

# 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 Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Professor G. A. Smith's "Jerusalem."<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR SAYCE, D.D., LL.D.

THIS is what our grandfathers would have described as a monumental work, and will remain the standard authority on the subject of which it treats for a long while to come. Professor George Adam Smith's gifts as the interpreter of ancient Israelitish geography have never been shown to greater advantage, and it is difficult which to admire most, the vast amount of learning and research to which the book bears witness, or the charm of style and lucidity of arrangement which are conspicuous in it. Scarcely anything relating to Jerusalem seems to have escaped his notice; foreign as well as British periodicals have been laid under contribution, and references are made to obscure articles in obscure publications. The chapters in the second "book" of the first volume on the "Economics" of ancient Jerusalem are at once original and important; for the first time attention has been drawn to the question of the natural resources and revenues of Jerusalem and the sources of its food-supply. Jerusalem did not lie upon the line of the high road which ran along the coast from Egypt to Phœnicia; it was situated among barren hills, and there was no navigable river near it. Whence, then, did it derive its wealth, and how came it to attain the position of a capital and a centre of power?

To these questions Professor Smith endeavours to find an answer. To the oil supplied by the olive-trees of the neighbourhood he would ascribe the beginnings of its commercial prosperity. It was the oil which first enabled its citizens to obtain in exchange the imports which they needed. Then with the establishment of David's empire came the carrying-trade, between Edom and Arabia on the one side, and Phœnicia and Europe on the other. This carrying-trade was never wholly lost, and after the disastrous age of the Exile was revived under a newer form.

<sup>1</sup> "Jerusalem: the Topography, Economics, and History. From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70." By George Adam Smith. 2 vols. Hodder and Stoughton. London, 1907. Price 24s.

Professor Smith is doubtless right in thus assigning to the trade in oil an important part in the early development of Jerusalem. But I think he has forgotten another and perhaps even more important factor in the early commercial history of the city. For several centuries Canaan was a province of Babylonia, and the name of Jerusalem itself, originally Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim," testifies—*pace* the Professor—to its Babylonian origin. Wherever Babylonian culture went it carried with it the brick architecture of Babylonia. In this architecture bitumen was used in place of mortar, and bitumen accordingly was from the outset one of the chief articles of Babylonian trade. Hence the serious character, from a Babylonian point of view, of the rebellion of the Canaanite kings, whose territory contained the bitumen springs of the Dead Sea region, and the dispatch of a large army to suppress it. Jerusalem lay on the route of the bitumen-trade; it was the first easily-defensible fortress west of the Dead Sea and the Jordan to which the naphtha could be brought, and here, consequently, Melchizedek came out to welcome Abram when the defeat of the Babylonian forces had transferred the command of the naphtha route from the Babylonians to Abram and his allies. The naphtha-trade, once started, would have been supplemented by the salt-trade, salt being a prime article of commerce in the East, and the Dead Sea furnishing an inexhaustible supply of it. Instead, therefore, of tracing the carrying-trade of Jerusalem to its trade in oil, as Professor Smith seems to do, I should be inclined to trace its trade in oil to its primitive carrying-trade in the products of the Vale of Siddim and "the Salt Sea."

The topography of Jerusalem is admirably handled by Professor Smith, and his scientific spirit of fairness is exemplified in the letters he prints from geological and topographical experts against his own theory of the effect of earthquakes on the water-supply of the ancient city. In the same spirit of scientific honesty he confesses that the materials do not allow us to determine whether "the Second Wall" ran inside or outside the site of

the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—a point upon which the dispute as to whether or not the latter represents Calvary largely turns; and like most modern scholars, he concludes that "Sion, or David's-Burgh, and the earliest city lay upon the East Hill." He believes, however, that under the Jewish kings the city extended also over the South-west Hill—the modern Mount Zion—a belief, however, which personally I am unable to share. The excavations of Dr. Bliss have shown that a wall once ran northward immediately to the west of the Birket-el-Hamra and the Pool of Siloam, and there is no reason for thinking that the remains of the wall running westward to the south of it across the mouth of the Tyropœon belong to the period before the Exile. As the Pool of Siloam, into which the famous water-tunnel opens, was protected by the wall west of the Birket-el-Hamra, I do not understand the force of Professor Smith's argument that, "under the conditions of ancient warfare," the South-west Hill would have commanded "the pool at the mouth of the Tunnel," and consequently must have already been enclosed within the city walls. It might command the mouth of the Tunnel under the conditions of modern warfare, but certainly not under those of ancient warfare.

