

## CHAPTER IX

### THE NAME JERUSALEM AND ITS HISTORY

**T**HE English spelling of the name Jerusalem— which is common to many modern languages —was derived by the Authorised Version of 1611 AD., through the Vulgate, from the Greek Ierusalem, and approximates to what was in all probability the earlier pronunciation in Hebrew, Yěru-shālēm. The Old Testament form, however, vocalises the last syllable differently : Yerushālim. Other Semitic dialects give the type Urusalem with several modifications. And even in Greek and Latin, besides Ierusalem, there are Hierousalem, Hierusalem, Hierosolyma, and Solyma, most of which reappear in one or other of the modern European languages. The history of all these forms, along with a discussion of the questions, which is the original or nearest the original and what the derivation of the latter may be, forms the subject of the present chapter?

<sup>1</sup> Of recent literature the following may be cited :—by J. Grill, *Z.A. T. W.*, 1884, 134 ff. : ‘Ueber Entstehung u. Bedeutung des Namens Jerusalem’ (written before the discovery of the name in the Tell el-Amarna letters, which contradicts much of the argument); by Haupt, *Götting. Gelehrt. Nachrichten*, 1883, 108, and *Isaiah, S.B.O.T.* (Hebrew), Excursus on ארִיאל, xxix. 1; by Marquart, *Z.A. T. W.*, 1888, 152; by myself, *Enc. Bibl.*, ‘Jerusalem,’ § 1, and Expositor for February 1903, ‘The Name Jerusalem and other Names’; by F. Pratorius, *Z.D.M.G.* lvii. 782; and by Nestle, *Z.D.P.* V, xxvii. (1904) 153 ff.; ‘Zum Namen Jerusalem.’ Other relevant

In the consonantal text of the Old Testament, the Hebrew letters for the name are ירושלם Y-R-U-S<sup>1</sup>-L-M. The Massorettes have vocalised them as יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Yĕrûshālâim, which takes the fuller form <sup>The Hebrew</sup> יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Yerushālâyim in three late passages.<sup>2</sup> <sup>Yerushalaim</sup> a late form.

This (without vowels) appears on coins which belong either to the reign of Simon, 142-135 B.c., or to the Jewish revolt against Rome, 66-70 A.D.;<sup>3</sup> and also sometimes in the Talmudic literature.<sup>4</sup> The termination -aim or -ayim used to be taken as the ordinary termination of the dual of nouns, and was explained as signifying the upper and lower cities, of which Jerusalem was composed at least in the later periods of her history? But either it is a mere local ending, for it appears in other place-names, in which it is not natural to conjecture a dual,<sup>6</sup> or a purely artificial form confined to the reading of the Scriptures and other solemn occasions. In any case Yerushalaim is a late Hebrew form, and appears in no other dialect.

literature will be cited in the course of this chapter, which is based on the *Expositor* article mentioned above. The forms of the name in various dialects are spelt as in my article in the *Enc. Bibl.*, of which Nestle says that, of the modern Encyclopædias, it 'geht am genauesten auf die Schreibung des Namens ein.' Cf. also Guthe in Hauck's *R.-E.*, viii. 673 f.

<sup>1</sup> Or SH.

<sup>2</sup> According to Baer: Jer. xxvi. 18; Esther ii. 6; 2 Chron. xxxii. 9. Other recensions of the text add two more: 1 Chron. iii. 5; 2 Chron. xxv. 1—in both of which Baer reads יר-לם. The Babylonian vocalisation gives the ל with a *Pathah* (short a); in Codex B it has a *Seghol*, 2 Kings iv. 7. (Cf. Bleek, *Einl.*, 6th ed. 588; Nestle, *op. cit.* 154.)

<sup>3</sup> On these coins and the question of their date, see Bk. II. ch. ix.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Tosephta* 'Kethuboth,' 4. Usually the form is ירושלם, *Mishna* 'Zebahim,' xiv. 8; 'Menahoth,' x. 2, 5; 'Arakîn,' ix. 6, etc. etc.

<sup>5</sup> Gesenius, *Thesaurus s.v.*; though another explanation might be found in the literary explanation of the name given below.

<sup>6</sup> Barth, *Die Nominalbildung der Semitischen Sprachen*, § 194 c. note 1.

The evidence is conclusive for an earlier and more common pronunciation, Yĕrûshâlēm.<sup>1</sup> This suits the Hebrew consonants; it is confirmed by the Septuagint and New Testament transliteration, Ierousalēm, and by the earliest appearance of the name in classic Greek;<sup>2</sup> it appears in the Biblical Aramaic, Yērûshlem,<sup>3</sup> and in the Hebrew contraction, Shâlēm.<sup>4</sup> It must, in fact, have been the pronunciation in ordinary use; and if we could only abolish our senseless abuse of the letter *j* as a soft *g*, we might congratulate ourselves on possessing, as the French and Germans do, a close approximation to the musical Hebrew form used by prophets and psalmists.

But there was another ancient form of the name, which has also had its tradition, lasting till the present day. In the Tell el-Amarna letters, written about B.C. 1400, in the Babylonian script and language, the spelling is U-ru (or Uru)-sa-lim.<sup>5</sup> On the Assyrian monuments of the eighth century, the transliteration is Ur-sa-li-immu.<sup>6</sup> This has descended through the Aramaic 'Urishlem,<sup>7</sup> occurring in a Nabatæan inscription discovered by Mr. Doughty not far from Hejra, in Arabia, the Mandaic

<sup>1</sup> יְרוּשָׁלַיִם.

<sup>2</sup> Ἱερουσαλημη. See below, p. 260.

<sup>3</sup> יְרוּשָׁלַיִם; Ezra iv. 20, 24, v. 1; יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, Ezra v. 14, vi. 9; Baer, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם-throughout.

