THE OLD ISRAELITE COMMUNITY

AND

THE RISE OF THE MONARCHY

VOLUME I

ProQuest Number: 10662725

ProQuest 10662725

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

THE NOMADIC BACKGROUND

THE NOMADIC BACKGROUND

Albright[1] has pointed out the need for a more precise understanding of the function of nomadism in the formative stage of Israelite history, and has issued a warning against the simple equation of the type of nomadism characteristic of camel-riding Bedouin with the very different variety typical of ass-nomads. Albright has noted that in the 13th century B.C. the domestication of the camel had not progressed to a point of completeness where it could exercise any decisive influence upon nomadism, and that it is not until the 11th century that camel-riding nomads first appear in the documentary sources. The fundamental difference which the entry of the camel on the nomadic scene made was that it enlarged the boundaries of nomadic life by making possible longer journeys and the covering of greater distances. The ass-nomad could not exceed a day's journey of twenty miles from water, and where sheep and goats were present, the degree of dependence on pasturage and water was greater than that imposed by domesticated asses. The Bedouin, on the other hand, could range over a much vaster beat, his camel feeding on desert shrubs, unacceptable to sheep or goats.

Albright further distinguishes between the true Bedawi and the semi-nomadic Arab,[2] noting that the beat of the latter and the sphere of tribal territory is more sharply delimited than

with the former. At the semi-nomadic stage the tending of
sheep, goats and camels goes hand in hand with the growing of
grain and, sometimes, the cultivation of vegetable gardens;
the 'razzia' which is a typical feature of Bedouin life proper
tends to recede from the scene. The ekeing out of an
existence through agriculture may be aided by engaging in the
caravan trade or in freight transport. Albright discerns this
pattern of semi-nomadic existence in the recorded traditions
of the movements of the early Hebrew tribes of the Negeb,
forced to abandon their country in pre-Israelite times, both
during the dry season and during long arid periods. He thinks
this state of society is reflected by the Patriarchal stories
of Genesis in which the ancestors of Israel are depicted as
alternating in movement between the Negeb and the hill country
of Central Palestine in what must have been a seasonal movement.[3]

Finally Albright states that the travelling smiths and
tinkers of modern Arab Asia, whether Sleib or Nawar (Gypsies),
who follow more or less regular trade routes, should be
regarded as the modern representatives of an ancient component
part of nomadic life, and that it is probable that the Kenites
of the Bible, with a name derived from 'qain' "smith", resembled
these groups somewhat in their mode of living. In confirmation
of this is the fact that Cain's descendant Lamech had three sons
each of whom is credited with one of the three specialised
functions of this class: tents and herds, musical instruments,

and copper and iron working. It is probable that the group
of Asiatics depicted on a tomb at Beni Hasan, belonging to the
19th century B.C., represents such a functional group, for the
asses, weapons, musical instruments, and portable bellows for
use in working copper are all in character. Albright thinks
that travelling craftsmen had a place in the ancestral Hebrew
groupings, and that they were closely associated with the
Mosaic movement, holding a recognised place in Hebrew society
until much later times.

Albright has performed a valuable service in pointing out
that the Israelites of the period preceding the Conquest are not
to be regarded as a homogeneous society, but rather as the
amalgam of heterogeneous and diverse elements, not having an
identical background in experience or a common cultural
denominator. There are three main strands which must be
distinguished as coming together to form the nation Israel, and
there is general agreement about this,/at the same time, great
disagreement in detail, as to the manner and circumstances of
the fusion. There were the groups and clans which escaped
from the Egyptian corvée, and these cannot be regarded as
typical ass-nomads, neither can they be considered apart from
the formative pressure of special historical experiences. We
have to take into account that there is something unusual in the
impetus which drives a group of Egyptian corvée slaves into the

desert, and that their subsequent coherence and history is more remarkable than their original exodus. We are not to expect that the social organisation or economic pattern of this group durring their desert sojourn will be that of normal ass-nomads. Albright thinks that the Negebite tribes of Caleb and Kenaz who are a contributory strand of the Israelite confederacy are, on the other hand, to be regarded as ass-nomads of a more normal character. The third strand is supplied by the groups of Hebrews who were already in Canaan when the Exodus tribes arrived, who associated themselves with the Mosaic movement, and whose way of life ranged from semi-nomadic to more settled agricultural conditions.

