

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.*

II.

THE NAME JERUSALEM AND OTHER NAMES.

IN Hebrew the original pronunciation of this name (as will be shown immediately) was Yērûshālēm, from which we are derived the Greek Ierousalem and various modern modifications. But in the Tell el Amarna letters, written about 1400 B.C. in the Babylonian language and characters, the form is Urusalim; in Assyrian inscriptions of the eighth century, Ursalim[u]; in Aramean, 'Urîshlem; and in early Arabic, 'Aurishalam[u]. There are thus two lines of tradition as to the original form. Since the *s* of the Babylonian is to be taken as the equivalent of the Hebrew *sh*, the difference between them is confined to the first part of the name.¹ The question to which we have to address ourselves is, Which of the two was the original? Though the question turns on a letter or two—Yērû (it may have been 'Îrû) or 'Ûrû—it involves a matter of no little historical importance. For it amounts to this: Was the name of the city a native name, or was it imposed by the Babylonians?

1. The Hebrew letters ירושלם, *y-r-u-s-l-m*, are constantly vocalised in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament as יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Yērûshālāim, which takes the fuller form יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Yērûshālayim, in three late passages,² and upon coins that belong either to the reign of Simon 142–135 B.C., or to the Jewish revolt against Rome, 66–70 A.D.³

¹ Winckler, Haupt, etc., spell the name of the city with the simple *s*, but Sayce's; the root from which the second part of the name is derived is *sh-l-m*: spelt with *sh* both in Assyrian and Hebrew.

² According to Baer: Jer. xxvi. 18; Esther ii. 6; 2 Chron. xxxii. 9. Other recensions of the text add two more: 1 Chron. iii. 5; 2 Chron. xxv. 1—in both of which Baer reads יְרוּשָׁלַיִם.

³ Eckhel, *Doct. Vet. Num.* iii. 466 ff.; Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 66 ff.; cf. Schürer, *Hist.* ii. 379 ff. The spelling -ayim occurs also in the Talmud—e.g. Tosephtha, Kethuboth, 4.

The termination -aim or -ayim is late and probably artificial.¹ The evidence is conclusive for an earlier and more common pronunciation, Yērûshālēm. This suits the Hebrew consonants; it is confirmed by the Septuagint transliteration, Ierousalem;² it appears in the Biblical Aramaic Yērûshlem,³ and in the Hebrew contraction, Shālēm.⁴ It must in fact have been the pronunciation in ordinary use, while that of -aim or -ayim, which appears in no other dialect, was confined to the liturgical reading of the Scripture, and to other solemn occasions.

On the supposition that Yērûshālēm was the original name of the city, various derivations have been suggested: some ludicrous and none satisfactory. The latter half of the word is usually taken as meaning *peace* or *security*; but while the early rabbis interpreted the first part as *sight* or *fear*⁵ (hardly credible suggestions), modern etymologists have been divided between *the possession* and *the foundation of peace* or *security*.⁶

2. The rival form in the Tell-el-Amarna letters is read by Assyriologists as Urusalim;⁷ in the Assyrian inscriptions of Sennacherib, seven hundred years later, it appears as

¹ It used to be taken as the ordinary termination of the dual of nouns, and was explained as signifying the Upper and Lower Cities of which Jerusalem was composed in the Greek and Roman periods (so Gesenius, *Theo. s.v.*), though another derivation might be found in the legendary explanation of the name given below n. 5. But it may be a mere local termination, for it appears in other place-names where it is difficult to suspect a dual. See Barth, *Die Nominalbildung der Semitischen Sprachen*, § 194c, n. 1.

² Ἰερουσαλημ.

³ ירושלים, Ezra iv. 20, 24, 51; ירושלים— v. 14, 69.

⁴ Ps. lxxvi. 3; LXX, ἐν εἰρήμῃ.

