

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

body of Christians then existing is by him dubbed revolutionary.

R. Exactly. That is my point. That is how Church History is written!

M. By an eminent Anglican divine! Then, Riddell, it wants overhauling.

R. It wants a new bottom, Mason—the Christian Prophets; a new bias, or rather balance—that of Truth; but though the crew is ever slowly changing, I find comfort in knowing that our Pilot remains the same, as faithful as He is sure. And we can trust Him still.

E. C. SELWYN.

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

IV.

THE PRELUDE.

THE histories of many of the famous cities of the world run back into legendary tales of their origins: the selection of a site by some wandering hero surprised into the intuition of advantages which it takes centuries of fame to prove; a sacrifice and the descent of favourable omens; or a miracle; or the apparition of a deity. It is the fate of the most sacred city of all to be destitute of such memories. Her name, as we have seen, betrays no certain sign of a belief in her divine foundation.¹ There is no story of the choice of her site by the first men who dwelt, or worshipped upon it. And (if we leave aside in the meantime the ambiguous narrative in Genesis xiv.) the earliest notices of Jerusalem present her entering history with a plain, unromantic air, singularly in keeping with that absence of

¹ EXPOSITOR for February, 1903. Yet see farther on in this article.

mystery which we have noted in her atmosphere and grey surroundings.¹ About 1400 B.C., four centuries before her fame began, we have from Jerusalem herself, though discovered among the archives of the Egyptian court, a small number of clay tablets, eight in all; which describe with plaintive truthfulness and no touch of the ideal her primitive conditions. They invoke no deity, they assert no confidence either material or spiritual. They speak only of her loneliness and her dependence, her abandonment to an approaching foe, and her disappointment in her protectors. Yet, even so, these tablets are as symbolic as any legend or prophecy could have been. Their tone is in unison with the dominant notes of the long tragedy to which they form the prelude. They express that sense of forsakenness and of vanishing hope in the powers of this world which haunts Jerusalem to the very end.

Nor is it less typical of the course of her history that the Tablets should reveal Jerusalem as already under the influence of the two great civilisations, which, between them, shaped the fortunes and coloured the character of her ancient people. The Tablets are written in the cuneiform script, and in the language, of Babylonia: a proof that the influences of that most ancient seat of human culture already lay strong across Western Asia. The politics, which the Tablets reveal, have their centre at the other side of the world, with Babylonia's age-long rival. Jerusalem is a tributary and outpost of Egypt; and Egypt is betrayed to us in that same attitude of helplessness towards her Asian vassals which is characteristic of her throughout history. As in the days of Isaiah she is *Rahab that sitteth still*; promising much, but when the crisis comes inactive and unwilling to fulfil her pledges.² As in the days of Jeremiah, the expected *King of Egypt cometh not any more*

¹ EXPOSITOR for January, 1903, p. 16.

² Isaiah xxx. 7.

out of his land,¹ and Jerusalem is left alone to meet the foe from the north. Other instances might be found. When Antiochus Epiphanes took Jerusalem in 169 B.C., and desecrated the Temple, Judæa was a vassal of the Ptolemy of the time, but he did not stir to her help. Down to the retreat of Ibrahim Pasha in 1841, Egypt, whether because of the intervening desert or the fitful prowess of her people, has been unable, for any long period, to detach Palestine from Asia and bind her to the southern continent.

Soon after 1600 B.C. Egypt, under the Eighteenth Dynasty, began a series of campaigns in Syria, which carried her arms (on one occasion at least) to the Euphrates, and reduced the states of Palestine for four centuries to more or less regular dependence upon her. No fewer than fourteen of these campaigns were undertaken by Thutmosis III. *circa* 1500 B.C. He defeated, at Megiddo, a powerful Canaanite confederacy, but left to his successors, Amenhotep II. and Thutmosis IV., the reduction of some separate tribes. So far as we know, the next Pharaoh, Amenhotep (Amenophis) IV., enjoyed without interruption the obedience of his Asian vassals. By his only possible rivals, the kings of Mesopotamia and Babylonia, he was recognised as sovereign of Syria, and his influence extended as far north as Armenia. His vast Empire; his lavish building throughout Egypt and Nubia; his magnificent temples at Thebes; his mines and organisation of trade; his wealth; along with the art and luxury which prevailed under all the monarchs of his dynasty, and their influence on the Greek world,—represent the zenith of Egyptian civilisation. Whether, in his security and the zeal with which he gave himself to the improvement of his own land, Amenhotep III. neglected the Asian provinces of his empire is uncertain. But in any case he was succeeded by a son whose interests in Egypt were still more

