

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

THE AYER LECTURES OF THE
COLGATE-ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL

1941

By

WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT

PH. D., LITT. D., D. H. L., TH. D. (Utrecht)

*W. W. Spence Professor of Semitic Languages in the
Johns Hopkins University*



125064

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1942

monic system of administrative districts was continued, at least in principle, for a century and a half after his death. Moreover, the three provinces which Tiglath-pileser III created out of the annexed portions of the Northern Kingdom in 733 B. C., Megiddo, Dor and Gilead, correspond closely to the fourth, fifth and seventh districts of Solomon.⁴²

2. THE PLACE OF THE TEMPLE OF SOLOMON IN THE HISTORY OF ISRAELITE RELIGION

Few subjects in biblical research are so tantalizing as the Temple of Solomon. In spite of the space devoted to it in our sources, many points still remain obscure. Until recently the architectural plan and decoration of the Temple could not be related with confidence to any archaeological discoveries. Now, thanks especially to the recent treatments of Temple architecture by Möhlenbrink, Watzinger and Wright,⁴³ this problem is largely settled, as we shall see below. We shall also deal below, though all too briefly, with the related question of the character and purpose of the cultic installations described in Kings. Details of cult, however, must remain in many cases doubtful, because the Priestly Code restricts itself in principle to an account of the Tabernacle service in so far as it could be reconstructed from tradition in the late seventh and the sixth centuries B. C. There can be little doubt that many elements of liturgy and sacrificial practice were continued with relatively little change in the Temple of Solomon and that the practice in the latter profoundly influenced the tradition with regard to the former; but many uncertainties remain, as we shall see in selected instances.

For a long time there was no general agreement as to the type of national architecture to which the Temple of Solomon might best be attributed. The total absence of comparable Iron-Age building remains in Phoenicia and Syria made it diffi-

cult to assign it to Phoenician inspiration, and the closest parallels remained Greek. The latter were in part so close as to suggest some kind of reciprocal dependence, and more than one authority on Greek architecture felt himself forced to disregard the description of the Temple of Solomon entirely, on the ground either that it was unique and incommensurable or that it was to be dated after the sixth century B. C., when Hellenic influences were beginning to be felt throughout the Near East.⁴⁴ Discoveries of roughly contemporary buildings at Sham'al (Zendjirli) and Carchemish modified this attitude slightly; in 1933 Watzinger came out vigorously for a Phoenician or Syrian source, from which both Hebrews and Greeks drew their inspiration. In 1936 the Oriental Institute of Chicago excavated a small temple of about the ninth century at Tell Tainât in northern Syria; when the plan was published by C. W. McEwan in 1937 it became immediately certain that the missing Syrian parallel had been discovered.⁴⁵ This building was rectangular in form, divided into three connecting rooms: the portico, with two columns in front; the main hall; and the cella, with a raised platform in the rear. In length it was about two-thirds the size of the Temple of Solomon (omitting the side-chambers of the latter); in floor space it was also about two-thirds as large, since the width was proportionately greater. A very important respect in which the Temple of Solomon resembled Syrian structures of the Iron Age was in the practice of lining the interior walls above the orthostates with wood. Recent finds of carved ivories at Megiddo (early twelfth century), Samaria (ninth century) and elsewhere, together with the discovery of proto-Aeolic pilaster capitals at Megiddo (tenth century on), Samaria (ninth century) and elsewhere,⁴⁶ have thrown a great deal of light on the interior decoration of the Temple, which turns out to have been characteristically Phoenician, just as one might expect from the fact that it was built by a Tyrian architect.

Much light has already been shed on the two enigmatic columns of Jachin and Boaz. Such columns or pillars, flanking the main entrance to a temple, were common in the first millennium B. C. in Syria, Phoenicia and Cyprus; they spread eastward to Assyria, where they occur in Sargon's temples at Khorsabad (cir. 710 B. C.), and westward to the Phoenician colonies in the Western Mediterranean.⁴⁷ Some of these pairs of columns were used to support the roof of the portico, in megaron fashion, others were free-standing, without constructional relation to the building. There can be no reasonable doubt that the pillars Jachin and Boaz were of the latter type. There are a number of theories as to their function and significance:⁴⁸ they are supposed to have been sacred obelisks or *maššebôth* with phallic associations; others regard them as cosmic pillars (like the pillars of Hercules) or as representing the twin mountains between which the sun was believed to emerge each morning; some think that they reflect stylized sacred trees; Robertson Smith regarded Jachin and Boaz as gigantic cressets or fire-altars.⁴⁹ Robertson Smith's view has been treated by more recent scholars as fanciful, but the writer considers it essentially correct as applied to the two pillars before the Temple of Solomon. Since this question has not been discussed for many years and since the writer has unpublished material of vital significance to present,⁵⁰ a more detailed treatment is in order, especially since the problems involved are characteristic of similar problems in the field.

