



A Millennium of Biblical History in the Light of Recent Excavations

Author(s): William F. Albright

Source: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* , 1930, Vol. 69, No. 1

A MILLENNIUM OF BIBLICAL HISTORY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT EXCAVATIONS

By WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT

(Read April 25, 1930)

DURING the past ten years the study of Palestinian archæology has made very great progress, and now rests upon an entirely different basis of method and interpretation from what was the case in 1914. Three factors are mainly responsible for this happy state of affairs. In the first place must be mentioned the vital fact that Palestine is now a mandate of Great Britain, whose government has taken an enlightened interest in furthering the cause of archæology. This it has done in several ways: first by establishing a department of antiquities, with a British director and a trained staff, secondly by establishing an international archæological advisory board, consisting of the representatives of the most important national groups and archæological institutions in Palestine, thirdly by making the formalities connected with the granting of a permit much less cumbersome and tedious than they used to be in Turkish days. While the task of securing a permit to excavate is thus far simpler than it formerly was, the scientific requirements have become more stringent, so that it is easier for reputable organizations and harder for irresponsible ones to secure permits to dig.

The second important factor in this progress is the great increase of archæological interest in America, which has reached its climax with the splendid gifts of Mr. John D. Rockefeller Jr., through Professor Breasted, for the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and for the Palestine Museum, now under construction in Jerusalem. The \$2,000,000 donation to the latter, half of which will be applied to the construction and equipment of the museum (including the library), while the other half will be reserved for endowment,

ensures a suitable home for the antiquities found in the excavations and falling to the share of the Palestine government. Two major archæological enterprises have also been launched by American institutions: the excavation of Megiddo by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, now under the direction of Mr. P. L. O. Guy, an able young English archæologist, and that of Beth-shan, where the University of Pennsylvania Museum has carried on eight campaigns, the last five of which have been directed by a gifted young Australian, Mr. Alan Rowe. Unhappily the Beth-shan excavation has now been interrupted for an indefinite period, owing to the difficulty of continuing to work, season after season, in the climate of the Jordan Valley. Besides these elaborately organized expeditions there have been several smaller American undertakings, of which we may mention those which have been most concerned with the pre-Christian period: the excavation of the acropolis of Gibeah of Saul (Tell el-Fûl) by the American School in Jerusalem, under the writer's direction; two campaigns (with a third in the summer of 1930) at Tell Beit Mirsim (Kirjath-sepher) under the patronage of Dr. M. G. Kyle and under the writer's direction; three campaigns at Tell en-Nasbeh (probably Ataroth), directed by Dr. W. F. Badè of the Pacific School of Religion; two campaigns at Beth-shemesh, directed by Dr. Elihu Grant, with the assistance of Dr. C. S. Fisher. American money has also been given freely for the partial support of other excavations in Palestine since the war, especially at Shechem (Balâtah), where a German expedition has been at work.

The third vital factor in producing the satisfactory situation which now exists is the new spirit of unity and continuity which prevails among the workers in this field as a whole. Before the World War there was very little collaboration among scholars of different nationalities and confessions, all interested in Palestinian archæology. Nor were there—with one exception—any who contributed to the stability of this science and the security of its achievements by specializing in it, and thus ensuring the continuity and coherence of research. The one

exception was Père H. Vincent, of the Dominican École Biblique in Jerusalem, who, though then a young man, was already a scholar of distinction. Even R. A. S. Macalister, the most active archæologist in the field, was primarily interested in Celtic studies. The English and German excavators followed different routes, employed different methods, paid little or no attention to each other's work, and did not attempt a synthesis. To be sure, the lack of definiteness in the chronology of excavations was largely due to the fact that scientific method was in its infancy, but if properly cultivated it would undoubtedly have developed much more rapidly. Macalister, easily the most gifted of the field archæologists, worked alone at Gezer, during five campaigns on this site, with the natural result that his views became more one-sided, while the few errors with which he started became cumulative with the passage of time. The chronology of Jericho set up by Sellin and Watzinger was nearly a thousand years wrong at a crucial point, the date of the "red city," the last Canaanite settlement on the site, which should have been placed between the seventeenth and the fifteenth centuries B.C., instead of between the ninth and the seventh, as Watzinger has himself recently acknowledged.¹ At Gezer Macalister's dating became more and more inconsistent; in his final publication he contradicted himself repeatedly with regard to the date of the same object, at the same time that he systematically reduced Iron Age dates by two or three centuries. Small wonder that when historians tried to systematize the results of pre-war excavation they found such a hopeless confusion that they were often led to express the view that archæological discoveries in Palestine were nearly valueless unless accompanied by written records!

Thanks to the rapid development of institutions and societies in Jerusalem, several of which are mainly devoted to archæological research, there are now media by which one scholar may readily become familiar with the methods and discoveries of others. Through the international Palestine

¹ See *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 80, pp. 131-6.