¹ 2 Kings xxv. 7.

engrossing, and who for this or other reasons was unable to preserve the conquests of his predecessors. Amenhotep IV. was that singular monarch who effected a temporary but thorough revolution in the religion and art of Egypt. Turning his back upon Amen and the other ancient gods, he spent his reign in the establishment of the exclusive worship of Aten, the Sun's Disk, and in the construction of a centre for this and a capital for himself. He introduced styles of art as novel as his religious opinions; free and natural, but without other proofs of ability. Absorbed in these pursuits Amenhotep IV. was the last kind of monarch to meet, or even to heed, the new movements in Asia which threatened his empire. Across the Euphrates there lay three considerable kingdoms: Babylonia, then under a Kassite dynasty; Assyria, her young vassal, but already strong enough to strike for independence; and Mitanni, a state of Hittite origin in Northern Mesopotamia. It was not, however, from these, divided and jealous of each other, that danger had to be feared by Egypt. From Asia Minor, the main branch of the Hittite race, the Kheta or Khatti were pushing south-east, alike upon their kinsfolk of Mitanni, and upon the Egyptian tributaries in Northern Syria.

It is beneath this noontide, and approaching eclipse, of Egypt's glory that Jerusalem emerges into history. The correspondence, of which her eight clay tablets form a small portion, was discovered at Tell el Amarna, in Middle Egypt, the site of the capital of Amenhotep IV. It was conducted between his father and himself on the one side and the Trans-Euphrates Kingdoms, and the Syrian feudatories of Egypt on the other.¹ We see through it, passing over

¹ The tablets of Tell el Amarna are now in Berlin and London. The following facts, recorded in them, are taken from H. Winckler's transliteration and translation in *Die Thontafeln von Tell el Amarna*: Berlin, 1896. In the following references B., followed by a figure, signifies the Berlin collection; L. the London collection; and W. Winckler's re-arrangement and numbering

Palestine a close and frequent communication between the Nile and the Euphrates.

The human interest of these Letters is intense: kings at peace, but in jealous watch of one another, their real tempers glowing through a surface of hypocrisy. They marry and give in marriage; they complain that they cannot get evidence whether their daughters or sisters sent abroad for this purpose are alive or well treated; they appeal to the women of the courts which they seek to influence. Above all they are greedy of gold, of which Egypt was then the source; one complains that a present of gold-ore, when it arrives, yields less than the promised value, another that wooden images have been sent instead of golden. One even grumbles that his royal brother has not inquired for him when he was ill.¹ There is some humour and appreciation of humour; much cunning, and once (if the interpretation be correct) a frank proposal of villainy.² Between these very human courts and their countries there moves a constant commerce: "Write me what thou desirest from my land, they will bring it thee, and what I desire from thy land, I will write thee, that they may bring it."³ For the Egyptian gold and oil, the states of the Euphrates send manufactured gold, precious stones, enamel, chariots, horses and slaves. These are not all royal presents. A

of the letters. Knudtzon, in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iv. pp. 101 ff., 279 ff., gives some revision of the Tablets, and the correction of earlier readings and translations. An account of the substance of the Tablets is given by C. Niebuhr, in *Die Tell Amarna Zeit* in the 2nd Heft of vol. i. of *Der Alte Orient*, and by Wallis Budge in the last chapter of vol. ii. of his *History of Egypt*. See also Winckler, pp. 192-204 of 3rd ed. of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*.

¹ B. 7: W. 10.

² B. 9: W. 15: "Why should the ambassadors not remain on the journey, so that they die in foreign parts? If they remain in foreign parts, the estate belongs to the king. Therefore when he (thy present ambassador) remains on his journey and dies, then will the estate belong to the king. There is therefore no [reason why we should fear] that the ambassadors die in foreign parts, whom we send . . . the ambassadors . . . and . . . and die in foreign parts."

³ B. 1: W. 6.