In 1920 the writer visited the painted tombs of Marisa (south of Beit Jibrin in southern Palestine) in company with their discoverer, the late J. P. Peters. In the second tomb, the so-called Tomb of the Musicians, dating from the late third century B. C., two paintings of candelabra were found on the two opposite piers leading from the vestibule into the main tomb-chamber. In a subsequent visit with C. C. McCown photo-

graphs, tracings and measured sketches were made. All trace of the painted candelabra has long since disappeared. Both candelabra are painted yellow, indicating that the originals were gilded or painted to imitate gold; the flaming wicks at the top were painted red. The height of the prototype represented by the paintings may be approximately deduced from the height of the accompanying worshippers, two of whom are shown standing with upraised hands beside each candelabrum. Since the worshippers are about one-third as tall as the cult-objects, the latter must be from fifteen to twenty feet high. L

We have referred to these objects as candelabra, in order not to anticipate our conclusions. Actually, however, they cannot have been simple candelabra, like the two metal candelabra from the tomb of Tabnit king of Sidon, which date from the late fourth century B. C.⁵¹ The latter are entirely different in shape, stand on a tripod and are only a third as high. Moreover, our objects were worshipped, which can scarcely have been true of simple light-giving cressets or candlesticks. They thus belong with a large class of incense-burners, also characterized by several horizontal projections of identical type (often replaced or supplemented by lily knobs), represented on Phoenician, Punic and Etruscan seals, coins and monuments dating chiefly from cir. 800-300 B. C.⁵² Most of the known examples have been collected by Karl Wigand, who applied the Greek term *thymiateria*, "stands for burning incense," to them.⁵³ The type in question undoubtedly originated in Phoenicia, from which it spread westward to Cyprus, Greece, Etruria, Carthage, and eastward to Mesopotamia. Representations show them either standing before a deity or priest, or flanking the entrance of a temple. In the latter case they are shown as slender free-standing shafts on either side of the main portal, characterized by the same horizontal projections, bowls and cones of incense or tongues of flame; their height, to judge from the adjacent

building, was comparable to that of the portico of the temple. It is naturally quite impossible to separate these objects from the similar shafts in the Tomb of the Musicians at Marisa, which have the same general form and the same immediate function, stood in pairs on either side of a portal, and were objects of adoration. The painted tombs of Marisa belonged to a Sidonian colony, as we are expressly told by an inscription commemorating its founder, Apollophanes, a statement amply confirmed by many specifically Phoenician names borne by deceased colonists. There is, accordingly, no possible doubt that these very un-Hellenic objects go back to Phoenician practice.

Another significant point illustrating the character of the incense-stands of Marisa is that they, like many other known objects of this class, incorporate the three or four horizontal projections which were peculiar to the Egyptian "djed" pillar, the sacred emblem of Osiris.⁵⁴ There is ample archaeological evidence for the popularity of the sacred symbol of Osiris in Palestine and Phoenicia. Locally made amulets in this peculiar form begin to appear before 1800 B. C. at Byblus.⁵⁵ A terra cotta mould from Israelite Samaria exhibits the same form.⁵⁶ Moreover, it is highly probable that the Phoenician god Šid, the vocalization of whose name is established by Greek and Latin transcriptions of theophorous names containing it, was originally identical with Egyptian Djid, the personified Osiris pillar.⁵⁷ The lily knobs were presumably decorative in origin, but they became characteristic elements of small incense-stands about the beginning of the Iron Age and continued in use for centuries thereafter. It is not at all probable that this class of metal incense-stands was called by the name *ḥammôn* (Heb. *ḥammân*), applied to incense-burning braziers and altars.⁵⁸ It is, however, instructive to note that the latter were associated in name with the god *Ba'al-ḥammôn* and were perhaps regarded as symbols of him.⁵⁹

As noted above, Robertson Smith suggested more than half a century ago that the pillars Jachin and Boaz were really lofty cressets. In support of this view he noted that the shafts of the two pillars were crowned with *gullôth* (I Kings 7: 41), and that *šebakôth* were added to cover the *gullôth*. Since *gullab* is the word used in Zech. 4: 3 for the basin of a lamp-stand with seven wicks,⁶⁰ and since *šebakah* means "network," hence "grating," this argument is very strong. Moreover, the crown of the shaft was adorned with lily-work, i. e., with lily knobs, just as in the case of the Megiddo incense-stand and of many later examples of Phoenician origin. Nor is it indifferent that the shafts were of copper or bronze, just as is attested in the case of the two shafts at Gades in Spain and just as must be inferred with regard to other such objects, including the prototypes of the incense-stands of Marisa (which seem to have been gilded). In height, too, the objects are comparable; the pillars at Gades are said to have been twelve cubits high, which is approximately the height of the prototypes of the Marisa paintings. The shafts at Jerusalem are said to have been eighteen cubits, or about twenty-seven feet, in height; the breadth attributed to them was about 3.8 cubits (cir. 5 ft. 9 inches), which scarcely seems probable. It may be that the original document from which the various biblical passages referring to the two pillars are derived, gave a circumference of two cubits, inadvertently reproduced by a copyist as "twelve," through one of the commonest types of scribal error (*homoioarkton*). Since the proportion of height to diameter of the shafts at Marisa was about 40: 1, the suggested ratio of 28: 1 is in no way abnormal. Whether the formulae from which the two names were abbreviated, were actually inscribed on the shaft or were transmitted by tradition is naturally an insoluble question.⁶¹

Since the two shafts of Jachin and Boaz thus go back to Phoenician models, there is reason to suppose that their sym-

bolic interpretation was influenced by Canaanite conceptions. As in the case of other cult-objects in the Temple (see below), they were presumably given a cosmic interpretation, *i. e.*, they may have been regarded as the reflection of the columns between which the sun rose each morning to pour its light through the portico of the Temple into its interior.⁶² Like the Egyptian "djed" symbol they may also have denoted "endurance, continuity," in which case their dynastic role would become self-evident. A third possibility is that they were interpreted historically to commemorate the pillar of cloud which accompanied the Israelites by day and the pillar of fire which went with them by night during their wanderings in the desert. At night the burning wicks of the *gullab* and in the day the smoking incense might well be associated with Israelite traditional history. However this may be, we may be sure that Jachin and Boaz possessed rich symbolic meaning to the men of Judah during the time of their existence.

