

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND TOPOGRAPHY
OF JERUSALEM.

V.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HISTORY.

WE have seen¹ that about 1400 B. C., Jerusalem, under that name, was a fortress and a town, with command over an uncertain extent of surrounding territory. The inhabitants were a Canaanite tribe, under their hereditary² chief Abd-Khiba, who, however, owed his position neither to his father nor his people, but to the then lord-paramount of the land, the King of Egypt. The fortress, already recognised as strong,³ had been occupied by an Egyptian garrison of Kashi, probably Ethiopians or negroes; and the Pharaoh, Amenhotep (Amenophis) IV., had "placed his name" on the town: that is (to adopt the most reasonable interpretation of these words) he had imposed upon Jerusalem the worship of himself as the incarnation of Aten, the Sun's Disk, in whose interest he was attempting to disestablish the other gods of Egypt. This interpretation is confirmed by the servile terms in which Abd-Khiba and the neighbouring chiefs prostrate themselves before Amenhotep, "their sun and their gods," as well as by the fact that in other places to which the Egyptian arms were carried the Pharaohs set up images of themselves and their deities.⁴ It is worth a passing notice that the form of Egyptian religion which most nearly approached Monotheism,⁵ should have been imposed, for however brief a

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1903.

² Tell-el-Amarna Letters 179 (Wi.) l. 13: "lands of my father."

³ See above, p. 303 n. 3.

⁴ Witness, for example, the stele of Sety I. discovered in 1901 at Tell esh Shihāb by the present writer.

⁵ Sayce, *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, 92 ff.

day, upon Jerusalem. How was its worship performed there? Were its high hymns¹ chanted by Egyptian officials and soldiery? Its Asiatic origin,² we are tempted to feel, may have helped its acceptance by the Canaanites. Yet how were they to understand its language? Would they comprehend more than what their letters express,—that it was the adoration of the Egyptian monarch himself? We can hardly think so; but, however this may have been, no trace of the worship of Aten survived. Overthrown in Egypt by the following dynasty it cannot have persisted in Syria. Amen and Mut are the gods whom Sety I. set up at Tell esh Shihāb.

For Jerusalem there was, of course, a local deity; but Abd-Khiba naturally refrains from alluding to him in letters to a sovereign who claimed to be “the glory” of the only god.³ The worship of this local deity can hardly have been interrupted by that of the Pharaoh, and must have continued till David brought to the town the ark of his Lord. Who was the predecessor of the God of Israel on the high place of Jerusalem? From what name did the inhabitants transfer to that of Jahweh the titles of Baal and Adon? Did the immemorial rites of the Canaanite religion continue by the side of the purer worship of the Temple, or is it they which we find recrudescing in the horrible sacrifices of the valley of Hinnom?⁴ Where in Jerusalem was the site of the Canaanite sanctuary?

These are questions which, however interesting they be, we are unable to answer with certainty in the present state of our knowledge. No god of Jerusalem is anywhere directly mentioned, and we are left for conjecture to the

¹ See Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv. 125: Sayce, *op. cit.* p. 95 f.

² Sayce, *op. cit.* 92.

³ Khu-en-Aten, the title of Amenhotep IV., means “the glory of Aten.”

⁴ That the sacrifice of children to the deity formed part of the Canaanite religion appears illustrated by the discoveries of Mr. Macalister in connection with the Canaanite sanctuary at Gezer: *P.E.F.Q.* 1903, 32 f.

theophorous names of her kings and perhaps of herself. Abd-Khiba's own name is theophorous, but there is no clear trace in the Semitic pantheon of a god called Khiba, and we have seen that the attempt to discover in the name a corruption of that of Jahweh cannot be justified.¹

The earliest Hebrew tradition records another theophorous name of a chief of Jerusalem, Adoni-Şedek, who was reigning when Israel entered the land.² Şedek was a deity of the Western Semites,³ and appears in several men's names both Aramean and Phœnician.⁴ It is worthy of notice that a priest of Jerusalem in David's time was called Şadoq, and natural also to compare Melki-Şedek, king of Salem, in the story of Abraham.⁵ But again, if the latter part of the name Jerusalem be that of Shalem or Shulman, another deity of the Western Semites,⁶ he may have been the local god of whom we are in search. Once more it has been

¹ EXPOSITOR for March. One of David's heroes, from the Canaanite town of Shu'albim (Josh. xix. 42, Jud. i. 35) bears the name שְׂדֵקֵי־יָבֵב El-Yahbā (2 Sam. xxiii. 32), in the second part of which it is possible to see the same root as in Khiba: but the formation is different.

