

The border of Manasseh marched in the north with that of Asher, and in the east with that of Issachar. "They met together." [יָצְאוּ] is the very same word that we found before, describing the coincidence of Ephraim's north border in the south border line at Jericho, where they formed one; so here it singularly occurs again to describe one of the most striking and conclusive features of the sketch we have given of these tribes.

(4.) ISSACHAR.

The outline of the above two tribes marks out to some extent the lot of the tribe of Issachar. It lay to the east of them, along the entire line of the Jordan, from the sea of Chinneroth on the north to nearly the Salt Sea on the south, where the border of Benjamin had a small part of it, from the Wady Kelt to the north bay of the sea. Issachar, as a tribe, is not described by Joshua, who only mentions the names of towns contained in it. It did not require description, as the containing boundaries of Ephraim and Manasseh on the west, with the River Jordan on the east, sufficiently defined it. It was of a triangular form, having its apex at Jericho and its base to the north of the plain of Jezreel, where it was met by the border of Zabulon, and where its chief cities lay. It contained thus a long tract of territory, but as this was for the most part wilderness, its dimensions were much greater than its worth, while three great and fertile districts were taken from it and given to Manasseh.

Such is the account we have drawn from the simple reading of Joshua, and we have followed that reading closely, without bending, as we think, a single word to serve a private purpose. The outline, if correct, gives an entirely new configuration to these three tribes, relieves a very intricate and important part of Scripture of the cloud that rested on it, and may, we hope, help to open up the way to a better delineation of the other northern tribes that still remain so confused and undetermined.

DUNSE, 1st November, 1876.

DANIEL KERR.

NOTES ON THE ABOVE.

There can be no doubt that the general direction of the boundaries is correctly understood by the author of the above paper, and that the arrangement will be new to the general public. The Survey allows of our throwing further light on the details. The following seem to me the most important points to notice.

1. *Archi Ataroth*. The first word is considered by most scholars to be separate from the second, and to be the name of a tribe (the *Archites*, 2 Sam. xv. 32, &c.) derived from a place called *Arich*. I have already pointed out (*Quarterly Statement*, 1876, p. 184) that this is probably the modern *Arîk*, between Bethel and Bethhoron.

2. *Bethel and Luz*. The Hebrew has *Bethel Luzah* where the English has "Bethel to Luz." The Vulgate reads Bethel Luza, and the LXX. Βεθθα Λουζα. As we have also the direct assertion (Gen. xxxviii. 19)

that Bethel was "called Luz at the first," we cannot hesitate in coupling the two names together as referring to the modern *Beitîn*.

3. *Gezer*. The author places this town on Wady Suleimân, apparently forgetting M. Ganneau's identification of Gezer at *Tell Jezer*, much farther south. It is possible that there was more than one Gezer; and, again, that the word Gezer in this passage may be a corruption. On the other hand, a position for Gezer near Jimzu, on Wady Suleimân, would fit well with the description of its position given in the Onomasticon; and it is impossible to bring the boundary of Ephraim farther south than Wady Suleimân, because the sites of Aijalon, Beth Hanan, Beneberak, Jehud, and El Tekeh, all towns of Dan, are pretty certainly fixed immediately south of this line. The Gezer, however, of this passage has not as yet been recovered. The proposed line agrees also well with Josh. xvii. 10.

4. *Ataroth Adar*. The author has not apparently noticed my proposed identification of this site with the modern *et Tîreh* (*Quarterly Statement*, 1875, p. 168) though agreeing with his view of the subject.

5. *Asher ham. Michmethah*. It is the opinion of Reland and others that the two names refer to one site, the second being a qualifying term. This considerably simplifies the understanding of Josh. xvii. 7, "Asher to Michmethah that lieth before Shechem." The site has been identified in various places as *Teiasîr*, or as *'Asîreh* (Asher of the early Christians), north-east of Shechem, or as *'Asîreh*, south of Shechem; but the last two names are spelt with the *Ain* and the *Sad*, and represent properly an ancient Ozor or Hazor. The word Michmethah is of uncertain meaning, but is thought by some to mean "rocky" (Arabic *Makhammah*; compare Michmah and *Mukhmâs*, the *Khe* for the Hebrew *Caf*). There is immediately west of, and in sight of Shechem, a remarkable precipice crowned by a sacred building called *Sheikh es Sîreh* (spelt with the *Stn*). This seems to me the most probable site of this important point, and there are two indications which tend the same way: 1. The head of the "Brook Kanah" leads up towards this point as now laid down by us. 2. Ophrah of Abiezer (in the territory of Manasseh) is not improbably the modern *Fer'ata* immediately north of the same line (see *Quarterly Statement*, 1876, p. 197, *Ophrah*). We have not, however, any very definite idea of the north boundary of Ephraim, though it very probably ran close to Shechem, and so towards *Salîm*, to the head of Wady Far'ah (the waters of Ænon), which formed, there is good reason to suppose, the north-east division between Ephraim and Manasseh.

6. *Ataroth*, in the Jordan Valley, is very possibly *Tell et Trûni*, not far north of the next site.

7. *Naarath*. The question of the identification of this site will be found discussed in the "Notes from the Memoir," No. 25, of the present number of the *Quarterly*.