Oriental Society, now in its tenth year of life, and through the interlocking activities of the more important institutions devoted to archæological studies, especially the French École Biblique, the British School of Archæology, the American School of Oriental Research, the Archæological Department of the Hebrew University, the German Protestant and Catholic Institutes for Palestinian Studies, the Pontifical Biblical School, a constant interchange of views accompanies the publication of discoveries. The Department of Antiquities of the Palestine Government, with its rapidly growing museum, soon to be housed in the Rockefeller building, as noted above, provides a clearing house for archæological information, the value of which will steadily increase as time goes on.

The history of scientific excavation in Palestine dates back only to 1890, when Flinders Petrie applied the methods of studying a mound which had been developed by Schliemann and Dörpfeld at Troy, and the methods of employing pottery for chronological purposes which he himself had worked out in Egypt, to the site of Tell el-Hesi in the south of Palestine. Though his ideas were decried by the leading archæologists and historians of the day, they have gradually prevailed. Today they are regarded with suspicion only by those who know nothing of ancient Palestine. While, as observed above, there has been much loss of time because of the desultory and fragmentary character of Palestinian archæology in the past, we are now rapidly reaching the point where the system of sequence dating can be employed by historians of ancient Palestine with absolute security. Back to about 1700 B.C. any group of characteristic vases or potsherds, all contemporaneous, can be dated with a margin of error of a century—two centuries in extreme cases. If the pottery is sufficiently abundant, it is already possible, in most cases, to date it with an even lower margin of error. It does not, of course, follow that all such datings are correct; at present there are only a few scholars, such as Vincent (*facile princeps*), Fisher (who has an elaborate corpus of Palestinian pottery in

preparation), and Guy (the excavator of Megiddo), whose judgment may be relied upon. During the past nine years the writer has seen many verifications of the dates assigned by archæologists of this small group to pottery, when tested by later discoveries, or by the judgment of others, arrived at quite independently. It is true that we can only give very rough dates for the pottery of the ages preceding 1700 B.C. In fact, the exact nature of neolithic (chalcolithic) pottery was not known until 1929, and the dates assigned by eminent authorities to pottery of the Early Bronze have proved to be fundamentally erroneous. This situation is due, of course, to the fact that there has been virtually no excavation in sites and strata older than the eighteenth century B.C.

Of all periods in the long history of Palestine, where sedentary human occupation stretches over some 6,000 years, none has been so illuminated by recent archæological research as that comprised between the latter part of the Middle Bronze Age and the end of the second phase of the Early Iron, 1600-600 B.C. Spurred on by the wide-spread interest in the historical background of the Old Testament, archæologists have devoted themselves with particular zeal to sites and levels which might be expected to yield most information bearing on it. Since 1921 the writer has directed four campaigns of excavation at Tell el-Fûl (Gibeah of Saul) and Tell Beit Mirsim (probably Kirjath-sepher), besides making soundings on other sites, and acting as archæological adviser to various expeditions, especially to the Danish excavators at Shiloh. He has also visited all the excavations conducted since the war, and has studied scores of other sites belonging to the Old Testament period. He does not, therefore, feel the need of making any apology for undertaking the task of synthesis, though one must, of course, recognize that there are still many lacunæ in our knowledge, and that many cultural phases and ethnic movements are very imperfectly understood.

If we transport ourselves back to the seventeenth century B.C., we find ourselves in the age known to biblical students

as that of the Patriarchs, while historians designate it as the Hyksos period, and archæologists refer to it as the latter part of the Middle Bronze Age. The Hyksos period was inaugurated by a great barbarian irruption, or perhaps by a series of such irruptions, the exact course of which is still unknown. It is now certain that the Indo-Iranians played a dominant rôle in this movement, which presumably originated in the basins of the Caspian and the Aral, but they were hardly the only peoples to participate in it.¹ At all events, they were responsible for the introduction of chariot-warfare into the Near East. With the horse-drawn chariot came a new military aristocracy, of feudal character, which transformed the social and political organization of western Asia and Égypt.² The pathway of the barbarian invaders is marked by a line of great rectangular fortresses, often half a mile or more in length, a line stretching from the plains of Transcaspia across northern Persia and Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine, into Égypt.³ The fortresses were really fortified camps, surrounded by massive ramparts of *terre pisée* ("beaten earth," varying in consistency from hard clay to a mass almost as hard as concrete). They were employed primarily to shelter the wagons and chariots of the barbarian army, and proved so well adapted for this purpose that some of them continued in use for centuries. The best example of a Hyksos fortified camp in Palestine is the site of Hazor, the most important Canaanite city of Galilee, which is just a kilometre long, and four hundred metres wide.⁴

It is now becoming increasingly clear that the traditions of the Patriarchal Age, preserved in the book of Genesis, reflect with remarkable accuracy the actual conditions of the

¹ Cf. Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, vol. II, 1 (2nd ed.), pp. 33 ff.; Albright, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, vol. 10, pp. 243-54.

² Cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 ff.; Albrecht Alt, *Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina*, p. 8; also a forthcoming paper by the writer on Mitannian *maryannu*, "Chariot-warrior," in *Archiv für Orientforschung*.

³ See *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, vol. X, pp. 245-54. The material has now been greatly increased, and the writer's conclusions have been accepted by many archæologists, among them Garstang, Petrie, Du Mesnil du Buisson, etc.

⁴ See Garstang, *Annals of Archæology and Anthropology*, vol. 14, pp. 45 ff.; Albright, *Zeitschrift für Altestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1929, p. 12.

Middle Bronze Age, and especially of the period between 1800 and 1500 B.C. The ancestors of Israel are represented as semi-nomadic Hebrews, migrating into Palestine from northern Mesopotamia, where their home had been, and where their base continued to be.¹ In Palestine they wandered in the central highlands, between the Canaanite and Amorite towns which were scattered sparsely over it. Various non-Semitic peoples, like the Horites and the Hittites, appear as the inhabitants of enclaves, isolated one from the other.² The early traditions of Israel preserve important references to an invasion of Palestine by a coalition of Mesopotamian princes, among whom the northern barbarians, or Gôyîm (Babylonian Manda), appear,³ as well as to a Hebrew migration into Egypt, in connection with the rule of a Hebrew vizier.⁴ One isolated passage (Num. 13 : 22) says that Hebron was built seven years before Tanis, the Hyksos center in the Delta. Several passages refer in unmistakable terms to persistent traditions of a partial early conquest of the central highlands by the Hebrews, but most of these memories have been completely dimmed by the splendor of the official story of the conquest under Joshua.⁵ Recent archæological discoveries show that hitherto obscure references to social customs of the Patriarchal Age must be explained in the light of contemporary Horite practises in northern Mesopotamia.⁶ The researches of the American School in Palestine have proved conclusively that the picture of the state of settlement in the hill country of Palestine, as found in Genesis, is in strict accord with the

¹ See *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 43, pp. 385-93.

² Cf. *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. II, pp. 125 ff. The Hebrews came in during this period, and not during the preceding, Amorite period, before the eighteenth century. For this age, on which most important light has now fallen from Egyptian sources, see *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. VIII, pp. 223-56.

³ See *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, vol. X, pp. 236 ff., 255 ff.

⁴ New light on the Joseph story has recently been shed, as will be shown in a different place.

⁵ Cf. *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1929, pp. 11-13; *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 35, pp. 3-6.

⁶ For general orientation see Chiera and Speiser, *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. VI, pp. 83 ff., and for the most remarkable biblical parallel so far discovered in these documents see Gadd, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. 23, p. 127.

archæological facts, and is not a product of fanciful archaizing on the part of priestly scribes.¹

Unhappily, we know little about the political history of the Hyksos Empire, but Palestinian archæology elucidates the fragmentary documentary material in a most satisfactory way. The "rulers of foreign lands," as the Hyksos princes called themselves, settled the ethnic groups which had formed a part of their movement, or which had been swept up into its course just as the Huns swept up the Goths and the Vandals, here and there in different parts of their empire.² The biblical accounts of the conquest picture vividly how complex the ethnic structure of Palestine was, with at least half a dozen different non-Semitic peoples occupying different parts of it. The cuneiform tablets from Palestine found at Taanach, at Shechem, and especially at Tell el-Amarna in Middle Egypt, accentuate the biblical statements, showing that most of the names of the local princes were non-Semitic, the greater part being Indo-Iranian (Sanskrit), while Horite (Hurri) and Cappadocian ("Hittite") names are by no means lacking. It cannot be accidental that the Indo-Iranian names are most abundant in the plains of Haurân and elsewhere in northern Palestine, where conditions are best for horses and chariots.

The Canaanite civilization arising from the fusion of all these elements was very complex in character. It was essentially feudal, being based on the domination of an aristocracy of chariot-warriors, under one of their number as prince. Each local prince called himself by the simple designation *awîlu* (noble) when addressing his overlord, but from his subjects, and even from his equals, he demanded the appellation "king." The best term would be "baron," a word which has the same original significance of "(free)man" which is possessed by *awîlu*. Under this baron and his knights (*maryan*, Canaanite *na'ar*), whose only difference from equestrian knights was that they fought from chariots instead of from the backs of horses, were the serfs (*awîlût ḥupši*), who

¹ Cf. especially *Annual*, vol. VI, pp. 67 ff.

