

described in another graphic verse (verse 3), which, although written with exquisite characteristic parallelisms, has been greatly misunderstood, but should be rendered thus :—"All thy officers who have fled together from the bow are bound. All thy captives" (*i.e.*, the prisoners thou hast taken) "who were bound together from afar have escaped." What, then, under these humiliating national circumstances, will be the result of this widening of the valley that was now being done under Shebna's auspices? Verse 7, whether it is history or prophecy, was undoubtedly written to point out this result or the kind of result which they should expect. "And it came to pass that the best of thy valleys were full of chariots" (*i.e.*, the chariots of Elam and Kir mentioned in the preceding verse), "and horsemen set a firm foot in the gate." But we do not know, unless it can be ascertained from the rock itself, whether the prophet's righteous indignation and inspired denunciation resulted in the immediate relinquishment of the work.

My question, therefore, now is, Can a hill-side be found with an escarpment which looks like a widening or the beginning of widening of a low entrance into Jerusalem? If so, and if a sepulchre can also be discovered in a prominent position in the wall, it is that of Shebna, and a most difficult chapter in the Bible is explained. I only add, in conclusion, that, though the sepulchre be found, Shebna's bones will not be found therein; because (according to verse 18) he was ultimately to be a prisoner and to die in a broad land—*i.e.*, in a land that is flat and has no rocks for sepulchres: therefore far away from Jerusalem, near which there is hardly any flat country at all.

E. FLECKER.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN "JUDAH AND BENJAMIN."

EVEN with the great progress we have made in the knowledge of the Holy Land, the accurate laying down of the *boundaries of the twelve tribes of Israel* presents much difficulty. When one reads the double descriptions of the boundary between "Judah and Benjamin" (Josh. xv, 5-11, and xviii, 15-19), it seems, as so many places and points are mentioned, and since we possess such an accurate map of the Palestine Exploration Fund, that to trace this boundary out on the map would be an easy matter. But if one tries this he soon finds difficulties, especially at the most important part, *viz.*, in and about the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

As far as I have learned the country, and according to the studies I have made on this subject, I draw the boundary line as follows:—According to Joshua xv, 5, and xviii, 19, the boundary began towards the east at the "bay" of the sea, or the small peninsula at the mouth of the Jordan—exactly speaking, from the mouth of "Khaur el Kutuf;" it went in a north-west direction over to the "Khaur (or ravine) Wady

Makarfet," to the point where it breaks through the old bank of the river, and then along this ravine to a point having "Beth-hoglah" in some distance opposite in the *north*. This town¹ was, as I am persuaded, situated at or near the present "Kusr Hajleh," and the spring, north-east of it, had the name from the town. The triangle-shaped tract of land, lying between the Jordan—the base line—and the lines in the *north*, the old bank of the river; in the south, Benjamin had the already mentioned boundary line, called by the Arabs "Ez Zôr" (forming the two other lines). It is called "Ez Zôr," as every one passing through it has to do with difficulties; and it is fatiguing, for the many water ravines and swampy places.

The boundary line went along this ravine, "Makarfet," further on to "Beth Arabah." The name "Arabah" is identical with the present word "Ghor" (a broad wâdy greatly depressed), and "Beth Arabah"² was the inhabited place therein. I think it is the present "Mekur es Sidr"—meaning excavations and caves in the slopes of the ravine—the boundary running in the bed of the valley; therefore the southern caves, or "Beth Araba," are belonging to Judah (Josh. xv, 61), and the northern to Benjamin (xviii, 22). It is to be understood that on the banks of the ravine may have stood also *built* houses, embraced with some fence.³ The line went in the ravine up to the foot of the mountains, and there to the "stone of Bohan," a "white-striped rock," on one of the first heights—I think the one on which foot the Wâdy "Makarfet" comes out, and another smaller one enters into it. From here the line went into the valley of Achor (verse 7). "Valley Achor" was in the neighbourhood of Gilgal (Josh. vii, 24–26), and I am convinced it is the "Wâdy Umm el Bucimat," meaning the "mother of the door of death;" and the Rujm "es Shemâliyah" there is the heap of stones the children of Israel put over Achen and his family. Rujm Shemaliyah means the "northern heap" of stones, in opposition to another one in south, called the "Kebliyah," or southern. "Achor" means "trouble," grief, and "sorrow," and the present name implies the same idea; but there are promises (Hos. ii, 15, and Isa. lxxv, 10) of a better time. Some consider the Wâdy Kelt to be the "valley of Achor;" but this cannot be, for the Kelt is a narrow, deep gorge, with a river bordered with bushes and thickets, and certainly not convenient (nor advisable) for the executions of people—this wants a dry (broken) valley; and further, the Kelt is too near to the northern boundary of Benjamin and Ephraim according to Joshua xvi, 1, 2.