Mesopotamian king complains that his merchants have been robbed in Canaan, Pharaoh's territory. Caravans cross Palestine or pass from it into Egypt. Phœnician ships, not without danger from Lycian corsairs, bring to Egypt copper, bronze, ivory, ships' furniture, and horses from Alashia, either Cyprus or Northern Syria; and take back silver, oil and oxen.¹ One letter begs the king of Egypt not to allow the writer's merchants to be wronged by his tax-gatherers.²

Such are a few of the many details, so many, and so intimate that it may be truly said that before the Roman Empire, there is no period for which we have records so replete with the details of social life or with revelations of personal character and policy. All is vivid, human, frank. Of this busy passionate life, in 1400 B.C., Jerusalem was a part, lying not far from one of its main arteries.

The letters from the chiefs of Palestine, among whom the ruler of Jerusalem was one, reveal the duties that Egypt require of her feudatories, the awe in which they hold her power, the dangers that threaten them through her inaction, and all the intrigue and duplicity arising from so ambiguous a situation. The writers have Semitic names; that is, they are native Canaanites or Amorites. They profess themselves slaves of Egypt, and address the Pharaoh with fulsome flattery. They prostrate themselves before him—seven and seven times. He is their lord, their king, their gods and their sun.³ They are his slaves, and the slaves of his horse.⁴ They hold their hereditary domains by his gift.⁵ They send tribute,⁶ and are obliged to certain services, such as provisioning the royal troops who march through the land,⁷ and maintaining royal garrisons.⁸ They guard the posts entrusted to them by the

¹ L. 5-7 and B. 11-15: W. 25-33. ² B. 12: W. 29.

³ A frequent formula. ⁴ B. 118-122: W. 210-213.

⁵ Frequent. ⁶ E. G. L. 67: W. 198.

⁷ L. 52, 54: W. 207, 209: B. 114: W. 194.

⁸ B. 113, 121: W. 193, 212: L. 52, 53: W. 207, 208.

king, and the king's chariots; but also the gods of the king.¹ In return they expect to be protected by Egypt, and to receive supplies.² One of the chiefs, Iapitiri of Gaza, says that in his youth he has been taken to Egypt.³ In short the position of these feudatories of Pharaoh is analogous to that now occupied by the semi-independent rajahs of India under the British Government. And just as the latter places, at the courts of the rajahs, political agents with great powers, so Egypt had at that date in Palestine her own officials, who went from place to place as advisers and superintendents of the feudatories.⁴

Dushratta, king of Mitanni, had written to Amenhotep III. of the pressure of the Hittites on his kingdom.⁵ Correspondents of the Egyptian court in Northern Syria give warnings of the same danger. But these and the chiefs in Palestine intimate other foes. "The power of the Khabiri⁶ is great in the land," advancing from the north; and with the Khabiri are sometimes named the Suti.⁷ These enemies are not without allies among the Canaanite chiefs. A certain Lapaya of Megiddo and his sons are chiefly accused by those Egyptian vassals who remain or pretend to remain loyal.⁸ Biridiya of Makida writes that since the royal troops were withdrawn the sons of Lapaya have so closely watched his town, that his people cannot get vegetables or go outside the gates.⁹ But indeed no man is sure of his

¹ B. 122 : W. 213.

² Frequent.

³ L. 237 : W. 214.

⁴ Paḥannuta, Shûta, Paḥura and Iankhamu are named: A title for these officials is *rabiš*.

⁵ L. 9 : W. 16.

⁶ B. 113 : W. 113 : L. 49 : W. 204, etc. etc. An unknown people, identified by some (as is well known) with the Hebrews; cf. Niebuhr, *Die Amarna-Zeit*, 23f. They were Semitic immigrants into the land and belonged to the same movement as, or more probably to an earlier movement than, that which brought Israel there: "tribes," says Winckler (*Keilinschr. v. das A. T.*,³ p. 198), "represented as in the process of immigration and invasion of civilised territory, the same rôle taken up later by the Israelites."

⁷ L. 51, 74 : W. 206, 216.

⁸ B. 111, 115 : W. 192, 195 ; L. 72 : W. 196, etc.