⁵ There is one rabbinic explanation worth quoting for its humour. It occurs in a Midrash, *Bereshith rabba* ch. 89. Abraham called the place יְרוּשָׁלַיִם (Gen. xxii. 14), but Shem (i.e. Melchisedec) had called it שְׁלֵם (Gen. xiv.). God, unwilling to offend either Patriarch, gave it both names—Yirēah-Shālēm = Yērûshālēm. The numerical value of יְרוּשָׁלַיִם and ירו is the same: 216.

⁶ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, *possession of peace*: Reland and others. ירו שלם (from ירה, to cast or throw down), *the foundation of peace*: Ges. *Theo.* Ges.-Buhl., *Lex.*¹²; cf. Grill, *Z.A.T.W.*, iv. 134 ff.; or *the foundation of security*: Merrill, *Bibl. World*, 1899, 270.

⁷ Sayce, Uru'salim.

Ur-sa-li-im[mu]. Assyriologists take the first part, Uru, as meaning *city*.¹ Sayce interprets the second as the name of a god, and translates *City of 'Salim*,² but this has been opposed, especially by Zimmern;³ and Haupt renders it in analogy to the Arabic Dâr-es-Salâm and Medinet-es-Salâm as *Place of Safety*, "praesidium salutis." He recalls the term *stronghold*⁴ as applied to the town in Hebrew, and compares the name of the "southernmost Babylonian port, Bâb-salimeti, 'safe entrance.'" As Uru is the Sumerian word for city,⁵ and Salim is Semitic; the name, according to this interpretation, is a hybrid.

Of these two forms, the Hebrew Yerushalem and the Babylonian Urusalim, which is the original? Was the name native, that is Canaanite? or was it imposed by the Babylonians during a period when, as we know, the Babylonian culture pervaded Palestine?

In an interesting argument,⁶ Dr. Haupt decides for

¹ 'Vielleicht': Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, 226 f. Others (Sayce, *Records of Past*, 2nd ser. v. 61; Haupt, as below, etc.) without any qualification.

² *Records of the Past* (see Series v. 61); *The Early History of the Hebrews*, 28. "The figure and name of the god Salimmu, written in cuneiform characters, are on a gem now in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg. The same God, under the name of Shalman, is mentioned on a stela discovered at Sidon, and under that of Selamanês in the inscriptions of Shêkh Barakât, north-west of Aleppo (Clermont Ganneau "Études d'Archéologie Orientale" in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, cxiii. vol. ii. pp. 36, 48; Sayce, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, xix. 2, p. 74)."

³ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1891, p. 263. Sayce's argument that Salim is a divine name is based upon his reading *Issuppu* in l. 12 of Letter 102 (of the Berlin edition), which he renders "prophecy" (of the mighty king); and on his rendering *Zuruh* in ll. 14, 34 of 104, "oracle" (of the mighty king); and on his rendering of l. 16, Letter 106 "the temple of the god Uras (whose) name (there is) 'Salim.'" But Winckler, *Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna* reads, in l. 12 of 102 (Wi. 179), Zu-ru-uh, which both there and in ll. 14 and 34 (Wi. 181) of 104 (Wi. l. 33) Zimmern and he render "arm": taking "the mighty King" not as a deity, but as Pharaoh. Winckler reads, Letter 106 l. 16 (numbered by him 15) quite differently from Sayce: (alu) Bit-Ninib.

⁴ מצודה.

⁵ Preserved in the name of the South Babylonian city Ur: Heb, Ur Kasdim; and appearing also in other place-names, e.g. Ur-dalika. Delitzsch, *Par.* 328.

⁶ In a note to the critical text of Isaiah (xxix. 1) in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.

the Babylonian,¹ from which the Hebrew (or Canaanite) Yerushalem—originally, as he thinks, Irushalem—was derived either by dissimilation,² or as a dialectic modification. “The dialectic form of *Uru* is *eri*”; and “*er* is the syllabic value of the idiogram for city,” that “has passed into Hebrew as עיר” (‘ir). “Urusalim is thus a compound of the Sumerian word for ‘fortified place,’ ‘city,’ and the Semitic *shalim*, ‘safety.’ The *u* after the *r* is the Sumerian vowel of prolongation; the *i* in Urishalim, (Syriac, ‘Urishlem; Arabic ‘Aurishalam) substitutes the *i* of the genitive as termination of the construct state, and is therefore more correct from the Semitic point of view. Irushalim (ירושלם) from which the common form of the name Jerusalem is derived, represents the dialectic form of the word *uru*, viz. *eri*, which has passed into Hebrew as עיר. We should expect *Erishalim* or *Irishalim*”: the *u* in *Irûshalim* “may be due to dissimilation.”