If the picture is at least as complex as this, we do well to be guided by Albright's warning that parallels between early Israelite society and pre-Islamic Arabic society are not to be pursued too rigorously. Leaving aside the special historical pressures associated with the inchoate nation Israel, there is the other fact that nomadism prior to the domestication of the camel was subject to severe disqualification and debarred from that degree of development and expansion which the camel made possible. With the new mobility afforded by the camel, movement between the desert and the sown was begun on a large scale, whether it was the irruption of nomadic hordes bent on spoil or conquest, or the more peaceful penetration of

caravans along the trade routes. The desert was no longer

sealed off from the sown as was previously the case when

infiltration could involve only a mere trickle, and when the

desert was a no-man's land, the prison-house of disoriented

groups and individual fugitives, where semi-nomadic Arab tribes

alternated with the flotsam and jetsam of sedentary society,

with runaway slaves, bandits and their descendants.[5] With

this account given by Albright of nomadism prior to the

domestication of the camel, the picture painted of David and

his band agrees well. As when we are told (1 Samuel 22: 1,2)

that David is joined at Abdullam by a group of disaffected of

different kinds, some discontented with the life of more normal

society, some in distress and some in debt.[6] Further there is

the statement of Nabal who appears to equate David and his men

with "the flotsam and jetsam of sedentary society"[6a] with his

dark allusion to slaves breaking away from masters and finding

an exercise for their villainy in the polite blackmail of

affluent sheep masters. (1 Samuel 25: 7,8) David had, it

appears, undertaken the, perhaps, self-appointed task of

protecting the flocks of Nabal, and, when the latter refuses

to give hospitality or will not bow to demands which may have

amounted to more than this, David speaks up in the character of

a desperado and threatens wholesale slaughter. It is clear too

that Abigail anticipated exactly what the consequences of her

husband's refusal would be, and acted with initiative in order
to avert violence.

Is there any point then in comparing nomads who are "the
flotsam and jetsam of sedentary society" with pre-Islamic
Bedouin who are the heirs of centuries of camel homadism and
have a highly developed pride of race and family? To this
question Albright tends to give a negative answer and the
differences between the one kind of nomad and the other are so
great that a negative answer seems to be called for. These
differences doubtless extend to constitutional, social and
economic structure, but the most marked and unique feature of
pre-Islamic Bedouin society was the emergence of a culture
which enthroned 'muruwwah', and which gave expression to its
conception of chivalry and courtly ideals in poetry characterised
by ornate literary expression and rigid conventionality of
form.   Difficult of comprehension though this poetry be, as
belonging to a culture and a framework of ideals and aspirations
with which we have little common ground in our own experience,
yet it conveys to us the impression of cultural attainment -
of ideals positive and constructive, notwithstanding their
martial ferocity and ethical limitations.[7]

Yet we would still contend that there are features of
nomadic life of so general and universal a kind as to serve as
a common denominator of nomadism, and that these general