² Joshua x. 1 ff. This passage is from JE, and substantially from E. The parallel in Judges i., from J, names the King Adoni-Bezēk, and the LXX have this form in both passages. On which ground some prefer the reading Adoni Bezēk. This is, however, improbable, since in personal names Adon is always compounded with the name of a deity, and no deity Bezēk is known, while Şedek occurs several times as the name of a Western Semitic god. Besides, the reading Bezēk may easily have arisen in Jud. i. 5, through confusion with the name of the place where Israel encountered the king. Moore, Bennett and Nowack read Adoni-Şedek. Budde, who previously preferred Adoni-Bezēk, leaves the question open in his recent commentary on Judges.

³ See Zimmern, *K.A.T.*³ 473 f.

⁴ Kemosh-Şedek, Sedek-Rimmon, Şedek-Melek. Also as a Canaanite name in the Tell-el-Amarna Letters, No. 125 (Wi.), line 37; Ben Sidki (spelt by the Canaanite scribe Zidki), for which Knudtzon (*Beitr. z. Assyrl.* iv. 114) reads Rab-Sidki.

⁵ Gen. xiv. 18. Winckler, *K.A.T.*³, p. 224, takes Salem in this passage, not as an abbreviation for Jerusalem, but as a form of the divine name Shalem, and Melek-Salem as only another form of Melki-Sedek, whom he assigns to the city of Hazazon Tamar=Banias (*Gesch. Isrl.* ii. p. 37). All this is very precarious: yet Winckler founds upon it the identity of the god Sedek with the god Sulman or Shalem.

⁶ Zimmern, *K.A.T.*³ 474 f. Winckler, *id.* p. 224, sees in Shelomoh, the Hebrew for Solomon, a form derived from the divine name Shalem.

supposed that in the name of David and other personal names, and in the designation of Jerusalem as the *city of David*, there lurks Dōd, either a divine name or an appellation for the *genius loci*.¹ And finally in Isaiah's name for the city, Ari- or Uri-el, we have another possible designation of the Canaanite god of Jerusalem. But whoever he was, whether one of these or another, it is remarkable that no direct mention of him has survived in the later history, although his worshippers were spared, and lived in the city along with the Hebrews. Either the later scribes took great care to eliminate from the Hebrew records every trace of this predecessor of Jahweh; or his influence was so restricted and unimportant that his name and memory disappeared of themselves. One fact is significant, that Jerusalem is not regarded in the Old Testament² as having been a famous shrine before David brought his people's God to it. Beersheba, the various Gilgals, Gibeon and Bethel are all mentioned as high places, whose ancient sanctity impressed the invading Israelites and attracted suppliants and pilgrims down to at least the eighth century. That Jerusalem does not appear in this list along with her neighbours is surely proof that her Canaanite shrine had only a local importance and was without influence on the rest of the land. The significance of this for her subsequent history we shall see later on.

The last of our questions is that of the exact position of the Canaanite sanctuary in Jerusalem. For remains of this it is hopeless to search on a site so crowded and so disturbed during all the subsequent centuries. The shrine may have been about the well of Giḥon, for in David's time, as we saw, this was regarded as sacred;³ or it may have

¹ So Winckler, *K.A.T.*, p. 225. But this would imply that David received his name only after the capture of Jerusalem or else that there was a remarkable coincidence between his name and that of the city he conquered. Again we see how precarious Winckler's reasoning is.

² Outside the ambiguous Salem of Gen. xiv. ³ EXPOSITOR for March.

stood in the valley of Hinnom, where the sacrifices of children, a feature of Canaanite worship, afterwards broke out among the Israelites.¹

But if unimportant religiously—at least as compared with Bethel, the Gilgals and Beersheba—Jerusalem must have been in those early days a fortress of no ordinary strength. We have seen² that her citadel lay upon the south-eastern of her hills, just above Gihon, where on all sides save one the ground falls from the ridge to a considerable depth: on both east and west with precipitous rapidity. Apart from what may be an editorial gloss the Old Testament traditions are unanimous that before David the Israelites failed to capture the citadel³; the garrison felt themselves so secure that they laughed even at the challenge of David.⁴ In fact through the earliest centuries of Israel's history Jerusalem was the most easterly of a line of positions—Gezer, Beth-Shemesh, Shá'albim, Ayyalon, Kiriath-ye'arim (Kephira, Gibeon, Be'eröth), Jerusalem—from which Israel did not succeed in ousting their occupiers, but which, during the period of the Judges, formed a barrier between the children of Judah to the south, and the rest of Israel.⁵ The Elohistic documents calls those

¹ See next paper, on Millo.

