

JEREMIAH'S JERUSALEM.

(Continued.)

WHEN Jeremiah was going about with the bar upon his neck he was met by a prophet, Ḥananiah ben-Azzur, who in the name of Jahweh told him that the Babylonian yoke would be broken, Jeconiah be restored, and the sacred vessels be brought back which Nebuchadrezzar had carried away. Jeremiah did not contradict this, but prayed that it might be as Ḥananiah said, and solemnly left the question between them to the issue of events; evidently in doubt for the moment as to whether the word of Jahweh was with himself or with the other. The confident Ḥananiah broke the bar on Jeremiah's neck, the symbol of the Babylonian yoke, and the prophet Jeremiah went his way. Later, Jeremiah's confidence was restored. He denounced Ḥananiah as false, and—in the spirit of Deuteronomy itself—predicted his death.¹ Thenceforth he remained constant in his conviction that the only hope for Judah was in submission to the Babylonian. If Zedekiah revolted, Jerusalem must fall.

If the date we have assumed for this episode be correct, Zedekiah did not venture to break his homage to Nebuchadrezzar for four or five years. But in 588 a new monarch ascended the throne of Egypt, Ḥophra² by name, and began to interfere in the politics of Palestine. The Egyptian party in Jerusalem found its opportunity and Zedekiah appears to have come to an understanding with the Pharaoh.³

¹ The verses stating this are doubted by some critics.

² "The Hebrew transcription is rather exact," W. M. Müller, *Enc. Bibl.* col. 2107. Herodotus: Ἀπρίης. He is the Pharaoh of Jer. xxxvii. 5, 7, 11.

³ Ezek. xvii. 15.

Against this coalition, Nebuchadrezzar moved south in person, and established his headquarters at Riblah on the Orontes. On the 10th day of the 10th month of the 9th year of Zedekiah, January 588-587 B.C., a Babylonian army began the siege of Jerusalem.

King Zedekiah and his people might have seen in this swift act of arms the contradiction of Hananiah's prophecy ; and at first sight it is surprising that they did not surrender the City. Their resolution to defend it proves the sincerity of the party whom Jeremiah himself had treated with such courtesy. And in truth, besides their religious beliefs this party of resistance had much that was substantial on which to rely. The walls of Jerusalem were strong and well-garrisoned. Nebuchadrezzar's general did not attempt to take them, but at first built, as Titus did centuries after, a rampart round the City. Egypt, too, was really ready to move to her relief ; and in order to show the sincerity of their faith in the help of Jahweh, the king and his council made the first actual step towards fulfilling the spirit of the Deuteronomic laws by engaging in the Temple to enfranchise all their Jewish slaves.¹ At first this atonement appeared to be successful. An Egyptian army advanced towards Jerusalem, and the Babylonians raised the siege. The confidence of Jeremiah's opponents revived. To the sincerely religious among them it may have appeared as if Jahweh had repeated the wonderful relief of 701. But the king and the people forgot their oath to release the slaves ; and on this ethical ground, if also from his saner estimate of the political situation, Jeremiah proclaimed that the Egyptians would withdraw and the Babylonians come back to besiege and to take the City. Either then, or previously, he replied to a deputation from the king, who inquired whether Jahweh had not been propitiated, that Jahweh's purpose was clear. They

¹ xxxiv. 8 ff.

must not deceive themselves with the thought that the Chaldeans would depart. Even if the expedition of Pharaoh were not futile, even if he had smitten the whole Chaldean army and only the wounded were left to it, *these would rise up every man in his tent and burn the City.*¹ That is to say, Jeremiah, now indifferent as to the military issue of the imminent conflict between Egypt and Babylon, was ethically convinced of the doom of Jerusalem. But the opposition to him remained. When, taking advantage of the withdrawal of the Chaldeans, he tried to go out to Anathoth to secure his patrimony, a captain of the guard arrested him on the charge of deserting to the enemy. In spite of his denial of this, *the princes*—how changed from those of Jehoiakim's reign!—*smote him and put him in a pit in the house of Jonathan the scribe.* Here he received a secret message from the distracted Zedekiah inquiring if there was any word from the Lord. He replied firmly that Zedekiah would be delivered into the hands of the king of Babylon, and then claimed that he ought to be set free. He was innocent, and if left in this dungeon, would die. Zedekiah answered with a compromise. He took Jeremiah out of the pit, but confined him *in the house of the guard, and gave him daily a loaf from the bakers' bazaar, till all the bread in the City was done.*²

The Babylonians returned, and the siege was held closer than before. Jeremiah appears to have got his release, but was a second time imprisoned,³ without doubt on the charge of *weakening the men of war* by persisting in his call to surrender.⁴ They cast him into a cistern in the house of Malchiah, from the mire of which he was drawn out by Ebed-Melech, the Ethiopian, and placed in the court of the guard, where the king again consulted him. It is

¹ xxxvii. 1-10.