characteristics afford real points of contact between two
brands of nomadism so different as the Israelite and the pre-
Islamic Arabian. What then are these general features?[8]
Nomadic society in general knows nothing of centralised
authority, for it is ideally an association of kinsmen, and
the voluntary recognition of certain kinship obligations as
sacred is the concession which makes possible the advance from
absolutely unbridled individualism to a very loose kind of
corporate society. Thus Brockelmann[9] has shown that in pre-
Islamic Arabia where we find a type of society which exemplifies
the sanctions of kinship in undiminished vigour, we find also,
as a factor strictly complementary, the repugnance towards any
recognition of subordination by law. The constitutional
expression of this is the absence of any true conception of
executive power, the šaiḫ never being more than a primus inter
pares, and it is reflected judicially in the absence of any
judicial authority whose verdicts are enforceable, as also in
the absence of anything resembling a police force charged with
keeping order and bringing culprits to law. In such a society
corporate life is possible only because the sanctions of kin
are powerful and are accepted and enforced as a point of
individual and family honour. The point of view from which
these obligations are accepted and met is not that of the
limitation of individual liberty by law in the interests of a

corporate social entity; this would have the taint of a
subordination quite unthought of. Society is not founded on
anything so rational as law, and the apparent contradiction
between unbridled individualism and the intense consciousness
of kinship obligations is met by recognizing the operation of
the quasi-physical, mystical belief that the blood of kinsmen
was an indivisible entity, and that consequently the life of
the individual was inseparable from that of his kin. From this
standpoint, the fulfilment of kinship obligations is a necessary
condition of the preservation of individual honour, and only
as he treats them as sacred and binds himself to meet them can
the individual grow to full stature.

Outside the circle of kin, however, there is no basis for
corporate life, no recognized law by which the life of society
may be ordered, and the door is opened to anarchy and violence.
The ethical and civilizing value of kinship obligations hold,
by definition, only within the circle of kin; hence the often-
noticed tendency among nomads towards inter-tribal strife, and
the centrifugal characteristics of a society which has a back-
ground of nomadic tribalism.

That kin is a basic factor in Israelite society has been
shown by Pedersen,[10] who has undertaken a linguistic examination
of the terms which denote units of Israelite social organisation.
He has demonstrated that Israelite society is organised in

expanding circles of kinship, with the consciousness of kinship
most intense in the narrowest circle and most attenuated in the
widest. Between are the intermediate areas where the felt
intensity progressively decreases on the way to the outer
circumference. Thus in the narrowest circle of the bēṯ ʾāḇ the
feeling of kinship is most intense and in the widest circle,
the ʿam, kinship, while none the less real, loses in intensity,
because of the extensiveness of its field. Between these two
poles are the varying degrees of kinship intensity created by
membership in mišpāḥāh and šēḇeṭ (or matteh). Pedersen
points out that kinship is no less real between members of
the ʿam than it is between the members of a bēṯ ʾāḇ or a mišpāḥāh
or a šēḇeṭ. The consciousness of a difference in quality emerges
only with the question of competing loyalties, and in this case
the kinship of the šēḇeṭ has more compulsion than that of the
ʿam, the kinship of the mišpāḥāh constrains more than that of
the šēḇeṭ, and the kinship of the bēṯ ʾāḇ prevails over that of
the mišpāḥāh. This is a conception which we shall make use of
later, because it affords a way of approach to an understanding
of the tensions and divided loyalties of Israelite society.

We had also noted that the indivisibility of the individual
and his kin was a mark of nomadic society. In the Old Testament
we find references which indicate that here too the destiny of
the individual was closely interwoven with that of his kin. We

read in 1 Samuel 17: 25 that the king proposed to reward with great riches the man who killed Goliath, that he would give him his daughter and make his father's house free in Israel, i.e. the destiny of the man's family is wedded to his own. Again in 1 Samuel 22: 1, 2 we are told that the fortunes of David at Adullam are shared by his kin. Further there is the difficult passage 1 Samuel 20: 14-16.[12] In v. 16 the rendering "And Jonathan made (a covenant) with the house of David" might be justified in isolation, but it does not easily connect grammatically either with what precedes or with what comes after, and we should be inclined to emend the text. What is more significant is that there appears to be no dubiety that in v.15 Jonathan indicates that the covenant between himself and David is in effect a covenant which comprehends the House of Jonathan. This taken in combination with the other fact that in v.16 mention is made of the "House of David" would appear to justify the conclusion that the covenant was thought of as extending to the respective kins of David and Jonathan. Nor should 1 Samuel 20: 42 be overlooked, for here the covenant obligations between David and Jonathan are extended to their posterity. The evidence admits of some uncertainty but, on the strength of it, we would suggest that it implies that individuals could not involve themselves in such a covenant as David and Jonathan contracted without, at the same time, involving their respective kins. There would seem to be the