<sup>4</sup> Psalm lxxvi. 3; LXX. ἐν εἰρήμῃ; cf. Genesis xiv. 18.

<sup>5</sup> Berlin collection, Nos. 103, 106, 109; Winckler, *Thontafeln van Tell-el-Amarna*, 306, 312, 314; Sayce, *Records of the Past*, second series, v. 60 ff., 72 f.

<sup>6</sup> Delitzsch, *Par.* 288; Schrader, *C. O. T.*, ii. 214.

<sup>7</sup> יְרוּשָׁלַיִם; *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, ii. 1, 294. The exact spot is El-Mezham. The inscription is of one נתניה = נתנאי, Nethaniah, apparently a Jewish name.

Urashelam (?), the Syriac Urishlem,<sup>1</sup> and the Arabic Aurishalamu.<sup>2</sup>

There are thus in the main two lines of tradition as to the original form of the name. Since the *s* of the Babylonian is to be taken as the equivalent of the Hebrew *sh*, the difference between them is confined to the first part of the word.

Whether the Babylonian or the Hebrew is the original?

The question to which we have to address ourselves is : Which of the two was original? Though the distinction turns on a letter or two, it involves a matter of no little historical importance. For it opens up the larger question : Was the name of the City a native, that is a Canaanite, name, or given by the Babylonians during a period when, as we know, the Babylonian culture pervaded Palestine?

Assyriologists take the first part of Uru-salim as meaning 'city.'<sup>3</sup> Sayce interprets the second part as the name of a god, and translates 'City of Salim.'<sup>4</sup> But the determinative for deity is wanting, and the introduction of a divine name is

Meaning of Urusalim.

<sup>1</sup> Mandaic, אורישלמא; Syriac, ܐܘܪܝܫܠܝܡ.

<sup>2</sup> اورشلمو : this is an old Arabic form quoted by Yāqūt (*Mu'jam-el-Buldan*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 317) from a pre-Islamic poet. It occurs also in Idrisi : Robinson, *B.R.* i. 380. Robinson spells it Aurûshlim.

<sup>3</sup> 'Vielleicht' : Delitzsch, *Wo Zog das Paradies?* 226 f. Others without any qualification : Sayce, *Records of the Past*, second series, v. 61; *Academy*, 7th February 1891; Haupt as below. Nestle, *Z.D.P.* V. xxvii. 155, gives some other references.

<sup>4</sup> See references in last note and compare *Early History of the Hebrews*, 28: 'The figure and name of the god Salimmu, written in cuneiform characters, are on a gem now in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg. The same god, under the name Shalman, is mentioned on a stela discovered at Sidon and under that of Selamanês in the inscriptions of Shêkh Barakât, north-west of Aleppo (Cl.-Ganneau, *Études d'Archéologie Orientale*, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, cxiii. vol. ii. 36, 48; Sayce, *P.S.B.A.* xix. 2, 74).'

opposed by Dr. Zimmern,<sup>1</sup> who, however, elsewhere admits the possibility of it.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Haupt translates the name in analogy to the Arabic Dâr es Salam and Medinet es Salâm as 'Place of Safety,' 'præsidium salutis.' He recalls the term *stronghold*<sup>3</sup> as applied to the town in Hebrew, and compares the name of 'the southernmost Babylonian port, Bâb Salimêti, "safe entrance." ' 'Urusalim is thus a compound of the Sumerian word for "fortified place," "city," and the Semitic *Shalim*, "safety." The *u* after the *γ* is the Sumerian vowel of prolongation; the *i* in Urishalim (Syriac Urishlem, Arabic Aurishalamu) substitutes the *i* of the genitive as termination of the construct state, and is therefore more correct from a Semitic point of view.'<sup>4</sup>

This Babylonian form Urusalim or Urisalim Dr. Haupt takes to be the original name of the City, and the Hebrew

The theory that Jerushalem is derived from it. Yerushalem or Irûshalim to have been derived from it either by dissimilation, that is avoidance of the repetition of the same vowel, or as a dialectic modification; *eri*, a dialectic form of *uru*, passing

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1891, p. 263. Sayce's argument that Salim is a divine name is based upon his reading *Issuppu* in l. 12 of Letter 102 (of the Berlin collection), which he renders 'prophecy' (of the mighty king); and on his rendering *Zuruh*, in ll. 14. 34 of 104, 'oracle' (of the mighty king); and on his rendering of l. 16, Letter 106, 'the temple of the god Uras (whose) name (there is) 'Salim.' But Winckler, *Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna*, reads in l. 12 of 102 (Wi. 179), Zu-ru-ukh, which both there and in ll. 14 and 34 (Wi. 1, 33) of 104 (Wi. 181) Zimmern and he render 'arm': taking 'the mighty King' not as a deity, but as Pharaoh. Winckler reads, Letter 106 l. 16 (numbered by him 15) differently from Sayce: (alu) Bit-Ninib.

<sup>2</sup> *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed., 475.

<sup>3</sup> מְצוּדָה.

<sup>4</sup> 'From the Assyrian point of view Urusalim is less correct than Urisalem.'—Haupt; and he compares Penuel and Peniel. So also יְרוּשָׁלַם, 2 Chron. xx. 16; יְרוּשָׁלַם, 1 Chron. vii. 2; יְרוּשָׁלַם, Kt. and יְרוּשָׁלַם, Kr., 2 Chron. xxix. 14; יְרוּשָׁלַם, 1 Chron. ix. 6; and יְרוּשָׁלַם, 1 Chron. xv. 18.

into Hebrew as 'יר (עיר). Similarly Dr. Nestle says: 'Since from the genealogies of Genesis I learned to equate Yaradh (ירד) with 'Iradh (עירד), I have felt disappear every objection to see in Yerushalem (ירושלם) an older Irushalem (עירושלם). If the letter 'Ayin (ע) can vanish in the middle of a word, why not also at the beginning of a name, which often enough will be spoken together with a preposition?' If these arguments be sound, the name Jerusalem was not a native or Canaanite name, but given by the Babylonians during one of the early periods of the supremacy of their arms or of their culture in Palestine. And we should have to seek for the native name of the town among such as the Stronghold, Sion, the 'Ophel, or Jebus.