Verse 7 is in the Hebrew (and in all the translations to which I had access, which differ greatly) very difficult at first. But one has to keep in mind that here the line went through a complete wilderness, and so no names or places could be mentioned, till it came to cultivated land, full half-way up to Jerusalem, and there is "Debir" mentioned, a town,

¹ Hieronimus gives it three miles from Jericho, and two miles from the Jordan.

² Compare Joshua xviii, 18, where the German Bible gives "Gefilde."

³ And so forming a town.

or village rather—as in the enumeration of towns Debir is not mentioned (the one spoken of in Joshua xv, 49, is near Hebron)! Between the “Valley of Achor” and “Debir” “Gilgal” is mentioned in Joshua xv, 7, which is given in the parallel passage more completely as “Geliloth” (Josh. xviii, 17), meaning the round conical white chalky hills, which are numerous in this wilderness, and distinct from those at Jericho or on the banks of the Jordan (Joshua xxii, 10, who therefore said: those which are at the “ascent to Adunim, which is on the south side of the river,” thereby clearly describing the chalky hills, and above the high group of red looking hills, on which are the ruins of an ancient fort¹ and of a Khan called “Khan Hathrârah;” and which place is generally taken as the Adunim by all writers. West of them, a more level tract of land, and already cultivable, is called “Thoghret ed Debr,” which Rabbi Schwarz translates the “meeting-place of Debir,” referring to one of the stations, where the Israelites went up to Jerusalem for the feasts. The name is taken from the neighbouring Debir.

Debir must therefore be sought in the neighbourhood of this place. Half-an-hour south of this plain, in the same valley (but lower down), where several valleys unite, we find on the map “Umm el Rujm,” *i.e.*, the *mother of stone heaps*, and this place I consider to be the ancient Debir, and belonging to Judah, as the boundary coming up from the upper end of the valley Achor (which for a time has in its upper part a north direction, and the white chalky hills above its upper termination to “Adunim,” nearly along the present road to the neighbourhood of Debir to the present “Thoghret ed Debr.” Its name is derived from the neighbouring village from here (Debir or “Umm er Rujm”); the line went westwards, up the valley, and finally to the Water en Shemesh, and further on to En-Rogel (verse 7). En-Rogel is generally believed to be, and is without question, the present Bir Ayoob below Jerusalem. But where is En Shemesh? Robinson, and many others following him, think to find it in Ain Nond east, below “Azirieh,” or Bethania. But the name does not agree, and so we must look for another one elsewhere. The name “Es-Shemesh” occurs in this district three times. The first is a cave, “Mogharet es Shems,” north of the Wâdy Kelt, opposite the Khan Hathrârah, and cannot be the place looked for; the other is a rock, “Arak es Shemes,” south of the Jerusalem road, and from Thoghret ed Debr half-way up to Jerusalem: it is not the place looked for. The third is the site of an ancient village or town north of Jerusalem, east of the Nablus road, called now “Khurbet Soma,” *i.e.*, the “Ruins of Sama.” In this word we find the original root of the word “Es Shemes”—and many other reasons make me believe that this site is the ancient “En Shemes,” although there is now no spring, or ‘Ain, but only a very large cistern, which was formerly an open pool!² We must remember that in this district there are to-day

¹ Talat ed Dumm.