The opinion of so great an authority as Dr. Haupt is to be received with respect; yet it seems to me, *first*, in itself to be open to serious objections, and *second* not to be so probable (to say the least) as the converse alternative, viz., that the Babylonian form is a corruption of a native or Canaanite name, which has been more correctly handed down in the Hebrew Yêrûshâlêm.

To begin with, Dr. Haupt’s argument derives no support from the fact of the survival of the initial vowel *U* in the Aramean ‘Urishlem and the Arabic ‘Aurishalam;³ for such a survival only proves the derivation of these forms

¹ “From the Assyrian point of view Urusalim is less correct than Urisalem.” Haupt; and he compares Penuel and Peniel. So also יְרוּשָׁלַם 2 Chron. xx. 16, יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. vii. 2; יְרוּשָׁלַם Kt. and יְרוּשָׁלַם Kr. 2 Chron. xxix. 14; יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. ix. 6, and יְרוּשָׁלַם 1 Chron. xv. 18.

² That is avoidance of the repetition of the same vowel.

³ This is an old Arabic form quoted by Yakut (*Mugam el Buldan*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 317) from a pre-Islamic poet. It occurs also in Edrisi: Robinson *B.R.* I. p. 380. Robinson spells it Aurûshlîm (Index).

from the Babylonian—a derivation historically very probable as the Arameans were in close intercourse with Babylonia, and carried their own language far into Arabia¹—and would not offer independent evidence for the originality of the Babylonian form. Again, it is impossible to argue for Dr. Haupt's hypothesis (as might at first thought appear to be possible) on the ground that Jerusalem had a native name or names which were displaced by the Babylonian designation, and rendered archaic or confined to the language of poetry. For we have no means of knowing whether such names—the Stronghold, Zion, Ophel, or Jebus²—were ever applied in primitive times to the town as a whole; or what in any way might have been the native name for Jerusalem before the Babylonians succeeded (according to Dr. Haupt) in displacing it. There is, therefore, no external or independent evidence for Dr. Haupt's conclusion, which is entirely drawn from the Babylonian language.

Thus, unsupported by evidence outside the Babylonian language, Dr. Haupt's derivation of the name lies open (in the first place) to the objection of a foreign source. In the case of a Palestine place-name this objection is serious. So far as we know, no other name of a town or locality in Palestine is so derived, except, in one or two doubtful cases, in which, perhaps, the worship of a Babylonian god succeeded in attaching his name to a site.³ Why in the

¹ I find the Aramaic form אורשלים in a Nabatean inscription (found by Doughty in El-Mezham, not far from Hegr in Arabia, and given on p. 294 of vol. i. pt. 1 of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*), which would explain the Arabic 'Aurishalem. The Mandaic is אוראשלים.

² Jebus, indeed, may be a late and artificial name: see "Jerusalem" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 2,416.

³ For example, Nebo, which is not certain; and Beth-lehem, in which one or two scholars trace the name of the god Lahum, but for this there is (to say the least) an equally probable etymology. G. B. Gray (*Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 127, 324), indeed argues that the presence in a place-name of Beth-, compounded with another word, proves that this latter is either a divine name or had a divine name attached to it in a fuller form of the word. But for reasons against this see *The Critical Review*, 1898, p. 20.

case of Jerusalem alone should a Babylonian name have been given, and prevail? Even to render this probable, we should require to know that the site had been without a name till the Babylonians occupied it, or that its native name was one of those terms which the Hebrews used, either poetically for the whole town, or for some parts of it. But for this, as we have seen, there is virtually no evidence; and we are, therefore, left to the conclusion that Dr. Haupt's derivation is in itself improbable.

