

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## JERUSALEM UNDER DAVID AND SOLOMON.

WE have seen that the Jebusite fortress, which David took and called David's-Burgh—our versions mislead by their translation: *City of David*—lay on the Eastern Hill, south of and below the site of the later Temple, and just above Gihon, the present well of our Lady Mary.

To this conclusion we seem shut up by the Biblical evidence; and it is supported by the topography. But for the questions to which we now proceed the evidence is more precarious. What was the size of the Jebusite town around the Stronghold? And how much did David add to it? To these questions we are not able to find definite answers, in either the topography, the archaeology or the Biblical data. In fact there is almost no archaeological evidence in Jerusalem itself. The Biblical references are meagre and the topographical data are inconclusive.

### 1.—THE JEBUSITE TOWN.

That a Jebusite township existed around or beside the stronghold Şion is as certain as that from remote times it was called Jerusalem. More probably than not it lay on the same Eastern Hill as the Stronghold, covering the rest of Ophel down to what was afterwards known as Siloam—more probably, I say, for its people would thus secure the shelter of the Stronghold and be near to the spring of Gihon. Nor does the narrative of David's capture of Şion introduce or imply anything else. According to this David marched from Hebron to Jerusalem

against the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land,<sup>1</sup> possessors therefore of that town and some indefinite territory about it. They dared him to overcome them; nevertheless he took Sion, and dwelt in it, and *built round about.*<sup>2</sup> In all this there is nothing which implies, as many moderns, following Josephus, have asserted, that there were already two Jerusalems, as in the time of Josephus, separated by the central wady, the later Tyropœon. Of course it is possible that the Jebusite dwellings extended into the wady and up the Western Hill. But the Biblical data yield no proof of this, nor of a double capture, as has been imagined, first of the stronghold and then of the town, by David. Nothing less than the discovery on the Western Hill of houses or walls recognisable as pre-Israelite, or of a collection of cuneiform archives would be sufficient proof that the Jebusites occupied the Western Hill.<sup>3</sup>

The only question, therefore, remaining is: whether Ophel presents a large enough surface for the Jebusite town? Now we happen just recently to have been furnished with some archaeological data, which assist us towards an answer to this question. In his last report on his very fruitful excavations at Gezer, Mr. Stewart Macalister gives some estimates of the length and the date of the outmost of the city walls which he has laid bare. "I estimate its total length," he says, "at about 4,500 feet, which is rather more than one-third of the length of the modern wall of Jerusalem." "After a careful study of the masonry of all the exposed parts" of the walls and "the associated antiquities," Mr. Macalister assigns the houses built over the ruined inner wall to the middle of the second millennium B.C., "every dateable object in them being

<sup>1</sup> 2 Sam. v. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Id. 6, 7 and 9.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Charles Wilson (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed.) suggests a small suburb on the S.E. slope of the Western Hill, where there are some ancient well-hewn chambers; and Dr. Bliss discovered others higher up (*Excavations at Jerusalem*, p. 288).

contemporary with Amenhotep III." But "as it is inconceivable that a city of the importance of Gezer should have existed at any period without a wall, the ruin of the inner wall . . . must have been synchronous with the erection of the outer wall which superseded it." Though repaired from time to time, this wall is "fundamentally of the respectable antiquity of the Tell el-Amarna correspondence," and "lasted from about 1500 to about 100 B.C." If, then, Mr. Macalister's observations and reasoning be correct, we know the size of a royal Canaanite city, contemporary with Jerusalem, and like the latter holding itself from the Israelites till about 1000 B.C. Its walls measured about 4,500 feet round. Now if we take Dr. Bliss's General Plan No. II. attached to his *Excavations at Jerusalem*, 1894-1897, and measure from the south end of Ophel at the point marked "scarp" along the red line of "inferred wall" on the eastern edge of Ophel to the bit of wall uncovered by Dr. Guthe, and thence still northward to the 2309 contour line, and then 400 feet west, and thence southward along the line of ascertained rocks and scarps on the west side of Ophel to our starting point, we get (if my measurements be correct) a circumference of approximately 3,800 or 3,900 feet. That means space for the Jebusite town not very much less than the Canaanite Gezer; which, so far as we can discern from the Tell el-Amarna correspondence, was at least of equal political importance with Jerusalem, and from its more favourable position for agriculture, trade and other communications with Egypt and Phœnicia may well have been at the time a larger and wealthier community.

