

tombs were cleared. R. Akiba was supporting his unsound theory as to purity by a bold invention as to underground passages, being forced to admit that the Royal Tomb was (as all men knew) inside the city. This kind of argument is not yet extinct, but R. Akiba's passage had no more existence in fact than Mr. Birch's second Siloam aqueduct. As to the long passage from Gibeon, I have only to say that I do not think the authors of the Pascal Chronicle knew more about the Tomb of David than we do. I do not see how Mr. Birch has proved my references to be unverified, although Mr. Fergusson's view as to Akra are not the same in his various books on Jerusalem.

C. R. C.

EMMAUS.

I.

THE identification of Urtâs with Emmaus seems to be accepted in some quarters as "proved beyond cavil or doubt" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 62). At the risk of being classed among "cavillers," I venture to give reasons for entirely dissenting from the proposed identification. In *Quarterly Statement*, 1879, p. 105, I endeavoured fairly to summarise the evidence for the several claimants to represent Emmaus. There is given there a quotation from Lightfoot, who proposed to identify Etham with Emmaus, not only anticipating Mrs. Finn's proposal, but giving another, and I think more plausible, support for it than she has done. My objections are—

(1) There is no evidence to show that "the bath" Mrs. Finn writes of is of the age she assumes—that it was old enough, not to say important enough, to give its name to a place known to Luke and Josephus.

(2) The existence of a bath, or baths, in a valley down which flows abundance of water is not, *primâ facie*, a thing so special as to explain the distinctive name of a village. If every place is to be recognised as a possible "Emmaus" where the name "Hammâm" is found, we shall have plenty to choose from. Is this different from the place noted in "Memoirs," iii, p. 94, thus?—"Hummâm Suleimân—an old pool, now filled up, with fine masonry walls, and some pillar shafts lying in it. It is in the valley below Urtâs." "An aqueduct from it is said by the natives to have supplied Birket el Hummâm at Jebel Fureidis." Here are two spots at which the name occurs in this same valley. And see the "Memoirs" *passim*.

(3) Etham has transmitted its name from the days of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 6), and is still known as 'Ain 'Atan. What evidence is there that it ever was "superseded after the days of Solomon by that of 'Paradise?'" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 58.) If the evidence of the natives is of value on the point, the name is still "Hummâm Suleimân," and with Urtâs preserves the memory of Solomon's gardens and pools uninterruptedly.

(4) Josephus knew the site of Solomon's gardens (8 "Ant.," vii, 3), and tells us "they were at Etham about 50 furlongs distant from Jerusalem."

He knew also the position of the Roman colony, of which he writes, "it is called Emmaus, and is distant from Jerusalem 60 furlongs" (7 "Bell. Jud.," vi, 6). Clearly he knew nothing of the name Etham having been superseded, and he did not suppose it the same as Emmaus, or he would not have given the two names thus, at different distances from Jerusalem. His position of Emmaus is the same as Luke's, showing it to be correctly given. His position of Etham is also correctly given, as measurement shows.

(5) Manifestly the Emmaus of Josephus and Luke was a well-known place—"a village." Jerome located the Emmaus of Luke at Nicopolis, though surely one who lived so long at Bethlehem would have heard of the name there, had it been known. No traces of villages such as tombs, &c., seem to have been found. Meshullam, who lived so long there apparently, never heard the name as that of a village. Urtâs refers, it is generally agreed, to the old gardens of Solomon, and is not, as, *e.g.*, Kolonieh, of later origin superseding Emmaus; while nothing remains, so far as has yet been shown, to prove that the place ever was other than a garden, with "pools" in it, and that there ever was a change of its name to Emmaus, and then a reversion to its earlier name. Urtâs, Hummâm Suleimân, 'Ain Atan, are against the suggestion, and agree in one ancient tradition.

