

# *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 *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_peq\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_peq_01.php)

(1) "Thou shalt find two men by Rachel's sepulchre." We see the spot marked out by the present "Rachel's sepulchre" near Bethlehem.

(2) "Thou shalt come to the plain (lit., oak) of Tabor." There is the place somewhere between Jebel Deir Abu Tor and the hill to the left, possibly the "House of the (T)erebinthi."—Jos. Wars. v. 12. 2.

(3) "Thou shalt come to the hill of God." "They came to the hill." We see it distinctly. It is the place of the Upper City of Jerusalem (Gabbatha, John xix. 13).

(4) "When thou art come to the city." We can make out perhaps just a house or two, but the greater part lies hidden in the Valley of Hinnom, behind (3).

(5) "He came to the high place." It is the Mount of Olives, "where David (Sp. Comm., men) worshipped God."—2 Sam. xv. 32.

Thus "the high place" brings Saul close to his destination—viz., his father's house at Zelah, on one of the eastern ridges of the Mount of Olives.

(1), (2), (3) are certainly visible from Ramah. See chapter on the Bakoosh cottage. (5) is visible from "the parlour," and will prove to be so (I believe) also from Ramah. Perhaps some one at Jerusalem will more exactly describe the view.

W. F. BIRCH.

## CAPERNAUM.

By PROFESSOR SCHAFF, of New York. (Translated from the Transactions of the German Society for the Exploration of Palestine.)

THE position of Capernaum is still a disputed question. Opinions are almost equally divided between Khan Minyeh and Tell Hum. Quaresmius (1639), Robinson (1838), MacGregor (1869), Porter (1875), Sepp (1876), Lieutenant Kitchener and Selah Merrill (1877), sought for it at Khan Minyeh, at the northern end of the Plain of Gennesareth, near Ain et-Tin and close to the shore of the Sea of Galilee. Pococke (1738), Burckhardt (1822), Ritter, John Wilson (1847), W. M. Thomson (1859), Hepworth Dixon (1864), Renan (1864), Captain Wilson (1871), Stanley (1871), Furrer (1871), and Socin, in Baedeker's "Syria and Palestine," place it at Tell Hum, a ruined town which lies three English miles to the north of Khan Minyeh, and nearly at equal distances between that town and where the Jordan flows into the Sea of Galilee. A third hypothesis, which suppose the site of the town to be near the Round Spring (Ain el-Mudawer) at the southern end of the Plain of Gennesareth (el-Ghuweir) has been abandoned by its chief advocate, Canon Tristram. The English Society for the Exploration of Palestine proposes to dispatch a special expedition to Galilee, in order, if possible, to settle definitely the sites of the towns of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin. On a late journey through the Promised Land I had myself decided in favour of Tell Hûm, but will gladly await the further information that will soon be afforded by excavations at that place.

The following points must be taken into particular consideration in this controversy:—

I. The *Biblical* argument. Capernaum (*i.e.*, “the village of Nahum,” not “the place of consolation,” as Origen and Jerome make it) was the most guilty of the three cities of Galilee over which Jesus pronounced the “woe” which was afterwards literally fulfilled (Matthew xi. 20-24). It is not mentioned in the Old Testament, but is frequently alluded to in the Gospels. It was the place where Jesus generally lived during the time of His public labours amongst the people after He was obliged to leave Nazareth. It was therefore called His “own city” (Matthew ix. 1; compare iv. 13). It was the home of Peter and of his mother-in-law (Luke iv. 38), and probably also of Matthew, who was taken away from the receipt of custom there and called to be an apostle (Matthew ix. 9). The village was large enough to be called a “city.” It had a flourishing trade, a custom-house (Matthew ix. 9-11), and also a synagogue, which the noble heathen captain had built for the Jews (Luke vii. 1-10).

As regards the site of the town, we only know certainly from the Gospel account that it was situated on the north-western shore of the sea, close to the sea, and in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthali (Matthew iv. 13). The defenders of the Khan Minyeh theory confidently assert that the site of Capernaum was in the Plain of Gennesareth, which extends about three miles from Mejdal (the ancient Magdala) to the rocky hill at Khan Minyeh, while Tell Hum lies farther to the north. But this is nowhere distinctly affirmed, it is only a conclusion drawn from the circumstance that after the miracle of the loaves and fishes, which was performed not far from the north-eastern shore of the sea, Jesus landed in Gennesareth, according to the synoptical account. (Matthew xiv. 34, Mark vi. 53), and at Capernaum, according to the more exact account given by John (John vi. 17, xxiv. 59). These two accounts are certainly most easily reconciled with each other by adopting the conclusion that Capernaum was situated in the Plain. But, on the other hand, we find that the people of Capernaum reached the opposite shore, where the miracle was afterwards worked, more quickly on foot than Jesus and His disciples by ship (Mark vi. 33). This is much more comprehensible when Tell Hum is regarded as the point of departure instead of Khan Minyeh, which is more than an hour's walk further off. The different accounts given in the gospels may perhaps be brought into agreement with each other by the hypothesis that on the morning after the miracle Jesus landed first in Gennesareth (as Matthew and Mark inform us), and went on to Capernaum either by land or water, and that when there He proceeded to the synagogue, where He explained the spiritual meaning of the miracle of the loaves and fishes (John vi. 59). Mark's account shows that Jesus passed through many villages on His way to Capernaum (Mark vi. 56).