⁹ B. 115 : W. 185.

neighbour. The letters of the vassals are full of accusations of each other, and excuses for the writers. Iapahi of Gezer says that his younger brother has revolted from him to the Khabiri,¹ and Tagi writes that he would have sent his brother to the King, but he is full of wounds.² Some, perhaps all, must be telling lies.

Among these chiefs of Southern Palestine who thus accuse each other is Abd-Khiba, the writer of the eight Jerusalem letters. In Letter I.³ he defends himself against some one who has been accusing him as a rebel (lines 5-8).⁴ Yet it was neither his father nor mother who set him in this place, but the strong arm of the king⁵ which introduced him to the territory of his father [bit (amilu) abi-ia] (9-13). Why then should he rebel against the king (14 f.)? By the life of the king he is slandered; because he had said to the king's official [rabiš sharri], "Why do you favour the Khabiri and injure the tributary princes [khazianutu]?"⁶ and, "The king's territory is being ruined" (14-24). The king knows that he had placed a garrison⁷ in Jerusalem but Iankhumu (the king's deputy or general) has removed it (25-23). Let the king take thought and trouble for his land, else his whole territory will disappear, the king's towns under Ili-milku having already revolted (34-38). Abd-Khiba would come to court, but he dare not unless the king send a garrison (39-47). He will continue his warnings, for without royal troops the king's territories will be wasted by the Khabiri (48-60). The letter concludes with a message to the king's secretary to impress the contents on him.

Letter II.⁸ describes the dangers to the king's territories

¹ L. 50 : W. 205.

² L. 70 : W. 189.

³ B. 102 : W. 179.

⁴ The accuser appears to have been a neighbouring chief Shuwardata.

⁵ See above, *Expositio* for February.

⁶ Lehnsfürsten : Winckler ; heads of the tribes of the country : Budge.

⁷ Besatzung : Winckler ; Outpost : Budge.

⁸ B. 103 : W. 180.

as increased—all towns have conspired against Abd-Khiba, Gezer, Askalon and Lakish have given the enemy provisions (4–24)—and repeats the assurance that Abd-Khiba holds Jerusalem [Urusalim] solely by the king's gift (25–28). Another chief has yielded his land to the Khabiri (29–31). Abd-Khiba is innocent in the affair of the Kashi, who are themselves to blame by their violence (32–44). They appear to have been the Egyptian garrison in Jerusalem, and were perhaps Kushites or Ethiopians. Paura the Egyptian official came to Jerusalem when Adaya, along with the garrison, revolted, and said to Abd-Khiba, "Adaya has revolted: hold the town." So the king must send a garrison (45–53). The king's caravan has been robbed in the territory¹ of Ajalon. Abd-Khiba could not send the king's caravans on to the king (54–59). The king has set his name on Jerusalem for ever, he cannot surrender its territory (60–63). The postscript to the secretary of the king says that the Kashi remain in Abd-Khiba's territory.

In Letter III.² Abd-Khiba, after again repudiating the slander against him (7–8), describes himself as no prince [khazianu] but an *u-i-wa*³ of the king, and an officer who brings tribute, holding his territory not from father or mother, but by the king's gift (9–15). He has sent the king slaves, male and female (16–22). Let the king care for his land, it is all hostile as far as Ginti-Karmil (22–39). Some chiefs, presumably loyal, have been slain (40–45). If the king cannot send troops, let him fetch away Abd-Khiba and his clansmen that they may die before the king (47–60).

Letter IV.⁴ is broken: fragments report chiefs as fallen away from the king, and beg for troops. Letter V.⁵

¹ Shati-i; W. compares Heb. שָׂדֵי.

² B. 104: W. 181.

³ Uwëu; Niebuhr; stabsofficier.

⁴ B. 105: W. 182.

⁵ B. 106: W. 183.

repeats the loss of the king's land to the Khabiri, among other towns Bit-Ninib in the territory of Jerusalem (5-17), and asks for troops (18-28). Letter VI.¹ repeats former assurances of Abd-Khiba's submission and complains that the king has not sent to him. Letter VII.,² two-thirds of which are wanting, after telling the same tale of disasters to the Egyptian power, and the wish of Abd-Khiba to repair them (1-16), adds that the garrison which the king sent by Khaya has been taken by Adda Mikhir into his territory of Gaza (17-20). Letter VIII.³ deals with two of the rebels Melk-ili and his father-in-law Tagi.⁴ All of these tablets have the usual introduction, in which Abd-Khiba does homage to the king.

