

Seirath (Judg. iii, 26). The name apparently still survives in Umm Sirah and Wady Umm Sirah, about three miles north-west of Ain es Sultán.

W. F. B.

VALLEY OF HINNOM.

I PROPOSE to reconsider Colonel Warren's theory of extending the Valley of Hinnom up the Kedron ravine to the east side of the city. The Dean of Westminster has endorsed it ("Recovery of Jerusalem," p. xiv), and called special attention to its importance. M. Ganneau, in 1870, advocated the same theory on finding a rock (Zehweleh) close to the Virgin's Fount, which he identified with the rock Zohelath, and the fountain En Rogel. Other writers have also affirmed that the valleys of Kedron and Hinnom are identical; so that the theory would seem to have received some considerable endorsement; and Colonel Warren has reaffirmed it recently in his "Underground Researches" in the following words: "I have shown that the Valley of Hinnom is to the east of the city," p. 19.

It thus appears, a passage in Jeremiah has led eminent authorities astray, and that *east gate* has been accepted as a correct translation in chap. xix, 2.

"Go forth into the Valley of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the east gate." Jer. xix, 2.

This word would be as correctly translated *west* as *east*, and would be incorrect in either case, as the following comparison will prove.

"Entry of the (haresoth), east gate." Jeremiah xix, 2.

"Before the (haresath), sun went down." Judges xiv, 18.

If it indicates sun-*rising* in the first case, it indicates sun-*setting* in the other case; and hence means *west* in the one case, and *east* in the other, which is an absurdity.

The actual truth is simple enough. The word is used in the Bible to represent the sun as god of day, whether in the east, or west; and, therefore, the words *shor haresoth* (Jeremiah xix, 2) ought to have been translated by the simple title, *sun-gate*. It is the idolatrous and Moabitish name for the god of day, whether rising or setting. Hence, we read that one of the five Egyptian cities was called in the language of Canaan עִיר תְּחֻמִּים = City of the Sun, or Sun City (Isaiah xix, 18). And in another place, we read: "He commandeth לְחָדָם = the sun, and it riseth not (Job ix, 7). The Hebrew root-word is *huras*, and in Arabic, *harasha*. The feminine plural form is *haresoth*, as given in the disputed passage.

A careful consideration of the whole chapter (Jeremiah xix), will make it self-evident that the prophet was not sent to the *east gate* of the Temple Area, but to some gate at the *south* of the Temple Hill, and of the Ophel. Here are all the controlling passages. Let us examine them.

"Go forth unto the Valley of Hinnom, by the entry of the (harsoth) east gate, and proclaim *there* the words that I shall tell thee." Jeremiah xix, 2.

What definite locality is meant by the word *THERE*? no one can doubt it answers for the preceding words "Valley of Hinnom." But *what* place in the Valley of Hinnom is definitely meant; is it east, west, or south of the Temple Area? The two passages we now cite, which follow the above, will give a definite answer to this problem.

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that *this place* shall no more be called *Tophet*." Ver. 6.

"Then came Jeremiah *from Tophet*, whither the Lord had sent him to prophecy." Ver. 14.

These are the controlling passages: surely no one will pretend to say that Tophet was at the *entry* of the east gate of the Temple Area, and yet Tophet was the exact spot where Jeremiah was sent to, and the *place* where he delivered the prophecy he was sent to deliver.

Tophet was *south* of the Ophel Hill somewhere; we need not discuss its exact place. No description of Tophet will apply to the *eastern side of the city*, or eastern front of the Temple Area along the Kedron ravine, especially Isaiah xxx, 33; 2 Kings xxiii, 10; Jeremiah vii, 31, 32; xix, 6, 11-14. Whatever place is meant by the *harsoth*, or *sun-gate*, in the passage in question which has led to this theory, Tophet was the place intended, and no other is meant; and Tophet is said to have been "by the *entry*" of this gate.

Whoever supposes that Tophet was placed by the entry of the east gate of the Temple Area must also be prepared to admit that Josiah, when he defiled Tophet (2 Kings xxiii, 10; Isaiah xxx, 33; 2 Chronicles xxxiv, 4), made a permanent place of defilement in front of the east gate of the Temple Area somewhere in the Kedron Valley; such in fact as ever afterwards became the only physical type of *Hell* known to a Jew. Such an abomination at the eastern front of the Sacred and Holy Place, and in sight of the worshippers, and under the very walls and foundations of the Holy Courts, is too horrible to contemplate, and would never have been permitted; and hence such an interpretation and theory as make this word *harsoth-gate* to mean *east-gate* of the Holy Sanctuary is utterly inadmissible. The objection is fatal to any such supposition.

It is much more reasonable to suppose that the prophet was desired to go to the south gate leading to Tophet, where the idolatrous people were probably assembled, in front of all the places devoted to Moabitish wickedness—to Tophet at the entry of this south gate, where the sun was probably then being worshipped. And in such a case, what would be more natural than for the Moabitish name of the sun as the god of day, to be given to this southern gate, and to be branded for the time being with the Moabitish name of the sun, then being worshipped at the "entry of the *sun-gate*? not that *shor harsoth* was its permanent name, but the locally descriptive name given to it for the time being, to be in accord

with the idolatry going on there, and the prophecy delivered by Jeremiah?

Colonel Warren says: "the Arabic accounts speak of the Kedron as the Wâdy Gehinnom." ("Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 239.) This is true. But the name is against the theory. The Kedron is a true ravine, and the Arabs call it the Wâdy Kedron; when speaking of it east of the Temple Area, and independent of its relation to the valley south of the Temple Hill. But *Wâdy Ge-Hinnom* means ravine of the Valley Hinnom, which is technically correct, for Kedron is the ravine or wâdy which runs through the valley in front of the Ophel Hill, and of the Pool Siloam. If the word *wâdy* was equivalent to *valley*, they would say Wâdy Hinnom, but never Wâdy Gehinnom, which is what they do say. They never apply the word *gai* to the ravine, and say Ge-Kedron, as they say Ge-Hinnom; yet they say Wâdy Kedron, but never Wâdy Hinnom. These objections might be multiplied a hundredfold; but I refrain, that my note may not be too long.

Strathroy, Ont.,
Canada.

S. BESWICK.

NOTES ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS.

By GREVILLE J. CHESTER, B.A. (Member of the Royal
Archæological Institute).

THE importance and interest of this subject will, it is hoped, be deemed sufficient excuse for my making a few observations upon Lieutenant Conder's paper in the *Quarterly Statement* of October, 1880.

In his first section Mr. Conder sums up his arguments based upon the extension of land due to the annual deposit of mud upon the Mediterranean coast, by stating that "in all probability neither the bar nor the lagoon (of Serbonis) existed at all in the early historic period of the Exodus. The old Serbonian Bog has no doubt (!) long since become dry, as the present lagoon appears also likely in time to become, and the fact pointed out by Mr. Greville Chester that the Gelseh (*i.e.*, Mount Casius) is merely a great sand-dune is of considerable importance in confirmation of this view." p. 232.

Now in respect to this statement I have to remark that while I totally disbelieve that the Serbonian Bog is the *Jam Sûph*, for reasons given in my report of my journey to the place in question, and while I consider Dr. Brugsch's theory of the route of the Israelites as far as Mount Casius, probably Baal-zephon, as *in its main features* a highly probable one (how the Israelites got away from that point is another and different question to be dealt with hereafter), I am disposed to consider Mr. Conder's remarks already quoted as destitute of any solid foundation in fact whatsoever. While fully admitting the advance of land into the sea by the