

our safety out of the pale of their church. Without returning railing for railing, we must, in duty to Christ and the souls of men, expose the unscriptural and absurd principles and practices of their scheme. We cannot point to a work in which this is done more thoroughly and successfully and with a better spirit than in these Lectures.

N. A.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.

By E. Robinson, D. D., Prof. of Bib. Lit. in the Union Theol. Sem. New York.

#### I. GIBEAH OF SAUL.

In the *Biblical Researches* (Vol. II. p. 114), I have regarded the present village *Jeb'a*, lying eastward of er-Râm (Ramah), and south of Mûkmâs (Michmash), as representing the ancient Gibeah of Benjamin or of Saul. Some difficulties in the way of this hypothesis are there stated; such as that the masculine form of the Arabic *Jeb'a* corresponds better with the ancient *Geba*, while Gibeah would more naturally appear in Arabic in the feminine form, *Jeb'ah*, as indeed we actually find it in the case of the Gibeah of Judah. The hypothesis was founded on the assumed position, that both Gibeah and Geba must have lain over against Michmash, on the south side of the deep ravine or passage which there exists. That Geba was actually so situated, appears from Isa. 10: 29. For a like position of Gibeah, appeal was made to 1 Sam. 13: 15, 16 and 14: 5. In these passages the English version reads *Gibeah*; but by some oversight I must have neglected to look at the Hebrew, which in both instances has *Geba*. The proof, therefore, in respect to Gibeah, so far as it was drawn from these verses, fails. Yet in 1 Sam. 14: 16 the Hebrew too reads *Gibeah*; and this passage is quite as decisive as the others were supposed to be. My idea was, that Geba lay not far eastward of Gibeah; where it would still be over against Michmash, and where, too, we were told of ruins; and so far as can be gathered from the notices of Scripture, there would seem to be no occasion for changing this opinion.

My attention has been again called to the subject by a remark of Mr. Gross, a young theologian at Calov in Würtemberg, in his review of the *Biblical Researches* in the *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1843, p. 1062. He there takes the position, that Gibeah must have lain south of Ramah and Geba; and that therefore the *Jeb'a* which we found is ancient Geba. This view as to the more southern position of Gibeah he has presented more fully in a recent letter to me; and supports it by the following considerations:

1. "In Josh. 18: 22—23, Geba is reckoned to the northern cities of Ben-

jamin ; while Gibeah is named with Jerusalem and Kirjath-jearim as a southern city."—But among the known places here described as northern, we find likewise Jericho, Beth-Hoglah, and Beth-Arabah ; and among the cities assumed as southern, are also Gibeon, Ramah, and Beerth. The division, therefore, if there be one intended, would seem to be rather into eastern and western cities.

2. "In Judg. 19: 11—14, we find named in succession, on the great road from south to north, Jerusalem, Gibeah, Ramah. The Levite does not reach Ramah, but only Gibeah ; which therefore lay on the great road between Jerusalem and Ramah."—But this passage is susceptible of another explanation. From Jerusalem northwards there have always been two great roads, nearly parallel, leading into Mount Ephraim ; one by Ramah and Beerth, and the other by Jeb'a (Gibeah) and Michmash. When the Levite spoke of stopping for the night at Ramah or Gibeah, we may suppose that he had not decided which route to take ; but he ultimately took the eastern one and lodged at Gibeah.

3. "In Isa. 10: 28—32, there follow one another, very definitely, Michmash, the Passage, then Geba, then Ramah, and finally Gibeah. Just so, with the omission of Gibeah, and in inverted order, Ramah, Geba, Michmash, in Ezra 2: 26, 27. Neh. 7: 30, 31 ; and Geba, Michmash, Ai, Neh. 11: 31. According to these passages Gibeah could not possibly have lain in the same latitude with Geba."—I am here unable to see what the passages from Ezra and Nehemiah have to do with the question. Gibeah is not mentioned at all ; and had the writer thought proper to name it, there is nothing in these verses nor in the nature of the case to show that he would not have inserted it between Ramah and Geba. In Isaiah c. x, where Sennacherib is represented as crossing the valley from Michmash to Geba, it is not intimated that Ramah and Gibeah were upon his route ; but the idea expressed is, that the inhabitants of these cities lying west of his route and beholding his progress are terrified and flee. That the writer here mentions Ramah before Gibeah does not seem to me in any degree necessarily to determine their relative position.

