

THE GERMAN EXCAVATIONS AT JERICHO.

By STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.

OF the Palestinian sites which have recently been excavated, none, perhaps, appeals so strongly to the popular imagination as Jericho. The student of the Old Testament may appreciate the part played in history by Lachish, Gezer, Taanach and Megiddo, but the ordinary reader is probably arrested less by these names than by that of the city taken by Joshua. It is a matter for congratulation, therefore, that the German excavations, in spite of their brief duration, have not only furnished much valuable evidence for the history of Palestinian culture, but have also allowed us to form an excellent idea of those great walls, the story of the overthrow of which has impressed us from early childhood. These excavations are admittedly imperfect, and only a small portion of the available evidence has been published; yet sufficient is known to justify some attempt to place the results in a kind of historical framework, and with interesting consequences. Of course, as material continues to accumulate from a variety of sites and centres of influence, it will be possible some day to have a veritable "archaeological history" of Palestine, but while so much still remains provisional, and so many complicated problems still defy solution, it will be prudent to attempt the less ambitious task of describing briefly the main results of the excavation of Jericho in their bearing upon the history of the site.¹

¹ Dr. Sellin gave a report of the first operations, April 5-26, 1907, in *Mitteil. u. Nachricht. d. deutschen Pal.-Vereins*, 1907, No. V, pp. 65-71. In his account of the subsequent labours, Jan. 2-April 8, 1908, in the *Mitteil. d. deutschen Orient. Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, Dec., 1908, No. 39 (pp. 1-41, with 2 plans and 18 illustrations), he incorporates the reports of Dr. Langenegger and Dr. Watzinger. Unless otherwise stated the references in this article are made to the second of the reports. Of the various summaries and discussions (for which see *Q.S.*, 1908, p. 79), special mention must be made of that of Prof. Vincent in the *Revue Biblique*, 1909, pp. 270-279, which seeks to bring out more clearly the value of the results for Old Testament history.

In dealing with archaeological evidence, it is not out of place to keep in mind the possibilities of the district concerned and the circumstances which have influenced its fortunes; for the contribution of archaeology to history is manifestly incomplete unless we consider the various complex conditions and causes which go to form history. It is interesting, therefore, that all writers agree in praising the fertility of the plain of Jericho. Famous for its waters and its wealth of produce, it is a district where, under propitious circumstances, nature and human industry can successfully combine. Robinson described it as "certainly one of the richest in the world; enjoying all the rains like the hill-country, and susceptible besides of unlimited irrigation from copious fountains" (*Bibl. Researches*, II, 304). Prof. G. A. Smith styles Jericho "the gateway of a province, the emporium of a large trade, the mistress of a great palm-forest, woods of balsam, and very rich gardens" (*Hist. Geog.*, p. 266). As an invaluable source of supplies it was important in peace and war, and both the historical evidence and the surface-remains of buildings and aqueducts show how the region flourished under a capable administration. Only with the decay of enterprise and with inattention to irrigation did nature begin to take the upper hand. The district was no doubt always affected by natural conditions; the climate was hot, unhealthy and sickly, and with the decline of industry there was a rapid deterioration, which (it would seem) was only temporarily stopped by the energetic Crusaders.¹ Modern travellers have often noticed the inherent weakness of the character of the inhabitants, and, like Robinson, have realized that, for the return of prosperity, "nothing is wanted but the hand of man to till the ground" (*loc. cit.*) As is so frequently the case, even in other lands, economic conditions can only be improved by strengthening the character of the people and by a firm administration. In short, not to delay further upon the possibilities of the district, Jericho was a place the political and economic importance of which was not likely to be overlooked, and in the light of this the historical and archaeological evidence gains a new interest.

It had often been inferred that the hills above the Sultan's Spring (*Ain es-Sultán*) marked the site of the ancient Jericho. Archaeological support for this was furnished by the cuttings of

¹ Col. Conder, no doubt rightly, ascribes the treachery of the climate (especially in the rainy season) to the decay of cultivation (*Tent Work in Palestine*, II, 26).

