, and an apparent lacuna occurs in Josh. xvii. 9, "these cities of Ephraim are among the cities of Manasseh," which has no apparent connection with the context, and refers to no extant list. One city of Ephraim—En Tappuah (now *'Atuf*, according to Robinson) is, however, given in another verse. The LXX. version has a curious reading of *τερεμινθος*, instead of "these cities," due to the very cramped form of the Hebrew text. The separate cities of Manasseh, Bethshean, Ibleam, Dor, Endor, Taanach, Megiddo, are enumerated, and it is worthy of note that none of these are in Samaria, except possibly Dor. There is, however, a *Dúra* in Lower Galilee, which may be the place intended, for these towns are enumerated as "three countries." The LXX. gives three names—Bethshan, Dor, and Megiddo.

This entire absence of any list of Samaritan towns contrasts in a striking manner with the enumeration of 150 cities in Judæa, and of about eighty in Galilee.

(5) One other curious point remains to notice. In Joshua xxi. we have the list of Levitical cities, and again in 1 Chron. vi. we have the list, taken apparently from a more ancient document. The comparison

is instructive. In the tribe of Judah were nine of these towns; the names in the two lists agree with one exception, and that perhaps easily explained. One town also is omitted in the list in Chronicles. In Benjamin were three cities, one omitted in the less perfect record. In Dan the lists also agree, but are imperfect. In Asher were four, the lists agreeing with one slight difference. In Naphtali also the lists have but slight variations, but in the tribes of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Issachar the variations are greater, as will be seen below.

Josh. xxi.

Shechem (in Samaria).
 Gezer (in Judæa).
 Kibzaim (in Samaria).
 Bethhoron (in Judæa).
 Taanach (in Galilee).
 *Gath Rimmon (in Judæa).
 Kishon.
 Daberah (in Galilee).
 Jarmuth.
 En Gannim (in Galilee).

1 Chron. vi.

Shechem (in Samaria).
 Gezer (in Judæa).
 Jokmeam.
 Bethhoron (in Judæa).
 Aner (in Samaria).
 Bilcam (in Samaria).
 Kedesh (in Galilee).
 Daberah (in Galilee).
 Ramoth (in Samaria).
 Anem (in Samaria).

It is evident from the above comparison that a considerable confusion, not accounted for by mere errors of transcription, occurs in reference to Samaritan towns.

(6) The territory of the tribe of Dan extended, according to the statement of Josephus, over the whole plain of Sharon (Antiq. v. l. 22) to Dor—*Tantûra*. If this statement be accepted, it is very remarkable that the whole of the towns of Dan may be identified with places south of the River 'Auja, and therefore within the boundaries of Judæa. The total of the number of the towns of Dan is not, however, given in the Book of Joshua.

The points thus remarked may be briefly summed up:

- 1st. We have in the Book of Joshua no account of the conquest of Samaria.
- 2nd. We have, apparently, no list of the royal Samaritan cities.
- 3rd. We have no description of the boundaries of the two great Samaritan tribes similar to those of the northern and southern tribes.
- 4th. We have no list of the Samaritan cities.
- 5th. A considerable discrepancy exists between the names of Levitical towns in the two parallel lists of Chronicles and of Joshua in that part of the country belonging to Samaria.
- 6th. The towns of Dan lying in Samaria must be considered to be omitted if we accept the boundaries assigned by Josephus to the tribe.

The outcome of these facts seems to me, when taken with the wonderful consistency and perfection of the topography of Judæa and

* In each list the town is enumerated as belonging to Manasseh. Gath Rimmon belonged, however, to Dan.

Galilee contained in the Book of Joshua, to be that *the book as we now have it is incomplete in the portion referring to Samaria.*

It will be found also that in the Old Testament, taken as a whole, there are only about forty Samaritan places noted out of some 500 or 600 places in Western Palestine.

The Jewish hatred of the Samaritans rose by the early Christian period to so great a pitch that the Mishnic doctors avoided even mentioning the name of Samaria. Thus in the Talmud altogether only some half-dozen Samaritan towns are noticed. In describing Palestine the Mishna (Sheviith, ix. 2) divides it into Judæa, Galilee, and *Perea*, by which Samaria is apparently intended, though the name properly only applies to a district east of Jordan. It is not therefore from Jewish sources that we can hope for information as to Samaritan topography.

In considering the question of Samaritan topography, it is first necessary to define the limits of Samaria. This task I have attempted in a former paper. (See *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1876, p. 67.)