² Cf. Alt, *Landnahme*, loc. cit.

tilled the soil and built the castles of their lords. Each castle stood on a natural hill, or on an artificial mound, composed of the débris of previous occupations, and was surrounded by massive fortifications. At no time in the history of Palestine do we find such massive walls as in the feudal age, when there was a constant struggle between the robber barons for domination, and serfs were always available for the *corvée*. The fortress walls were frequently over fifteen feet thick, and were protected at their base by massive sloping revetments, from twenty to thirty feet in height.

Thanks to recent discoveries at Beth-shan and Tell Beit Mirsim, our knowledge of Canaanite religion has been revolutionized. This religion was fundamentally identical with the Syro-Mesopotamian religion of the third millennium, though influenced both by Egypt and by Asia Minor. It is not yet possible to say whether it was affected perceptibly by the Indo-Iranian cult of the divine order (*arta*), or of the gods Indra and Yama, lords of the storm and of the underworld, whose names appear in theophorous compounds mentioned in the Amarna tablets. The two great deities of the Canaanites were the god of heaven, who generally combined the attributes of a solar divinity and of a storm-god, and the great mother goddess, who appears variously as a celestial being, generally the moon, and as a chthonic divinity. The god of heaven received, of course, different names in different places, but the general term *Ba'al*, "lord," prevailed over all more specific ones. As god of the storm he was *Hadad*, while another name, belonging more intimately to his function as patron and donor of fertility, was *Dagan*. A chthonic form of the same god, with special reference to his connection with the underworld, both as a destroyer and as giver of fertility, was *Rashap*, who was worshipped at Beth-shan as lord of Hades, in lion shape.¹ The mother-goddess received the names *'Ashtart* and *Ashirat*, both found all over the Semitic world. These names belonged to her primarily as queen of heaven, but as a chthonic deity she was called *'Anat*, the goddess of fate, who apportioned life

¹ For the nature of this god see Albright, *Haupt Anniversary Volume*, pp. 144 ff.; Rowe, *Museum Journal*, vol. 20, pp. 48 ff.

and death from her abode in the lower world.¹ 'Anat was worshipped either as a serpent, or as a goddess with a serpent coiled about her legs, or climbing up one leg. The serpent was the symbol of life and death, and also represented the fecundizing element, without which the earth would remain sterile. Because of her close resemblance in many respects to 'Ashtart, 'Anat was early identified with her, and became queen of heaven as well as earth goddess. Finally, the two deities were combined by the Aramæans into the composite figure of Atargatis, the great Syrian goddess.²

These deities, with the minor divinities of their circles, were worshipped by the Palestinians of the Bronze Age either in temples, following the custom of the older sedentary population, or in open-air high places, according to the practise of the younger, semi-nomadic element. The cult was extremely debased, that is, it preserved very crude, primitive elements, in an age of comparatively advanced civilization; the combination of crudity and sophistication inevitably leads to corruption. The sexual aspect of the cult of fertility was abnormally developed, with the concomitant appearance of temple courtesans, worshipping a goddess whose most common appellation was "the courtesan" (*Qadesh*). The temple courtesans were both male and female; the priests were, at least generally, eunuchs (*kemarîm*), like the later Galli of Syria and Asia Minor.

After the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt, the Egyptians entered upon their heritage, and for just four centuries maintained the tradition of their Asiatic empire (c. 1550-1150 B.C.). Meanwhile, Hebrew tribesmen were gradually gaining control of the central highland between Jerusalem and the Plain of Esdraelon, as well as of certain other less important sections of the country. After their

¹ On 'Anat see Albright, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 41, 73 ff., and Vincent, *Revue Biblique*, vol. 37, pp. 540 ff. Vincent has pointed out that she must have been a serpent-goddess; for the serpent-goddess of Tell Beit Mirsim see *Bulletin*, No. 31, pp. 3, 6; the serpent on the thigh of the goddess appears at Bethshemesh (Grant, *Beth Shemesh*, p. 35) and on a large terra cotta statuette from the Wâdi Mughârah, found in 1929 by Miss Garrod, but not yet published.