Let me emphasize how these last data, with which Mr. Macalister has provided us, prove the far-reaching value of his excavations. Not only has he laid bare Gezer itself in its palaeolithic, pre-Israelite, Syrian and Maccabean periods with a thoroughness and wealth of results achieved

by no previous excavations in Palestine, but his results have bearings, only beginning to become evident, on the history of other towns as well.<sup>1</sup>

## 2.—DAVID'S BUILDINGS.

It was on the Eastern Hill that David fixed his residence, and there that he built, or at least commenced his buildings. Immediately upon the fact of his taking up his residence in Sion we read, *and David built or fortified round about from the Millo and inwards*, or as the Greek version gives it, *and he fortified it, the city, round about from the Millo, and his house.*<sup>2</sup> Whichever of these readings we take, it is evidently the same site on which he dwelt that David fortified. A new feature appears in the Millo.

Winckler has recently argued<sup>3</sup> that the Millo was the ancient Canaanite sanctuary, which David destroyed and rebuilt. For this conjecture he offers no evidence, and there is none. The Millo, literally "the Filling," has been usually taken to be either a dam or a rampart or a solid tower. This meaning is confirmed by the use of the root in other North Semitic dialects.<sup>4</sup> The LXX. render it by "the

<sup>1</sup> It will not be deemed out of place if I call attention to the urgent need of funds for this great enterprise of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The period granted for the excavations at Gezer by the Turkish firman is fast running out, and unless Mr. Macalister is provided with the means of employing a much greater number of workmen in the spring months, he will be unable to complete his work. This has constantly grown in value, and as one who has had the opportunity of twice visiting the operations and seeing the details, I feel it my duty to make this appeal on behalf of the work to the liberality of all students of the Bible. The address of the Fund is 38 Conduit Street, London, W.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτὴν πόλιν (as if עָר or עִיר (עִיר) κύκλῳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀκρας καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. Cf. 1 Chron. xi. 8: *and he built the city round about from the Millo, even round about.* The Chronicler's text is awkward and appears to betray his difficulties with the data at his disposal. Note that Absalom came to Jerusalem=City of David, 2 Sam. xv. 37.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist.* ii. 198; *KAT.*, 3rd ed. 239.

<sup>4</sup> In Assyrian the verb in one form means to "heap up an earthen rampart." The Targumic מְלִיטָה means a rampart of earth filled up between walls.

Citadel."<sup>1</sup> The account of David's building implies that it was not a line of fortification, but occupied a definite spot; it is stated that he started his building from it. Either, then, it was an isolated rampart, covering some narrow approach from the north on the level, towards the stronghold, which was otherwise surrounded by steep rocks; or it was one of those solid towers<sup>2</sup> which were often planted on city walls. The Millo has been variously placed by modern writers: by some at the north-east corner of Ophel, because of the words which follow it, *and inward*; by others at the north-west corner<sup>3</sup>; by others as a rampart across the Tyropœon to bar the approach from the north.<sup>4</sup> To the Chronicler the Millo was in the City of David.<sup>5</sup> It is impossible to place it more exactly.

David's fortifications, then, were on the Eastern Hill, and compassed Ophel<sup>6</sup>; they included, or involved, an ancient tower or rampart somewhere on the circumference. Within this fortification, all of which perhaps bore the name of David's-Burgh, he built, with the aid of Phœni-

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ Ἄκρα: LXX. B. x. 23, etc. This, if the Greek Ἄκρα is intended, would be evidence that the LXX. translators believed it to be on the East Hill. LXX. A. in 1 Kings ix. 15, 24, transliterates it Μελω; Luc. in 1 Kings xii. 21 Μαλω.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Josephus, v. B.J. iv. 3: square solid towers on the wall of Agrippa: τετράγωνοι τε καὶ πλήρεις.

<sup>3</sup> ZDPV. xvii. 6 ff.

<sup>4</sup> G. St. Clair, *PEFQ.*, 1891, 187 ff.; Schick, id., July 1893, with plan; cf. id. 1892, 22. The Khatuniyeh has been suggested as the Millo, separated from the Millo by a tunnel-like passage, 15 ft. 4 in. wide, and connected with it by a bridge. On Guthe's plan, p. 217 of his commentary on Kings (in the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar* series) Millo? is marked on east slope of the Western Hill above the Tyropœon. But this position is excluded by the datum of 2 Chron. xxxii. 5. I do not see how Benzinger (on 1 Kings ix. 16) concludes from 2 Sam. v. 9 and the parallel passage in 1 Chron. xi. 8 that the Millo served for the protection of the western town. On the contrary, these connect it too closely, for such an assumption, with David's occupation of the Eastern Hill.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Chron. xxxii. 5.