The southern line as laid down by Josephus (B. J. iii. 3. 5) appears to have been the great valley called *Wady Deir Ballût*, which rises near *Libben* (the ancient Lebonah), and leaves *Shiloh* within the territory of Judæa. *Antipatris*, fixed at *Râs el 'Ain* (see the distances given, *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1876, p. 13), is thus, as stated in the Talmud, a frontier town, and *Anuath* (*'Aina*, C.R.C.) and *Borceos* (*Brukin*, C.R.C.) are both found on the frontier line. This boundary may perhaps represent an encroachment of some ten miles on the territory of Ephraim, being about that distance north of the boundary of Benjamin.

The north boundary is defined by the towns of Bethshan (*Beisân*), En Gannim (*Jenîn*), and Caphar Outheni (*Kefr Adhân*, C.R.C.), being probably commensurate with the northern boundary of Manasseh. Bethshan and the valley of Jezreel at one time belonged to Samaria, but were subsequently taken by the Jews, in memory of which annexation the 15th and 16th of Sivan were kept (Megilla Taanith, iii. 8). This may possibly account for the curious line drawn by Josephus, making *Xaloth* (generally placed at *Iksal*) and En Gannim (*Jenîn*) some fifteen miles south of the former, both frontier towns.

It is doubtful whether the Jordan valley belonged to Samaria. Possibly in the time of Christ it was, as now, a "no man's land," but it appears clear that the Roman highway from Galilee to Jerusalem, along the Jordan valley by Jericho, was used by pilgrims at that period. (See Matt. xx.)

It is also doubtful whether the territory of Samaria reached the shore of the Mediterranean. Josephus claims the great plain as far as *Ptolemais* (*'Akkeh*) as belonging to Judæa (B. J. iii. 3. 5); but the Rabbinical writers of the Gemara make *Antipatris* a frontier town, and assign *Caphar Saba* (*Kefr Saba*) to Samaria (Tal. Jer. Demai, ii. 2), whilst *Cæsarea* was inhabited by a mixed people, Jews, Greeks, and Samaritans. (Tal. Jer. Abodah Zarah, v. 4.) Some doctors regarded this town as part of the "land," others as Samaritan. Frequent fights took place

in it between Jews and Samaritans in the 5th century A.D., and it is called in one passage "the land of life," in another "the city of abomination."

It seems certain that Manasseh reached to the sea-coast (Josh. xvii. 10, "and the sea was his border;" and again, ver. 9, "the outgoings of it were at the sea"). It seems probable, therefore, that the extent of Samaria differed at different periods, a conclusion which may be supported from Samaritan accounts, and by the fact that three toparchies were taken from Samaria and added to Judæa by Demetrius Soter. (1 Macc. xi. 34, and Ant. xiii. 4. 9.)

The natural sources whence we might expect to obtain information as to the topography of Samaria are the Samaritan chronicles, but unfortunately nothing of any great antiquity has as yet been discovered among these interesting people, except the three rolls of the *Thorah*, or Law, the most ancient manuscript of which is at present a sealed book to Europeans. It seems, however, that some light may be derived even from the comparatively late documents which we possess, the topography of the more important of which may be briefly examined.

The first of these is generally known as the "Samaritan Book of Joshua," and probably dates from the close of the 13th century. It was published at Leyden in 1848 A.D., by M. Juynbol, from an Arabic MS. in Samaritan character, and the original, which he translates with copious notes, is thought to have been compiled from an early Samaritan and from three later Arabic chronicles. The earlier part is dated 1362 A.D., and the later 1513 A.D.

The second, called El Tholidoth, or "The Generations," is commonly called "Neubauer's Chronicle," being published by that scholar in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1869, in Hebrew character, with translation and foot-notes. It professes to have been commenced by Eleazar ben Amran, in 1149 A.D. (544 A.H.), and the second portion to have been added 200 years later by Jacob ben Ismael, being carried down as late as 1859 by other hands. The original still exists at Nablus, in the hands of the high priest; and I was informed that each priest added to it a short account of the most important events during his career.

The first Chronicle contains the names of about thirty places, and forty altogether are enumerated in the latter, the great majority in this case being Samaritan towns.

II.

The *Samaritan Book of Joshua* is divided into two distinct parts, the first of which only is of special interest, being apparently derived from some earlier work. It brings down the history of Israel from the date of the conquest to the time of Samuel, whose predecessor, Eli, was from a Samaritan point of view the earliest schismatic, and the founder of a new and heretical temple at Shiloh in opposition to that built by Joshua on Mount Gerizim.

During the two hundred and sixty years of Divine favour, when

Israel was governed by King Joshua and his nine successors, sacrifice was offered on Gerizim, and the Sabbatical years and payment of tithes duly observed. The schism between the children of Judah and the *Kusaniya* or "orthodox," as the Samaritans call themselves (a word which the Jews converted into Cutheans according to one theory), dates from the time of sin, after the death of Samson, when the divine glory disappeared from Gerizim.

