

Conclusi of Solomon, the Wilderness of St. John [‘Ain el-Habis], the Castle of the Maccabees, the House of Samuel, the House of Amos on the summit of a high hill, St. John’s Church, the place where the Blessed Virgin Mary met St. Elisabeth, and some vestiges of St. Joseph’s home, Philip’s Fountain, the place where Christ joined company with the two apostles, the House of Cleophas, the Fountain of Samuel.

Several of the above sites I am unable to identify, and it seems as though some of these show-places have been forgotten.

Almost the only break in this arid catalogue is the following incident, which shows that the “crank” had already reached Jerusalem—“An English gentlewoman was there some years ago who . . . being somewhat crazy would go in her own country habit, and did so: and some Turks, looking scoffingly at her one day, as she passed along the streets, she pulled a cross out of her bosom; and shaking it at them, said, ‘Come here, you infidel dogs, come and worship this!’ They suspected it was an insult and affront to their religion by the manner of it, and were a-going to mob her, and seize her: but the monks and others, who were to accompany her, speaking the country language told them, she was a mad-woman, and that there was neither sense nor meaning in what she said and did; and by that means they brought her off scot free.”

ANCIENT PALESTINE.

By STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.

I.—*Earliest Period.*

YEAR by year the horizon of the serious student of the Old Testament is widened by the increasing accumulation of material bearing directly or indirectly upon his subject. It is no longer possible to regard the Israelites as a people holding an isolated position; they are now found to take their place in the ancient world with others closely related to them in race, language and

thought. No longer may one confine oneself to their writings, which have been preserved in the Old Testament, without taking into account the many conditions by which they have been influenced, and the factors which have left their mark upon its pages. New worlds have been opened up by Egyptology and Assyriology; excavation in Palestine itself and in the adjacent lands has revealed an amount of culture which could never have been imagined; continued research among Semites, whether in Arabia, Palestine, Syria, or Mesopotamia, has brought to light features of cult and custom identical with, analogous to, or illustrative of ancient conditions and life. It is now recognized that there is much in the institutions of the Israelites which was common to them with their neighbours. "Thus, their beliefs about the origin and early history of the world, their social usages, their code of civil and criminal law, their religious institutions, can no longer be viewed, as was once possible, as differing in kind from those of other nations, and determined in every feature by a direct revelation from Heaven; all, it is now known, have substantial analogies among other peoples, the distinctive character which they exhibit among the Hebrews consisting in the spirit with which they are infused and the higher principles of which they are made the exponent."¹

As everyone knows, the Old Testament is replete with problems immediately one seeks below the surface for the religion, history, archaeology or sociology of the people in whose midst it took birth. Many of these problems may be insoluble, since the book has had a lengthy history, and one can scarcely hope to recover long lost information which will elucidate all obscurities. But many representations and statements only appear in their proper perspective when studied in the light thrown upon them from outside. It is true that the discoveries upon Israelite soil have not yet been of such far-reaching importance as those in adjacent countries; but considering the restricted extent of excavation hitherto, the results have been comparatively richer and more stimulating, and there is every hope that with the means to pursue such research further, discoveries of a more historical character (viz., inscriptions) will be found.

It is evident that the rich archæological results of recent years

¹ Prof. Driver in Hogarth, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 7 sq.