In itself such a conclusion is by no means impossible. There is a little evidence of the impress of Babylonian names upon Palestine: for example, Nebo, Beth 'Anâth, 'Anathoth, and (according to some), even Bethlehem' But this is both meagre and ambiguous, and affords no support to Dr.

Supported  
by no external  
evidence and  
purely  
linguistic.

Haupt's theory. Indeed, if the *Bit Ninib* mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna letters as in the territory of Jerusalem (No. 183) be Jerusalem herself," then that was the Babylonian name of the town, and Jerusalem was the native name. Nor does Dr. Haupt's theory derive support from

<sup>1</sup> Even Nebo, the most likely, is not certain, and for Bethlehem, in which one or two scholars trace the name of the god Lahmu, there is, to say the least, an equally probable etymology, *house or domain of bread*. It has, indeed, been argued that in a place-name compounded with Beth- and another word the latter is either a divine name or had a divine name attached to it in a fuller form of the word (G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, 127, 324). But for reasons against this argument see *The Critical Review*, 1898, 20.

<sup>2</sup> As Haupt himself supposes, *Joshua*, *S.B.O.T.* (Engl.) 54; though Zimmern thinks this improbable, *K.A.T.*, 3rd ed. 411 n. 4.

the fact of the survival **of** the form *Uri* in Aramean and Arabic; for such a survival only proves the derivation of these forms from the Babylonian (a derivation historically probable, as the Arameans were in close intercourse with Babylonia and carried their language far into Arabia), and does not furnish independent evidence for the originality of the Babylonian form. There is, therefore, no external or independent evidence for Dr. Haupt's conclusion, which is entirely drawn from the Babylonian language.

Coming then to the linguistic evidence, we have to observe first that if the form *Irushalem* had been derived from *Urusalim*, and the equivalent in Hebrew of the Babylonian *Uru be 'Ir* (רַע), with an initial 'ayin, we might have expected in the Hebrew name an initial 'ayin, **or** at least, as in the Syriac and Arabic derivations from the Babylonian, an initial 'aleph. The absence of this seems to prove that in *Irushalem* or *Yerushalem* we have a form on another line of tradition altogether than that which the Babylonian started.

But more important still, Dr. Haupt's hypothesis is confronted with an alternative, for which there is some evidence in other Palestine place-names. He says that the Hebrew *Yerushalem* (*Irushalem*) was produced from *Urusalim* either by dissimilation or, more probably, as a dialectic variety. But not only is it equally possible on phonetic grounds that *Urusalim* is a corruption, by assimilation of the vowels, from *Yerushalem*; there are, besides, actual instances of such a change in the Assyrian transliteration of the native names **of** other places in Palestine. For while it is true that the long, **or** otherwise well-marked,

Linguistic  
objection to it.

Possible  
alternative  
*Urusalim* a  
corruption of  
*Jerushalem*.

vowels in such native names are correctly reproduced in the cuneiform transliterations, as in the cases of Lākhīsh, Ashdōd, Yāphō (Joppa) and Sīdōn, which in Assyrian appear as Lā-kī-s-u, As-du-du, Ya-ap-pu-[u], and Si-du-n[u], it is also very significant that when in a native name a weak vowel precedes a strong one, as in the first part of Yērūshālēm, it is very often in the Assyrian transliteration assimilated to the sound of the latter. Thus 'Edom (אֱדוֹם) becomes U-du-um[u],<sup>1</sup> Pěkôd (פְּקוֹד) Pu-kû-d[u];<sup>2</sup> Bēnê-Bēraḵ (בְּנֵי-בְרָק) Ba-na-a-a-bar-ak ; and 'Ēlul (אֱלּוּל the name of the month) U-lu-l[u]. Even a long vowel is sometimes assimilated to another long one as in Mōāb, which in one Assyrian form is Ma-'-aba; Ammôn (עַמּוֹן) which becomes Am-ma-n[u];<sup>3</sup> and the Talmudic 'Ushā (אֲשָׁא),<sup>4</sup> which becomes U-s-u-[u]. An instance of assimilation is also found in the Assyrian Ma-ga-du-[u] (but elsewhere Ma-gi-du-[u]) for Megiddo, and perhaps in mi-ṣir and mu-sur for the name of Egypt, which the Hebrew gives as Maṣōr. The last instance reminds us that in several cases the Assyrian shows a fondness for the vowel *u*, where there does not appear to have been any trace of this in the original: as in Al-ta-ḵu-[u],<sup>5</sup> from 'Elteḵēh (אֱלִתְחָה), and Gu-ubli,<sup>6</sup> from Gēbal (גְּבַל). In face of all these—really a large proportion of the few place-names of Palestine of which we possess Assyrian forms—it is clear that Urusalim may possibly have been produced by assimilation from Yērû- or Iru-shalem. And this alternative to Dr. Haupt's derivation

<sup>1</sup> Delitzsch, *Par.* 295.

<sup>2</sup> The name of a tribe (Jer. 1 21 ; Ezek. xxiii. 23).

<sup>3</sup> Though in this case the native pronunciation may have been 'Ammân.

<sup>4</sup> Sukka, f. 20a.