² See the paper in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, cited in the preceding note.

initial successes, between the break-down of the Hyksos empire and the time of Tuthmosis III (early fifteenth century),¹ they do not, however, appear to have gained much until the latter part of the thirteenth century, when the Israelite confederation invaded Canaan, sweeping over it like a storm and dividing the hill country among its tribes. *Israel* is first mentioned in the Egyptian inscriptions about 1230 B.C., when it takes the place of *Hebrews* as the designation of the semi-nomadic tribesmen who occupied the hill country.² After the Israelite conquest, the Hebrews, both older occupants and newcomers, began to settle in towns, utilizing the recently developed art of building cisterns to enable them to build towns and villages all over the hill country, which had been sparsely peopled until then. Very few of the Israelite towns in the hill country were occupied by an older Canaanite population; most of them, like Gibeah of Saul, show no traces of occupation before the end of the Bronze Age, when the Israelite conquest took place.³

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the Israelite conquest brought with it a radical transformation in the character of the culture. The Hebrews were vividly conscious of the gulf which separated them from the older Canaanites; in theory, though perhaps seldom in practise, they considered the Canaanite population as *hérem*, that is, as devoted to extermination. Imperfectly as this principle was carried out, it still proved of the greatest importance, making the Israelite culture independent in vital matters from the very beginning. The Hebrews kept their old tribal organization intact down to the time of David, and in certain respects it survived as late as the Babylonian Exile. This tribal organization, based on a patriarchal theory, but greatly modified in practise by customs surviving from a more primitive matriarchal state of society, was essentially democratic; every able-bodied Israelite was equal to every other one, and the tribal nobility enjoyed very little real power. The change in organization appears con-

¹ See *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1929, pp. 11 f., and the references there given.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 12 f.

³ See *Annual*, vol. IV, pp. 44 f.

cretely in the curious fact that the average thickness of the walls of early Israelite towns was seldom more than a third that of the older Canaanite fortresses, on whose ruins the Israelite settlements were founded. Under a democratic order, it is naturally impossible to erect as massive fortifications as would be possible under the system of the *corvée*, where serfs were impressed into service. The very word for serf, peasant bound to the soil, received the new meaning "free peasant," whence "freeman in general" (*hopshî*).¹

The Israelite conquest also brought an abrupt change in religious beliefs and practises. While it is quite true that the simple religion of the semi-nomadic Hebrews was unable to resist the influence of the complex and attractive religion of Canaan, but adopted many beliefs and practises from it, it must be remembered that the Israelite confederation was a direct result of the preaching of a new faith, to which it remained more or less deeply attached. Since the exact character of the religion of Yahweh, as preached by Moses, is a controversial subject, upon which archæology is not yet able to speak decisively, we need not go into it here.² Suffice it to say that it must have been essentially monotheistic, and have already possessed a sufficient number of ethical, social, and ritual prescriptions to have given Judaism a good start in the direction of its later development. In any case, archæological evidence is absolutely opposed to many of the views of the dominant school of historical criticism with regard to the origin and evolution of Mosaism. The recent excavations at Shiloh have proved conclusively that it was an important Israelite town, abandoned before 1000 B.C., after a destruction by fire, and not reoccupied until after the Exile. While it is hardly probable that the site of the tabernacle, which was believed in later times to have been a large tent, will be discovered, it is already certain that the account of its history, as given in our sources, is essentially correct. An inscribed

¹ See *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. VI, pp. 106 ff.

² For the writer's view cf. provisionally *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 43, pp. 370 ff. The situation is now being cleared up by the studies of Alt and others. That Moses was a thorough monotheist seems to me practically certain, though hardly susceptible of direct proof at present.

weight, of about the eleventh century B.C., shows that writing was employed at Shiloh in the days of the Judges.

The excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim and elsewhere have shown that the cult of the mother goddess was not entirely given up, but, on the other hand, they have shown that the Astarte plaques of the Bronze Age were replaced by little busts set on pedestals, exactly like the toys of the period in general character, and but little more sacred. All of the high places described in archæological publications dealing with Palestinian excavations except one (at Gezer) have proved to be ordinary private houses, stables, or other edifices without sacral purpose. On the other hand, the altars of incense found at Gezer, at Shechem, Megiddo, and Tell Beit Mirsim (eleventh or tenth century B.C.) are now known to be the *hammanîm* against which the later priestly writers of Judah inveigh, because of their association with heathen cult.¹ However, they probably represent a phase of the cult of Yahweh in Israel. Except at Megiddo and at Shechem no temples of the Early Iron Age have yet been excavated, and these towns were both Canaanite rather than Israelite, as is well known.

Some two or three generations after the Israelite conquest, while the Israelites were still engaged in conflict with the remaining Canaanite towns, there was a new irruption of foreign tribes, this time from the north and west—the migration of the Sea Peoples. For centuries the Egyptian Pharaohs had employed mercenaries from the northern shores of the Mediterranean, the forefathers of the later Sardinians, Tyrrhenians, Lycians, and others. Some of these Mediterranean mercenaries were settled at garrison towns, like Bethshan, where their burials have been found, showing a barbaric adaptation of Egyptian practises. Finally, however, at the beginning of the reign of Ramesses III (cir. 1180–1150 B.C.),² which followed a generation of more or less complete anarchy in Egypt, a number of the “peoples of the sea,” as the

¹ See *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1929, p. 13, and *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. IX, pp. 50 ff.

