

the difficulty occasioned by the loss of the *'ain* in the first element of which it is composed. I am however more inclined to see in this first element a play upon Yĕru, "a cairn," which we may gather from Genesis xxii ("in the mount of the Lord is יְרֵרָה") was the name of a locality on Moriah. Isaiah (xxix, 1, 2) similarly plays on the name by turning it into Ari-el. The title "city of peace" may well have been given to David's capital when his foreign wars had been ended, and the name of Solomon, "the peaceful," had been given to his son Jedidiah. The dual form Yĕrushalaim, which apparently goes back to the time of the Macchabees, probably refers to the old division of Jerusalem into the lower city and the Temple-hill.

A. H. SAYCE.

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF PRÆ-EXILIC JERUSALEM.

IN my paper on the Siloam Inscription, I have tried to show how closely the question of the date to which the inscription is to be assigned is connected with that of the topography of ancient Jerusalem. The key to the whole position is the fact that the south-eastern hill, the so-called Ophel, represents Zion, the City of David. This fact once granted—and it is now no longer possible to deny it—not only does the rest of the topography of præ-exilic Jerusalem become clear, but the Solomonic date of the Siloam Inscription, as it seems to me, follows unavoidably. It may assist the reader if I here summarise the arguments which I have urged in its behalf.

(1) Our knowledge of the water-supply of ancient Jerusalem is derived from three passages of Isaiah, a passage in the Books of Kings, and another in the Books of Chronicles. Only the first three passages are contemporaneous with the state of things to which they allude; their testimony is therefore superior to that of the other two passages, and should be considered first.

(2) According to Isaiah vii, 3, in the time of Ahaz, the prophet met the king "at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller's field" (see also Isaiah xxxvi, 2). The fuller's field adjoined the Bir Eyyûb; the upper pool, consequently, must be the Pool of Siloam, and the conduit the tunnel which conducts the water into it.

(3) In Isaiah viii, 6, also in the time of Ahaz, the prophet refers to "the waters of Shiloah that go softly," in contrast to the waters of the Tigris. The only softly-going waters at Jerusalem, conducted through the Shiloah, or "artificial aqueduct," were those of the Siloam Tunnel.

(4) In Isaiah xxii, 9, at the time of the invasion of Sargon (B.C. 711), and consequently in the reign of Hezekiah, the Jews are said to have "gathered together the waters of the lower pool." As "the lower pool" implies an "upper pool," the lower Pool of Siloam must be meant, and the

collecting of the waters in it must refer to some work by which it was supplied with water from the Virgin's Spring (the only spring in or near Jerusalem), instead of depending, as before, upon the rainfall alone. That is to say, the conduit which leads from the upper to the lower Pool of Siloam must have been cut through the rock at this time.

(5) This is expressly stated in 2 Chronicles xxxii, 30, unless this passage is to be interpreted in a sense contradictory to the evidence of Isaiah. The chronicler tells us that after sealing up "the exit of the waters of the Upper Gihon," which was outside the walls (see verse 3), Hezekiah directed them in a straight line, downwards, on the western side of the City of David. There is no other watercourse except the conduit leading from the upper to the lower Pool of Siloam which answers to this description.

(6) The passage in 2 Kings xx, 20—Hezekiah "brought water city-wards"—is too vague for any conclusions to be drawn from it, though it would most naturally refer to Warren's tunnel.

(7) The Siloam Tunnel must, therefore, have existed in the reign of Ahaz, and since we know of no Jewish king before Hezekiah who was a great builder, except Solomon, we are justified in ascribing its construction to him.

(8) This is confirmed by the Septuagint version of 1 Kings iii, which states that Solomon "cut through the City of David," an expression which can apply only to the Siloam Tunnel.

(9) It is, moreover, most improbable that Solomon, who constructed the fortifications of Jerusalem, should have allowed the only spring in the neighbourhood of his capital to remain outside the walls, without attempting to supply the city with something less precarious in time of siege than rain-water.