<sup>5</sup> Del. *Par.* 288.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 283.



has a further superiority over the latter in that it implies for Yerushalem what we find for all but a very few and doubtful place-names in Palestine, a native origin.

What the etymology of Yerushalem may be it is almost impossible to descry. Various derivations have been

suggested, some ludicrous, none satisfactory. The latter half of the word is usually taken as meaning peace or *security*; but while the early rabbis and earliest Christian writers

interpreted the first part as vision or *fear*,<sup>1</sup> modern etymologists have been divided between the possession and the *foundation—of peace* or security? The resemblance of the first part of the name, *Yĕru*, to the imperfect of the verb, and the composition of instances of the latter with a divine title in so many of the Palestinian place-names, suggests a similar derivation for *Yĕrûshālem* : as if it were from the verb *Yarah*, and should mean *Shalem* or *Shalman*, *founds* ; or rather, since this meaning for *yarah* is not certainly possible, *Shalem* casts the *lot*. On the whole however, *shalem* is more probably a noun peace or an adjective *perfect* or secure. *Yeru* might be either a verb, *he* (the god) casts a *perfect* or *peaceful (lot)*, or a noun, as if secure *lot*. There are, however, other alternatives. The

<sup>1</sup> There is one curious Rabbinic explanation in the *Midrash Bereshith Rabba*, ch. 89. Abraham called the place יִרְאָה (Gen. xxii. 14), but Shem (*i.e.* Melchisedec) had called it שָׁלֵם (Gen. xiv.). The Almighty, unwilling to disappoint either Patriarch, gave it both names, *Yireah-Shalem* = *Yerushalem*. The numerical value of יִרְאָה and יְרוּ is the same. In the Greek and Latin *Onomastica* (see Lagarde, *Onom. Sacra*, and Nestle, *op. cit.* 154), Jerusalem is usually explained as ὄρασις εἰρήνης, *visio pacis*.

<sup>2</sup> יְרוּשָׁלַם, *possession of peace*, Reland and others ; יְרוּשָׁלַם (from ירה, *to throw down*) *the foundation of peace*, Gesenius *Thes.*, Gesenius-Buhl., *Lexicon*, 12th ed. (cf. Grill, *Z. A. T. W.* iv. 134 ff.); or *the foundation of security*, Merrill, *Bibl. World*, 1899, 270.

Arabic 'Arya means *abiding, continuous*; 'iryu, a *stable* or *stall*. And there is the common Semitic root 'ûr or 'îr, *to lighten*, from which we have the Hebrew 'ûr (אור), *fire* or *hearth*, and the Arabic 'Irat, *focus* or *hearth*, and 'awwar, *to kindle*. The probability of this latter derivation is increased if we read (with Canon Cheyne and others) Isaiah's name for Jerusalem, 'Ariel: *God's Lion*, as 'Uriel, **God's Hearth**, and suppose that the prophet formed it in analogy to the name of the City. Yerushalem would then signify *hearth of peace* or *inviolable hearth*. But all these are suppositions, none of which we have any means of proving. It is interesting that Saadya sometimes renders the name by Dâr es-Salâm, and sometimes by Medinat es-Salfim : the House or City of Peace? Worth noticing also is the suggestion that Yerushalem was originally a personal name; as is well known, it is used as such in the present day.<sup>3</sup>

We have now to pursue the history of the name through Greek and Latin to the languages of modern Europe.

The Hebrew Yêrûshâlêṃ appears in the Alexandrian translation as Ἰερουσαλήμ (Ierousalem) : the constant form in all those books of the Greek canon which have been translated from the Hebrew. As in Ierusalēm in the Septuagint and Clearchus. the case of so many other proper names in the Septuagint, it is an exact transliteration of the original, made before the vowel-points were inserted in the Hebrew text, and reflecting (as we have seen) the early

<sup>1</sup> xxviii. 2 ; אריותל.

<sup>2</sup> Nestle, *op. cit.* 154 ; cf. Medinat es-Salâm, the Khalif Mansur's official name for Baghdad (Noldeke, *Sketches from Eastern History*, 129).

<sup>3</sup> Franz Pratorius, *Z.D.M.G.* lvii. 782, quoted by Nestle, p. 153.

and common pronunciation of the name. The earliest appearance of this form in other Greek, which I have been able to discover, is that in a passage of Clearchus of Soli,<sup>1</sup> a pupil of Aristotle, which is quoted by Josephus? He gives it accurately, but with a Greek termination: Ierousalēm-ē. Since he says that it is 'altogether awkward' to pronounce—which he would hardly have asserted of the Hellenised form Hierosolyma—and since Josephus everywhere else uses Hierosolyma, we may be sure that in 'Ierousalēm-ē' we have the original spelling of Clearchus himself? And if this be so, it is another proof of the original pronunciation of the name.<sup>4</sup>

In the Septuagint and the citation by Josephus from Clearchus the light breathing should probably be prefixed to Ierousalem;<sup>5</sup> but in any case the rough Hierousalem. breathing came early into use: Hierousalem. This may have been originally due to an effort to express the consonantal force of the first letter;<sup>6</sup> but more probably arose from—and was at least confirmed by—the fashion prevalent in Western Asia from the third and second centuries B.c., of Hellenising proper names.

<sup>1</sup> End of the fourth and beginning of the third century B.C.

<sup>2</sup> *C. Apion*, i. 22: Τὸ δὲ τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν (i.e. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) ὄνομα πάνυ σκολιόν ἐστίν· Ἱερουσαλήμην γὰρ αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν. In the meantime the initial breathing is purposely omitted from Ἱερουσαλημη.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore Niese's note—'suspectum'—to the reading Ἱερουσαλημη (see Index to Niese's ed. of *Jos.* s.v.) is unnecessary.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 252.