4. "From 2 K. 23: 8. Zech. 14: 10, it follows incontestably, that Geba, as the northernmost border-city of the kingdom of Judah, must have lain further north than Gibeah."—Geba was doubtless the extreme *north-eastern* city of Judah ; but not necessarily further *north* than all other places. Beerth, which belonged to the same kingdom, lay two or three miles more northward than Geba.

One or two other minor points in the letter, I have omitted ; and thus far, I am unable to perceive any valid progress in unsettling the position assigned by me to Gibeah. The writer appears to have adopted it as a principle, that the Bible, in enumerating a list of names of cities, gives them mostly in *their geographical order*. This principle seems to me not to be a safe one. Indeed it is disproved by the lists in Josh. 18: 22—28 ; and also by those in Josh. c. xv, in Ezra c. ii, and in Neh. c. vii. xi. The most that can be said is, that in Joshua the cities of certain districts are named together ; but not in any definite order, and least of all in geographical order.

If, however, we now call in the aid of other testimony to fill out and

explain that of the Scriptures, the aspect of the case is changed. Mr. Gross refers to Josephus as placing Gibeah at one time *twenty stadia*, and at another *thirty stadia* north of Jerusalem; and assuming a medium of twenty four or five stadia, he finds Gibeah at the hill now called *Tuleil-el-Fül*, situated one hour or three Roman miles (24 stadia) north of Jerusalem, and fifty minutes or two and a half Roman miles (20 stadia) south of er-Râm or Ramah. See Bibl. Res. II. p. 317.

This discrepancy in the two statements of Josephus might seem, after all, to leave the whole matter in uncertainty. Yet if we take his largest statement, thirty stadia, and compare it with the distance of forty stadia from Jerusalem, which he elsewhere assigns to Ramah, (Antiq. 8. 12. 3), it is obvious that Gibeah could not well have been at Jeb'a; since that place is several stadia more distant from Jerusalem than is er-Râm. There are, moreover, circumstances narrated in one of the two passages of Josephus,—circumstances which I did not take into account, and which Mr. Gross also appears to have overlooked,—which, coupled with a passage of Jerome, do serve to fix, beyond controversy, the site of Gibeah at Tuleil el-Fül; and thus elevate a happy conjecture into a matter of historical demonstration.

Jerome in narrating the journey of Paula, describes her as ascending to Jerusalem by the way of Lower and Upper Bethhoron; on her right she sees Ajalon and Gibeon, where Joshua commanded the sun and moon to stand still; she stops a little at Gabaa (Gibeah), then levelled to the ground, calling to mind its ancient crime and the concubine cut in pieces; and then leaving the mausoleum of Helena on her left, she enters Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Now this very road is the great camel-road from Yâfa and Lydda to Jerusalem at the present day; which, from the top of the long ascent, looks down upon the vale of Ajalon, then passes along on the north of Gibeon, and falls into the great northern road from Nâbulus to Jerusalem at a point just north of Tuleil el-Fül.<sup>2</sup> Gibeah therefore must have been situated somewhere upon this road between Gibeon and Jerusalem; for had it been at Jeb'a, Paula must have gone several miles directly out of her way to stop at it.

