

to help us, and if we do not respond to the love and providence of God, visible all around us in the natural world, then Nature herself is our accuser and our judge.

Stones? Those are our circumstances. There are some who say that circumstances never gave them a chance of seeing the Lord, of hearing His voice or serving His cause. There often is a bitter truth in that indictment. But is there ever the whole truth? I once read this story about one of the men of the New Testament. He was small of stature and he lived in Jericho. By this time he was an old man. Every day he could be seen tending the ground with loving care round about an old sycamore tree. One day some one stopped and spoke to him. 'Sir,' he said, 'why do you lavish so much care and love upon that old sycamore tree?' And then the old man told him his story. 'One day, many years ago,' he said, 'I heard the news that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. But at that time I was very unpopular, and, being on the short side, I couldn't see for the crowd. My circumstances were against me. But,' he said, 'there was this tree. It was from the branches of this tree that I first caught a glimpse of what Jesus was like.' It was his one chance, but he took it. Suppose he had missed it? Maybe we have more chances than we think. And if we miss them, then our very opportunities will become our judges, and the very stones of our circumstances will cry out. Lastly, there is this:

The rebuke of the unexpected response.

Upon that first Palm Sunday who was it who really bore witness to the kingship of Christ? Was it Man? Was it the men of privilege and opportunity? 'And when he was come near, he

beheld the city, and wept over it.' Or was it the common people? It is true that to-day they were shouting Him up: in a week they were shouting Him down. From the world of men the tribute was meagre and thin, and most of it came from the lips of little children.

From the world of men, let us turn to the world of Nature. It was the colt of an ass,

The tattered outlaw of the earth
Of ancient crooked will,

that bore the Master towards His kingdom. And the colt was there because the Lord had need of him. It was the palm leaves from the hedge-rows that made a path under those tired feet and eased the roughness of that way of sorrows. And (we have His own word for it), if the need had arisen, the stones would immediately have cried out. The ass, the palms, and the stones! They are not going to desert Him now. Christ gets glory from unexpected quarters. He finds friends among the unprivileged. But it is not for them that He is going to Jerusalem to die. Not for beasts, or flowers, or stones. But their share in His Triumphant Entry is a stinging rebuke to the ingratitude of human hearts. It is often the outsiders who are nearest to Him in the end.

What lies behind the mystery of these crying stones? Many a surprise. 'I tell you, if they were to keep quiet, the very stones would shout.' They are shouting now. But they are shouting so loudly that many of us cannot hear what they are saying. Perhaps we shall know some day. It may be something like this: 'For many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.'

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

Dress and Apparel.—Though there are numerous words for these both in the original Hebrew ('*ēzōr*, '*kuttōneth*, '*simlah*, '*me'ūl*, '*addereth*, etc.) and in our English Version of the Old Testament ('garments,' 'raiment,' 'attire,' 'coat,' etc.), our information as to the particular articles of dress worn by the Israelites is obscure and scanty. In other words, while the Hebrew vocabulary is abundant, its meaning is somewhat uncertain. The translation is

assisted in some cases by the Hebrew etymology, but as a rule it has largely to be determined by the context. Under the circumstances we have to fall back for our principal source of information (not always trustworthy perhaps) on the monuments that contain figured representations of the Palestinian people. Unfortunately, there is almost an entire lack of such records in Palestine itself, but this deficiency is compensated by the ancient

paintings and reliefs found in Egypt and Assyria, which give us pictures of Canaanite, Hebrew, and other Palestinian prisoners or tribute-bearers. The Egyptian representations date mostly from the Second and Third Bronze Ages (c. 2000-1200 B.C.), while the Assyrian ones belong to the end of the Judæan and Israelite monarchies. We have practically no monuments giving us descriptions of dress at the time of Joshua's Conquest or during the post-Exilic period.