Again, if the form *Irushalem* had been derived from *Urusalim*, and the equivalent in Hebrew of the Babylonian *Uru* be 'Ir (ר"י), with an initial 'ayin, we might have expected in the Hebrew name an initial 'ayin, or at least, as in the Syriac and Arabic derivations from the Babylonian, an initial 'aleph. The absence of this seems to prove that in *Irushalem* or *Yerushalem* we have a form on another line of tradition altogether than that which the Babylonian started.

But more important still, Dr. Haupt's hypothesis is confronted with an alternative, for which there is some evidence in other Palestine place-names. He says that the Hebrew *Yerushalem* (*Irushalem*) was produced from *Urusalim* either by dissimilation or, more probably, as a dialectic variety. But not only is it equally possible on phonetic grounds that *Urusalim* is a corruption, by assimilation of the vowels, from *Yerushalem*. There are, besides, actual instances of such a change in the Assyrian transliteration of the native names of other places in Palestine. For while it is true that the long, or otherwise well marked, vowels, in such native names are correctly reproduced in the cuneiform transliterations, as in the cases of *Lākhīsh*, *Ashdōd*, *Yāphō* (*Joppa*) and *Sidōn*, which in Assyrian appear as *Lā-kī-s-u*, *As-du-du*, *Ya-ap-pu-[u]*, and *Si-du-n[u]*; it is also very significant that when in a native name a weak vowel precedes a strong one, as in the first part of *Yērūshālēm*, it is very often in the Assyrian transliteration assimilated to the sound of the latter. Thus 'Ēdom

(אֲדוּם) becomes U-du-um[u];¹ Pēkôd (פְּקוֹד) Pu-ku-d[u];² Bēnê-Bēraḳ (בְּנֵי-בְרָק) Ba-na-a-a-bar-ak; and 'Ēlûl (אֵלּוּל the name of the month) U-lu-l[u]. Even a long vowel is sometimes assimilated to another long one as in Mōâb, which in one Assyrian form is Ma-'-aba; Ammôn (עַמּוֹן) which becomes Am-ma-n[u];³ and the Talmudic, 'Ushā (אֲשָׁא),⁴ which becomes U-s-u[u]. An instance of assimilation is also found in the Assyrian Ma-ga-du-[u] (but elsewhere Ma-gi-du-[u]) for Megiddo, and perhaps in mi-šir and mu-šur for the name of Egypt, which the Hebrew gives as Mišraim. The last instance reminds us that in several cases the Assyrian shows a fondness for the vowel *u*, where there does not appear to have been any trace of this in the original: as in Al-ta-ku-[u],⁵ from 'Eltēḳēh (אֶלְתֵּֽקֶה), and Gu-ubli,⁶ from Gēbal (גְּבַל). In face of all these—really a large proportion of the few place-names of Palestine of which we possess Assyrian forms—it is clear that Urusalim may very probably have been produced by assimilation from Yērû- or Iru-shalem. And this alternative to Dr. Haupt's derivation has a further superiority over the latter in that it implies for Yerushalem what we find in almost every other place-name in Palestine, a native origin.

What the etymology was it is almost impossible to descry. The rabbinic fancies quoted earlier in this article may be dismissed. The resemblance of the first part of the Hebrew name יְרוּ, Yeru, to the verbal imperfect, and the composition of instances of the latter with a divine title in so many of the Palestinian place-names, suggests a similar derivation for Yērûshālēm: as if it were from the root יָרָה, Yārāh, and should mean *Shalem casts or founds (the city)*.⁷ But, as we have seen, Professor Sayce's interpretation of Salim as a divine name is unconfirmed by other

¹ Del. Par. 295.

² The name of a tribe (Jer. l. 21; Ezek. xxiii. 23).

³ Though in this case the native pronunciation may have been 'Ammân.

⁴ Succa, f. 20a. ⁵ Del. Par. 288. ⁶ *Ibid.* 283. ⁷ Cf. p. 125 n. 1.