Josephus, in one of the passages referred to, is relating the story of the Levite and his concubine; and remarks that the Levite was unwilling to remain for the night at Jerusalem among the heathen, but chose to go on twenty stadia further, in order to lodge in a town belonging to his countrymen. He came therefore to Gibeah.<sup>3</sup> The twenty stadia then are not here employed as marking the exact distance of Gibeah; but simply in respect to the desire of the Levite to advance *some* twenty stadia further.—The other passage of Josephus is more explicit. He is describing the march of Titus from Samaria by way of Gophna to besiege Jerusalem. "Having halted [at Gophna] one night, he set off again with the dawn;

<sup>1</sup> "Inde proficiscens ascendit Bethoron inferiorem et superiorem;—ad dexteram aspiciens Ajalon et Gabaa. In Gabaa urbe usque ad solum diruta, paululum substitit, recordata peccati ejus, et concubinae in frustra divisae.—Ad laevam mausoleo Helenae derelicto—ingressa est Jerosolymam urbem."—*Hieron. ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Paulae, Opp. ed. Martian. Tom. IV. ii. col. 673.*

<sup>2</sup> See Bibl. Res. III. p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> Antiq. 5. 2, 8.

and having completed a day's march, he encamped in a place called by the Jews in their own language "Valley of Thorns," near by a certain village named Gabath-Saul, which signifies "Hill of Saul," and distant from Jerusalem about thirty stadia.<sup>1</sup> The same afternoon Titus with six hundred chosen horsemen, advances to reconnoitre the city; and returns, after having been exposed under its walls to great personal danger by a sudden sally of the Jews. During the night a legion coming from Emmaus (Nicopolis) joins the main army; and the next morning Titus moves forward and encamps on Scopus, seven stadia distant from Jerusalem, where the city and temple lay conspicuously spread out before the view.<sup>2</sup>

Scopus was the brow of the hill on the north of the valley of Jehoshaphat, where this valley runs from west to east; and this brow or elevation spreads off northwards as a high plain or table-land for some two miles or more, quite to Tuleil el-Fül. Directly at the western base of this high conical hill, the ground and road descend gradually into a valley or lower plain; which further towards the north opens out more widely, on the east into the plain which surrounds the hill of er-Râm, and on the west into the broad level tract around Gibeon. Titus, advancing from Gophna, marches between eleven and twelve Roman miles, and encamps at the distance of about thirty stadia from Jerusalem and of course twenty-three stadia from Scopus; at or near the point where the road from Bethhoron comes in, as appears from the junction of the legion coming from Nicopolis, obviously by the way of Bethhoron. The distance of thirty stadia here, evidently applies to the place of encampment, and not to the village; and this point of the junction of the roads, according to our rate of travel in 1838, is nearest one hour and a quarter or  $3\frac{1}{4}$  Roman miles (30 stadia) from Jerusalem. The place of their encampment therefore is distinctly and definitely marked. But it was also "near to a certain village called Gobath-Saul, i. e. Hill (*λόφος*) of Saul;" and at this day, ten minutes distant from the same point, toward the south-east, there rises the conspicuous conical hill called Tuleil el-Fül. It is the only hill near, and stands entirely isolated on the northern border of the elevated plain above mentioned. It is seen at a great distance, especially in the eastern quarter. On it was once a square tower, now fallen into ruins and having the appearance of a pyramidal mound.<sup>3</sup> This then beyond all question is the *λόφος* or Hill of Saul described by Josephus. There are no other remains around the hill itself; but, a few rods further west, directly upon the great road as it enters the lower plain or valley, there are seen a number of ancient substructions, consisting of large unhewn stones in low massive walls.<sup>4</sup> Probably the ancient city extended down from the hill on this side and included this spot.

This narration of the Jewish historian, as it seems to me, furnishes,

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. B. J. 5, 2. 1, "Ἐνθα μίαν ἑσπέραν ἀλλισάμενος, ἵπὸ τὴν ἕω πρόσεισ· καὶ διανύσας ἡμέρας σταθμὸν στρατοπεδεύεται κατὰ τὸν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων πατρίως Ἀκανθῶν αἰλῶνα καλούμενον, πρὸς τινὲν κώμην Γαβαθσαούλη καλουμένη· σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο λόφον Σαούλου διέχοντα ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολίμων ὅσον ἀπὸ τριῶντα σταδίων."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 5, 2, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Bibl. Res. II. p. 317.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 317.

