THE DIVINE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The question whether the Old Testament has any testimony to give as to the Deity of our Lord, when strictly taken, resolves itself into the question whether the Old Testament holds out the promise of a Divine Messiah. To gather the intimations of a multiplicity in the Divine unity which may be thought to be discoverable in the Old Testament,[1] has an important indeed, but, in the first instance at least,[2] only an indirect bearing on this precise question. It may render, it is true, the primary service of removing any antecedent presumption against the witness of the Old Testament to the Deity of the Messiah, which may be supposed to arise from the strict monadism of Old Testament monotheism. It is quite conceivable, however, that the Messiah might be thought to be Divine, and yet God not be conceived pluralistically. And certainly there is no reason why, in the delivery of doctrine, the Deity of the Messiah might not be taught before the multiplicity in the unity of the Godhead had been revealed. In the history of Christian

[1] As H. P. Liddon does in the former portion of the lecture in which he deals with the "Anticipations of Christ's Divinity in the Old Testament" (*The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ*. Bampton Lectures for 1866. Ed. 4, 1869, pp. 44 ff.). Similarly E. W. Hengstenberg gives by far the greater part of his essay on "The Divinity of the Messiah in the Old Testament" (*Christology of the Old Testament*, 1829, E. T. of ed. 2, 1865, pp. 282-331),—namely from p. 284 on—to a discussion of the Angel of Jehovah.

[2] For such questions remain as, for example, whether the Angel of Jehovah be not identified in the Old Testament itself with the Messiah (Daniel, Malachi). So G. F. Oehler (art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencyc.*, p. 41; *Theol. des A. T.*, ii, pp. 144, 265; *The Theology of the Old Testament*, E. T. American ed., pp. 446, 528), A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokolyptik*, pp. 47 ff. Cf. E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. pp. 195, 282, who cites these references in order to oppose them.

SUGGESTIONS OF THE SURVEY PARTY RE-GARDING BIBLICAL SITES

The survey of western Palestine was begun in the late autumn of the year 1871. Preliminary reconnaissances of parts of the country had been previously made by Captain Anderson and Captain Warren of the Royal Engineers, and Major Wilson had completed the Ordnance Survey of the neighborhood of Jerusalem, with the line of levels from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea and from Jerusalem to Solomon's Pools. Upon the decision of the Palestine Exploration Fund to survey the entire country west of the Jordan, the work was entrusted to Captain Stewart, R. E. His staff consisted of two men, non-commissioned officers of the Royal Engineers and trained surveyors, Sargeant Black and Corporal Armstrong; and Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake was appointed as linguist and archaeologist to the expedition. Captain Stewart arrived at Jaffa early in November, 1871, but severe illness shortly after his arrival compelled him to return to England. Mr. Drake, however, was able to take temporary charge, and the work progressed. Lieutenant Claude Reigner Conder, R. E., who had just finished his military education at Chatham and was not quite twenty-four years of age, was appointed to the command of the expedition. He arrived in Palestine on July 8, 1872, and, with the exception of an absence of four months, worked continuously until the end of September, 1875, when he returned to England, having surveyed forty-seven hundred square miles. The remaining thirteen hundred square miles of the survey of western Palestine were finished in 1877 by Lieutenant Kitchener, who had joined the party in November 1874.[1] Mr. George

---

[1] Quarterly Statement, 1872, pp. 2 ff. and 34, 102, cp. 153; Tent Work in Palestine, vol. i. pp. vii., xiv., xv.; Memoirs, vol. i. 18 and 23-28; Palestine, pp. 19 and 31.

Armstrong, who went out with the expedition in 1871 and returned with Captain Conder in 1875, was also a member of the party, under the command of Captain Conder, which conducted a survey in eastern Palestine in the late summer and early autumn of 1881. Some years later a part of the country east of the Jordan in the north was surveyed for the committee by Herr Gottlieb Schumacher, of the German colony at Haifa.[2] To the labors of these men biblical scholarship already owes much and will be lastingly indebted.

In 1878 Lieutenant Conder published two volumes entitled "Tent Work in Palestine", in which he states that of the places west of the Jordan mentioned in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and New Testament "434 are identified with reasonable certainty", and of these "172 are discoveries due to the Survey" (vol. ii. p. 334). At least thirty-six of these one hundred and seventy-two proposed identifications were, however, abandoned at once.[3] Two years later, in "A Handbook to the Bible", he gives a list of "840 places in the Holy Land" and notes that "500 have been recovered either with certainty or with great probability, and of these 140,[4] marked by an asterisk(*), are not shown on previous maps" (p. 400). "Palestine," in the series known as "The World's Great Explorers and Explorations",

---

[2] Quarterly Statements, 1882, pp. x. 1; 1886, p. 1; Survey of Eastern Palestine, vol. i. p. v.; Palestine, p. 20.

[3] In the "Handbook to the Bible" the site is declared to be unknown of the town called Ashan and the two known as Ashnah, Baal and Balah, Beth-berei, Beth-car, Cabbon, Chor-ashan, Eder, En-hakkore and Ramath-lehi, Ephes-dammim, Gomorrah, Hadattah and Hazor-hadattah, Hazar-gaddah, Hormah and Zephath, Zelah, Zuph. Later a new site is proposed for Ashnah of Josh. xv. 33.

The names of Asher, Cola, Hali, and Shahazimah are allowed silently to drop out of notice. Cola and Hali, however, are revived in "Names and Places", and are there starred.

A different site is adopted in the Topographical Index of the "Handbook" for Aphek of 1 Sam. iv. 1, Baalah, Kirjath-baal and Kirjath-jearim (Soba being abandoned), Baal-hamon, Bered, Bezeth, Hezron and Kerioth-hezron, Ummah.

[4] 141 are so marked.

was published in 1889. In it Major Conder says that out of "422 names of towns, valleys, mountains, streams, and springs in Palestine mentioned in the Old Testament [and Apocrypha], and now identified on the ground, those marked †, which amount to 144 in all,[5] were discovered by the present author" (p. 262). This number is so nearly the same as that given in the "Handbook to the Bible", that it might be supposed that the two lists are in virtual agreement. This is not the case, however. Many names found in the "Handbook" have been discarded,[6] and many identifications are proposed which are not included in the previous lists. In another book of the year 1889, entitled "Names and Places in the Old and New Testament and Apocrypha, with their modern identifications", compiled by Mr. George Armstrong, revised by Colonel Sir Charles W. Wilson and Major Conder, and published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, "the identifications suggested by Major Conder as due to the Survey are marked with a star." One hundred and forty-six names from the Old Testament and the Apocrypha are marked by this sign, reckoning duplicates but once. Fourteen other identifications, claimed by Major Conder in his "Palestine" as his own, are included in Mr. Armstrong's list, but are not distinguished by an asterisk as identifications due to the Survey.[7] For convenience, these fourteen names may be

---

[5] Only 141 names are marked in this way in the list.

[6] The following fourteen are starred in the Topographical Index of the "Handbook", but are not even listed in "Palestine": Aphek of 1 Sam. iv. 1 and Aphek of 1 Sam. xxix, 1, Ataroth of Josh. xvi. 7, Berea, Bezek of Judg. i. 5, Diblath, Ebenezer, Elon, Enam, Esora (Judith iv. 4), Gibeath ha-Elohim (1 Sam. x. 5), Kibzaim, Zair, Zartanah.

And these nine, which appear in the "Handbook" but are not starred, have vanished from sight, not being listed in "Palestine": Baal-tamar, Belmaim or Belmen, Bered, Bezeth, Bileam, Bozez, Caphar-salama, Idalah, Mount Seir (Josh. xv. 10). Several of these twenty-three names will reappear later, in the catalogue compiled by Mr. George Armstrong.

[7] Beth-dagon in Asher, Debir on the northern border of Judah, Hazar-susah, Janum, Joktheel, Kedesh (Judg. iv. 11), Madmen, Maha-

added to the one hundred and forty-six, and also eight identifications proposed by Major Conder, but rejected in Mr. Armstrong's list, may be included,[8] and the resulting one hundred and sixty-eight be made the subject of a general examination.

