

clasp themselves about the great verities of our faith ; then whatever tempests be abroad they will harm us no more than the noise of the wind in their branches harms the strong oaks of the forest. Wherefore, "be not children in mind ; but in mind be men."

GEORGE JACKSON.

JERUSALEM FROM REHOBOAM TO HEZEKIAH.

(Concluded.)

6. AMAZIAH, circa 797-789 or 779.

THE history, confined in the last reign to Jerusalem, spreads in this upon wider arenas, but only to return to the capital with disastrous effects.

The murdered king was succeeded by his son, Amaziah : proof that the assassins had been provoked not by hatred to the dynasty, but by what they regarded as their victim's own fault, whether in the surrender to Hazael or in the murder of Zechariah. Amaziah, indeed, appears to have owed his elevation to the assassins, for we read that *as soon as* (which means *not until*) *the kingdom was firmly in his grasp he slew them*. It is noteworthy not only that a usurping faction should thus find the house of David indispensable to the kingdom, but that this house should be able so bravely to show its independence of every faction and its ability to punish even more or less justifiable assaults upon its representatives. This endurance of dynastic authority is not the only relief to the depressing tales of intrigue, tumult and bloodshed, in which the history of Jerusalem at this period so largely consists. For the execution of the murderers of Joash was signalized by an innovation, which betrays the existence of impulses—to whatever source they may be assigned—surely making for a higher morality. The editor records that Amaziah did not also slay the

children of the murderers, and recognizes in this his obedience to the Deuteronomic law : *the fathers shall not be put to death for the children nor the children for the fathers, every man shall be put to death for his own sin.*¹ The fact that such a law was required is of itself proof that early Israel had shared the widespread feeling of the time, that in the guilt of an individual the members of his family were involved. It is true, we are not quite clear whether this feeling was universal in antiquity. In the Code of Hammurabi there is no trace of the extension of the capital penalty from a criminal to his children ; but these could be sold into slavery for their father's debts.² Early society regarded the family as the moral unit. In the absence of a law or strong public opinion to the contrary the passion of private revenge, to which ancient jurisprudence largely left the punishment for murder, would not hesitate to work itself out upon the family of the criminal, as it does to-day among the Bedouin. And it is easy to see how even public justice could go to that extreme under the prevailing idea of the moral solidarity of the family. In Israel there were already current during our period traditions of how the children of criminals had, at certain crises, been put to death for their father's crimes by the supreme authority ;³ and in the Book of the Covenant, the only code of the period, there was no law to the contrary. Deuteronomy is the earliest code which contains such a law. We may be sure, too, that the editor of the Book of Kings did not invent the story of Amaziah's sparing of the murderers' children. He must have found it in the sources from which he drew his materials ; and he hails it, as he does every other approximation to the Deuteronomic standards. But if the annals of Judah mentioned the fact, this can only have been because it was recognized as something unusual.

¹ 2 Kings xiv. 5 f. ; Deut. xxiv. 16.

² § 117.

³ Josh. vii. 24 ff. ; 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.

We may, therefore, add this leniency on the part of Amaziah to the symptoms, not a few, which the troubled period reveals of the presence of influences gradually elevating the social ethics of Judah. The particular innovation was not, as we have seen, inspired by the Book of the Covenant. Whence, then, did it spring? From the king's own resolution, or from his religious advisers, or from such a general discontent with the cruelty of the ancient custom as would probably arise in the generally improved ethics of the community? We cannot tell. Only of this may we be reasonably sure, that it was thus gradually, and even sporadically, that many ameliorations of ancient custom arose in Israel, which were finally articulated and enforced in such definite codes as form our Book of Deuteronomy. The Spirit of the God of Israel, nowhere more manifest than in Jerusalem, working on individuals or on the general conscience of the community, modified or annulled, one by one, the harsher and baser elements of that consuetudinary law, which Israel had inherited as a member of the Semitic race. A code like the Book of Deuteronomy was not brought forth at a stroke, but was the expression of the gradual results of the age-long working of the Spirit of the Living God in the hearts of His people.