therefore, conclusive proof, that here was the position of the ancient Gibeah of Saul. This too accords well with all the passages of Scripture (except one) where Gibeah is mentioned; and certainly tallies much better with the journey of the Levite,<sup>1</sup> than does the explanation above given. The one exception is 1 Sam. 14: 16; where in the Hebrew, as well as in the English version, Gibeah is so spoken of as necessarily to imply that it lay over against Michmash, at or near Jeb'a. The circumstances there narrated are utterly incompatible with the position of Tuleil el-Fül at the distance of four miles or more. But we find elsewhere some confusion in the use of the names Geba and Gibeah, which indeed are only masculine and feminine forms of the same word. Thus Geba is certainly read for Gibeah in Judg. 20: 10, 33; comp. vv. 9, 36. So in 1 Sam. 14: 16, I am unable to doubt, after the testimony of Josephus, but that *vice versa* Gibeah is here put for Geba by an error in transcribing; comp. 1 Sam. 13: 16.

It follows of course that Jeb'a is the representative of the ancient Geba. I would therefore request that it may be so marked on the maps of the Biblical Researches; and also that the name Gibeah be inserted in connection with Tuleil el-Fül.

## II. RACHEL'S SEPULCHRE. RAMAH OF SAMUEL.

In the course of the last year or two I have received several letters from persons in Europe, expressing doubts, whether the modern Tomb of Rachel occupies the true place of the ancient sepulchre. One writer in Scotland supposes, on no very definite grounds, that the latter must have been quite near to Jerusalem. In the letter of Mr. Gross mentioned in the former part of this article, he likewise takes the ground, that the present site of the sepulchre is not the true one. He supposes that the Ramah of Samuel was at er-Râm on the north of Jerusalem; and that Rachel's sepulchre, according to 1 Sam. 10: 2 and Jer. 31: 15, must have been situated between that place and Gibeah of Saul; that is to say, between er-Râm and Tuleil el-Fül, as shown above.

Several considerations present themselves, which seem to show that this view is untenable.

1. According to Gen. 35: 16, 19. 48: 7, Jacob was journeying from Bethel southwards, when Rachel being seized with the pains of labor, died and was buried in the way of Ephrath, "where there was yet a *kibrah of land* (קברת דארת) to come to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem." It is added, Gen. 35: 20, "and Jacob set a pillar upon her grave; that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day." The length of the measure here called *kibrah* is indeed unknown, and was so already when the Septuagint version was made; since that version retains the same word in Greek letters, *καβραία*. But the very fact that Jacob was travelling *from* Bethel *to* Ephrath, while Rachel's death is narrated as taking place before coming to Ephrath, and her grave described as in the way of or *to* Ephrath, shows that the English version cannot be far from right, when it translates: "And there was but a *little way* to come to Ephrath." At least,

<sup>1</sup> Judg. 19: 12-15.

the spot must have been nearer to Ephrath or Bethlehem than to Bethel. So too Josephus understood it, for he says that as Jacob was journeying from Bethel, Rachel died in travail and was buried in the region of Ephrath.<sup>1</sup>—The tradition too by which a knowledge of the spot was handed down, was not merely an ordinary unwritten tradition; the value of which latter in itself I do not estimate very highly. The expression, “that is the pillar of Rachel’s grave unto this day,” if penned by Moses, was written nearly five hundred years after Rachel’s death; or, if it was a subsequent addition, it may date even from the time of Ezra, a thousand years later; and in either case it shows a long and definite tradition, which cannot thus far be called in question. And afterwards the very fact that such a record existed in their sacred books which were read every Sabbath-day in the hearing of all the Jews, would necessarily fix the attention of the people with unwavering certainty upon the spot thus definitely marked; and so long as the Jews retained possession of their land, and this public reading of the Scriptures was continued, the place of Rachel’s sepulchre could not well be forgotten. This brings us to near the close of the first century of the christian era; and at that very time the language of Josephus above quoted, shows that the tradition was still current. When therefore, two centuries later, we find the Bourdeaux Pilgrim, in A. D. 333, making mention of the sepulchre as being situated four Roman miles from Jerusalem and two from Bethlehem; and Jerome again, near the end of the same century, describing Paula as stopping at Rachel’s tomb on her way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem; and when we perceive that this position accords with what we learn from Scripture and from Josephus; we are warranted in holding this to be the true position, as handed down by long and trustworthy Jewish tradition. That the present site is the one pointed out by the Pilgrim and Jerome, no one doubts.—On the other hand, if we look for Rachel’s sepulchre between er-Râm and Tuleil el-Fûl, then Jacob at the time of her burial was not yet half-way from Bethel to Bethlehem; for Tuleil el-Fûl itself is further from the latter place than from the former. To assume, therefore, such a position would be to contradict the testimony of Scripture and of Josephus, and also of long and trustworthy tradition, as shown above.