The name Abd-Khiba, to which we may first turn our attention, is obviously Semitic ;⁵ and theophorous : *slave or worshipper of Khiba*. The formation is very common in Phœnician with the names of many deities and in Arabic. In the Old Testament we have Obed-Edom the Gittite, Ebed-Melik, Abed-nego, Obadiyah, and Abdëël. The name of a deity Khiba does not elsewhere occur ; but the root ḥabah (Hebrew) or khaba (Arabic, and Assyrian),⁶ *to hide*, or *hide oneself*, is not unsuitable to a divine title. The suggestion has been made that Khiba disguises an original Jahu, that is a form of Ihvh, the consonants of the name of the God of Israel. But in the two cases the radical *h* is not the same ; and it has not been proved (although suggested) that a possible link between the two forms, viz. Iba in certain compound names, is a corruption of Jahu.⁷ It would indeed be a marvellous discovery if Abd-Khiba, this early

¹ B. 174 : W. 184.

² B. 199 : W. 185.

³ B. 149 : W. 186.

⁴ The territory of these chiefs appears to have been on what was afterwards the Philistine Plain near Gath.

⁵ Sayce gives it as Ebed-Tob, but other Assyriologists as Abd-Khiba or (in another system of transliteration) as Abd-ḥiba.

⁶ Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*, 265 f.

⁷ See Johns (following Jensen) *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, iii. p. xvi.

king of Jerusalem, was really an Obadiah, but the hypothesis is purely imaginative.¹

Before proceeding to describe Abd-Khiba's political position we may continue the religious question to which his name gives rise. That the princes of Palestine at this time had native gods is proved by their theophorous names—Milki-el and the like. Their silence about these is to be explained by the fact that the king to whom their letters are addressed not only belongs to a different race, but was himself conceived as an incarnation of the deity. Hence the fulsomeness of the terms in which they write to him: "their sun, their gods." The only gods the Syrian chiefs mention are the gods of Egypt. We have seen that one chief calls himself the guardian of these gods.² This phrase is perhaps explained by a stele of Sety I. discovered at Tell esh Shihab by the present writer in 1901. It is a large basalt slab representing the king of Egypt in the act of making offerings to Amen and Mut. In a manuscript communication the eminent Egyptologist W. Max Müller says that the style of this monument proves it to be no mere Syrian imitation of Egyptian religious art; but the work of Egyptian artists. Probably similar representations of their gods were set up by Egyptian conquerors in other towns of Palestine. As Sety's is in basalt, the rock of the district in which Tell esh Shihab lies, those in southern Palestine would be in limestone; the reason of our failure to discover them there. Abd-Khiba bases one of his appeals to Amenhotep IV. not to desert Jerusalem on the fact that "the king has set his name on Jerusalem for ever."³ With some probability Winckler argues that this means that Amenhotep IV. had set up the worship of Aten, of whom he conceived himself to be the incarnation, within Jerusalem. If this is correct, some monument was placed

¹ See Zimmern in *Keilinschr. u. das A.T.*³ p. 467.

² B. 122: W. 213. ³ B. 103: W. 180, line 61.

there analogous to that of Sety I. in Tell esh Shihab. Further, there was in the territory of Jerusalem a town, Bet Ninib, that is the sanctuary of the Babylonian deity Ninib. The attempt to identify this town with Jerusalem has not been successful. But it is to be noted—against the statement, made in the beginning of this article, that a divine title has not been clearly identified in the name Jerusalem—that some Assyriologists hold that the Assyrian Sulmān is probably an epithet of the god Ninib.¹ So much for the religion.