The Biblical scholar at once asks how far these one hundred and sixty-eight proposed identifications fulfil the conditions of a satisfactory identification. For in order to identify a site with any degree of certainty, apart from the proof afforded by the remains themselves and brought to light by excavation, four lines of evidence should concur: a location in the land corresponding to the Biblical indications; natural objects and characteristics of the place like those perchance alluded to in the Scriptures; a name perpetuating the ancient name; and, if possible, a mention of the place in early records, with specific measurements and other information regarding distance and relative position, as in the "Onomasticon" of Eusebius or the Egyptian and Assyrian records.[9] Even these indications are not infallible, otherwise Lachish might still be sought as

---

neh-dan, Mozah, Ramah of Asher, Rock Seneh, Shaaraim, Thimnathah, Zareth-shahar. Of these, all except Debir, Madmen, Ramah, and Zareth-shahar had already been suggested in the "Handbook to the Bible".

[8] Beth-haccherem, Gallim, Is. x. 30, ascent of Horonaim, Minnith, Mizpeh of Benjamin, Penuel, cliff of Peor, mount Zalmon.

[9] Lieutenant Conder says: "The sites are in all cases, as far as I have been able to make out, suitable, in relative position as regards other places mentioned in connection with them. The name is naturally the deciding indication, and in cases where the name is not radically the same, the reasons which lead to the proposed identification will generally be found in the text" (Tent Work, ii. 333, cp. 65).

"The identifications . . . depend either on the survival of the ancient name in an Aramaic or Arabic form at the present day at the site, or on the accordance between measured distances and those given by the authorities cited, including the works of Josephus, the Talmud, and the Onomasticon of Eusebius" (Handbook, p. 400).

"When the Hebrew and the Arabic are shown to contain the same radicals, the same gutterals, and often the same meanings, we have a truly reliable comparison" (Palestine, p. 219).

formerly at Umm Lakis (as by van de Velde)[10]; neverthe-
less these are the tests to which every proposed identifica-
tion must be subjected.[11]

On comparing the list published by Major Conder in his
book entitled "Palestine", the list drawn up on behalf of
the Palestine Exploration Fund by Mr. George Armstrong,
and the remarks by Major Conder which accompany Mr.
Armstrong's list, a group of proposed identifications is
readily discovered among the one hundred and sixty-eight
about which neither Mr. Armstrong nor Major Conder ex-

---

[10] Memoir to Accompany the Map of the Holy Land constructed by
C. W. M. van de Velde, section ix. pp. 280-356.

[11] The suggestions made by the members of the Survey have been
before the public for thirty-five years and more, and have received
attentive consideration in the comprehensive studies of Biblical geog-
raphy which have been made during that time. The writer of the
present note published the results of his investigation in his "Dictionary
of the Bible", first issued in 1894. The material was canvassed by
Professor Frants Buhl for his "Geographie des alten Palästina", 1896,
and was fully covered by Professor Hermann Guthe, who wrote the
geographical articles for his "Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch", published in
1903. Dr. Alphonse Legendre, professor in the seminary at Mans, has
expressed his judgment in Vigouroux' "Dictionaire de la Bible", 1895-
1912, in the course of his articles on the tribes of Israel and again in
most instances in a special article on each name. Professor George Adam
Smith, in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land", 1894, has
touched upon a number of the suggestions made by members of the
Survey, and in the splendid "Atlas of the Historical Geography of the
Holy Land", 1915, prepared by him in collaboration with Dr. J. G.
Bartholomew, almost all of the sites which figure in the proposed identi-
fications are marked, and a judgment on the satisfactoriness of the
identification is in most cases expressed, while in others it may perhaps be
assumed to be implied. The "Atlas" is less critical than the other works
referred to, but with this exception these investigators are in substantial
agreement in their judgment regarding each of the suggestions made by
the members of the Survey and regarding the finality of the proposed
identifications.

The latest opinion of Colonel Conder regarding most of the identifi-
cations proposed in his previous works is expressed in geographical
articles in "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", published in 1908; and a
number of articles (as far as Remeth) were written by Major Conder
for Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", the volumes of which appeared
during the years 1898-1902.

presses any doubt. The names number thirty.[12] The state-
ments are positive, without any hint of the possibility of
error or that the identification is merely probable. In other
writings, however, especially in articles written later for
dictionaries of the Bible, Major, afterwards Colonel, Conder
speaks more cautiously of many of these thirty identifica-
tions.[13] How probable, then, are these thirty? How sound
are the reasons advanced for them? Are the four criteria
of name, location, character of the site, and early references
satisfied, so as to raise a strong presumption; or are only
some of these conditions met? Is it the Biblical site itself
which has been located, or only the place later pointed out
as the site? The village of *Abel-meholah,* to quote Captain
Conder's words in the second volume of the "Memoirs"

---

[12] Abel-meholah, Adummim, Ataroth-addar, Beth-eked, Eleasa, Ge-
derah of Judah, Naamah, plain of Nasor, Ramoth, Rock Seneh, Tim-
nah of Judah, Timnath-heres, Tirzah, valley of Zephathah. The remain-
ing sixteen are listed in the next footnote.

[13] In articles in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", 1898-1902, and
"The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", 1908, he used words like probably
and perhaps. In the "Memoirs" of the Survey, 1881-1883, also Captain
Conder shows caution regarding some of the towns of this group for
which he did not furnish articles for Hastings' "Dictionary of the
Bible"; and including two articles in that dictionary which were written
by prominent colleagues of Captain Conder in the Survey, more than
half of the proposed identifications in this group are ultimately found
to be offered not as certain, but as probable or possible. Thus in
Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible", Adamah, Adami, Archi, Hannathon,
Horem, Jeshanah, Rabbith, of all of which the identification is said to
be probable; Arab, perhaps; Bezek (1 Sam. xi. 8) the most likely site;
Dabbesheth, may be. In the "Memoirs": Rakkon (vol. ii. 63), Gederah
of Benjamin (vol. iii. 10), Gibeah of Judah (vol. iii. 25), and Debir,
Josh. xv. 49, (vol. iii. 402). In articles written for Hastings' "Dictionary
of the Bible" by his colleagues; Jabneel (C. Warren, "no clew"),
Sela-hammahlekoth (C. W. Wilson, "suitable"). In addition to these
sixteen, Colonel Conder, speaking of three towns mentioned in foot-
note 12, calls the site proposed for Beth-eked probable, and that for
Tirzah the most probable; and he declares that the site proposed by
him earlier for Gederah of Judah is doubtful (Illustrated Bible Dic-
tionary).

In other words out of one hundred and sixty-eight suggested identi-
fications only about fourteen, and on closer examination still fewer,
are without a note of caution.

(ii. 231), "is identified in the Onomasticon with a place 10 miles south of Scythopolis, called Bethaula (Βηθμαιελά). The distance brings us to 'Ain Helweh, the name of which contains the proper radicals, and the position seems not discordant with the notice in the Bible (Judges vii. 22)". In accordance with these data, obtained from the Scriptures and Eusebius, Abel-meholah has, of course, heretofore been located in this immediate neighborhood, in or near Wady el-Maleh, and still is;[14] and full assent is readily given by all investigators to Captain Conder's statement, except to the assertion that the word Helweh "contains the proper radicals" to represent Meholah. In etymology and meaning the two names are entirely different. Unhesitating assent is likewise given to Captain Conder's statement concerning *Bezek* when, in speaking of the ruin Ibzik, seven miles west-northwest of 'Ain el-Helweh, he says: "Ibzik . . . is unquestionably a Bezek known to Eusebius, [one of the two neighboring villages of the name, seventeen Roman miles from Neapolis towards Scythopolis], and probably the place where Saul collected his army before attacking the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi. 8)."[15] "Name, situation, and distance suit" (Guthe). Concerning the ascent of *Adummim*, on the boundary between the territories of Judah and Benjamin, it is stated that "the name is exactly represented by the Arabic Tal'at ed Dumm, [ascent of blood], and the position south of Wady Kelt and about half way to Jerusalem appears to fit well".[16] There is entire agreement among students of the historical geography

---

[14] 'Ain el-Helweh, the sweet spring, is in Wady el-Helweh, about one third of a mile south of its junction with Wady el-Maleh, and a mile and a half east by south of 'Ain el-Maleh, the salt spring. A mile and a half to the north, where Wady esh-Shukk enters the Wady el-Maleh, van de Velde placed Abel-meholah.[10] Three quarters of a mile still farther north is another spring of sweet water, also bearing the name 'Ain el-Helweh.

[15] Tent Work in Palestine, i. 108; cp. Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 231.