The history of the conquest under Joshua, as here given, appears to be a sort of legendary paraphrase of the Bible narrative from a point of view quite contrary to the Jewish. For, whilst it appears certain that a holy place of some kind existed at Shechem, as we gather from the words in Josh. xxiv. 26, "and he took a great stone and set it up there under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord" (or holy place of Jehovah), a site which is with much reason identified with the "pillar that was in Shechem" (Judges ix. 6), and with the present *Jâmi'a el 'Amûd*, or "mosque of the pillar;" yet, on the other hand, we find Shiloh to have been the gathering-place of Israel in Joshua's time (Josh. xxii. 9), and very probably the place where the tabernacle was pitched, which militates against the Samaritan account of the schism agreeing with that of the Mishna.

The book opens much in accordance with the Biblical narrative, but no less than four chapters are devoted to the history of Balaam and to his death, being an enlargement of the one Biblical verse (Josh. xiii. 22), "Balaam also, the son of Beor the soothsayer, did the children of Israel slay with the sword," an episode interpolated in an apparently unaccountable manner in the middle of a topographical chapter both in the Hebrew and also in the Septuagint.

The episodes of the spies, of the sin of Achan, the fraud of the Gibeonites, and the league of the cities of Gibeon, Kirjath, and Beeroth (compare Gibeon, Kirjath-Jearim, Beeroth, and Chephirah, Josh. ix. 17), also receive many embellishments, and long imaginary speeches are put in the mouths of the characters.

The battle of Ajalon follows in order, and the flight of the kings to the cave of Makedah or Fakedah (probably an error of the Arabic transcriber) near a place called *Kasaha*. Makedah is by a later Samaritan account identified as not far from Mount Gerizim.*

The next chapter (ch. xxi.) contains an account of the advance on Shechem, and of the miraculous discomfiture of the enemy.

"For God on that day wrought a miracle in the sight of the enemies. For to those who would have fled a flame came forth before them to burn them, and a spirit stood before them, so that the horses and their riders fled together and were slain together, when they heard the shout of the children of Israel. And for them the hours of the day were lengthened as God promised them, until they had made an end at that

* Captain Warren tells me that the Samaritans offered to show him the site at a distance of some twelve hours from Nablus. It may consequently be marked on the Survey and can easily be recovered.

time. Nor was one of their enemies left alive when the battle was finished. Then the king sent from Maharun (possibly *el Mahrûneh*, near Dothan) a letter to Eleazar the priest, and fastened it to the wings of a dove." The victory was thus communicated to him, "and the signs and wonders which had been shown to them were written therein."

"Then they departed and went and purified themselves, Joshua and all they who were with him. For a great river descended from the Mount of Blessing and watered the plain, and to it the king went down with all his host."

This account reads strangely like an echo of some lost chapter of the history of the invasion by Joshua, but the following episode is even more closely connected with part of the country not noticed in the Bible narrative.

In chapter xxvi., after the division of the land and the building of the temple on Gerizim, "which citadel was called Samaria," and the establishment of Nabich, the son of Gilad, of the tribe of Manasseh, as king over the two and a half tribes returning to beyond Jordan (compare Josh. chap. viii. and xxii.) we find an account of a new league against the children of Israel under the leadership of Saubac, king of Fâris, and the kings of the following towns:—

1. Armunieh the great.
2. Rumieh the less.
3. Saida.
4. El Keimun.
5. Damascus.

It is remarkable that these places may all be easily identified, as may the names *el Lejjûn* and *Merj el Kebir*, or "great plain," which occur in the same narrative, as being in or around the plain of Esdraelon. Thus on the north of the plain are the towns of *Rummaneh* and *Rumeh*, west of the great plain is the village of *Saida*, and on the east, according to the list of Thothmes III. (see last *Quarterly Statement*), was an ancient town called *Damesku*, whilst *el Keimûn* and *el Lejjûn* are the modern names of two places in the plain itself.

This consistency in topographical detail suggests that the story, though embellished with magic incidents fit for the histories of the Thousand and One Nights, has some foundation on an older and more trustworthy historic document.

It is unnecessary to give the history in detail. The challenge was brought to Joshua in the plain of Balata (evidently near the modern village *Balata*) in the region of the Holy Mountain; Joshua sends back a defiance, and proceeds with his army to *el Lejjûn*; by magic art he is enclosed in seven walls of iron, the foe having collected their forces in *el Keimûn* (a few miles farther north). From this position he is rescued by Nabich, and the giants defeated and slain. With this episode the history of the wars ends, and no account is given of the conquest of Galilee, though the possessions of Israel are described as extending to Lebanon.

