

THE ANCIENT ROAD FROM NEAR THE PRESENT BAB EZ ZAHARE.

By the Rev. ANDREW J. GREGG.

IN the present north wall of Jerusalem I have found its intersection by the road from the Haram es Sherif and from Antonia which crosses the hill over Jeremiah's grotto, passes by the tombs of the kings and near the heap of ashes, goes right straight on down the hill, crossing the present north road, passes near the tombs of the judges and near Mizpah, on to Antipatris and so to Cæsarea. This would be the road by which the ashes were brought from the temple to the fields of Kedron, and by which our Lord would, with greatest convenience to the garrison of Antonia, have been taken to execution, whether on the "green hill far away" or at the place of ashes, and St. Paul would have been brought by the same road on his night ride to Cæsarea. Old residents of prominence in Jerusalem, to whom I spoke of it and showed it, had not known of it before, and I do not see it alluded to in any book or map.¹

Where the American house now stands, on the highest point of the rock over Solomon's quarries, the present wall takes a turn southwards, then eastwards, and again northwards, forming a sort of bay; from the east point of this bay there are 14 loopholes in the wall to the next tower, and Herod's Gate is at the next tower east of this. Count five loopholes from the corner and 10 from the tower, and immediately underneath is the bed of the road cut in the solid rock. I tore away the clay to make sure; the part of the road outside the wall being scarped down nearly flush with the present structure above.

THE VALLEY OF HINNOM.

By the Rev. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.

IN defence of Wady er Rababeh the popular line for this valley and in opposition to the *true* line through the Tyropœon Valley, Prof. Wright (*Statement*, 1898, 261) asks me (1) "to point out Jebus in the list of the towns of Judah," while Jerusalem is confessedly included in Benjamin's list; and he refers (2) "to the north line of Judah in Josh. xv, and the south line of Benjamin in xviii being exactly the same, and both of them passing 'south' of Jebus."

In reply to (1) I ask Prof. Wright to point out Bethlehem in the said list. On his doing so, I will in turn gladly point out Jebus. Apart

¹ But see Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," Art. "Jerusalem," by Sir Charles W. Wilson, B.E., pp. 1594 and 1656.—ED.

from that list, however, I am satisfied that Bethlehem-Judah was in Judah.

As to (2), let it be conceded that the two Hebrew terms translated (r.v.) *southward* in Josh. xv, 8, xviii, 16, practically mean on the *south* side, so as to make the line pass south of Jebus. I would then point out that the north line of Benjamin is also in xviii, 13, said to pass "to Luz, to the side of Luz (the same is Bethel) southward."

Now if the southerly term used in verse 16 requires Jerusalem to be wholly north of the southern line, *i.e.*, in Benjamin, why should not precisely the same term in verse 13 require Bethel to be wholly north of the northern line, *i.e.*, in Ephraim?

Difference of latitude of places surely does not necessarily extort latitude of meaning. It is true that in 1 Chron. vii, 28, Bethel is named among the possessions of Ephraim, but in Josh. xviii, 22, only nine verses from home, Bethel is distinctly catalogued in the list of the towns of Benjamin. Thus it is clear that the mention of *south* does not help Dr. Wright's popular position for Hinnom. Further if it be argued that the mention of Jerusalem in Benjamin's list requires not only the more important or populous part of Jebus to have been in Benjamin, but also the whole of Jebus to have been in the said Benjamin, then at once I go up again to Bethel for a reply. I find that Josh. xvi, 2, states that the south line of Ephraim (here "exactly the same" as the north line of Benjamin) "went out from Bethel to Luz" (r.v.), yet Bethel and Luz are "the same" in xviii, 13, and elsewhere. It results, therefore, that Biblical usage permits Bethel to be now identical with Luz, now diverse from Luz, *i.e.*, it admits of a larger and a smaller Bethel.

The licence thus granted to Luz in the north may be fairly claimed for Jebus in the south of Benjamin, and, as I showed in 1878, satisfactorily removes a topographical difficulty by allowing the Valley of Hinnom to divide Jerusalem, and to be drawn along the Tyropœon, a line as respectful to Jeremiah as it is necessary to Tophet. Hesbon seems similarly to have been divided between two tribes, as in Josh. xiii, 17, it is named among Reuben's cities, but is mentioned as given out of the tribe of Gad in xxi, 39, and 1 Chron. vi, 81.

As the castle of the Jebusites was situate on Ophel (so called), the southern part of the eastern hill, Jerusalem justly comes to be reckoned among Benjamin's cities in Josh. xviii; still a portion of Jerusalem was really west of the Tyropœon (probably) on the hill of the upper city (of Josephus), and so was actually within the tribe or lot of Judah. Accordingly Judah (Judges i, 3) after saying to Simeon: "Come up with me into *my lot*," lawfully, according to the Bethel licence of an elastic Jerusalem, attacked and took Jerusalem; but as they captured only the weaker part of Jebus, it was not specifically catalogued in their list in Josh. xv. A note was merely added (v. 63): "As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem, unto this day."

I am obliged to Dr. Wright for advocating the popular Hinnom error which (Bonar, 488) first appeared in the seventeenth century. His objections to my Tyropœon line have now (it seems to me) been amply proved to be groundless; and this is the only line that satisfies Judges i, 3; Josh. xv, 63; Jer. xxxi, 40; and vii, 32.

In conclusion I quote from Mr. Henderson's "Palestine," p. 123: "A most ingenious note will be found in Dr. Bonar's 'Land of Promise,' p. 486, proposing to find the Hebrew Ge-ben-hinnom in the Greek Tyropœon. He supposes that Josephus took the first two syllables of the name Ge-ben-hinnom for *Geben*, the Hebrew for *cheese*, and translated it by the Greek equivalent, and he points to an exactly similar mistake by the LXX in Ps. lxxiii, 15, 16."

PISGAH.

By the Rev. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.

DR. POST points out in *Statement*, 1888, 196, that "the most comprehensive, as well as the most detailed, view of the whole Promised Land" is to be obtained from Jebel Hosh'a. Apparently he would identify it with Pisgah or Nebo, if the name Neba did not occur near Siaghah. As any possible site for Dan must be invisible from Siaghah and its immediate neighbourhood, Neba deserves no consideration or favour as Pisgah so long as a view is required strictly conformable to the Biblical details in Deut. xxxiv. Neba may derive its existence from the city Nebo, and Ayûn Mûsa (the Springs of Moses) be no more genuine than the traditional Mount Zion.

While there are some attractive arguments for making Jebel Hosh'a to be the head of Pisgah, the objections to such an identification seem to me solid and unanswerable.

In favour of Jebel Hosh'a it might be urged that:—

1. It commands the finest panorama in Palestine, taking in even the extreme southern end of the Dead Sea, the plain of Jericho, and (I believe) Dan, in the Merj Ayun, together with Hermon. Perhaps this last item is a positive drawback.
2. As Shittim was in the plains of Moab, so possibly Jebel Hosh'a may have been in the *land* of Moab (*Statement*, 1898, 113), though I suspect it was in "half the land of the children of Ammon" given to Gad (Josh. xiii, 25).
3. Jebel Hosh'a is certainly *over against*, *i.e.*, in sight of Jericho (Deut. xxxiv, 1).
4. If Moses in his first survey from Jebel Hosh'a faced N.N.E., then the Dead Sea would have been to him "the behind sea."