Sir Charles Warren and by the subsequent examination undertaken by Dr. Bliss, and the German excavations have brought the fullest proof.¹ The relatively modern village of Erihâ, not far away, still preserves the old name. To the west stands the precipitous Jebel Karantel, the "mountain" to which the Israelite spies might easily have fled through the intervening cane-jungle and thorn-groves.² About five miles eastward flows the Jordan.

The site lies about 15 miles from Jerusalem, 33 from Samaria, and it formed a station in the important cross-route from Moab to Palestine (to Bethel and Beth-horon; or to Beth-shean). Jewish pilgrims from Peraea and Galilee used to assemble there on their way to the Temple (cp. also Luke xix, 1). As appears to have been often the case, especially in North Syria, the inhabitants found it desirable to occupy the higher ground of the plain, and the plateau of Jericho, which is situated about 12 metres (40 feet) above the level, furnished an excellent site. The plateau is about 360 metres (or 1100 feet) N.E. to S.W., and is egg-shaped, the point lying at the southern end; the greatest width is 160 metres (500 feet). From this plateau rise seven hills varying in height from 5 to 12 metres (16-40 feet), protected in olden times by a majestic wall of a total length of nearly half-a-mile. It ran round the hills following the natural configuration of the plateau; it had the same egg-like shape, being curved and not angular; and it enclosed the source of the water-supply. The total area within has been roughly estimated at about 12 acres. Thus the ancient Jericho had the elevated position, the access to water, and the relatively small compass of other "cities" of Palestine.

This great city-wall is well described by Dr. Felix Langenegger (pp. 15-22). It rested upon a bed of loam and gravel about 3 or 4 feet thick (.80-1.30 metres); this was perhaps on account of the difficulty of levelling the rock, or to counteract detrition. The material came from the immediate neighbourhood. At the lower part were one or two rows of large stones (1 × 1.20 to 1 × 2.10 metres), above which were from six to twelve layers of smaller ones. All the interstices had been carefully filled in to give greater stability and security. The wall sloped upwards to a height of 4.50 to 5.40 metres (16 feet), and was highest at the northern end; perhaps because this

¹ See *Q.S.*, 1894, p. 176. The German excavators seem to have been unaware of the data; at all events they do not refer to them.

² C. R. Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, II, 6.

was exposed to the pass that came down from North Israel. On the top of it was a cob-wall about 6 feet 6 inches thick, and, if now nearly 8 feet high (2·40 metres), was once no doubt considerably higher. About half of the circumference of the wall was traced, and almost at the close of the excavation some remains of a large gateway were found at the southern end. The workmanship along the southern end was cruder and more irregular, suggesting to Dr. Langenegger not merely the work of different builders, but perhaps a different date for its construction. Taken as a whole, the wall has justly been regarded as a triumph of engineering skill which a modern builder, in the same conditions, could scarcely excel (p. 15). Like the great tunnel of Gezer (see *Q.S.*, 1908, pp. 218 *sqq.*, 228), it is an unexpected example of the advanced knowledge of building reached in early Palestine, and is certainly not the work of amateurs inexperienced in the art of fortification. Its massive character can be easily appreciated, thanks to the instructive illustrations which accompany Dr. Sellin's report, and one can readily perceive that in olden times the great walls of Jericho, visible for a considerable distance over the plain, must have appeared formidable and impregnable. One instinctively visualizes the scene with the help of Egyptian and Assyrian representations of Palestinian or Syrian fortresses, and sees these walls eight yards or more in height, with houses, towers, and strongly-armed warriors (as at Lachish), confronting the gaunt Bedouin of the desert armed with their simple weapons.