In concluding the sketch of this curious work I may give a list of the places mentioned in its pages.

LIST OF TOWNS MENTIONED IN THE SAMARITAN BOOK OF JOSHUA.

1. Jelil	=	Gilgal.
2. Iriha	=	Jericho.
3. Makedah	=	Makkedah.
4. Kasaha.		
5. Maharun	=	<i>Maharûneh?</i>
6. Armunieh	=	<i>Rummaneh?</i>
7. Rumieh	=	<i>Rumeh?</i>
8. Saida	=	<i>Saida?</i>
9. el Keimun	=	<i>Tell Keimûn.</i>
10. esh Shâm	=	Damascus?
11. Samrûn	on	Gerizim.
12. Merj Balata	=	plain near <i>Balata.</i>
13. Jebel el Barakeh	=	Gerizim.
14. el Lejjun	=	<i>el Lejjun.</i>
15. Merj el Kebir	=	<i>Merj Ibn 'Amir.</i>
16. 'Ain in Neshâb		near the last.
17. Merj el Baha	=	Plain of Moreh.
18. Kefr Ghuweirah	=	<i>'Awertah.</i>
19. el Mâiteh	}	on Gerizim.
20. el Maia		
21. Fer'ata	=	<i>Fer'ata.</i>
22. Yâfa	=	Jaffa.
23. Lidd	=	Lydda.
24. B. Jibrin	=	<i>B. Jibrin.</i>
25. Ghuzzeh	=	Gaza.
26. Seilûn	=	Shiloh.
27. Beit el Mukuddis	=	Jerusalem.
28. Yasuf	=	<i>Yasûf.</i>
29. Fundeka	=	<i>Funduk.</i>
30. B. Lahm	=	Bethlehem.
31. Nablus	=	Shechem.

Thus out of a total of 31 places, 13 are within the confines of Samaria, and most of these are not mentioned in the Bible narrative.

III.

The *Samaritan Chronicle* is a more sober document, though it also goes back to the beginning, and gives the astronomical reckoning from Adam. Some of its topographical details are of much value.

Gerizim.—The most important Samaritan site is the mountain now called *Jebel et Tôr*, the Samaritan and in all probability the ancient Jewish Gerizim. The fifth article of the Samaritan Creed was the assertion that Gerizim was the chosen abode of God upon earth. "Over it is Paradise, whence comes the rain." Here Adam and Seth raised altars, here Melchisedec, servant of "the most high God," was met by Abraham, for Gerizim the Samaritans hold to the present day is the highest mountain in the world, the only one not covered by the flood, though they admit that Ebal, just opposite (which overtops Gerizim by

200 feet) is to the eye, though not in reality, more lofty. Here, to continue the history of this famous site, Abraham offered up Isaac, the very spot being shown on the eastern brow of the mountain (see *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1873, p. 66). The probability that this, rather than Jerusalem (as Josephus and the Talmudists affirm), is the true site of the place in the land of Moriah which the patriarch saw afar off, has been ably argued by Dean Stanley ("Sinai and Palestine," p. 246). The Samaritans read Moreh for Moriah, and connect the site with the plain of Moreh, where Abraham pitched his tents (Gen. xii. 6).

Gerizim was also the site of Jacob's vision, and of Bethel, according to the Samaritans. Hence Luz also was identified by them with a ruined town near the foot of the mountain. Finally, it was on Gerizim, and not on Ebal, from their point of view, that Joshua erected first an altar, afterwards the tabernacle, and finally a temple. The Samaritan text reads "Gerizim" for "Ebal" in Deut. xxvii. 4, and in Deut. xi. 30 the words "opposite Shechem" are added, to define the position of the two mountains, in contradiction to the Jewish statement that Ebal and Gerizim were nearer Jericho (Tal. Bab. Sota, 33b).

In the Samaritan Chronicle the following passage occurs (*Journal Asiatique*, 1869, p. 435):—"Luz, which is Shomron, the place where the good King Joshua built a temple near the holy tabernacle. It is likewise Mount Joshua." Thus even the site of Shomron was transported to this centre, which formed a sort of loadstone for Scriptural localities, unless the Samaritan Shomron, or "Watchtower," was a place distinct from that of the Bible (1 Kings xii. 25), the Sebaste of Herod. The exact site of the Samaritan Luz is not as yet fixed. Major Wilson places it near the place of sacrifice at the western foot of the peak from information derived on the spot from the peasantry. Another account given to me, though not perhaps trustworthy, places it at *'Ain Sârin*, a fine spring east of the summit, to which a curious tradition, resembling the story of Susannah and the elders, now attaches. It is evident that the identification of Luz as on Gerizim was rendered necessary by the tradition that Bethel was here to be sought, as we read (Gen. xxviii. 19), "but the name of that city was called Luz at the first." There is, therefore, no ground for identifying this Luz with the Luz of Judges i. 26, which was in the "land of the Hittites," probably the present *Luwetzeh*, near Banias.