further implication that the circle of kin was still the area
where the strongest obligations were acknowledged, and, as such,
was the basic factor of corporate life. Thus in covenanting
to knit together their kins David and Jonathan seek to forge
between themselves an indissoluble bond, and to contract
mutual obligations the most sacred and urgent.

Cognizance must also be taken of the links with nomadic
usage discernible in the legal principles of the Book of the
Covenant.[13] It is the case, of course, that the material provision
of this code envisage an agricultural community simple in structure
but, as Robertson Smith[14] has pointed out, the principles of
civil and criminal justice in the Code are those current among
the Arabs of the desert. These are two in number, retaliation
through self-help and pecuniary compensation. That kinship
obligation[15] is still a foundation of corporate life is shown
by the fact that murder and certain other offences are dealt
with by the law of blood revenge, the duty of revenge in the
case of murder falling upon the nearest kinsman of the man
murdered. Smith[16] notes that the degree of personal freedom and
individualism typical of a loosely knit society, which coheres
by voluntary acquiescence in kinship obligation rather than by
recognition of a firm executive power or subordination to law,
is reflected by the fact that personal injuries fall under the
law of retaliation just as murder does, and by the recognition

that it is the right and duty of the injured party to secure redress through self-help. Within such a framework of constitutional and legal ideas the concept of punishment (as something legally contrived) has properly no place, since it implies the presence of a centralised power which restrains lawlessness, passes judgment upon the lawless, and enforces its verdict. The nearest approach there is to this is the principle of retaliation through self-help. Otherwise there is only compensation which, in some cases, is at the discretion of the injured party (who has the alternative of direct revenge), but generally is defined by law. This degree of definition and limitation of the arbitrary action of the individual indicates, as Driver[17] has noted, some progress in civilisation and an advance beyond pure nomadic usage. On the other hand that degrading punishments such as imprisonment and flogging are unknown, is in keeping with the sturdy equalitarianism of nomadic society and the value placed upon the dignity of the individual.

It goes without saying that the material provisions of the Book of the Covenant, which legislate for life under agricultural conditions, must be studied in their relation to Canaanite, Babylonian and Hittite Laws.[18] It is also true that the recognition of Israelite slaves in a community of kinsmen

is a departure from and contradiction of nomadic values. In

the Book of the Covenant Israel stands out as an interesting

case, because she is portrayed in a setting of simple

sedentary life, while she has a pre-history which links her

with the desert. What we find as a consequence is the

presence of provisions which could have had no place or

meaning prior to the settlement in Canaan, belonging as they

do with the new civilisation into which Israel has entered,

and side by side with these, regulating corporate life,

constitutional and legal principles which offer us firm points

of contact with the foundations of nomadic society. Smith

sums up well: "The Israelites directly contemplated in

these laws are evidently men of independent bearing and personal

dignity such as are still found in secluded parts of the

Semitic world under a half-patriarchal constitution, where

every freeman is a small landholder. But there is no strong

central authority. The tribunal of the sanctuary is

arbitrator not executive. No man is secure without his own

aid, and the widow or orphan looks for help not to man but

to Jehovah himself. But if the executive is weak, a strict

regard for justice is inculcated. Jehovah is behind the law

and He will vindicate the right. He requires of Israel

humanity as well as justice."[19] This further aspect of

religious motivation is of considerable significance, but we

reserve the discussion of it for another place.[20]