[16] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 172.

of the Holy Land that the ancient name is echoed here, under this form. For many years it has been recognized in Kal'at ed Dumm, a ruined castle on the summit of the ascent, "without doubt the lofty Adummim of the Bible".[17] The original name was probably suggested by the red strata in the rocks.[18] Regarding the border of the *Archites* (Josh. xvi. 2), the statement made in the "Memoirs" (iii. 7) is carefully worded: "'Ain 'Arîk . . . is probably Archi on the boundary of Benjamin, between Bethel and Beth-horon." The identification is "not certain" (Buhl), it is advanced in the "Memoirs" as probable. The location suits better than the name for the initial consonant is not the same in the Hebrew and Arabic names.[19] Regarding *Jeshanah,* Captain Conger says: "The name and position [of 'Ain Sinia] suggests the identity of the place with Jeshanah, a town noticed as taken from Jeroboam together with Bethel and Ephraim (2 Chron. xiii. 19)".[20] 'Ain Sinia is situated three miles and a half north of Bethel. Its identification with Jeshanah was proposed by M. Clermont-Ganneau, and has been most favorably received.[21] As to the town of *Debir,* in the hill country of Judah (Josh. xv. 49), Captain Conder says: "There seems to be every reason for sup-

---

[17] E. G. Schultz, quoted in Ritter's "Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula", English translation, 1866, vol. iii. 10; see also van de Velde, "Memoir to Accompany the Map", p. 282.

[18] Kitto, "Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature", 1845, article Adummim.

[19] The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew, however, accepts the identification without question. So, too, does Legendre in the "Dictionaire de la Bible" (ii. 1874); but elsewhere in the "Dictionaire", in an unsigned article, the identification is spoken of as probable (i. 932). The difference in the initial consonants, aleph in the Hebrew word and ain in the Arabic, is not a fatal objection to the identity of the place, as is illustrated somewhat poorly by the name Ashkelon.

[20] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 291; Name Lists, p. 224.

[21] Clermont-Ganneau in "Journal asiatique", 1877, pp. 490 ff. Like Buhl, and Conder in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", Socin says "probably" (Baedeker⁶ 187); Davis and Guthe mention, and Guthe in his article on Sen explicitly accepts; F. Vigouroux seems to accept (iil. 1397); and the "Atlas" accepts the identification with Isana (p. 23 and index), that is, with Jeshanah (pp. 12, 32-37, 39-42).

posing Dhâheriyeh, [a name interpreted as "the village on the ridge, or the 'apparent village' "[22]], to be the ancient Debir, a place not identified before the Survey. The name has the same meaning, derived from its situation on the 'back' of a long ridge; and the position between Shochoh (Shuweikeh), Dannah (Idhnah), Anab ('Anâb), and Eshtemoa (Es Semû'a), seems very suitable (Josh. xv. 48)."[23] This village, which lies a little more than eleven miles to the southwest of Hebron, is "probably the site of ancient Debir".[24] This identification, however, "rests upon a mistaken interpretation of the name Debir"[25]; but yet it is decidedly the best suggestion that has been made. The situation is almost in the center of the group of towns in the midst of which it is named; and it is not more than seven miles from any one of them, so far as they have been reasonably identified. The "Atlas" adopts the identification without a query; but Professor Smith in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land" (p. 279) speaks of it only as probable, and so also does Legendre (ii. 1200; similarly iii. 1763). The identification of *the rock Sench* is reasonably certain (see section iv). For *Sela-hammahlekoth,* the rock of divisions, a cliff in the wilderness of Maon, to the southeast of Hebron, where Saul was providentially led to withdraw from the pursuit of David, Captain Conder proposes the gorge of Wady Malâki as "a suitable position".[26] The suitability of the location and of the character of the ravine are gladly conceded; and the detour which the gorge of Wady Malâki would compel Saul to make might explain the ability of David to put the mountain between himself and Saul (1 Sam. xxiii. 24-29).[27] But these things are far

[22] Survey of Western Palestine: Name Lists, p. 429.

[23] Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 93.

[24] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 402.

[25] Sayce in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible; Legendre, ii. 1199.

[26] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 314; Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 91 f.

[27] Too much stress is perhaps laid on the word sela', rock, in "Tent Work in Palestine", ii. 91 f. For usage, it is enough to compare Num. xx. 8; Judg. vi. 20, xv. 8, xx. 45.

from establishing identity, although they are favorable to it; and decided exception must be taken to the suggestion that the name Malâki "may be a corruption of the Hebrew by the loss of a guttural",[28] namely heth.

General recognition as being at least worthy of consideration, though more or less lacking in proof, is accorded the identification suggested for Beth-eked[29] or the "shearing-house" (2 Kin. x. 12), Elasa, Gederah of Benjamin,[30] Rabbith, and Rakkon. More questionable are the identifications proposed for Arab, Hannathon, and Jabneel the frontier town of Naphtali.

Regarding the remaining fourteen towns of this group of thirty, there is great unanimity in the judgment of the investigators who have been mentioned[11] that the proposed identifications are groundless. The suggestion of the Surveyors is rarely mentioned, usually it is ignored or fatal objections to it are pointed out or the brief statement is made that the place has not been identified.[31] Major Conder, in

---

[28] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 314; Illustrated Bible Dictionary; and C. W. Wilson in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

[29] This suggested identification is not due to the Survey. Measured along the natural route, by way of Jenin, Beit Kad is situated fifteen Roman miles from Legio, the distance given in the Onomasticon for Baithachath, which is identified by Jerome with the shearing-house, 2 Kin. x. 12. Beit Kad, however, is not on the road from Jezreel to Samaria, but lies three miles to the east of Jenin. Traveling from Jezreel "Jehu on the way to Samaria could not well arrive there" (Thenius, in 1849, commenting on 2 Kin. x. 12).

[30] 1 Chron. xii. 4. The context seems to require a town in the territory of Benjamin, and as Gibeon has just been mentioned the suggestion is suitable that the place is still represented by Jedîreh, three quarters of a mile northeast of el-Jib (Gibeon). Too much confidence, however, should not be placed in the fact that the two names Jedîreh and Gederah are identical.

[31] Thirteen identifications are rejected: Adamah with ed-Dâmieh, and Adami with the ruin Admah; Ataroth-addar with ed-Dârieh, Dabbesheth with Dabsheh; also the identifications proposed for Gederah, Gibeah, and Timnah of Judah; for Horem, Naamah, Ramoth of Issachar, Timnath-heres, Tirzah and the valley of Zephathah. The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew accepts Gederah, Gibeah, and Timnah of Judah, Naamah, and the valley of Zephathah.

For the plain of Nasor read with the R. V. plain of Hazor.

his later articles in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" and "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", returns to his earlier opinion, expressed in "Tent Work in Palestine", p. 334, and identifies *Adamah* with the ruin Admah, and *Adami* with ed-Dâmieh. The "Atlas" of Smith and Bartholomew is alone in accepting ed-Dâmieh as the site of Adamah, but it queries this identification in the index; and Professor Smith in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land", p. 396, note 1, speaks of ed-Dâmieh, not as the site of Adamah, but "perhaps the Adami of Josh. xix. 33". *Gederah of Judah* was in the lowland; and a ruin known as Khurbet Jedîreh is in the lowland, three miles and a half southeast of Gezer, in the territory afterwards assigned to the tribe of Dan. But its situation is apart from the towns with which it is grouped in the book of Joshua (xv. 33-36), and the enumeration of the towns seems to be moving steadily southward, placing Gederah far away from the ruin Jedîreh. Moreover the word Gederah, meaning enclosure, sheepfold, like Gibeah, a hill, and Ramah, a height, denotes an object so common that the name does not furnish a safe clue to an identification. Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is doubtful", and argued against his former identification with the ruin Jedîreh.[32] That *Gibeah of Judah* is represented by Jeb'a, eight miles west by south of Bethlehem, is not a new suggestion, but was made long ago by van de Velde.[10] The village, however, lies outside the group in which Gibeah is mentioned (Josh. xv. 55-57). Yet notwithstanding the inappropriateness of the situation involved in the identification proposed for Gibeah, and also in that proposed for *Timnah of Judah,* a fact that should not be wholly ignored favors these identifications (see, in this article, section iv. 5). The situation is also against the sites suggested for *Naamah* and *Ramoth of Issachar.* Sir Charles W. Wilson considers Teiâsir, the site proposed by Captain Conder for *Tirzah,*[33] to be "too far north to suit

---

[32] Article in the Illustrated Bible Dictionary.
[33] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs ii. 228.

