

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/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_peq_01.php

probability the remarkable Tell el Mutsellim, or Mutasellim, was the ark or fortress of both cities, but while Lejjun on the south of the Tell, doubtless represents Legio, it may be suggested that the site of the City of Megiddo is indicated by the remains extending northward and westward from the Tell, including el-Medineh, or "the City." Lieutenant Van de Velde places Megiddo on the Tell itself, but Robinson affirms that there is no trace of any kind to show that a city ever stood there. It appears to be quite impossible to separate Megiddo from the Kishon or Mukutta as Lieutenant Conder proposes. The alluring resemblance to the ancient name in Khurbet el Mujedda, is too heavily counterpoised by its situation in the Jordan Valley, at the eastern foot of Mount Gilboa, and south of Beisan; a situation not only too far apart from Taanach and the Kishon, but also divided from them by the bold Heights of Gilboa.

In connection with Megiddo, Dr. Robinson has contended against identifying Legio with Maximianopolis, which was said by Jerome to be a later name of Hadad-rimmon. In Dr. Robinson's opinion, this place had a more southerly site, and the suggestion has been confirmed by Lieutenant Van de Velde (i, 355), who claims Rummaneh near Tannuk as still retaining the essential part of the old name Hadad-rimmon; but he agrees with Van Rourmer against Robinson in connecting Legio with Maximianopolis.

10th July, 1880.

TRELAWNEY SAUNDERS.

II.

LIEUTENANT CONDER proposes to locate Megiddo by the Jordan in the plain of Beisan, where the name *Mujedda* yet remains. In his "Handbook" he says "Egyptian and Assyrian records do not as yet cast much light on the subject." There is one passage of interest which confirms his conjecture. It is given in *Brugsch's Egypt* (English edition) ii, p. 106, in a poem of Pentaur, of the time of Ramses II. It reads as there given, "Describe Bethsheal, Thargaal, the Ford of Jirduna how it is cursed. Teach me to know the passage in order to enter into the city of Makitha, which lies in front of it." This, if correctly rendered, seems conclusive.

ARCH. HENDERSON.

ON THE RIVER KANAH, THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH.

THE River Kanah* was identified by Dr. Robinson† with the present Wady Kanah, a name applied to a part of the main channel of the system of watercourses which has its outfall through the Nahr el Auja. The main channel begins near Yanun, 7 miles south-east of

* Joshua xvi, 8; xvii, 9.

† Robinson's "Bib. Researches," iii, 135; "Phys. Geog. Holy Land," 100.

Nablus (Shechem) on the edge of the Jordan Valley, and at an altitude of 2,700 feet above the sea. It passes through the Plain (Sahel) of Muknah, and between Ain Abûs and Kuzah ; descending from the mountains into the Plain of Jaffa at a place called es-Zakur, on the south of Hableh. The highland here has a height of 469 feet, while the plain at its foot is only 125 feet at Jiljulieh. Beyond Jiljulieh the Wady has a permanent stream and turns abruptly, running to the southwest for about 4 miles as far as Tell (Mount) el Mukhmar, where it receives three large tributaries, and continues to the sea as the Nahr-el Auja (Crooked River). The outlet into the Mediterranean is nearly 4 miles north of Jaffa.

Stretching across the country from the edge of the Jordan Valley to the sea-shore, the Wady Kanah appears to be well fitted on that account to mark the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh. But two objections have been made to it. The first, because it excludes the important city of Shechem (Nablûs) from the territory of Ephraim ; and the second, because it reduces Ephraim to a width which is deemed to be unequal to the importance of that dominating tribe. Hence attempts have been made to identify the River Kanah with other watercourses further north.

The Palestine Exploration Map throws new light on the identification of the River Kanah with Wady Kanah, through its exposition of the places which are connected with the River,* in the biblical record of the boundary. In Joshua xvi, 6-8, it is written :

“ And the border went out toward the sea to Micmethah on the north side and the border went about eastward unto Taanath-Shiloh, and passed by it on the east to Janohah ; and it went down from Janohah to Ataroth, and to Naarath and came to Jericho, and went out at Jordan. The border went out from Tappuah westward unto the river Kanah : and the goings out thereof were at the sea.”

Joshua xvii, 7-9, contains a parallel passage, much amplified, with reference to Tappuah, which it will save repetition to quote further on.