At the northern end of this egg-shaped city were the remains of a fine building described as a citadel (pp. 7, 22-26). A long wall, 11 feet 6 inches thick (3·30-·70 metres), ran, not very evenly, more or less parallel to the northern part of the city wall and about 38 yards behind it. At each end were massive towers 8·30 × 4·70 metres and 12·20 × 5 metres, extending to within 70-100 feet of the eastern and western sides of the wall. The entire frontage (E.S.E. to W.N.W.) amounted to about 265 feet; within the citadel the distance would be roughly 198 feet. Not enough was excavated to determine the original extent of this building; at all events it was found that the walls turn southwards and (to judge from the plan) slightly converge. In front of this citadel ran another wall, less massive (1·50-·60 metres thick); this too turned to the south at the western end, but towards the east it was confused with some tower-like structure. The space between the inner and outer wall

was about 10 feet (3-3.50 metres), and contained small connecting walls, some of which belonged to earlier buildings. On excavating southwards from the western tower, a small area (about 200 square metres) disclosed the fact that the inner wall of the citadel was about 26 feet in height, and built against it were various chambers of different periods (p. 14). A larger area (about 500 square metres) in the valley on the south side of the middle of the citadel-wall revealed small houses (or chambers) separated by a curving passage; the buildings were of various periods, and the deposits threw much light upon the culture of the "Canaanite" age (see below, p. 62 *sq.*). On the west side of the plateau, excavation brought to light the old city wall. Within its circumference were two strong walls running southwards, parallel to one another and to the direction of the city wall, from which the outer (western) one was (to judge by the plan) only about 32 or 33 feet removed. This was traced (for about 82 feet) to a tower-like construction which turned to the east, while the inner wall led to a pillar and door-way. It seems evident that this building, protected as it was on the west side by a well-preserved glacis, was of considerable importance, but its relation (if any) to the citadel was not ascertained (p. 10 *sq.*).¹ Apart from these two structures no other buildings of importance are described, although elsewhere there were many indications of settlements belonging to various periods. Especially interesting were the areas (1) between the city wall and the citadel (about 1350 square metres), and (2) the *Quell-hügel*—to adopt (for the sake of safety) the name given to the hill which rises above the pool—a locality (about 300 square metres) of much value for the archaeological history of the city.

Although various objects of religious significance were unearthed, the excavators found no temple or sacred place. Of the sacred-pillar or *Massebah*, to which Dr. Sellin referred in the first report (p. 70), we have no further information. In some recent discussions of Palestinian excavation it has been urged that there has sometimes been too ready an inclination to find a religious meaning in the most ordinary objects—as though every pillar was necessarily a sacred one, or every semblance of human or animal shape invariably an idol. On the other hand, it is only just to remember that religion played a far greater part in Oriental life than the European critic

¹ On the plan there is a space of about 200 feet point to point from the citadel (which is running south) and this building (which runs north). The directions, however, are not parallel. See also below, p. 67.

often supposes, and it is legitimate, within proper limits, to expect and to look for the traces of the ancient religion. It may be that further excavation will bring to light some sacred place in Jericho corresponding to the buildings on the eastern hill of Gezer, on the eastern side of Tell el-Mutesellim and on the north-east edge of Tell eṣ-Şâfy. At the last-mentioned place, as also at Gezer, a tomb still stands quite close to the sacred places unearthed in our day. Jericho, it is true, does not appear to be so distinguished, yet such has been the religious conservatism of Palestine that even the remains of some religious edifice at the pool, even if of Roman or later date, presuppose an earlier sacred site.¹ It is tempting to combine the almost invariable continuity of religious tradition with the prominence of Jericho—the name alone has a suggestion of a moon-cult—and with such evidence as we fortunately have for its place in religious history (see below). Apart from this, moreover, it is an interesting fact that numerous Arab graves were found in the north of the plateau, above the "citadel" and between it and the city wall (pp. 7, 9), and this seems to point to some persisting belief in the sacred character of the immediate neighbourhood. Further, two family graves of the Early Byzantine period were found about 100 feet north-east of the eastern tower of the citadel. It is really premature to venture even upon a guess, but it is possible that the recovery of the citadel in its original extent will bring that of the temple of Jericho.