Archaeological finds have thrown a great deal of light on the furnishings and cult-objects of the Temple. Thus the portable lavers,⁶³ fire-shovels, flesh-hooks, etc., are now well known.⁶⁴ The cherubim have been discussed elsewhere;⁶⁵ in any case they were inherited from the Tabernacle and cannot figure among cultic innovations in the Temple. We shall, accordingly, restrict our attention to the copper Sea, as well as to the altar of burnt offering and the portable platform, since the symbolic meaning of the latter two has been practically disregarded. Since the first two and probably the third were invested with cosmic symbolism of great interest, they are particularly instructive.

The Sea (I Kings 7: 23-26) has been universally recognized as having cosmic significance of some kind.⁶⁶ In function it cannot be separated from the Mesopotamian *apsû*, employed both as the name of the subterranean fresh-water ocean from

which all life and all fertility were derived and as the name of a basin of holy water erected in the temple.⁶⁷ All these cosmic sources of water were conceived in mythological imagery to be dragons, as we know from Accadian, where *tî'âmtu*, "sea," and *apsû* were both portrayed in art and myth as dragons,⁶⁸ from Canaanite, where the same is true of *yammu*, "sea," and *naharu*, "river,"⁶⁹ and from Biblical Hebrew, where we find *tehôm* (etymologically identical with *tî'âmtu*),⁷⁰ *yam*, "sea,"⁷¹ and *neharôth*, "rivers,"⁷² all described as dragons. In Hebrew the word *yam* means "(large) river" and "fresh-water lake" as well as "sea" in the English sense. In our case we cannot, however, be sure whether the designation *yam* came originally from inland, referring to pure fresh water as the source of life, or from the coast of the Mediterranean, in which case it referred to the Mediterranean as the main source of Canaanite livelihood. In view of the ease with which motifs can be transferred and of the highly syncretistic character of Phoenician culture, the question is not vitally significant; either or both alternatives may be correct. The relation between the Sea and the portable lavers was like that between the *apsû* and the *egubbê*, "portable basins of holy water," in Babylonian temples.⁷³ Scholars of the pan-Babylonian school have falsely interpreted the Sea as the heavenly ocean and the twelve oxen (properly bulls) which supported it as the twelve signs of the zodiac. Unfortunately cuneiform evidence is increasingly opposed to the idea that the twelve signs of the zodiac had come into astrological use so early. The oldest known list of twelve zodiacal signs is much more recent, as has been pointed out by Weidner; the Babylonian proto-zodiac had seventeen signs.⁷⁴ It is much more probable that the twelve bulls (which the "oxen" must have been intended to represent) are partly symbolic, partly decorative in origin.⁷⁵ The bull was one of the most popular symbols of fecundity in the ancient Near

East; the animal was almost invariably associated with the rain-giver Hadad (Baal), but also appears in connection with the life-giving water of rivers and the underworld.⁷⁶ The four-fold arrangement in groups of three clearly represents the four seasons of the year, well attested in Jewish and Arabic calendars, and traceable at least as far back as the third century B. C.⁷⁷ In connection with the circular arrangement of the twelve oxen, it is interesting to note that the Hebrew word for "season" is etymologically connected with the Ugaritic word for "year," and that it originally meant "cycle, orbit" (Psalms 19: 6) from a common Semitic verb meaning "to encircle."⁷⁸ The arrangement in four groups was presumably also connected with the four directions. From the decorative point of view it may be noted that the use of animal supports for sacred objects and pieces of furniture became very common in the Iron Age, and is found in the case of images of deities, thrones, beds, etc.

It was shown more than twenty years ago that the altar of burnt offering, a description of which, with valuable details of terminology, has been handed down to us from Exilic times, reflects Mesopotamian cosmic ideas.⁷⁹ Subsequent treatments of the altar by de Groot and Galling⁸⁰ have missed this point. According to the description in Ezekiel 43: 13-17⁸¹ the altar of burnt offering was built in three square stages, each with a side two cubits shorter than the stage below it; the sides of the three stages were, respectively, twelve, fourteen and sixteen cubits long. The lowest stage was set on a foundation-platform called the "bosom of the earth" (*beq ha-'ares*).⁸² This foundation-platform was set in the pavement, its upper surface being apparently level with the surrounding pavement, but distinguished from it by a "boundary." The total height of the three stages was ten cubits, agreeing thus exactly with the height of the altar recorded in Chronicles.⁸³ The "twenty