The vigour and originality which this episode evinces were next illustrated by Amaziah in defeating the Edomites. The scene was the *Ravine of Salt*, probably the present Wady el-Milḥ, in the south of Judah.¹ The Sela', or Rock, which Amaziah took and called Joḳthéel, can hardly have been the later Nabatean capital, Petra; which, as Buhl has shown, is probably not mentioned in the Old Testament.² It was surely no chief town of Edom that Amaziah

¹ 2 Kings xiv. 7. The expression 'ל or 'ס' does not suit the wide valley of the Arabah, which Benzinger takes as the scene of the battle. Benzinger also takes the Sela' as Petra.

² *Gesch. der Edomiter*, 35 ff.

took, or else the subjection of the people to Judah would have been mentioned ; but some citadel which guarded the road from Judah to the Red Sea. Amaziah had sought to open this road, and his success is proved by the fact that its goal, Elath, was held and fortified by his successor.¹

Elated by this victory, Amaziah sent a wanton challenge to Joash of Israel. Their armies met at Beth-Shemesh. If this was the Beth-Shemesh at the mouth of one of the passes from the Philistine country towards Jerusalem, Israel's choice of such a point of attack on Judah may be explained either by an alliance between them and the Philistines or by such tactics as led many of the Seleucid generals to approach Jerusalem from the Shephelah rather than upon a more direct road from the north. But there may have been another place of the same name on the northern frontier of Judah. In any case, after defeating Amaziah, Joash did deliver his attack on Jerusalem from the north—the first of many recorded assaults on that side of the city where alone the fortifications are not surrounded by deep ravines—and *brake down four hundred cubits of the wall from the gate of Ephraim to the corner-gate*, probably at the north-western corner of the city, and despoiled the Temple and the Palace.²

It was probably in consequence of this defeat that the people of Jerusalem conspired against Amaziah.³ He fled to Lakish, but they sent after him and slew him, and brought back his body on horses. Once again the dynasty of David survived the fall of its chief. Whatever the plans of the Jerusalem conspirators had been, *all the people of Judah took Azariah and made him king in room of his father Amaziah*. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to see in these events another instance of the opposition we perceived in Athaliah's

¹ 2 Kings xiv. 22.

² 2 Kings xiv. 8-14, from an Israelite document.

³ 2 Kings xiv. 19 ff., probably from the Judean annals.

time between the citizens of the capital and the country population. But we may take the opportunity to recall all the different interests and parties which we have found moving in the history of Judah at this time. These are the dynasty, the priesthood, the princes of Judah, the populace of Jerusalem, the people of the land, and, for a time, the foreign, heathen elements.

7. UZZIAH OR AZARIAH, 789 OR 779-740.

With the moral and political factors in her life which have been noted in this and previous articles, Jerusalem entered the long and prosperous reign of Uzziah.

The editor of the Books of Kings records from his sources but two events in this reign, the restoration of the Red Sea port of Elath to Judah, to which we have already referred, and the king's leprosy. When this stroke befell Uzziah *he lived in his own house relieved of the duties of governing, and Jotham the king's son judged the people of the land.*¹ At what date this happened we are not told. It has been supposed that the variant numbers assigned to Jotham's reign in 2 Kings xv. 30 and 33 refer the—*sixteen* years to Jotham's regency during his father's life, and the *twenty* to that *plus* the years of his reign after his father's death. In this case Uzziah resigned the government about 755, for Jotham died in 735. But it is equally probable that Uzziah did not resign till 750.

On the other hand, the Chronicler's account of the reign

¹ 2 Kings xv. 5. The Hebrew text has בְּבֵית הַחֵפְשִׁית, which some of the Versions (ancient and modern) render a *separate house*, others a *house of freedom* (i.e. instead of being shut up with other lepers). Klostermann emends בְּבֵיתָהּ הַחֵפְשִׁית, *in his own house, free or unmolested*. But if we accept this reading, it is most natural, both because of the clause which follows (*and Jotham the king's son was over the palace, judging the people of the land*) and because of other uses of חֵפְשִׁי, to take this as meaning *free from the duties of government*; cf. the use of חֵפְשִׁי in Mishnic Hebrew, *free* as a corpse is from the obligations of the law, or as Saul was by his death from the kingly office. See Levy, *N. H. und Chald. Wörterbuch*.

is very full.¹ Apart from his explanation of Uzziah's leprosy, which is obviously due to the influence of the Levitical system in his own time, and such details as the size of the Judæan army (and perhaps the engines ascribed to Uzziah), the account is evidently drawn from earlier sources, and is confirmed by what the prophets tell us of the state of Judah at the end of Uzziah's reign. According to the Chronicler, then, Uzziah made expeditions against the Philistines,² the Arabs in Gur or Gerar,³ and the Me'onim—all of them tribes upon the avenues of Judah's commerce with the south.