In any case, only a very small part of the total area of Jericho has been at all thoroughly examined, and without a fuller account of what has actually been achieved inferences are necessarily precarious. It seems that the finds which have been made are very numerous, and it is much to be regretted that the reader is very inadequately helped in any endeavour to co-ordinate the material in the two reports. Many of the most interesting details mentioned in the first report are not mentioned in the second, and this is the more unfortunate because the latter presents a very convenient sketch of the different phases of culture, arranged in clearly-cut historical periods (Canaanite, Israelite, late Jewish or Hellenistic, Byzantine). In turning to a brief summary of the evidence, I adopt the terminology of the report, but work backwards from the most recent deposits to the oldest. This is preferable, partly because of

¹ See, for these remains, Clermont-Ganneau, *Archæolog. Researches*, II, p. 32.

the intricate character of the strata in certain areas, and partly because the authors are influenced by a view of the early history of Jericho which stands in need of closer examination.

(1) The Mohammedan graves on the surface call for no remark as they had been rifled.

(2) The "early Byzantine" age was well illustrated by two graves at the city-wall in the north-east, and by remains immediately below the surface of the Quell-hügel which proved the existence of some settlement (pp. 14, 37 *sq.*). Among the deposits were coins, interesting vessels of glass (illustrated on p. 37) and stone, clay lamps, knives and other objects of iron, ornamented wooden caskets, and marble slabs which perhaps were originally used as tables. Attention is drawn to the egg- or pear-shaped amphorae of hard burnt clay, green to yellowy-red in colour, with a decoration of wavy lines resembling the "much older Israelite" variety.¹

(3) Preceding this we have the remains of the "late Jewish or Hellenistic" period, which were found everywhere below the Arab graves north of the citadel.² In digging down, the work was much complicated owing to the disturbance caused by the Mohammedan burials (p. 7), and it was difficult to distinguish the true relative dates of objects (p. 9). To this culture belonged sherds of black polished Attic ware, ascribed to the fifth or fourth century B.C., fragments in terra-cotta of human and animal heads, jar-handles with Rhodian stamps, and others (either near or a little below them) with Aramaic lettering (pp. 9, 35). The last-mentioned are a distinct novelty in Palestinian archaeology (p. 38 *sq.*). They are inscribed with the Divine Name (*Yâh*, twice *Yâhû*). Nine were found in this locality, two came from the "western trenches," and one was found in 1907 within the citadel itself. They were not all of the same manufacture or stamp, and consequently represent a well-distributed usage, the meaning of which can only be conjectured. Dr. Sellin tentatively compares the bells inscribed "Holy unto Yahweh" (Zech. xiv, 20 *sq.*). Prof. Vincent records this with

¹ In connexion with this it is to be remembered that Dr. Sellin had also observed at Taanach ware with reminiscences of earlier motives and shapes, which he ascribed to the native culture of the Roman period (*Tell Ta'aneh*, pp. 54, 85). Even the early Arab ware shows a certain similarity in colour-decoration with the old painted pottery (Bliss and Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine*, p. 134).

² A very rich store of pottery was also found in "late Jewish" houses at the south-west of the city (p. 14).

approval, and also brings these Aramaic handles into connexion with the familiar Judæan series, suggesting that the Divine Name of the post-Exilic theocracy takes the place of "to the king—Socoh (or Hebron, etc.)" on the handles of the monarchy (*Rev. Bibl.*, p. 276 *sq.*). To add to these conjectures I am tempted to compare the custom of printing the name of a god upon the bricks employed in the construction of Greek temples. This suggestion, inspired by Nilsson's study of Rhodian jar-handles, approximates that of Dr. Sellin, and assumes that the jars to which the handles belonged were used in religious ceremonial.¹ Another jar-handle with an Aramaic stamp (said to read מַצְדָּה) was found in the "north-east" by the city-wall. From this corner also came one of the Royal jar-handles inscribed "to the king," with traces of the name Socoh. It had the same characteristics as the rest of this class of object, and no doubt belongs to the same period. This, however, is scarcely the eighth or seventh century, as Dr. Sellin believes (p. 40); one must no doubt descend "to the very end of the Hebrew monarchy," with Mr. Macalister (*Q.S.*, 1909, p. 291), or, in my own opinion, even later (*ib.*, pp. 292 *sqq.*).