Assyriologists, and on the whole it is safer to take *salim* or *shalem* as being either a noun, *peace*, or an adjective, *safe*, *secure*, *inviolable*. "Yeru" might either be a verb, and the name mean *he* (the god) *founds peace*, or a noun, as if *secure foundation*. There are, however, other alternatives. The Arabic 'Arya means *abiding, continuous* ('iryu, a stable or stall). And there is the common Semitic root 'ûr or 'îr, to *lighten* (Arabic, 'awwar, *to kindle*), from which we have the Hebrew word 'ûr (אֵשׁ), *fire* or *hearth*, and the Arabic 'Irat, *focus* or *hearth*. The probability of this latter derivation is increased if we read (with Cheyne and others) Isaiah's name for Jerusalem,¹ 'Ariel, *God's lion*, as 'Uriel, *God's hearth*, and suppose that the prophet formed it in analogy to the name of the city. Yerushalem would then signify *hearth of peace* or *inviolable hearth*. But all these are suppositions, which we have no means of proving.

We have now to pursue the history of the name through Greek and Latin to the languages of modern Europe.

The Hebrew Yērûshâlēm appears in the Alexandrine translation as *Ἱερουσαλημ* (Ierousalem): the constant form in all those books of the Greek canon which have been translated from the Hebrew. As in the case of so many other proper names in the Septuagint, it is an exact transliteration of the original, made before the vowel-points were inserted in the Hebrew text, and therefore reflecting (as we have seen) the early and common pronunciation of the name. The earliest appearance of this form in other Greek, which I have been able to discover, is that in a passage of Clearchus of Soli,² a pupil of Aristotle, which is quoted by Josephus.³ He gives it accurately, but with a Greek termination: Ierousalēm-ē. Since he says that it

¹ xxviii. 2.

² End of 4th and beginning of 3rd cent. B.C.

³ C. *Apion*, i. 22: Τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν (i.e. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) ὄνομα πάντῃ σκολιῶν ἔστιν Ἱερουσαλημῆν γὰρ αὐτῆν καλοῦσιν. In the meantime the initial breathing is purposely omitted from *Ἱερουσαλημη*.

is "altogether awkward" to pronounce—which he would hardly have asserted of the Hellenised form Hierosolyma—and since Josephus everywhere else uses Hierosolyma, we may be sure that in Ierousalēm-ē we have the original spelling of Clearchus himself.¹ And if this be so, it is another proof of the original pronunciation of the name.²

It is doubtful what breathing the Septuagint translators and the citation by Josephus from Clearchus prefixed to Ierousalem;³ but in any case the rough breathing came into early use: Hierousalem. This may have been originally due to an effort to express the consonantal force of the first letter;⁴ but more probably arose from—and was at least confirmed by—the fashion prevalent in Western Asia from the second and first centuries B.C., of Hellenising proper names. To the same source we may trace the further modification of the name into the plural noun *Ἱεροσόλυμα* (with or without the article), Hierosolyma. When this first appeared it is impossible to discover. The earliest, directly recorded, instances of it, so far as I can trace, belong to the first century B.C. In Maccabees ii.-iv., in which the Septuagint spelling of proper names is so often followed,⁵ we find not Ierousalem but Ierosolyma; and so in the "Letter of Aristeas"⁶ (under the later Ptolemies), and in Strabo, quoting probably from an author who wrote soon after the

¹ Therefore Niese's note—'suspectum'—to the reading *Ἱεροουσαλημη* (see Index to Niese's ed. of Jos. s.v.) is unnecessary.

² See above, p. 123.

³ The edd of the LXX (including Swete's), and Niese's ed. of Jos., prefix the *spiritus asper*. But in his *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek* Swete gives the light breathing, pp. 305, 313: and so Reinach in the excerpt from Clearchus (*Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, p. 11).

⁴ As in the expression of 'Ayin, yet in other cases of the initial *yoδ*, this is transliterated as I with the light breathing: e.g. *Ἰορδάνης*, *Ἰησοῦς*, etc.