² xxxvii. 11-21.

³ xxxiii. 1-13.

⁴ xxxviii. 4.

uncertain whether it was during his first or this second imprisonment that, confident as ever of the fall of the City, he pledged his hope for the future of the nation by purchasing from his uncle the fields in Anathoth.¹ But though Jerusalem should be burnt, he predicted its re-building,² and its restoration as a centre [of worship].³ The form in which the latter prediction is put is very significant.

*For a day shall be when the watchers call
Upon Mount Ephraim—
“Rise and let us go up to Sion,
To Jahweh our God.”*

That is to say, Jeremiah not only was confident of the resumption of worship in the Temple, but he conceived of the national worship as centralized there, in obedience to the Deuteronomic Law. This means, that in common with all his countrymen, he had accepted the great change in the ritual prescribed by that law and carried out by Josiah. But if that be so—and even Duhm admits the passage to be genuine—we have in it evidence that Duhm's theory of Jeremiah's indifference, or even hostility, to the Deuteronomic reforms, is quite impossible.

The end was not far off. The timid, those who in their despair felt that Jahweh had forsaken the City and those who had before deserted Him for the Babylonian gods, went over to the enemy.⁴ Famine ensued, and the pestilence.⁵ The enemy pressed, as every besieger before and after them did, upon the northern wall, where the ground was level, and their engines were not confronted as on other sides by high rocks. At last, on the ninth day of the fourth month

¹ xxxii. Stade assigns this to the first incarceration.

² xxxiii. 1-13.

³ xxxi. 2-6, which even Duhm admits to be an authentic oracle.

⁴ xxxviii. 19.

⁵ Id. 2.

of the eleventh year of Zedekiah, July 587-586, a breach was made. As the Chaldeans were thus about to enter on the north, the king and his guards fled by the gate in the south-east corner of the City, by the royal gardens, towards the Jordan. They had better have sought the deserts of Judah. They were pursued, captured, and taken to Riblah, where, after his sons were slain before him, the last king of Judah had his eyes put out and was carried to Babylon. The Chaldeans burned the Temple, the Palace, and many of the other houses. The walls were ruined. And the most of the population were carried away to Babylonia.

V. TOPOGRAPHY.

To complete this account of Jeremiah's Jerusalem, we have now to gather the topographical details, a few of which occur in the prophet's own oracles ; but by far the most are given incidentally and in the plainest prose by Baruch, his biographer. The result is a picture of the City of a different character from that which we received from Isaiah. In his case the details come to us through a prophet's imagination of her ideal, or through the warmth of a heart that, while it was indignant with her careless crowds, still loved and pitied them. The like of this we cannot expect either from Jeremiah, who had no such love or imagination of Jerusalem, nor from Baruch, who was not a prophet but a scribe. But Baruch had the invaluable pedestrian sense of the ups and downs of his City's site, and the plain man's memory of the exact scenes of his hero's adventures. The result is a picture, grey indeed, but more accurate than any we have yet had, of the outlines and disposition of Jerusalem, as well as of her commoner buildings and more obscure receptacles. We may begin with the Temple, the centre and crown of the whole, cross its courts and come down through their gates to the Palace and its outhouses ;

thence pass through the City to the walls and city gates, and so out upon the immediate surroundings.