The interpretation of the passages receives fresh light and remarkable distinctness from the Palestine Exploration Map. Micmethah in Joshua xvi, is connected with Asher in Joshua xvii, Micmethah is the starting point eastward in chapter xvi, and westward in chapter xvii. In the latter, “ Asher - ham - Micmethah in the Hebrew is rendered in the authorised version “ Asher to Micmethah,” but some critics consider that the Hebrew relates to one place, and for this view there will be seen to be some foundation. Asher means “ happy,” Micmethah means to sink, perhaps together the words may be translated – the happy depression or valley. On turning to the new map to discover “ Asher-ham-Micmethah that lieth before Shechem,” there will be found the ruin El-Azeir (Asher) in the Plain of Muknah (Micmethah,) just outside

* In Hebrew *Nachal*, which like the Arabic “ Wady ” signifies a torrent, bed or watercourse

Shechem, on the high road to Jerusalem, and on the south side of Wady Kanah. The identification of Micmethah with the Plain of Muknah is suggested by Lieutenant Conder, R.E., in his "Handbook to the Bible," page 264; but he takes no notice of El-Azeir, except to insert it on the map. Following up the text eastward, Taanath-Shiloh was identified by Dr. Robinson* with Tāna, a ruined site on the edge of the eastward arm of the Plain of Muknah. From Tāna, the border "passed by on the east to Janohah," which has been identified with Yanun,† a village and ruined site on the mountain which lies on the south of Tana, and close to the easternmost head of Wady Kanah. From Yanun (Janohah,) the eastern boundary of Ephraim is carried on in Joshua xvi to Jericho and the Jordan, but its discussion is deferred, for the sake of pursuing the identification of the northern boundary from Asher-ham-Micmethah (el-Azeir in the Muknah) westward. The text of Joshua xvii, 7, 8, 9, is as follows :

"And the coast of Manasseh was from Asher to Micmethah, that lieth before Shechem; and the border went along on the right hand unto the inhabitants of En-tappuah. Now Manasseh had the land of Tappuah; but Tappuah on the border of Manasseh *belonged* to the children of Ephraim; and the coast descended unto the river Kanah, southward of the river. These cities of Ephraim *are* among the cities of Manasseh. The coast of Manasseh also *was* on the north side of the river, and the outgoings of it were at the sea."

Turning now to the Palestine Exploration Map, it will be found that between Ain Abus and the confluence of Wady Yasūf the Wady Kanah, here named Wady Jerrā, makes a long bend to the north, and in the bend is situated Khurbet (ruin) Tafsah. This name is taken to be a corruption of the Hebrew "Tappuah;" and the Biblical record appears to mean that the boundary, after following the Kanah from El-Azeir (Asher) to Ain Abus, instead of going along the arc formed by the northward deflection of the Wady, strikes a chord-line across from east to west, leaving the land of Tappuah (Tafsah) "on the right hand," so that "Manasseh had the land of Tappuah;" although if the line of the Wady Kanah had been followed strictly, Tappuah would have belonged to Ephraim. Thus in agreement with the sacred text, the coast here "descended southward of the river," and these cities on the Ephraimite side, became "among the cities of Manasseh." Still the text maintains, that, "the coast of Manasseh also (or nevertheless) was (that is as a rule) on the north side of the river, and the outgoings of it were at the sea."

Lieutenant Conder, following names in the "Samaritan Chronicle" and the "Septuagint" places Tappuah at the village of Yasuf, which he says, is at the head of the Wady Kanah; ("Handbook to the Bible," p. 263). But Yasuf is really at the head of the small branch named Wady Yasuf, which joins Wady Kanah near the western end of the

* "Bib. Res." iii, 295.

† Van de Velde's "Travels," ii, 303. Robinson's "Bib. Res." iii, 297.

Tappuan chord-line. After the foregoing explanation, it seems unnecessary to carry the boundary so far south of the Kanah.

Regarding "the outgoings at the sea" Dr. Robinson has expressed the opinion that instead of the boundary of Manasseh following the river as the text implies, it proceeds probably from the point where the watercourse leaves the highland in a direct line to the sea, at or near Arsûf. (Robinson's "Phys. Geog. Holy Land," p. 100.) If this were not the case before the tribe of Dan received its allotment, there is evidence that it was so afterwards, for the Palestine Exploration Survey has discovered on the north of the Nahr-el-Auja (River Kanah) an ancient site, which is now named Tell er Râkeit, with which the Danite town of Har-Rakon or Rakkon is identified. Dr. Robinson's proposal is thus confirmed.

In support of the objections to the identification of Wady Kanah with the biblical River Kanah, two other Wadys have been proposed.