2 Kin. xv. 14."[34]   Regarding *Horem* Major Conder in his
article on the town in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible"
abandoned his identification of it with the ruin Ḥârah, seven
miles northwest of Kedesh-naphtali, and favored "the
modern Hûrah, west of Kedesh-naphtali", an identifica-
tion suggested by van de Velde, and "which appears on
the [Survey] map as Kh. el-Kurah", ten miles west of
Kedesh.[35]   But later Colonel Conder again advanced the
ruin Ḥârah, three miles north of 'Ainitha, as the probable
site.[32]

There remain now some one hundred and thirty-nine
names.   The suggested sites are offered cautiously in one
or another of the publications of the Palestine Exploration
Fund; and the brief discussion of them which now follows,
and of some which received but a bare mention in the pre-
ceding section, aims simply to exhibit the basis upon which
they rest.   They are treated in groups, each being assigned
to that group which seemed most appropriate, although at
times a different assignment would not have been unsuitable.

I. Identifications which in each case are but a mere sur-
mise in a large field, the suggestion of a site believed to be
suitable but for which substantial reasons are lacking.   The
particular location proposed by the members of the Survey
for the site of *Mahaneh-dan* and for the sites, east of the
Jordan, of *Bamoth-baal, Beth-peor,* the field of *Zophim,
Horonaim, Penuel,* and the top of *Peor* have not com-
manded acceptance, and in Mr. Armstrong's list the last
three, Horonaim, Penuel, and the top of Peor, are stated
to be "not identified".   Five other suggestions in a wide field
for search deserve more extended comment.   *Ramoth-
gilead:* no agreement has been reached among exegetes
whether its site should be sought north or south of the
Jabbok.   If north, then the town of Reimun, as Major

---

[34] Article in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.
[35] Memoir to Accompany the Map, p. 322; Survey of Western Pales-
tine: Memoirs, i. 205; Tent Work in Palestine, ii. 337; and Vigouroux,
iii. 753.

Conder following Ewald suggests, might represent the site, perhaps better than other sites that have been suggested; but no importance attaches to the slight external resemblance between the names Reimun and Ramoth. The proposed identification of *Mizpah of Gilead* with Sûf is accepted without question by Smith and Bartholomew, who fail to indicate Maṣfa, northwest of Gerasa and not far from Sûf, to which attention has been drawn by Schumacher. *Nahaliel* or the valley of God, which lay north of the Arnon, in the territory conquered from Sihon, king of the Amorites, would be "not an unfit name for the Wady Zerka Ma'in with its healing springs" (George Adam Smith).[36] With regard to *Makkedah,* a town in the lowland of Judah, its name and el-Mughâr of course do not correspond. The suggested identification rests mainly on the fact that the Arabic name means the cave, and there was a cave near Makkedah (Josh. x. 16). There were, however, many caves in the lowland. The location of Makkedah is but a conjecture. The site cannot be determined from the biblical data until the towns with which Makkedah is associated in Josh. xv. 40 and 41 have been positively identified. The identification of *Diblath* with Dibl, a village of upper Galilee, is a desperate guess, based wholly on a similarity of name. And where is the neighboring wilderness (Ezek. vi. 14)? Perhaps Diblath is the town of Bethdiblathaim, near the Arnon (Jer. xlviii. 22, 23), probably known also simply as Diblathaim (near Almon, Num. xxxiii. 46). Colonel Conder came later to share this view.[32]

II. Identifications which determine with more or less certainty the location of a place mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, or Josephus, or in the Talmud, or in other early documents, but where the reasons which led the writer to identify the place with a biblical site are unknown and at times are even questioned.[37] Kefr Thilth is proposed as

---

[36] The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p. 561 f.

[37] "The same doubt attaches to the frequent citation of passages from the Mishna and Talmud. Whether the men who set down in these

the modern representative of *Baal-shalishah*.   The Septua-
gint and Lucian have Beth as the first syllable instead of
Baal, and the Septuagint read Sarisa instead of Shalishah
(Hebrew, Lucian).   Eusebius and Jerome mention a vil-
lage called Bethsarisa, fifteen Roman miles to the north of
Diospolis, that is Lydda, and identify it with the place men-
tioned in 2 Kin. iv. 42, namely Baal-shalishah.   The ruins
Kefr Thilth are seventeen Roman miles northeast by north
of Lydda, and Sirîsia thirteen and a half Roman miles, as
the crow flies.   It is natural to connect Bethsarisa with
Sirîsia; but "Kefr Thilth preserves the name of Shalishah"
(Conder),[34] corresponding exactly in radical letters.   With
regard to *Ebenezer,* on the ground of Eusebius' statement
that Ebenezer was situated between Jerusalem and Ash-
kelon, near Beth-shemesh,[38] and the similarity of sound with
Eben, the first constituent of the name Eben-ezer, Major
Conder proposed to find the site at Deir Abân, two miles to
the east of 'Ain Shems.   The identification cannot be cor-
rect if the town of Shen (1 Sam. vii. 12) is Jeshanah; and
consequently Colonel Conder later located Ebenezer "be-
tween Tell Nasbeh and 'Ain Sînia (6 miles apart), near
Bethel on a very high ridge".[32]   Of the town of *Hannathon,*
Major Conder says, "The site is uncertain, but the name is
probably to be identified with the Talmudic Caphar Hana-
niah, which according to the Mishnah . . . marked the
limit of Upper Galilee.   This is now Kefr 'Anân"([34]; and
see "The Expositor," Oct., 1885, p. 254).   It is proposed to
identify *Hapharaim* with the ruin Farrîyeh, six Roman
miles northwest of Lejjun, rather than with el-Afuleh, seven
Roman miles east-northeast of Lejjun.   The former site
agrees better in name, conforms exactly with the statement
of Eusebius regarding distance from Legio, and is more

---

works their opinions about the geography of Palestine, followed a
genuine tradition—which may certainly have existed—must in each
several case be carefully investigated" (Socin in "The Expositor,"
October, 1885, p. 252).

[38] Onomasticon, edition of Lic. Dr. Erich Klostermann, p. 32, ll. 23-26.

nearly north of Legio;[39] but it is questionable whether the ruin lies within the bounds of Issachar. El-Afuleh is within the territory of Issachar, but the name does not correspond to Hapharaim. The *hill of Phinehas:* in drawing attention to a tomb situated on the western side of Awertah, a quarter of a mile from the town and "bearing the name *el-'Azeir* (this would be Eleazar's)", Captain Conder has perhaps pointed out the cause which gave rise to the Samaritan tradition that the hill of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, is the ridge on which Awertah stands, scant five miles from Shechem.[40] The town of *Idalah* is identified by the Talmud with Ḥiriyeh, which is possibly echoed in el-Ḥuwarah, one mile south of Bethlehem of Zebulun.[41] *Ophrah of Manasseh* was the ancient name of Fer'ata, six miles west by south of Shechem, according to the Samaritan Chronicle.[42] 'Ain 'Atan is En Etam, the Rabbinical identification of the waters of Nephtoah.[43]

III. Identifications which depend upon a chain of evidence, links of which are weak. Here belong, first of all, several geographical names found in the book of Judith, namely Bethulia, Belamon, Betomestham, Cola, Choba, Chusi and the brook Mochmur. The name *Bethulia* may be echoed in Mithilia,[44] as Major Condor suggests; but Bethulia is one of the great puzzles. Its identification depends in part upon the determination of the sites of Betomestham and Belamon, and also upon the decision of the question regarding the original reading of Judith iv. 6, the

---

[39] Onomasticon, 28, 25.

[40] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 218; see Name Lists, p. 124, "el-Azeir. Ezra is so called in Arabic".

[41] Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 189; Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 288.

[42] Handbook to the Bible, p. 421.

[43] Handbook to the Bible, p. 258.

[44] The name is given as Meselieh on the Survey map, as Mithilieh by Major Conder in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", as Meselieh or Mithilia in the "Memoirs", ii. 156 f., as Meselieh or Methelia in the "Name Lists", p. 188. Another place of the name is Khurbet Mithilia, three miles to the north of Athlit and about a mile back from the sea.