² EXPOSITOR for April.

³ The gloss above mentioned is Judges i. 8: and the men of Judah fought against Jerusalem and took it, and smote it at the edge of the sword and set fire to it. But this seems contradicted by Jud. i. 21: and the Jebusite who dwelt in Jerusalem the children of Benjamin did not drive out, but the Jebusites have dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem to this day; and by Josh. xv. 63: and the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah did not drive them out, but the Jebusites have dwelt (with the children of Judah: omit LXX) in Jerusalem till this day. The substitution in Jud. i. 21 of Benjamin for Judah of Josh. xv. 63 is usually supposed to be due to an editor who thereby strove to remove the contradiction with Jud. i. 8. It is possible to effect a technical conciliation between Jud. i. 8 on the one hand and Jud. i. 21 and Josh. xv. 63 on the other (cf. e.g. Sayce, *Early Hist. of the Hebrews*, p. 246 f.; Otley, *Hist. of the Heb.* 87 f.). But even those who propose this either interpret Jud. i. 8 only of the town, and agree that the Hebrew invaders did not capture the fortress of Jerusalem; or suppose that the Hebrew occupation was only temporary.

⁴ 2 Sam. v. 6. See below.

⁵ In the Song of Deborah Judah is not mentioned.

tribes who thus maintained their position against Israel *Amorites*; the Jahwistic document, *Canaanites*: both of them general terms for the Semitic populations which preceded Israel in Palestine. More particularly the Jahwistic document defines the inhabitants of Jerusalem and some neighbouring states as Jebusites, a name which is not found outside the Old Testament, but is sufficiently accredited within that.¹ This compact little tribe is of interest to us, not only because of the stand which it made for centuries against the Israelite invaders, but because it became, upon David's capture of its stronghold, a constituent of that strange medley, the Jewish people, and doubtless carried into their life the tough fibre of its tribal character and the temper of its immemorial religion. We can have no doubt that the tribe was Semitic, and that it subsisted by agriculture—the Jebusite is called *the inhabitant of the land*²—and by the simpler industries of the long-settled Canaanite civilisation. But, as we have seen, and shall have to emphasize again, the position of Jerusalem was not very favourable to trade, and we ought probably to exclude all but local forms of the latter from our conception of the life of the Jebusites. Beyond these indications there is little to enable us to define the relation of the Israelites to those Canaanite *enclaves* which

¹ The name Jebusite has been handed down all along the main lines of the tradition. J: Josh. xv. 63; Jud. i. 21, xix. 11 (Moore). J E: Ex. iii. 8, 17, xxiii. 23, xxxiii. 2 (xxxiv. 11?); Num. xiii. 29 (Jud. iii. 5?). D: Ex. xiii. 5; Deut. vii. 1, xx. 17; Josh. iii. 10, ix. 1, xi. 3, xii. 8, xxiv. 11. P: Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16, 28. Redactor: Gen. x. 16 (perhaps also Josh. iii. 10, xxiv. 11; Jud. iii. 5—see above). Other writers: 2 Sam. v. 6, xxiv. 16, 18; 1 Kings ix. 20; Ezra ix. 1; Neh. ix. 8; 1 Chron. i. 14, xi. 4, 5, xxi. 15, 18, 28; 2 Chron. iii. 1; “Zech.” ix. 7. The word Jebus for the town itself is found only in Jud. xix. 10 f. and in 1 Chron. xi. 4 f. In the latter passage it appears to be an intrusion: but although this is also held to be the case in Jud. xix. 10 f., we cannot be so sure. Jebus may have been a geographical designation—that is for the tribal territory, from which the writer transferred it to the city, or else a late and artificial form (see *Encycl. Bibl.* vol. ii. col. 2416).