<sup>6</sup> No trace of an ancient wall has yet been discovered up the west bank or slope of Ophel; some scarps occurring there cannot be certainly identified as part of a city wall.

cian workmen, a house for himself of stone and cedar,<sup>1</sup> which subsequent notices imply was small,<sup>2</sup> and a house for the Gibbōrim, or chief warriors; and here also he pitched a tent for the Ark of the Lord, which he brought up, and in, to David's-Burgh.<sup>3</sup> The rest of Ophel below the stronghold, and perhaps the gorge to the west, were occupied by houses. At least there is mention of houses below David's own.<sup>4</sup>

The next question is: did David's Jerusalem extend beyond Ophel? On the east the town was certainly bounded by the bed of the K̄idron, for we read that when the King fled from Jerusalem before Absalom he tarried till his soldiers passed him at Beth-ha-Merhaḡ, *house of the distance or farthest house*, that is the utmost building on that side of the town, and then passed over the brook K̄idron.<sup>5</sup> Jerusalem never crossed this natural limit to the East, though it is quite possible that the present suburb of Silwan existed from very ancient times.<sup>6</sup>

The opinion that David's Jerusalem extended to the Western Hill is supported even by some who place Sion on the Eastern.<sup>7</sup> For this we have no direct evidence. Only it is difficult to see how the undoubted increase of the city under David could have been accommodated upon Ophel. Confining ourselves to the data of the Books of

<sup>1</sup> 2 Sam. v. 11.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings iii. 1, ix. 15. The Chronicler indeed (2 Chron. viii. 11) says that the daughter of Pharaoh could not live in the house of David because it was rendered holy by the proximity of the Ark. But as the new palace of Solomon was next the Temple this can hardly have been the reason (Stade, *Gesch.* 311 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> 2 Sam. vi. 15, 17.

<sup>4</sup> Id. xi. 8, 13.

<sup>5</sup> Id. xv. 17, 18, 23.

<sup>6</sup> If, as I have suggested (EXPOSITOR, 1898, p. 226), En-Rogel was the name of a village as well as of a fountain, it may have occupied the site of Silwan. The old cave-dwellings in Silwan, of course, may not be older than Greek times (id. p. 315, n. 5; the cave-dwellings on Ophel).

<sup>7</sup> Sir Charles Wilson, art. "Jerusalem," *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed.; Benzinger, *Comm. on Kings*, 1 Kings iii. 1, and Plan, p. 217.





one principal gate; the phrase *the way of the gate*<sup>1</sup> contrasts with the numerous list of gates in later centuries.

### 3.—TWO ROADS.

One bit of the orientation of David's Jerusalem has been preserved by the Greek version of chapter xiii., the tale of how Absalom invited the king's sons to a feast at *the shearing of his sheep in Baal-Hazor which is beside Ephraim*, that is the modern 'Azur, near et-Ṭaiyibeh, 15 miles from Jerusalem, on the great north road. At this feast Amnon was murdered in revenge for his humbling of Tamar, Absalom's sister, and the rest of the king's sons fled. At first the news came to David that all were murdered. But as the king and his courtiers rent their clothes Jonadab declared that Amnon alone was slain, and soon the look-out reported the coming of much people on the Horonaim road: the road from the two Beth-horons, which coincides with the road from Baal-Hazor, a few miles north of Jerusalem. *And the young man, the outlook, lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold much people coming on the road behind him, from the side of the mountain on the descent, and the outlook came and reported to the king, and said, I have seen men out of the Honoraim road from the part of the mountain.*<sup>2</sup> Doubtless the watchman stood on some high tower on the royal residence; that he saw the Horonaim road *behind him* does not mean that he looked out of the back of his head, but that this road was to the West or North-West of his station, descending as the present road does from the hills on the north, and probably passing down the central wady, west of the present Haram area to the royal residence at the head of Ophel. The phrase *behind him*, or *to the west of him*, is an interesting little bit of confirmation that David's house lay on the Eastern Hill. Had it been on the

<sup>1</sup> 2 Sam. xv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. xiii. 34; LXX.

Western Hill, the watchman could not have had the north road to the west of him. And it further shows that Jerusalem was not so extended as yet to the north, that in that direction the view was not open.