I have already remarked that, as Dr. Guthe and Mr. Birch have observed, the Upper Gihon of the chronicler, with its *motsá*, or "exit," must be the Virgin's Spring, the *motsá* of which is mentioned in the Siloam Inscription. Indeed, since Gihon means "a natural spring," it is hard to understand how any one with a knowledge of Hebrew could ever have supposed that it represented an artificial reservoir. Dr. Guthe has evidently hit upon the right explanation of the epithet "upper," which is applied to it. The compiler of the Books of Kings still knew only of one Gihon (1 Kings i, 33, 45; so also 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14); but after the exile what Isaiah called "the end of the conduit" came to be regarded as a second spring of water, in consequence of the aqueduct made by Hezekiah to the lower pool, so that the Virgin's Spring—that is to say, the original Gihon—was termed the Upper Gihon, and the lower outlet of the Siloam Tunnel the Lower Gihon, or perhaps Gihon simply.

Dr. Guthe's recent excavations and researches have brought to light two important facts. First of all, the Solomonic wall of Jerusalem enclosed both the upper and the lower Pools of Siloam; and secondly, a valley or depression formerly ran from the Tyropœon to the Kidron valley, entering the latter a little above the Virgin's Spring. With these

facts in our hands, we can, I believe, restore the topography of Jerusalem as it existed in the time of the Kings.

As I have already pointed out, and as Professor Robertson Smith has perceived, the determination of the City of David shows that the Tyropœon was the old valley of the son of Hinnom. Into this the western gates of the præ-exilic Jerusalem must have opened. What these gates were we learn from Nehemiah.

Nehemiah "went out by night by the gate of the valley, even before the dragon-well" (Neh. ii, 13). We gather from chapter iii that this gate was on the same side of the city as the Pool of Siloah, so that "the valley" must be the Tyropœon. It is called בְּאֵר הַדְּרוֹן, in contradistinction to "the brook-valley" (בְּאֵר הַכִּדְרוֹן) of the Kidron. Jeremiah (xxxi, 40) terms it "the vale (*emek*) of the dead bodies and of the ashes," since it was to be choked with the ashes of Jerusalem, and the corpses of its defenders, by way of punishment for the human victims that had been burnt in it to Moloch (see Jer. xix, 6, 7, 11-13). The dragon-well must now be buried under the rubbish that fills the valley. Possibly it stood in connection with the old rock-cut drain or conduit discovered by Warren on the western side of the south-eastern hill.

As Nehemiah had to pass "the dung port" and "the gate of the fountain" before he reached the brook Kidron (ii, 13-15), it is plain that those two gates must also have opened into the Tyropœon. This gives us a clue to the position of the gates enumerated in chapter iii, which I shall now examine in detail.

Nehemiah here begins with the sheep-gate, and the towers of Meah and Hananeel, which defended it on the western side (Neh. xii, 39). As the sheep gate is mentioned in John v, 2, its position has long been recognised on the northern side of the Temple-hill (Moriah). This agrees with the fact that its restoration was undertaken by "Eliashib the high priest, with his brethren the priests," the natural guardians of the Temple-hill. Since Jeremiah (xxxi, 38) describes Jerusalem as extending from the tower of Hananeel to the gate of the corner in the extreme south-east, it must have been the most northern portion of the city, lying probably on the north-west, and thus occupying the site of the later tower of Antonia. See also Zechariah xiv, 10 (where "the king's winepresses" would naturally be in the king's garden, at the mouth of the Tyropœon).

The next gate mentioned by Nehemiah is the fish-gate (verse 3). This must have been on the west side of Moriah, and have opened into the Tyropœon, since the enumeration proceeds, after the notice of two or three more gates, to the mention of the valley-gate (verse 13), and the pool of Siloah by the king's garden (verse 15); we must therefore be moving from north to south on the western side of the city. According to 2 Chronicles xxxiii, 14, Manasseh built a wall all round the fortified part of the City of David, beginning with the sloping cliff west of the Virgin's Spring, which is described as "in the brook valley" of the Kidron, and ending with the fish-gate, from which it would appear that the fish-gate stood at the