Abd-Khibā held Jerusalem by appointment of the King of Egypt. Winckler says that the Tablets distinguish between *Amelu*, princes ruling in their own right, and *Khazanūta*, not the old hereditary princes, but others selected for the headship by Pharaoh out of the princes or families of the towns or tribes;² and that Abd-Khibā was such a Khazanū. Yet the latter describes his domains, although he had not received them from father or mother, but from Pharaoh, as his ancestral domains. The phrase expressing this is so often repeated that it seems to have been a formula of submission. To Jerusalem there was attached a certain "territory," including the town of Bit-Ninib. Jerusalem itself appears to have been a fortified place. At least it contained an Egyptian garrison, and even without that it might hold out against the king's enemies.³ Taking this bit of evidence along with others, viz. that Abd-Khibā appears to have been held responsible for the disaster to a caravan in Ajalon,⁴ and that he maintained his post against a universal hostility, we may infer that Jerusalem was already a place of considerable strength. Its chief could send caravans of his own to Egypt; but it is to be noted that no products of the soil are described as his

¹ See Zimmern in the *Keilinschr. u. das Alte Testament*,³ 411, 474 f.

² *K.A.T.*³ 193 f.

³ Letter ii. 45-53.

⁴ *Id.* 54-59.

tribute, only a number of slaves, probably captives of war.¹

We have now to ask where this primitive Jerusalem was situated—this Canaanite fortress which held an Egyptian garrison, and which when that fled was still expected to hold out against the enmity of all its neighbours and the foe advancing from the north. There is a general agreement that the site must be found somewhere within the limits of the later Jerusalem; that is, upon one or other of the two promontories which run south to the west of the valley of the *Ḳidrōn*. But opinions are divided between the eastern and the western of these spurs.

We can have little doubt about two things: *first*, that the earliest settlers in this district would select the sides of the only valley in which water was present in any quantity—that is, as we have seen, the *Ḳidrōn*, or the sheltered mouth of the valley running into it—the later Tyropœon; and, *second*, that when it became necessary to fortify themselves they would do so on one or other of the two promontories or spurs, which, except at their north ends, sink steeply, if not precipitously, into the gorges below them.

¹ Founding upon his own transliteration and translation of the Tablets (different in some important points from that on which Winckler, Jensen, Niebuhr and Budge are substantially agreed, and which is accepted above) Prof. Sayce (*Early Hist. of the Hebrews*, 28 f.) maintains that the Tablets “show that Jerusalem was already the dominant state of Southern Palestine. Its strong position made it a fortress of importance, and it was the capital of a territory which stretched away towards the desert of the south. . . . Abd-Tob [so Prof. Sayce transliterates the signs which others read as Abd-Khiba] reiterates that he was not, like the other governors of Canaan, under Egyptian rule. They had been appointed to their offices by Pharaoh, or had inherited them by descent from the older royal lines of the country. . . . He, on the contrary, was the friend and ally of the Egyptian king. His kingly dignity had not been derived from either father or mother, but from the ‘Mighty King,’ from the god, that is to say, whose temple stood on ‘the mountain of Jerusalem.’” But against this view may be urged (1) that the other scholars above mentioned see no allusion to a god on the tablets: “the mighty king” to them is Pharaoh himself; and (2) the terms in which the chief of Jerusalem submits himself to Pharaoh (terms accepted by Prof. Sayce’s translation) are as humble as those in which the other princes express themselves. There is really nothing in the tablets of Abd-Khiba to show that he held rank higher than the neighbouring chiefs.

Our choice clearly lies between these. Although very early dwellings may have been excavated on the eastern bank of the Kīdrōn Valley, on the site of the present village of Silwān, where there are still cave-dwellings, the place is not suitable for fortification.¹

Josephus, arguing from the conditions of Jerusalem in his own day, apparently takes for granted that the Canaanite, pre-Davidic fortress lay upon the western promontory, the traditional Mount Zion. Under his influence this view prevailed till recent times, and, in face of the younger theory that the original Jerusalem lay upon the eastern promontory, has been revived by (among others) the missionary Georg Gatt² of Gaza, and Dr. Carl Mommert, of Schweinitz, Silesia.³ They place the fortress on the southern end of the western promontory, generally known as the south-west hill. The height of this above the encircling valleys and the steepness of the slopes by which it rises from the latter, are quoted by those who regard it as the original citadel, as proof of its fitness for fortification; while some are further prejudiced in its favour by the long, chiefly ecclesiastical, tradition which identifies it with Mount Zion. But it is doubtful whether so broad and long a hill, without any separate eminence upon it, would have been suitable for a citadel.⁴ But, worse still, it is waterless, and lies aloof from the ancient source, or sources, of water in

¹ It is to be wished that excavations were possible along this bank of the Kīdrōn Valley.