Nothing is said of the architecture of the Temple ; but it is referred to in the plural, *the Temple of Jahweh, the Temple of Jahweh are these*,¹ probably as including its courts and the separate buildings in them, for elsewhere these are implied as part of the Beth-Jahweh.² The usual term for visiting the Temple was to *go in* to it.³ The contents of the sanctuary are not mentioned, beyond the notice that Nebuchadrezzar carried away its furniture and vessels.⁴ Whether the Ark was still there or had disappeared we do not know.⁵ Round the Temple lay its court : *the court of the house of Jahweh*, where the prophet spoke because *all the people gathered there* ⁶ ; *the upper court*, as Baruch calls it in distinction from the lower, *other* or *middle* court of the Palace, and *the great-court* which surrounded both.⁷ There were thus from Solomon's time to Jeremiah's *three* courts, of which only *one*, the *upper* or *inner*, was the Temple-court proper ; and to it, as we see from the Books of Kings and from Baruch's narratives, the people were freely admitted both before and after the Deuteronomic reforms. The courts about the Second Temple were different. That next the sanctuary, corresponding to Solomon's *inner* court but apparently smaller, was called *the court of the priests*,⁸ and

¹ vii. 4 ; cf. Matthew xxiv. 1, 2.

² xxxv. 4, etc.

³ xxxvi. 5 ; cf. xxvi. 2.

⁴ xxviii. 3 ; lii. 18 (from the Book of Kings), etc.

⁵ The words in iii. 16, which imply that it had disappeared, occur in an obviously exilic passage : verses 14-18. Whether verse 16 be a quotation from Jeremiah himself (so Erbt) it is impossible to say. There was a tradition after the Exile that Jeremiah hid the Ark : 4 Esdras x. 22 ; 2 Macc. ii. 5.

⁶ xix. 14, xxvi. 2 : *the inner court* of 1 Kings vi. 36.

⁷ *Upper court*, xxxvi. 10 ; *other court*, 1 Kings vii. 8 ; *middle court*, 2 Kings xx. 4 ; *great court*, 1 Kings vii. 9, 12 : Burney's emendation of this verse after the LXX. brings out all *three* courts.

⁸ The Chronicler (2 Chron. iv. 9) antedates this court, existing in his own time, to the time of Solomon, and calls an outer Temple-court the *New*

either from the beginning in accordance with Ezekiel's directions or from some later stage in its history the laity were excluded from it. Within the upper court were *chambers* or lodges for the priests and others, a few of whom are named: *the sons, or guild, of Hanan ben-Gedaliah, the man of God*, whose chamber was *beside the chamber of the officers*, and this above that of *Ma'aseyah ben-Shallum, a keeper of the threshold*¹; and *Gemariah ben-Shaphan, the scribe*, from the door or window of whose chamber Baruch read Jeremiah's roll *in the ears of all the people*.² That Jeremiah himself sometimes held one of those chambers seems probable from the number of times that the command came to him to *go down—to the king's house, to the house of the potter*.³ This upper court had several gates known as *the gates of the House of Jahweh*.⁴ One or two are named. On the south was *the new gate of Jahweh* or of *the House of Jahweh*,⁵ probably that which Jotham built or re-built.⁶ Where this stood is uncertain. The princes took their seats at it on coming up from the Palace,⁷ and so some place it on the south. But so public a gate could hardly have been next the Palace. It may have stood on the east. Or it may have been the same as the next one on the north of the upper court—the gate of Benjamin, called also *the upper*,⁷ perhaps to distinguish it from the corresponding gate of

court (xx. 5). Schlatter (*Zur Topogr. u. Gesch. Paläst.* 173) assigns this to Asa, and quotes 2 Kings xxi. 5 for the existence of two courts of the Temple in Manasseh's time. But if pre-exilic (which is doubtful), this verse regards the great-court as a Temple-court proper. And Schlatter's whole argument (from p. 167 onwards) for the pre-exilic Temple-courts is founded on the evidence of the Chronicler and the Rabbis, who speak only of post-exilic conditions.

¹ xxxv. 4.

² xxxvi. 10.

³ xxii. 1; xviii. 1.

⁴ vii. 2. LXX.

⁵ xxvi. 10; xxxvi. 10.

⁶ 2 Kings xv. 35.

⁷ Heb.: $\Pi\Gamma\Delta$, [LXX. *ἐν προθύροις*. xx. 2. *πύλη οἴκου ἀποστραγγμένου τοῦ ὑπερῶου*, the *north gate* of Ezek. viii. 3, ix. 2, and *gate of altar* viii. 5.

Benjamin on the City Wall. There stood *the stocks*—or perhaps low vault in which a prisoner had to sit bent—where Pashhur, the royal overseer of the Temple, confined Jeremiah. Another entry into this court is called *the third entry that is in the House of Jahweh*, but perhaps we should read *the entry of the Shalishim*, either a certain grade of officers, or the three divisions of the Temple and Palace guards.¹ The Septuagint, however, takes it as one of the houses in the court.