² For his date cf. *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1929, p. 9, n. 3.

Egyptians called them, invaded the coasts of Egypt and Palestine. At the same time, roughly speaking, the Hittite empire was overthrown by a barbarian irruption from the northwest and northeast, which forced various Anatolian peoples into Syria. The relative sequence of movements eludes us, so we do not know certainly whether the Egyptian inscriptions are right in suggesting a joint movement, both by sea and by land. At all events, many of the Canaanite towns of the coastal plain of Palestine were occupied by the maritime invaders, led by the Philistines, who took the most desirable section of the country, between Joppa and Gaza. Excavations have so far been carried on in only one of the Philistine towns, Ashkelon, and while the soundings here were not extensive enough to lay bare any area of the pre-Hellenic city, a stratum of ashes was found to separate the Canaanite town from the superimposed Philistine stratum, a fact which points to a destruction of the former by the invaders. Ramesses III claims to have won a great victory over the invaders, but he confesses that he settled them as his subjects, *i.e.*, confirmed their title to the conquered territory, subject only to the payment of tribute to Egypt. After his death Egypt once more fell into a state of anarchy, and for over two centuries remained too weak to attempt to assert her domination over Palestine.

In the Israelite towns of the Shephelah, the low hill country between Judah proper and the Philistine plain, we find Philistine influence dominant from about the middle of the twelfth century B.C. At Tell Beit Mirsim we found that the Israelite town of the second stratum from the top exhibited three periods, a pre-Philistine one (cir. 1220-1150), a Philistine one (cir. 1150-1000) and a post-Philistine one (cir. 1000-920 B.C.), though the third one is not so clear as the other two. At Beth-shemesh, Mackenzie made similar observations with regard to the first two of these periods, so there can be no doubt that the Philistine conquest fell considerably later than the Israelite one.¹ The Philistine influence upon Israel was

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8 ff.

undoubtedly very important, both directly and indirectly. The Philistines were by no means barbarians; they unquestionably came from some region of the Ægean, and were to some extent under Cretan influence. They introduced iron into general use in Palestine, though they held a monopoly of iron manufacture until the time of Saul. Iron had, indeed, been long known, but until the eleventh century B.C. it was too scarce and expensive to be used for ploughs or sickles, to say nothing of other tools. Most of the iron in use came from Pontus, where it was a jealously guarded monopoly of the Hittites in the thirteenth century. Early in the Iron Age deposits of it were discovered in the Lebanon, after which it became abundant. In the excavations at Gibeah an iron plough tip was found in the fortress of the time of Saul (cir. 1020-1000 B.C.). The Philistines also introduced an entirely new type of pottery, of Ægean origin, as well as new styles in clothing. The use of the fibula, or safety pin, for fastening clothes was certainly brought in by the Philistines. The Philistine armor, as worn by Goliath, is characteristically Ægean.

The Philistines perpetuated Ægean institutions in their confederacy of five towns, each ruled by a tyrant, and their strongly commercial orientation. It was not long before they were in control of the trade routes running north toward Syria and east into Transjordan. The related peoples who occupied most of the old Canaanite towns of the coastal plain and Esdraelon were doubtless not altogether averse to the protection against Israelite incursions which the Philistine hegemony brought them. The Israelites, on the other hand, felt the foreign yoke severely, and finally revolted successfully under the leadership of Saul, the first king of Israel.

Saul was still a peasant, and it was reserved for his successor, David, to establish monarchical institutions. Our excavations in the fortress of Saul's time on the acropolis of Gibeah showed a considerable amount of rustic comfort, but no luxury whatever. The art of construction was still extremely rude, and a gulf separates the masonry and architecture of

Saul's period from that of Solomon's. In fact, the age of Saul was characterized by a deliberate opposition to Philistine culture; not a single example of Philistine pottery was found in the stratum of this period at Gibeah.

Up to 1928 it was possible to say that the age of David and Solomon was archæologically quite obscure. In that year P. L. O. Guy, director of the excavations at Megiddo, carried on under the auspices of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, discovered the stables built by Solomon in order to accomodate his chariot horses. The construction of the stables is remarkably strong, and the cement paving which was liberally employed in them gives a surprisingly modern appearance to their ruins. Mr. Guy has been able to show that similar structures found before the war at Tell el-Hesi and Taanach, but never understood, are in reality precisely similar, and date from the same period. At Hazor Garstang has since found other stables, apparently also of the Solomonic age. The great expansion of Israelite military power under David and Solomon may be appreciated when we learn that stabling space for three hundred horses has been found at Megiddo alone. The masonry of the stables is practically identical with that of the buildings of the time of Ahab (cir. 870-850 B.C.), excavated by Reisner at Samaria, constructed a little more than half a century after Solomon's death. There can be no reasonable doubt that this type of construction was borrowed from Phœnicia, though positive evidence is still lacking. The spread of Phœnician influence in Palestine at this time is attested both by our documentary and by our archæological materials. The diffusion of Phœnician influence was greatly aided by the fact that the language of northern Israel was practically identical with Phœnician, though differing in important points from the dialect of the south, which we know as Biblical Hebrew. We have very important documents of North Israelite speech in the ostraca found by Reisner in the ruins of a building of Ahab's time at Samaria, as well as in the Mesha Stone, set up by a king of Moab who had successfully revolted from Israel. Dussaud is probably