cubits" stated by the Chronicler to be the length and breadth of the altar, may either be a round number, or it may reflect the side of the foundation-platform, which is not easy to reconstruct with certainty from the present text, but seems to have been between 18 and 20 cubits. Galling has recently noted that the dimensions of the Temple of Ezekiel are substantially the same as those of the Solomonic Temple as given in Kings, and that the differences may readily be explained if we assume that the ruins of the Temple were actually measured by the Exilic prophet, who lacked precise information from a documentary source.⁸⁴ In the case of the altar we may suppose either that the "twenty cubits" of Chronicles is a round number, or that Ezekiel's figures are given from memory and do not coincide precisely with the original dimensions. It stands to reason that any priest who had been a member of the Temple staff would know the approximate dimensions of the altar from memory, simply by relating them to the height and limbs of a man. The summit of the altar, which was crowned by four "horns" at the four corners, is repeatedly given the curious name *'arel* or *har'el*, erroneously explained by most scholars as "hearth of God," or the like.⁸⁵ Actually this *'r*, the vocalization of which is rather uncertain, can be shown to mean "underworld, denizen of the underworld,"⁸⁶ and is almost certainly derived from Accadian *Arallu* or *Arallû*,⁸⁷ which has the dual sense of "underworld" and "mountain of the gods," the cosmic mountain in which the gods were born and reared according to an Assyrian text.⁸⁸ The expression *har'el* actually means "mountain of God"; it is thus a slight popular etymology of the Accadian loan-word. Such borrowing from Sumero-Accadian is no more remarkable than the fact that the Canaanites borrowed the Sumerian *egal*, "temple, palace," with which several names of Sumerian temples begin,⁸⁹ or the Sumero-Accadian word *kiuru* (*kîyôr*), on which see the discus-

sion below. Moreover, there is a still more unexpected borrowing from Accadian in the name of the foundation-platform, "bosom of the earth," since exactly the same expression, *irat eršiti* or *irat kigalli*, "bosom of the earth, bosom of the underworld," was employed in the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar for the foundation-platform of the royal palace and of the great temple-tower of Marduk in Babylon, Etemenanki, the "Tower of Babel."⁹⁰ Lest a wholly unwarranted lowering of dates be based on this parallel with the texts of the early sixth century, it must be emphasized that the latter archaize very strongly and that the expressions are much older.

These parallels become intelligible as soon as we recall that the Mesopotamian temple-tower was also built in stages and that its summit was similarly called *ziqquratu*, literally "mountain-peak," while Sumerian names of temple-towers very often refer to them as cosmic mountains (*kbursag* or *kur*). Moreover, the summits of temple-towers were also adorned with four "horns," as we know both from inscriptions and from monumental representations.⁹¹ It is, accordingly, not surprising that the foundation-platform (Accadian *temennu*) should also receive the same unusual designation "bosom of the earth" in both the Mesopotamian temple-tower and the Israelite altar. In any case we may safely regard the form of the altar, together with its symbolism, as derived from Phoenicia, where it went back to older Canaanite borrowings from Mesopotamia.

The Chronicler has preserved another very interesting tradition, omitted in Kings, according to which Solomon stood before the altar on a copper *kîyôr*, five cubits square and three high, while he prayed to Yahweh (II Chron. 6: 12-13). Otherwise the *kîyôr* appears frequently, especially in the description of the Tabernacle and Temple, as the name of a portable laver of copper. The dimensions of the latter *kîyôr* are given as four

cubits (in diameter); in the Temple of Solomon it stood on a wheeled carriage four cubits square and three high. Name, material and dimensions show that we are actually dealing with comparable objects. We may perhaps infer that the lavers were square instead of being round like the similar portable lavers of Late-Bronze Cyprus. There can be little doubt that the portable platform on which Solomon stood to pray before Yahweh must be compared with two Syrian monumental representations to which attention was called by the late Heinrich Schäfer in 1937.⁹² In a limestone stela found at Ugarit in 1932 a king is shown praying to the storm-god Baal; the stela may be dated about 1400 B. C.⁹³ The king is shown standing on a chest or tub, apparently of metal and provided with a lid. His hands are upraised in the attitude of prayer. A stela from Lower Egypt in the Cairo Museum, published many years ago by W. Max Müller,⁹⁴ portrays a Syrian bearded god standing on a lion, with the Egyptian divine scepter in his hand. Before him stands a votary, perhaps a priest, with upraised hand; an altar of incense stands at one side. This votary also stands on a chest, this time a square or oblong box on legs. Here also the chest has a lid, as indicated by a short handle projecting in front. Judging from relative heights, the chest on which the king stands at Ugarit was about a cubit high, whereas the chest in the Egyptian stela was about two cubits high (counting the legs). It is rather obvious that the Biblical account refers to the same practice, though it may have been quite differently motivated. Whether the copper platform was designed merely to lend resonance to the speaker's voice or whether it also contained sacred objects on which the votary relied to add efficacy to his prayer,⁹⁵ we cannot say.

The name *kîyôr* is very significant. In Accadian it occurs in the inscriptions of Sargon II of Assyria repeatedly as a word for "copper caldron" (of unknown shape, but sometimes

large enough to hold fifty measures of liquid); it is regularly spelled *kiuri* in one text, *ki-ûr* in the other.⁹⁶ But the latter spelling is found repeatedly in cuneiform vocabularies and Sumerian texts with the meanings "foundation-platform" (*durushshu* [with synonyms *ishdu* and *temennu*] and *kigallu* [see above]) and "entrance to the underworld" (*nêrib eršiti*). The phonetic form of the Sumerian word is fixed by the fact that the spelling *ki-ûr* alternates with *ki-ûr*.⁹⁷ Hebrew *kîyôr*, "platform" and "laver," thus goes back to a Sumerian word meaning literally "foundation of the earth," with cosmic significance (it is employed also in temple-names, as in *E-ki-ûr-ra*, "House of the Foundation of Earth"). There is not enough material available to enable us to go farther⁹⁸—the implications are clear.