In the southern desert the king built towers, the best means (also known to the Romans and the Turks) of keeping the nomads in subjection and the desert roads open.⁴ *And he hewed many cisterns, for he had much cattle in the Shephelah and the Mishor or Plain, most probably the level land at the foot of the Shephelah hills, and vinedressers in the mountains and the garden-land, for he was a lover of husbandry.*⁵

¹ 2 Chron. xxvi.

² Verse 6. As the building of cities by Uzziah in Philistine territory is questionable, it has been proposed to read *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר בְּאַשְׁדּוֹד*, now *Jabneh is a city in Ashdod*; and to take *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר* as a superfluous gloss.

³ Verse 7. For *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר בְּגֵרָר* read *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר בְּגֵרָר*. Winckler (*Gesch.* i. 46) then proposes to take *גֵרָר* as the same name as Gari in the Tell el Amarna Letters (Lond. 64, l. 28), which he takes as equivalent to Edom. *גֵרָר*, however, may be a corruption of *גֵרָר*, Gerar, which is read by the Targum: cf. 2 Chronicles xiv. 13. For *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר בְּגֵרָר* Kittel proposes *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר בְּגֵרָר*, which, however, is only partly justified by the LXX.

⁴ Cf. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, I. *passim*.

⁵ Verse 10. This sentence seems compounded from more than one source, or at least to have had additions made to it, and is therefore as it stands ambiguous. If the Hebrew text be retained, its accents must be discarded, and *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר*, without a conjunction, taken with the preceding *and in the Shephelah and on the Plain*. But if with the LXX. we omit *וַיִּבְנֶה עִיר*, as well as the conjunction before *בשפלה*, then the verse will run as given above. The verse is interesting as giving the different kinds of land of which Judah was composed. The *Mishor* cannot be, as Ewald and Buhl assert (*Geog. des Alten Palästina*, p. 104), the Moabite *Mishor* or Plateau, for that lay outside Uzziah's domains, but either part of the 'Arabah south of the Dead Sea or the level land at the foot of the Shephelah hills. The last

In Jerusalem itself, according to the Chronicler, Uzziah made some simple additions to the walls. *He built towers in Jerusalem over the Gate of the Corner, that is on the extreme north-east, and over the Gate of the Ravine, on the south of the City, and upon the angles or turnings of the walls, and made them strong.*¹ This is a notice credible both in itself and from the great increase in building which distinguished the king's reign.² It represents a development of the fortifications of Jerusalem which is well within the ascertained achievements of the age in military engineering, and which was probably forced upon the defenders of Jerusalem by their experience of the ease with which the Israelite army had made a long breach in the northern wall. From as early as the fourth millennium³ Babylonian engineers built the walls of fortresses with a regular sequence of right angles, out and in, with heavy towers over the gates and at the corners, so that the besieged could command with their bows the foot of the walls and prevent these from being breached by the besiegers.⁴ The Syrian and other fortresses attacked by the Assyrians in the ninth and eighth centuries are represented, almost without exception, as polygonal.⁵ Very frequently the walls are double or even treble, and in general they are furnished with battlements, casemates and loopholes. But the main feature is the tower projecting from the wall and manned by archers, who shoot over its

is most probable because of the conjunction of the Mishōr with the Shephelah. But if this be so, we have another reason (besides those given in my *Hist. Geog.*, p. 202) for confining the name Shephelah to the range of low hills west of the Judæan range, and holding it to have been distinct from the maritime Plain; this as against Buhl, *loc. cit.*

¹ Verse 9, The Hebrew has the singular, but the LXX. gives the more probable plural.

² See below, the third paragraph from this.

³ See the plan of a fortress engraved on the lap of the statue of Gudea.

⁴ *Die Festungsbau im Alten Orient*, by A. Billerbeck in *Der Alte Orient* series, 1900, Heft 4, pp. 11, etc., with plans.