Greek text being in conflict with the Syriac and Vulgate.[45]
It is uncertain whether *Belamon,* Belmen, Belmaim, Bel-
baim, Abelmain, as the name variously appears (Judith iv.
4, vii. 3, viii. 3), is the same place as Ibleam or Bileam. No
confidence can be felt that the names *Betomestham* and
Cola (Judith iv. 6, xv. 4) are still heard in Beit Massin and
Kâ'aûn; and Colonel Conder himself latterly called Betomes-
tham "an unknown site".[32] The names *Choba* and el-Me-
khubby perhaps correspond etymologically; and the location
appears to be not unsuitable, but it cannot be determined
from the references in the book of Judith (iv. 4, xv. 4, 5).
If Choba be Coabis, mentioned in the Peutinger Tables,[46]
twelve Roman miles from Scythopolis and twelve from
Archelais (Kurâwa), the situation of "the cave called 'Arâk
el-Khubby and the ruin el-Mekhubby," close to the road
from Shechem to Bethshean, is favorable to the identifica-
tion. Regarding *Chusi* and the torrent-bed *Mochmur* (Ju-
dith vii. 18), the town Ekrebel, in the Syriac version Ekra-
bath, mentioned in the book of Judith, may be Akrabatta of
Josephus (War ii. 12, 4; iii. 3, 5) and, if so, the modern
Akrabeh. In that case Chusi may be identified with Kûza,
as Conder suggests, and the brook Mochmur with a valley
in the neighborhood. But what wady represents it? Wady
Ahmar, which descends eastwardly to the Jordan, men-
tioned long ago by Mr. George Grove[47] and later adopted
by Major Conder, or Wady Yetma, which begins at Akra-
beh and descends toward the Mediterranean Sea, passing
three miles to the south of Kûza and taking a different
name, as held by Father Barnabas Meistermann? The
name Ahmar must not be allowed weight, since the remote,
small, upper branch of the Wady Ahmar, at the point where
Akrabeh stands, is known by a different name (Wady es-
Seba, ravine of the lion, according to the Survey map);

---

[45] Meistermann, New Guide to the Holy Land, p. 356 f.
[46] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, ii. 231.
[47] Article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, edition of 1863.

and moreover the ancient name of the brook mentioned in the book of Judith seems to have been Maḥmur.

Four towns mentioned in the Old Testament belong to this category of proposed identifications which depend upon a chain of evidence, of which some or all the links are weak. Thus, the value of the suggestion that *Kedesh* of Judg. iv. 11 is represented by the ruin Kadish, on the highland about three miles south of Tiberias, is connected with the question of the correctness of the identification proposed for Zaanaim. The names, indeed, correspond exactly, but are common in the ancient and modern geography of the country, and afford little aid in determining a site (see section iv. 3). Regarding *Zaanaim* or Zaanannim, the absence of the article with the word oak in the Hebrew text, the presence of the letter beth on each occurrence of the name, and the reading of the Septuagint favor Bezaanim (that is, Beṣa-'anim) as the original name (Josh. xix. 33, R. V. margin; Judg. iv. 11). The Talmudists seem to have heard a word which they used for a fen or marsh (biṣ'a) in Beṣa'anim; and they identified the place with the basin or swamps of Kedesh;[48] but it is not clear what locality they thus designated. Conder thinks that the name is still heard in the ruin Bessûm, a mile and a half north-northeast of Sarona and four miles due west of Khurbet Kadish, in "more exact form" surviving in the name 'Ayûn el-Busâs.[49] But on comparing the modern Arabic and the ancient Hebrew names, it is doubtful whether Beṣa'anim is etymologically akin to 'Ayûn el-Busâs and Bessûm, although the sibilants ṣad and ḍad do have affinity. If *the Nekeb,* i.e., "the pass", be regarded as a distinct name in the list (Josh. xix. 33) and not as distinguishing the village of Adam of the pass from Adam beside Zarethan, and if the Talmud be followed in identifying the Nekeb with Saidatha and Neubauer's suggestion be rejected that this is Bethsaida of the New

---

[48] Kohut, Aruch, i. 24; Neubauer, Géographie du Talmud, p. 225.

[49] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 365 bis; Name Lists, p. 124, 'Ayûn el-Busâs or el-Busâs; p. 128, Khurbet Bessûm.

Testament,[50] and if Bezaanannim and Jabneel be identified with Bessûm and Yemma (Josh. xix. 33 R.V. text and margin), then Seiyâdeh may be Saidatha and mark the site of the Nekeb. Es-Sîmia is suggested for the site of *Eshean.* The correspondence between the two names depends upon altering the Hebrew text to Soma in accordance with the reading of the Vatican text of the Septuagint, although A and Lucian support the Hebrew form and the unusual reading of the Vatican text may be due to a copyist's misreading of the Hebrew letters or confusion of the name with the preceding word. For the site of *Mizpah of Benjamin* Sha'fât is proposed. Mizpah became in Greek Maspha (2 Chron. xvi. 6; Neh. iii. 7, 15) and Massêpha or Masêphat or Massêphath (1 Sam. vii. 5 and 6, with the local ending). Near Jerusalem, with a view of the city and temple, was "a place called Sapha, which name translated into Greek means skopos", a lookout, a watchman; or in a textual variant skopê, a lookout-place or a watchtower (Antiq. xi. 8, 5; on the way from Gaza to Jerusalem? xi. 8, 4) ; and north of Jerusalem, about seven furlongs distant, between that city and Gibeah of Saul was a plain named Scopus, whence the city and temple could be seen (War v. 2, 1-3). Mizpah, which means watchtower, is conjecturally identified with these places. Now two miles and a quarter north of Jerusalem is the village Sha'fât, and it is suggested that this name is a corruption of the ancient name, thus Mizpah, Maspha, Sapha, Sha'fât.[51] It must be remembered, however, that the etymology of Mizpah is entirely different from that of Sha'fât, there being only one radical letter common to the two names. Moreover, it is not claimed that Jerusalem is visible from Sha'fât village, but from the plateau. Mizpah itself seems to have been near Gibeon, but not to the east of it like Sha'fât (Jer. xli. 6, 12). Colonel Conder later abandoned the identification in favor

---

[50] Géographie du Talmud, p. 225.
[51] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 14; Guérin, Judée, i. 395-402; cp. van de Velde, Memoir to Accompany the Map, 335.

of Tell en-Naṣbeh, three miles northeast of Gibeon.[32]   As to
Pirathon: on eliminating Fer'ata because the Samaritan
Chronicle identifies it with Ophrah, Fer'on remains, con-
taining the radical letters of Pirathon.   It is rather far
north to be in the territory of Ephraim; and Colonel Conder
finally declared that "the site is unknown".[32]   The identifi-
cation of *Zebulun* in Asher (Josh. xix. 27) with Neby
Sebelân assumes that Zebulun in this passage denotes a
town and not the territory of the tribe Zebulun, and is
based   on   the   improbable   identification   proposed   for
Dabbesheth.

IV. Identifications of an ancient site with a ruin or a
town bearing a similar name.   Several varieties of varying
degrees of probability may be considered under this head.

1. An identification is reasonably certain when name, lo-
cation, and nature of the locality are suitable.   For ex-
ample, the rock *Seneh* with the southern cliff of the Wady
Suweinît, which retains the old name, at a point to the east
of Geba.   This identity was mentioned by Dr. Edward
Robinson,[52] and accordingly, not having been suggested
first by the Survey, it is properly without an asterisk in
Mr. Armstrong's list.   With confidence also, although few
data are available, the identification proposed for *Shamir*
can be accepted; for the name Shamir can be combined with
Sômerah, and the latter place is situated among the towns
with which Shamir is associated in the book of Joshua (xv.
48-50).   The proposed identification of *Zereth-shahar,* a
town of Reuben, in the mount of the valley (Josh. xiii. 19)
with the ruins es-Sara, on a hill on the south side of Wady
Zerka Ma'in, deserves favorable consideration.   The hot
springs and the mountain bear the name es-Sara.   The lo-
cation, the brief description of the locality, and quite likely
the etymology suit.

2. Though the name still remains, the data including the
name may determine the immediate vicinity only.   Thus,
the name of *Debir,* on the northern boundary of Judah

---

[52] Later Biblical Researches, p. 289.