Our survey of the hitherto unrecognized or misunderstood cosmic significance of various parts of the construction and paraphernalia of the Temple of Solomon proves that the latter possessed a rich cosmic symbolism which was largely lost in later Israelite and Jewish tradition. Its existence is very important for correct understanding of the religion of Yahweh in the early monarchy. That Yahweh was universal deity in the time of the Judges we have already seen in Chapter IV, though increasing particularistic tendencies might occasionally dim the cosmic significance of Israel's God. But in the time of David and especially of Solomon there was no longer room for any doubt as to the universal character of Yahweh's dominion. For a good sixty years Israel was a state with imperial pretensions. As we have seen above in this chapter, David and Solomon controlled virtually all Palestine and Syria except the kingdoms of Sidon and Hamath; all the deities of the conquered lands were therewith eliminated from serious competition with Yahweh. In the Temple Yahweh was enthroned as the sole ruler of the entire cosmos; heaven, earth and underworld were

all subject to him; all functions of all pagan deities were gathered into his hands. The Temple further symbolized the permanence of the Davidic dynasty, which was expected to stand as long as the two cosmic pillars Jachin and Boaz. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that there is no room here for territorial henotheism. The cosmic monotheism of Solomon's Temple makes Mosaic monotheism a *sine qua non* for the comprehension of early Israelite religious history, since there is no suggestion in any of our sources that a paramount spiritual leader had arisen between Moses and David.

At the same time there was a serious spiritual weakness in the new Temple, with its elaborate organization and its heavy indebtedness to Syro-Phoenician religious architecture and practice. The danger of syncretism became very great—so great that the following centuries were, to a considerable degree, characterized by bitter intermittent conflict between religious assimilators and religious separatists. The first official concessions were made by Solomon himself when he allowed shrines and altars of foreign deities to be built in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem itself. Whether this concession was only political or tinged with syncretistic practice we cannot say. However, there were still undoubtedly many vestiges of Canaanite cult which survived among the people, and Solomon's concessions can only have encouraged the partial relapse into paganism with which Deuteronomic tradition credits the next two generations. /

3. ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY

The paganizing movement which may be said to have been inaugurated with the building of the Temple and to have been accelerated by Solomon's tolerance of pagan cults within the very shadow of the Temple, continued and developed to dangerous extent during the next two generations. In the

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

Philistia (I Kings 9: 16), cannot be called serious; the text seems to be corrupt (there are now two successive statements that Solomon built Gezer), since Macalister found no trace of destruction by fire in this period, and since it is geographically and historically improbable (for my substitute theory that "Gezer" is here a corruption of "Gerar" see my discussions JPOS, 1924, pp. 142-4, and AASOR XII, § 98).

²⁰ *Amos Studies* (1941), pp. 183-205.

²¹ See his valuable study, *Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina* (1930), *passim*.

²² See Alt, "Jerusalems Aufstieg," in *Zeits. Deutsch. Morg. Ges.*, 1925, 1-19.

²³ Alt, *op. cit.*, p. 48; cf. Albright, JBL LI (1932), p. 80.

²⁴ See Albright, *loc. cit.*

²⁵ Möhlenbrink, *Der Tempel Salomos* (1932); cf. FSAC 225.

²⁶ Scott, JBL LVIII (1939), pp. 143 ff.

²⁷ See especially Alt, *Alttestamentliche Studien zu R. Kittels 60. Geburtstag* (1913), pp. 1 ff.; Albright, JPOS, 1925, pp. 25 ff.

²⁸ I adhere as strongly as ever to my former view on this point, in spite of Alt, *Staatenbildung*, p. 54, n. 30.

²⁹ See his study, "Samarie aux temps d'Achab," in *Syria*, 1925-1926.

³⁰ JPOS, 1925, pp. 38 ff.; 1931, pp. 248 ff. For the latest bibliographic survey of the material see Diringer, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (1934), pp. 50-57. I am more than ever convinced that none of the places mentioned in these ostraca is located outside Western Manasseh.

³¹ See BASOR 73, 21, n. 38. Increasingly numerous epigraphic finds make it certain, in my judgment, that the ostraca published by Reisner in 1924 date from the reign of Jeroboam II. Since the ostraca extend from the ninth to the seventeenth year of some king (see below, n. 110), Jeroboam's predecessor, who is credited with only sixteen years, drops out. Epigraphically these ostraca cannot go back into the ninth century.

³² See Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches* (1921), pp. 60 f., 69; Albright, JPOS, 1925, pp. 43 f.; Alt, *Zeits. Deutsch. Paläst.-Ver.*, 1929, pp. 220-242, where Alt has brilliantly refuted Jirku's attempts to weaken Forrer's system.

³³ See K. Möhlenbrink, *Der Tempel Salomos* (1932), which is by far the most thorough recent treatment, but is archaeologically rather weak; C. Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palästinas*, I (1933), pp. 88-95, admirable from the comparative archaeological side; G. E. Wright, *The Biblical Archaeologist*, IV, 2 (May, 1941), brief but excellent, utilizing material of first importance which has only now become available.

³⁴ A drastic illustration is the work of Gabriel Leroux, *Les origines de l'édifice hypostyle* (1913), pp. 159-162. Because Leroux rejected the idea that there could be Phoenician influence on early Greek architecture he was forced to deny the validity of the striking parallel to the earliest classical Greek temple-plans which is provided by the Temple of Solomon. The discovery of the Tainât temple has effectually spiked this point of view, since it has practically

the same ground plan as some of the archaic Doric temples, e. g., at Syracuse and Selinus, but is over two centuries older than they are. Temples C and D at Selinus, which resemble the Tainât plan very closely, are generally dated cir. 570-560 B. C. (cf. e. g., D. S. Robertson, *Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture*, 1929, pp. 71 ff., and chronological tables).