² It is to be remarked that the text does not say Ain Eshemes, but the “waters of Es Shemesh.”

only a few springs. It is clear that many former springs have in course of centuries entirely dried up, or now only flow a short time, after heavy rains; of this sort I know a great many. So it may have happened with the "En Shemes." Further, the words "Ain" and "Beth" are so often mentioned in the Bible, and also amongst the Arabs of this day, that they appear often synonymous, so that one is sometimes used for the other. Joshua xv, 10; 1 Samuel, vi, 12-20, is "Beth Shemes," now called by the natives "En Shemes," although there is no spring. And so may "Khurbet Soma" in Joshua's time be called "En Shemes;" afterwards, in the time of the Kings, it was called Beth Samys, and so the Septuagint has it throughout.

In 2 Kings xiv, 11-13, and 2 Chron. xxv, 11, we read, that Amaziah, King of Judah, would not hear advice; so Jehoash, King of Israel, made war and came up, and both kings "looked one another in the face at Beth-Shemesh, which belongeth to Judah," and Amaziah was beaten, captured, and 400 cubits of the walls of Jerusalem (in the northern direction) was broken down by Jehoash. It is evident that *this* Beth-Shemesh cannot be that above-mentioned, situated in the plain; for the distance from Jerusalem is too great, and no reason can be found to transplant this skirmish there; but, which was quite natural, Jehoash went over the boundary, marching towards the capital, Jerusalem (this boundary being a few hours north of Jerusalem, at Bethel), and when Amaziah heard this he went also out against him, and they met one another on the high flat ground at Khurbet Soma, the ancient Beth-Shemesh, near Shafat. To such a conclusion there are good reasons. I draw, therefore, the boundary line from Debir (in the neighbourhood of Khan Hathrûrah), first westwards up the Wâdy Sidr, along the Jerusalem road, till, at the point where the latter crosses over a ridge to a more southern valley, the line remaining still in Wâdy Sidr, and going along the traces of an ancient Roman road, to the place Deir es Sidd, and then up the Wâdy Sulim, up to the Khurbet Sôm'a; the ancient En Shema, and from here, bending at a right angle, southwards along the Nablus road to Jerusalem, and through the Damascus gate down the Wâdy (Tyropœon) to En-Rogel or Bîr Eyûb. In doing so, Jerusalem becomes cut in two parts: the eastern part belonging to Judah, the western to Benjamin. That such a line is correct we see from the parallel passage, Josh. xviii, 16, 17, where it is clearly stated, that from En-Rogel (verse 16) it went northwards to "En-Shemesh," which, therefore, fully agree with the present Khurbet Sôm'a. That Jerusalem was divided to the two tribes we learn also clearly from the Scriptures, Josh. xv, 63; it is said: "The children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites, but dwelt with them unto this day;" but in xviii, 28, we find Jerusalem enumerated among the cities of Benjamin, and said to be Jebus (compare also Judges xix, 10, and 1 Chron. xii, 4). So these passages seem one to contradict the other, when Jerusalem will be taken as a whole allotted only to one tribe, and one finds many and curious explanations of the commentators to reconcile these passages. All difficulty falls away when the boundary is drawn as I have done. That both tribes had part of

Jerusalem, the Talmud also states, and hence Rabbi Schwarz makes the Tyropœon the same thing as the Valley of the "Son of Hinnom," and the latter to the "valley of the giants," or Rephaim, but nothing of the following agrees with the state of things.¹ The Talmud says that the boundary line went even through the Temple, and over one corner of the altar of burnt-offering,² so that the Temple proper was situated in Benjamin, and quotes Gen. xlix, 27. But one would think the blessing to Judah, Gen. xlix, 8-12, would rather indicate the government and central point of the people, which was the Temple, to Judah. So in the chief point, that the boundary went through the town, they are right, but in the minute details they fall, according to my understanding, under the sentence (Mark vii, 8), "and many other such-like things ye do."