The only other road made visible by the records is that pursued by David when he fled before Absalom (chap. xv.). It is called the *Way of the Wilderness*. There seems to have been an exit from the city of David on the north into the Kidron valley, for later, when Joab had taken Adonijah to feast by 'En-Rogel, the modern Job's Well, their company were not aware of the descent of another company from the king's house to crown Solomon at Gihon till the acclamation that followed this came down the valley towards them.<sup>1</sup> Compare the later mention of a water-gate near Gihon, which must always have been there. Once across Kidron the Way of the Wilderness led up *the ascent of Olives*,<sup>2</sup> to the top where there was a sanctuary—*there he was wont to worship God*.<sup>3</sup> A little beyond the summit Ziba met him with provisions for the wilderness, and David proceeded to Bahurim.<sup>4</sup> This the Targum identifies with Almon,<sup>5</sup> now Almit in Benjamin near 'Anathoth. If this be correct, the Wilderness was that of Benjamin, and the way led not round nor over the south shoulder of the Mount of Olives, but north-east up the hill. If this be so, then Beth-ha-Merhaḳ may have lain not immediately under the north end of Ophel, but some way up the valley of the Kidron, and in this case there were probably a number of houses along the valley on the east of the stream-bed.

#### 4.—VIEW OF JERUSALEM UNDER DAVID.

Standing, then, on the Mount of Olives we may discern the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings i. 9, 41 ff.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. xv. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 32. Probably the same spot to which Ezekiel saw the offended God of Israel remove from the Temple mount (xi. 23, xliii. 1 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Id. xvi. 1-5.

<sup>5</sup> Josh. xxi. 18.

following to have been the aspect of Jerusalem in David's time. Where the great Temple platform now is there was a rocky summit with a small plateau, the threshing-floor of Araunah. The southern flank of this fell steeply to the northern fortifications of David's-Burgh with the Millo, a solid bulwark or tower projecting from them. A narrow gateway opened on the north, on a steep descent to Gihon, and the road from it turned northwards for a little with a few houses straggling up it till the Far-house was reached and then crossed the stream. Within the walls stood the Stronghold, the small house of David, the house of the Gibbōrim, with some other buildings, and close to the King's house the Tent of the Ark. Some further open space there must have been for the later graves of the kings. The wall compassed Ophel, with one principal gate, at probably the lower end of Ophel, from which the houses thickly climbed towards the Citadel. On the Western Hill our records leave a mist. Probably its slopes into the central wady, opposite the north end of Ophel, were also covered with dwellings. Benzinger, indeed,<sup>1</sup> thinks that "under David the southern part and eastern slopes of the Western Hill were already built upon." This may have been so. But the more natural growth outwards from the "City of David" would rather have been from its northern end into the central wady and up the opposite slopes of the Western Hill. In any case we have no proof nor even probability that the whole of the South-Western Hill was built upon in David's time. The new town, whatever its size may have been, does not seem to have had a wall around it during David's reign. The first record of such a wall is given under Solomon.<sup>2</sup>

But in all this scene nothing is so vivid as the King himself. I have said that it is easy to exaggerate, as some historians

<sup>1</sup> On 1 Kings iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings iii. 1, etc.

have done, David's own share in the making of Jerusalem. Her full influence and sacredness were a Divine achievement, which required the ages for its consummation. The Prophets and the Deuteronomic legislation were perhaps the greatest factors in her wonderful development; much of her glory, which later Hebrew literature throws back upon David, is only the reflection of their work. Nevertheless it was his choice of her which started everything; which brought history to her walls and planted within them that which made her holy. The Man, whose individual will and policy seem essential to the career of every great city, Jerusalem found in David. He made her the capital of a kingdom; he brought to her the shrine of Israel's God; he gave her a new population: and, if we remember the personal rôle which the sovereigns of antiquity filled in development and regulation of trade, we shall see his hand in the first drawing to her—little as she was fitted by nature for so central a position—of those industrial and commercial influences which in our modern world are so independent of the control of individuals, however powerful. But besides thus standing behind the City and providing the first impetus to her career, the figure of David stands out among the early features of her life more conspicuous than any of them. Of all the actors on that stage, from David himself to Titus, there is none whom we see so clearly upon it, whether under the stress of the great passions or in the details of conduct and conversation. We see him in temptation, in penitence, in grief, or dancing in that oriental ecstasy of worship which had not yet died out of the Hebrew religion; now bent beneath the scandals of his family; now rending his garments at the death of Adonijah; now weeping on the way to the wilderness when he flees from Absalom; or again listening to the arguments of his subjects against himself; or besought by his soldiers to remain within the walls while they go out to war, *that the lamp of*

*Israel be not quenched*; or tenderly nourished in his feeble old age. The personal drama is never again so vivid in Jerusalem as it is while David is the hero.