² 2 Sam. v. 6. Therefore as formerly under Abd-Khiba, so now Jerusalem must have commanded some extent of the surrounding territory.

endured for centuries in their midst. In the story of Judges xix. the Levite refuses, though night is near, to turn aside into *this city of the Jebusites and lodge in it*, for it is *the city of a stranger, where there are none of the children of Israel*.¹ Israelite and Jebusite, therefore, kept apart, but they talked what was practically the same dialect; there must have been some traffic between them, the less settled Israelites purchasing the necessities and some of the embellishments of life from the townsfolk, as the Bedouin do at the present day; and, in addition, there may have been occasional intermarriage. So affairs lasted till the time of David.

The story of David's capture of Jerusalem (about 1000 B.C.) raises a number of questions of chronological and other details which lie outside the scope of our present aims. These are rather to discover David's reasons for the choice of Jerusalem as his capital, and the effect of this choice on the subsequent history of Israel. We may, however, give a brief statement of the former.

The account of the capture comes to us as part of the Second Book of Samuel, chapters v.–viii., which present a summary of David's reign written from a religious point of view.² The order in which the events, now of interest to us, are arranged is as follows. After Ishba'al's death Northern Israel submits itself to David, who is king in Hebron. He then takes Jerusalem, and thereupon has to sustain a double attack of the Philistines, whom he defeats. He brings the ark to Zion, and proceeds with the rebuilding of the city. If this is meant by the editor to be the chronological order, it implies that the Philistines were moved to attack their former vassal by the extension of his power over the northern tribes, which also had been subject to

¹ Verses 11 and 12.

² See the Commentaries, especially Driver's *Notes to the Books of Samuel*, H. P. Smith's *International Critical Commentary*, and Budde's *Kurz Hand-Kommentar*.

them,¹ and by his capture of a fortress, which must have threatened Israel in the rear in all their previous campaigns against Philistia. But this order seems contradicted by the details from which the summary account has been composed. One of these, *v.* 17, states that the Philistine attack upon David followed the submission to him of Northern Israel, and that when he heard that the Philistines were advancing he *went down to the hold*. But a hold to which he had to *go down* cannot have been Jerusalem,² but was some fortress at the foot of the hill-country, perhaps Adullam. If he was already in possession of Jerusalem, such a procedure is hardly intelligible. We may infer therefore that David's capture of Jerusalem was subsequent to his defeat of the Philistines. Again, this latter (according to *v.* 17) followed the anointing of David as king of all Israel. And yet the phrase in verse 6, *the king and his men went to Jerusalem against the Jebusites*, seems to imply that David attacked that fortress before he had all Israel behind him, and when he was only a southern chief with a band of followers.³ Accordingly other arrangements of the chronological order than that followed by the editor of chapters v.-viii. have been offered by modern scholars. Kittel and Budde suppose that after David became king of all Israel the Philistines opened war upon him, and that only after defeating them he took Jerusalem and brought in the ark. Others⁴ place the capture of the city first, and find in it the provocation of the Philistines to attack David, who defeats them, and is only then joined by Northern

¹ As Kamphausen was the first to point out.

² As Ottley and others maintain.

³ For this phrase the Chronicler (1 Chron. xi. 4) has substituted *David and all Israel went to Jerusalem*, which seems to be an effort to reconcile the above difficulties.

⁴ E. G. Ottley, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, 138. Winckler dates the capture of Jerusalem before a forcible conquest of Benjamin, which he imputes to David, and the effects of which he traces in the subsequent life of the king (*K.A.T.*³ 230).

Israel. Whichever of these arrangements be the right order of the events—and perhaps it is now impossible to determine this—the capture of Jerusalem is closely connected, either as preparation or as consequence, with the renewed hostility of the Philistines and David's assumption of the kingship over all Israel.

The narrative of the actual capture of the stronghold also raises questions. The text is uncertain, and, as it stands, hardly intelligible. It tells us that when David and his men went up against the Jebusites these taunted him. By a slight change in one of the verbs their taunt most naturally runs thus: *Thou shalt not come in hither: but the blind and the lame will drive thee off*¹: meaning David cannot come in hither. Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Sion—the first appearance of this name in the history. The next verse (8) is both uncertain in its text and impossible to construe as it stands. Our familiar English translation, even in the Revised Version—And David said on that day, “Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites, let him get up to the watercourse and smite the lame and the blind, that are hated of David's soul”—is purely conjectural, as may be seen from the word introduced in italics and the alternative versions in the margin. Besides, we should not expect directions to take the *hold*, after the statement of its capture in verse 7. The original has *a Jebusite*,² and the word translated *watercourse* means rather *waterfall*, of which there was none in Jerusalem; while the consonants of the text read the active form of the verb: *they hated*. The first clause can only be rendered *Whosoever smiteth a Jebusite*, and the rest, as Budde and others have inferred, ought to be emended so as to express some threat against the slaughter of a Jebusite, in conformity with the testimony that David