⁵ *Idem*, p. 14.

breast-work at the advancing foe.¹ Of all this long-developed science Uzziah's engineers appear to have employed only the gate towers and the flanking towers at angles where the walls turned round the city or bent with the natural line of rock. Probably this was all that was required on the walls of Jerusalem, which for the most part were planted on the edge of deep ravines high above the reach of breaching engines. At least Uzziah's flanking towers fully served their purpose. Where before his reign the comparatively small forces of northern Israel had made a long breach on the northern wall, the only breachable part of the defences, after his reign the engines of Assyria herself failed to effect an entrance. On all these grounds we may accept the Chronicler's report of Uzziah's fortification of his capital. We shall find this developed by Uzziah's immediate successors.

It is different, however, with the armament which the Chronicler declares Uzziah to have placed upon the walls. *And he made in Jerusalem engines, the invention of an engineer, or ingenious man, to be on the towers and the angles to shoot arrows and great stones.*¹ Benzinger thinks that the redundant expressions "speak for the age of this notice; at the time of the Chronicler there were no more such marvels. It is true that nowhere else in the Old Testament are such engines mentioned. But since the Assyrians had them, they cannot have remained unknown to the Israelites." This reasoning is doubtful both in its premises and conclusion. Billerbeck states that "the ancient artillery," with its engines for shooting arrows and throwing stones, first appears in the fifth century before Christ.² I cannot find any such engines pictured on the Assyrian or Egyptian pictures of battles or sieges in the eighth or previous centuries, and it is strange that if

¹ So in nearly all Assyrian and Egyptian pictures of sieges. ² Verse 15.

³ Op. cit. p. 5.

Uzziah had used them the prophets who describe other novel constructions of the time should fail to speak of them. The next earliest notice of shooting instruments in Jewish writings is 1 Maccabees vi. 51.¹

The Chronicler also ascribes to Uzziah the organization and equipment of a huge army.² We may question the total number given, 307,500; but the number of heads of families who had to furnish the fighting men, 2,600, is not improbable, and the Chronicler cannot have invented the names of the officials charged with the levy. Uzziah re-armed his host.

Those records of Uzziah's activity, in which we have seen no inherent improbability, are confirmed by the evidence of the Prophets at the close of that monarch's reign. There is, as we should expect, a background of agriculture and pasture to the pictures of the national life presented by Amos and Isaiah.³ But against that background rises, in a way novel in Israel's history, an extraordinary enterprise in building⁴—the instruments and material of which are used familiarly as religious figures,⁵ and one of the names, *'armōn*, hitherto limited to royal castles, is applied to private dwellings—with an increase of all manner of wealth and luxury.⁶ But these imply a great development of trade; and of this and of the tempers it breeds the Prophets give us direct evidence. Amos describes an excessive zeal in buying and selling. Hosea calls northern Israel a very *Canaanite*, or trader.⁷ Isaiah says *Judah is filled from the East, she strikes hands with*

¹ The דָּגָר of 2 Kings xxv. 1 and Ezek. iv. 2, etc., are towers manned by archers and pushed forward on wheels or rollers.

² Verses 11-14.

³ Amos ii. 13, iii. 12, iv. 9, v. 11, 16 f., vi. 12, vii. 1 ff., viii. 6. Cf. Isaiah i. 3, 8, iii. 14, v. 1-10, 17, vii. 23, ix. 3, etc.

⁴ Amos iii. 15, v. 11, etc. Hos. viii. 14. Isaiah ii. 15, ix. 10 (9).

⁵ Amos vii. 7 ff.; cf. Isaiah xxxviii. 16, xxx. 13.

⁶ Amos iv. 4 f., etc.; Hos. xii. 8; Isaiah ii. 7, etc.

⁷ xii. 7; cf. vii. 8, viii. 10.

the sons of strangers,¹ and mentions ships of Tarshish and caravans.² The sins of trade: the covetousness which oppressed the poor, and threatened the old religious festivals, false weights, and lying are exposed and condemned.³ Whether Uzziah throughout his long reign remained under that subjection to northern Israel which was confirmed by Amaziah's defeat at Beth-shemesh, or gradually advanced to more equal relations with Jeroboam II., it is difficult to say. In either case the two kingdoms were at peace, and between them commanded the trade from Elath to the borders of Phœnicia and Damascus. So great a commerce was in the hands mainly of foreigners—Arabs according to Isaiah,⁴ and doubtless also Arameans.⁵ These must have brought into Judah many foreign products and inventions; a familiarity also with life and institutions both in Assyria and Egypt. The Assyrian armies had been as far south as Damascus and were still moving in northern Syria. Isaiah describes the aspect of their ranks; and through the other prophets there beats the sense of their irresistibility.