The southernmost is the Wady esh Shair, in connection with 'Ain-el-Kusab (Khassab), at its source on the north-western outskirts of Shechem, at the foot of Jebel Eslamiyah (Mount Ebal). The meaning of Kanah is "reedy," and Kusab is held to mean the same.* The Wady esh Shair, called also Wady Zeimer, was supposed to reach the Mediterranean through Nahr-el-Falik (Falaik). But the Palestine Exploration Survey has rectified this error, and shows that the outfall is really through Nahr Iskanderuneh, formerly named Nahr Abu Zabura.

The northern competitor is Nahr-el-Akhdar, called Nahr-el-Mefjir in the Palestine Exploration Map. This outlet is the recipient of three main channels, viz: (1) Wady Abu Kaslan, rising near Yasid, six miles north of Shechem; (2) Wadyes Selhab, rising near Akabeh, 12 miles north-east of Shechem; and (3) Wady Arak, rising near Umm el Fahm, 25 miles north-west of Shechem. Both (2) and (3) may be dismissed as untenable, because they take Ephraim so far north as to leave no room for Manasseh between Ephraim and Issachar. Dothan is on the south of Wady Selhab.

In connection with both of the proposals to find the River Kanah on the north of Shechem, Yasir (Teiasir in the P.E. Map) has been taken as the probable site of Asher. See Dr. Grove's note on Asher, art. Manasseh, "Smith, Bib. Dict." ii, 520. But Yasir (Teiasir) is more than 12 miles from Shechem, and separated from it by three mountain ranges; whereas el Azeir is at the foot of Mount Gerizim (Jebel et Tor), and thus more truly "lieth before Shechem." It is, however, a curious circumstance that Teiasir is found on a Wady Mukhnawy, just as el-Aseir is on the Sahel Mukhna. The advocates of the Wady esh Shair, have, however, a much better Asher for their purpose in Asfret el Hatab, lying at the northern base of Mount Ebal (Jebel Eslamiyah), and in a Wady connected with Wady esh Shair. As no Tappuanah, however, can be found anywhere

* This identification was proposed by Rabbi Schwarz, and Dr. Grove seems to prefer it in his article "Kanah," and also in the article "Manasseh," in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible."

north of Wady Kanah, the conclusion is in favour of that line, where it is found with the rest of the points identified. With regard to the Ephraimite city of Shechem, being found within the tribal limits of Manasseh, it may be remarked, that the parcel of land which Jacob bought at Shechem was bequeathed to Joseph, and although Manasseh was his eldest son, the patriarch Jacob's blessing fell upon Ephraim, taking effect in the elevation of Joshua, who appears to have recovered possession of Jacob's land at Shechem without a struggle; and having made the place his capital, and the gathering place of all the tribes, it probably became a seat of his own immediate family and followers. Perhaps the extension of Manasseh south of the Kanah was a compensation to Manasseh for the Ephraimite possession of Shechem, and it may have been for the more complete satisfaction of Manasseh, that Shechem was surrendered by Ephraim, first as a city of refuge and afterwards to the Kohathite Levites. Nothing in subsequent events serves to throw any light on the Kanah as a boundary.

TRELAWNEY SAUNDERS.

NOTES ON DISPUTED POINTS.

MR. BIRCH's papers must be regarded as of great interest to the subscribers of the Palestine Exploration Fund. I would, however, venture to defend myself against some of the objections which he has raised in the previous *Quarterly Statement*.

Tombs of the Kings (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 167). Mr. Birch objects that the site I have proposed is beyond the limits of Zion. I am, however, not aware of any direct statement in the Bible to the effect that the Kings were buried on Zion.

The Kings were buried in the City of David, which Mr. Birch places on Ophel. This identification appears to me improbable for several reasons. 1st. It is contrary to the account of Josephus (whose authority Mr. Birch however denies). 2nd. The wall on Ophel was not one *enclosing*, but one *outside* the City of David (2 Chronicles xxxiii, 14). 3rd. Millo was according to the LXX, the same as Akra, and was in the City of David. Mr. Birch must, it would seem, either remove Akra to the Ophel ridge, or must discard this ancient identification of Millo.

This question is one which of course presents difficulties or it would not have been a matter of dispute for the last half century. Theories however, which discard the evidence of Josephus and other ancient authorities may perhaps be thought to be less satisfactory than those which aim at reconciling every ancient account.

The reason why I have supposed Asa and Ahaziah not to have been buried in the tomb of David is that each is recorded to have been buried in his own sepulchre (2 Chronicles xvi, 14; 2 Kings ix, 28). It is