¹ Reading with Wellhausen הַסִּירָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל

² So Ps. xlii. 8. But in Mishnic Hebrew the word does mean “conduit.”

spared the defenders of the city when he took it.¹ Budde's own emendation, though not quite satisfactory for it introduces a negative, may stand in default of a better. By the omitting one letter and changing the vowel points,² he gets rid of the difficult *waterfall* (which besides is not what the Greek translators read) and substitutes for it the word *his neck*, rendering the whole thus: *Whoso slayeth a Jebusite, shall bring his neck into danger, the halt and the blind David's soul doth not hate.*³ We thus lose a picturesque but impossible account of how the citadel was taken, with all occasion for the topographical conjectures that have arisen from that; but we gain a sensible statement following naturally on the preceding verse and in harmony with other facts. The concluding clause of verse 8: *wherefore they say a blind man or a halt may not enter the house*, is obviously an insertion that attempts to account for the later Levitical provision to exclude all blemished persons from entering the Temple.⁴ *And David dwelt in the stronghold and called it the City of David.*

From these details we may turn to the larger questions of David's policy in regard to Jerusalem. Here for clearness' sake we may distinguish between his capture of the city and his choice of it as his capital.

The capture of Jerusalem—whatever he might afterwards make of the city—was necessary for David in respect equally of his dominion over Northern Israel, and of his relations to the Philistines. The last of the alien *enclaves* on the hill-country of the Hebrews, the Jebusite fortress, stood between the two portions of David's kingdom, and hard by the trunk-road that ran through them. If, as is likely from 2 Samuel v. 6, the capture happened before David's accession to the united sovereignty, it may be taken

¹ 2 Sam. xxiv. 16.

² Instead of בְּצִוּרוֹ וְאֶת־, he reads בְּצִוּרוֹ אֶת־. The Greek version has "with a dagger."

³ לֹא שָׂאנָה

⁴ Lev. xxi. 18.

as proof of his political foresight and of the fact that he already cherished the ambition of being ruler of all Israel; while its achievement may have helped the attraction of the northern tribes to his crown. Most probably it did not happen before his campaign or campaigns with the Philistines¹; and in that case his experience in these must have shown him the inexpediency of leaving an alien stronghold on his rear as often as he should have to descend to meet the Philistines on the border of the Shephelah. Besides, Jerusalem lies near the head of one of the passes leading up from the Philistine territory. David had himself encountered the Philistines on the plain of Rephaim near the Jebusite fortress, and by that alone must have felt the indispensableness of having the latter in his possession. Plainly therefore, the capture of Jerusalem was as necessary to Israel's independence of Philistia as it was to their unification.

The same motives must have worked in David towards the selection of the captured city for his capital—but along with others. As king of all Israel he could not remain in Hebron. This town lay too far south and its site possesses little strength. On the other hand, to have chosen one of the fortresses of Ephraim or even to have settled in Shechem, the natural centre of the country, would have roused the jealousy of his own southern clans. His capital must lie between the two: most fitly between Bethlehem and Bethel. But upon this stretch of country there was no position to compare for strength with Jerusalem. Bethel, indeed, was better situated for the command of roads and the trade on them, but the site has little military value. Bethlehem, again, might have made a better fortress than Bethel, and lay in a district of much greater fertility than Jerusalem. But it had not even the one spring, which (at least) Jerusalem possessed; and it was wholly southern and shut off from the north. To the prime necessities of

¹ See above, p. 328.

great strength and a tolerable water-supply, to the further advantages of a position on the trunk-road and not far from the head of an easily defended pass into the western plain, Jerusalem added the supreme excellence of a neutral site which had belonged neither to Judah nor to the northern tribes, and was therefore without prejudice in the delicate balance of interests to preserve which strained David throughout the rest of his reign and which was so soon to be disturbed under his grandson. Nor within the basin in which Jerusalem lies could there be any question between the exact site of the Jebusite stronghold and the other as fortifiable hills around. The capture of many an eastern city has meant the abandonment of its site and the rise of a new town at some little distance. But, as we have seen,¹ the position in that large basin most favourable for sustaining the population of a town is where the waters of the basin gather and partly come to the surface before issuing by their one outlet—to the south-east. Here flowed the only spring or springs. There was thus no other way for it. *David dwelt in the stronghold,*² in the ancient Jebusite fortress which lay, as we have seen,³ on the south-eastern hill of the present Jerusalem, and immediately above Gihon.