form one class of evidence; the contemporary historical inscriptions another; whilst records written after the events themselves stand upon quite another plane. With the help of these there is now so much material accessible in valuable monographs, articles, etc., that a reconstruction of the history of Ancient Palestine bids fair to be soon within the realms of possibility. But it is necessary to remember that a great deal of the evidence is inevitably still incomplete, and the required connecting links between the various classes are still often more or less hypothetical. It would be precarious to make any indiscriminate combination of heterogeneous evidence or to institute comparisons between different fields when the historical relationships are obscure. Since research is likely to be as fruitful in the future as in the past, it would be premature to attempt to weave the distinct threads into one web, and consequently it is proposed in these sketches of Ancient Palestine to treat the evidence separately. The historical records of the Old Testament will not be handled, since it is now recognized that they must first be subjected to criticism. This, however, it would not be desirable to undertake in these pages, and it must suffice to say that they can have but one meaning, and that the truest interpretation everywhere will more probably be recovered by treating the evidence independently, than by injudicious comparison. Moreover, it is proposed to ignore for the present the equally independent data which are purely archæological, and we shall endeavour to confine ourselves as far as possible to the external history of Palestine alone. When we perceive that we have on the one hand, human documents, records emanating from the Israelites, written in different ages, and subject to a variety of influences; and on the other hand, when we consider the remarkable manner in which, year by year, Palestine is being forced to disclose her secrets, and the ancient past is being revealed with greater clearness, it will no doubt be recognized that a consideration of external political events is one of the preparations to a right conception of Hebrew history.

Whilst light in abundance has been cast upon Egypt and Babylonia, in the earliest times we know little enough of the history of Palestine itself.¹ Although Israel's great neighbours have left us monuments which take us back at least to the fourth millennium before Christ, it is not until about the fifteenth century B.C. that

¹ The following remarks may be supplemented by the instructive account given by L. B. Paton, *The Early History of Syria and Palestine* (1902), chaps. i and ii.

the "least of all lands" enters into the glare of history. Not that it had had no history previously—the archaeological results speak with no uncertain voice regarding its inhabitants, but the comparatively small extent of excavation in Palestine has not yet succeeded in unearthing those native records with *definite* chronological data which, it is hoped, will some day be forthcoming. Consequently, the historian is necessarily obliged to rely partly upon the general evidence supplied by those archaeological remains which underlie strata of the fifteenth century, and partly upon general considerations based upon the trend of later periods or upon the development in neighbouring lands.

It is probable that the wave of migration from Arabia, which spread over South-Western Asia and peopled the land with Semites, did not leave Palestine untouched. That this is something more than mere probability finds support in the ethnology of ancient Palestine, which points to the superimposition of a Semitic type upon an earlier and non-Semitic race. The date of this, the *first* Semitic movement, has been fixed approximately, from Babylonian evidence, for the fourth millennium, but whether the Egyptians entered Egypt at the same time and what was the character of the races among whom the Semites settled, are problems which cannot be discussed with profit here.¹ The movement in question is one that is readily intelligible when one glances at the map and observes how the lines of departure from Arabia diverge at a point almost equidistant from Palestine and Babylonia. The great Syrian desert which extends from the fringe of the fertile country east of the Jordan to the Euphrates must be encompassed at the northern or southern end, and consequently the proximity of the Syrian states and Assyria on the one hand, and of Arabia on the other, are two of the many factors which have to be taken into consideration throughout the whole extent of Palestinian history.

Until the vexed question of Egyptian chronology has been settled and there is more agreement in the dates ascribed to Dynasties I–XVII, it would be unsafe to combine Egyptian evidence with that from Babylonia where, too, a certain amount of obscurity still prevails. Already, during the first few Egyptian

¹ The origin of the traces of Semitic structure in the Egyptian language has been recently discussed by Prof. Breasted in his admirable *History of Egypt*, p. 25 sq. Some of the points of contact, however, upon which stress is often laid, are extremely speculative.

dynasties,¹ there was intercourse between Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula, whose mines were worked for the sake of their mineral wealth.² With desert tribes of the district there were frequent conflicts, and it is interesting to observe that the Bedouin are depicted with unmistakably Semitic features. Indeed, Prof. Petrie observes that the face of the Sinaitic chieftain represented upon the monument of Semerkhet is very much like that of the present chief! To what extent Egypt had dealings with the south of Palestine itself is not known with certainty, although it is naturally probable that the tribes to the east of the Delta, with whom the Egyptians were familiar, were in close touch with those more to the north.