⁴⁶ *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1937, p. 9, fig. 4; Wright, *Biblical Archaeologist*, May, 1941, p. 21 and fig. 3. On the comparative architectural associations of this type cf. V. Müller, *JAOS* 60 (1940), p. 162.

⁴⁶ Cf. the observations of G. E. Wright, *loc. cit.* There is crying need for an up-to-date critical study of all this accumulated material, for which see especially the recent survey by C. Watzinger, *Handbuch der Archäologie* (1938), pp. 805-816. To this must now be added the remarkable collection of ivories from the thirteenth century and the first half of the twelfth, discovered in 1937 at Megiddo (Gordon Loud, *The Megiddo Ivories*, 1939), as well as an important painted pilaster capital of the proto-Aeolic type, found in Stratum V (cir. 1050-950 B. C.) of Megiddo in 1935.

⁴⁷ Cf. Scott's list, *JBL*, 1939, pp. 143 f.

⁴⁸ Cf. Scott, *ibid.*, pp. 144 f.

⁴⁹ *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, new edition (1894), pp. 487-490.

⁵⁰ Cf. my article in *BASOR* 85.

⁵¹ See Th. Reinach and Hamdy Bey, *Une nécropole royale à Sidon* (1892), pp. 89 f. and fig. 35.

⁵² The coins are later, but reflect traditional practice.

⁵³ Karl Wigand, *Thymiateria* (*Bonner Jahrbücher*, No. 122, 1912).

⁵⁴ For the soundest and one of the most recent iconographic analyses of the early Egyptian *djed* pillar see H. Schäfer in *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith* (1932), pp. 424 ff.

⁵⁵ See Montet, *Byblos*, Plate LIV: 241-5.

⁵⁶ *Harvard Excavations at Samaria*, II, Plate 64 m.

⁵⁷ In Old Coptic we find the pronunciation *iat* preserved; since Coptic short *a* reflects New Egyptian short *i* in accented closed syllables, we may safely reconstruct the original as *djid*. The Egyptian sound conventionally transcribed *dj* virtually always appears in Semitic transcriptions of Egyptian words as *sade*, and inversely Semitic *š* is transliterated *dj* in Egyptian in all historical periods.

⁵⁸ For *hammân*, "incense-stand," see H. Ingholt, in *Mélanges Dussaud*, Vol. II (1940), and K. Elliger, *ZAW*, 1939, pp. 256-65, who conclusively disposes of Lindblom's objections (cf. *FSAC* 333, n. 45). The original sense of the word *hammân* must have been "stand for heating, brazier," from the common Semitic verb *hmm*, "be hot," causative "to heat." The word then applied primarily to a large class of terra-cotta braziers and objects of similar form and function, including incense-stands; for previous treatment cf. especially Watzinger, *Tell el-Mutesellim*, II (1929), pp. 38 f., May, *Material Remains of the Megiddo Cult* (1935), pp. 20-23, Alan Rowe, *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-shean* (1940), pp. 52 ff. I am not suggesting that all these objects were braziers or incense-stands; some were undoubtedly pot-stands, others were stands for offerings, still others were sacred "flower-pots." The largest and

most instructive collection remains that from the archaic temples of Ishtar at Assur, where we can distinguish sharply between high narrow stands (which continue in the West down to about the twelfth century B. C.), squat stands of brazier type, and "house"-stands, the original purpose of which is obscure. For the conclusive demonstration that the tall slender terra-cotta stands of the second millennium B. C. were suitable for use as braziers see Ingholt's experimental proof, *Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Archaeol.-kunsthist. Meddelelser*, III, 1 (Copenhagen, 1940), pp. 52 f. and plate XVI, 1. From at least as early as the tenth century B. C. until the Roman period we have slender limestone altars of incense with four horns, clearly identified as *hammānim* by the evidence cited by Ingholt and Elliger. It would seem that the stone altars replaced pottery stands at the beginning of the Iron Age.

⁸⁹ The problem of this deity, who was worshipped at Sham'al in northern Syria in the ninth century and who later became the chief god of the Tyrian colonists at Carthage, is still unsolved. The recent theory of Hurrian origin is possible, but very questionable. Cf. most recently Eissfeldt, *Ras Schamra und Sanchuniaton*, pp. 36-42.

⁹⁰ Cf. AASOR XVII (1938), § 5 and n. 3.

⁹¹ For these inscriptions see above, n. 36.

⁹² For the cosmic pillars cf. Job 26: 11. On this motif, and on the supposed exact orientation of the Temple to permit the rays of the rising sun to shine directly into the Holy of Holies at the autumnal equinox, see especially Morgenstern, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VI (1929), pp. 1-38; Hollis, *Myth and Ritual* (edited by S. H. Hooke), pp. 87 ff.; H. G. May, *JBL* LVI (1937), pp. 309 ff. While Morgenstern's argument is impressive I am still a little skeptical. Hollis's far-reaching suggestions cannot be taken seriously; cf. my review, *JPOS*, 1934, pp. 154 f.