(4) In describing the work north of the citadel, Dr. Sellin reports that they came to the foundations of about thirty "small houses" closely packed together and only in one place severed by a passage. Infant burials were found beneath the floors. Older walls had occasionally been appropriated, and in general it was impossible to distinguish the "old Jewish or Canaanite" from the "late Jewish" walls (p. 9 *sq.*). In a description of the deposits, Dr. Watzinger finds two periods; the later, characterized by the use of small field-stones for building, proves to be clearly late Jewish or Hellenistic (p. 35), and has already been noticed above. The earlier is posterior to the destruction or breaching of the city-wall, one well-preserved house being built over the lowest of a series of steps built up against it (pp. 10, 32). The infant jar-burials were accompanied by amphoræ of "Syro-Israelite" form and egg-shaped jars with white *engobe* and lilac-brown colouring. The latter are associated with Cypriote and late-Mycenæan analogies and are treated as imports. These, and the relation of the house to the wall, as also the discovery of vases (with comb-decoration of wavy lines or rows of points) associated with Troy, City VII, lead Dr. Watzinger to date

¹ M. P. Nilsson, *Timbres amphoriques de Lindos* (Copenhagen, 1909), p. 64. See below, p. 77.

this culture from the end of the second millenium B.C. The ware in general, apart from imports and native imitations, is developed from the "old Canaanite," some of the older characteristics being retained; but the earlier opinion that this inter-connexion is an "archaism" is renounced in favour of the view that the intermediate development did not take place in Jericho itself but in another district.¹ Dr. Watzinger's view appears to be influenced by the conviction that there is a distinct gap in the culture-evolution of Jericho; this is associated with the destruction of the city by Joshua, and consequently the absence of certain characteristic "old Canaanite" forms and the subsequent sudden appearance of other distinctive varieties are held to point to a break in the normal evolution.²

(5) In between the two cultures north of the citadel, viz. (3) and (4) above, the excavators place the "Israelite" culture of the Quellhügel. Here the houses are of a quite distinct type from those of the northern settlement (p. 32), the "Canaanite" type of pot, as in (4), is wanting (p. 33), and other distinctive features are absent (p. 35). Moreover, in the Hellenistic period, the wheel-made vases, which belonged to the jar-burial deposits, are related to, but more developed than, those in the Quellhügel (pp. 35, 37). The houses furnished surprisingly large stores of remains which threw much light on the life of the people. The date (time of Ahab) is furnished by two Cypriote jugs of red clay with black colouring which are found in Greece to the seventh century. In general the relationship of the pottery is with the Graeco-Phoenician ware at Cyprus as against the "old Canaanite." Pottery of grey or yellow and red clay, with concentric circles in dark violet colour, recalls that found at Taanach. The similarity is not noticed in the report, but seems clear (see Sellin, *Tell Ta'anek*, p. 100).

(6) For the oldest culture we are taken to the "Canaanite" houses in the citadel (pp. 27 *sqq.*). The ware had all the characteristics of the old Palestinian pottery, and could compete with the

¹ In connexion with this he draws attention to a curious variety of wheel-made ware which was evidently an imitation of metal vases (p. 34).