That the Palace, which was to the south of the Temple, lay upon a lower level than the latter is proved by the verbs which Baruch uses for passing between them. The princes of Judah, when they heard in the Palace the noise in the Temple court, *came up* from the king's house to the house of Jahweh.² Micaiah ben-Gemariah *went down* from the upper court to tell the princes of Baruch's reading of the roll.³ Like the upper court, the court of the Palace had its chambers or lodges for officials, of which one at least is mentioned, *the chamber of the king's scribe* or chancellor.⁴ Part of the Palace court was railed off as *the court of the ward*,⁵ in which prisoners were kept; and, as still in Oriental prisons, were allowed to transact business with their friends through the rail, and receive food from the outside.⁶ When it was felt that Jeremiah was not securely confined in such conditions, he was cast into a cistern in the court, described as that of *Malchiyah, son of the king*,

¹ xxxviii. 14. Shalish is the title of a certain officer in N. Israel (2 Kings vii. 2). On the divisions of the guard, see 2 Kings xi. 5-7. The LXX. of Jeremiah xxxviii. 14 gives, instead of this entry, the house of 'Aseleisel or Shealtiel: εἰς οἶκτον ἀσελεισηλ (B), ασαληλ (N), σαλαθηλ (A).

² xxvi. 10.

³ xxxvi. 12; cf. xxii. 1: *go down to the house of the king of Judah*.

⁴ xxxvi. 12.

⁵ xxxii. 2: הַבַּיִת הַבְּרִיחַ, *which was in the king's house* (thus, as in the case of the Temple, the name *the king's house* covered the court round it).

⁶ Id. 8, 12; xxxviii. 28; cf. xxxiii. 1; xxxix. 14 f.

or of *Hammelech*¹; and when more room was needed for political prisoners it was found in *the house of the cistern*, a vault with a cistern, under *the house of the scribe* or chancellor.² From this house the princes *went into the king, to the presence-chamber*.³ This was in *the winter-house*, where the king sat before a brasier⁴; the summer-house would be on an upper storey, to which lattices admitted the breeze.⁵ Within the Palace was also the house of the royal women⁶; and a *treasury* or *store-house* is mentioned, with vaults or pits beneath for cast clothes.⁷

The other public buildings on the Eastern or Temple Hill are not mentioned in the Book of Jeremiah.

Outside the Temple and Palace lay *the streets* or *bazaars* of Jerusalem and her broad places⁸—the narrow lanes for which the compact City⁹ has always been notorious, and the comparatively small open spaces within the gates. The various crafts gathered in their own bazaars. There were *the bakers' street*,¹⁰ *the house of the potter*¹¹; and doubtless the gold and silversmiths, the weavers,¹² the image-makers,¹³ the workers in wood, stone and metal,¹⁴ the locksmiths,¹⁵ and the wine-sellers¹⁶ had also each their own bazaar. The fish-sellers were by the Fish-gate.¹⁷ Again, no public buildings are mentioned; beyond the Palace and the Temple and the lodges in their courts, we hear only of the houses of the

¹ xxxviii. 6.

² xxxvii. 15.

³ xxxvi. 20; for הַיְצִיָּה (eis τὴν αὐλήν) *into the court*, where the king could hardly have sat in the winter, read הַיְצִיָּה (after 1 Kings i. 15), generally the interior of a house (Deut. xxxii. 25), but especially the private room of the master (Jud. iii. 24, etc.).

⁴ Id. 22.

⁵ הַיְצִיָּה הַיְצִיָּה, *upper chamber of cooling*, Judges iii. 20, 24. The upper storey is still called *'aliyah* in Arabic.

⁶ xxxviii. 22, etc.

⁷ Id. 11.

⁸ v. 1, etc., etc.

⁹ Ps. cxxii. 3.

¹⁰ xxxvii. 21.

¹¹ xviii. 2.

¹² x. 9; vi. 29.

¹³ x. 14.

¹⁴ All included under the common name שְׁרָרִים, xxiv. 1.

¹⁵ Ibid. שְׁרָרִים; but the meaning is not certain.

¹⁶ xiii. 12.