right in pointing out that the tradition of Solomon was carried on, not by his descendants in Judah, but by the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom, who revolted from his son. The administrative organization introduced by Solomon was, at all events, maintained in the Northern Kingdom, as we know from the ostraca, as well as from other indications.¹

Israel, however, was no longer in the direct line of Jewish evolution; that privilege became more and more exclusively the property of Judah. The excavations of recent years, especially in the top stratum of Tell Beit Mirsim, have enabled us to understand the nature of Judæan culture much better than before. Tell Beit Mirsim, we must remember, was a typical peasant community in the Iron Age, and no signs of wealth may be expected there. In the seventh century B.C. it had a population of about five thousand souls, but during a good part of the year the inhabitants lived in booths outside the walls, just as the modern Arabs of the district spend only two or three months in their town of Dûra, and live during the rest of the year in tents, caves, or booths on or near their land. The principal industry of the place was the preparation of woolen cloth for export; the town was situated on the edge of a great sheep-raising district. Innumerable loom weights show that practically every house possessed a hand loom. Five dye factories were excavated in the first two campaigns, four of which were almost exactly alike in their disposition. In the middle of a large room were two massive stone basins, in which the cloth was dyed. By their side were generally shallow basins of cement, while a line of fallen stones of considerable size, each one hollowed out, pointed to an original pipe-line for convenient bringing of water from a neighboring cistern. In the corners were always two large hole-mouthed jars, partly full of lime, which is still used today in the dye industry. The characteristic feature of these dye-plants is the amount of labor which was devoted to the fabrication of the massive stone basins and pipe-lines, which could just as well be made of earthenware, as was indeed true of the basins found in one dye-plant.

¹ See *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. V, pp. 25 ff.

When we turn to the construction of the houses, we find the same situation. Each house, as a rule, contained, on the ground floor, a large room with four massive stone pillars, usually monolithic in character, and averaging seven feet in height. When we recall that the inhabitants of the houses were simple peasants, and consider the construction of modern Arab peasant houses, we are struck with the native physical energy and enterprise of the Israelites, who would go to so much trouble to build their houses. We also find that sanitary conditions were better in the Israelite town, despite its crowded condition, than in an Arab town or village of the same general type. The central room of the ground floor was provided with smaller rooms opening from it, which served as magazines, or the like. A stone staircase, outside the house, gave access to the second story, which was generally built of brick and wood, and where the occupants slept. The floor of the ground story was generally, though not always, paved with stone or plaster, and the walls were plastered with good lime plaster. The ceiling was of wood, as were also the doors. Streets were narrow, but were generally paved with cobblestones, though the latter were not laid in patterns. There were numerous cisterns, but all were provided with channels of cement for the purpose of conveying the water from the roofs of the houses, as well as with settling basins of cement, in order that the water might be partially purified before entering the cistern. In short, sanitary conditions were much superior to what they are in modern Arab communities, though there was no satisfactory arrangement for the disposal of sewage. The sanitary tabus of early Hebrew legislation also contributed greatly to the advantage of public health. Christianity and Islam have both given up the sanitary tabus of Judaism, a development which has led to deplorable results in poor and depressed communities.

Both the documentary sources and the archæological evidence enable us to follow the gradual evolution of Israelite society from a simple tribal democracy, entirely devoted to farming and herding, to a typical monarchical state, where

manufacture and commerce played increasingly important rôles. The development of commerce began actively under Solomon, who was himself a great merchant prince, through whose influence the Israelites undertook elaborate commercial expeditions into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, and even to the Indian Ocean and to the Phœnician outposts in Spain. It was, however, in the Jewish state of the eighth century B.C. that commerce became most highly stressed. The mere fact that the town of Tell Beit Mirsim, located in the south of Judah, was devoted to the manufacture of woolen goods, shows to what an extent economic specialization had developed. We know from the pre-exilic records preserved in the book of Chronicles that certain towns were occupied by members of the guild of metal-workers, others by potters, still others by manufacturers of linen goods, etc. This high degree of specialization shows that conditions were economically complex, and that commerce must have attained a high degree of development. To what extent the pre-exilic Jews participated in Phœnician commerce is a moot question, but they were in any case very strongly influenced by it.