The Altar on Ebal.—As regards the episode of the reading of the law and the building of an altar on Mount Ebal (Josh. viii. 30), a further piece of information derived from the Survey here naturally finds a place. The *Jami'a el 'Amûd*, or "Mosque of the Pillar," has been identified by Dr. Williams as the scene of the reading of the law and the site of the "pillar which was in Shechem" (see *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1873, p. 71, Major Wilson's paper on Ebal and Gerizim). The

* The Book of Joshua also speaks of Gerizim, "which citadel was called Samaria."

site seems in all respects satisfactory, but the position of the altar on Ebal, where, according to the Septuagint, Joshua inscribed *Deuteronomy*, "a copy of the Law of Moses" (Joshua viii. 22), in the sight of the people, has been sought in vain, for it seems to have escaped notice that there is a *Mukâm*, or sacred site, a little farther north, on the ridge of the mountain, but not at the highest point, which is still called 'Amâd ed-Dîn, "the Monument of the Faith." This site has at least as good a right to be claimed as representing the situation of Joshua's altar as has the *Jami'a el 'Amûd* to be considered as standing on the place of the "pillar in Shechem," which was by the sanctuary of Jehovah. The name *Imâd ed Dîn* was heard by Dean Stanley as referring to the mountain. The *Mukâm* is shown on Murray's map, but without a name, and the identification of the site is, I believe, here proposed for the first time.

The survival of this name is all the more interesting when we consider how constant has been the Samaritan tradition placing the altar on Gerizim.

In curious contrast to the centralisation of the Samaritan sites round their holy mountain, which is still the "Kibleh" of the faith, are the words of Psalm lxxviii. (ver. 9-11, and 67-69.)

"The children of Ephraim, being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle.

"They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in His law.

"And forgot His works and His wonders that he shewed them. . . .

"Moreover He refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim.

"But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which He loved."

Shechem.—Placed beneath the holy mountain, Shechem, the natural capital of Palestine, remains still the last Samaritan refuge. Here Melchisedec lived, and, according to their version of the passage (Gen. xxxiii. 18), "Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem." Here is the mosque of *Hizn Yakûb*, "the family of Jacob," and east of the town the two sites of Joseph's tomb and Jacob's well, in the identity of which both Samaritans and Jews agree with the Biblical narrative (see Gen. xxxiii. 18; Josh. xxiv. 30; John iv. 12).

Joshua's Tomb.—Next in importance to Moses, the great prophet whose like, according to the Samaritan translation of Deut. xxxiv. 10, was never to appear on earth again, the "blessed King Joshua" is the most important character in the Samaritan list of saints and heroes. Yet, curiously enough, his tomb seems to have been lost to them. The Book of Joshua records the burial of this hero at Timnath Serah, in Mount Ephraim (Josh xxiv. 30), a site which has been identified with the modern *Tibneh*. For an account of the tomb, see the *Quarterly Statement*, October, 1873, p. 143. It is worthy of notice that the great tree at *Tibneh*, which is a sacred spot, has the name *Sheikh et Teim*, that is, "the elder the servant of God." The same title is applied to the mosque at Shiloh, *Jami'a et Teim*, "mosque of the servant of God."

Jewish tradition, however, as represented by Rabbi Jacob, of Paris, 1258 A.D., places Timnath Serah at a village called Kefr Heres, about five miles south of Shechem, where to the present day Joshua and Caleb are said by the Jews to be buried. The probable site of this place is the modern *Kefr Hâris*, which, though it is eight miles from Nablus, is in the required direction—towards the south. Here exist two Mukâms of the ordinary character, one being that of *Neby Kifil*, or “the dividing prophet,” in which appellation we may very probably recognise a tradition of Joshua. About a mile farther east is the Mukâm of *Sitt Miriam*, perhaps an ancient cenotaph of Miriam, the sister of Moses.