¹⁷ Zephaniah i. 10: see below.

people¹; but among these were, as in the time of Amos, some *palaces*,² and *wide houses ceiled with cedar and painted with vermilion*.³ The roofs were flat, and the bazaars probably covered as in later days. Before the reforms of Josiah there was an altar in every street, and on the house-tops family services were performed to Baal and the host of heaven.⁴ Neither the size of the City nor its divisions are given; the name *City of David* is not mentioned. But from Zephaniah⁵ we learn that Jerusalem comprised the *Mishneh* or *Second-town* and the *Maktesh* or *Mortar*, perhaps the hollow between the western and eastern hills where the Phœnician merchants and money dealers had their quarters.⁶

We hear, of course, of the City's walls and gates.⁷ Of the latter four at least are named: the gate *Harsith* (Potsherds?) on the valley of Hinnom⁸; *the gate between the two walls by the king's garden*,⁹ in the extreme south-east by Siloam; *the middle gate*,¹⁰ probably on the north wall, and *the city gate of Benjamin*,¹¹ on the north-east; and from Zephaniah, the *Fish-gate*. In exilic additions to the Book we find also the *Corner-gate* and *Horse-gate*,¹² and the *Gate of the Children of the People* (?)¹³ The two former occur in a passage which defines the boundaries of the City, beginning with the north-east corner *from the tower Hananeel to the gate of the corner*, on the north-west, *the measuring line shall go out to the hill Gareb* (which is a place-name or designation of a field in

¹ xxxix. 8; lii. 13 (= 2 Kings xxv. 9).

² ix. 21.

³ xxii. 14.

⁴ xxxii. 29, etc. ⁵ i. 10, 11.

⁶ *Mishneh*: 2 Kings xxii. 14, 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 22, which state that the prophetess Huldah lived there. Cf. Nehemiah iii. 9, 12, xi. 9 *Maktesh*: Zeph. i. 11.

⁷ xvii. 1-10, 19.

⁸ xix. 2.

⁹ xxxix. 4.

¹⁰ xxxix. 3.

¹¹ xxxvii. 13.

¹² xxxi. 38, 40.

¹³ xvii. 19: *by which the kings of Judah go in and out*.

other Semitic languages),¹ presumably at the south-west corner, *and it shall turn round towards Goah*; or, as the Syriac gives it, Gabatha or Gibeah,² and . . . ³ *and all the fields to the torrent of Kidron to the angle of the Horse-gate eastward.*

In the topography of the Book of Jeremiah nothing is more distinctive than its treatment of the surroundings of Jerusalem. We hear, by name or feature, of places further afield: of Anathoth, Ramah, Bethhaccerem, Tekoa, Mizpah, the trench which King Asa made against Baasha of Israel, the great waters that are in Gibeon, and Geruth, or Gidroth, Chimham, near Bethlehem. But of the immediate suburbs of the City, their names or features, almost none are given. We hear nothing of Nob, the Mount of Olives, or the Plain of Rephaim; nothing of Gihon, 'En-Rogel, the conduits or the highways; nothing of the near sky-lines or the woods, or (till the very end) of the King's Garden. Jeremiah and his biographers behold Jerusalem only as the City of Doom—doomed by the sins which burst into their wildest orgies beneath her walls, doomed to the assaults which must presently fill her environs. And, therefore, these environs, so striking in their features and so brilliant in their memories, are described only as the haunts of idolatry, the scenes of siege, the site of graves. It is as if to the prophet's eye Jerusalem had no longer any suburbs save guilt and war and death.

Thus the oracles upon the Scythian and Babylonian invasions predict in their vivid way the defenceless country-

¹ Sabean גרם, a place-name. In Arabic different forms of the root mean "rough," "scaly," "rusty"; a measure of corn or size of field on which it can be sown, and cold north wind. Aram, an earthen vessel, measure of corn and size of field which can be sown with it, leprosy, and northward. Assyr. leprous.

² LXX. : ἐξ ἐκλεκτῶν λιθῶν.