1. **Loin-cloth and Plaid.**—The oldest and most generally used article of dress was the simple loin-cloth (*'ēšōr*), often incorrectly translated 'girdle' in our English version (as in Job 12¹⁸, Is 5²⁷ 11⁶, Ezk 23¹⁵, etc.). It consisted of a strip of skin (cf. Elijah, 2 K 1⁸; John the Baptist, Mt 3⁴, Mk 1⁶); or ordinary cloth (cf. Jer 13¹⁷); or in cases of mourning, hair-cloth (E.V. 'sackcloth,' cf. Is 20²). It was wrapped round the loins, reached down to the knees, and was fastened by a waist-belt. This article of apparel is well represented in the well-known mural painting taken from the tomb of Khnumhotep at Beni Hasan in the Nile Valley, a painting which describes the coming of thirty-seven Amorites (or possibly Hebrews), under a chief named Absha, in the sixth year of Senusret II. of the Twelfth Dynasty (c. 2000 B.C.), and is thought by some to refer to the arrival of Abraham and his retainers in Egypt (cf. Gn 12¹⁰).¹ Here the loin-cloths of the Egyptians are of white linen, and somewhat bell-shaped like kilts, while those of the Palestinians are narrower but embroidered and ornamented in various colours, especially red, white, and blue. This portraiture is probably correct, for there is good evidence that the Hebrews (if they were such) were fond of colour. It is true, their language possessed no developed colour vocabulary—it had no distinct terms for different shades—but they were certainly not deficient in colour sense (as used to be contended by some scholars). The Song of Deborah gives proof of their liking for garish apparel. 'Have they not divided the spoil (taken from the Hebrews),' says the mother of Sisera, 'a spoil of divers colours for Sisera, divers colours of embroidery?' It is worthy of note perhaps that two small silver statuettes from Ras Shamra have loin-cloths made from gold leaf, and the Baal of Thunder discovered there has one adorned with horizontal stripes.

In the course of the centuries, particularly by the beginning of the Iron Age (c. 1200 B.C.), this simple article of dress tended to be worn exclusively

¹ For the picture, see Newberry, *Beni Hasan*, i. pl. xxviii.

by soldiers and manual workers. It was the only apparel of the Philistine warriors (who may be recognized by their diadem of feathers) as pictured on the second pylon of the temple erected by Ramesses III. at Medinet Habu near Thebes, and it was the main part of the military dress of the Israelites at the time of the monarchy, if we judge from the reliefs of Sennacherib representing the siege of Lachish (c. 700 B.C.). In the latter case it is seen to be the dress of the soldier pushing a pack-camel before him and of the other walking by the side of an ox-cart on which the fugitives have piled their belongings.

In the case of the better-class people, especially when not working, the loin-cloth was merely an under garment. Thus, in the Beni Hasan picture, the leader of the group as well as his immediate associates wear over it a sort of plaid (mostly of blue and red colour) fastened above one shoulder and leaving the other shoulder uncovered down to the armpit, while the women wear the same kind of garment though slightly longer.

2. **Tunic or Sleeved Garment.**—Among the Hebrews of all classes, both male and female, from about 1200 B.C. downward, the loin-cloth was largely displaced in every-day life by a sleeved under garment or tunic, reaching down to the ankle among the well-to-do or at least to the middle of the lower leg, and either embroidered in colour along the selvages and hems or simply fringed. The Hebrew name was *kuttōmeth*, wrongly rendered 'coat' in our English Version (cf. Gn 37^{3,31}, Ex 28³⁹, Lv 10⁶, 2 S 15²², Ezr 2⁶⁹, etc., cf. also Jn 19²³ R.V.m.). Though really an under garment like the loin-cloth, this tunic was the one in which the ordinary everyday work was done. It is the *kettōmeth passim* ('tunic reaching to palms and soles') of Joseph and of the royal princess Tamar, wrongly translated 'coat of many colours' (Gn 37³, 2 S 13¹⁸). The Jewish captives of Lachish, when making their submission with bare head and feet to Sennacherib, are pictured in such a garment, fitting close round the neck (cf. Job 30¹⁸), while the scribe who presents himself before Bar-rekub of Sam'al, on the Zenjirli stela, and the musicians of the Assyrian army, are similarly depicted.

