REMARKS ON THE OCTOBER, 1901, "QUARTERLY STATEMENT."

The coins found by Professor G. A. Smith at Tell esh-Shihab and at Banias (Quarterly Statement, October, 1901, p. 350) evidently come from the Low countries. The first is interesting, as being an example of the local currency of the town of Campen, which struck such "money of convention" from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. The inscription on the obverse should be given as MO(neta) ARG(entea) CIVI(tatis) BEL(gicae) CAMPEN(sis).

The second is a specimen of the coinage of West Friesland; the inscription, no doubt, is MO(neta) ARG(entea) PRO(vinciae) CONFOE(deratae) BELG(icae) WEST(frisiae).

The specimens of recent foreign coinages to be found in Palestine afford a rather interesting study; though, as the majority of the pieces are large silver coins worn by Fellah women, it is generally impossible to obtain more than a passing glimpse at the individual examples, and a considerable familiarity with the various types is necessary to identify them. The only coin I have seen that can compare in interest with Professor Smith’s was a seventeenth century Polish piece: this also had been perforated for suspension. Perhaps the half-crown of George III of Britain, which I once noticed in a woman’s headdress, was a little unexpected. But one of the most curious discoveries of this kind that I have heard of was a battered English halfpenny of William III, dug up somewhere near Jerusalem. It would be interesting to know the history of the wanderings of this relic.

R. A. S. M.

THE BIBLICAL CUBIT—A NEW SUGGESTION.

After the meeting of the Executive Committee on November 5th, the members present gave a private interview to the Rev. W. S. Caldecott, in order that he might explain to them the construction of a new model of the Tabernacle which he had constructed.

Mr. Caldecott stated to the members of the Committee that the model had been made under the governing influence of a new theory of the biblical cubit, at which he had arrived. He referred
to Fergusson's statement, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" (article, Temple), that the question as to how the curtains were applied as a covering to the Tabernacle had hitherto (1863) proved a stumbling block to restorers. He did not think that Fergusson's solution of the difficulty was a satisfactory one, as, in his restoration, both sets of curtains (i.e., that containing ten, and that containing eleven curtains) were hung over the centre ridge-pole; whereas one of these sets was manifestly meant to cover the Tabernacle, and the other the tent of the Tabernacle.

Another objection taken to Fergusson was based upon his representation of the completed Tabernacle (Fig. 4), showing six pillars in its front elevation (besides the centre tent pole), whereas the text twice states that the number was five (Exodus xxvi, 57, and xxxvi, 38).

To meet these difficulties it was proposed to apply cubits of different lengths, each being applied to its own specific department, of construction.

The lecturer stated that he accepted Colonel Conder's idea of there having been three cubits in use amongst the Hebrews, as published in 1875, in the "Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology," vol. iv, pp. 121-5. He also accepted Sir Charles Warren's conclusion that the length of one of these three cubits was 18 inches, as stated in the "Jerusalem Memoir" (P.E.F.).

His own addition to these opinions was that the 18-inch cubit was the largest of the three, and consisted of five palm-breadths. This, he thought, was the "great cubit" of Ezek. xli, 8, which was ordinarily used as a surveyor's cubit or land measure. In a few special cases—all of which are so distinguished—it was used in the specification of Ezekiel's temple plan. In every other case its sole application was to ground areas, the two courts of the Tabernacle being delimited by it.

There is evidence in Ezekiel that the cubit next in size to the great cubit was one of an hand-breath less in length (Ezek. xl, 5, and xliii, 13). By the suggestion that the great cubit consisted of five palms, or 18 inches, the conclusion will be easily arrived at that each palm was 3·6 inches, and that the medium cubit had a length of 14·4 inches.

This was the cubit used throughout the Tabernacle erection, with two exceptions. One of these has already been referred to as covering the site. The other involved the use of a still smaller
cubit of three palms (\(=10.8\) inches), which was used in the measure of all gold work, whether as material or as ornament. In the Talmud it is called “the cubit of the vessels” of the sanctuary, as the one next in size to it (larger) is called “the cubit of the building” (Menakhoth, 97A, cited in “Jerusalem” volume, p. 241). It is this small cubit—for which an appropriate modern descriptive name would be “the goldsmith’s cubit”—that it is supposed the ten curtains of the Tabernacle were, in construction, measured by. To them is given, in Exodus xxvi, 2, a width of four cubits, and a length of 28 cubits. Being embroidered with figures of cherubs worked in gold thread (as the eleven goat’s-hair curtains were not) they naturally fell under the goldsmith’s rule. When conjoined, their width would thus be 40 small cubits, equal to 30 medium cubits. Thirty cubits (medium) being the length of the Tabernacle boards when placed in position, it will be seen that the ten curtains exactly enclosed it on its upper side. The union of the two sets of five curtains, in the middle, would allow for the protrusion there of the second tent pole of the three which supported the ridge bar.