One of the most interesting illustrations of the originality displayed by the pre-exilic Judæans is the fact that in the eighth century B.C. they invented a system of currency unknown, apparently, in all the neighboring countries. Payments of taxes in kind were a feature of ancient taxation; in Israel crop taxes were paid in grain, wine, and oil, for convenience. The wine and oil, which formed the staple taxes, were, from the eighth century down to the Exile, placed in standardized jars, with the capacity of a bath (*i.e.*, about eight gallons), each jar having been stamped on one handle, before it was baked, with the seal of the royal administrative district. These jars then circulated as standard values.

It is thus quite certain that the commercial expansion of Jewry under the conditions of the Diaspora was by no means so sudden as used to be thought, but was simply an acceleration of an otherwise normal evolution. Our new comprehension of this evolution is naturally of great value for the

just evaluation of the work of the prophets. It cannot be accidental that the great prophetic activity of the eighth century B.C. was coeval with a burst of commercial and industrial activity. This new life brought with it a great extension of the bounds of Hebrew thought, both cosmically and politically, but it also involved a transformation of the old, relatively democratic, social organization of the early monarchy into a more complex industrial system, where the upper classes oppressed the lower classes. Even where there was no real oppression, the introduction of new luxuries, enjoyed only by the rich, and the formation of caste barriers gave the poor a feeling that they were being oppressed. The prophets tried to bring about a social reformation; some of them even tried to bring back the primitive semi-nomadic life of early Israel, much as Mahatma Gandhi is endeavoring to do in India today. It was this reaction to simplicity of life and law which was probably responsible for the collection in writing of the Hebrew traditions which we find in the J and E documents, from the eighth and early seventh centuries, as well as in Deuteronomy, which represents an effort to restore the primitive Mosaic legislation at the end of the commercialized seventh century, where it appears oddly anachronistic, despite certain modern touches, especially in cult legislation.¹

¹ In order to avoid misunderstanding, the writer regards a brief statement of his views as advisable. He believes that the Jews, both pre-exilic and post-exilic, traced the origin of the law (*tôrâh*) back to Moses, and that the codes of the Pentateuch were just as honestly intended to reproduce Mosaic legislation as the Moslem *ḥadīth* was supposed to reflect actual teachings of Mohammed. In practise, however, it goes without saying that an orally transmitted law would steadily grow, both by absorbing later legislation, and by explanatory additions. The actual Mosaic nucleus of the codes is, therefore, presumably small, though any serious attempt to reconstruct it is at present quite impossible. In all likelihood there was a more or less authoritative body of oral tradition, both historical and legal, which was transmitted by the priesthood of Shiloh. Certain documents incorporated in P may well go back to written sources of the eleventh century or older. After the downfall of the Shiloh cult, consequent on the destruction of the place by the Philistines, the priests were scattered, and the body of authoritative tradition, above referred to, passed through a new and complex period of oral transmission, partly in the south, partly in the north. About the end of the eighth century these two recensions or "documents," known respectively as J and E, were put into writing, followed in the seventh century by the compilation of JE. Deuteronomy, dating in its present form from the end of the seventh century, has a much older nucleus, consisting probably of the narratives and laws which were handed down at the old shrine of Gilgal, near Shechem, in so far as they supplemented the material of Shilonic origin

In the foregoing pages we have tried to give an idea of the light shed by archæology on the broad sweep of Hebrew history, from the Patriarchal Age to the Exile, without going into details. There are still many lacunæ; our knowledge is just beginning to be sufficiently exact to make synthesis possible. We have avoided really disputed questions, so far as possible, though it must be confessed that the field of biblical history is still so enshrouded by religious and anti-religious prejudice that it is impossible to make any statement without meeting opposition from some quarter. However, this very situation makes the vigorous pursuit of archæological research in Palestine a matter of the greatest possible interest and importance to all philosophically minded persons.

(JE). The Priestly Code (P) never seems to have had a strictly independent existence, but represents new material added by the priests of the Temple at Jerusalem to JE, whether before or after the fall of Jerusalem is not yet certain. But even P does not attempt to describe the usages of the Temple, but rather to go back to the days of Moses. Some of the matter included in P is older and more valuable than that of JE, despite the relative lateness of the work as a whole. Happily for us, in spite of the effort made by the compilers of these documents to give only authentic material, dating to the time of Moses, they have not succeeded, but have given many religious laws and prescriptions of obviously late date, by comparison of which the relative age of the documents may be established. It is only by full recognition of the antiquity and tenacity of oral tradition in Israel, on the one hand, and of the late date at which our material was compiled and edited, on the other, that we can do justice to the history and religion of more than a thousand years' span which are imbedded in that marvelous work known as the Pentateuch.