<sup>5</sup> The edd. of the LXX. (except Swete's), and Niese's ed. of *Jos.*, prefix the *spiritus asper*. But in his ed. of the LXX. and *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek* Swete gives the light breathing, pp. 305, 313: and so Reinach in the excerpt from Clearchus (*Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, p. 11), but Muller (*Frag. Hist. Gr.* ii. 323) the rough.

<sup>6</sup> Yet initial *yod* is usually transliterated with the light breathing (e.g. Ἰορδάνης, Ἰησοῦς, etc.) except in such Hellenised forms as Ἱεροβοάμ, Ἱερεμιάς.

To the same source we may trace the further modification of the name into the plural noun Ἱεροσόλυμα (with or without the article), Hierosolyma. When this first appeared it is impossible to discover.

The earliest, directly recorded, instances of it, so far as I can trace, belong to the first century B.C. In Maccabees ii.-iv., in which the Septuagint spelling of proper names is so often followed,<sup>1</sup> we find not Ἱερουσαλεμ but Ἱεροσόλυμα; and so in the 'Letter of Aristeas'<sup>2</sup> (date doubtful) and in Strabo, quoting probably from an author who wrote soon after the Syrian campaign of Pompey in 63 B.C.<sup>3</sup> In Latin Cicero has it,<sup>4</sup> and subsequent writers, for example Pliny, Tacitus and Suetonius:<sup>5</sup> still in a plural form Hierosolyma. It was therefore in common use from the first century B.C. onwards. But it appears so uniformly in quotations from earlier Greek writers: that

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *Introd.* 313.

<sup>2</sup> Both with and without the article. See Thackeray's ed. in Swete's *Introd.* pp. 525 f. In this edition of Aristeas the rough breathing is prefixed; and it is a question whether the rough breathing should not also be prefixed in Maccabees ii.-iv., as in Tischendorf's ed. Swete gives the light breathing.

<sup>3</sup> See Reinach, *op. cit.* p. 97. It occurs, too, in Philo (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23), Plutarch, and so through Appian (*Syr.* 50), Dion Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* (xxxvii. 15 f., etc.), and subsequent writers: always as a plural and generally with the article. The edd. give the rough breathing.

<sup>4</sup> *Pro Flacco*, c. 28 §§ 68 f.

<sup>5</sup> Pliny, *H.N.* v. 14 f.; Tac. *HI.* ii. 4, v. 1; Suet. *Tit.* 5. We find it also on an inscription in the time of Claudius: [Hi]erosolymitana (*Corp. Inscr. Lat.* x. No. 1971).

<sup>6</sup> From Hecataeus of Abdera (c. 300 B.c.), in a fragment of Diodorus Sic. preserved by Photius; from Manetho (third cent. B.c.) in Jos. *C. Ap.* i. 14 f.; Berosus (under Antiochus Soter, 280-261 B.c.) in Jos. *C. Ap.* i. 19; from Menander of Ephesus (probably early in second century B.c.), and Dios (?) in Jos. viii. *Ant.* v. 3, cf. *C. Ap.* i. 17; from Agatharchides of Cnidus (under Ptolemy VI., 181-146 B.c.) in Jos. *C. Ap.* i. 22; from Polybius (c. 210-128 B.c.) in Jos. xvi. *Ant.* iii. 3; from Timochares (probably second century B.C.); Xenophon the topographer (? before the first century B.c.), and Philo 'the Elder,' a poet—all three in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* ix. 35,

we are justified in tracing its origin to some distance behind the first century; and all the more so that the materials for its formation were present in Greek literature and were quoted in connection with the Jews as early as the fifth century B.C. Josephus, who in his Hellenic fashion constantly employs the form Hierosolyma<sup>1</sup>—though he must have known better—derives it more than once<sup>2</sup> from Solyma, that is the Salem of Melchisedec.<sup>3</sup> He spells it Solyma because Greek writers had already used this shorter form and found for it an etymology of their own. He quotes<sup>4</sup> the Greek poet Choerilos, who, he thinks, in the fifth century B.C. had spoken of the Judæan range as the ‘Solyman mountains’;<sup>5</sup> and Manetho,<sup>6</sup> who speaks of the Hebrews, leaving Egypt, as the Solymites.<sup>7</sup> It was natural for classic writers to identify this name with that of the Lycian Solymi mentioned by Homer.<sup>8</sup> This appears to have been the origin of the form Hierosolyma, though we cannot help wondering if its resemblance to the name of Solomon had anything to do with

36, 37, cf. 20, 24; from Posidonius of Apamea (c. 135-51 B.C.) in Diod. Sic. xxxiv. (preserved by Photius). The historical Greek writers quoted here are all given in Muller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. But the student will find more convenient the collection of these extracts, and of those of pagan Latin writers given above and below, which has been drawn up by Théod. Reinach in his useful *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.

<sup>1</sup> Both with and without the article : e.g. *Ant.* V. ii. 2 ; VII. ii. 2, iii. 2 ; VIII. x. 2, 4 ; X. vii. 1 ; XI. i. 1, 3, iii. 1, 10, iv. 2, v. 6, 8.

<sup>2</sup> 1. *Ant.* x. 2 : 6 τῆς Σολυμᾶ βασιλεὺς : τὴν μέντοι Σολυμᾶ ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα. vi. B.J. x. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *C. Apion*, i. 22.

<sup>6</sup> *C. Apion*, i. 26.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xiv.

<sup>5</sup> Ἐν Σολύμοις ὄρεσιν.