The names *Hâris* and *Kefr Hâris*, which apply to villages close to one another, exactly represent the Hebrew Heres, which occurs in Judges ii. 9, where we read Timnath Heres for Timnath Serah. It appears from Judges i. 35 that “Mount Heres” was a district, and extended to the neighbourhood of Ajalon (Yalo). Its probable meaning is “the rugged mountain,” but the present pointing makes it mean “mountain of the sun,” although Jerome seems to have understood it in the other sense. He places Joshua’s tomb in the tribe of Dan (Onom. Thamnathsara), on the road from Lydda to Jerusalem, and states it to have been in his day a large place, where Joshua’s tomb was shown. “Very marvellous it is,” he further says, “that the distributor of the possessions should have chosen for himself so rugged and mountainous a spot” (Epist. Paulæ. 13). Jerome evidently means the present *Tibneh*, and seems to have in his mind the name Heres, as meaning “rugged,” but the Talmudical authorities, taking as usual the more unnatural meaning, say that Heres means the sun, and that it was derived from the fact that a figure like the sun was carved on the tomb, to signify that the personage there buried had caused the sun to stand still (Rashi *Comment* on Judg. ii. 9). The tomb generally supposed to be Joshua’s at Tibneh has no such carving, though one near it is ornamented. If Heres mean “Mount Heres,” the title might be well applied to the rugged hills extending from Yalo to Shechem, and including Tibneh, Hâris, and Kefr Hâris.

Joshua is often confused in the mythology of the peasantry with the Imâm 'Ali Ibn Abu Taleb, the companion of the prophet (see *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1874, p. 87), who has three Mukâms, one at Jericho, one at Ramleh, one west of Nablus. Neby Kifil has also another Mukâm near that of Neby Dan and Neby Hudah, east of Lydd. Some tradition of Joshua is also possibly attached to the Mukâm of *Sheikh 'Aisa*, west of Sebaste; and at Yanûn, also in Samaria, is the tomb of *Neby Nûn*, probably the father of Joshua. These traditions, however, will form a paper by themselves, which I hope to be able to compose later.

The Samaritan Book of Joshua represents the king to have been buried at *Kefr Ghuweirah*, and as it also states Eleazar to have been entombed in the same place, there can be no doubt that the modern *'Awertah* is intended, but unfortunately only two tombs exist here, which may now be mentioned in turn.

'*Awertah*.—"Here," says the Samaritan Chronicle, "are the tombs of the holy priests." The Jews also agree that Eleazar and Phinehas were buried here, and, as in the former case where Jewish and Samaritan traditions agreed on the sites of Joseph's tomb and Jacob's well, the Bible record seems satisfied by the position, so in this case there seems no valid objection to fixing the "hill that pertained to Phinehas (*Gibeah-Phinehas*) . . . in Mount Ephraim"—where Eleazar is said to have been buried (Josh. xxiv. 33)—at the modern 'Awertah. The older form of the name, *Caphar Abarthah*, given in the Samaritan Chronicle, is a good instance of the Samaritan confusion of the two letters *B* and *Vau*.

Two tombs, both held sacred by Jews, Samaritans, and Moslems, are here shown, one called *el 'Azeir*, west of the village, being that of Eleazar, the other *el 'Azeirat*, that of Phinehas, east of the village. It is worthy of remark that another *el 'Azeir*, a *Mukâm* also, exists farther south, east of Turmus Eyya, and beyond the limits of Samaria. This may represent a later Jewish tradition.

The tomb of Eleazar is 18ft. 3in. long by 15½ft. broad; a rude erection of masonry and plaster, like that of Joseph. It stands in a paved court, in which grows a magnificent terebinth. I visited the spot in 1872, and sketched the tomb.

The other tomb, that of Phinehas, is close to a small mosque. The sepulchre, resembling the last, measures 14ft. by 7½ft. It is surrounded by a wall having round arches to a series of arcades. This enclosure measures 26ft. by 20ft., and is certainly not modern. The interior court is paved, and a vine is trained across the top of the arcades to form a species of roof. The mosque we did not enter, nor has any tradition connected with it been as yet collected. I made at the time a sketch of this monument as well.

Such are the sacred places of Samaria as pointed out by native tradition. The Samaritan Chronicle, however, gives information on other obscure periods of the history of this curious people. It gives a list of twenty-two towns where the high priests who succeeded Tobiah resided, all being apparently in Samaria, as far as they can be identified.

It is known that in the second and third centuries the Samaritans were in a very flourishing condition, and had colonies in Egypt, and even a synagogue at Rome. The Chronicle gives their possessions in Palestine as allotted by the high priest Baba the Great, about 160 years after Hadrian had destroyed Jerusalem. This description is interesting, as it seems to include all Palestine with the exception of the mountains of Judæa, dividing the land into eleven districts, as given below. (*Journal Asiatique* for 1869, p. 440.)