⁹³ Their name, *kīyôr*, is also Mesopotamian, as shown by the fact that the word appears as *kiuru* in the Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon II, with the same meaning, and that it has a Sumerian etymology (see below in the text, on the portable platform with the same name). The writer called attention to this equation in 1916 (*JAOS* 36, p. 232; cf. *JAOS* 40, p. 317, n. 18), and the combination of *kīyôr* with *kiuru* was again made much later by J. Friedrich, quite independently (see *Archiv Orientalni*, 1932, pp. 66-70). Friedrich's view that the word is of Urartian origin is improbable; it is far more likely that Ur. *kiri* was derived from *kiuri*. It may be observed that he cites (as having parallel formation in Hebrew) the word *kīshôr*, "spindle" (synonymous with *pelek*, derived from Accadian *pilakku*), which has been happily derived from a Sumerian **ki-sur*, literally, "place of spinning." Note the identity of vocalization in both equations.

⁹⁴ Cf. Wright, *The Biblical Archaeologist*, May, 1941, pp. 28 ff.

⁹⁵ On the cherubim see Dhorme and Vincent, *Revue Biblique*, 1926, pp. 328 ff., 481 ff.; Graham and May, *Culture and Conscience* (1936), pp. 195 f., 249 ff.; Albright, *The Biblical Archaeologist*, I, 1 (1938). There is now a great deal more material which is available for the corroboration of the thesis that the cherub was conceived as a winged sphinx (human-headed lion).

⁶⁶ E. g., Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 3rd ed. (1927), p. 329. For older discussions cf. Benzinger in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, col. 4341.

⁶⁷ Cf. A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, 3rd ed. (1916), p. 488 and n. 1. His reference to the *apsû* is correct (cf. Albright, *AJSL* XXXV [1919], p. 185, etc.), but it is very unlikely that the *tâmtu* which was set up by the Cossaeon king Agum II (cir. 1500 B. C.) in the temple of Shamash, in connection with his celebration of the return of the images of Marduk and Šarpânîr, had anything to do with a basin of water, even if the reading is correct, which is uncertain.

⁶⁸ Even the Deluge, *abûby*, was portrayed in art as a winged dragon; cf. Amarna, No. 22 (Knudtzon edition), iii: 5, 25; ii: 51; iv: 4; Thureau-Dangin, *Huitième campagne de Sargon* (1912), lines 373, 379.

⁶⁹ See JPOS, 1936, 18.

⁷⁰ E. g., Gen. 49: 25; Deut. 33: 13; Psalms 42: 8 (7); 148: 7.

⁷¹ E. g., Isa. 51: 10; Job 3: 8 (JBL LVII, 227); 7: 12; 9: 8; 26: 12; Psalms 74: 13.

⁷² E. g., Psalms 74: 15; Hab. 3: 8-9 (cf. Cassuto, *Annuario di Studi Ebraichi* 1935-1937, Rome, 1938, pp. 17 ff.).

⁷³ For untenable speculations on this subject see L. Venetianer, *Ezechiels Vision und die salomonischen Wasserbecken* (Budapest, 1906). He explains the *ôfannim* as "water-channels" instead of as "wheels," comparing Accadian *epinnu*, but the latter is now known to mean "plough," as first shown by M. Witzel.

⁷⁴ Cf. Weidner, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, VII (1931), pp. 170-178, especially pp. 174 f.

⁷⁵ Animals became most popular as supports of furniture precisely in the Early Iron Age. In the second millennium we frequently find animals decorating the sides of basins (e. g., AASOR XVII, § 76).

⁷⁶ Cf. JAOS 40, 316 f.

⁷⁷ See Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, I, pp. 45-48.

⁷⁸ The stem appears as *nqp*, whence also Ugaritic *nqpt*, used in parallelism with *înt*, "year." Heb. *teqûfab*, "season," is derived from the secondary *qwp*, "encircle," which is closely related to South Arabic *qyf* with the same meaning (cf. Rhodokanakis, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1936, pp. 216 ff.).

⁷⁹ Albright, *JBL* XXXIX (1920), pp. 137-142.

⁸⁰ J. de Groot, *Die Altäre des salomonischen Tempelhofes* (1924), which is original in its ideas, but must be used with caution; K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon*, p. 22; Galling in A. Bertholet, *Hesekiel* (1936), pp. 153 ff.

⁸¹ I see no reason to doubt that this passage refers to the original altar of burnt offering as built by Solomon, presumably described from memory (see n. 84, below) and very possibly altered somewhat in detail during the intervening centuries.

⁸² The Targum renders this peculiar expression as *tashwithâ*, "pavement."

⁸³ There is no reason to suppose that the omission of this description by the editor of Kings was due to anything but accident; the religious reasons sometimes adduced are arbitrary.

⁸⁸ Cf. Galling in Bertholet, *Hesekiel*, pp. xix-xxi.

⁸⁹ See my remarks JBL, 1920, p. 139. The false assumption that the first element in the word *ari'el*, etc., means etymologically "hearth" seems ineradicable. That the *har'el* served as an "altar-hearth" is true, but there is nothing in the name to require this interpretation.

⁹⁰ A few indications must suffice; the subject will be taken up elsewhere in detail. The word first occurs as a Canaanite loan in Egyptian (thirteenth century), used synonymously with *'udir* (Heb. *'ôzer*), "helper," and *dubî* (Heb. *šôbe'*), "warrior(s)" in Pap. Anastasi I, 23: 9, in the sense of "warrior, hero," or the like; it is written *'i-ir-'i-ra*, i. e., *'er'el*, since there was no *l* in Egyptian (for the vocalization cf. Albright, *Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*, 1934, p. 35, III. C). Next it occurs in the same sense II Sam. 23: 20. In the Moabite Stone, lines 12-13, we must probably render, "And I brought back from there Ôri'el (Uriel) its chief (*dawid*, used as in the Mari documents) and I dragged him before Chemosh at Qeriyôt." This passage thus drops out of the picture. In Isa. 29: 1 ff., we have some remarkably interesting plays on words, using the word first in the sense of "hero," second in that of "shade." Since it is a dirge, closely imitating Canaanite models and employing many Canaanite words, the following lines are significant:

And thou shalt become like an *'er'el* (so for *'ari'el* of the text) . . .