(6) What position would be selected for a Roman colony, it would be venturesome to attempt to decide. It is not likely that 800 disbanded soldiers would be *very* modest in their claims on a land conquered and depopulated. The little garden of Urtâs would certainly suffice for but few of them. Moreover, Josephus, in the same chapter in which he tells of the planting of the colony at "a place called Emmaus, 60 furlongs from Jerusalem," tells us of the capture of "that citadel which was in Herodium." Herodium is 60 furlongs from Jerusalem; if he meant Herodium in both places why did he not say so, instead of introducing the name and distance from Jerusalem of another "place"—a village too (Luke), not a *walled* citadel?

(7) As regards El Kubeibeh, on the other hand, it is found to be the correct distance from Jerusalem. The Crusaders said they found the name of Emmaus there. They knew of Emmaus Nicopolis, and its acceptance by Eusebius as the Emmaus of Luke, and had no occasion to *invent* the name. The name of a colony clings to the place. Three miles along the Roman road, passing through El Kubeibeh, there is Wâdy el Hūmmâm, and down that valley is Khurbet el Hūmmâm, where they could have planted their holy place had they not found the name where they said they did. Two Roman roads cross just there; while the story of the land from the days of Joshua to that of the Maccabees, demonstrated the value of holding that position—communicating, moreover, as it did, with the sea and the garrison of Cæsarea.

As regards Kurbet el Khamasa, a statement of its claims, to which nothing can be added, is given in "Memoirs," iii, p. 36. Between it and El Kubeibeh the case seems still to lie.

II.

ALL readers of the *Quarterly Statement* must have been interested by the account of Mrs. Finn's researches in the Valley of Urtas (January Number, 1883); but I doubt whether many were convinced by her arguments in favour of identifying that place with Emmaus. As, however, Mr. Mearns (January Number, 1884) refers to a paper of mine (July, 1881) on the same subject, and supposes that I have probably given up my own view and adopted Mrs. Finn's, I shall be much obliged by your allowing me to point out why Mrs. Finn's argument appears to me inconclusive, and to state a little more in detail my reasons for adhering to the opinion that connects St. Luke's Emmaus with Kubeibet, and with the Wādy Buwai stretching down to Kolonieh.

Mrs. Finn's case rests on a mistaken inference from the words of Josephus about the Galilee Emmaus. He interprets the name to mean, *pro hac viâ*, Hotwells ("Bell," iv, 1, 3). But he certainly does not intend it to be understood that the name Emmaus always has that meaning. The same Hebrew name might easily have different Greek equivalents, and *vice versâ*. Josephus mentions two other places called by the same name, but does not in either case connect the name with Hamath, or Khamath (Hot Spring); and it is certain, as a matter of fact, that in one at least of those places (Nicopolis) there is no trace of there ever having been a hot spring.

This particular question is indeed no new one. Lightfoot long ago pointed out that although the Galilee Emmaus derived its name from its hot springs, the Gospel Emmaus could not do so, because the Arabic, Syriac, and Persian translations of St. Luke begin the word with an ע, and the Talmudists write the Nicopolis Emmaus אמאוס. He concludes: "There were at Emmaus [Nicopolis] noted waters, but we can hardly suppose that they were warm, if we consider the usual writing of the word among the Talmudists."¹ And I may add that this argument is strengthened by the recollection that the Jerusalem Talmud, and probably the Mishna, were written at Tiberias, by men therefore well acquainted with the hot springs of Hamath.²

There is therefore no ground for the assumption with which Mrs. Finn sets out, that the interpretation given by Josephus to the Galilee Emmaus is to be extended, or has any application to any other Emmaus. In that particular instance Ammaus represented אממת. In a second case it represented, as we have seen, אמאוס. In a third it may with equal propriety, and probably does, represent המוצה.

But how does Mrs. Finn apply her inference, assuming it to be correct, that every Emmaus must be a Hamath? She knows that there are no hot springs at Urtas, or at any suitable distance from Jerusalem.

¹ Lightfoot, ii, p. 371; *cf. ibid.*, p. 42.

² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

She does not suggest (as Mr. Mearns does) that in a volcanic country hot springs may have changed to cold. But noting that the Arabic Hammâm stands for artificial hot baths, as well as for hot springs, she argues that Emmaus may have been employed with a like latitude; so she asked herself, "Were any baths to be found at a suitable distance?" If so, there would be Emmaus. The copious fountain in the Urtas Valley attracted her attention, as being sufficient to supply baths. The recollection of once visible traces of baths still existed in the neighbourhood: search is made: remains of extensive and luxurious baths are brought to light, dating very probably from the days of Herod the Great: and Mrs. Finn concludes that she has found Emmaus.

But with all deference I submit that just as every Emmaus was not a Hamath, or Hot Spring, so every discovery of Hammâm, or Baths, is not the discovery of an Emmaus. That there were Hammâm at Urtas Mrs. Finn has discovered as a veritable and interesting fact; and, as a matter of course, *these Hammâm were called Hammâm*. But that the village itself, or the district, was ever known by the name of Emmaus, or even of Hammâm, Mrs. Finn has not advanced a fragment of evidence. Nay, she has not shown that any village or district whatever has ever been called Hammâm because artificial baths were erected there. Of course baths cannot but be called baths, but every place that has baths is not necessarily called Bath. There is nothing whatever in the fact that baths were found at Urtas, and that they were suspected to exist there and were called (as they could not but be) Hammâm, to prove that the *valley* or *village* ever bore the name of Hammâm, or of Emmaus.

Mrs. Finn endeavours to fortify her claim for Urtas as the Emmaus colony of Josephus, by suggesting that it was chosen by Vespasian with a view to keeping a watch over the surviving remnant of Jewish fanaticism at the fortress of Masada. But the colonisation referred to was in no sense what she calls it, *military*. It was a *grant of land* to 800 *disbanded* veterans, for their residence and possession (*εἰς κατοίκησιν*).

Thus the reasoning in favour of Urtas crumbles away step by step. While against the theory there are one or two matters certainly worthy of consideration, which have not been noticed.

1. Is it probable that the splendid and "Royal" baths which Mrs. Finn describes, and which, according to her theory, had given a new name to the valley, a name under which the valley was familiarly known in the days of St. Luke and of Josephus, should have been so completely obliterated and the new name so entirely forgotten by the days of St. Jerome—that he, living close by, should have entirely overlooked it, and should have ascribed to Nicopolis, as he did, the honour of being St. Luke's Emmaus?

2. Is it probable that Josephus, alluding to a place so notable, and so near *Bethlehem*, should have called it "a district 60 furlongs from Jerusalem?" And if he did so, is it probable that St. Luke also, who in the second chapter of his history had illumined the famous city of David with a new and imperishable glory, should in his last chapter have spoken of a village within a mile and a half of that city, as "60 furlongs

from Jerusalem," and not in the far more natural way, as "a village near Bethlehem?" No writer would speak of Clewer as a "village some twenty miles from London," when he could give the far more pointed description "close to Windsor."

As I observe the fragile nature of Mrs. Finn's arguments, and these *a priori* improbabilities in her theory, I feel that, while all must have thanked her for her valuable contribution to the discussion (and none more so than myself, who recollect a very pleasant evening spent at her house at Jerusalem some thirty years ago), the careful searchers for Emmaus will not subscribe to the title of her paper as "*Emmaus Identified.*"

Let me now state my reasons for believing that the district (*χωρίον*) of Emmaus which Josephus says was given by Vespasian to 800 disbanded veterans, lay along the valley that has Kolonieh at its southern extremity, and that the village (*κώμη*) spoken of by St. Luke was near the head of that valley and reaching on to Kubeibeh.

In Joshua xviii, 26, we read of a certain Mozah; but in Hebrew it reads, with the article, *הַמֹּצָה* (Ham-Môtsah), and it is represented in the LXX by *Ἀμόσα* (in Codex A., *Ἀμόσα*), and in the Vulgate by *Amôsa*. This Môtsah is named in the connection with Mispah, Rekem, and Chephira, or Haccephirah. And in the locality where the acknowledged sites of these places are found there is still existing a ruin called Khan Beit Mizza; and the interchange of Yod and Vaw is so frequent that there is good ground for thinking that Mizza or Mitsa represents the ancient Mozeh, Môtsah, or Ham-Môtsah. In other words, this ruin, Mizza, represents more or less closely a place called in the LXX *Ἀμόσα*, in the Vulgate *Amôsa*.