western exit of the valley discovered by Dr. Guthe, which separated Zion from Moriah. Hence we can understand why Zephaniah (i, 10, 11) associates it with Maktesh, the merchant quarter of Jerusalem, and contrasts the "cry" heard from it with the "great crashing from the hills" on either side. Maktesh is further called the "second" city by Zephaniah, and it was here that Huldah lived, according to 2 Kings xxii, 14 (where the Authorised Version mistranslates "college"), the full expression appearing in Nehemiah xi, 9, where we read that "Judah, the son of Senuah, was over the second city."¹ The foreign merchants are termed by Zephaniah "the people of Canaan," or Phœnicia, and according to Nehemiah xiii, 16, "men of Tyre" dwelt in Jerusalem, "which brought fish." Hence, evidently, the name of the gate, which was the nearest and most accessible to travellers who approached the city from the sea-coast.

The "old gate" (verse 6) may have been the one by which the Jebusite town was entered. To the south of it came "the throne of the governor beyond the river"—which was possibly set up in the *btrah* or "castle adjoining the temple" (Neh. ii, 8; vii, 2),—and "the broad wall." This protected the bazaars of the goldsmiths and perfumers (verse 8). Here "the half part of Jerusalem" seems to have ended, since the next piece of wall was built by "Rephaiah, the son of Hur, the ruler of the half part of Jerusalem;" while after a short interval, which was mainly filled with "the tower of the furnaces," the wall was continued by "Shallum, the son of Haloresh, the ruler of the half part of Jerusalem." At this point, we may assume, Zion, or the City of David, was supposed to begin.

The "tower of the furnaces," or rather "ovens," was probably near "the bakers' street" (Jer. xxxvii, 21). Here, at any rate, were the public ovens, built of the clay found in the valley below. It must have been in this part of the Tyropœon that the potteries were situated, which gave their name to "the gate of the potteries," mistranslated "east gate" in the A. V. (Jer. xix, 2). The gate of the potteries seems to be the valley-gate of Nehemiah, which, like the gate of the potteries, led immediately into the valley beneath. This valley-gate lay a thousand cubits to the north of the dung-gate (verse 13), so called, perhaps, from the dung which was here thrown over the cliff into the valley. South of it was "the gate of the fountain," and south of that the wall which enclosed "the pool of Siloah" (or, rather, "the aqueduct") "by the king's garden," and extended "as far as the stairs that go down from the City of David" (verse 15). Remains of these stairs have been discovered by Schick and Guthe a little to the east of the Pool of Siloam, and Dr. Guthe points out that they must have run as far as a point, inside the walls, a little to the south of the Virgin's Spring, since he has found traces of steps here. In the preceding chapter (ii, 14) Nehemiah has called "the pool of the aqueduct" (or "the Siloah") "the king's pool," from which we may infer that the king's pool was so named

¹ It would appear from this that Moriah was divided into two quarters, the first, on the south-eastern side, being known as the upper or "first city," while "the second city" lay below it on the west.

from its adjoining the king's garden. We learn from Nehemiah xii, 37, that the stairs led by "the house of David," which may be "the tower of David" mentioned in Cant. iv, 4, and used as an armoury, under which name it is alluded to in Nehemiah iii, 19. At all events the garden attached to David's palace must have lain on the slope or at the foot of the hill on which the palace stood, and was not likely to have been resigned by Solomon when he transferred his residence to the temple-hill. The king, therefore, after whom the garden and the reservoir were named, would have been either David or Solomon. I believe that the garden is the same, or partly the same, as that called "the garden of Uzza" in 2 Kings xxi, 18, 26, which could not have been far from the sepulchres of David, in which the successors of Hezekiah were not buried apparently because there was no longer sufficient room. We hear of an Uzza in 2 Samuel vi, and 1 Chronicles xiii, who died while touching the ark close to the threshing-floor of Nachon or Chidon, the spot being consequently called Perez-Uzzah. The threshing-floor must have been in a level but breezy spot, such as that at the entrance of the Tyropœon, and the context shows that it must have been close to the ascent to the City of David. I conclude, therefore, that when Manasseh built the outer wall round the City of David (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14), he built also a house for himself in the place known as the garden of Uzza, both garden and house being enclosed by the new wall.¹ It is, perhaps, a fragment of this wall that has been discovered by Colonel Warren south of the Birket el-hamra.