At the close of the IIIrd Dynasty, Snefru,³ one of the most energetic of early kings, whose reputation outlived him for a thousand years, had commercial relations with North Palestine and sent a large fleet of vessels to obtain cedars from Lebanon through the port of Byblos. In Egypt itself wood was scarce and expensive, and it is repeatedly found in later history that it was upon Palestine and Syria that Egypt relied for the supply of timber superior to the native date-palm, sycamore, tamarisk, and acacias. A few centuries later, Pepi I (VIth Dynasty) comes to the front for his vigorous foreign policy, a remarkably interesting account of which is preserved in the biography of Uni, one of his trusted officers. This Uni was sent against the Bedouin tribes east of the Delta,⁴ who, as had often been the case in the past, had made incursions or had interfered with the mining operations in Sinai. A further expedition was made by sea along the Palestinian coast, and its inhabitants were punished by the destruction of their vines and fig-trees, an interesting allusion which proves that agriculture was already practised at this early date. Incidentally, it may be added that the

¹ Prof. Petrie dates Dynasties I-II at 5518 and 5247 B.C., Prof. Breasted, 3400-2980 B.C.! The great Sargon of Babylonia is placed about 3800 or exactly a thousand years later. (The evidence is found in the cylinder-inscription of Nabonidus, *circa* 550 B.C., who states that he came upon the foundation-stone of Naram-Sin [the son of Sargon], which no king had seen for 3,200 years. It is often assumed that this is simply a mistake for 2,200.)

² Prof. Petrie, in his recent work, *Researches in Sinai*, has brought a great deal of fresh light to bear upon relations between Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula from the Ist Dynasty downwards.

³ About 2900 B.C. (Breasted), or 4800 (Petrie).

⁴ The *amu* in question are perhaps "boomerang-throwers," the Bedouin being frequently represented with this weapon. But the term is used widely of Asiatic peoples.

inscription of Uni is also valuable as containing the first written reference to iron (*ba*).¹

The Old Kingdom, so far from having been an age of seclusion and isolation, was in communication with surrounding lands. Internally, it was a period of inexhaustible fertility and wealth. Egyptian art was at its zenith, and some of the earliest sculptures have a realism which was never attained in the later ages when art became more and more conventionalised. It has been thought that the infusion of new blood from Ethiopia was responsible for the manifold culture which becomes particularly prominent in the IVth-VIth Dynasties. After this period the history of Egypt becomes a blank. The land was disorganized, and a period of weakness ensued, the cause and duration of which can hardly be determined. It is convenient, therefore, to turn to Babylonia in order to perceive whether this second great ancient seat of culture is likely to have exercised any influence over Palestine. At the outset, it may be mentioned that certain undeniable points of contact have been found between the civilizations of Babylonia and Egypt which may not unnaturally be due to the position of Arabia as the common source;² but since, at present, so little is known of the ancient history of that land, and since the period from which the earliest of its extremely interesting inscriptions date is still uncertain, it would be unwise to indulge in any speculation.

With the great Sargon of Agadé and his son Naram-sin evidence for intercourse between Babylonia and Palestine first comes under consideration. Apropos of Sargon, it is scarcely necessary to refer at length to the legend of his lowly origin, which is conspicuous for its numerous parallels in later history. As is well known, Sargon relates how his mother was a vestal (*enttu*), his father a man of

¹ See H. R. Hall, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, p. 198. In Babylonia, iron objects, which may date from the time of Gudea (see p. 62), have been found at Tellah. There is reason to suppose that the Babylonians derived their knowledge of it more from outside (*e.g.*, the Chalybes, Tubal, or other iron-working tribes), but meteoric iron may have been not merely venerated but actually used from the earliest times. Hilprecht, on the other hand (*Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 238), denies the antiquity of iron, and doubts whether it appears in Assyria and Babylonia much before 1000 B.C. The question of the introduction of iron into Palestine is one of the problems yet to be solved.

