

## JUDAH ON JORDAN.

(Josh. xix, 34.)

A SIMPLE explanation of this curious reading occurs to me as follows. The Hebrew is—

וכי הודה הירדן

The *Daleth* and the *Resh* are so easily confused, and are so well known to have been confused in many cases in the Old Testament, as also the *Heh* and the *Cheth*, that we might very well read Hurah for Hudah.

Hurah ha Yarden would mean "the Hollow of Jordan," and is thus equivalent to the *Ghor*, or hollow, which was the real east boundary of Naphthali—just as "Judah on Jordan" is said to be. The roots Kûr, Ghor, and Khor are all allied to each other. It is interesting to find the Ghor noticed under this name in the Bible.

C. R. C.

## SAUL'S JOURNEY.

THIS question is likely to be long disputed because of the meagre nature of our information. I may perhaps be allowed once more to state a route which seems intelligible. It does not seem to me that any value attaches to ideas of *view* from any point on the journey, because nothing is said in the Bible about such a view. It is assumed by the disputants in the last *Quarterly Statement* that the "land of Benjamin" is mentioned in connection with Saul's journey. This is not the case. The Hebrew says (1 Sam. ix, 4) "he went across the *Aretz Yemeni*." This may be rendered "the land of the south," and seems to show a change of direction. It is not said whence Saul started, whether from Zelah or Gibeah. But he went—

Through Har Ephraim — Jebel Nâblus.

„ Aretz Shalisha — probably near Kefr Thilth.

„ Aretz Sh'alim = "land of caverns."

„ Aretz Yemeni = "land of south."

To Aretz Tzûph, or "of the view."

This name in Arabic might be either Safa or Shûfa. I should be sorry to be too positive as to the exact site of the Nameless City, but Kirjath-Jearim is a very likely place for Samuel to have visited, because the ark was then at this city. It stands on the south side of a valley, and on the north side just opposite is a ridge with two ruins called *Shûfa*, which may represent Zuph very properly.

There is a curious indication also in the expression "the end of the city" (verse 27), for this expression is also used of Kirjath-Jearim (Josh. xviii, 15). It refers, perhaps, to the curious spur on which the old ruin 'Erma stands.

There is another point, perhaps not very important but yet worth noting. Josephus (who, however, had only the Old Testament to guide him) calls the Nameless City Ramah. This might be his rendering of Arim, the later form of Jearim (Ezra ii, 25). From Kirjath-Jearim the route which would most easily be followed is along the ancient highway which leads east to El Khudr, and joins the Hebron road near that town: thence Saul would go north and pass naturally by Rachel's tomb (1 Sam. x, 2). As to the return, it seems to me as clear as anything can well be that it was to Gibeah of Saul, called in full Gibeah ha Elohim, a sacred place where there was a "garrison" (Speaker's Commentary would render "pillar") of the Philistines. The word here is נֶצֶב as in 1 Samuel xiii, 3, and it is identical with the Arabic *Nusb*, which means in the Korân and in common use a menhir and nothing else. There was such a Netzeb at Geba as mentioned in the latter passage, and there seems no reason why the place should not be the same in both cases, viz., *Jeb'a* near Michmash.

Mr. Shapira's rendering of 1 Samuel x, 2 has no particular value, because it is not the meaning of the Hebrew. Mr. T. Saunders only reproduces very old-fashioned views as to Ramah founded on the facts that Samuel had an ancestor named Zuph, a man of Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. i, 1), and that Ramah and Bethlehem are connected in the New Testament (Matt. ii, 18). It is surely quite impossible to extend Mount Ephraim so far south as Mr. Saunders would do. The latter gentleman has, however, shown so little respect for either topography or philology in his theories that, in my opinion, he should not be cited as an authority. Mr. Birch's objections to this view as to Ramathaim-Zophim seem to me to be very strong.

C. R. C.

---

### SUPPOSED NABATHEAN AND HIMYARITIC TEXTS FROM MEDEBA.

3rd August, 1883

THESE four inscriptions are preserved in the Latin Patriarchate at Jerusalem, where I saw and copied them in 1881. They had been sent by the Latin missionaries from Medeba, east of Jordan, and were discovered early in 1881. Visiting Medeba in August of the same year I was informed that they had all been found by excavation, or amid heaps of fallen stones, when the newly-established Latin colony, at this ruined city, was engaged in building up rude drystone enclosures for their cattle. It is possibly one of these stones which Canon Tristram saw in 1872, and which he mentions of an illegible Phœnician text (many of the letters being similar to those of the Phœnician alphabet). He saw also Latin and Greek texts, which seem to have been since removed or destroyed ("Land of Moab," p. 311).

These inscriptions are in characters quite different, as a rule, from the alphabet of the "Moabite pottery;" and it does not appear that they have ever passed through the hands of any person interested in the said