1. "To Ishmael he gave the land of Luzah to Gilil on the sea." (The Arabic version says "to the plain of the sea.")
2. "To Jacob of Iskar he gave the land as far as Tiberias.
3. "To Zeith Ben Thaham he gave the land east of Mount Gerizim to the Jordan.

4. "To Jehoshua Ben Berak Ben Eden he gave the country from Caphar Halul to Beth Shebat.

5. "To Abraham Shamatimah Ben Ur Ben Pherath he gave the country of Horon to the land of Palestine (or of the Philistines).

6. "To Israel Ben Mahir he gave from Gaza to the River of Egypt.

7. "To Joseph Ben Shuthelah he gave the land of the Goodly Mountain to Cæsarea.

8. "To Lael Ben Beker he gave the land of the frontier of Carmel as far as Accho. (This has a curious bearing on Josh. xix. 26, which it appears to me to explain.)

9. "To Beker Ben Ur he gave the land of the hill of Naker to Sural, which is Tyre. He dwelt there, and died at Caphar Marun (*Marûn*).

10. "To Shebat Ben Sebo Ben Makir he gave the land from the River Litah to Sidon.

11. "To Barad Ben Shiran Ben Amed he gave the Mountain of Galilee, from the river to Lebanon, and all the villages round this mountain."

The divisions so described are for the most part pretty clear, as will be seen below:—

1. The country south-west of Nablus to *Jell*, north of Jaffa, and to Cæsarea.

2. The Plain of Esdraelon and of Beisan, and the 'Ard el Humma, in which district were towns such as Sirin and Tuta, mentioned as inhabited later by Samaritans.

3. The hills of Samaria east of Nablus.

4. Probably Lower Galilee, as far as *Kefr Sabt*, on the east.

5. The Plains of Philistia as far as Gaza, the north line being from Beth Horon (*B. Ur*) to Gilil (*Jell*), joining on to the south side of No. 1.

6. South of the last to *Wady el 'Arish*.

7. The hills of Manasseh, north of No. 1 and south of the next.

8. North of the last, Carmel and the Plain of Akkeh.

9. Phœnicia, from Accho to Tyre.

10. North of the last from the Litany River to Sidon.

11. Upper Galilee.

These districts are therefore contiguous one to another, and extend over the whole of Palestine with the exception of Judæa proper, to the mountains of which the Jews are by this description confined.

At a later period the Samaritan Chronicle gives a valuable list of those towns which were inhabited by the Samaritans after the Hejira. This is a period when very little is known of this nation. The places mentioned extend over nearly the whole of the district allotted by Baba, and colonies are also mentioned in Damascus, Cairo, and Baalbek. The colony at Gerar and Gaza seems to have lasted till late in history, but no Samaritans are now to be found out of Nablus.

The following are the two lists noticed above:—

LIST OF PLACES INHABITED BY THE HIGH PRIESTS (AFTER THE TIME OF TOBIAH).

N.B.—S. for Samaria.

Samaritan Text.	Arabic Text.	Modern Name.
1. SALEM (the Great).....	Sálim (the Great)	<i>Sálim, S.</i>
2. BETH FATUHA	B. Fatûha	
3. SANTA KARIMATHAH.....	Tul Keram	<i>Tul Keram, S.</i>
4. ELONAH TABAH	Shejr el Kheir (<i>i.e.</i> , "Holy Oak").	
5. SHECHEM	Nâblus	<i>Nâblus, S.</i>
6. AMNAH SERAH.....	'Adeh Serêh.	
7. BETH FAUR	Beit Fâghûr.....	<i>Khûrbet B. Far ? S.</i>
8. ISKAR.....	'Askar	<i>'Askar, S.</i>
9. LUZEH	Lûzeh	<i>Lôzeh, S.</i>
10. CAPHAR JIHBETH.....	Kefr el Wahebeh.	
11. KATHAH (the Great).....	Kudhyeh (the Great).	
12. NOBAH	Nebh	<i>Nûba ? S.</i>
13. AKRABITH	'Akrabeh	<i>'Akrabeh, S.</i>
14. OPRAH	Fer'ata	<i>Fer'ata, S.</i>
15. BEIROTHAH	el Bîreh	<i>Bertah ? S.</i>
16. LAN	(Illegible.)	
17. JUSEPHEH	Yâsûf	<i>Yâsûf, S.</i>
18. MERDAH	Merdah	<i>Mirdah, S.</i>
19. TIRAH NEMARA		<i>Tîreh ? S.</i>
20. BETH PHURIK	Beit Fûrik	<i>Beit Fûrik, S.</i>
21. KIRJATH HAGAH.....	Kuryet Hajjah.....	<i>Kuryet Hajja, S.</i>
22. SUCHAH.....	Shuweikeh	<i>Shuweikeh, S.</i>

LIST OF PLACES INHABITED BY THE SAMARITANS IN THE 7TH CENTURY.