Smith's phrase "a half-patriarchal constitution of society where every freeman is a small landholder" offers a suitable point of departure for the discussion of the Hebrew word ḥopšī. Albright[21] originated a discussion of this word by suggesting that in one of the Amarna Letters (the second letter of Abi Milki)[22] the ideogram ZAG has the meaning of 'emûqu' "power", and that ḥabši is a gloss for ᶜina dun(n)i emûqi added to fix the meaning of the circumlocution exactly and to avoid misinterpretation. Albright suggests that ᶜina dun(n)i emûqi means "in one's own strength", and that it is an attempt to render "free from oppression", a meaning which is fixed precisely by the gloss ḥabši. Albright[23] subsequently retracted this suggestion and connected ḥap(b)ši with the Egyptian ḥâpeš, giving another interpretation to the passage in question. It is, however, with the by-products of the discussion originated in this way that we have to do, since they have focussed attention on the meaning of the Hebrew word ḥopšī.

Pedersen[24] noted that the word ḥubšu was well known in the Amarna Letters, and that the 'amêlût ḥubši', "the people of the ḥubšu", are mentioned eleven times in the letters of Rib-Addi. The references show this people to have been a principal part of the subjects of Rib-Addi, they are possessors of houses, and they are not to be regarded as an unsteady element in the

population, intermediary between the nomad and the inhabitant
of the town.[25] Pedersen thought that the explanation of the
importance attached to the 'amêlût hubši' in the letters of
Rib-Addi was that they were landed proprietors i.e. freemen
who owned their own farms and whose families constituted the
fundamental stock of the population. Hence Pedersen suggested
that 'habšu' corresponded to Hebrew 'hayil' and 'hubšu' to
Hebrew 'gibbōrē hayil'. The word hubšu, according to Pedersen,
is a collective designating a species, and the single instance
of the species must be denoted by a formation with a final
'i'. So we get hub(p)ši > hopšī which is the Hebrew word for
a freeman. In the Old Testament hopšī occurs seventeen times[26]
and the word generally means the opposite of slave. This,
Pedersen thinks, may represent a slight degradation of the
word, if the original meaning is thought to be not simply
'free', but also 'owning land'. In 1 Samuel 17: 25 Pedersen
takes the word to mean an aristocrat[27] raised by the king
above the people, and therefore above the gibbōrē hayil.
Pedersen recognizes that this treatment leaves certain
problems unsolved and adds significantly: "We are not able
to point out the history and real meaning of such names, but
it is obvious that the Hebrew word is to be closely connected
with the old 'hubšu'".

Albright[28] in a further note takes cognizance of Pedersen's

contribution and offers a solution along different lines.
Albright notes that the word ḫubšu as found in Late Assyrian
texts [29] has the meaning "serfdom", "corvée", and a ṣab ḫubši
is a serf, a person subject to corvée.   Albright suggests
that the phrase ʾawîl ḫubši, plural, awîlût ḫubši (Pedersen,
ʾamêlût) in the Amarna Letters has a meaning similar to the
Assyrian one.   The awîlût ḫubši are subjects (in a pejorative
sense) of the king.   Albright points out that since Canaanite
society was organised into patricians and serfs, and there
was no yeoman population until such was created by the
Israelites, Pedersen's suggestion that the 'ḫubšu' of the
Amarna Letters were freeholders is intrinsically improbable.
Albright would give 'ḫubšu' the abstract meaning of bondage, [30]
conceding, however, that the 'awîl ḫubši' of Rib-Addi was on
a higher level of independence than the Assyrian 'ṣab ḫubši'
who was a true serf.   Albright accepts Pedersen's combining
of 'ḫubšu' with Hebrew 'ḥopšī', and observes that the nisbeh
'ḥopšī' would correspond formally with 'awîl ḫubši' and 'ṣab
ḫubši'.   The change in meaning from "serf" or "peon" or
"peasant" to "landholder" and then "freeholder" (as distinct
from "serf" or "slave") Albright would connect with the time
of the Hebrew Conquest, when the Hebrews may have adopted the
word peasant from the Canaanites and given it a new connotation
in keeping with the transformation in social conditions. [31]

Albright cites the dase of the word "manufacture" which underwent such an evolution in meaning consequent upon changed industrial conditions in the nineteenth century.

