

writes in his diary : "A couple of leagues from Jerusalem is a place where there are four villages,¹ and there is here a spring of water, with numerous gardens and orchards ; and it is called Farádis, on account of the beauty of the spot." The editor adds : "This is the ancient Herodium in the Wády Urtás, at the present day known as the 'Frank Mountain.' The word *urtás* is probably a corruption of *hortus*, which has the same meaning as *Firdús*."

To me it seems it might be more properly applied to 'Arrúb, where there is still the same name, as shown in the above article ; and the four villages can also be found there, but not so easily at Urtás. These four villages were in A.D. 1047 (850 years ago) inhabited, but are now desolate, and the gardens gone.

SOME REMARKS ON THE TABERNACLE CONTROVERSY.

By DR. CONRAD SCHICK.

DURING my long life I have not only studied this matter thoroughly, but have made several models of the Tabernacle, which are now in England, America, Germany, and Jerusalem. I made them in two forms—the one according to the explanation of the Jews, the other following in the essential parts Mr. Fergusson in Smith's "Bible Dictionary." So the visitor could judge for himself. Still I had to answer a great many objections, but have not gained much by them.² Under these circumstances it is natural that whenever there comes before me some article or paper on the Tabernacle I read it with interest, and so also the quite new idea laid down in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1896, p. 189. But finding this very incorrect I thought not much notice would be taken of it, in which presumption I was wrong, as since quite a controversy has arisen about it (1896, p. 223 ; 1897, pp. 154, 225). In these papers it is chiefly the meaning of the Hebrew text that is criticised, but how the Jews interpreted the words is left out entirely—yet Jews should know it best. But as apparently technical expressions are used, of which the real meaning is lost, so all have to go back to the root of the word, and bring things out differently. In these cases the architect or technical man should also be asked, and this gives me the freedom to make the following remarks :—

1. The paper (*Quarterly Statement*, 1896, p. 189) begins with a gross

¹ Khürbet Fureid's ; K. Beit Zâta ; K. Marrina ; K. Beit Sh'ár.

² People are often remarkably ignorant.

error, giving the height of the Tabernacle "over 40 feet,"¹ whereas the "kroshim" (the boards), according to Exodus xxvi, 16, and xxxvi, 21, were only 10 cubits, or 15 feet, long, hence the Tabernacle when put up was only so high with a flat roof, or, as Mr. Fergusson gives it, with a pitched roof $22\frac{1}{2}$ feet high. On what are the 40 feet, or 27 cubits, grounded? Apparently there is an error. Further, according to the text, each board had two sockets of silver on which the boards stood, and on each side (except the front) were five bars, and not only five in all, as the drawing (p. 189) shows, for we read in Exodus xxvi, 26-27:—"bars of Shittim wood" (whereas the sockets were of silver), "five for the boards of the one side of the Tabernacle, and five bars for the boards of the other side of the Tabernacle" (the drawing gives $2\frac{1}{2}$), "and five bars for the boards of the side of the Tabernacle, for the two sides westward." This is the same as in chapter xxxvi, 31, 32. So there were 15 bars, without the "middle bar." Then I wish to remark that if the boards (put on both sides) were not standing upright but sloping, so that both were meeting at the top, the house was furnished, it did not want any carpets, whereas the carpets were just the main parts! For in chapter xxvi, 1, it is said: "Thou shalt make the Tabernacle of (or with) ten curtains," and in v. 6, "couple the curtains together. . . it shall be one Tabernacle"—without the boards, those are mentioned afterwards. Further, according to Exodus xxvi, 2, and xxxvi, 9, the first curtains were 28 cubits, or 42 feet, long, hence hanging down 21 feet on each side, but as the greatest height of the Tabernacle (Fergusson) was only 15 feet, about 7 feet of the carpets were, on each side, useless or lying on the ground; and if, as stated in the paper I refer to, it was 40 feet high, 19 feet of the boards on each side had no covering. It is also stated that the bars were not round but in section square—the reason or proof is not mentioned—and would be unlike to modern Arabian tent-poles, as those are all round.

2. *Quarterly Statement*, 1896, p. 223.—Agreeing with Mr. Fergusson, except the "middle bar," which it makes a ridge-cord, extending from the middle of the west wall (as there were six—resp. eight—boards it would be between the third and fourth), eastward over the empty space of the Tabernacle as far as the middle pillar at the eastern entrance.² In fact, the difference is only between a cord and a wooden bar.

3. *Quarterly Statement*, 1897, p. 155.—Agrees with Mr. Fergusson's theory, but goes on to say that this theory does not agree with the text. In what manner I cannot understand, for Mr. Fergusson has five bars on each side—just as the text says—and the "middle bar" or ridge-pole is quite another one, not one of the five, for in Exodus xxvi, 26, 27, the side-bars are described, and after that in v. 28 is then said: "And the middle bar, in the midst of the boards, shall reach from end to end"; "in the midst of the boards" means rather between and higher up and longer

¹ Also the diagram shows the height four times the width at the bottom.