3. **Outer Garments.**—In regard to outer garments, serving to protect the wearers, whether men or women, against cold weather, and to cover them during the night (cf. Ex 22^{26f.}), several kinds are mentioned in the Old Testament. (1) The commonest was the *simlah* or *salmah* (cf. Gn 45²², Dt 8⁴ 10¹⁸ 21¹³, Jos 9⁶, 1 K 11²⁰, Is 3⁶, etc.), which consisted of a long rectangular piece of cloth (wool

or linen), not 'put on' the body but wrapped round and round it like the *himation* of the Greeks which it closely resembled (as in Mt 5⁴⁰ 24¹⁸, Mk 13¹⁶, etc.), and held together by a girdle at the waist. If the wrapping was not long enough to reach up to the shoulders it appears to have been supplemented sometimes by an independent cape. This Palestinian garment is well represented on the Egyptian monuments of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. It is worn, for example, over the tunic by the Palestinian prisoners who are pictured on a relief from the tomb of Harmhab (c. 1358 B.C.), and by the besieged inhabitants of Ashkelon as represented on the reliefs of Ramesses II. (2) Another type, probably of Babylonian origin, was the *me'il* usually translated 'robe' or 'mantle.' Properly speaking, it seems to have been a superior kind of shawl, ornamented with fringes, which was crossed over the shoulders and then wound round the tunic. It had a richer and more ornate appearance than the *simlah*, and was worn only by men of rank, such as Saul and Jonathan (1 S 18⁴ 24⁵), the princes of the sea (Ezk 26¹⁶), Samuel (1 S 15²⁷), Ezra (Ezr 9³), David (1 Ch 15²⁷), High Priests (Ex 28³¹, Lv 8⁷), and others. It is shown on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III. (c. 841 B.C.), where the Israelite nobles are represented bringing Jehu's tribute, and is found on bas-reliefs in Syria (Barekub of Sam'al is thus portrayed) and in Hittite lands, as well as on the mural paintings of the Assyrian palaces at Til Barsib (modern *Tell Ahmar*) on the Euphrates. (3) There was still another kind of outer garment, 'addereth, which was a wide cloak or mantle of hair, confined usually to the prophets (cf. Gn 25²⁶, 1 K 19¹³, 2 K 2⁸, Zec 13⁴, also Jos 7²¹ 'fine mantle of Shinar').

TRANSJORDAN.

Not a Desert.—One cannot read the latest results of Professor Glueck's archæological activities on the east of the Jordan¹ without feeling that he has successfully disposed of several erroneous suppositions regarding this little known region (including Moab and Edom). One of these, still prevalent among many Biblical readers, is that it consists almost entirely of dry sterile desert or billowing sands, without vegetation or water, something like the Sahara. Most of it, certainly, is hard, sandy soil, brown and black, covered with minute fragments of glistening lava in infinite profusion (resulting from prehistoric volcanic action), but Dr. Glueck states that 'after the spring rains the grass

¹ See especially his recent publication, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, Conn.).

springs up as if by magic,' followed by 'a carpet of green,' and that there are extensive pasture grounds (cf. Ps 65^{12, 13}, Jl 1^{19, 20} 2²², Jer 23¹⁰, etc.). The usual Hebrew word for 'desert' (*midbār*) implies this, for it really means a tract to which herds are led for pasture (from *dābar* 'to lead or guide,' cf. *dōber* 'pasture,' Mic 2¹² R.V., Is 5¹⁷ R.V.). It is not generally known, for example, that the slopes of Mt. Nebo and the plains stretching west towards the Dead Sea, as well as the regions east and south-east, are well cultivated in many parts, and the same is true of the lands of Moab and Edom. If the *wadi*-beds are dry, water can generally be found just beneath their surface. This is due to the fact that the water sinks down and is retained underground by the hard or rocky bottom, so that copious supplies can always be obtained by digging holes about two feet deep in the bed. The ancient inhabitants of Transjordan were familiar with this phenomenon, as the Bedouin are to this day, and hence built many of their dwelling-places on sites overlooking dry *wadi*-beds (cf. Jos 15^{61, 62}). This peculiarity of the region explains the 'miracle' in 2 K 3^{16, 17}, which seems to have taken place in the *Wadi* forming the dividing line between Moab and Edom, whose upper reaches are still called *Wadi el-Ahsa* ('Valley of the Sandy Water-pits'): 'Thus saith the Lord, I will make this torrent bed full of cisterns (*gēbīm*). . . . Ye shall see neither wind nor rain, yet this torrent bed shall be filled with water.' The 'miracle,' so-called, may thus be regarded as a natural phenomenon, resting on accurate local knowledge.