From "En-Rogel" (Bir Eyûb) the boundary went (according to verse 8) up in the valley of Ben Hinnom, on the south side of the Jebusites, to the "top of the mountain lying to the west," at the point where the valley makes a sharp bend towards north—this mountain was situated on the north end of "Rephaim" over the "valley of the giants," and by this we see it is the present "Ras ed Tabus" (south-west of Jerusalem). From here the line went to the "waters of Nephtoah," generally, and with good reasons, considered to be the "Ain at Lifta." It may appear strange that in verse 8 and beginning of verse 9 the several points are one so near the other—as in the rest of the description generally, are of great distances. But this is quite natural, just as here was Jerusalem and the centre of the people, and two tribes having shares in its territory, the boundary had to be given very exactly and minutely. The more so as, at that time, the two inhabited parts were small places or towns, yet both belonging to the Jebusites! Further, it was necessary to state minutely, as the line made at En-Rogel a sharp angle, which otherwise would not have been properly understood. From the "waters of Nephtoah" the boundary went on to the cities of Mount Ephraim (*i.e.*, Ephraim) to Baalah and Kirjath-Jearim" (verse 9). It is easy to be traced from Lifta down into the valley ("Wâdy Beit Hannina"), and westwards along it till "Beit Tulma," where the valley bends towards south, and as it is said "went to the cities of Mount Ephron"—it is clear that this valley formed the boundary between the mountains of Judah and the mountains of Ephraim. From "Beit Tulma" the line ascended the slope of the mountains, left "Khurbet Beit Mizza," the ancient "Mirza," to the right in north as belonging to Benjamin (Joshua xviii, 26); also the old Weli, or monument, "Abd el Aziz," a very ancient-looking place, with a monument as in other "Mukams," and the "Kubbet Rahil," near Bethlehem, and is overshadowed by very old trees; close by it is a tank and some ruins of former buildings. The present name, "Abd el Aziz," is a modern and a Moslem one, but I was told the place is also sometimes called "Kubbet Rahil" (= Tomb or

¹ Talmud, Sebachim, liii, 2; Joma xii, 1.

² Even in this way the *eastern* part will belong to Judah, and so on, contrary to his own statement.

Monument of Rachel), and I think it is the one situated at the boundaries of Benjamin (1 Sam. x, 2), and distinct from that near Bethlehem where Rachel died—and is in the tribe of Judah; for the Benjamites made also a monument for their mother in their own ground, as I believe, and this would be it, as I have pointed out in an article on "Saul's Journey" (1 Sam. ix, &c.), which appeared in a German paper.¹ North of this place are the ruins of "Rume," and south some others, not entered in the large map, and Kustul; and westwards many other cities of Mount Ephraim. The line went from the top of this ridge downwards to "Ikbala," near south of the main Jerusalem—Jaffa road—it is situated at a spring in the valley, and forms a very idyllic corner of the earth. I consider it as a former place of "Baal," and from here the line went up to the town "Kirjath-Jearim." The text connects them both, which I explain so: that "Ikbala" has been the place for worship and for national feasts, the town itself was more west of another spring situated higher up, viz., the present "Abu Ghoosh;" it was at the time surrounded by forests or thickets, therefore its name "Jearim," but since this, thickets have disappeared, and reduced more west, and so it bears now the name "Anab," "Kuryet el Anab," = "town of the grapes," as there are now very fine vineyards.