<sup>7</sup> Οἱ Σολυμίται.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 2. Jos. VII. *Ant.* iii. 2 : ἐπὶ γὰρ Ἀβράμῳ . . . Σόλυμα ἐκαλεῖτο, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ αὐτὴν φασὶν ἰβες, ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρὸς ταύτ' ὠνόμασεν Ἱεροσόλυμα· τὸ γὰρ ἱερὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων γλῶτταν ὠνόμασε τὰ Σόλυμα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀσφάλεια.

its rapid acceptance.<sup>1</sup> The form Solyma, which Josephus<sup>2</sup> also uses as a feminine singular (indeclinable), appears as a plural neuter in Martial: and as an adjective, Solymus, in Valerius Flaccus, Staius, and Juvenal<sup>4</sup>—all at a time when the siege by Titus had made the name of the city very familiar throughout the Roman world. In Greek, Pausanias, in 175 A.D., also gives the form Solyma.<sup>5</sup>

So much, then, for the history of a false form. It is curious to observe that the one pagan writing in which the correct spelling, Ἱεροσαλήμ, is found (except the extract from Clearchus), is that ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to the pedantic Emperor Julian.<sup>6</sup>

The New Testament employs both forms, Ἱεροσαλήμ and Ἱεροσόλυμα. The former (indeclinable) is used mostly in the writings of Luke (about twenty-seven times in the Gospel and forty in Acts, as against the use of Ἱεροσόλυμα four times in the Gospel and over twenty in Acts<sup>7</sup>) and Paul; also in the Apocalypse and Hebrews. Grimm<sup>8</sup> has suggested that it has been selected where a certain sacred significance is intended: or in solemn appeals.<sup>10</sup> It has the article only when accompanied by an adjective.<sup>11</sup> The form Ἱεροσόλυμα appears as a singular feminine only once.<sup>12</sup> Elsewhere it is a neuter plural, as in Josephus

Ἱεροσαλημ  
and  
Ἱεροσόλυμα  
in the New  
Testament.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Menander of Ephesus: Σολόμων δ' Ἱεροσολύμων βασιλεύς; and Dios : τυραννῶν Ἱ. Σολόμων; both quoted in Jos. VIII. Ant. v. 3, and C. *Ap.* i. 17 f.

<sup>2</sup> Above, p. 262 n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Epigram.* xi. 94 (written in 96 A.D.).

<sup>4</sup> Val. Flaccus (fl. 70-90 A.D.), *Argonautica*, i. 13; Staius, v. 2, 138; Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 544.

<sup>5</sup> *Perieg.* viii. 16, 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Epist.* 25.

<sup>7</sup> Knowling on Acts i. 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Lex.* s.v.

<sup>9</sup> Gal. iv. 25.

<sup>10</sup> Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34. Add Luke xxiii. 28.

<sup>11</sup> Winer, *Gram.*, E.T., 125; yet see Acts v. 28.

<sup>12</sup> Matt. ii. 3. Here, as in Matt. iii. 5, it stands for the inhabitants of the city.

and Greek writers; so in all the Gospels: and Acts and Galatians. It occurs only in John with the article in the oblique cases.<sup>2</sup> It is doubtful whether either of the two forms should have the aspirate. Blass gives it to the Greek alone; Westcott and Hort deny it to both.

Following the Greek Testament the Vulgate has both the Hebrew and Greek forms, in some codices with the aspirate, in some without: Hierusalem and  $\text{Ἱεροσόλυμα}$  Hierosolyma, Ierusalem and Ierosolyma (fem. and neut.); these continue through the Christian centuries. The Pilgrim of Bordeaux<sup>3</sup> and Eucherius<sup>4</sup> write Hierusalem; Eusebius,  $\text{Ἱεροσσαλημ}$ ; Jerome, Ierusalem, Iero- and Hiero-solyma (fem. and neut.: Lag. *Onom. Sacr.*); Antoninus<sup>5</sup> and Arculf,<sup>6</sup> Hierosolima; Willibald, Bernard and Theodoric,<sup>7</sup> Ierusalem; Chroniclers of the Crusades, Hierosolyma and Hierusalem and Ierusalem;<sup>8</sup> documents of the Crusades, Hierosolyma.<sup>9</sup> The earliest French writings have Iherusalem,<sup>10</sup> Jerusalem, Jerusalen, and Jerusalem.<sup>11</sup> Barbour's *Brus*<sup>12</sup> has Ierusalem, and Spenser's *Faërie Queene*,<sup>13</sup> Hierusalem. The English Authorised Version of 1611 has Ierusalem

<sup>1</sup> *eg.* Matt. xx. 17; xxi. 1. (?); Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; John ii. 23, v. 2.  $\text{Ἱεροσόλυμα}$  always in Mk. and John.

<sup>2</sup> John v. 2, x. 22, xi. 18. So Winer, *op. cit.* p. 125. John v. 1 the acc. is without the article. On the whole N.T. use see Zahn, *Einkl. i. d. N. T.* ii. 311.

<sup>3</sup> 333 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> c. 427-440.

<sup>5</sup> c. 570.

<sup>6</sup> 680.

<sup>7</sup> Wil., c. 722; Bern., 867; Theod., c. 1172.

<sup>8</sup> Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

<sup>9</sup> Rohricht, *Regesta Regni Hieros.*

<sup>10</sup> In the *Cité de Ih.*, 1187.

<sup>11</sup> *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, from the end of the twelfth century; but in a revised form of somewhat later date (edited by Gaston Paris, 1897).

<sup>12</sup> iv. 29.

<sup>13</sup> Bk. I. canto x. 57.

in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, but Hierusalem in the New Testament.'

Thus Jerusalem (with some variants) comes to be the form in the languages of Europe. Hierosolyma, and the shortened Solyma, treated now as feminine, appear occasionally in poetry and romance.