(Josh. xv. 7), is probably preserved in Thogret ed-Debr; but the specific identification with this cleft is proposed by Major Conder with caution, who calls it "probable"; and it must be received with caution, since the name is echoed in several localities in this neighborhood. *Etam,* a place of abundant waters, two reeds (schoinoi) from Jerusalem (Antiq. viii. 7, 3), near Bethlehem, Tekoa, and Peor (Josh. xv. 59, Septuagint; 2 Chron. xi. 6), was evidently at or near the spring 'Ain 'Atân, a name sufficiently like Etam to be its echo. A village or ruin in the neighborhood, therefore, marks the site. The village of Urtas was suggested long ago.[53]

3. Though the name is the same, it may not be significant for purposes of identification, being some common object of nature from which places often receive name; and the data regarding the location may be quite general. Thus, in default of particulars as to location, no reliance can be placed upon the existence to-day of a town called el-Mughâr or el-Mogheiriyeh, cave, or Jebi'a, hill, or Ramah, height, or Tibnah, straw.[54] And such is the case with the identification proposed for *Mearah;* also that for the two towns, or perhaps one town, of *Beth-shemesh* in the north;[55] and that for *Etam,* a name which means place of beasts of prey, a village of the Simeonites (1 Chron. iv. 32) with 'Aitun, nine miles north by east of the ruin Umm er-Rumânin; and that for *Ether,* thornbush, in the lowland of Judah, but given to the Simeonites (Josh. xv. 42; cp. 1 Chron. iv. 32), with the ruined village of 'Atr,[56] about a mile northwest by north of Beit Jibrin; and that for *Gibeah of Benjamin,* meaning thereby *Gibeath* mentioned in Josh. xviii. 28, with Jeb'a, two miles southwest of Kuriet el-'Enab;[32] and that for Luz,

---

[53] Robinson, Biblical Researches, edition of 1841, ii. 168.

[54] So in "Baedeker" Socin says: "'Ain Karim probably answers to the Karem of the Septuagint (Josh. xv. 60), although the name, which signifies vineyard, is too common to be much relied upon as a clue."

[55] The site of Beth-shemesh, Josh. xix. 22, is "doubtful", and that of Beth-shemesh, Josh. xix. 38, is "unknown" (Conder).³⁴

[56] See already van de Velde, Memoir, p. 311.

almond tree, in the land of the Hittites (Judg. i. 26), with el-Luweizîyeh, four and a half miles west by north of Banias, and *Ramah,* on the boundary line of Asher, with Râmia, thirteen miles south by east of Tyre. The situation of these towns is not defined within narrow limits, and the names themselves are too common in the geography of the region to serve alone for the substantial foundation of an identification. The identification of Ramah with Râmia was proposed by Dr. Edward Robinson,[57] and is not starred by Mr. Armstrong; and then, too, Ramah on the boundary of Asher may be the fortified town of Naphtali, and represented to-day by er-Râmeh, about six miles southwest of Safed and seventeen miles east of Acre. The identification of *Beth-gamul* with el-Jemail, seven miles to the east of Dibon, is favored by its association with Dibon, Nebo, Beth-diblathaim, Kiriathaim, and Beth-meon in Jer. xlviii. 22 f. The similarity of name is illusory, however; for the geography of modern Palestine is studded with local names derived from the same root as Gamul.[58]

4. The name may be the same, without being notably frequent in the geography of the country, yet the data regarding the location may be quite general. Thus, *Chozeba* corresponds etymologically with Kûeizîba, and the ruins known by the latter name are in the territory of Judah, as they should be; but the location, five and a half miles north of Hebron, is not altogether beyond question, since it is on the eastern slope of the mountains and not in the lowland west of the mountain, as are the towns mentioned with

---

[57] Later Biblical Researches, p. 63 f.

[58] Seventy-five miles to the northeast is, of course, Umm el-Jemâl, in which many have seen the site of Beth-gamul. Near el-Jemaîl are ʿAin el-Jemmâleh and Wady Jemmâleh (Survey of Eastern Palestine, pp. 9, 253). Or, to take a more familiar part of the country, the Survey map shows el-Jemel two miles and a half due east of Jerusalem, the ruin Umm el-Jemel three miles toward the southeast of the city, and ʿAin el-Jemil five mile toward the northwest. Two miles south of Beth-shemesh is Beit el-Jemâl, and about a mile and a half south of Gezer is Bir el-Jemâl. Similar names are found in other parts of the country.

Chozeba in 1 Chron. iv. 17-23 so far as they have been iden-
tified. Moreover, Chozeba is generally believed to be the
same as Chezib and Achzib. Regarding the town of *Ijon,*
"the name is thought to survive in Merj 'Ayûn" (Con-
der),[34] a fertile district at the foot of Mount Hermon, on
the west; and the indications of locality point to a town in
this immediate neighborhood (1 Kin. xv. 20; 2 Kin. xv.
29). Two sites have been proposed. Conder suggests el-
Khiâm on the eastern edge of Merj 'Ayûn, but says that
"the most important site on this plateau is Tell Dibbin on
the northern edge, and this tell "may be the site of Ijon",
as "Robinson . . . suggested", and as is generally pre-
ferred. As to the town of *Hazar-susah,* the site is unknown,
but "may have been at Sûsin, 10 miles south of Gaza"
(Conder).[32] This identification had previously been sug-
gested by Canon Tristram, and is not starred by Mr. Arm-
strong as due to the Survey.

5. Again, though the name is the same, the location of the
suggested site may beget distrust; as in the case of *Gibeah*
and *Timnah,* towns of Judah. The names are not signifi-
cant, and the situation of Jeba' and Tibna, ten and twelve
miles north of Hebron and almost due west of Bethlehem,
is suspicious in view of the other towns of the group (Josh.
xv. 55-57). Rather a site southeast of Hebron is indi-
cated. The fact, however, that Jeba' and Tibna are situ-
ated side by side, and Gibeah and Timnah are named
together, must be allowed weight (Conder, article Tim-
nah[32]). The proposed identification of *Thimnathah,* cor-
rectly Timnah, of Dan (Josh. xix. 43, R. V.) with the
ruin Tibne, twelve miles northeast of Lydda, is groundless.
It is rejected by investigators generally, including C. W.
Wilson.[34] This town of Dan is rather the town of the
name on the boundary of Judah-Dan, west of Beth-shemesh;
an opinion to which Colonel Conder finally gave assent.[32]
The name *Giloh* is not quite identical in etymology with that
of the ruin Jâla, and the location of the ruin, six and a
half miles north by west of Hebron is aloof from the

towns associated with Giloh in Josh. xv. 48-51, so far as they have been identified. *Haruph,* whether the name of a town or a family, belonged to Benjamin (1 Chron. xii. 5; cp. Neh. vii. 24-32), not to the lowland of Judah (where the village of Kharûf is situated, five miles east of Eleutheropolis). *Hezron* (Josh. xv. 3); the location proposed is unsuitable, being east of 'Ain Kadîs, and the identification is based on Lieutenant Conder's private assumption that Kadesh-barnea is not to be sought at 'Ain Kadîs, but lay some forty miles to the east of that spring.[59] *Jarmuth,* known also as *Ramoth* and *Remeth,* was a town of Issachar (Josh. xix. 21; xxi. 29; 1 Chron. vi. 73), and hence scarcely identical with er-Rameh, five miles and a half southwest of Dothan. *Megiddo* is not Mujedda, three miles southwest of Bethshean. The city of *Salt* was presumably near En-gedi (Josh. xv. 62), hence not Tell el-Milḥ. The situation of Surdah renders the proposed identification of it with *Zeredah* utterly improbable. Surdah is situated in the hill country of Ephraim, indeed; but it is two miles and a half northwest of Bethel, twenty miles from the Jordan and not within sight of the river; whereas Zeredah was apparently within the bounds of Ephraim, west of the Jordan, and either opposite Succoth or else serving with Succoth to mark the northern and southern limits of a section of the plain of the Jordan (1 Kin. xi. 26; 2 Chron. iv. 17, cp. Zarethan in 1 Kin. vii. 46). *Zoar:* the name Shaghûr may be etymologically related, through a later form of the name; but the location conflicts with the statements of Josephus and Eusebius, if not also with those of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

6. In this connection may be mentioned those suggested identifications where a correspondence more or less close exists between an ancient and a modern name and an echo of the former may supposedly be heard in the latter, but the name is an insufficient basis and indications of the situation of the ancient place are too scanty in Hebrew and other early literature to render a positive identification pos-