#### 5.—JERUSALEM UNDER SOLOMON.

In this respect we find a change when we pass from David to Solomon. Instead of the vivid personal features, the clear figure, of a man, there rises a more majestic apparition indeed; but, just by the measure of its grandeur, vague and nebulous. *Solomon in all his glory*—we see the glory, but it dazzles our eyes to the character behind. Some of this bright haze is no doubt due to the narrative, parts of which are the work of later writers at a distance from their subject, and parts, where they are contemporary, the work of courtiers to whom the king, the royal figure, is everything—a significant proof of the change that came with Solomon into the atmosphere of Jerusalem. But something may be due to the want in Solomon himself of that keen-cut character and urgent temper, which give such distinctness to the movements of David. From the first Solomon shows no such power of initiative, as for instance his brothers Absalom and even Adonijah did. His succession to the throne is secured for him by others. He has no opportunity of signaling himself in battle. Nor through the rest of his reign are there any of those personal adventures, which bring David out of the crowd and present his figure throbbing before us. Solomon's appearances are all official—on the judgment seat, on the throne, consecrating the temple. We cannot conceive of him dancing before the Ark, as his father did. Even the wisdom which exalts his personality sublimates it at the same time. Even the one personal temper imputed to him—*now king Solomon loved many strange wives*—may have been only the result of policy and a love of splendour. In short, behind his wealth, his wisdom, his wives and his idols it is difficult to

see the man himself. Yet through that long and prosperous reign there must have been a strong personal force on the throne. Even if we agreed with the critics who assign most of the story to later ages, this would but prove the memory of a high reputation for ruling. The tradition of so wide a kingdom, and such influence abroad: the facts of so great an activity in building, so elaborate an organization of the state, such large enterprises in trade, and, in consequence, such great wealth—these imply that if Solomon was the fortunate heir of his father's conquests, his mind rose to the splendid heritage, and easily, as it would appear, maintained its authority to the end. We read of no intrigues or revolts within the palace; and the spirit of opposition in Northern Israel was ineffective so long as Solomon lived.

Such was the new lord of Jerusalem: fateful to her in more ways than one. He found her little more than a fortress and he left her a city. For the tent which covered her wandering Ark<sup>1</sup> he built a temple of stone on a site which kept its holiness through his people's history and is still sacred to religion. He devoted to his capital the labours of the whole nation and the wealth of a very distant trade; embellishing her with buildings which raised her once for all above every other town in Israel, and gave her rank with at least the minor capitals of the world. But, though all this centralization of the national resources worked towards her future fame, and enabled her till this came to endure through the next two centuries of misfortune, it must also be estimated as one of the direct causes of the latter. The discontent and jealousy excited throughout Northern Israel by the drain upon their men and their wealth were among the strongest influences which led to the Disruption of the Kingdom and the deposition of Jerusalem from the rank of capital of all Israel to that of the chief

<sup>1</sup> It had left the city even in David's time.

town in the petty principality of Judah, precariously situated near the frontier of her most jealous neighbours. Nor did even the erection of the Temple ensure the immediate religious fame of the city. For more than two centuries the Temple did not become the national shrine; about 750 the pilgrims from Northern Israel still passed it by for Beersheba.<sup>1</sup> Yet the Temple, not only because it was more imposing than any other in the land, but because it possessed the ancient shrine of all Israel and a purer form of worship than elsewhere prevailed, could wait for the future. Solomon was thus the pioneer of the Prophets and of the Deuteronomic legislation in the creation of the unique sacredness of *Sion*.

We may now trace the exact directions along which the centralizing policy of Solomon bore in upon Jerusalem, and what necessary exceptions there were to it.

1. In the first place there was the division of the kingdom into twelve provinces, each of which furnished the king's court, and perhaps the wider circle of his workmen, with food for one month a year. The list of the provinces may have been drawn up late in the king's reign, and is therefore out of place where it stands in the history,<sup>2</sup> but it is more convenient to take it now. The fragmentary state of the text forbids dogmatic inferences from it, as to the size of the various provinces and whether the impost was arranged to lie more heavily on those with a non-Israelite population (as some assert). But one feature is striking. It has been pointed out that neither Jerusalem, Bethlehem nor Hebron is included; as if Solomon relieved from the duty the seats of his own family. In any case

<sup>1</sup> Amos viii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings iv. 7 ff. There is no reason to doubt the reliability of the list. The late date in the king's reign assigned to it is inferred, not so much from the mention of two of the king's sons-in-law among the officers, as from the fact that the court could hardly have reached the size implied till after he had reigned some years.

those national contributions poured into Jerusalem, not for the nourishment of the court only, but directly or indirectly for the enrichment of the whole population. Their reception and consumption must have increased the number and business of the latter. Many provincials must for the first time have formed the habit of visiting the capital, and this would probably lead to the permanent settlement of a number of them within and about its walls.

