

(*χωρίον*) to 800 disbanded veterans for their possession and residence (*εἰς κατοίκησιν*), and when he further gives this district the name of *'Αμμαους*, it is impossible to avoid the conjecture that *'Αμμαους* is more or less closely connected with the ancient *'Αμώσα*, 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*, *Amósa*, *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

risk, therefore, of threshing the old corn over again, I write a few lines, which will, at any rate, I hope, make my own meaning clear.

The Siloam tunnel is cut through the south-eastern hill of modern Jerusalem, the so-called Ophel, and it is towards the lower or south-western end of it that the famous inscription is engraved. I have endeavoured to show that the tunnel is the same as that referred to by Isaiah (viii, 6), in the reign of Ahaz, and that the conduit made by Hezekiah was the second tunnel, which led from the Upper Pool of Siloam, or the Lower Gihon, to the Lower Pool of Siloam. Other scholars believe that the Siloam tunnel itself is the one that was made by Hezekiah. Whether they or I are right is of no consequence for the present argument: in either case we now know the exact position of the hill through which Hezekiah's aqueduct was excavated. It is the so-called Ophel, or south-eastern hill.

Now we have two accounts in the Bible of the construction of this aqueduct. One is in 2 Kings xx, 20, which does not state where it was precisely that it was made; the other is in 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, which tells us that Hezekiah "directed the waters of the upper Gihon—or Virgin's Spring—to the west side of the city of David." Consequently, the tunnel which starts from the eastern slope of the south-eastern hill, and ends on its western slope, must run through the site on which the city of David stood, and this site must be the south-eastern hill. I see no escape from this conclusion. Furthermore, we have the explicit statement in 2 Samuel v, 7, that the city of David was built on Zion. The hill of Zion, therefore, was the south-eastern hill.

So much for Captain Conder's theory of the position of Zion. The Siloam Inscription has virtually settled the dispute. It also settles the question as to whether the hill of Zion extended across the deep Tyropœon valley—a rather remarkable feat one would have imagined for a single hill. Hezekiah's conduit ended on the western side of the city of David, while the two Pools of Siloam are on the western slope of the south-eastern hill; accordingly, the city of David, and the hill on which it stood, could not have extended across the gorge to the west of it. The Tyropœon Valley, therefore, must be the valley of the sons of Hinnom, into which the western gates of Zion opened.

When this conclusion is reached, it follows, as I have pointed out, that Ophel is only the northern portion of the south-eastern hill. In my former paper I blundered over the account given by the chronicler (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14) of the wall built by Manasseh, owing to my not perceiving that the Gihon he mentions was the Lower Gihon, or Pool of Siloam. Manasseh began his wall "outside the city of David," and to the west of the Pool of Siloam, but also somewhat to the south of it, at the point where the "gorge" of the sons of Hinnom met the *nakkal*, or valley of the Kidron. From this point it ran northwards as far as the fish-gate, where it turned to the east and "compassed about Ophel." I suspect that "the broad wall" spoken of by Nehemiah (iii, 8; xii, 38) formed part of it.

Pre-exilic Jerusalem, accordingly, consisted of two hills only: the south-

eastern, or Zion, the northern "excrescence" of which was termed Ophel—a name which implies an "excrescence" on another hill, and not the whole hill itself—and Mount Moriah, on which the Jebusite city stood. Until it was levelled by Simon the Hasmonean, the highest point of Zion dominated Moriah, which will explain why the Jebusite redoubt, or protecting fortress, was built here, and also why David erected here his palace and barracks. From the time of Solomon onwards the south-eastern part of Moriah was occupied by the palace and temple where the court officials and guards as well as the priests lived; the rest of Moriah continued to be the seat of the Jebusites and foreign merchants who filled the bazaars on the north and west.

Now it is clear to me that Captain Conder, with his mind full of the Temple area of the Herodian epoch, has never realised that it was this amalgamation of the old Jebusite town and its Jewish suburb which I meant by pre-exilic Jerusalem. Otherwise he would never have imagined that I confined "the capital of Syria in David's time" to an area of only 15 acres. He himself tells us (in his "Handbook to the Bible") that the building space on Moriah amounted to 35 acres, and this has to be added to the 15 acres before we have an approximate measure of the size of Solomon's city. My impression is that the Jewish suburb itself, though we are told only 15 acres in extent, was no smaller than the Hebron which was for seven years the capital of David. The Jerusalem of David's later years would not be much inferior in size to the rival capital of Ammon.

Captain Conder thinks that his views as to the size of pre-exilic Jerusalem are supported by the Book of Nehemiah, where it is said (vii, 4) that "the city was large and great, but the people were few therein." Unfortunately, however, he has not read on to the next chapter. Had he done so he would have seen what Nehemiah's statement really means. Here (viii, 1) we learn that not only the inhabitants of Jerusalem itself, but also of the country round about, "gathered themselves together as one man into the square that was before the water-gate," and there listened to Ezra, while he read the Law. It was no wonder, therefore, that the city seemed "large and great" to them. Captain Conder has forgotten the infinite capacities of Orientals for packing themselves together in a small space: had he slept with the fellahin of Palestine as often as I have done, I think he would have understood how it is managed.

A. H. SAYCE.

### "AS THOU COMEST UNTO ZOAR."

EVERY new discovery in Bible lands tends to throw new light on the Bible text; and every fresh illumination of the Bible text in the light of later Biblical research is almost sure to give added meaning, as well as added clearness, to both text and context. There is always a positive