

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

B. B. EDWARDS AND E. A. PARK,  
Professors at Andover,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

DR. ROBINSON AND PROF. STUART.

---

VOL. I.

---

LONDON:  
WILEY AND PUTNAM,  
1844.

tory of man, (*Ideen für der Gesch, der Mensch.*), and Fred. Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*, (*Phil. der. Gesch.*) 1829, in two parts. The work of Herder is uncommonly spirited and exciting; but John Müller says of it, not inaptly, "I find in this book every thing except Christ, and what is the history of the world without Christ?" In this regard Schlegel is more satisfactory than Herder, but he refers everything, not so much to Christianity as to Roman Catholicism. Leo has written his *Universal History* with a felt reference to the christian state, as the ultimate good to which our race can aspire. His work bears the appropriate motto, Acts 17: 26, 27. In this passage are contained the truths, first that the kingdom of God is the proper object for which man should strive, since it is in this kingdom that the divine character is fully manifested; and secondly, that God in stationing men in different parts of the earth, and at different periods of time, has intended to prepare them step by step, for the true religion. Leo has shown in his history, that during the ages preceding the advent of Christ, the way had been preparing for the introduction of the kingdom of God, as it is portrayed in the New Testament. These preparative processes were in part negative, for men had exalted nature, or art, or the State, into the chief object of their existence, and had thus precluded the possibility of a true and perfect development of their capabilities. These preparatory processes were also in part positive; for Judaism had previously given the first outlines, and the symbolical representations of christian truths and ordinances.

[The First Part of the Encyclopaedia will be concluded with three more sections, one on the Science of Writing History, one on Anthropology, and one on Rhetoric.—T.]

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.

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

#### I. ELEUTHEROPOLIS.

THE evidence on which I was led to approve and maintain the identity of this metropolitan city with the ancient Betogabra, now Beit Jibrin, is fully detailed in the second volume of the *Biblical Researches in Palestine*. The ancient importance of this city led Eusebius and Jerome to make it the central point in Southern Palestine, by which to mark the

VOL. I. No. 1.

position of some twenty places in the same region, the direction and distance of which from Eleutheropolis they specify. Six of these places viz. Zorah, Bethshamesh, Jarmuk, Socoh, Jedna, and Nezib, lying in various directions from Eleutheropolis, the Rev. Mr. Smith and myself were able to identify; and following out the directions and distances as assigned by Eusebius and Jerome, they brought us in every instance to Beit Jibrin as the great central point. The conviction thus wrought on our minds as to the site of Eleutheropolis, was strengthened by several minor historical circumstances;<sup>1</sup> and so strong was the proof, that the correctness of our position was at once admitted by all scholars.

But at the time, no direct historical testimony could be found, on which this identity could be distinctly noted. There was still wanting some indubitable evidence of this kind, out of a period when a knowledge of the identity in question could be presupposed as a matter of common notoriety. Such a testimony has since been found by Prof. Roediger of Halle, in the *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum*, published by Assemani in Syriac, Greek and Latin. The martyr Peter Abaelama, it is there said in the Syriac account, was born at Anea, which lies in the district of Beth-Gubrin,

ܐܢܝܐ ܐܢܝܐ ; which the Greek and Latin accounts both read, in the district of Eleutheropolis.<sup>2</sup> This testimony seems decisive; and I know not what can be alleged against it.

More recently, K. von Raumer, in his *Beiträge zur biblischen Geographie*, has brought forward another corroborative proof of the same identity. It is derived from the comparison of two lists of ancient bishoprics in Palestine; one ascribed to Nilus Doxopatrius, a Greek writer who flourished in Sicily about A. D. 1143;<sup>3</sup> the other said to be collected by Petrus Regemorterus, and appended to the History of William of Tyre. They are both found in Reland's *Palaestina*, p. 219 sq. p. 225 sq.

## NILUS.

1. *Diaspolis*, s. urbs Georgii.
2. *Ascalon*.
3. *Joppe*.
4. *Gaza*.
5. *Anthedon*.
6. *Diocletianopolis*.
7. *ELEUTHEROPOLIS*.
8. *Neapolis*.
9. *Sebaste*.
10. *Jordan*.
11. *Tiberias*.
12. *Diocaesarea*.

## ON WILLIAM OF TYRE.

1. *Lidda*.
2. *Joppe*.
3. *Ascalon*.
4. *Gaza*.
5. *Meimas*.
6. *Diocletianopolis*.
7. *BEITT GERBEIN* (Beit Jibrin).
8. *Neapolis*.
9. *Sebastia*.
10. *Jericynthus*.
11. *Tyberias*.
12. *Dibcaesarea*.