By the adoption of this allocation of cubits Fergusson’s proposed place for the ten curtains over the ridge pole may be set aside. The length of each curtain being 25\(\frac{1}{4}\) feet—made up of 28 cubits of three palms each—its drapery, when hung over the Tabernacle boards, would keep it some 6 feet from the ground, whereas Fergusson’s plan makes the lateral extension of the two sets of curtains nearly the same, or as 28 : 30.

The treatment required by the eleven curtains in one of their dimensions, viz., the width, is wholly different. Being woven by the medium cubit of 1\(\frac{1}{8}\) feet, and each of the eleven being four cubits wide (Exodus xxvi, 8), we have a total width of curtain, when conjoined, of 52\(\frac{1}{8}\) feet. Of the eleven, one was deducted from this extension by being hung, in halves, over either end of the Tabernacle tent. We then have 48 feet of curtaining to deal with. The application of the medium cubit to the Tabernacle boards will show that the Holy of Holies was a cube of 12 feet, and that the Holy Place had a length of 24 feet, and a width and height of 12 feet each. To these, on the authority of Josephus, must be added a third area, to which, by analogy, must be given a size identical with that of the area of the Holy of Holies. The references to Josephus may be seen in “Antiquities,” III, 6, § 4, and III, 7, § 7, and are as clear as is necessary.
In these three areas—two of 12 feet square and one of 24 feet in length—we have the space required to be covered in by the 48 feet of which the goat's-hair curtains consisted, the third area being defined by the position of the five pillars.

Other evidence, on the same behalf, was produced by Mr. Caldecott, who claims to have established that there were three cubits of the respective lengths of \( \frac{9}{10}, \frac{12}{16}, \) and \( \frac{15}{10} \) of an English foot, the first of which was used exclusively for gold and silver work, the second for building purposes, and the third for measuring areas only.

---

THE SAMARITAN PASSOVER.

By the Rev. John E. H. Thomson, D.D.

On Monday, May 2nd, 1898, a party of us—my wife and myself, accompanied by two young ladies—started from Nazareth for Nablus to see the Samaritan Passover. I need not spend time detailing our journey across the plain of Esdraelon, our stay in the native hostel in Jenin, or our visit to Sebaste. It is a road well known. I would, however, like to make a passing note on 'Ain Jalud, Gideon's fountain, where we lunched on our first day. The name certainly means the well of Gilead; and as certainly Gilead, as we find it in later history, was across the Jordan. Might I venture to suggest that Gilboa originally was called Gilead, hence we find it said in Judges vii, 3, "Let him that is fearful or afraid depart out of Mount Gilboa." The suggestion of Professor G. A. Smith that Gilead here may be a misreading for Gilboa does not seem probable, as the mountain to the south of Mount Moreh, out of which the well of Harod sprang, was well known later as Mount Gilboa; the tendency would rather have been to have changed Gilead into Gilboa than the reverse. 'Ain Jaluk, a variant found in the Jerusalem itinerary, is due to mishearing. Another note I would make on Fendaktmlyeh—a name generally understood to be equivalent to πίντε κύματι. The modern Arabic equivalent of the Greek \( \pi \) is \( \digamma \), as Boutros and Boulos. Is it possible that in some cases the ancient Greek softened \( \pi \) into \( \varepsilon \) as the modern Greek softens \( \beta \) into \( \varepsilon \)? Another example of the same change is Fahil (Pella); but on the other hand we have Baneas from Panias.

We arrived about sunset on Tuesday evening at the Latin Convent Nablus. We had been informed that on the evening of Thursday, May 5th, the Passover was to be killed, so we had expected to have a free day before the Passover to climb Mount Ebal. However, when we were dismounting we heard the porter muttering to himself, as if explaining