³ *All the valley of the corpses and the ashes of the fat* omitted by LXX., and perhaps a gloss.

folk streaming for refuge to Sion,¹ the approach of the foe always from the north, the setting of his first posts,² his felling of the trees and casting of ramps against the walls,³ the corpses scattered over the fields,⁴ and the final acres of graves.⁵ But for all we are told of the shape or disposition of the stage on which these scenes are to be enacted, it might be a level plain, without feature, name or memory. And the only waft of its natural atmosphere that we feel is the sirocco blowing in from the bare heights of the desert, *a hot wind neither to fan nor to cleanse, towards the daughter of my people.*⁶

The single variation to these prospects of suburban war is introduced in connexion with the national sin. The prophet's eye, to which the whole land was defiled, saw the pollution concentrated upon the valleys and slopes about the Holy City. The curse of Manasseh was upon them. The worst rites of the idolatries which that king had introduced or revived could not be performed within the walls of the capital. The adoration of the host of heaven might be offered from every housetop and upon the Temple-courts themselves. But the sacrifice of children, prompted by a more malignant superstition, had to be performed, in accordance with the conscience of the ancient world, outside the walls, and in one of the ravines which entrench them. Except the Kidron this is the only suburb which the oracles or narratives of Jeremiah mention: the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom.

Both the name and the position of this sinister valley have been the subjects of much discussion. Of the name there are various forms: Gê-ben-Hinnom, *Ravine*, or *Gorge*, of *the Son of Hinnom*,⁷ Gê-bne-Hinnom, *Gorge of the Sons of*

¹ iv. 6.² iv. 16, vi. 3.³ vi. 6 ff.⁴ ix. 22.⁵ vii. 32.⁶ iv. 11.⁷ Heb. text of Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, xxxiii. 6; Jer. xix. 2; and the Heb. and Greek of Jer. vii. 31, 32, xix. 6, xxxii. 35.

Hinnom,¹ *Gê-Hinnom* ²; and *Ha-Gai* or *The Gorge*.³ The last two of these occur only in late passages and are doubtless abbreviations of the first, which from its frequency is to be preferred to the second.⁴ Whether *Ben-Hinnom* was the name of a man or of a deity it is impossible to say. The reading is too often confirmed in both the Hebrew and the Greek of the Old Testament ⁵ to leave room for emendation (Canon Cheyne has on religious grounds proposed *Na'aman*),⁶ and the attempts to translate it as *wailing*, in reference to the cries of the sacrificed children, are fanciful and have received little support. It must be admitted that no name corresponding to *Hinnom*, either human or divine, has been found in Hebrew or any other Semitic language; and it is not impossible, therefore, that the term was originally geographical or botanical. It occurs only from the time of *Ahaz* (? or *Manasseh* ⁷) to that of the Chronicler. In the Targums it appears not in a geographical but in a theological sense ⁸; and in the same sense the gorge is described without being named in the Apocalyptic literature.⁹ The Books of *Maccabees* and *Josephus* do not give the name, nor is it employed geographically in the Talmud, except perhaps to designate a valley of hot springs east of *Jordan*.¹⁰ Apparently it had ceased to be used of the gorge at *Jerusalem* after 300 B.C.

¹ Kethibh of 2 Kings xxiii. 10 (but the Keri and Gk. have *son*), and the Gk. Cod. B of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6 and Jer. xix. 2.

² Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 6 (once each in Heb., twice in Gk.) and Neh. xi. 30 (omitted in Gk.).

³ 2 Chron. xxvi. 9, Neh. ii. 13, 15, iii. 13; perhaps also Jer. ii. 23.

⁴ The plural *Bne* may have risen from assonance with the preceding *Gê*.

⁵ Heb. always *חִנּוֹם*; Gk. *Εννομ* (most frequently), *Ονομ*, *Ονομ*, and in Josh. xviii. 16 *Γαιερρα* (B) and *Γαι Ονομ* (A).

⁶ *Encyc. Bibl.*, art. "Hinnom, Valley of."

⁷ See below. It has been proposed as an emendation to the *Valley of Vision* in Isa. xxii. 1, 5.

⁸ On Psalm cxl. 11: *חִנּוֹם*.

⁹ R. H. Charles, *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, art. "Gehenna."

¹⁰ Neubauer, *Geog. du Talmud*, 36 f.

The Gorge of Hinnom has been placed by different authorities in each of the three valleys of Jerusalem: the eastern Kidron or Wady en-Nâr, the central Tyropoeon, el-Wâd, and the southern (and western) Wady er-Rabâbi; while some have sought to unite these views, so far as Topheth is concerned, by placing the latter on the open junction of the three valleys below Siloam.