The fountain-gate may have derived its name from the Pool of Siloam, though I am more inclined to think that the fountain meant was that of En-rogel, the modern Bîr Eyyûb. It was the nearest gate to the latter, and probably opened upon "the highway of the fuller's field." It must have been just outside it that Isaiah met Ahaz (Isa. vii, 3), and that the Rab-shakeh delivered the message of Sennacherib to Eliakim, Shebna, and Joah, who had "gone forth to him" (Isa. xxxvi, 3).

The piece of wall following that which protected the Pool of Siloam extended "to the pool that was made and the house of the warriors," and was "in sight of the sepulchres of David." These were hewn in the cliffs above it, as we learn from 2 Chronicles xxxii, 33 ("the ascent of the sepulchres of the sons of David"), and Isaiah xxii, 16, and were accordingly enclosed by the wall. The position assigned to them by Nehemiah shows that Professor Robertson Smith is wrong in transferring the tombs to the neighbourhood of the temple-hill on the strength of Ezekiel xliii, 7, 9. Ezekiel merely declares here that the whole of the new Jerusalem, and not the temple-hill only, shall be dedicated to God, and, consequently, that no part of it shall be defiled henceforward by the corpses of its kings. There is nothing to indicate in what precise part of the city the tombs were.

The localisation of the royal sepulchres explains, as I have already

¹ Manasseh's building operations took place after his return from Babylon. Possibly he found the old palace on Moriah in a ruinous condition, and while restoring it occupied David's house in the lower city.

remarked, why they have never yet been found. Only excavation can bring them to light. It also explains why David originally fixed upon this particular site as the burying-place of himself and his family. It adjoined his palace, and doubtless formed part of the ground belonging to it. We learn from the cuneiform records that the Babylonian kings were buried within the precincts of their palaces, and that this was also the case at Jerusalem is shown by 2 Kings xxi, 18; 2 Chronicles xxxiii, 20. The "house of the warriors" must have been the barracks of David's body-guard, whose technical title was *Gibborim* (2 Sam. xxiii, 8; cf. xi, 9).

It follows from the description of Nehemiah that "the pool that was made" was the lower Pool of Siloam. Now it has long been recognised that this pool was the one enlarged by Hezekiah, and provided with fresh water by means of his conduit. Here, therefore, is another proof that the pool constructed by Hezekiah was the lower Pool of Siloam, and that his conduit is not the Siloam Tunnel, but the aqueduct which leads from it to the lower reservoir. The remains of the pool have been found by Dr. Guthe close to Isaiah's tree, and since the city wall forms one of the walls of the reservoir, the latter must have been constructed after the completion of the walls. Indeed, Dr. Guthe has discovered a subterranean channel running under the pool and walls and intended to convey the water of the Tyropœon valley into the valley of the Kidron, the natural course of the water having been destroyed by the fortification of the hill.

The next topographical indication given by Nehemiah is "the ascent to the armoury at the angle" or "turning of the wall" (verse 19). This brings us to the south-eastern extremity of præ-exilic Jerusalem, the corner, in fact, of Jeremiah xxxi, 38. The gate mentioned by Jeremiah as existing here is not noticed by Nehemiah, though possibly it may be the fountain-gate of Nehemiah. There were, however, two corner-gates, since the one referred to by Jeremiah occupies a different position from another mentioned in 2 Kings xiv, 13; 2 Chronicles xxvi, 9, and Zechariah xiv, 10. The latter was only 400 cubits south of the gate of Ephraim, which, as we shall see, was between the broad wall and the old gate, and stood to the north of the valley-gate. It was opposite the gate of Benjamin on the east side of Zion, and was also known as "the first gate." From this it is evident that it constituted the first entrance into the City of David on the north-west side, and must therefore have formed part of the fortifications entrusted to the care of Shallum, "the ruler of the half part of Jerusalem." Hence, further, it must have adjoined the tower of the furnaces, so that this must have been one of the three towers erected by Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 9). The other two were at the valley-gate and the angle of the wall, where the foundations of a tower have been discovered.