⁵ Swete, *Introd.* 313.

⁶ Both with and without the article. See Thackeray's ed. in Swete's *Introd.* pp. 525 f. In the Letter of Aristeas, the rough breathing is prefixed; and it is a question whether the rough breathing should not also be prefixed in Maccabees ii.-iv; as is done in Tischendorf's ed.

Syrian campaign of Pompey in 63 B.C.¹ In Latin Cicero has it,² and subsequent writers, for example Pliny, Tacitus, and Suetonius:³ still in a plural form Hierosolyma. It was therefore in common use by the first century B.C. But it appears also so uniformly in quotations from earlier Greek writers,⁴ that we are justified in tracing its origin to some distance behind the first century; and all the more so that the materials for its formation were present in Greek literature and were quoted in connection with the Jews as early as the fifth century B.C. Josephus, who in his Hellenic fashion constantly employs the form Hierosolyma⁵—though he must have known better—derives it more than once⁶ from Solyma, that is the Salem of Melchisedec.⁷ He spells it Solyma because Greek writers had already used this shorter form and found for it an etymology of their own.

¹ See Reinach, *op. cit.* p. 97. It occurs, too, in Philo (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23), Plutarch, and so through Appian (*Syr.* 50), Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* (xxxvii. 15f., etc.), and subsequent writers: always as a plural and generally with the article.

² *Pro Flacco*, c. 28.

³ Pliny, *H.N.*, v. 14f.; Tac. *Hi.* ii. 4, v. 1; Suet. *Tit.* 5. We find it also on an inscription of the time of Claudius: [Hi]erosolymitana (*Corp. Inscr. Lat.* x. no. 1971).

⁴ From Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 300 B.C.), in a fragment of Diodorus Sic. preserved by Photius; from Manetho (3rd cent. B.C.) in Jos. *C. Ap.* i. 14f.; Berosus (under Antiochus Soter, 280–261 B.C.) in Jos. *I. Ant.* vii. 2; from Menander of Ephesus (probably early in 2nd cent. B.C.), and Dios (?) in Jos. *VIII. Ant.* v. 3, cf. *C. Ap.* i. 17; from Agatharchides of Cnidus (under Ptolemy VI., 181–146 B.C.) in Jos. *C. Ap.* i. 22; from Polybius (c. 210–128 B.C.) in Jos. *XVI. Ant.* iii. 3; from Timochares (probably 2nd cent. B.C.); Xenophon the topographer (? before the 1st cent. B.C.), and Philo the elder, an epic poet—all three in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* ix. 35, 36, 37, cf. 20, 24; from Posidonius of Apamea (c. 135–51 B.C.), in Diod. Sic. xxxiv. (preserved by Photius). The historical Greek writers quoted here are all given in Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. But the student will find more convenient the collection of these extracts, and of those of pagan Latin writers given above and below, which has been drawn up by Théod. Reinach in his useful *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.

⁵ Both with and without the article: e.g. *Ant.* V. ii. 2; VII. ii. 2, iii. 2; VIII. x. 2, 4; X. vii. 1; XI. i. 1, 3, iii. 1, 10, iv. 2, v. 6, 8.

⁶ *I. Ant.* x. 2: ὁ τῆς Σολυμᾶ βασιλεὺς; τὴν μέντοι Σολυμᾶ ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα. VI. *B.J.* x. 1.

⁷ Gen. xiv.

He quotes¹ the Greek poet Choerilus, who so early as the fifth century B.C. had spoken of the Judæan range as the "Solyman mountains";² and Manetho,³ who speaks of the Hebrews, leaving Egypt, as the Solymites.⁴ It was natural to classic writers to identify this name with that of the Lycian Solymi mentioned by Homer.⁵ This appears to have been the origin of the form Hierosolyma; though we cannot help wondering if its resemblance to the name of Solomon had anything to do with its rapid acceptance.⁶ The form Solyma, which Josephus⁷ uses as a feminine singular (but indeclinable), appears as a plural neuter in Martial,⁸ and as an adjective, Solymus, in Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Juvenal⁹—all at a time when the siege by Titus had made the name of the city very familiar throughout the Roman world. In Greek, Pausanias, in 175 B.C., also gives the form Solyma.¹⁰