---

[59] Handbook to the Bible, pp. 250, 257.

sible. Thus it is in the case of *Gibbethon, Irpeel* in Benjamin, *Lahmam* or Lahmas in the lowland of Judah, *Lassharon, Rabbah* of Judah, the rock *Etam,* and the land of *Tob.* The site of *Achzib* of Judah, known also in correct variant form as *Chezib,* is placed at 'Ain el-Kezbeh. Kezbeh denotes a tree of hard wood (Name Lists, p. 280), and being a familiar word might supplant the use of Chezib and Achzib in the mouth of a people speaking Arabic; but it does not contain the middle radical of the root which regularly corresponds to that of Achzib. Favorable is the location near Mareshah, Keilah, and Adullam (Josh. xv. 44; Mic. i. 14; Gen. xxxviii. 1, 2, 5), in the bounds of Eleutheropolis (Onomasticon, p. 172, 6). Much depends on the proper identification of Adullam, and that site is uncertain. *Alema* (1 Mac. v. 26) is identified by Schumacher, acting for the Palestine Exploration Fund, with Kefr el-Mâ, ten miles east of the sea of Galilee. Buhl (p. 253), like Merrill, prefers Alma or Ilma, about twenty-five miles farther east, five miles to the northwest of Kerak. *Beth-haccherem* is mentioned twice (Neh. iii. 14; Jer. vi. 1). Its identification with 'Ain Karim[60] is opposed by the statement of Jerome, in commenting on Jeremiah, that it was a village on a mountain between Jerusalem and Tekoa, and visible from Bethlehem. According to Mr. Armstrong it is "not identified", and Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is unknown".[32] Regarding *Bezek,* the location of Bezkah, three miles northeast of Gezer, is suitable, being in the territory allotted to Judah (Judg. i. 4); but the allusion to the situation is not definite, and the place is conceivably the same as that mentioned in 1 Sam. xi. 8. For the site of *Jeshua* the ruin Sa'weh, twelve miles east of Beer-sheba, is suggested. Jeshua is mentioned with towns in the extreme south of Judah (Neh. xi. 26), and may be the same as Shema, which is associated with the same towns (Josh. xv. 26; and xix. 2 Septuagint), and the ruin Sa'weh lies in the midst of this group. *Lachish* has some similarity in sound

---

[60] See footnote number 54.

with Tell el-Ḥesy, but the other requirements are sufficiently met to command confidence. As to *Madon* in northern Canaan, the text is uncertain, and the name should perhaps be Maron (Josh. xi. 1, Septuagint B; and xii. 19 Lucian). On the Survey map it is marked with a query at Madîn, five miles west by north of Tiberias; but Major Conder himself says that the site is doubtful.[34]

V. Suggested identification where the names do not correspond and 1. The available data in the Old Testament and other early literature indicate the general location only. Identifications of this sort are groundless, but of course by a lucky chance may happen to be correct. Such are the sites conjectured for *Achshaph, Almon-diblathaim, Beth-dagon* in Asher, *Edrei* in Naphtali, *Eleph, Enam, En-haddah, Hadashah, Hosah,*[61] *Jazer, Madmen, Maked, Manahath, Mishal, Nahalal, Sharuhen, Tirzah.*[61] For Enam and Jazer Colonel Conder abandoned his former identifications, and latterly suggested for Enam "Kefr 'Ana, six miles northwest of Tibneh, . . . where the valley of Sorek enters the Philistine plain", and for Jazer the ruin Sâ'aûr, on a high hill four miles north of Heshbon.[32] The location of *Ai, En-tappuah,* the hill *Hachilah,* and *Maarath* is known within comparatively narrow limits, but the present names of the sites suggested for these places by members of the Survey do not correspond in etymology with the ancient names of these places. Of the identification proposed for *Abez,* Professor W. R. Smith says that the name el-Beidah " 'the white village' can have nothing to do with the old name" Abez.[62] Nothing favors the identification of *Amad* with Khurbet el-'Amud, two miles east by south of Achzib of Asher. 'Am'ad is not the same word as 'Amûd, although probably from the same root. Moreover 'amud is not a name significant for the purposes of identification. It is, of course, a common noun, meaning column; and local names containing this word are met with in all parts of

---

[61] See Expositor, October 1885, p. 254.
[62] Encyclopaedia Biblica.

Palestine, wherever there is a ruin with a column or two sticking out of the ground.[63] Of *Ashnah,* mentioned with Eshtaol, Zorah, and Zanoah, in the lowland of Judah, as the site of which Kefr Ḥasan (Armstrong) or Khurbet Ḥasan two miles northwest of Zorah, is proposed, Major Conder himself later said: "The site is unknown."[34] The situation of Bel'aîn near Gezer is suitable to be the site of *Baalath* (Josh. xix. 44; Antiq. viii. 6, 1), but the name does not correspond. The group of towns, in which *Gallim* of Josh. xv. 59 Septuagint appears, suggests indeed a site for this Gallim at or near Beit Jâla, three miles northwest of Bethlehem, but etymology does not commend the identification. Mr. Armstrong rejects it. As the site of *Hali* the ruin 'Alia is proposed. The names, however, are not identical, and the word 'Alia is frequent in geographical names (see van de Velde[10]). *Helkath-hazzurim,* the place of combat between twelve of Abner's young men and twelve of Joab's was at the pool of Gibeon, but the exact spot cannot be pointed out. There is nothing in Mr. C. F. T. Drake's suggestion of a connection with the name Wady el-'Askar, soldiers' valley, just north of Gibeon; for 'askar is a word of frequent occurrence in the geography of Palestine, and is without historical significance as the reminiscence of an ancient fight. The forest of *Hereth,* in A. V. Hareth, was apparently in the land of Judah, and the identification of Hereth with Kharâs is proposed; but the formation of the two names is different, and it is doubtful whether even the roots correspond. The suggestion that *Ir-nahash* is represented by Deir Nakhkhas is already found in van de Velde's

---

[63] Several such names are found in the ancient territory of Asher: within six miles to the east and the south of Tyre are the hill el-'Amud, the ruin el-'Amud, and the ruin el-'Awâmid; about the same distance north by east of Achzib is the rather famous field of ruins known as Khurbet Umm el-'Amud. If in Wady el-Melek, immediately north of Mount Carmel is really echoed the name Allammelech (Josh. xix. 26), and if a certain similarity of sound is allowed weight, then the situation of Umm el-'Amed a mile west of Bethlehem of Zebulun and a mile and a half south of the Wady el-Melek, is suitable as the site of 'Am'ad.[10]

"Memoir" (p. 322). But the first two letters of Deir
Nakhkhas may not be ignored and Ir-nahash seen in the
remainder. Nor may it be said off hand that Deir has taken
the place of Ir.[32] So far as the names are concerned the
"monastery of the cattle-drover" has nothing to do with
the "city of Nahash" or "snaketown". As to the identifi-
cation of *Mar'alah* with Ma'lûl "not only the change of r to
l, but also the intrusion of 'ain before lamed, must be ac-
counted for" (Ewing).[64] *Mozah* is not the same etymo-
logically as Mizzeh (in Beit Mizzeh), notwithstanding Con-
der's remark that "the Hebrew tsade becomes the Arabic
zain in some cases".[34] The two names, moreover, are dif-
ferent in meaning. *Naarath* was on the southern boundary
line of Ephraim, between Janoah and the Jordan (Josh.
xvi. 7), according to the "Onomasticon" five Roman miles
from Jericho. These indications point to a site on the Nahr
el-'Aujah; perhaps, as Guérin suggested, at 'Ain es-Sâ-
mieh[65] or, as Conder thinks, about ten miles lower down, at
the ruin el-'Aujah et-Tahtâni, short of six Roman miles
from old Jericho. Regarding the town of *Nebo,* which is
mentioned in Ezra ii. 29 immediately after Bethel and Ai,
the data do not indicate its location, and neither Beit Nûba,
thirteen miles westsouthwest of Bethel, nor Nûba, seven
miles northwest by north of Hebron, is etymologically the
same as Nebo. For the site of *Neiel,* somewhere on the
eastern frontier of Asher, Ya'nin is suggested;[66] but even
with due allowance made for the final letter, the two names
are utterly unrelated. Conder distinguishes *Ramath-mizpeh*
from Mizpeh of Gilead (although granting the possibility
of its being the same place[32]), and identifies it with Remtheh·
The two names are entirely different in etymology; and the
situation of Ramath-mizpeh is not clearly indicated in the
Bible, and this is true whether Ramath-mizpeh is a different

---

[64] The Temple Dictionary of the Bible.