Not Uncultured.—Another prevailing idea is that the inhabitants in these regions were backward, and less civilized than those on the west side of the Jordan. The fact, however, is that, although they may not have had prophets similar to those of Israel and Judah, they must have had outstanding leaders and also gifted writers who recorded historical events, though the works of the latter have not been handed down to us any more than the 'Book of Yashar' (Jos 10¹³, 2 S 1¹⁸). Important inscriptions, however, have been found, such as the famous Moabite stela of black granite at Dhiban (now in the Louvre), which may be dated c. 842 B.C., and which (apart from the finds at Ras Shamra) is the longest literary document in ancient 'Hebrew' outside the Bible, as well as the famous stela found at Baluah, belonging (it is believed) to the twelfth century B.C., and containing many lines of inscription now too weather-beaten to be decipherable. In most respects, indeed, the inhabitants east and west of the Jordan wrote and

spoke the same 'Hebrew' language, were of the same racial stock, and no doubt developed similar cultures.

Not Unproductive.—The land, so far from being unprofitable and valueless, is rich in copper and iron deposits, particularly in the Wadi Arabah. These were exploited by the kings of Judah, and at Ezion-geber on the Red Sea an elaborate smelter or refinery was built by Solomon, where previously 'roasted' ores were worked up into ingots of purer metal. Long before Solomon's time the mines seem to have been worked not only by the Edomites but by the Kenizzites and Kenites, who were skilled metallurgists (cf. Tubal-cain, Gn 4²², and Arab. *qain* 'a smith'), and the Hebrews probably acquired their knowledge of metals from these workers. It is stated in Chronicles that the Kenizzites lived in Ge-harashim, *i.e.* 'the Valley of Smiths' (cf. 1 Ch 4^{13, 14} R.V.m., Neh 11³⁶), which Glueck with good reason takes to be the Wadi Arabah, and in the preceding verse (4¹²) we read of Ir-nahash ('the City of Copper'), which is probably to be identified with modern Khirbet Nahash ('the Copper Ruin'), near the north end of the Arabah. The valley must have been a hive of metal workers, and one of the most productive regions in the Near East.

LACHISH.

The Fosse Temple.—Further excavation at this ancient Judean site is at present hampered, owing partly to the time required for carefully examining all the material found, and partly to the unsettled conditions meanwhile in the Near East. When all such difficulties, however, are overcome, the Wellcome-Marston Expedition hopes to resume its valuable work. The recent reports on the temple which stood for two and a half centuries (*c.* 1475–1230 B.C.) in the Hyksos fosse, outside the city wall, and which seems to have been dedicated to native Syrian deities, show several correspondences with Hebrew ritual and worship, due no doubt to common Semitic tradition. We have mentioned some of these already. In addition, it may be stated that a number of lamps have been discovered in the cupboard adjoining the shrine, and their existence there reminds us of the close connexion in the Hebrew tabernacle between the lighting of the lamps and the burning of incense on the altar: 'Every morning when he (Aaron) dresseth the lamps, he shall burn incense' (Ex 30^{7, 8}). Again, there has been found among the pottery on the floor near the altar a large bowl with a bridge across it, which has been identified as a foot-bath,

and its presence at this particular spot seems to accord with the law for ceremonial ablutions in Hebrew sanctuaries: 'He (Moses) set the laver between the tent of meeting and the altar, and put water therein, to wash withal. And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and their feet thereat' (Ex 40^{30, 31}). On the other hand, one important divergence from Hebrew custom lies in the apparent absence of anything corresponding to the Holy of Holies. The worshippers seem to have had access to the whole sanctuary. They brought their offerings in bowls, and were allowed to deposit them in the presence of the deities. This appears to have been the chief form of worship during the long period of the temple's existence, for the number of bowls, apart from other vessels, found in the building and in the refuse pits outside, amounts to no less than 1806.

Its Destruction.—The burning of the temple, and probably of the whole city, has been dated by Professor Albright, after pottery examination, to about 1230 B.C., and there is good reason to believe that this is correct. At the same time, the destruction cannot have been due, as he suggests,¹ to the Israelite entry into the land shortly before, for if we allow the necessary 'forty years' for the wilderness period, this would mean that the Exodus from Egypt took place during the reign of Ramesses II. (*c.* 1301–1234 B.C.), which is most improbable, to say the least—and there are other important reasons against such a date. The destruction was undoubtedly due, as the excavators themselves prefer to believe, to Merenptah's Raid, which we know from this Pharaoh's Victory Stela occurred in 1230 B.C., and was more widespread and devastating than commonly supposed. There is certainly evidence that Gezer was destroyed at the time, and this would involve Lachish and Ashkelon, with which that city was closely associated. Other cities, too, such as Kiriath-sepher, are known to have been laid waste near the end of the thirteenth century, and all the evidence clearly points, not to the Israelites, but to Merenptah's Egyptian hosts.