David, then, being (or about to be) monarch of all Israel supplied his monarchy with its correlative, a capital, strong in her natural position, and politically suitable by her neutrality towards the rival interests in his kingdom north and south. To this capital hitherto unimportant religiously—another advantage—he brought the dwelling and symbol of his people's God. It was a movable chest—the sanctuary and palladium of a nomad people; that had come with them through the wilderness; that except for intervals had never settled anywhere; that had gone into their battles; that had fallen into the hands of their foes. With

¹ EXPOSITOR for March.

² 2 Sam. v. 6. ³ EXPOSITOR for April.

the prestige of the defeat of the latter, and as if its work of war were over, David brought it for the first time within walls. As the Psalm says,¹ he gave it *a resting-place, a resting-place for ever*. We can have little doubt that what moved David to recover an object which had so long fallen out of his people's history, and give it a place in the new capital, was not merely that it was the only relic of the past with which any memories Israel had of their unity as a nation were associated. David was moved by a religious inspiration. The national unity had never been maintained or when lost had never been recovered, except by loyalty to the nation's One God and Lord. His Ark implied Himself. It was His presence which sealed the new-formed union, and consecrated the capital.

The nation, then, appeared to be made; and in every respect, military, political and religious, Jerusalem stood for its centre. Yet such achievements could not be the work of one day nor of one man; least of all could this happen in the case of a town so lately adopted, and with so many natural disadvantages, among a people so freshly welded together. Those historians therefore are premature, who at this point celebrate all the meaning of Jerusalem in the history of Israel, as if that were due to David alone. The work was Divine and required the ages for its fulfilment. The most we can say of David, beyond the splendid insight with which he met the exigencies of his own day, and his religious devotion, is that in giving Israel Jerusalem he gave them the possibility of that which was yet to be. But for centuries the position of Jerusalem remained precarious. She was violated by Shishak; harassed by the Northern Kingdom, so far as she was a capital, and ignored so far as she was a sanctuary. Elijah passed her by when he went to seek Jahweh at Horeb; and according to Amos² the Israelite devotees

¹ cxxxii. 8, 14.

² viii. 14.

of Jahweh in the eighth century preferred Beersheba to Zion. It required the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom; the desecration of the rural sanctuaries by the Assyrian invasion, the splendid vindication of her own inviolableness by Isaiah, and the centralisation of worship in the Temple by the Deuteronomists of the seventh century, before, in the providence of God, Jerusalem became the heart and soul of the nation, from which all their life went forth and with whose fall they died.

At the same time David took other steps towards this final result than those which lay in his capture of the city, his residence there and his bringing in of the Ark.

The first of these was the reprieve, which he granted to the Jebusite population, of the massacre or deportation which often followed the capture of a besieged city. There can be little doubt that David, who surrounded himself with a foreign body-guard, and amid the rival jealousies of his still incohesive people found his most faithful supporters among foreigners—witness the passionate loyalty of Ittai the Gittite¹—obeyed not merely the promptings of his native generosity towards his foes, but a sound political instinct in sparing the Jebusites and allowing them to remain in his capital. David's policy may be compared with that of Herod amid the Jewish factions of his time, in building for himself at Sebasté a Greek town upon Samaritan soil.

Again, David fostered a considerable development of trade, which was doubtless to the advantage of Jerusalem, and must have further swollen the increase of her population caused by the settlement in her of his soldiers, officials and priests. Historians and critics, who have recounted the advantages of Jerusalem as a capital, have generally included among these a central position for the trade of the land.² But to do so is to be ignorant

¹ 2 Sam. xv. 21.

² So Kittel, *Gesch. Hebr.* ii. p. 134.

of the geographical facts, and consequently to write without discrimination. Jerusalem does not lie, as has been frequently asserted, upon *two* of the trade-routes of Palestine—that running north and south along the backbone of the land and connecting most of the chief centres of population from Bethshan to Hebron and Beersheba, and that climbing across the range from east to west. She lies on the former. The latter traverses the range near Bethel—hence a market as well as a sanctuary—and some twelve miles north of Jerusalem. Jerusalem had therefore no natural command of the transit-traffic—not half so much as Bethel had, and scarcely the equal of that of Hebron, with her more open roads to the coast, and her market for the nomads of the southern desert. If then Jerusalem did compel the trade of the land to concentrate upon her gates, this was not so much by virtue of natural advantage, as by her political supremacy.