II. We turn next to Josephus, who was thoroughly well acquainted with the district, and who has given an enthusiastic description of its beauty and fruitfulness at that time. He only twice mentions Capernaum

by name, but he does it in such a way as to bear decided witness in favour of Tell Hum. He relates in his *Life*, § 72, that when he was badly hurt by a fall from his horse at the mouth of the Jordan, he was first taken to the village of Kepharnome, and then on the same night to Taricheæ. Now it is clearly the most natural thing to suppose that, being much weakened by his injuries, he should have rested at the nearest village, Tell Hum, before he proceeded on his journey. In his "History of the Wars of the Jews" (iii., 10. 8), he mentions an abundant spring, Kaphernaum, which watered the Plain of Gennesareth, and which contained the *coracinus*, a fish that was found in the Nile. It is probably the 'Ain et-Tabigah, between Khan Minyeh and Tell Hum. This spring quite corresponds with the description given by the Jewish historian, and is surrounded by the ruins of an aqueduct which led the water along the sea shore to the northern end of the Plain; it is now used to water horses (compare "The Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 271, and Canon Tristram, "Bible Places," p. 264). Dr. Robinson endeavoured to show that the 'Ain et-Tin, near Khan Minyeh, was the spring mentioned by Josephus; but that spring does not possess the above-mentioned fish, and is too small, and lies too low, for purposes of irrigation. The 'Ain Mudawer has certainly plenty of water, and is full of fish, but it lies in too southerly a direction, and too far inland.

III. The *Jewish* and *Arabic* traditions are in favour of Tell Hum, where they also place the graves of the Prophet Nahum and of Rabbi Tanehum. Compare Thomson's "The Land and the Book," i., p. 546, and Furrer's article on Capernaum in Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, iii., p. 495.

IV. *Christian* tradition, which has been very active in localising Biblical occurrences, leaves us in the lurch in this instance, and gives no decisive opinion.

V. The *geographical* argument is overwhelmingly in favour of Khan Minyeh, which lies near the sea, and is a very suitable place to have a custom-house, and to be an emporium of trade on the present high road to Damascus. But traces are also to be found at Tell Hum and Kerāzeh of a high road of the same kind.

VI. The *archæological* argument taken from the name and the ruins is decidedly for Tell Hum. The name is manifestly identical with that of Capernaum. "Kefr," or "Kafr," means village, and "Tell" is a sort of hill or heap of ruins. A ruined Kefr becomes a Tell. "Hum" may be an abbreviation of Nahûm. The ruins of Tell Hum are so considerable that they must be those of a large village or town. They are lying in chaotic confusion, and extend over half an English mile in length and a quarter of a mile in breadth. Amongst the ruins, which have been carefully examined by Colonel Wilson, and which he has described in "The Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 268, are the columns and walls of the "white synagogue" that—if Tell Hum is Capernaum—was built for the Jews by the heathen captain, and in which Jesus often taught. In Khan Minyeh, on the contrary, no considerable mass of ruins has been discovered. Dr. Robinson supposes that the remains of

the town may have been sent to Tiberias by sea, and have been used up there for building purposes. But it is no easy matter to transport the ruins of a large town, and in addition to that those of a synagogue, to say nothing of the fact that Tiberias was already built (A.D. 20) while Capernaum was in a flourishing state.\*

If Tell Hum was not Capernaum it must have been Chorazin. But Chorazin is to be sought at Kerāzeh, where considerable ruins are to be found, as well as a synagogue of black basalt, and houses in good preservation. The name is evidently the same.

