

the fourth century to fix Bethabara so far south, whilst a position near upper Galilee would both suit the narrative and allow of the reconciliation of the two readings Bethany and Bethabara.

Bethabara is commonly spoken of as the site of our Lord's baptism. In this again we follow the fourth century tradition. From the gospel we gather nothing beyond the fact that it was the scene of certain events which are placed in the Gospel Harmonies (see Smith's Bib. Dic. p. 721) after the Temptation, and which occupied two days, seemingly consecutive, whilst on the third Jesus reached Cana of Galilee.

In a former paper (*Quarterly Statement*, April, 1875) I called attention to the fact that the name 'Abâra still applies to the principal ford of Jordan north of Beisân, and thus leading to Bashan or Batanea, whilst the site is within a day's journey of the neighbourhood of Nazareth. Against this identification all that can be urged is the tradition which places Bethabara near Jericho. It may be said also that the name is merely descriptive, and might apply to any other ford; to this I can only reply, that of more than fifty fords the names of which were collected by the Survey party, not one other had any name at all approaching in sound to this, and that, though doubtless descriptive, it is not a common name in the country, as it does not reappear in the list of 6,000 names within the limits of the Survey.

It seems difficult to understand how the name Bethabara can have been accepted by the early fathers of the church unless the site either existed in their day, or a tradition dating as early as the middle of the second century pointed to it as the site of the Bathania of the Gospel. The above notes will serve at all events to show that the topography is capable of exact explanation whichever reading be the more authentic.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.

## SYCAMINON, HEPHA, PORPHYREON, AND CHILZON.

THE question of the sites of the four towns above named is interesting and somewhat complicated.

Haifa is noticed in the Talmud under its modern name (Gemara, Sabbath, 26a) and by the name Cayphas in Crusading chronicles, such as Geoffry de Vinsauf 1187, Scewulf 1102, Benjamin of Tudela 1160, and Sir John Mandeville 1322; under this title also it is marked on Marino Sanuto's map (1321). The name comes from a Hebrew root meaning "shore," and in Arabic a "mountain side," referring to its position at the foot of Carmel by the sea. The Crusaders, however, had curious ideas of the derivation of the title. According to some it was built by Caiaphas, the high priest, and named from him; others supposed a connection with the name Cephas, and referred it either to the "stonyness" of the place, or to Simon Peter, who fished there according to one account.

This curious legend has probably some connection with the Crusading Capernaum, which was shown near the shore of the Mediterranean farther south, at *Kefr Lām*.

The Crusaders further called Haifa Porphyreon, as is certain from William of Tyre. The real town of this name, which was derived from the purple of the Murex there caught, was eight Roman miles from Sidon towards the north, and just south of the River Tanyras (*Nahr Damūr*), but the Crusading idea was probably connected with their extraordinary fancy for placing Ancient Tyre at 'Athlīt, which would bring Porphyreon into a relative position near Haifa.

The question of Palætyrus, or Ancient Tyre, thus becomes connected with the present subject. This place, the original site of Tyre, was, according to Strabo, thirty stadia south of New Tyre on the promontory; yet there is a passage which looks as if even in the fourth century it was placed near Athlīt, for Jerome speaks of Dor (s.v. Dornapheth, Onomasticon) as nine miles north of Cæsarea (at *Khūrbet Tantūrah*) "to those going to Tyre now deserted." The Crusaders added to their theory the position of Porphyreon at Haifa and of Sarepta, possibly at *Surafeūd*, just south of 'Athlīt. They also grouped the sites of Capernaum and Meon (the town of Nabal) close by, and the pilgrim on landing was thus shown immediately sacred places, the true sites of which were removed by days of travel.\*

There is further some evidence that Sycaminon was also placed, in the fourth century, at Haifa. Jerome, in the Onomasticon (s.v. Japhthie), identifies Haifa with Japhia of Zebulon (*Yāfa*, near Nazareth) and with Sycaminon. The latter name appears as Shikmonah in the Talmud (Mishna Demoi I.), referring to a place celebrated for its pomegranates, and Sycaminon is also noticed by Josephus (Ant. xiii. 20) as near Ptolemais. The derivation is supposed to be from the Sycamine figs, one tree of which still remains on the shore near Haifa. Sycaminon is also noticed in two early itineraries, and its distance given from Acre and Cæsarea.

The fact that in the Talmud both names occur seems to indicate that Sycaminon and Hepha were distinct places, and this leads to their identification with the ruined sites of *Haifa el 'Atīka* (ancient "Haifa") and *Tell es Semak* ("mound of the fish"), the latter possibly a corruption of Shikmonah; but as these two are only two miles apart they might easily be confounded, as identified in the Onomasticon; in the Crusading times we find them again distinct—Haipha, under the name Cayphas, whence the modern Frankish Caiffa originates, and also as Porphyreon, Sycaminon, and Sycamazon, a bishopric under the metropolitan of Cæsarea, as early as 431 A.D.

