

approved by Major Wilson, not so far down in the Valley of Hinnom as we must do if the present Siloam is Siloah.

(3) We may also draw the line of the wall of Nehemiah (as proposed by Lieut. Conder) *across* Ophel, if such be necessary, instead of bringing it down to the present Siloam.

This doubt as to the exact position of the Pool of Siloah (Neh.) of course unsettles the position I endeavoured to fix for the sepulchres of David. Thrupp (p. 164) just notices a legend placing the tomb of the kings near the fountain of Siloam.

THE TWO WALLS.

1. As the wall (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14) was an additional wall in the Kidron Valley, the words of Josephus, *διὰ καρτερῆς φάραγγος*, might be applied to this part, and so on this side Zedekiah may have escaped.

2. Or, since the ditch or pool of Hezekiah (Isa. xxii. 11) might have to be defended by a new fortification, two walls—the forerunners of the *long walls* of Athens—may have been run down to the present Pool of Siloam, and between them the escape made.

3. Or, since the diverting of the waters of Enrogel would prevent the easy irrigation of the king's gardens in the Nachal, fresh gardens may have been made in the Valley of Hinnom and Tophet, use being made of the water from the lower pool (that of Siloah), placed as above (3). The escape might then have been made by the fountain gate and through these gardens.

W. F. BIRCH.

RABBAH OF THE CHILDREN OF AMMON.

THE Rabatamana of Polybius, afterwards Philadelphia, now Amman, deserves special notice.

A. It was situated in the *plain* (*mishor*) east of the Jordan, and consisted of two parts, the city and the citadel. "The city lay in two narrow *valleys*; these uniting become one, which has a good supply of water and pools large and deep enough for a swim" (Q. S., 1872, p. 65).

See Jer. xlix. 3, 4. "Cry, ye daughters of Rabbah. . . . Wherefore gloriest thou in the *valleys*, thy flowing *valley*" (*emek*, in each case).

Crowning the *height* (? = Hebr. TZUR = rock) on the north-west, the shoulder between the two *valleys*, rose the citadel, holding a commanding position over these *valleys* (= *emek*), and the country round (= *mishor*)," *id.* 65.

How perfectly do these characteristics suit Jer. xxi. 13, 14 (*emek* 5, above). Our *key* fits exactly, and makes it certain that the prophet refers to Rabbah. Besides (Jer. xxi. 13), "Who shall come down to us?" is the very question repeated (Jer. xlix. 4), "Who shall come unto me?" and the king of Babylon was advancing against both Rabbah and Jerusalem (Ezek. xxi. 20, 21) though he took the latter first.

Jeremiah prophesies (xxi. 12-14) that the gate of mercy was still open to Jerusalem, but not to Rabbah.

Thus the *topographical key* is useful in rightly applying misapplied prophecy.

B. Rabbah, as Polybius relates, was taken (B.C. 218) through its Tzinnor being revealed to the enemy.

In 2 Sam. xii. 26-28, "Joab fought against Rabbah of the children of Ammon, and took the royal city. And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have fought against Rabbah, and *have taken the city of waters*. Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and encamp against the city and take it."

Some think the words in italics should be translated, "*I have intercepted or cut off the waters of the city.*" Houbigant gives it, "*et aquas ab urbe jam derivavi.*" This agrees with Josephus, who says, τῶν τε ἰδίων αὐτοῦ ἀποτεμνόμενος, and adds that the Ammonites besieged in the citadel "depended only on one small well of water, and this they durst not drink of too freely, lest the fountain should entirely fail them."

Joab might have been poetical, but it was more fit in a military despatch to say, "*I have cut off the waters which supplied the town*" (Junius) than to describe the "royal city" as "the city of waters."

Joab could never forget the Tzinnor of Jebus. It is not likely, then, that *he* would be over-hasty to say he had cut off the waters from the city, merely because he had possession of the stream or pool in the valley, but if there was a *Tzinnor* or *gutter* at Rabbah, and if with or without the help of some unpatriotic Ammonite (? Shobi, the son of Nahash) Joab found it and stopped it, he might safely speak of an impending surrender in his pressing message to David.

The words of Josephus are just the account we should expect from a person knowing but a part of the true case.

Here is a nice bit of excavation for our American cousins. "Biblical discovery in Philadelphia" would do for a sensational heading. With a Tzinnor found at Zion, another cropping up at Rabbah, I would ask, "What next?" Was not there a Tzinnor at Samaria, to enable it to endure a three years' siege?

W. F. BIRCH.

NOTES ON THE POSITION OF TARICHEÆ.

THE following notes on the position of Taricheæ may prove of value to those interested in the topography of the Sea of Galilee. The city, though not noticed in the Bible, appears to have been only second in importance to Tiberias, and was regularly besieged by the Romans. Taricheæ is apparently not noticed in the Talmud, and thus it is from Pliny and from Josephus only that we obtain any indications of its position.

Like Tiberias, Taricheæ was situate on the shore, with cliffs rising above it. It was washed on some sides by the sea, and strongly fortified on the land side. Before the city there was a plain. (B. J. iii. 10. 1).