² In the first report (p. 69), Dr. Sellin, describing the work at Hill 3, south of Hill 1, recognized different periods, but was astonished to find that the "Canaanite" ware apparently lasted for something like a thousand years. Here were numerous lamps ranging from the primitive bowl or saucer to the later kind with three or four snouts; also two clay tablets prepared for use but uninscribed. The second report does not enable us to determine how far we must modify the conclusions which are to be drawn from the earlier one.

best polished examples from prehistoric Egypt. The associations were with Egypt and the Mediterranean, not with Babylonia; bronze did not appear to be in use. According to Dr. Watzinger this culture is clearly Canaanite because it is only found in strata of the time before the "destruction" of Jericho, it ceases "suddenly" and has no connexion with the subsequent ware, whereas elsewhere in Palestine the Canaanite pottery is seen to develop into the Israelite (p. 29). Dr. Sellin, too, lays emphasis upon this feature of the archaeological history—a gap, which has not been observed elsewhere in Palestine, follows the fall of Jericho, and the site was used for horticultural or agricultural purposes until the rise of the later city (pp. 10, 32, 41). Prof. Vincent, in turn, marks the sudden interruption of life and of the archaeological evolution in the middle of the Canaanite period, and sees an immense hiatus between the destruction of Jericho in the thirteenth century and the daring of Hiel the Bethelite (1 Kings, xvi, 34; see *Rev. Bibl.*, pp. 274 *sq.*, 278 *sq.*). This harmony between the Old Testament and the excavations is the more important because hitherto such drastic results of the Israelite conquest have not been observed; elsewhere, in fact, the biblical student can only infer that the settlement was a slow one, and that Canaanite culture, so far from being annihilated, was gradually assimilated by the immigrant tribes (cp. *ib.*, p. 278).

However, this conclusion, with all its interest for biblical history, can with difficulty be reconciled either with the Old Testament itself or with the evidence of the published reports. Naturally, it is impossible not to be struck by the vivid account of the capture of Jericho, the overthrow of its walls, and the destruction of the city by fire (Josh. vi). But, according to the available evidence, the excavators found that the walls were not entirely overthrown—even on the north (p. 19)—and they do not mention any signs of a considerable conflagration.¹ In point of fact, although we read that the devastation of the city was complete, and "only the silver and gold, and the vessels of brass and *iron*" were preserved (Josh. vi. 24), iron, it is now recognized, was not in use at this early period, and its introduction has been ascribed to the Israelites themselves.² On

¹ There were traces of burning in the "Israelite" stratum (p. 30), and the earlier report mentioned several indications of attacks (p. 68), upon which we have no subsequent information.

² Cp. the incidental remark of Prof. Vincent in his article, p. 279.

the basis of archaeological research, therefore, we must suppose that although Israelite history knew of some great capture of Jericho, the details of *our* record are not altogether trustworthy. Indeed, the most casual reader will observe that Jericho still continued to form a boundary-city, and that it is mentioned among the cities of Benjamin obviously as a habitable site (Josh. xvi, 1, 7; xviii, 12, 21). It was occupied by the Kenites (Judg. i, 16), and it goes without saying that "the city of palm-trees" held by Eglon, king of Moab, when he oppressed Israel, was no mere ruin (Judg. iii, 13). It was still a residential site in David's time (2 Sam. x, 5). Consequently, the statement that Hiel of Bethel "built" Jericho in the reign of Ahab (1 Kings, xvi, 34) need not necessarily refer to anything more than some work of fortification. The Biblical evidence, whether taken as it stands or treated on strictly critical lines, does not prove or demand that there had been any gap in the history of Jericho as a city, and indeed, on *a priori* grounds, it is very unlikely that so important a place would have been left alone by Israel or by Judah, or even by Moab.¹

Incidental references combine with the archaeology to show that the continuity of the history of Jericho was not broken in the centuries which follow. The deportation of Judaeans in the time of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah did not mean a depopulation, and the small number of the men of Jericho in the post-Exilic lists (Ezra ii, 34) naturally throws no light upon the size of the city. Here Jericho is evidently associated with the new Jewish community, and in the account of the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem men of Jericho and the priests of the district find a place (Neh. iii, 2, 22).² We have here a single area comprising Jericho, Gibeon, and Mizpah in the north, Beth-zur (4-5 miles north from Hebron) in the south, Tekoa in the east, Keilah, Netophah and Zanoah in the west. It is a period when we can still recognize the prominence of certain groups which had moved up towards Jerusalem from the neighbourhood

¹ Cp. Dr. Skinner, *Century Bible*, *ad loc.* "the place had not lain waste since its destruction by Joshua"; also the commentaries of Benzinger (p. 105), and Kittel (p. 136); and J. Boehmer, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1909, p. 324 *sq.* It is, perhaps, not a coincidence that this reference to the fortification of Jericho comes just before the outbreak of the war between Moab and Israel.