We are now on the eastern side of the City of David, and Nehemiah's narrative, proceeding in a northward direction, takes us next to the private residence of Eliashib the high priest. Here there was a long stretch of wall, without a gate, the descent into the Kidron valley being too steep to allow of one, until we come to another "corner" or "turning of the wall"

(verse 24). This must be represented by the angle which turns sharply inwards to the west, uncovered by Dr. Guthe a little to the north of the Virgin's Spring. Unfortunately the text of Nehemiah that follows is imperfect, but it would seem from verse 25 that the northern side of the angle faced "the tower which lieth out from the king's high house that was by the court of the prison." We know from Jeremiah xxxii, 2 that the court of the prison was within the precincts of the royal palace. As the palace is stated to be "on high," the tower must have stood below it. Its position is further defined in verse 26, where it is stated that the Nethinim who lived on Ophel repaired the wall "as far as in sight of the water-gate eastward, and the tower which lieth out." The water-gate plainly derived its name from the Virgin's Spring, and a road must have led to the spring from it. From Nehemiah xii, 37 it appears that "the stairs" of the City of David terminated somewhere to the west of the water-gate, which would agree with the position of the steps discovered by Dr. Guthe westward of the Virgin's Spring. The stairs may have led into the broad sheet "before the water-gate" referred to in Nehemiah viii, 1.

"The great tower that lieth out" is again mentioned in verse 27. Here the Tekoites are stated to have "repaired a second portion, from in sight of the great tower that lieth out, and as far as the wall of Ophel." The nature of the ground explains these various statements. The water-gate would have stood on the northern side of the angle already described. Westward of it was another angle formed by the wall which turned off hence to the north-east, its eastern extremity, as has been shown by Warren's excavations, projecting very considerably beyond the first-named angle at "the turning of the wall." Consequently the tower which stood at this extremity would have been opposite the latter angle, though at a good distance from it, the intervening piece of wall forming the boundary of Ophel. Ophel, accordingly, was the rising ground which extended on the east side of Zion from a part of the wall running north of and opposite to the water-gate, as far as another part of the wall a little to the south of the great tower. From this latter spot, as far as the piece of wall which fronted the tower on the west, the fortification was restored by the Tekoites. But this work is described as having been carried on from north to south, instead of from south to north as in all other cases. The reason of this is to be found in the fact that the Tekoites had already repaired a piece of the wall on the western side of Jerusalem, and as this was north of the great tower on the eastern side, when they came to work on this side they began with the northern limit of the work assigned to them instead of the southern.

Ophel, accordingly, is not the whole of the south-eastern hill, which is really the old Zion, but only the rising ground at the north-east end of it. Consequently, the expression of the chronicler (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14) is somewhat loose, and the passage must really mean that Manasseh "built a wall outside the City of David," but westward of the Virgin's Spring, which was continued through the valley of the Kidron, and ran as far as the approach to the fish-gate, and that he also surrounded Ophel with a high wall.

The royal palace, as we know, was on the temple-hill, and adjoined the temple itself ; it would, therefore, have risen above the great tower, which was designed to defend the point where the temple-hill was separated from Ophel. The horse-gate, as we may gather from 2 Kings xi, 16 ; 2 Chronicles xxiii, 15 ; and Jeremiah xxxi, 40, was at the south-eastern extremity of the temple-hill. It was, in fact, the carriage-road into it, and Jeremiah implies that it was regarded as the northern boundary of the City of David, which, in future, the prophet declares, should become as holy as the temple-hill itself. It was to defend this gate that the great tower must have been built, the foundations of which seem to have been discovered by Colonel Warren.

As the horse-gate marked the southern commencement of the upper city, the wall to the north of it was naturally restored by the priests. The next gate was the east gate (verse 29), which is probably to be identified with the gate of Benjamin (Zech. xiv, 10), since the latter was opposite to the corner-gate on the western side, and was named from the fact that it opened into the territory of Benjamin. It no doubt lay below "the upper gate of Benjamin, which was by the house of the Lord" (Jer. xx, 2). At the extreme north-eastern corner of the temple-hill lived more Nethinim and merchants, who doubtless communicated by means of a street with those in the quarter called Maktesh. Here, apparently facing the north, was the gate of Miphkad, or "mustering."