² Between the boards there was support, so it required a piece of wood to be put on the top of both, over which the rope could be laid.

than the others ; "from end to end," that is 40 cubits long. There were 10 curtains, each 4 cubits wide, making 40 cubits, whereas the boards, 20 in number, each $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits wide—as the text says—makes only a wall of 30 cubits, hence the rods on the sides were only 30 cubits long. That this ridge-pole wanted some support is unquestionable. There were the middle pillars on both ends, the corner boards being longer or rather having a movable arm upwards, some arrangement over the pillar between the Holy and most Holy and others, as I showed in my models.

It is said Fergusson invented and suggested things which are not mentioned in the text. This is so to some degree. But it is clear that there were some things which are not mentioned in the text. For instance, every Arabic tent has also a carpet on the floor ; shall this wandering temple not have had one ? I think it had, and that the floor was not left as bare earth or sand, but that a carpet was put on it, which, however, is not mentioned in the text. Further, the four pillars between the Holy and most Holy must have had some architrave, otherwise, although based each on a silver socket, they would not have stood firm enough when bearing the curtain. These latter also required some contrivance for hanging them up and keeping them in their right position, but this also is not mentioned. Again, the third and fourth covering wanted also some arrangements, which are also not mentioned in the text, and then comes the comparison with the temple, which was built according to the Tabernacle, only the measures were doubled. The temple, it is said, was 30 cubits high, that is, the doubling of the 15 of the Tabernacle. It had little buildings round about, also behind, and at the Tabernacle it was the verandah. It had a porch of 10 cubits, the doubling of the 5 of Mr. Fergusson's Tabernacle. It was 20 cubits wide "according to the width of the house," hence the doubling of the Tabernacle, which was 10 cubits wide, and so on. The paper of which I speak says, on p. 155 : "Mr. Fergusson has not a single inch to enclose the large triangular spaces above the five pillars," but Josephus ("Antiq." III, 6, 4) speaks of many curtains besides those mentioned in Scripture, and if these will not be admitted, the third cover of red rams' skins, and the fourth of badgers' skins are only mentioned not fully described, so one has the liberty to arrange them according to his own idea, and in my models I filled up these spaces with the outer coverings (the third and fourth).

4. *Quarterly Statement*, 1897, p. 225.—This paper intends to show that the Tabernacle was a tent, and hence the right explanation of its description must be in conformity with an Arab tent. I had not the pleasure to see Mr. C. W. Colton's "little book" on the Tabernacle, and hence I cannot say anything about it, except what is here mentioned, viz., that he omits "the ropes invented by others to hold the planks" in place, as such are not mentioned in Scripture and not necessary, which are both quite true, but it is new to me that ropes had to hold the planks in their upright position. I have it not on my models, nor have I seen them in Mr. Fergusson's drawings, nor in any other. The bars hold the whole

structure together. The writer of this article agrees that the curtains may rest on the structure made up by the boards and bars, but thinks that the curtains could also further rest on the pillars, five at the entrance and four between the Holy and Holy of Holies, also being supported by the staves or poles of the utensils, taking them out of their rings when the things, showbread table, altar of incense, candlestick, &c., were resting on the ground, and using them during the resting time as additional supports for the curtains. This idea is ingenious, but I think incorrect, for although it is said in Numb. iv, 12, that after the utensils were wrapped in their various coverings they should be "put on a bar," this bar could not be at the same time the support of the curtains, which would be free when the four curtains of the tabernacle were taken away. The altar of incense was 1 cubit wide. To carry it on the shoulders of men poles of 5 cubits were long enough, only half the height of the boards of the Tabernacle, and could not have been used as supports for the curtains of it. The poles of the "altar of burnt offering" may have been used for such. The altar, 5 cubits wide, wanted staves or poles at least 10 cubits long, or even longer, and could be left there till the taking down of the four main carpets or curtains. All this is suggested to bring the Tabernacle in a fuller conformity with "oriental tents." But besides all this remains the framework of wood, the 28 boards, each $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubit broad, similar to which there is nothing in any regular oriental tent, and hence the necessary conclusion is that the Tabernacle was a special tent-building, not in full conformity with other tents, but as a wandering temple having its own special features. The more so as everything had at the same time a typical meaning.

TELL ER REESH, &c.

By Rev. J. E. HANAUER.

At a distance, according to Dr. Schick (*Quarterly Statement*, 1893, p. 286), of about 5,200 feet from the Eastern Gate of Jaffa, there is a long, low ridge or swell of ground, having upon it several depressed knolls (*see* enclosed map tracing) running through the orange gardens in a general direction from north to south, and crossed by the carriage-road to Jerusalem at the place where there stands a group of houses known by the name of "Saknet et Turk." About 1 kilometre south of this Saknet the undulating ridge culminates in a remarkable isolated *natural* hill called "Tell er Reesh." The name means "Mound of the Feathers" or "plumes," but the sound "Reesh" is temptingly suggestive of "Richard"; and though we have no proof positive that one of the two English Crusading Richards encamped here, yet it is not unlikely that Cœur de Lion did so, seeing that the Tell commands a first-rate