The effect of all this on Jerusalem may be easily conceived. The City must have regained the measure of prosperity which she enjoyed under Solomon, and despite her political separation from northern Israel may even have risen beyond that. As through the rest of her history before the Exile we are without any data for estimating the number of her population, and with very few for determining the space covered by her buildings. The passages quoted above from Isaiah imply a large increase of the foreign elements in her population. Many at least of these alien traders would be accommodated outside the walls: most probably in a suburb along the northern

¹ ii. 6.² ii. 16, xxx. 6.³ Amos ii. 6, iv. 1, viii. 4 ff. Hos. xii. 7. Isaiah iii. 15, v. 23, etc.⁴ ii. 6. ⁵ *Encycl. Bibl.* "Trade and Commerce," § 51.

wall, which there is no reason to doubt still ran from the Corner Gate near the present Jaffa Gate eastwards to the north end of the Temple enclosure. Within the walls the inhabitants would be more crowded than before, the buildings more numerous, compact and lofty. Isaiah, as we shall see in our next study, prophesies in presence of the characteristic tempers of a large city life. In the national wealth the Temple must have shared; its revenues would be rapidly increasing. Thus, in every direction, the material political and moral forces with which Jerusalem entered the long reign of Uzziah were greatly developed before its close.

8. JOTHAM, REGENT FROM 755 OR 750; KING 740-735.

The only addition to the buildings of Jerusalem ascribed to Jotham by the Books of Kings is *the upper gate of the Temple*,¹ probably the same as Jeremiah's *upper gate of Benjamin*, and Ezekiel's *northern gate*.² The Chronicler adds that Jotham *built much on the wall of the Ophel*.³ The position of The Ophel is clearly determined by the data of Nehemiah and Josephus. It lay on the eastern hill south of the Temple and above Gihon. As we have seen, from an early time a wall ran up the eastern edge of the hill, and this wall Jotham now strengthened, probably in the same style as that of his father's additional fortifications.

The name Ophel raises an interesting question. It does not certainly occur in pre-exilic writings,⁴ though there is

¹ 2 Kings xv. 35.

² Jer. xx. 2; Ezek. viii. 3, ix. 2.

³ 2 Chron. xxvii. 3.

⁴ Of the two occurrences in prophecy, Isa. xxxii. 14 and Micah iv. 8, the former is not found in the LXX., and is probably a later insertion, while the latter cannot confidently be assigned to Micah. Nehemiah, iii. 26 f. and xi. 21, gives the name as already familiar, and places it south of the Temple and above Gihon. The only other occurrences of the name in the Old Testament are the passage above and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14. The

no reason against its having been in use at an earlier time. The interesting point, however, is that the name Ophel is not used in the Old Testament except by writers who do not employ the name Şion. We saw that both the Chronicler and Ezra-Nehemiah seem to have avoided the name Şion except in the two cases in which the Chronicler uses it of the old Jebusite citadel,¹ and now we find that it is in these writers alone that the name Ophel appears. The two names apply to practically the same site; nor are they dissimilar in meaning; for while The Ophel is "The Mound," or "Swelling," Şion (as we saw)² most probably meant "protuberance, shoulder or summit of a ridge." Naturally, therefore, the following questions arise: Were Şion and The Ophel contemporary and alternative names for the same site? Or, when the name Şion was removed (as we saw) from the ridge above Giĥon, did the name, The Ophel, succeed it there? If the former, then we have an explanation of the appearance of The Ophel only in writings which avoid the use of Şion; if the latter, we understand the confinement of the name The Ophel to the later literature.