There is a further contribution to this discussion by I.Mendelsohn[32] who examines the occurrences of the term hub(p)šu in the Amarna Letters, Assyrian Law Code, Late Assyrian Texts, in Ugaritic literature and in the Old Testament. Whereas both Pedersen and Albright in different ways envisaged a change in meaning of the term as between one field and another, Mendelsohn seeks to show that it has a consistency of usage in all the different areas where it is found, and that its meaning approximates most nearly to 'colonus' in the sense in which this term was used in the Early Roman Empire, where the 'coloni' constituted a class of free-born tenant farmers. Mendelsohn notes, as Pedersen[33] had done, that in the Old Testament, with the exception of 1 Samuel 17: 25, 'hopšī' means the opposite of slave. (Mendelsohn does not offer any elucidation of 1 Samuel 17: 25). The released Hebrew slave is called 'hopšī' as being legally free but landless, and having only one recourse in order to earn a livelihood - to hire himself out as a day labourer or settle on a rich man's estate as a tenant farmer. According to Mendelsohn the laws in Exodus 21: 5,6 and Deuteronomy 15: 16, 17 suggest that these possibilities did not always exist, and

that, as a consequence, some of the hopšim chose bondage
with economic security, rather than liberty with the hazards
of economic insecurity.

Albright[34] in an editorial footnote acknowledges the value
of Mendelsohn's enquiry, but warns against over-systematisation,
and adheres to his already expressed view that the sense of
hup(b)šu may have altered considerably in different regions in
the course of time, pointing out the very great shift in the
status of coloni between the first and sixth centuries A.D.

Mendelsohn's assertion that 'hopši' has the specialised
meaning in the Old Testament of a landless freeman as opposed to
a freeholder may be questioned. The Old Testament evidence
does not appear to permit the fixing of a meaning more precise
than that of a freeman as opposed to a slave.[35] The question then
is whether in Old Israelite society the typical freeman was a
tenant farmer or day labourer working on the large estate of a
rich farmer, or whether we ought not rather to think of a
nation of freemen each with his holding. That the situation
did deteriorate by the eighth century B.C. in such a way as to
create a landless class of peasants, some day labourers and
some debt slaves, does not constitute support for Mendelsohn's
view that this was an accepted feature of Israelite social
structure and agrarian policy from the beginning of settled
life. On the contrary the situation as it existed in the eighth

century was deplored as un-Israelite and abnormal and as destructive of traditional Israelite sanctions attaching to land tenure. We shall deal with this question below, and shall adduce considerations which support the conclusion that the traditional Israelite understanding of a freeman comprehended the ancestral plot which was properly inalienable from the family whose freehold it was.[36]

Albright's attempt to associate the change in meaning of 'hopšī' with the Hebrew Conquest and the kind of social structure which they created on entering upon settled agricultural life is attractive, because it would illustrate how the Israelites sought to secure and perpetuate the nomadic values of freedom and independence under new conditions by constituting every freeman a small landholder.

This tentative assertion, however, that the nomadic background of the Israelites expressed itself in the kind of society they created on entering Canaan, need not, and indeed ought not, to rest upon this interpretation of hopšī which, at the best, is no more than a probability. Albright[37] has brought into connection with his interpretation of hopšī certain archeological data which confirm our sketch of the social organisation created by the incoming Israelites. He has pointed out that excavations show an abrupt break between the culture of the Canaanite Late Bronze Age and that of the Israelite Early