1. In the *Onomasticon* Eusebius and Jerome place Γαιεννοῦμ or Gehennom under the eastern wall of Jerusalem; the Moslem geographers Muḳaddasi and Nâsir-i-Khusrau call the Kidron-valley Wâdy Jahannum; the Jewish commentator Kimchi¹ identifies the valleys of Jehoshaphat and Hinnom; and on Fuller's Map in his *Pisgah Sight of Palestine* the "Vallis Ben-Hinnom" runs between the City and the Mount of Olives. Dean Stanley and Sir Charles Warren have revived this identification.² But their argument for it is defective in all its premises. The identification does not "follow from Jeremiah xix. 11." The gate Ḥarsith, which opened on Hinnom, does not mean East-gate. The identity of 'En-rogel with the Virgin's Fountain, on which Sir Charles Warren depends, is contradicted by the narrative of Solomon's coronation.³ And the Mohammedan tradition, which he quotes, is not only contradicted by another, for Idrisi places Jahannum in the W. er-Rabâbi⁴; but the origin of it, as well as of the statement in Eusebius, may be easily accounted for—and in this way. When the Gê-ben-Hinnom, as a place-name, had disappeared from the surroundings of Jerusalem, the theological Gehinnom as a state of torment for apostate Jews could not remain in the air, but demanded a local habita-

¹ On Isa. lxvi. 24.

² Stanley, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, xiv.; Warren on "Hinnom" in *Hastings' Bible Dict.*

³ EXPOSITOV, March, 1903, p. 225.

⁴ Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i. 403; this, however, is not quite certain.

tion ; and this was found for it, if one can judge from Isaiah lxvi. 24, somewhere near the Temple and in all probability in the valley of the Kidron.¹ As we see from the story of Josiah's reforms, the bed of the Kidron was already a place for refuse and regarded as unclean. The offal of the Temple, according to the Old Testament and the Talmud,² was cast into it ; and probably in part consumed by fire. In any case, we may see how the theological Gehinnom came to be located here ; the more so, that according to the belief about it, the sufferings of its victims were to take place in sight of the righteous, of whose eternal habitations the Temple-courts were the natural symbol. But this location of the theological Gehinnom in the Kidron Valley (from which probably arose the modern name, Wady en-Nâr), is no argument for placing there the actual Gê-ben-Hinnom. On the contrary, such a geographical identification is excluded by these two data of the Old Testament : that the Kidron is never called Gai but Nahal, and that the gate which Nehemiah calls the Gate of the Gai lay not on the east of the City over Kidron, but on the west over either the Tyropoeon or the W. er-Rabâbi.

2. The Gê-ben-Hinnom has been identified by the Rev. W. F. Birch, Professor Robertson Smith and Professor Sayce with the Tyropoeon. This is not unsuitable to the place assigned to the Gai in the record of the boundary between Benjamin and Judah,³ nor to the data provided by Nehemiah.⁴ But it is only possible if the Tyropoeon lay outside the City at the time of Manasseh, for human sacrifices never

¹ So Kimchi on this passage.

² Jer. xxxi. 40: *Jerus.* "Nazir," 57. 4; *Babyl.* "Yoma," 58. 2. Buhl's identification (p. 94) of the 'emeḵ' of Jer. xxxi. 40 with the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom is on the ground of the name impossible. The 'emeḵ' is the more open space of the Kidron-valley.

³ Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16.

⁴ Which Robertson Smith, indeed, thinks a proof of the identification.

took place within the walls of a town. But, as we have seen,¹ Siloam in the lower Tyropoeon was within the City by the time of Hezekiah ; and its reservoir, to which that monarch brought the waters of Gihon by a conduit beneath Ophel, could have been of no use to the citizens in time of siege unless they also held the Western hill. Under Manasseh, therefore, the Tyropoeon was well within the City and could not have been the scene of the sacrifice of children.

3. There remains the third of the valleys, the Wady er-Rabābi. This suits the direction assigned to the Gê-ben-Hinnom on the border between Benjamin and Judah ; and under the later monarchy, as at all other times, it lay outside the City walls. By far the greatest number of modern authorities accept it as the Gai.² Sir Charles Wilson has suggested that the name Hinnom may have extended to the flat ground where all three valleys meet.³ Here in fact it was placed by Jerome in his Commentary on Jeremiah⁴ : among the gardens watered from Siloam, a place " amoenus atque nemorosus, hodieque hortorum delicias praebet." And mediaeval writers argued that Topheth and Hinnom both meant pleasure, and supported the argument by an alleged antithesis between these names and the *Valley of Slaughter* in Jeremiah vii. 32.⁵ Hence Milton's " pleasant valley of Hinnom." But the junction of the three valleys is practically part of the Nahal Kidron and too open to be designated a Gai. The designation fully suits the W. er-Rabābi a little way up from its mouth, where the rocks are high and the passage narrow. Certainly the scenery is there more consonant to the gloomy superstition and its savage rites than are the gardens and groves watered from Siloam.