² These priests, and the company of prophets in the stories of Elijah and Elisha, and the clan of the Kenite father-in-law of Moses, are not without their interest for the religious associations of the district; cp. also Josh. v, 15.

of Hebron, and the evidence for a bond of union between Jericho and Judah may possibly find an archaeological illustration in the Socoh jar-handle noticed above (p. 61).

Later, in the Maccabean period, the district is again mentioned in our scanty historical sources. Jericho, like Gezer, was among the places seized and fortified by Bacchides (1 Macc. ix, 50), and a fuller account of the excavations will doubtless include an investigation of the archaeological relationship, if any, between the remains at Jericho and the various Maccabean buildings discovered by Mr. Macalister at Gezer. The strategical importance of the city is also illustrated in the account of the treachery of the military commander Ptolemy, son-in-law of the high-priest (xvi, 12 *sqq.*). One of the most interesting features of this period is the friendship between the Maccabees and the Nabateans (v, 24 *sq.*; ix, 35), the powerful tribes who are not to be ignored in any study of the introduction of the Aramaic language and script (the ancestor of the "square Hebrew") into Palestine.¹ It is not out of place, perhaps, to recall in this connexion the jar-handles with Aramaic lettering (p. 60, above). Upon the grandeur of Jericho in Herod's time we need not delay. Of its hippodrome and palaces nothing remains, and it is to be presumed that, in addition to the disasters which befell the city, the invariable use of building material by subsequent inhabitants completed the ruin. The old site was occupied by a Byzantine settlement, and it is improbable that it had been deserted since the period of "Hellenistic" culture, although the Jericho of Herod certainly extended further a-field and is usually sought at the Wâdy el-Kelt. It is hardly safe to lay weight upon the absence of characteristically Roman remains upon the plateau itself; Dr. Bliss found a few specimens of the ware (*Q.S.*, 1894, p. 177), and the true lower chronological limits of the "Hellenistic" culture can hardly be fixed with certainty.

The chief archaeological phenomena at Jericho are (*a*) the cessation of certain kinds of distinctively Canaanite ware in the citadel, and (*b*) the distinctive features of the culture in the "Israelite" stratum at the Quell-hügel. Now, in the Quell-hügel three trial shafts revealed remains from the "oldest Canaanite" to the "Jewish" period, while in digging down the excavators passed from the upper, the "Byzantine," to the "Israelite-Jewish" stratum, where, however,

¹ The east of the Jordan appears to have been more Aramaean or Canaanite than Arabian (see Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, p. 307).

there were traces of the still older "Canaanite" walls (p. 11). The "Canaanite" ware of the lowest stratum resembled that of the citadel (p. 27). In the citadel the buildings dated from different periods, and some of the foundations even ran under the large double wall and therefore were older than it (pp. 14, 24). The citadel, in fact, seems to have taken the place of an earlier building (p. 26), while, at some later date a storied-dwelling had been erected on the space towards the northern end (p. 7). This appears to be the tower described in the first report (p. 67 *sq.*), where reference is made to its pottery of the "Canaanite" age and to twenty-two small unburnt tablets ready for use. In view of all this intricacy it is not surprising that the pottery in the citadel belonged to four closely interconnected periods (p. 27). If it contained a distinctive ware which comes to a sudden end (p. 29), it also disclosed an Aramaic jar-handle which was discovered in 1907 amid deposits which tempted Dr. Sellin to date it provisionally at about 1500 B.C.¹ In the settlement north of the citadel there was clearly a long and uninterrupted culture (p. 10), and although its earliest pottery pointed to a development from the old Canaanite, Dr. Watzinger's explanation (above, p. 63) is interwoven with a particular view of the early history of Jericho for which there is no real justification. The conclusion that the "Israelite" culture on the Quell-hügel is to be sandwiched in between the Hellenistic and this earlier culture north of the citadel is surely difficult, and the arguments seem to rely too much upon the *absence* of certain classes of material. Thus Dr. Sellin is inclined to attach some weight to the fact that Aramaic jar-handles (which belong to the late Jewish or Hellenistic age) are found with other objects of the period in the north of the citadel, but not a single example was found in "the Quell-hügel, that is to say in the older Jewish houses" (p. 40). Yet, we are not told that there is a gap between this so-called "Israelite" stratum and the Byzantine remains above it; the absence may be due to mere chance, and at all events one must know more of the jar-handle, from this place, which, it is said, bears five characters in Old Hebrew or perhaps Aramaic (*ib.*).