The position of the two other Galilean towns, Bethsaida and Chorazin, over which Jesus pronounced His "woe" (Matt. ix. 20-24), depends to a certain extent, but not entirely, on that given to ancient Capernaum. As for Bethsaida (Fish-house), the birthplace of Peter, Andrew, James, and John, it is generally known as the Galilean Bethsaida, in contradistinction to Bethsaida Julias, in Gaulonitis, and is then sought either in 'Ain et-Tabigah or in Khan Minyeh. But it is extremely improbable that two towns in such close proximity to each other should have had the same name. We therefore hold with Dr. Thomson ("The Land and the Book") that there was only *one* Bethsaida, which was situated near the place where the Jordan flows into the Sea of Galilee, and that, like many other towns, it was divided in two by the river.

The eastern part of the town, which was improved by Philip the Tetrarch, and where he died, was called Bethsaida Julias, to distinguish it from the village on the western bank of the river, and also in honour of Julia, the daughter of Augustus. This was done by the Tetrarch almost at the same time as his brother, the younger Herod, built the town of Tiberias, and called it after the Emperor Tiberius. There is no difficulty in deciding the position of this eastern Bethsaida, of which there are still some ruins in existence. It was always western or Galilean Bethsaida that was mentioned in the Gospels (John i. 44; xii. 21;

\* It is interesting to compare the conclusion at which this author arrived during his travels in Palestine in 1877 with the report given by Lieutenant Kitchener, who visited and mapped out this district on behalf of the Palestine Exploration Fund. He also identifies the spring Kapharnaüm with the 'Ain et-Tabigah, although he did not find any coracinus in it; but he says that the water was too muddy, and too much overgrown with reeds, for it to have been possible to see fish which, like the coracinus, always remain at the bottom of the water. The site of Capernaum he places at Khurbet Minyeh, a locality which he separates from Khan Minyeh, and reports that a great extent of ruins may be found there under the present surface of the ground, of which one can as yet only distinguish a few bits of wall. Kitchener makes the distance of the 'Ain et-Tabigah from Khurbet Minyeh three-quarters of an English mile, and from Tell Hum 1½ English miles; moreover, as the water of the spring was led in the opposite direction to that of Tell Hum in old times, the spring could scarcely have received its name of Kapharnaum (Josephus) from a village situated at the latter place. See *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1877, p. 122 f. This continued difference of opinion awakens all the greater desire for a thorough investigation of the subject, and this is what the English Society now proposes to undertake.—Ep.

Mark vi. 45; viii. 22; Luke ix. 10). Eastern Bethsaida was such an essentially heathen place that it had as little to do with the Gospels as the town of Tiberias.

Thus, until further research has been made, we may look for Chorazin in Kerāzeh, for Bethsaida on the Jordan opposite Bethsaida Julias, and for Capernaum in Tell Hum.

#### OBSERVATIONS ON THE ABOVE BY LIEUT. KITCHENER, R.E.

Some remarks appear to me to be necessary on Professor Schaff's summary of the existing evidence on the position of Capernaum.

I. In point Professor Schaff states that it would be simpler for travellers on foot to proceed with greater rapidity than a boat on the lake starting from Tell Hum rather than from Khan Minia, as the distances are proportional. Whether they both started from either place I cannot follow the Professor in his argument.

II. By following the very graphically described fight between Scilla and Josephus on the map, and working out the different movements of the troops, it appears certain that the position of the battle was between Tell Hum and the mouth of the Jordan. Tell Hum was therefore the Julias that Josephus was defending. It appears only natural that when wounded he should be carried to the first village in rear of the headquarters, which would be at Khurbet Minia. I am therefore of opinion that Josephus's testimony is decidedly in favour of Kh. Minia.

It being allowed that Ain Tabighah is the spring of Capernaum mentioned by Josephus, it cannot be too strongly pointed out that the water was undoubtedly carried to Kh. Minia directly in the opposite direction to Tell Hum.

III. Though I inquired diligently for the tomb of the Prophet Nahum around the lake, I could not find any Arabic or Jewish traditions locating that sanctuary at Tell Hum, or anywhere else near the lake.

Doubtless some Jews in Tiberias would say if asked, that the tomb was at Tell Hum, as they would say anything else.

V. I would suggest an addition to this point in the Professor's arguments: "But leading by a very circuitous route, and passing over a very difficult country."

As far as I could discover, this road led from Khurbet Minia to Tell Hum, thence to Kerāzeh—in other words, from Capernaum to Bethsaida, and thence to Chorazin. As Wildbad describes the journey, no doubt there was a road from Chorazin to the great Damascus road, but I found no traces of it, and it would pass over some very difficult country covered with loose blocks of basalt.

VI. The synagogue explored by Colonel Wilson, C.B., is evidently similar in date to others in the country, such as those at Kerāzeh, Irbid, and elsewhere. I have attempted in a paper (*Quarterly Statement*, 1877, p. 123) to prove the date of these synagogues, and that they