[65] Samarie, i. 211-213.

[66] "The similarity of name suggests its identification with Ya'nin in the
required direction" (Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, i. 286).

place from Ramoth-gilead, as Conder believes, or is the
same place. *Shion* in Issachar, and according to the "Ono-
masticon" (p. 158, 13) near Tabor, is identified with 'Ayûn
esh-Sha'in, as was proposed by Eli Smith; but the names
are not the same in etymology, and the situation seems
strange for a town of Issachar. *Tiphsah,* mentioned in
2 Kin. xv. 16, does not correspond in etymology to Tafsah,
a ruin six miles southwest by west of Shechem; for the
Arabic word ṭafsah, begins with the emphatic t-sound ṭā and
means filth, and its first letter is a radical, not a formative,
and represents the Hebrew teth, not the tau of Tiphsah.
Strangely enough later Colonel Conder, contrary to the
Arabic form of the name as given in the "Name Lists" (p.
186), says: "Tafsah . . . preserves the final guttural"
heth.[32]   The name of mount *Zalmon* is not related etymo-
logically to "Jebel Eslamiyeh (Ebal)".   The identification
is rejected by Mr. Armstrong, and is not alluded to by
Colonel Conder in his latest work.

2. Identifications proposed, although the soundness of the
Hebrew text is questionable and an error in the transmis-
sion of the ancient name is possible and at times quite prob-
able, as in the case of the identifications proposed for *Anem,*
Aner, and *Sechu,* as though these names were in their origi-
nal form.   *Dimon* is probably an intentional variant of
Dibon, and not a textual corruption.   The identification
suggested for *Sarid* may be favorably mentioned here.
Sarid was on the southern frontier of Zebulun, west of
Chisloth-tabor (Josh. xix. 10, 12); and if the name is a
corrupt form of an original Sadid, the site may well be
represented by Tell Shadûd, five miles southwest of Naz-
areth.   In 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 for *Hodshi* read Kadesh; a plausi-
ble emendation of the text, proposed by Thenius and sub-
sequently confirmed by Lucian's recension.

3. Identifications proposed, although the names do not
correspond and the location of the suggested site awakens
distrust.   Thus *Aphek,* mentioned in 1 Sam. xxix. 1, does
not correspond etymologically with Fuku'a; and the situ-

ation of Fukuʻa on the mountain, six miles southeast of
Jezreel, renders the proposed identification still more im-
probable. Colonel Conder later ignored this identification,
and said that the site of Aphek was perhaps north of Jez-
reel.[32] Regarding the valley of *Charashim,* that is, of
craftsmen, Conder's real thought is only that the ruin Ḥirsha
"may perhaps retain a trace of the title",[67] but it is ques-
tionable whether the names correspond etymologically,
whether the sibilants are related. Moreover, the ruin
Hirsha is ten miles from the nearest towns mentioned in
Neh. xi. 34 and 35, and is remote from the circumference
of the district which these towns encircle. As to *Dannah,*
the situation of the towns associated with it in Josh. xv. 49
suggests a site much farther south than Idhna. The latter
part of *Elon-beth-hanan,* namely Beth-hanan, may be rep-
resented by Beit ʻAnân, eight and a half miles northwest of
Jerusalem; but the names are not identical, and Beth-hanan,
to judge from the towns associated with it, was in the low-
land of Dan, whereas Beit ʻAnân would naturally belong to
Benjamin and be subject to the official for Benjamin (1
Kin. iv. 9, 18). Regarding *Holon,* the name does not cor-
respond with that of Beit ʻAlâm, and Major Conder dropped
this identification in favor of a neighboring site, a mile to
the northeast, known as Beit Aûla.[34] But etymological
agreement does not exist even yet, and a site six miles and
a half northwest of Hebron seems too remote from the
other towns of the group. Later Colonel Conder again
suggested Beit ʻAlâm.[32] The names *Janum* and Beni
Naʻim are entirely different in etymology; and the situation
is rather unfavorable, to judge from the location of the
towns with which it is associated and the order in which
they are listed in the one passage where Janum is named.
The name of *Jethlah* and that of Beit Tûl are not etymo-
logically akin, and the suggested site is a surprising location
for a town of Dan. As to *Kirjath-jearim,* neither the
etymology nor, so far as appears, the location is met by

___
[67] Survey of Western Palestine: Memoirs, iii. 36.

the ruin 'Erma,[68] eleven miles west by south of Jerusalem,
and two miles and a quarter south by west of Kesla. Con-
trary to Conder's opinion, Josh. xv. 10 is surely against the
location proposed by him. 'Erma is also remote from the
Gibeonite settlements (Josh. ix. 17). The proposed identi-
fication of *Madmannah* with Umm Deimneh, twelve miles
northeast of Beer-sheba, was rejected later by Major Con-
der himself as unsuitable,[34] only to be revived by him
later.[32] The emphatic consonant k of el-Mekenna is not the
Hebrew kaph, which appears in *Meconah,* and the place of
Meconah in the succession of towns mentioned in Neh.
xi. 28 suggests a place between Beer-sheba and En-rimmon,
not a place twelve miles northnorthwest of Beit Jibrin.
Moreover, it does not correspond either in distance or di-
rection from Eleutheropolis with the village Machamim
mentioned in the "Onomasticon" (with Beth-maacah, p. 57),
with which Conder would connect it. The site of *Meronoth*
is probably to be sought, not at Marrina, seven miles north
of Hebron, but in Benjamin, in the neighborhood of Gibeon
and Mizpah (Neh. iii. 7). His identification of *Minnith*
with Minyeh is rejected by Major Conder himself and by
Mr. Armstrong, the former saying: "Minyeh . . . south of
Nebo . . . may be derived from another root, and in any
case is much too far south"[34] Yet Colonel Conder suggests
it again.[32] The correspondence of the name *Secacah,* a vil-
lage in the wilderness of Judah (Josh. xv. 61), with ed-
Dikkeh is doubtful, and the situation of the ruins two miles
east of Bethany renders the identification suspicious, and
Colonel Conder finally said, "The site is not known".[32]
More suitable as a reminiscence of the name and in location
is Wady ed-Dekakin, which begins about three miles to the
southeast of Bethany, runs eastwardly and northeastwardly
toward the Jordan, and belongs entirely to the wilderness.
Shaaraim was a town in the lowland of Judah (Josh. xv.

---

[68] This word means a dam or dyke and suggests that the ruin has
taken its name merely from a dam that was thrown across the wady
at this point.

36), apparently west of Socoh and Azekah (1 Sam. xvii.
52 with 1). The ruin Sa'îreh is in the hill country rather
than in the lowland, but it may have been reckoned to the
lowland. Moreover, if Shaaraim means the two gates, as
is generally and plausibly believed, the two names do not
correspond in radicals. For the site of *Zior* Major Conder,
as previously van de Velde,[10] has suggested Si'aîr. This
word may be the common noun meaning flame. At any
rate it is not radically the same as Zior. Moreover, the
mention of Zior would be expected in Josh. xv. 58 and 59,
not in verse 54, if its site was four miles and a half north-
northeast of Hebron.

The majority of the proposed identifications, it must be
remembered, are offered by Major Conder and his asso-
ciates on the Survey as possible or probable only.[13] While
many of them may be correct, as a whole they do not suffi-
ciently meet the conditions of substantial identification
which were in the mind of Lieutenant Conder himself from
the very beginning of his work[9] and which must concur in
order to be valid evidence. And with notable exceptions,
such as Eltekeh and Ramoth-gilead and the boundary towns,
even a successful and final identification of the sites for
which suggestions are made in this list of one hundred and
sixty-eight, while interesting would yet be a matter of com-
parative unimportance, since many of the towns are men-
tioned but once or twice in the Scriptures, played no part in
Israel's history, and if identified could seldom be used as a
factor in solving larger geographical problems. The great
contribution which Major Conder has made to the study of
the geography of the Holy Land consists, therefore, not in
these suggestions, which are but a by-product of his work,
but in the survey of Western Palestine and the accompany-
ing descriptive "Memoirs."

Princeton. JOHN D. DAVIS.