And lower than the ground shalt thou speak,

and thy utterance shall sink below the dust;

And thy voice shall be like a ghost from the underworld,

and from the dust shalt thou chirp thy utterance.

For a possible occurrence in a ninth-century Phoenician inscription from Cyprus see BASOR 83, p. 16 and n. 12. The shift in meaning from "hero" to "shade" or inversely was common in the ancient Near East; cf. Heb. and Can. *refa'im*, "Rephaim," and Greek *hērōs*. Other data of equally striking character will be dealt with elsewhere.

⁹¹ Cf. my discussion JBL, 1920, p. 137.

⁹² This mountain, which bore the Accadian name *Kbursân* (without ending, and hence to be treated as a proper name, "The Mountain") has been discussed by H. Zimmern, *Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest, zweiter Beitrag* (Leipzig, 1918), pp. 3 f., n. 2.

⁹³ That this word was borrowed directly from Sumerian, not through Accadian as usual, has been happily suggested by A. Poebel, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XXXIX (1929), p. 145; cf. JAOS 57 (1937), 71, n. 95.

⁹⁴ On the Tower of Babel see H. Gressmann, *The Tower of Babel* (New York, 1928), pp. 1-19. For the latest and most reliable reconstruction of the *zigguratu* E-temen-an-ki at Babylon, see W. Andrae, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 71 (1932), pp. 1 ff.

⁹⁵ Cf., e. g., the Rassam Cylinder of Sardanapalus, vi: 29, and the *šit šamsi* of *Šilkhak-in-Shushinak*, king of Elam in the twelfth century B. C. (Vincent, *Canaan*, p. 144), which exhibits two stage-altars or temple-towers (?), each with four broken-off "horns" at the four corners of the top stage.

⁹⁶ *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache*, 73, pp. 54 ff.

⁹⁸ See Schaeffer, *Syria*, XIV, pp. 122 f. and plate XVI.

⁹⁹ *Egyptological Researches*, I (1906), p. 30 and plate 40.

¹⁰⁰ The shape suggests a possible connection with the sacred box which was the palladium of Israel for so many centuries.

¹⁰¹ See above, n. 63.

¹⁰² Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar*, p. 49.

¹⁰³ For possible associations cf. JAOS 40, p. 317, n. 18.

¹⁰⁴ FSAC 228-30 and references. I hope to publish my treatment of this material at length soon.

¹⁰⁵ I cannot agree at all with Morgenstern's ingenious and plausible discussion of I Kings 13 in his *Amos Studies*, I (1941), pp. 161 ff. His treatment of the date of Jeroboam's annual pilgrimage feast at Bethel (*ibid.*, pp. 146-160) is useful because it directs attention to neglected features of the problem, but I cannot accept his conclusion. To me it is far more likely that Jeroboam revived an obsolete—or nearly extinct—alternative date for the festival, which was already celebrated in Jerusalem at the same time of the year as we find to be the case later. Jeroboam undoubtedly posed as a reformer, not as an innovator, and his changes were clearly intended to restore older practices (cf. Ex. 32) which had been abandoned by normative Yahwism, or which had been supplanted by the latter.

¹⁰⁶ "Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel" in *Festschrift Georg Beer* (1935), pp. 1-18.

¹⁰⁷ In his valuable study, "Ba'alšamēm und Jahwe," ZAW, 1939, pp. 1-31, especially pp. 19 ff.; see also *Der Alte Orient*, 40 (1941), pp. 18 f.

¹⁰⁸ It is now certain that Melcarth was a deity of cosmic origin as well as cosmic function; see Chap. III, n. 29.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. JAOS 60 (1940), p. 298, and Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, p. 150.

¹¹⁰ This may follow from the name of Abel-beth-maachah (modern Tell Âbil), literally, "Stream(so!) of Beth-maachah," since early Canaanite place-names of this type almost invariably contain a divine element (cf. AJSL, 1936, pp. 6 f.). Note the feminine ending and the fact that the name is nearly always under suspicion of being either gentile or non-Israelite where it appears in the Bible (e. g., the mention in Gen. 22: 24 refers to the district by this name; the patronymics in I Kings 2: 39; I Chron. 11: 43; 27: 16 may all be derived from Beth-maachah, just as "Shamgar ben Anath" means "Shamgar of Beth-anath," and Hadad-ezer ben Rehob" is equivalent to "Hadad-ezer of Beth-rehob"; the names of wives or concubines of founders of tribes like Caleb and Machir often reflect mixture with non-Israelite elements; the wife of the father of Gibeon, I Chron. 8: 29; 9: 35, was presumably non-Israelite like the original population of that town).

¹¹¹ It must be remembered that a queen-mother was often an exceedingly important person in the ancient Near East. Illustrations are numerous; we may select as particularly instructive the cases of Jezebel and Athaliah, of Nehushta, mother of Joiachin (early sixth century; cf. JBL, 1932, p. 91), of Sammuamat (Semiramis), mother of Adad-nirari III (late ninth century), and of Naqi'a, mother of Esarhaddon (early seventh century).