² *Sion in Jerusalem*, Brixen, 1900, pp. 34, 38 ff. See also the same author's *Die Hügel von Jerusalem*, a new exposition of the description of Jerusalem in Josephus V. *B.J.* iv. 1 f., Freiburg, 1897; also in *Z.D.P.V.* vol. xxv.

³ *Topographie des alten Jerusalem*, Erster Theil; *Zion und Akra, die Hügel der Altstadt*, Leipzig, n.d. (Preface dated December, 1900), p. 19; with plan; also in *Z.D.P.V.* xxiv. pp. 183 ff.

⁴ So Sir Charles Wilson, art. "Zion" in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, vol. iv. 983: "The western spur is broad-backed, and so far as the original form is known, there is no broken ground or conspicuous feature upon it that would naturally be selected as the site of a castle such as those usually erected for the protection of an ancient hill-town."

the K̄idrōn Valley. Unless the earthquakes or the rubbish of the many overthrows of the city have closed some former vent, there was no spring on the Tyropœon or the W. Rababy, by the foot of this south-western hill; and indeed the geology, as we have seen, renders very improbable the existence there at any time of a fountain. It is true that some towns in Palestine are planted at as great distance from their wells as the south-western hill is from the K̄idrōn Valley; but in no instance (I think) does this happen where a more, or equally, suitable site for the town lies nearer the spring, as is the case in Jerusalem. Finally no remains have been discovered on the south-western hill which can be assigned with certainty to the pre-Israelite period. The cisterns are comparatively few; the walls and aqueducts that have been traced may be referred to a later age; and the rock-cutting above the western slope, known as Maudslay's scarp, is of uncertain date. Summing up, we may say that while there is no positive evidence for an early settlement on the south-western hill it is also improbable that a citadel was built there.

The eastern hill is not so high as the south-western, nor (if we exclude the Temple-site, which appears not to have been occupied before the time of Solomon,¹ and take into account only Ophel, the ridge to the south of the Temple), is it so extensive? But it is surrounded on three sides by valleys, into two of which, east and west, it sinks abruptly, while southward it gradually slopes to the junction of these valleys. Above all, one of these valleys, the eastern or K̄idrōn, is the only line in the district on which, as we have seen, it is probable there were always wells. Here lay Gihon, now the 'Ain Sitti Miriam, just under the eastern hill. Dr. Mommert's hypothesis,² that the Bir Eiyub was the original spring in the K̄idrōn Valley and that the 'Ain

¹ Till the Temple was built it was a threshing-floor: always placed outside a town.

² *Op. cit.* p. 13 f.

Sitti Miriam was opened in later times in order to secure a vent for the subterranean waters of the K̄idrōn Valley, close to the city, has no evidence to support it. On the contrary, as we have seen,¹ Giḥon not only existed in the time of David, but was even then a sacred, that is, an ancient, well. We may, therefore, in spite of the earthquakes which have shaken the district, regard it as the original well of Jerusalem: flowing during the Canaanite period. Gatt endeavours to discredit its importance to the early inhabitants by talking of the evil taste of its waters.² But this cannot be imputed to it in early times: the bad taste seems due to the sewage of the present city.

It is true that if they built their fort on the eastern hill above Giḥon, the Canaanites would not include the latter within its walls, nor be able wholly to prevent its use by an enemy besieging them. Giḥon lies at the foot of a steep rock, on which a wall could not well run except high above the spring. But at least, even with primitive means of warfare, the besieged could seriously hamper an enemy's use of Giḥon. Moreover the needs of times of peace must be taken into consideration. It is most probable that the earliest and unfortified settlement would be as near to the K̄idrōn spring or springs as possible, that is, on the slopes of the eastern hill, and perhaps in the mouth of the Tyropœon Valley, and that when a fort became necessary it would be built on the same hill somewhere above Giḥon rather than on a hill further away.