<sup>1</sup> *Bibl. Researches in Palestine*, II. p. 404 sq.

<sup>2</sup> See Assemani *Acta Sanctor. Martyr. Oriental. Tom. II. p. 209*, comp. p. 207. *Allgem. Lit. Zeit.* 1842, No. 72.

<sup>3</sup> See Leo Allatius de Nilis, appended to Fabricii *Biblioth. Graec. Tom. V. Cave and Du Pin erroneously assign Nilus to A. D. 1043*. He flourished under Count Roger.

## NILUS.

13. MAXIMIANOPOLIS.
14. Capitolia.
15. Myrum.
16. Gadara.
17. Nazareth.
18. Mons Thabor.
19. *Cyriacopolis*.
20. Adria.
21. Gabala.
22. Ælia.
23. Phara.
24. Helenopolis.
25. Mons Sina.

## ON WILLIAM OF TYRE.

13. LEGIONUM.
14. Capitolina.
15. Mauronensis.
16. Gedera.
17. Nazareth.
18. Thabor.
19. *Caracha* v. *Petra*.
20. Adroga.
21. *Afra*.
22. Ælia.
23. Faram.
24. Elinopolis.
25. Mons Sina.

Of these lists that of Nilus is in the Greek; the other in Latin. Their general coincidence shows, that they were drawn from similar sources; while the occasional discrepancy indicates that the sources were not always the same. The Greek writer prefers Greek names; the other the later and then more common ones; as in the case of *Diospolis* and *Lidda*.

Where the names of the two lists differ, do they refer to one and the same place? In the case of *Diospolis* and *Lidda*, they do so most undoubtedly; the former being the Greek name, and the latter the native name, which ultimately excluded the other. So too in No. 10, the bishopric which Nilus assigns to *the Jordan*, is doubtless equivalent to that of *Jericho*. The same is unquestionably true in No. 19 of *Cyriacopolis* and *Caracha*, the modern Kerak. On the strength of these coincidences, Raumer at once derives an argument for the like identity of *Eleutheropolis* and *Beit Gerbein* (Beit Jibrin).

But there are some other points at which Raumer did not look. Thus in No. 5, it would follow, on the same principle, that *Anthedon* and *Meimas* were identical. But Anthedon was a city, the seat of a bishop, situated on the sea-coast twenty stadia from Gaza toward the south;<sup>1</sup> while Meimas can well be no other than *Majuma* (Gr. *Μαίμας*), the port of Gaza itself.<sup>2</sup> As no one, I believe, supposes these two places to be identical; it follows, either that after the decay of Anthedon the bishopric was transferred to Majuma; or, more probably, that Majuma is mentioned by the Latin writer as the chief remaining community pertaining to that bishopric, and so its representative.—In like manner, there is no evidence that *Gabala* and *Afra* (in No. 21) were identical. Josephus speaks of a city *Gabala* in Galilee, which he also calls *Gamala*; and Eusebius mentions a place *Aphraim*, six miles north of Legio. But whether these are the same referred to in the lists, we have no means of determining.

It hence appears, that where the names of the two lists differ, they are not always, nor necessarily, synonymous; and may refer to different, though probably adjacent places. From the lists, therefore, the only legitimate inference that can be drawn, is, that Eleutheropolis and Betoga-

<sup>1</sup> Raumer's *Palaestina*, p. 170. Reland's *Palaest.* p. 566.

<sup>2</sup> Raumer, *ib.* p. 191. Reland's *Palaest.* p. 566.

bra were not far distant from each other. But, their identity being otherwise established, the evidence of the lists certainly becomes corroborative.

## II. LEGIO, MEGIDDO, MAXIMIANOPOLIS.

In the *Biblical Researches*, Vol. III. p. 179 sq., I have stated the circumstances which led me to regard the ancient name *Megiddo*, so often mentioned along with *Taanach*, as having been lost in the later Roman name *Legio*, the present *Lejjûn*. *Megiddo* was an important place, not far from *Taanach*; so important indeed as to give its name to that portion of the great plain. In like manner *Legio*, in the writings of Eusebius and Jerome, gives its name to the same part of the plain; and is moreover assumed as the central point, from which to mark the position, of several adjacent places.