The topography of the walls which I have thus endeavoured to extract from the account of their restoration given by Nehemiah, harmonises entirely with his description of the courses taken by the two choirs on the day when the walls were dedicated (Neh. xii). Here we are told that the first choir entered the city at the dung-gate, and then marching to the right made their way to the fountain-gate "which was over against them," and so "went up by the stairs of the City of David, at the going up of the wall, above the house of David, even unto the water-gate eastward." We may, perhaps, infer from this that the stairs began close to the fountain-gate. The other choir turned to the left, and accordingly passed "from beyond the tower of the furnaces even unto the broad wall : and from above the gate of Ephraim and above the old gate, and above the fish-gate and the tower of Hananeel and the tower of Meah, even unto the sheep-gate ; and they stood still in the prison-gate." The prison-gate is not mentioned elsewhere, and is either the gate of Miphkad, or an otherwise unnoticed gate between the latter and the sheep-gate. It must have stood near the common prison, which was, of course, different from the court of the prison in the palace, which was intended for high-born offenders.

My paper would not be complete without a word or two on the hills surrounding the ancient Jerusalem which are alluded to in the Old Testament. As I have shown, "the mountain that lieth before the valley of the son of Hinnom, and which is in the valley of the giants on the north," must be either Bezetha or Akra, the valley of the giants being the northern border of the ancient Jerusalem. The Mount of Corruption, on which Solomon raised high-places to the deities of the

surrounding nations (2 Kings xxiii, 13), *may* have been the Mount of Olives, since there was an old high-place on the top of it (2 Sam. xv, 32), but it may also have been on the western side of the city. Gareb (Jer. xxxi, 39), which was over against Jerusalem on the side of the Tyropœon, must be the hill on which the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands, and perhaps derived its name rather from Gareb the Ithrite, one of David's bodyguard, than from its "scabrous" appearance. Goah will be the district opposite to it on the eastern side of the city, and possibly denoted that part of the valley of the Kidron which lay to the north of the Virgin's Spring. The "king's dale" (2 Sam. xviii, 18; Gen. xiv, 17) ought to have been in the neighbourhood of the royal gardens.

A. H. SAYCE.

I append a rough sketch-map, in order to illustrate my restoration of the topography of præ-exilic Jerusalem.

THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

I.

I SUPPOSE that the excavations which have been made within the last few weeks in Egypt will have turned the attention of many to a different point for the passage of the Israelites to that which has lately been advocated in the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Society. I have felt for some time the difficulties connected with any route near to, or north of, Kantara; and I trust that very soon the matter will be much clearer to all who are interested in the truth of Biblical statements. When I went down the Suez Canal, and returned by it, some years ago, all I could say to myself was, that I *had* been over the spot where the Israelites crossed, but *where* that spot was I did not know. I hope that the discussion which has been proceeding will start from a new basis.

I start, therefore, by stating that I believe that the great debouching of the Israelites was not by way of Kantara, and the edge of the Mediterranean, but by way of Wâdy Tumilat, and the neighbourhood of Lake Timsah. The southern end of the land of Goshen ran up to the west of Wâdy Tumilat; the recent excavations at Tel-el-Maskhuta go to prove that Pithom and Raamses of Exodus i, 11, were at the eastern end of Wâdy Tumilat: the Wâdy Tumilat then must have been well known to the Israelites. I believe that when the command was given them to go forth out of Egypt they poured forth by Wâdy Tumilat. Thus doing they would be confronted by Lake Timsah. They would desire to turn northwards along its edge towards Kantara, the usual road to Syria, being also "the way of the land of the Philistines, which was near" (Exod. xiii, 17). But God did not desire that they should escape by that road; therefore, in Exodus xiv, 2, He bids them "turn." These two words, "near" and "turn," seem to give us two keynotes. Does not the first word, "near," point out that the escape was not from the northern end of Goshen by way of Kantara—for that would better be described as "direct," or as "directly