We have seen that an early Arabic form of the name was 'Aurishalamu, of which also there were abbreviations Shalamu and Shallamu.<sup>2</sup> The Arabs, <sup>The Arabic</sup> however (as we shall see in next chapter), <sup>forms.</sup> commonly designate the City by epithets expressive of its sanctity, el Mukaddas, el Kuds, and the like. But modern Jews, Levantines, and native Christians throughout Palestine frequently use Yerusalem.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the use of the name in the Latin Version of the N.T., see Wordsworth and White, *Novum Test. . . . Latine sec. ed. S. Hieronymi*, notes to Marc. iii. 8, Luc. ii. 22, Ioh. i. 19, and Index.

<sup>2</sup> Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 83.

<sup>3</sup> *Z.D.P.* V. xvii. 257.



## CHAPTER X

### OTHER NAMES FOR THE CITY

**F**ROM first to last a number of other names and epithets have been given to Jerusalem, either derived, like Jebus, from her lords previous to Israel; or like Sion, extended from some point within her site; or expressive of her sanctity, like the series founded on the root K-D-SH; or imposed by her conquerors, like Aelia Capitolina and its derivatives. Of one of these, Sion, we have already traced the progress from its original use for the citadel on the East Hill to its extension over the whole City and the sacred community.<sup>1</sup> The others will be described in this chapter.

Of the first of them little requires to be said. We will discuss elsewhere the name of the Jebusite predecessors of Israel.<sup>2</sup> In Judges xix. 10 f., and in **Jebus.** I Chronicles xi. 4 f., the name Jebus<sup>3</sup> is applied to the City : *the same is Jerusalem*. There is, however, no other instance of it in the Old Testament, and its appearance in these two passages has been suspected. The second is certainly late, the work of the Chronicler about 300 B.C., and there is cause to doubt the integrity of the text of the first. The town, we know, had long before the time of the Judges been called Jerusalem ; and

<sup>1</sup> See above, ch. vi.

<sup>2</sup> See below, Ek. III. ch. i

<sup>3</sup> יְבוּסִים LXX. *Iebous*.

when a second name appears only in what are probably late texts, the inference is reasonable that it has been suggested by the name of the tribe which Israel found in possession of the site. At the same time, there can be no doubt about the Jebusites themselves—they are accredited by every line of the Hebrew tradition—nor that they held a certain amount of territory round their fortress. To this territory the name Jebus may easily have been given in the common speech both of the Canaanites and the Hebrews; and it would be rash to assert that it was never used of the town, and is only a late and artificial suggestion. In such uncertainty we must leave the question.<sup>1</sup>

Another possibly mistaken application of an ancient name to Jerusalem may be mentioned here. The chronicler calls the Temple Hill, *Mount of the Moriah*, Mount  
Moriah. *where a vision was made unto David*<sup>2</sup> (?).

Josephus identifies it with the place in *the Land of the Moriah*,<sup>3</sup> where Abraham prepared to sacrifice Isaac,<sup>4</sup> and this was also a Rabbinic tradition.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly Mount Moriah has become a usual name among both Jews and Christians for at least the East Hill of Jerusalem. But, in the first place, Abraham's *land of the Moriah* (if that be the proper reading, which is doubtful)<sup>6</sup> is unknown, the identification of it with the Temple Mount is very

<sup>1</sup> See G. F. Moore, *Judges (International Critical Commentary)*, 1895; K. Budde, *Das Buch der Richter (Kurzer Hand-Commentar)*, 1897; S. R. Driver, 'Jebus,' in Hastings's *D.B.*; G. A. Smith, *Enc. Bibl.* col. 2416; H. Guthe, Hauck's *R.-E.* viii. 638.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. iii. 1 : הַר הַמִּרְיָה אֲשֶׁר נִרְאָה לְדָוִד.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xxii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Josephus, i. *Ant.* xiii. 1, 2 : τὸ Μώριον ὄρος.

<sup>5</sup> Levy, *Neuhebr., u. Chald. Wörterbuch*, iii. 58; *Bereshith Rabbath*.

<sup>6</sup> See Driver's *Genesis*.

late, being ignored even by the Chronicler; and the Chronicler's own use of the name, to which he gives another origin, is also late and unsupported by any earlier passage in the Old Testament. Whatever place it belongs to, the name probably has nothing to do with vision.

Next in order we may conveniently refer to two foreign designations, both by conquerors of Judah. **At** the head of the list which Shishak<sup>1</sup> gives of the cities he took in Judah, stands the name **Rabbat** (?), **and the City of Judah.** **Rabbat**, with which some have suitably identified Jerusalem;<sup>2</sup> for the word means 'chief town' or 'capital.' And by the time that the Israelite territory had so shrunk as to become the mere suburbs of Jerusalem, Asarhaddon called Manasseh king not of the land, but of *the City, of Judah.*<sup>3</sup>

A number of names and epithets given by the Prophets and Psalmists may now be mentioned. Isaiah addresses O.T. Epithets: Jerusalem as '**Ariel**,<sup>4</sup> which as it stands may mean **The Lion of God**, and is often so translated. But as in Ezekiel the same word is used for *the altar-hearth*,<sup>5</sup> and as Isaiah himself speaks elsewhere of God having *a fire in Sion* and *a furnace in Jerusalem*,<sup>6</sup> and in his inaugural vision beheld the Divine Presence above the burning altar of the Temple, it is more probable

<sup>1</sup> See below, Bk. III. ch. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Sayce, *Academy*, 1891, Feb. 4 and 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Records of the Past*, cf. 2 Chron. xxv. 28; the parallel passage, 2 Kings xiv. 28, has *city of David*.

<sup>4</sup> xxix. i. : אֲרִיאֵל, 'Aryal.

<sup>5</sup> Ezek. xl. 15 f. (Kethibh); cf. אֲרִיאֵל on the Moabite stone, lines 12, 17. Cf. above on the Arabic 'Irat or 'Iryat = 'hearth,' p. 259.