Is anything further known about Mozeh? The Talmud speaks of a certain *מִצְדָּה*, spelt as Joshua spells it. It gave its name to a valley "near Jerusalem" and "below Jerusalem," to which the Jews resorted on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles to provide themselves with the two willow branches which each worshipper was expected to carry on that occasion, and for some reason or other it bore the name of Kolonieh. (Smith's "Dic. of Bib., S.V.," Mozah, Cespari, § 191; Lightfoot, vol. i, 976.) But the ruin Beit Mizza, which, as we have seen, probably represents the ancient Amosa, is but a short distance from the only place anywhere near Jerusalem which now bears the name of Kolonieh. There is therefore good reason for regarding Beit Mizza as representing the Talmudic Mozah, and if so, the Mozah of Joshua and of the Talmud are the same. In confirmation of this it may be observed that Furst (without reference to the History) derives the name from *מִצְדָּה* to suck, and interprets it "the place of reeds." Certainly willow might well be looked for in "the place of reeds."

We have now then arrived at a further step in our argument. We have found that the *Amôsa* of Joshua became a colony. No one can fail, however, to see how near the name *Ἀμόσα*, or *Amôsa*, comes to *Ἀμμαους*, or *Ammaus*. And when we read in Josephus that Vespasian gave a *district*

(*χωρίον*) to 800 disbanded veterans for their possession and residence (*εἰς κατοίκησιν*), and when he further gives this district the name of *Ἀμμαους*, it is impossible to avoid the conjecture that *Ἀμμαους* is more or less closely connected with the ancient *Ἀμόσα*, or Motzah, and with the Kolonieh of the Talmud.

The difficulty now presents itself that Josephus says Ammaus is 60 furlongs from Jerusalem, whereas Kolonieh is about 36. But a little consideration suggests that as Josephus speaks of a *district* (*χωρίον*) to be divided among 800 men for a permanent residence, one end of this district may have abutted on the great Roman road to Joppa (at Kolonieh), and the other end may have been three or four miles further from Jerusalem, and altogether away from that road. And while the lower end of the valley would form the nucleus of any growing population, and would soon develop into a new town, and swallow up all recollection of a former state of things, the original village, which gave its name perhaps to the valley, may have been, *when the colony was first placed there*, at the distance named by Josephus. Few things are more observable than such a shifting of population and names, when villages and hamlets are changed into towns by some wave of circumstance.

Once more: If *Mótsah*, *Amôsa*, *Ammaus*, was the name of a district, the ruin *Beit Mizza* may be the southernmost trace of the old name, and the original village (*κώμη*) may have been, in the time of St. Luke, at the head of the valley, and extending beyond it. Here the Crusading tradition comes to our aid. For though that tradition may have no authority as such, yet the fact that it would have been more natural for the Crusaders to place *Emmaus* at *Kuriah Enab* on the *Jaffa* road, and the fact that the tradition harmonises with and helps to reconcile the other data, give it some real weight. According to this tradition *Kubeibeh* is the village *Emmaus*. It may have been the furthest extremity of the village; if so, the two disciples on that famous Easter Day would descend into "the valley near Jerusalem" just at the point over which *Beit Mizza* now stands, would pursue its course northward and westward, and as they reached its head would be at the end, or near the end, of their memorable journey.

One conclusion is indisputable, that no other location of St. Luke's *Emmaus* could by any possibility combine so many rays of light as converge upon the *Wády Buwai* from *Joshua*, the *Talmud*, *Josephus*, existing names, and Crusading tradition.

R. F. HUTCHINSON.

THE SITE OF ZION.

ANOTHER perusal of Captain Conder's article on this subject has led me to think that he has altogether misapprehended my views about the size and position of the pre-exilic Jerusalem, and has further overlooked the necessary inferences to be drawn from the *Siloam Inscription*. At the