9 AHAZ, 735 ?

The fortifications of Jerusalem strengthened by Uzziah and Jotham were speedily to be tested. The political calm in which Israel and Judah had lived for a number of years began to be disturbed soon after 745 by forces both from without and from within. In that year the Assyrian throne was ascended by a strong soldier who, under the title of Tiglath-Pileser III., revived a vigorous policy of

Ophlas of Josephus is evidently on the same position as the Ophel of Nehemiah: on the east wall just south of the Temple (v. *B.J.* iv. 2), near the Temple and the Kidron valley (Id. vi. 1; cf. ii. *B.J.* xvii. 9, and vi. *B.J.* vi. 3).

¹ See this vol. of the *Expositor*, pp. 7 f.

² Id. p. 3.

conquest, which, however, owing to the numerous directions on which it had to be prosecuted, could not be steadily sustained along any one of them. For the next fifteen years politics in Palestine swung upon the ebb and flow of Assyrian invasion. In Northern Israel this oscillation was aggravated after the close of Jeroboam's long reign by the overthrow of his dynasty and the succession of various short-lived usurpers. In 738 the second of these, Menahem, became, along with some of his neighbours, tributary to Tiglath-Pileser, then moving south on one of his Syrian campaigns. But for the next three years Tiglath-Pileser was occupied on the north of Assyria, and taking advantage of his absence short-sighted parties in all the Syrian states dared to form a new league against him. When Menahem died in 735, those in Israel who sympathized with this movement slew his son, and, raising their leader, Pekah, a Gileadite, to the throne, made alliance against Assyria with Reşin, or Raşon, of Damascus. It seems to have been Jotham's refusal to join them which stirred the allies against him.¹ But Jotham died in 735, and it was his son Ahaz who had to face their invasion of Judah,² with its aim of displacing the king by a creature of their own.³ Isaiah has himself described the panic which ensued in Jerusalem under this danger to the City and the Dynasty of David. *Now it was told to the house of David that Aram was pitched in Ephraim, and his heart and the heart of his people quivered as the trees of the jungle quiver before the wind.*⁴ Probably it was under this alarm that the superstitious king *made his son to pass through the fire*⁵; which can only mean a sacrifice by burning in order to propitiate the divine powers in some extreme danger.

¹ 2 Kings xv. 37.

² Id. xvi. 5.

³ Isaiah vii. 6.

⁴ Isaiah vii. 2.

⁵ 2 Kings xvi. 3; LXX. reads *sons*, so 2 Chron. xxviii. 3.

Isaiah nowhere alludes by word to this horror. But we may perhaps find the prophet's rebuke of so awful a sacrifice to despair in his taking with him to meet the king his own son, whom he also had dedicated, but to hope, by the symbolic name *She'ar-jashub, a remnant shall return*. They met at the end of the conduit of the Upper Pool on the highway by the Fuller's field. It is the same spot from which in 701 the Assyrian Rabshakeh addressed his challenge to the defenders of Jerusalem. It lay, therefore, outside the walls; note also the command to Isaiah to go forth to it. But beyond this we cannot tell certainly where it lay. On the one hand, it is reasonable to seek for the Fuller's field in the Kidron valley, where the only spring in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem is found. Here the Upper Pool might be identified with the inner of the two pools of Siloam¹ and, the conduit with the rock-cut channel leading directly to the Siloam gardens.² We would then have the explanation of the existence of the end of a conduit outside the City walls, for in this case the conduit was for the purpose of irrigating the gardens. Or we may take the Upper Pool to have been the basin into which Gihon (the Virgin Fountain) issues, and the conduit that which Dr. Masterman discovered along the edge of Ophel. But if the Upper Pool and its conduit were any part of the system of Shiloah, it is singular that this name is not given to them. Moreover, Sir Charles Wilson thinks that "the conduit of the Upper Pool must have been on the north of the City, because no general commanding an army would

¹ As I have done in a previous paper in this series, *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1903, pp. 222 f., Stade identifies the Upper Pool with the pool which Guthe believed he had discovered separate from the inner Siloam pool (Stade, *Gesch.* i. p. 592 n.), but Guthe's supposed pool is probably, as the more extended excavations of Bliss have shown, only a part of the inner Siloam pool.

² As Dr. Masterman writes me in correction of my statement, *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1903, p. 222, that this channel connects the inner pool with Birket el Hamra.

go down to the mouth of the Tyropœon valley to parley with the men on the wall, but would speak to them from some plateau on the north.”¹ He has suggested that the Upper Pool may have been one which in the eleventh century existed under the name of “the Lake of Legerius,” at the head of the Tyropœon valley, and that the conduit was one on the east hill by which water was led from the same locality to the Temple enclosure.² In any case the Upper Pool can hardly have been, as many have thought, the Birket Mamilla.