THE PRESENT NORTH WALL OF JERUSALEM.

It has long been held by many scholars and archaeologists that this is the wall commenced in A.D. 41 by Herod Agrippa I., being the one described in Josephus (*Wars*, v. 4) as the Third Wall of the city. It was built, according to Josephus, to enclose an extension of the city at this northern part, and though the work was stopped through the inter-

¹ *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 194.

vention of the Roman authorities, it was resumed and hastily completed by the Jewish defenders in anticipation of the siege of A.D. 70. The discovery has now been made, through careful and extensive excavations carried out by R. W. Hamilton under the Department of Antiquities in Palestine,¹ that the present wall cannot be the one referred to by Josephus, as there is no evidence that it could have been founded or built earlier than the time of the Emperor Hadrian (c. A.D. 117-138), who settled a Roman colony in Jerusalem and gave the city the name Aelia Capitolina. Under the circumstances, therefore, the wall referred to by Josephus must have taken a different line, and must be the one whose ruined foundations were discovered by Dr. Robinson about a hundred years ago, which runs roughly parallel to the present wall but about a quarter of a mile north of it, and which was partially excavated in 1925-27 by Dr. E. L. Sukenik and Dr. L. A. Mayer. The discovery, of course, does not affect the question as to the location of Golgotha, which is known to have been 'outside the gate' (He 13^{12a}), seeing that none of these two walls was in existence at the date of the Crucifixion, but the excavations have at last settled a much disputed controversy.

Hamilton has found that the earliest construction of the present north wall must be dated sometime 'between the foundation of Aelia and the late third or fourth century, A.D.'—probably about the end of the third century, judging by the sherds. Many of the blocks of masonry which had been at one time in some of the buildings of Herodian Jerusalem seem to have been brought and re-used in the wall.

The earliest structure discovered, dating from before the wall, is an underground aqueduct, about twenty inches wide, commencing below the wall foundation a little west of Herod's Gate, and running southward into the city. Its entrance beneath the wall is stopped up with rubble, but its course is clear and is paved with excellent flags.

¹ *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities*, x. 1. (1940), 1 ff.

About fifty-one feet onward it opens into an inspection chamber, constructed later, one of the side stones of which contains the funerary inscription of a centurion named Tiberius Claudius Fatalis. The inscription has been placed by M. Avi-Yonah about the early second century A.D., but it can afford no evidence as to the date of the aqueduct itself.

JEHOIACHIN, KING OF JUDAH.

It is worthy of note that a Babylonian cuneiform record has recently been found, referring to the imprisonment or exile of this Judæan monarch in Babylon. According to Old Testament history, he succeeded his father, Jehoiakim, in 597 B.C. at the age of eighteen (2 K 24⁸), and after a brief reign of three months surrendered to Nebuchadnezzar and was carried captive to Babylon, with his mother, his generals, his troops, and many inhabitants of Jerusalem. He remained in confinement there for thirty-seven years until released by the next king of Babylon, Evil-merodach, who gave him an honourable seat at the royal table (2 K 25²⁷⁻³⁰, Jer 52³¹⁻³⁴). The Babylonian tablet, mentioning the king's captivity, has been translated and discussed by Ernst F. Wiedner in an article² in Vol. II. of *Mélanges Dussaud* (pp. 923-935, with five plates), and further reference to the subject is made in *Archiv für Orientforschung*.³ We need not be surprised to find archæological discoveries confirming Israelite historical statements, seeing that the latter rest as a rule on early written sources contemporary, or nearly so, with the events narrated. This is undoubtedly true not only of the JE narratives, but of much of the material preserved in P. Referring to future archæology, Professor Albright says, 'We shall see a steady rise in respect for the historical significance of now neglected or despised passages and details in the Old and New Testaments.'⁴

² *Jojachin, König von Juda, in Babylonischen Keilschrifttexten*.

³ xiii. Heft 3 (1940), 180a.

⁴ *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 47.