The second volume of Professor Smith's work is devoted to the history of the Biblical Jerusalem, but I confess that I cannot extend the same unreserved welcome to the earlier part of it as to other portions of his work. When he forsakes geography and literature for the chair of the archæologist, his work betrays merely a second-hand acquaintance with the subject. He is dominated by prevalent literary theories about the age and composition of the Pentateuch, and the archæology is nothing but a *pis aller* thrown in, as it were, to fill up gaps. It makes one despair of literary criticism when a writer, so learned and exact, so sane, and in topographical matters so alive to the meaning of scientific evidence, should thus forget both scientific method and the nature of scientific proof as soon as he comes to deal with Old Testament history. At once the usual apparatus of the modern *littérateur* appears upon the scene; subjective

fantasies instead of facts, conclusions drawn from literary hypotheses, history based on literary philology, and dogmatic expressions of scepticism without a full knowledge of the facts. Take, for example, the name of Ebed-Kheba, the King of Jerusalem, in the age of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, which Professor Smith, though he is not an Assyriologist, pronounces the Assyriologists to be "probably" wrong in making Hittite. Had he been an Assyriologist himself he would have known that the question is settled. The name of Kheba is found on more than one Hittite cuneiform tablet from Boghaz Keui as that of a native Hittite deity, and from the Hittites it was borrowed by the people of Mitanni. It was this fact which made me give up my old attempt to explain the name—which should be read Ui-Kheba, Kheba-memis, or something similar—as Semitic. Literary criticism, however, has decided that there were no Hittites at Jerusalem, since the Old Testament says that there were, and literary criticism accordingly treats the Assyriologist or the archæologist as it treats the writers of the Hebrew Bible, denying their statements without knowing all the facts.

Or take, again, the Book of Deuteronomy, which Professor Smith assumes to have been forged, when it is said to have been "found" in the temple in the age of Josiah. Literary philology has averred that such was the case, and history consequently has to suffer. The book is invoked in evidence of the ideas and practices of the age shortly before the Exile; its historical value for an earlier epoch is denied and ignored. But here, once more, archæology has something to say on the matter. As Maspero, and, more recently, Naville, have pointed out, the discovery of an old book in a temple at a time when the latter was being repaired was nothing new or extraordinary. We hear of its happening several times in Egypt, and in Egypt we have archæological proof that when an old papyrus or parchment is said to have been found in the wall or other part of a temple the statement described a fact. The custom of burying a newspaper under the foundations of a building is not a modern

one, and in Babylonia, where clay took the place of paper, written documents were buried in the walls of a temple as far back as the fourth millennium B.C. In placing a copy of the Law in the walls of the Temple of Jerusalem, Solomon was only following the precedent of Babylonian and Egyptian custom. And, as Professor Naville has shown, the class of book that was committed to the safe keeping of the temple-walls was just such as that to which the Book of Deuteronomy belongs. Speaking as an archæologist, I find it difficult to believe that the main part of this book can be later than the Solomonic age, and to make it probable we must have, not the theorising of a subjective philology and a still more subjective hypothesis of philosophical development, but scientific facts and the application of a scientific method such as will alone satisfy a student of the inductive sciences.



## The Lessons of the Pan-Anglican Congress.

BY MRS. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON, B.A.

IT is generally agreed that the Pan-Anglican Congress raised great expectations and more than fulfilled the expectations that it had raised. The Bishop of St. Albans put into words what all were feeling when, meeting the General Committee as its chairman the day after the Thanksgiving Service, he said: "Every night I thanked God for the meetings that had taken place that day, for the wonderful spirit of goodwill, harmony, and kindly Christian feeling that characterized all sections. I have seldom been at gatherings at which so little was said that was unworthy of the occasion. Our imperfect faith has been indeed rebuked by the way in which our prayers for the Congress have been answered."

The sweetness and light of the sunniest June on record seem to have touched it throughout, and "inspiring" and "uplifting" are the words by which one oftenest heard it charac-