Ahaz, when Isaiah found him, was probably inspecting the water supplies in order to prevent their use by the expected invaders. Against these the fortifications of Uzziah and Jotham were found sufficient. Syria and Israel came up against Jerusalem, but were not able to breach or to storm it.³ The invasion, however, meant losses to Judah in other directions. The Edomites recovered Elath from the Jews,⁴ and the Philistines took several towns in the Shephelah.⁵

The waters of Shiloah or Shilloah⁶ are mentioned by Isaiah in another address during the reign of Ahaz. As we saw in the study of the Waters of Jerusalem this name, which means sent or conducted, must refer to some part of the system of aqueducts by which the waters of Gihon were led to the mouth of the Tyropœon. If the famous tunnel which now carries them under Ophel to the Pool of Siloam was the work of the engineers of Hezekiah,

¹ In a letter.

² Address to the Victoria Institute, May 26, 1902, p. 8.

³ Isa. vii. 1.

⁴ 2 Kings xvi. 6, where with the LXX. read Edom for Aram.

⁵ 2 Chron. xxviii. 18. The greater part of this chapter on Ahaz is obviously a very late Midrash on the history of Judah; but the section, verses 17-19, which is in a different style from, and disturbs the connection of, the rest, is, as Benzinger says, “at least not improbable.”

⁶ The spelling accepted by Baer from the Cod. Babyl. and the Complut. and other early editions.

Isaiah must intend some other part of the system : perhaps the ancient channel traced by Dr. Masterman along the eastern edge of Ophel. In any case Isaiah takes the gentle and fertilising streams of Shilloah as symbolic of the spiritual influences of Judah's God, from which the people as well as Ahaz were turning impatiently to seek their salvation through submission and tribute to Assyria. For such was the fateful step on which Ahaz was resolved, and it brings us into that new period of the City's history which is identified with Isaiah's name. Before we enter this there is one other act of Ahaz which we must include in our survey of that monarch's influence on Jerusalem.

To raise his first tribute to Assyria, Ahaz imitated certain of his predecessors and despoiled the Palace and Temple treasuries.¹ Tiglath-Pileser replied by marching into Palestine in 734, and carrying off the inhabitants of Israel's northern frontier, and of Galilee and Gilead. The discredited Pekah was slain by a conspiracy of his own people, and the leader Hoshea ascended the throne as a vassal of Assyria. In 732 Tiglath-Pileser took Damascus, and thither Ahaz repaired to do him homage. Impressed by an altar which he saw in Damascus, he sent the pattern to Urijah, the priest at Jerusalem, had one like it constructed for the Temple, and himself sacrificed upon this when he returned. Some further changes which he ordered in the Temple and the ritual are not very intelligible to us, but the account of them brings out clearly the undiminished supremacy of the crown over the Temple and its methods of worship.² Previous tributes to foreign monarchs, taken from the Temple treasures, had been occasional, and once paid were done with. But in the Assyrian Ahaz met a more persistent master to whom tribute had to be sent annually. There was no time to replenish the emptied

¹ 2 Kings xvi. 8.

² On the whole passage, 2 Kings xv. 10-16, see the commentaries.

treasuries, and Ahaz had to strip of their metal some of the most ancient and sacred of the Temple furnishings.

We have now finished our long survey of the history of Jerusalem from Rehoboam to Hezekiah. We have seen restored to the City much of that prosperity which she had enjoyed under Solomon and lost under his successors ; we have seen her made more strong than she had ever been before. Throughout she has preserved her one dynasty. Her spiritual life, too, is more articulate, and better trained ; has developed a considerable literature ; and is more closely drawn round the Temple as its centre. But a novel and more pregnant danger than she has yet encountered exists for her in the alliance with Assyria into which Ahaz has just drawn her. It is with all this that Jerusalem now passes into the hands of the greatest statesman who ever swayed her. How he developed her spiritual forces, used her dynasty and her military strength, and averted the fate which threatened her, will form the subject of our next study.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ 2 Kings xvi. 17 f. The text of this second verse is uncertain.