Iron Age in the hill country of Palestine. Early Israelite
strata offer no evidence of the concentration of power and
wealth in the hands of a few. He observes that the palaces of
Canaanite towns are replaced by "large and small rustic
enclosures and huts" and that Canaanite fortifications are
replaced by thin walls of the new casemate type. Elsewhere
Albright³⁸ has described the difference between the massive
Canaanite Bronze Age walls at Tell Beit Mirsim which were
eight to fifteen feet in thickness and the Israelite Iron Age
wall which was only five feet thick - a thickness which he
states was characteristic of Israelite city walls. He goes on:
"The change in the strength of the walls is not due to any
parallel development in surrounding lands nor to the increase
of public security (in the time of the Judges!), but evidently
to a complete alteration in social organisation. Under the
loose, patriarchal form of Israelite society there was no
systematic coercion of the individual .... the corvée was
unknown. It was, therefore, as a rule, manifestly impossible
to induce the inhabitants of an early Israelite town to submit
to the prolonged and difficult labour of constructing a massive
city wall. The Israelite wall of Jerusalem was not built until
the tenth century, when captives were available for the corvée.
Solomon introduced the corvée into Israel, but even he
apparently was very circumspect in his use of free-born

Israelites for forced labour".[39] In another place Albright[40]
speaks of the contrast between the well-constructed Canaanite
foundations and drainage systems of the thirteenth century and
the crude piles of stones, without the amenities of drainage,
which replaced them at Bethel. The reasons for this decline
in the material arts of life were that the invaders were a
semi-nomadic horde at a lower cultural level, and with a
quasi-democratic, patriarchal type of social organisation
which erased the old difference between patrician and half-free
peasant typical of Canaanite society. Albright notes that
when the Israelites occupied a Canaanite patrician house,
as at Bethel and Tell Beit Mirsim, they lived on the ground
floor instead of patrician-fashion in the upper story, with
the ground floor left for store-rooms and slaves.

We may conclude therefore that the archeological evidence
added to considerations of a more general kind supports the
conclusion that nomadic constitutional ideas and social values
influenced the social structure which the Israelites created on
settling down in Canaan.

CHAPTER TWO

TRIBALISM TO THE DIVISION OF THE KINGDOM

TRIBALISM TO THE DIVISION OF THE KINGDOM

If the arguments of the preceding chapter are valid, the
Israelite community is compounded of tribal units[1] and there
is consequently the possibility of tension or even incompatibility
between the narrower tribal demands and loyalties and the
wider allegiance demanded by the new inter-tribal entity.
When an attempt to widen the basis of community is undertaken
by a confederation of tribes who hitherto have owned no
allegiance or admitted no demands outside the sphere of the
tribe, it is to be expected that within the new confederacy[2]
tribal sensibilities will be easily wounded and tribal
jealousies easily aroused. Thus there is the danger that the
bond will not prove strong enough to counteract these powerful
centrifugal tendencies which derive from old ways of thought
and a particularistic pattern of action. Albright[3] has regarded
the Israelite tribes after the settlement in this light,
pointing out that, however much the importance of the religious
bond uniting the tribes may be emphasised, it would be misleading
to speak of Israel as a theocratic state. The Israelites,
he observes, were still fond of freedom and particularistic,
i.e. tribal in their outlook, and it was only in times of danger
or emergency that the tribal head could extend his jurisdiction
and authority beyond the borders of his own tribe.