That the eastern hill immediately above Giḥon is suitable for such a fort is affirmed by so eminent a military engineer as Sir Charles Wilson. But even the eyes of those who are not soldiers or engineers may see the possibility of the Canaanite fort on that position. Down either side the ground falls away abruptly to the Tyropœon and the K̄idrōn. The position is nearly 200 feet above the bed

¹ EXPOSITOR, March, 1903. ² (*p. cit.* p. 39.)

of the Kīdrōn¹ and over 100 above that of the Tyropœon. There is a steep slope to the south. The sole difficulty is to the north. Immediately above the Virgin's Well (2,087 feet above sea-level) there is a contour line of 2,279 on the Survey Map, from which the ground gradually slopes northward to 2,299, to 2,312, and finally at the foot of the South Haram wall, 2,379. Such a slope is certainly not suitable for the northern wall of the fort. Dr. Guthe indeed claims to have discovered a trench or ravine running across it; this is doubted by others who are familiar with the ground; for example, Sir Charles Wilson and Colonel Conder. But there is as yet no certainty as to what the formation of this part of Ophel was in ancient times; and even with the surface as it is at present Sir Charles Wilson and Sir Charles Warren believe that the Canaanite fort stood above Gihon. It is significant that since the English survey a very considerable number of authorities, by far the majority, have come round to the same conclusion.²

We have now to ask whether any of the ancient remains discovered on the ridge of Ophel indicate the Canaanite period. Both the English surveyors and Dr. Guthe discovered a large number of walls, rock-dwellings, cisterns,

¹ The descent into the valley of the Kīdrōn is very steep, about 30°, and the natural surface of the rock is covered with *débris* from 10 to 50 feet in height. —Sir Ch. Warren, *P.E.F. Mem.*, "Jerusalem," p 368.

² Foremost among them should be mentioned the Rev. W. F. Birch, who advanced the opinion as early as 1879 (*P.E.F.Q.* for that year, pp. 129, 178; also 1885, pp. 55, 250); Robertson Smith (*Enc. Brit.* art. "Jerusalem," p. 1648, and *Stade (G.V.I. i. 267 f.)* in 1881; Sayce, 1883 (*P.E.F.Q.*: two papers); Guthe, *Z.D.P.V.* 1883; Socin and Benzinger in *Baedeker's Palästina*,³ the latter also in *Hebr. Archäologie*, 1894; Buhl, *Geogr. des Alt. Pal.* 132; Ryle on *Neh.iii. 15 (Camb. Bible for Schools)*; Driver in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, ii. 554; Warren (*ib.* 386 f.), who had previously held another view; Bliss (*Excav. at Jerus.* 1894-7, pp. 287 ff.); practically also A. B. Davidson, *The Exile and Restoration in Bible Class Primers*. On the other side so eminent an authority as Colonel Conder (*Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Jerus.") still favours the south-western hill. He argues that the Ophel ridge was too small for a Canaanite fortress; he measures it as only 10 acres. But the fort must have been small, and the town or large village may have extended to the junction of the valleys or up their beds.

reservoirs, steps and scarped rocks. A number of these are as late as the Greek period; others may be very ancient. The oldest relic of a wall (or tower?) was that unearthed by Dr. Guthe above the Giḥon spring;¹ with a thick layer of black cement apparently ancient, but whether Jebusite or not he wisely abstains from affirming. Round cisterns he found only among those hewn in the rock:² such a shape of cistern is assigned by some to the Canaanites, but this also is uncertain. Of more importance are "the rock-chambers, with doors and openings for light"; and the dwellings half-cut in the rock and half-built against it. Some of these, Dr. Guthe thinks,³ go back to the earliest period. There can have been little building in stone before Solomon's time, or he would not have had to bring masons from Phœnicia, and no traces have been found of building in timber.⁴ But even from the rock-dwellings it is precarious to infer a very early date: for the habit of living in houses that were half hewn in the rock, half-built against it, continued in Greek times,⁵ and persists to-day in the village of Silwān. On the whole, then, while nothing that has been found on Ophel is unmistakably Canaanite, there is a good deal which suggests the primitive practice of dwelling in caves.

We may, therefore, conclude that the eastern hill, or Ophel, was, more probably than the western, the site of the castle and town of Jerusalem in the days of Abd-Khiba. I have in this study purposely refrained from using any of the Biblical evidence in this question. But when we come to it, we shall see that on the whole it corroborates our conclusion.

¹ See point E on Tafel viii. in his reports *Z.D.P.V.* v. ; cf. pp. 319 f.

² *Ibid.* 336.

³ p. 341.

⁴ 344f.

⁵ As is proved from the mosaic under some of these leaning constructions.