To this supposed identity of *Megiddo* and *Legio*, Raumer in his *Beiträge* objects; and prefers to regard *Legio* as representing the ancient *Maximianopolis*, which, as Jerome tells us was in his day the name of the more ancient *Hadad-rimmon*. His arguments are the two following:

1. A comparison of the foregoing lists (No. 13) shows, that where Nilus mentions *Maximianopolis*, the Latin text has *Legionum*; and hence the identity of the two is to be inferred; just as in the case of *Diospolis* and *Lidda*, *Eleutheropolis* and *Beitt Gerbein*, etc.—But here again he overlooks the fact, that in some cases in these lists the different names are not synonymous. E. g. *Anthedon* and *Meimas*, as shown above. The insertion of *Legionum* in the Latin list, may then be accounted for in the like way.

2. The *Itin. Heros*. gives the distance of *Maximianopolis* from *Caesarea* at 17 R. M. and from *Jezeel* at 10 R. M. On Kiepert's map Raumer finds the distance of *Lejjûn* from *Caesarea* to be 18 R. M. and from *Jezeel* 10 R. M. Hence again he infers the identity of the two places.—But since as he admits, *Maximianopolis* (*Hadad-rimmon*) must have lain near *Megiddo*,<sup>1</sup> it is obvious that these distances would apply to it just as well, if it lay not far south of *Lejjûn*; for example, at or near the present village of *Sâlim*, as seen by Mr. Wolcott.<sup>2</sup> That is to say, the *Bourdeaux* pilgrim, in travelling directly from *Caesarea* to *Jezeel*, would not necessarily go through *Legio*; but would more naturally pass further south.

I see no reason, therefore, for giving up, on these grounds, the identity of *Legio* and *Megiddo* in favor of the new hypothesis. And there is, further, this strong objection, that if we admit Raumer's view, then we have at one and the same time the two Roman names, *Maximianopolis* and *Legio*, currently applied to the same ancient place, *Hadad-rimmon*,—a fact apparently without a parallel, and not very probable in itself.

On the other hand, the phrase, "the waters of *Megiddo*," in the *Song of Deborah*, seems naturally to imply waters near *Megiddo* itself, and not merely the *Kishon* in the plain. In illustration of this, Mr. Wolcott informs us, that the present *Nahr Lejjûn*, even when not swollen, is a stream five or six feet wide, which feeds three or four mills, and comes

<sup>1</sup> Zech. 12: 16, "Hadad"

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 18

from the hills above. This is the largest stream in all the southern region of the great plain; and in the general dearth of perennial waters, would be an object worthy of poetical notice. The existence of such a stream at Lejjûn (Legio), seems to me greatly to strengthen the argument in favor of the identity of Legio and Megiddo.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CLIMATOLOGY OF PALESTINE.

By H. A. De Forest, M. D., Missionary at Beirut. Communicated by E. Robinson, D. D.

DURING the last year Dr. De Forest transmitted to me a copy of the daily record of meteorological observations made at Beirut and on Mount Lebanon, drawn out in the form of tables; and also the general averages and results, arranged in the like manner. These tables, though highly interesting and important to the scientific explorer of this aspect of nature, would yet hardly be appropriate to a work like the present. The main results, however, are embraced in the following letter, which accompanied the tables. Meantime we may hope, that Dr. De Forest and the other missionaries will persevere in making and recording their observations; which in time cannot fail to possess a high value. E. R.

*Beirut, June, 1843.*

DEAR SIR,—I take the liberty of sending you a copy of the record of observations which I have kept during the last fourteen months at Beirut and at Bhamdûn on Mount Lebanon. I send also the record kept at 'Aithâth on Mount Lebanon, during a portion of the winter and spring, by Dr. Van Dyck of our mission.

Beirut lies in Lat. 33° 50' N. and Long. 55° 30' E. and is elevated but little above the sea. Bhamdûn in Mount Lebanon is about five hours S. E. of Beirut, and is about 4,000 feet above the sea. 'Aithâth is three hours S. S. E. from the city; and has an elevation of near 3,000 feet.

It will be seen from the tables, that during the year ending April 30, 1843, the coldest day at Beirut was March 23d; when the mercury stood at sun-rise 50° F.; at 2 P. M. 57°; at sun-set 53°; average, 53° .33 F. The warmest day was Aug. 7th; when the mercury was at sun-rise 77°; at 2 P. M. 95°; at sun-set 83°; average 85° F. The difference of the extremes of temperature was 45°.

The average temperature of December was lower at Beirut than that of any other month in the year; it being 60° .13. July had the highest average, viz. 83°. These averages, it will be observed, are not of the entire twenty-four hours; but of the time from sun-rise to sun-set.

The average difference of temperature between Beirut and Bhamdûn from July 20th to Oct. 15th, was 12° .01 lower at Bhamdûn. In like manner the average difference