Samaritan Text.	Arabic Text.	Modern Name.
1. DAGON		<i>Beit Dejân, S.</i>
2. AZZAH	{ Inhabited by Samaritans } { of Tribe of Benjamin } { in the 14th Century }	<i>Ghuzzeh.</i>
3. GERAR		<i>Umm el Jerrâr.</i>
4. BETH PHURIK		<i>Beit Fûrik, S.</i>
5. CAPHAR NEMARAH.		
6. AL RAMLAH		<i>er Ramleh.</i>
7. CAPHAR SAFIRIEH	Safûrieh	<i>Safirîyeh.</i>
8. CAPHAR ABEARTHAN	'Awert	<i>'Awertah, S.</i>
9. SIRIN		<i>Sîrîn.</i>
10. TUTA	Tutai.....	<i>Umm et Tût ? S.</i>
11. CAPHAR MARDAN.		
12. GITH		<i>Jett, S.</i>
13. KIRJATH OPHLATHAH.....	Kuryet Ghuffeh	<i>'Afâleh ?</i>
14. BETH BEZIN		<i>Beit Bezzin, S.</i>
15. ELON MOREH	Merj el Baha	<i>Sahel Râjîb, S.</i>
16. MOHNAH HA ALIUNAH.....	el 'Askar el 'Ali	<i>Mukhnah, S.</i>
17. KIRJATH ASKUR		<i>Kh. 'Askûr, S.</i>
18. KIRJATH TZEKATHAH.....	Kûzah	<i>Kâzah, S.</i>
19. KIRJATH ATZAPHEH		<i>Umm Suffah ? S.</i>
20. KIRJATH CAPHAR KALIL		<i>Kefr Kullîn, S.</i>
21. KIRJATH HAM-MISHPAT		<i>Jenn Safut ? S.</i>

A few remarks may be added on the more important of these places:

Iskar.—It is clear from the Chronicle that two places of somewhat similar name existed in Samaria; one being called Iskar, in the plain between the two mountains towards the east. In the Arabic translation it is written 'Askar, and is evidently the modern village of that name. The other is called 'Askûr, and was near another site called Kuryet ha Mishfeh. This seems to be the ruin of 'Askûr west of Gerizim. The chief interest of the former name lies in the fact that 'Askar is generally thought to be the Sychar of the New Testament, and that in the Samaritan text we find the word in a transition form without the initial 'Ain which has taken the place of the *Yod*. This fact considerably increases the probability of the identification.

Ophrah.—The value of the variations in the Arabic translation of the Chronicle is here again evident. It serves to identify the modern Fer'ata, or later Jewish Pirathon, with an ancient Ophrah, and the one which suggests itself as most probably identical is Ophrah of the Abiezrite, a town of Manasseh, the home of Gideon (Judges vi. 11). If this be the case the identification has a direct bearing on the question of the north boundary of Ephraim at Asher-ham-Michmethah (Josh. xvii. 7), and would fix this place at 'Asirêh, as proposed by myself, agreeing with the identification of the River Kanah as *Wâdy Kanah*, and making Gerizim the outpost of Ephraim, whereas the ordinary identification of Asher with *Teiasîr*, or Mr. Drake's proposed site at 'Asirah, quite destroys the identification of the River Kanah and includes Ebal in Ephraim, leaving only a very narrow strip of country for Manasseh.

The only other point of great interest is the fact recorded that the Samaritans inhabiting Gaza and Gerar were Benjamites. It shows that the Samaritans claimed to represent all Israel except Judah, and not merely the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh.

This paper has already been prolonged to such an extent that there is no room for the discussion of minor points of interest, such as the identification of the plain of Moreh with the plain of the Muknah or "camping-place." It is sufficiently evident that the Samaritan literature allows us to fill up a portion of Palestine which is almost a blank as regards Biblical towns.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.

NOTES ON MASONRY.

THE following is an abstract of observations with regard to styles and dressing of masonry in Palestine, extending over three years, and embracing the results of visits to many hundreds of ruins. The prominently distinct styles in the principal buildings are seven in number.

1st. Megalithic ashlar; stones averaging 3 ft. 6 in. in height, generally great length, some reaching 30 to 40 feet. No attention was paid to quarry bed, as shown by various weathering; a draft from 1½ to 3½ inches broad, ¼ to ½ inch in depth. The tooling is fine and regular, done with a flat instrument with teeth, used in two directions at right angles to