2. Another influence of the same kind was the employment for thirteen years at least<sup>1</sup> of a number of Phœnician workmen,<sup>2</sup> and of a mass of Israelites, stated at 80,000<sup>3</sup> (with 3,300 overseers), who quarried stones in the mountains of Judah, and helped the Phœnicians in their building. That Solomon drew his levies of labour only from his non-Israelite subjects<sup>4</sup> is a statement which does not agree either with the data in Chronicles v., or with the intimation that Jeroboam was *over the levy of the house of Joseph*,<sup>5</sup> and must therefore be the insertion of a later hand.<sup>6</sup> It is probable that some of these labourers were added to the permanent population of Jerusalem. But in any case their sight of her, their sense of her new importance, must have been carried by them through the land, and have made Jerusalem far better known. The cedars cut in Lebanon and conveyed through the Phœnician ports, the mines in Lebanon,<sup>7</sup> and the metal castings in the Jordan Valley—all for a city which a few years before was a mere

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings vii. 1. If the building of the Temple, which is stated to have taken seven years (vi. 1, 38) was not contemporaneous with the thirteen years of the building of the palace, then the operations took twenty years in all (ix. 10). But this is doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings v. 18.      <sup>3</sup> Id. v. 15 f.

<sup>4</sup> ix. 22.      <sup>5</sup> xi. 28.      <sup>6</sup> Cf. too the words "unto this day" in ix. 21.

<sup>7</sup> In the LXX. version, chapter ii. 46c we read: *καὶ Σαλαμων, ἤρξατο ἀνοίγειν τὰ δυναστεύματα τοῦ Λιβάνου*; this is explained by Winckler (*A. T. Untersuchungen*, p. 175) as referring to mines in Lebanon, where ancient workings have been found. Cf. Benzinger on 1 Kings ix. 19. Cf. Jeremiah xv. 12.



Jebusite enclave—must of themselves have heightened her reputation, and brought an influx of trade to her gates.

3. On the frontiers of his territory Solomon fortified certain cities: Hazor, Megiddo, Gezer, Beth-Horon the nether, Baalath, and Tamar in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of Baalath the sites of all these are known, and one of them, Gezer, has (as we have seen) been laid bare by excavation in a more thorough fashion than the ruins of any other town in Palestine. Mr. Macalister is "strongly inclined to seek in the square towers inserted at irregular intervals along the [outer] wall for the tangible traces" of Solomon's re-fortification of Gezer after the probable breaching of the wall by the king of Egypt.<sup>2</sup> Hazor, probably the present el-Khurebe above the Lake of Huleh, commanded the main entrance into Palestine from the North; Megiddo, the passage from Esdraelon to Sharon; Beth-Horon, the most open ascent from Sharon, Jafa, and the group of towns about the latter to Jerusalem; Gezer (as in the time of the Maccabean kingdom), the approach up the Vale of Ajalon from the coast, and a road which probably entered the hills by the town of Ajalon, and thence travelled by the present Kuriet el-Eynab<sup>3</sup> to Jerusalem more directly than the Beth-Horon road. Baalath-jay either on this last road nearer to Jerusalem than Gezer, or on a more southerly approach to the capital. Tamar in the wilderness is the Roman Thamara,<sup>4</sup> on the road up the Negeb to Hebron from the Gulf of 'Akaba. If we may draw a deduction from the absence from the list of towns in Moab, Gilead and Bashan, Solomon appears to have had nothing to fear upon those frontiers of his kingdom, and in fact Hazor and Tamar confronted the only two foreign peoples from whom he is reported to have had

<sup>1</sup> ix. 15b, 17, 18.

<sup>2</sup> *P. E. F. Quart. Statement*, January 1905, pp. 30 f.

<sup>3</sup> I partly followed this natural and ancient track last April.

<sup>4</sup> Probably the present El-Kurnub,

trouble—the Arameans and the Edomites; while the absence of Jericho and Ephraimite cities prove how quietly he held Northern Israel. Megiddo and Gezer controlled the main trade route between Damascus and Egypt; but besides protecting the international traffic, and thus enabling Solomon to fulfil his engagements with other potentates,<sup>1</sup> these two fortresses may have been further intended as a signal to the Phœnicians of the power of Israel.

Each of these cities, then, on the borders of the proper territory of Israel, covered an important trade route; and three of them, Beth-Horon, Gezer and Baalath, protected the more immediate approaches to the capital. Tamar was in hardly less close connexion with Jerusalem, as one feels to-day at the occasional sight of a caravan from Sinai or the Gulf of 'Akaba at the Hebron gate of the city. Imagine these secure roads drawing in on Jerusalem! We can believe that with the completion of the fortresses upon them, a new sense of being at the centre of things, and an assurance of security, inspired her inhabitants, and contributed to her increase.