8. *En Tappuah*. The author does not notice Robinson's identification of this site with the present *'Atûf*, to which there is no valid objection, and the "Land of Tappuah," lying north of the large and important valley

called *Wady Far'ah*, would naturally belong to Manasseh, though the town was given to Ephraim. The word used to specify the position of this town does not strictly mean *on*, but rather *near* the boundary line, being near the north bank of the valley; the words, "on the right hand unto the inhabitants of En Tappuah," may be better rendered "south of the dwellers in En Tappuah;" it cannot properly be rendered "southwards to," nor is there any indication that the place was south of Shechem instead of east, as generally placed. The author appears to have had a difficulty in tracing the boundary line from Shechem to *Wady Kānah*, which is due solely to the latter having always been incorrectly laid down on the maps. It rises not far from Shechem. Its suggestion that *Jem'āin* may be En Tappuah is unfortunate; the word has nothing to do with the word *En*, "a spring," but appears to be the dual of *Jem'a*, "a people," and it is very curious that the greater part of Mount Ephraim is called by the native peasantry *Beldd el Jem'āin*, "land of the two tribes."

9. *Taanath Shiloh* is not identified by Mr. Kerr; there are, however, two sites which may be proposed, viz., 1. *T'ana*, a ruined site north of *Y'anūn* (Janohah). 2. *Thala*, east of *'Atūf*, which appears to have been the *Thena* of the Onomasticon, being exactly the distance from Shechem noticed by Jerome.

None of these notes, though considerably strengthening the general correctness of the conclusions made in the above paper, at all interfere with the statement made by me in the paper on Samaritan Topography, that "we have no description of the boundaries of the two great Samaritan tribes *similar* to those for the northern and southern tribes." Mr. Kerr, as well as Mr. Grove (Bible Dict. s.v. Michmethah), agrees with me in the conclusion that the Book of Joshua "is incomplete in the portion referring to Samaria."

10. *Issachar*. It is probable that all the tribe boundaries were natural, and Issachar appears to have had plains and no hills. Thus, though the north and north-east boundaries of Manasseh are undescribed, the identifications of Remeth (*Rameh*), Tirzah (*T'iasir*), Rabbith (*Rāba*), Aner (*'Allar*), allow us to divide the two territories along a natural watershed.

11. *Asher*. The paper here noted does not remove the great difficulty of the passage, "and they met together in Asher on the north" (Josh. xvii. 10), though it does explain how the tribes met "in Issachar on the east." The enumeration of separate towns of Manasseh, "in Issachar and in Asher," is followed by a list of places all in the lot of Issachar, except Dor, which belonged, according to Josephus, to Dan. It is usual to suppose that a strip of coast between Carmel and the sea belonged to Asher, which thus touched upon Manasseh, but the following are the objections to such a supposition.

1st. The following identifications may be proposed for places on the northern boundary of Zebulon, the southern of Asher.

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. B. Dagon | <i>Tell Da'ik</i> , C. R. C. |
| 2. Zebulon | <i>Sh'ab</i> , C. R. C. |

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 3. Han. Neiel | Y'anîn, C. R. C. |
| 4. Cabul | Kabûl. |
| 5. <i>Shihor Libnath</i> | Wâdy <i>Shaghâr</i> , C. R. C. |

These all point to the Belus as forming the boundary of Asher on the south.

2nd. Josephus states Asher to be bounded by Actippus (ez Zib) north of Acre.

3rd. Josephus states Carmel to have belonged to Zebulon.

4th. The town Idalah of Zebulon may be identified with *ed Dâlieh* on Carmel.

5th. The places on the south boundary of Zebulon, between the sea and the "river that is before Jokneam" (Josh. xix. 10-12), may be identified as existing between the sea and *Tell Keimûn* along the south boundary of Carmel as follows:—

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Maralah = the crusading Merla | = <i>el Mczr'ah</i> , C. R. C. |
| 2. Dabbasheth (the hump) | = <i>ed Dûweibeh</i> , C. R. C. |
| 3. Jokneam | = <i>Tell Keimûn</i> . |

If this view be correct, Asher was separated from Manasseh by the land of Zebulon.

It appears, therefore, more probable that the Asher intended in the present sentence (Josh. xvii. 10) is Asher-ham-Michmethah, which was situate at the north-west corner of the tribe of Ephraim.

The following is the complete list of places identified on the boundaries of Ephraim and Manasseh. It is very scanty as compared with the detailed account in the case of Judah, and it follows that the question of the boundaries between Ephraim, Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulon (or Asher) is the most difficult topographical question in the Book of Joshua.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Waters of Jericho | ' <i>Ain ed Dûk</i> . |
| 2. Wilderness of Bethaven | |
| 3. Mount Bethel | |
| 4. Bethel Luzah | <i>Beitîn</i> . |
| 5. Archites | ' <i>Ain 'Arîk</i> , C. R. C. |
| 6. Japhlites | |
| 7. Bethhoron the upper | <i>B. Ur el Fôka</i> . |
| 8. Ataroth Adar | <i>et Tîreh</i> , C. R. C. |
| 9. Bethhoron the lower | <i>B. Ur et Tahta</i> . |
| 10. Gezer | |
| 11. Asher-ham-Michmethah | <i>Sh. es Sîreh</i> , C. R. C. |
| 12. En Tappuah | <i>Atûf</i> . |
| 13. Taanath Shiloh | <i>Thala</i> , C. R. C. |
| 14. Janohah | <i>Y'anîn</i> . |
| 15. Ataroth | <i>Tell et Trûni</i> , C. R. C. |
| 16. Naarath | <i>Kh. el 'Aûjeh</i> , C. R. C. |
| 17. Brook Kanah | <i>Wâdy Kânah</i> . |

C. R. C.