¹ EXPOSITOR, July, 1905.

² Quaresmius, Barclay, Robinson, Wilson, Socin, Buhl, Benzinger, etc.

³ Smith's *Dict. of the Bible* (sec. ed.), 1373.

⁴ On vii. 31 f.

⁵ Quaresmius, lib. iv. cap. xviii.

On the ridge of the south lies the traditional Aceldama, the field of blood, and the rock around is honeycombed with groves. Melander (*Z.D.P.V.* xvii. 25 ff.) argues that this traditional Aceldama was the site of Topheth.

If one may judge from Phoenician analogies—and the rites were borrowed from Phoenicia—a great fire pit, a development of the primitive hearth, was dug on the floor of the gorge; and upon a pile of fuel or more elaborate structure, called the Topheth or more correctly Tephath,¹ the victim after being slain was laid, a whole burnt offering. The deity, who was supposed to demand so cruel an oblation, is named by the Hebrew text Molech,² but there are grounds for believing that this was a divine title, Melech,³ or King, rather than a name; and that the awful Despot who demanded such a propitiation was regarded by the Jews as none other than their own God. The terms in which the prophets of the seventh century remonstrate against the practice show that the people imagined they had Jahweh's command for it.⁴ They could quote the letter of an ancient law to that effect,⁵ and they had strong motives to so extreme a propitiation in that sense of Jahweh's wrath, which one national disaster after another stirred up within them.⁶ The practice is said to have been begun by Ahaz in the despair to which he was reduced by Aram and Israel,⁷

¹ The Hebrew vocalization Topheth is apparently modelled upon Bosheth=shame, and the vowels also give it the same sound as the word for a thing *spat at* or *abhorred*. The Greek gives Ταφειθ. The word is probably borrowed from the Aramaic, in which נ'פ'ת means *fireplace*. See Rob. Smith, *Rel. of the Sem.* (sec. ed.), 377.

² Jer. xxxii. 35; 2 Kings xxiii. 10.

³ Changed to Molech by the vowels of Bosheth as in the case of Topheth.

⁴ "Micah" vi. 6 f.; Jer. vii. 31; Ezekiel xx. 18 ff.

⁵ Exod. xiii. 12, quoted by Ezekiel, loc. cit.

⁶ The best discussion of this subject is the rich and careful argument by G. F. Moore, *Enc. Bibl.* art. "Molech."

⁷ Moore indeed argues that the reference to Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 4) cannot be correct, for the prophets of the eighth century do not condemn the sacrifice of children as those of the seventh century do. But it is difficult to

and it was revived by Manasseh, and spread among his subjects. The horror which it excited is vividly expressed in the remonstrances of Jeremiah. The place was accursed. God would slay His people upon it till it *should no more be called the Gorge of the Son of Hinnom but the Gorge of Slaughter*,¹ and it should be covered with graves: a Polyandron, as the Greek Version calls it, a place populous with the dead. This prediction was fulfilled not there alone, but all round the encircling valleys of Jerusalem, which are choked with her debris and the dust of her slain. The name itself, obliterated from the spot,² was translated to a still more awful use, and became, as Gehinnom, Geenna, Gehenna and Jahannum, the Hell alike of the Jewish, the Christian and the Moslem theologies. In the case of the Jews this Hell, as we have seen, was located in the Kidron valley below the Temple.

So Jeremiah saw Jerusalem awaiting her doom—an apostate City, beleaguered by her sins, her relentless foes, and the graves of her perpetually slaughtered people.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

perceive why the historian's attribution of the practice to Ahaz should be less correct than that to Manasseh, which Moore accepts. And, as we have seen (*EXPOSITOR*, May, 1905, p. 384 f.), the fact that Isaiah, when confronting Ahaz, took with him his own son dedicated by the symbolic name to hope, appears to have been the prophet's rebuke to the king for dedicating his son to despair.

¹ Jer. vii. 32.

² See above.