<sup>6</sup> xxxi. 9, unless, as some think, this is a later addition.

that the name means *the hearth of God*. The Hebrew *Bath* or *Daughter* is often applied to the population of a town or country, and in this sense we are to take as names of Jerusalem the following: *Daughter of Sion*,<sup>1</sup> *Daughter of Jerusalem*,<sup>2</sup> *Daughter of my people*,<sup>3</sup> *Virgin daughter of Sion*.<sup>4</sup> Also it is called *The City of Righteousness* by Isaiah: and by the Psalms *The City of God*, or *of our God*, or *of Jahweh of Hosts*, or *of the Great King*.<sup>6</sup>

Daughter of Sion, etc.

City of Righteousness and of God.

By the time of the Exile Jerusalem had come to be known among her people as *The City*, in distinction from *The Land*;<sup>7</sup> and this is usual also in the Mishna. It is significant of the growth of her importance both material and spiritual, and of the absence of other cities in the rest of the now much diminished territory. Townships there were, and not a few fenced ones; but Jerusalem stood supreme and alone as *The City*.

The City.

In Deuteronomy Jerusalem is not named, but frequently implied as *the place where Jahweh will cause His Name to dwell*.<sup>8</sup> This concentration of the national worship upon her Temple, preceded as it had been by Isaiah's visions of the divine presence, and his declaration of God's purposes for His

The Holy City 'Ir haqodesh.

<sup>1</sup> Lam. ii. 1; iv. 22; Isa. lii. 2, etc. On this name see above, pp. 148 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. xxxvii. 22; Lam. ii. 13, 15, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Lam. iv. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. xxxvii. 22; Lam. ii. 13.

<sup>5</sup> i. 26.

<sup>6</sup> Psa. xlv. 4; xlvi. 1, 2, 8 (the references are to the English Bible); cf. Isa. lx. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Ezek. vii. 23; Jer. xxxii. 24 f.; Ps. lxxii. 16 (*they of the City*)—הָעִיר;

Isa. lxvi. 6 (עִיר).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ps. lxxiv. 7 : *dwelling-place of Thy Name*.

inviolable shrine, led to the name *The Holy City*; *Ir hak-Kōdesh*<sup>1</sup> (compare *My Holy Mount*<sup>2</sup>); and from this has started the long series of names meaning the same in many languages, which has continued to the present day. On the coins which are variously assigned to Simon Maccabaeus and to the First Jewish Revolt (66-70 A.D.), the legend is *Yerushalaim Kēdoskah*, or *Hak-Kedoshah*, Jerusalem the Holy. Matthew twice calls it 'Ἡ Ἁγία Πόλις<sup>3</sup>—so still in the Mosaic Map of Medeba (sixth Christian century). Philo has Ἱερόπολις,<sup>4</sup> a form which suggests the origin of the form Ἱεροσόλυμα (with the rough breathing).<sup>5</sup> So in Arabic the commonest designation is derived from the same Semitic root for *holy*, K-D-S. It appears in various forms *Bēt el-Makdis*, <sup>el-Mukaddas</sup> <sup>el-Kuds.</sup> 'domain or place of the Sanctuary'; *el Mukaddas* or *el Mukaddis*, 'the Holy';<sup>6</sup> or (in the modern vernacular) *el-Kuds esh-Sherif*, or more briefly *El-Kuds*, 'The Sanctuary.' In the East this is by far the commonest name to-day? The suggestion made by M. Clermont-Ganneau<sup>8</sup> that el-Mukaddas or el-Kuds betrays a reminiscence of a dedication of the sanctuary at Jerusalem to a Canaanite deity Kadish is interesting, but there is no evidence for it. And the derivation of the name from the immemorial sanctity of the City is sufficient.

To complete this list of names we may add, though it really lies beyond our period, the name imposed on

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xlviii. 2 ; lli. 1 ; Neh. xi. 1 ; cf. Dan. ix. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Joel ii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. iv. 5 ; xxvii. 53.

<sup>4</sup> In *Flaccum*, § 7.

<sup>5</sup> See above, pp. 261 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Yaḳut, iv. 590 ; Taj el 'Arus, iv. 214.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the Syriac *Kudsch*, *Kidusch*, or *Kudisch*.

<sup>8</sup> *Archæo. Researches in Palestine*, i. 186.

Jerusalem by her Roman conquerors. When the Emperor Hadrian destroyed so much of the City and gave her another shape than that of her native growth, he strove also to destroy the native name <sup>Aelia Capitolina, Kapitolias,</sup> by substituting *Aelia Capitolina*? Till the <sup>'Iliya.</sup> time of Constantine, and for at least two centuries later, *Aelia* remained the official name<sup>2</sup> and usual geographical designation;<sup>3</sup> was still longer continued in Christian writings;<sup>4</sup> and even passed over into Arabic as *'Iliya*.<sup>5</sup> From the other part of Hadrian's name came Ptolemy's *Καπιτολίαις*.

<sup>1</sup> Dion Cassius, lxi. 12. On the coins of Hadrian (and his successors down to Valerian) bearing the legend Col[onia] Ael[jia] Kapit[olina] and the like, see Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, ed. 1903, ch. xi. Aelia was from Hadrian's own family name, Capitolina from Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom he erected a temple on the site of the Jewish Temple.

<sup>2</sup> *e.g.* in Canons of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, vii. ; and in Acts of Synod held in Jerusalem, A.D. 536 (cited by Robinson, *B.K.* ii. 9).

<sup>3</sup> *Onomasticon* ; Eusebius, *Αἰλίαι* ; Jerome, *Aelia*.

<sup>4</sup> *E.g.* Adamnanus, *De Locis Sanctis*, i. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Yakut, iv. 592.