So much then for the history of a false form. It is curious to observe that the one pagan writing in which the correct spelling is found, *Ἱεροσαλημ*, is that ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to the pedantic Emperor Julian.¹¹

The New Testament employs both forms, *Ἱεροσαλημ* and *Ἱεροσολυμα*. The former (indeclinable) is used mostly in the writings of Luke (about twenty-seven times in the Gospel and forty in Acts, as against the use of *Ἱεροσόλυμα* four times in the Gospel and over twenty in Acts¹²) and Paul; but also occasionally elsewhere. Grimm¹³ has pointed

¹ *C. Apion*, i. 22.

² Ἐν Σολόμοις ὄρεσιν.

³ *C. Apion*, i. 26.

⁴ Οἱ Σολυμίται.

⁵ So Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 2. Jos. VII. *Ant.* iii. 2: ἐπὶ γὰρ Ἀβράμῳ . . . Σόλυμα ἐκαλεῖτο μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ αὐτὴν φασὶ τινες, ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρος ταύτ' ὠνόμασεν Ἱεροσόλυμα: τὸ γὰρ ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων γλῶτταν ὠνόμασε τὰ Σόλυμα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀσφάλεια.

⁶ Compare Menander of Ephesus: Σολομών ὁ Ἱεροσόλυμων βασιλεὺς; and Dios: τυραννῶν I. Σολομών; both quoted in Jos. VIII. *Ant.* v. 3, and *C. Ap.* i. 17 f.

⁷ Above, p. 131, n. 5.

⁸ *Epigram.* xi. 94 (written in 90 A.D.).

⁹ Val. Flaccus (fl. 70-90 A.D.) *Argonautica*, i. 13; Statius, v. 2, 138; Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 544.

¹⁰ *Perieg.* VIII. 16, 4, 5.

¹¹ *Epist.* 25.

¹² See Knowing on Acts i. 4.

¹³ *Lex.* s.v.

out that it has been selected where a certain sacred significance is intended;¹ or in solemn appeals.² It has the article only when accompanied by an adjective.³ The form *Ιεροσολυμα* appears as an indeclinable feminine only once.⁴ Elsewhere it is a neuter plural, as in Josephus and Greek writers; so in all the Gospels,⁵ and Acts and Galatians. It occurs only in John with the article in the oblique cases.⁶ It is doubtful whether either of the two forms should have the aspirate. Blass gives it to the Greek alone; Westcott and Hort deny it to both.

Following the Greek Testament the Vulgate has both the Hebrew and Greek forms, in some codices with the aspirate, in some without: Hierusalem and Hierosolyma, Ierusalem and Ierosolyma; and all these four continue through the Christian centuries. The Pilgrim of Bordeaux⁷ and Eucherius⁸ write Hierusalem; Eusebius in the *Onomasticon* *Ιερουσαλημ*, and Jerome Ierusalem; Antoninus⁹ and Arculf¹⁰ Hierosolima; Willibald, Bernard and Theodoric¹¹ Ierusalem; Chroniclers of the Crusades Hierosolyma and Hierusalem and Ierusalem;¹² documents of the Crusades, Hierosolyma.¹³ The earliest French writings have Iherusalem,¹⁴ Jerusalem, Jerusalem and Jerusalem.¹⁵ Barbour's *Brus* (iv. 29) has Ierusalem, and Spenser's *Faerie Queen* (Bk. I. Canto X. 57) Hierusalem. The English

¹ Gal. iv. 25.

² Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34. Add Luke xxiii. 28.

³ Winer, *Gram.*, E.T. 125; yet see Acts v. 28.

⁴ Matt. ii. 3. See also in Matt. iii. 5; where it stands for the inhabitants of the city.

⁵ E.g. Matt. xx. 17, xxi. 1?; Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; John ii. 23, v. 2.