Robinson and others, not knowing of a second "Kubbet Rahil," tried to draw the boundary line from the top of the mountains, west before the valley of Hinnom—in another direction as I have now described, and having gone over to Lifta—they trace a more southern route, in order to come nearer to Rachel's tomb, near Bethlehem. Robinson mentions, therefore Ain Yâlo (below Malnah) and also Ain Korius to be the waters of Nephtoa. But against such a supposition must be placed their *names*, and those are at too great a distance from Rachel's tomb, the first three-quarters of an hour, the latter fully one-and-half hours, a distance even greater than Rachel's tomb is from Jerusalem! So this will not do, and therefore Captain Conder goes on to say that the waters of Nephtoa² are the springs in the neighbourhood of Solomon's Pools, beyond (south of) Bethlehem. First the meaning of the word Nephtoa, implying a group of springs, and those can only be found at Solomon's Pools; and secondly, the boundary would then run over close at Rachel's tomb; and thirdly, quotes the Talmud giving Nephtoa as Etam. Agreeable as all this looks, it is open to great objections.³ The name is missing, but this may be of little consequence; the great difficulty is, how to draw the line to Kirjath-Jearim? which then cannot be taken as Abu Ghoosh; and Conder therefore substitutes a Khurbet Erma, about two hours in south-west of Abu Ghoosh (or the above-fixed Kirjath-Jearim). By such a line, the tribe of Judah loses a great tract of land in favour of Benjamin, and further, the greater part of the cities in the Septuagint described to Judah,⁴ viz.,

¹ "Zeitschrift des Deutschen," Pal. Vereins, 1881, page 247.

² *Quarterly Statement*, 1879, pp. 95-99.

³ Joshua xv, 60.

⁴ Several of these are made by W. F. Birch (*Quarterly Statement*, 1882, p. 61), which I will not repeat.

Sores (= Saris), Canen ('Ain Karim), Galem (B. Jala), Bether (= Bittir), Monoch (= Malhah), will fall to Benjamin! And then he finds no Mount of Ephron, which certainly means simply Ephraim, as I took it in the above. Further, if even the Khurbet Erma would be taken as Kirjath-Jearim, the line further on of the boundary will not do, although he traces it, but without any probability; its line goes backwards, crossing twice one and the same valley; whereas, when Abu Ghoosh is Kirjath-Jearim all comes right. To point out this it is necessary for me to explain this, although the last of the tribe of Benjamin ended at Kirjath-Jearim, and so, strictly speaking, the further line would not fall under the headings of this my paper.

From Kirjath-Jearim the line went westwards to the Mount of Seir; this is apparently Saris,¹ and passed along unto the side of Mount Tevrin, which is Chepalon. The long ridge from Abu Ghoosh to Eshnah is, according my conviction, the "Mount of Jearim," the mount of thickets, as it is still to-day to a great extent. The line from Abu Ghoosh westwards went therefore (about) along the present Jaffa road, and passing north of the village Saris—not further following the road and telegraph line down the valley, but crossing the ridge in west of Saris, in a southern direction, and going down on the side of Mount Jeram into the Wâdy el Hamar to Chessalon, the present Kessla, which is on its south side. So to the north of it the valley and boundary run down, remaining in it till Beth-Shemesh, and going further on to Timnah (verse 10), where all is clear and correct.

There is no crossing of any valley; but the boundary is quite a natural one, and all expressions in the text come right, so I should think this is correct, and hence Abu Ghoosh is Kirjath-Jearim, and Lifta the Nethtoa, and Khurbet Sôm'a the En Shemes in the mountains, Umm Rujm Debir, and the chalky hills Geliloth, and so on.

Jerusalem, February, 1884.

C. SCHICK.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES IN THE HOLY LAND AND SYRIA IN 1883.

(Reprinted from the Times).

I. DISCOVERY ON MOUNT GERIZIM OF A MARBLE PEDESTAL, ORNAMENTED WITH BAS-RELIEFS AND INSCRIPTIONS.

ABOUT the middle of last year an important archæological discovery was made in a celebrated locality of Palestine which had not previously supplied us with anything particularly interesting in the way of antiquities. Some works undertaken by the Ottoman authorities for the construction of a building at Nablous, the ancient Shechem, at

¹ The line passed not to the town but to the Mount of Saris, which is exactly the case when following the present road, on the ridge of the hills.