The distance of Sycaminon from the two well-known points of Acre

\* The name *Tūeh*, applied to a village near Athlīt, may perhaps have some connection with this idea.

and Cæsarea is differently given by the Antonine and Jerusalem itineraries, thus :—

	Antonine.	Jerusalem.
Sycaminon to Acre.....	xxiv. r.m.	xv. r.m.
„ Cæsarea .....	xx. r.m.	xvi. r.m.

Total area to Cæsarea..... 44 Roman miles    31 r.m.

The true total distance is thirty-five and a half Roman miles measuring in a line, and by road thirty-nine and a half Roman miles. As Sycaminon was close to the Carmel promontory, according to every early account, it could not be only sixteen miles distant from Cæsarea, and a single X has evidently dropped out, which would bring the total of the Jerusalem itinerary nearly right, thus :—

Sycaminon to Acre .....	15 r.m.
„ Cæsarea (xxvi.)..	26 „
	41 r.m.

This, if the road went a little inshore of the Bay of Acre, would be correct. In the other itinerary, on the contrary, an X seems to have been added to the northern measurement, for Sycaminon under Carmel near Haifa could not have been twenty-four Roman miles from Acre. The correction makes the total thirty-four Roman miles, which is rather short unless direct measurement over the Bay of Acre be supposed.

There is, however, another difficulty in the question, for Sycaminon in the Jerusalem itinerary is placed after Calamon, three miles farther. Now Calamon was really three miles farther on the road than Sycaminon, and situate at *Khürbet Kefr es Samîr* (see *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1876, p. 20), and this would seem to make the total from Acre to Cæsarea forty-three miles.\*

The two itineraries, however, agree in placing Sycaminon fourteen to fifteen miles from Acre, measuring along the shore, and this distance agrees with the position of *Tell es Semak*, fifteen Roman miles from Acre and three Roman miles from Calamon (*Kefr es Samîr*) and twenty-four and a half Roman miles from Cæsarea.

The sites of Sycaminon and Haifa were thus near one another, but separate towns, as the literature of the subject indicates, and the ruins and names and distances point out.

The curious question remaining is whether Chilzon was ever a name applied to Haifa.

\* A possible explanation of the Calamon difficulty suggests itself to me as follows : That the Bordeaux Pilgrim crossed over Carmel to Calamon and went north to Sycaminon. This route would fit the distances very well, as follows :—

Acre to Kefr es Samîr (Calamon) 12 r. m.,	really 11½ r. m.
Kefr es Samîr to Tell es Semak    3 „	„    3 r. m.
Tell es Semak to Cæsarea .....	26 „    „    24½ r. m.

This would make the Jerusalem itinerary agree with the known position of Calamon without giving too great a total.

The name is that of the Murex, and means "snail" in Hebrew (the Arabic *Halzûn*). It has thus the same derivation with Porphyreon, also named from the Murex which yielded the purple. Reland supposes a connection with the text (Canticles vii. 5), "Thy head like Carmel, and the hair of thy head like purple," as alluding to the fishery of the Murex near Carmel. Chilzon is noticed, according to this authority, as a town from which, as far as the ladder of Tyre, the Murex was caught, but Neubauer supposes the word to be used only for the name of the mollusk in the Talmud.

In another ancient itinerary the town Chilzon is noticed as distinct from Haifa, and might be the northern or true Porphyreon. In the Targums the Chilzon or Murex is noticed as among the riches of the tribe of Zebulon, and as "coming up into the hills" (Buxtorf). This seems to give a clue to the real position of the place, for Zebulon did not possess any of the land north of Sidon where Porphyreon really stood, but the country from Carmel to Acre, and the Belus, in and near which the Murex is found and was caught originally.

The name still exists. It is applied to a large valley, a confluent of the Belus, called *Wâdy Halzûn*, "the valley of the snail" (or Murex). Here, then, if anywhere, Chilzon most likely stood, and not at Haifa, as supposed by Reland, if, indeed, a town of the name ever existed.

The fishery of the Murex extended from Phœnicia down to the Bay of Acre, and along these shores the mollusk (*Murex Trunculus*) is still found.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lient. R.E.

## BARAK AND SISERA.

Judges iv.

THERE are few episodes of the Old Testament history on which more light has been thrown by the Survey discoveries than that of the famous defeat of the Canaanites under Sisera.

The topography hitherto has been wonderfully obscure. The central position is Tabor. Hazor, Kedesh, and Bitzaanaim have been generally placed in Upper Galilee, over thirty miles from Tabor, whilst Megiddo has been placed close to Taanach, fourteen miles south-west. This is contrary to what we generally observe in the Scripture narrative, for the places noticed in a single episode are almost always close together.

I propose to show how the whole scene can be laid in the neighbourhood of Tabor within a radius of five or six miles.

The kings of Canaan (or of the low lands) were governed by Jabin, who lived at Hazor. They assembled at Taanach, and by the waters of Megiddo, but the battle was apparently not fought close to these places, for in Psalm lxxxiii. we read that they "perished in Endor," and the