4. Besides these six fortified towns Solomon had a number of *store cities, and cities for his chariots, and cities for his horsemen.*<sup>2</sup> These were the necessary exceptions to his centralizing policy. That he did not assemble his cavalry or chariots at the capital was due to the character of its surroundings, destitute of rich pasture, and too steep and broken for wheels. In contrast with the more open Samaria and Esdraelon, we seldom read of the use of chariots about Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> Solomon kept his where they

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Tell el-Amarna letters, in which a king of Mesopotamia complains to the King of Egypt of the lawlessness from which his caravans had suffered in Palestine, then Egyptian territory.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings ix. 19.

<sup>3</sup> There are two instances: in the one case the chariot carried a dead,

could manœuvre. His horses, no doubt, appeared at the city. Solomon was the first to introduce these into Israel, importing them, not from Egypt as the Hebrew text declares, but from the northern Muşri and Kuë in Cilicia, as the more correct Greek version enables us to discover.<sup>1</sup> They would replace at his court the mules on which royal personages had hitherto ridden.

From the foregoing, then, we may infer a very considerable increase of the population of Jerusalem under Solomon, not only during the thirteen or twenty years in which his buildings were in progress, but permanently. The sites on which the new inhabitants settled can only have been the South-Western Hill and the central wady. The extent of the enlarged city we shall consider when we treat of the wall which he built.

#### 6.—SOLOMON'S BUILDINGS IN JERUSALEM.

Besides a few general notices, scattered through the history of his reign, of the buildings erected by Solomon, there is a detailed account in chapters v.—vii. of his preparations for, and his erection of, the Temple, the royal house and adjacent structures. Unfortunately this description has suffered much from the dilapidation of the text, the consequent attempts at repair, and not a few insertions from the point of view of a later age, to which the Temple was of more importance than it was in Solomon's time. The details would require a separate article. In what remains of this one there can only be indicated the relative positions of the principal royal and sacred buildings, and the direction and extent of Solomon's fortifications.

in the other, a dying, man (2 Kings ix. 28; 2 Chron. xxxv. 24). See *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, p. 380, and, further, Appendix V.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings x. 28, where we should read: *the export of horses for Solomon was out of Muşri and Kuë; the dealers of the king bought them out of Kuë for a price.*

At first Solomon inhabited the City of David. This is clear from the statement that he brought there the daughter of Pharaoh until he should have finished his new buildings.<sup>1</sup> It was most natural that he should raise these in proximity to the old citadel, that is, on the East Hill. Now at this time there appears to have been open ground to the north of the City of David. Here, it is generally agreed, lay the threshing-floor of 'Araunah, which David bought, and on which he had erected an altar. Here also in the time of the Maccabees we find the Sacred Temple, and there can be no doubt that Solomon's had occupied the same elevated position: the Mount Sion of several Old Testament writers, the Mount Moriah of the Chronicler<sup>2</sup>: within, that is, the present Haram area. This is universally accepted. At present we cannot enter the debate as to what exact portion of the area was occupied by Solomon's Temple. It is enough to point out that the Temple formed part of a complex of buildings within one great court, that it was the highest of these, and that the others lay below it to the south, and so between it and the City of David. Immediately next it was the king's own house with that of the daughter of Pharaoh. According to Ezekiel<sup>3</sup> there was but a wall between the Temple and the Palace, which, however, lay lower than the Temple.<sup>4</sup> And this being so, the other buildings, the Throne Hall, the Pillared Hall, and the House of the Forest of Lebanon, must have lain on the other side of the Palace from the Temple. This, too, is the order in which they are described in the narrative of Solomon's buildings. In any case it is clear that the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings iii. 1; ix. 15.

<sup>2</sup> EXPOSITOR for January 1905.

<sup>3</sup> xlili. 8.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Kings xi. 19: *They brought down the king from the house of the LORD . . . unto the king's house*; Jerem. xxvi. 10: *The princes of Judah came up from the king's house to the house of the LORD*; xxxvi. 11 f.: *When Micaiah had heard out of the book the words of the LORD (in the upper court at the entry of the new gate to the house of the LORD) he went down into the king's house,*

Palace lay above the City of David, for it is stated that Pharaoh's daughter came *up* out of the City of David into the house which Solomon built for her.<sup>1</sup>

The data just given along, with the rock-levels of the site which the whole complex covered, prove that the separate buildings rose above each other on a series of terraces. They must have presented to the eyes of the people, still mainly in the agricultural stage of their development as a nation, a very imposing spectacle.