That there was, however, more of this trade to feed Jerusalem than historians have recognised, is a fact discernible by an exact consideration of the Biblical data. Even in the times of the Judges the lines of Israel's fighting were frequently along trade-routes; and that the commerce which happened on these was not without its value is proved by the glitter of gold here and there in the account of the campaigns, and by the reckoning of shekels in the other narratives. In the Philistines Israel encountered a trading people, settled upon the great road between Egypt and Mesopotamia; and the lines of the Philistine occupation of Israel's territory are exactly those of the cross traffic between the coast and Eastern Palestine.¹ The Philistine designs upon Israel must therefore have included the taking from them of the transit-trade. That Saul by his partial

¹ The cross-routes are three—(1) Ajalon, Beth-horon, Michmash and Geba, Ain Duk (Docus, Beth-Dagon), Jericho. (2) By Shechem to the Damieh fords of Jordan, on which route lies another Beth-Dagon. (3) Aphek in Sharon, Jezreel, Beth-Shan.

resistance of the Philistines enhanced the commercial prosperity of his people is clear from David's praise that Saul brought up *adorning of gold on the raiment* of the daughters of Israel.¹ But the symptoms increase under David himself. The rise in the East of such a monarchy as his always means the development and organisation of trade: a modern analogy may be seen in Palgrave's account² of Telal Ibn Rasheed's commercial policy at Ha'il in the fifties of last century. Other proofs are found in David's introduction of foreigners—so Ibn Rasheed attracted trading families from other towns to his own—in his alliance with Hiram, in his stamping of standard shekels,³ a sure sign of other royal regulations of commerce; and in two other invariable consequences—in the East and elsewhere—of a rapid increase of trade; namely, the formation of a corps of foreign mercenaries, and great activity in building.

From all this it was Jerusalem which would chiefly benefit; but (in accordance with what has been said above) not so much because of natural necessity as by her political rank. She was the capital, and in those times trade was the business of the king, and pursued, as Hebrew, Babylonian, and Egyptian records agree, by his servants. This must have greatly increased the population, and led to that extension of her walls and other buildings which is imputed by the Old Testament to David himself.

David's rebuilding of Jerusalem must be left to another paper; but before we close this study it is necessary to remark on one other consequence to the later history of

¹ 2 Sam. i. 24.

² *Central and Eastern Arabia*, ed. 1883, p. 93.

³ 2 Sam. xiv. 26: *the King's weight*. The phrase is taken by some commentators as a post-exilic of loss; but it seems to me without sufficient reason. The other proofs of the organisation of trade under David given above; and the general development of trade in Western Asia by that period under such a measure as the stamping of weights by David extremely probable. See *Trade and Commerce* by the present writer in *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. iv.

David's policy. He spared the heathen population. We are not told that he destroyed their sanctuary, or forbade the continuance of their worship. He certainly did not substitute the Ark for the image and symbol of whatever god had occupied that sanctuary before. The Ark was placed beneath a tent. But whatever may have happened to the Jebusite sanctuary, it is clear that a considerable heathen population, and all the attractions which a god in ancient possession of a definite territory has always had for the invaders of the latter, remained in Jerusalem side by side with the Israelite worship of Jahweh. If we are to understand the subsequent history of religion in Jerusalem, we must, with Ezekiel, keep in mind this native heathen strain. *Thine origin*, he tells her when exposing her affection for debased rites, *thine origin and thy nativity is of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was an Hittite.*¹

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XI.

THE COMPANIONSHIP OF THE TWELVE.

1. THE public ministry in Galilee, according to Matthew and Mark, began with the call of four disciples, Simon and Andrew, James and John. Luke, after recording a preaching tour through Galilee, reports the call of Peter, following on a miraculous draught of fishes. There seems to be little doubt that Luke's account is less trustworthy than Matthew's and Mark's. The visit to Nazareth is placed at the beginning of the ministry, although it belonged to a later date, as it serves as a programme of the work of Jesus, as

¹ Ezek. xvi. 3.