2. In 1 Sam. 10: 2, Rachel’s sepulchre is said to be “in the border of Benjamin at Zelzah.” But if it be sought between Tuleil el-Fûl and er-Râm, then it was not upon the border at all, but in the very midst of the tribe of Benjamin; for the southern border of this tribe took in Jerusalem, and the northern included Beeroth and originally Bethel.—Or, should it be averred that the word *border* (גבול) is to be here taken, not in the sense of *boundary*, but of *territory*; then, if Saul was merely passing between er-Râm and Tuleil el-Fûl (Ramah and Gibeah), two places in the land of Benjamin, it is difficult to see why a certain spot between the two should be so very definitely described as “in the territory of Benjamin,” and nothing be said of the other two.

3. According to 1 Sam. 9: 4 sq., Saul, in searching for his father’s asses, after passing through Mount Ephraim and other parts, passes also

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Ant. 1. 21. 3. ἐπει κατὰ τὴν Ἐφραθάνην γίνεται, ἐνθάδε Ῥαχὴλ ἐκ τοκετοῦ θανούσαν θάπτει.

through the land of Benjamin, (obviously from north to south,) and comes to the land of Zuph; which land therefore seems to have been a part of Judah on the south of Benjamin. Here he visits Samuel, apparently at his own house in Ramah; and so Josephus calls the city.<sup>1</sup> The story represents Saul as a stranger to the place; and Samuel's directions to Saul the next morning evidently imply that a journey of some length was before him to reach Gibeah. But if Samuel's Ramah was at er-Râm, then this place and Gibeah (Tuleil el-Fül) was only two Roman miles apart, and in full sight of each other across the lower intervening ground. That all the occurrences foretold by Samuel were to happen within that brief distance, and that Saul should here be so much of a stranger in a place which had been before his eyes and within half an hour's walk all his life long,—all this does not, at the least, seem very probable.

4. The passage in Jer. 31:15, is quoted in Matt. 2:18, and applied to Herod's slaughter of the children in Bethlehem. If it be there cited as having a special prophetic application to this event in Bethlehem, then the reference must unquestionably be to the sepulchre of Rachel as now shown in the vicinity of that place. But if it be cited only by way of illustration or allusion, (as I hold to be the case,) then Ramah seems to be mentioned as having been the depôt or rendezvous where the captives were collected in order to be marched to Babylon (Jer. 40:1); and Rachel is introduced, as the mother of the tribe in which Ramah is situated, bewailing her posterity thus led away into captivity. If the passage be viewed in this light, there is here no reference whatever to her sepulchre.

On all these grounds, I must still retain the feeling and the opinion, that the tradition in favor of the present site of Rachel's sepulchre, "cannot well be drawn in question;" and also that the Ramah of Samuel could not well have been at er-Râm.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### SELECT NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

A VERY interesting work was published in 1843, by Karl von Raumer, professor at Erlangen, entitled, *Geschichte der Pädagogik vom wiederaufblühen klassischer Studien bis auf unsere Zeit*. "History of Education from the revival of classical studies to the present time." It is contained in two elegantly printed volumes of about 400 pages each, and embraces the substance of a course of lectures delivered at various times from 1822 to 1842. The author is well known by his valuable geographical work on Palestine and other publications. The principal topics which pass under review, are the Middle ages, Italy from the birth

---

<sup>1</sup> Antiq. 6. 4. 1.