Solomon's fortifications of Jerusalem are attested in the three general statements already referred to.

iii. 31. Here we are told that Solomon *brought Pharaoh's daughter into the city of David, until he had finished building his house, and the house of Jahweh and the wall of Jerusalem round about.* This is given by the LXX. at ii. 35c<sup>2</sup> as *until he had finished the house of Jahweh at first and the wall of Jerusalem round about*; and at iv. 31 as: *the house of Jahweh and his own house and the wall of Jerusalem.*

ix. 15b gives a fuller but mutilated form of the same statement<sup>3</sup>: [until that he had finished] *building the house of Jahweh and his own house and the Millo and the wall of Jerusalem.* For which the LXX. gives at x. 23: *the house of Jahweh, and the house of the king, and the wall of Jerusalem, and the citadel.*<sup>4</sup> To this the Hebrew of ix. 24 adds that Solomon built the Millo when he brought his wife to the new house: LXX. ch. ii. 35 f. (Swete).

xi. 27 states that Solomon *built the Millo, he closed the breach of the city of David his father*: exactly translated by the LXX., which at xii. 24 adds the information that it

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings ix. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Swete's edition.

<sup>3</sup> Mutilated for the word *building*, in Hebrew *to build*, has nothing before it to put it in the infinitive. The word translated *reason* in the English version of the preceding clause should be *story* or *account*.

<sup>4</sup> Τὴν ἄκραν; and adds τοῦ περιφράξει τὸν φραγμὸν τῆς πόλεως Δαυίδ, (cf. Hebrew text of xi. 27) καὶ τὴν Ἀσσοῦρ καὶ τὴν Μαδιάν.

was Jeroboam who (under Solomon) *enclosed the city of David.*

This repeated statement, thus variously placed by the hands of different editors, is doubtless taken from an ancient source, probably the official annals of Solomon's reign; there is no reason to question its authenticity.<sup>1</sup> According to it, Solomon further strengthened the Millo which his father had repaired. We see now that the Millo cannot have been between the city of David and the new royal buildings to the north. It must have stood at one or other end of the line separating these, either over Kidron or over the central wady. Further, Solomon *closed the breach of the city of David*, which we are unable to define unless as a gap left by David in the fortifications of his citadel. And lastly he *built the wall of Jerusalem round about.* It is most natural to suppose that this enclosed part at least of the increase of the city, which (as we have seen) must have spread over the Western Hill. Josephus<sup>2</sup> identifies with the wall erected by Solomon the so-called First Wall, which ran eastward along the northern edge of the South-Western Hill to the western cloister of the Temple; and this identification has been largely accepted by modern authorities. Further, Dr. Bliss<sup>3</sup> suggests that the south-west angle of Solomon's fortifications may have been "Maudslay's Scarp."<sup>4</sup> Dr. Bliss uncovered a scarp running north-east from this across the brow of the South-Western Hill towards a rectangular line of wall upon the slope of that hill above the central wady; and he infers a continuation of this line to

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Wilson (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed. 1598a), following Josephus (viii. *Antt.* ii. 1, vi. 1) takes 1 Kings iii. 1 and ix. 15 as referring to two different buildings of the wall of Jerusalem by Solomon, before and after he built the Temple. But the statement is evidently the same in all its repetitions.

<sup>2</sup> v. *B.J.* iv. 2. Josephus calls it the wall erected by David and Solomon.

<sup>3</sup> *Excavations at Jerusalem*, 1894-97.

<sup>4</sup> Near Bishop Gobat's School.

the present south wall of the city at Burj-al-Kebrî, and so across the central wady to the Eastern Hill. This would mean that Solomon's Jerusalem, so far as fortified by him, covered at least the northern part of the South-Western Hill: by no means an improbable conception, and one which, if we think it inadequate for the increase of the population under Solomon, leaves room for suburbs outside the wall. But we must keep in mind that all this is only hypothetical, and that no ancient walls or other remains have been discovered in Jerusalem which can with certainty be identified as Solomon's.

In such uncertainty we must leave the subject. This only appears to be sure, that Solomon's Jerusalem covered some part of the South-Western Hill, an opinion accepted even by the majority of those experts who place the city of David on the Eastern. Professor Robertson Smith's statement that there is no evidence for the extension of Jerusalem to the Western Hill before the days of the Maccabees, is limited to documentary evidence, and is fully answered by the argument presented above, that the increase of the population under Solomon was considerable, and could only be provided for on the Western Hill.

In our study of the city under Hezekiah we shall see that it was impossible for that king to have held the Pool of Siloam unless the whole of the South-Western Hill was then within the walls. If, therefore, as Mr. Bliss suggests, the line of wall across the brow of the South-Western Hill was Solomon's, the other line which he has traced round the south of that Hill would represent a wall added between Solomon and Hezekiah, probably in consequence of a further increase of the city under Uzziah.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.