² The possibility that the original home of the Semites was in eastern Africa, and that Arabia was nevertheless the centre from which they spread over other parts of Asia, has been suggested by Nöldeke (*Ency. Brit.* XXI, p. 642), and quite recently urged by Grimme (*Mohammed*, pp. 6-9; Munich, 1904).

obscure origin; his mother placed him in a box of reeds, closed it in with pitch, and cast it upon the river, which bore him along to Akki, the kindly water-carrier, etc., etc.¹ As a matter of fact, the name of Sargon's father is known, and the story seems to be influenced by a "motive" common enough in eastern lands. Sargon himself claims to have extended his conquest over Mar-tu (land of Amorites, *i.e.*, probably Syria), and at least reached the north Syrian coastland. Whether he actually passed over to Cyprus is doubtful. The son Naram-Sin calls himself "king of the four quarters," and a vase, "the spoil of Magan," shows that among his expeditions Arabia was visited. Like his father, he appears to have made conquests in Mesopotamia, and upon a cylinder-seal found at Curium a man calls himself "the servant of the god Naram-Sin." This, it is true, might indicate the persistence of a tradition that Cyprus was visited, but the object appears to be late (of the seventh century), and it is obvious that it may have been carried to Cyprus.²

It has been observed that it is uncertain whether the dates of Sargon and Naram-Sin should be placed at about 3800 or 2800 B.C. In the absence of evidence to the contrary there is no strong objection to our accepting the higher date. There is more uncertainty, however, regarding the date of Ur-nina, founder of the dynasty of Lagash, who brought cedar-wood from Ma'al, and of Lugal-zaggisi, who asserts that his rule extended "from the lower sea to the upper sea," *i.e.*, to the Mediterranean. Ma'al is naturally to be identified with some cedar-bearing locality in Lebanon or, possibly, in the Amanus mountains. The view that these flourished about 3200-2900 B.C. has been very generally accepted, but has not as yet been proved; an earlier date is not excluded. A more vivid picture is furnished by the inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash, whose preparations for his building operations are detailed at length. There is considerable doubt as to the identification of the places whence he obtained his gold, alabaster, precious stones, and various kinds of wood,³ although, when all allowance is made, intercourse

¹ A number of parallels are collected by A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, p. 255 sq.; *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament*, pp. 28 sqq.

² See H. R. Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

³ The *khullup*-wood which he obtained from Gubin is identified with the *kharrub*-wood inlaid with gold which Thotmes III got from Syria.

with North Palestine (at least), Syria, and Arabia seems certain. Thus Tidanum, a mountain of Martu whence alabaster was brought, has been identified with the name Dedan, or has been located in the Anti-Lebanon. Copper was dug out at Kagalad, a mountain of Mash, which has been variously taken to be Hermon or an Arabian place. At all events, the mere fact that material could be collected from a number of obviously distant places, implies long-established trade-routes by land and by sea, previous intercourse with tribes, and the possession of such knowledge as the work of building entailed. The probable date of Gudea has been fixed at 2650 B.C.

A passing reference to the obscure period of Gimil-Sin, one of the kings of Ur, is necessary, since he is said to have constructed "the wall of Martu called Muriḫ-tidnim," and together with his predecessors Ur-gur and Dungi claims to have ruled over a territory as extensive as that of Naram-Sin. Dungi raised his daughter to the rank of lady of Markhashi, apparently Mar'ash, probably to cement by a marriage his commercial relations with the Taurus district. Dungi mentions among his expeditions the names of Simuru (? Simyra on the coast of North Syria) and Mash. Specific reference to Palestine itself is wanting, although it would not be unnatural to assume that Babylonian influence was already making itself felt.

As we approach the middle of the third millennium B.C., the first signs of the great Elamite invasion of the east begin to appear. The Elamites appear to be of the same race as the Kassites of later ages, and are typical of the waves which from time to time spread southwards from the north and north-east. It is, roughly speaking, about this period that a second wave of Semitic migration flowed out of Arabia and left its mark most prominently in the Babylonian Dynasty, now famous through the name of Khammurabi. Whether one may venture to associate the movement with the blank that appears in Egyptian history is, of course, highly problematical. The fact that the beginning of the Middle Empire (the XIth Dynasty) is assigned by the latest authorities to dates separated from each other by more than a thousand years obviously precludes any conjectural attempt.

(To be continued.)