⁶ John v. 2, x. 22, xi. 18. So Winer, *op. cit.* p. 125. In John v. 1 the accusative is without the article.

⁷ 333 A.D.

⁸ c. 427-440.

⁹ c. 570.

¹⁰ 680.

¹¹ Wil. c. 722, Bern. 867, Theod. c. 1172.

¹² Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

¹³ Röhricht, *Regesta Regni Hieros.*

¹⁴ In the *Cité de Ih.* 1187.

¹⁵ *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, from the end of the 12th cent.; but in a revised form of somewhat later date (published Paris, 1897).

Authorised Version of 1611 has Ierusalem in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, but Hierusalem in the New Testament.

Thus Jerusalem (with some variants) comes to be the form in the languages of Europe. Hierosolyma, and the shortened Solyma, treated now as feminine, appear occasionally in poetry and romance. We have seen that an early Arabic form was 'Aurishalam. Other Arabic forms are Shalamu and Shallamu,¹ and Yerusalim; the last used in Palestine, to-day, by Jews, Levantines and native Christians.²

OTHER NAMES. (1) AELIA.

When the Emperor Hadrian razed the City, he strove also to destroy the native name by substituting Aelia Capitolina. Till the time of Constantine and for at least two centuries later Aelia was the official name;³ was still longer continued in writing;⁴ and even passed over into Arabic as 'Iliya.⁵ From the other part of Hadrian's name for the city comes Ptolemy's *Καπιτολιας*.

(2) HOLY CITY—EL-KUDS.

In later passages of the Old Testament Jerusalem is sometimes designated The Holy City,⁶ and on the coins mentioned above Holy Jerusalem.⁷ This reappears in the New Testament,⁸ and on the Mosaic map in Medeba. Philo has Hieropolis.⁹

¹ Guy de Strange's *Palestine under the Moslems*, 83.

² *Z.D.P.V.*, xvii. 257.

³ *Onomasticon*, Euseb. *Αιλια*, Jer. Aelia; also in Canon of the Council of Nice, vii.; Acts of a Synod held in Jerusalem in 536 (cited by Robinson, *B.R.* ii. 9).

⁴ Cf. Adamnanus, *De Locis Sanctis*, i. 21.

⁵ Yakût, iv. 592.

⁶ Isa. xlviij. 2; Neh. xi. 1, etc. Epiphanius (c. 840).

⁷ ירושלם קדושה.

⁸ Ἡ ἁγία πόλις, Matt. iv, 5, xxvii. 53.

⁹ Ἱερόπολις: *In Flaccum*, § 7.

So in Arabic the commonest designation is derived from the Semitic root for *holy k-d-s*. It appears in various forms: Bêt el Makdis, el Muḳaddas, el Muḳaddis,¹ or (in the modern vernacular) el Ḳuds esh-Sherif, or more briefly el Ḳuds "the Sanctuary." In the East this is by far the commonest name to-day.

The interesting suggestion is made by M. Clermont Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine*, vol. i. 186, that el-Muḳaddas or el Ḳuds betrays a reminiscence of a dedication of the sanctuary at Jerusalem to the Canaanite deity Ḳadesh. But for this there appears to be no evidence.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

WENDT ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

II.

THE next case which Wendt brings forward is the speech in vi. 27 sqq. It does not harmonize with the historical situation. The speech follows upon the request of the people for a sign similar to that given by Moses in the manna. Could any more inappropriate occasion, Wendt asks, be imagined for such a demand? The people who asked this sign had received precisely such a sign the day before. Wendt thinks that in the original tradition the discourse vi. 27 sqq. had no connexion with the miracle of the feeding of the multitude. The Evangelist thought to give it an appropriate setting by connecting it with this miracle. What more fitting than that the feeding of the multitude should be followed by the speech in which Jesus spoke of Himself as the bread of life! So he endeavoured to connect the two by vi. 26 in which Jesus reproaches the people with seeking Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate and were filled. But the connexion thus estab-

¹ Yaḳût, iv. 590; *Taj el 'arus*, iv. 214.