Dr. Langenegger suggests that the city-wall in the south is earlier than the more regular and skilfully built portion in the north (p. 18 *sq.*). The latter, too, is of superior workmanship to

¹ P. 38, *cp.* the earlier report, p. 70. The stone image in human form about 8 inches in height there mentioned proved to be unique (second report, p. 14).

the citadel, which, in turn, supplants an earlier construction. Was this citadel erected before or after the massive city-wall? It is conceivable that this doubly protected building was only necessary after the city-walls had become useless. This is suggested by the remains of the important building on the western side of the hill (above, p. 58); it is remarkable for its glacis, and its walls are spoken of as being later than the city-wall (p. 10 *sq.*). Here, at all events, we seem to have some later attempt to fortify Jericho, but apparently no inferences as to date could be drawn from the deposits. Five different flights of broad stone stairs leading up to the hills on the north and west of the plateau appear to be later than the breaching of the walls, and it is very ingeniously suggested that they served to give access to the houses and gardens when, after the overthrow of Jericho, the site was used for agricultural purposes (pp. 10, 32). The first settlement north of the citadel is later than these, and Dr. Watzinger ascribes its earliest culture to the close of the second millenium B.C. (p. 62 above). If so, the interval between it and the assumed destruction of the old Canaanite city is scarcely enough to cause any appreciable effect upon the archaeological development, and if the remains show an uninterrupted settlement down to the Hellenistic period (p. 10, and above, p. 61), it is surely difficult to separate the earlier and later phases by the "Israelite" culture of the Quell-hügel which, in turn, lies in a series extending from old Canaanite (*i. e.* older than the north settlement) to early Byzantine (not represented at the north settlement).

The historical framework complicates the interpretation of the archaeological evidence, and one will await with eagerness the publication of fuller details which will, no doubt, elucidate those points which now seem obscure, and will supplement the numerous references and allusions which now awaken curiosity. Gladly would one know more of the strata in which were found the uninscribed tablets and the old jar-handle (p. 66 above), new links in the chain of the history of writing in Palestine. Most valuable, too, will be the more complete evidence which will elucidate the relation between (*a*) the "Canaanite" ware in the citadel, and (*b*) the older culture in the north settlement, on the one side, and, on the other, (*c*) the old painted pottery from Gezer and elsewhere, which is now found to extend into the monarchy. Most interesting of all will be a fuller description of the various distinctive finds mentioned in both reports which have already been found to

suggest external influences. That these are important for the archaeological history is recognized by the excavators who, however, are unduly influenced by certain views which, in my opinion, are open to criticism. In this connexion one must not overlook the proximity of Moab, and the evidence for its advanced civilization, and until we know more of its material culture, it seems unwise to ignore the part which it may have played in the development of the culture of Jericho. Moab is a factor, even though it be still an unknown one.

All who read the account of these German excavations, and consider the amount of solid material which has been brought to light in the course of a relatively small number of weeks, will agree that they have been eminently successful, and that rich stores of material undoubtedly awaits the expedition which is able to carry on the work of excavation to an end.