Such an occasion is that described in the Song of Deborah,
when the pressure of an outside danger stimulates the Israelite
tribes to common action. The core of the Israelite forces on
this occasion was made up of the tribes of Napthali (who
supplied the commander Barak, who in turn was inspired by a
prophetess dwelling in Ephraim) and Zebulon, and the others
who are commended as having honourably responded at the call
of danger are Ephraim, Machir, Issachar and Benjamin. Reuben,
Gilead and Dan[4] are mentioned with reproach as absentees,
while Meroz[5] is cursed for its faithlessness. The absence of
any mention of Judah has been construed in different ways, but
we are inclined, with Rowley,[6] to attribute it to the fact of
geographical isolation. T.H. Robinson[7] explains the non-mention
of the tribe of Judah by asserting that Judah was a Canaanite
tribe established in Hebron district and subject to pressure
from the Kenites and Kenizzites, until the two groups were
forced into a unity in the face of the Philistine menace, and
took the Canaanite name of Judah. Rowley has pointed out that
this theory does not account for the origin of Simeon and Levi
who are also unmentioned in the Song of Deborah, and he has
adduced considerations which militate against Robinson's view.
Rowley holds to the position that the tribe of Judah was a
mixed tribe with Calebite, Kenite and Kenizzite components
but with genuine Israelite elements.[8] It thus seems better

to interpret the absence of Judah in terms of geographical
isolation, and this throws up the question as to the part
played by geographical separateness in encouraging the
Israelite tribes to go their several ways and in making
difficult the practical realisation of concerted action. We
know [9] that there was a belt of Canaanite cities in the Vale of
Esdraelon stretching from Bethshan [10] to the coast which Israel
could not reduce, and it was in order to break down this obstacle
to their effective co-operation that the tribes north and south
of that belt assembled under the leadership of Deborah and
Barak to do battle with the Canaanite army under Sisera. Up
to this point the Israelites had not been able to break through
these Canaanite defences and part of the reason for their
failure was that the Canaanites possessed iron chariots while
the Israelites were without them. [11] Until such a time as the
chain of fortresses in the Vale of Esdraelon was penetrated, the
Israelites in Canaan were split into three isolated groups.
The second barrier was constituted by the Jebusite stronghold
of Jerusalem [12] which effectively cut off Judah from the tribes
in the central hill country. We also read that Gezer [13] remained
in Canaanite hands in the days of the Judges, and Rowley has
argued that with this belt of unconquered country separating
Judah from the northern tribes it would have been impracticable
for Judah to march against Sisera, since it would have meant

leaving hostile cities between themselves and their homes,
and would have invited attack on these homes in their absence.
In assessing the failure of the Israelites to sink tribal
differences and abandon tribal allegiances in the interests
of a wider community and a plan of common action, this fact of
physical separateness has to be borne in mind, because it
meant that the tribes were constrained by circumstances to fend
for themselves and to work out their own salvation. A larger
unity which remains ideal but is incapable of practical
attainment through unpropitious circumstances is a tenuous
thing in comparison with the tribal virtues which enabled the
isolated Israelites to survive in these perilous days and it
would not be surprising, if under such conditions, the narrower
and more deeply rooted tribal allegiance seemed more real than
an imperfectly realised community of tribes.

Even so we must not minimise the degree of concerted
action realised by the Israelites in spite of the above-mentioned
handicaps. The troublous nature of the times and the presence
of threats from outside revealed the presence of a feeling of
belonging together to each other among the Israelite tribes
and the recognition of the principle of common responsibility
in the waging of war. We have already noted the confederacy
under Deborah and Barak and there is also the case of Gideon
who, in the face of the Midianite menace, assumes command of a

confederate force of Israelite tribes. Gideon protests that
he has no title to leadership, his clan being poor in Manasseh,
but with elements from Manasseh, Asher, Zebulon and Napthali,
he successfully disposes of the Midianite threat.[15] The men of
Ephraim express their resentment that they were not called upon
to fight against Midian at the outset, and Gideon with smooth
words (Judges 8: 2) appears to acknowledge their title to
hegemony.

Jepthah[16] is portrayed as a bastard son denied a place in
his father's household and trying his hand as a freebooter. He
is invited by the elders to return and command the warriors of
Gilead at a time when the Ammonites press hard on them.
Jepthah, mindful of his former bitter experiences, requires
the guarantee that his leadership will be a permanency and will
not be wrested from him once the present emergency is past,
and having received this he successfully conducts operations
against Ammon but incurs the displeasure of the men of Ephraim
on the same grounds as Gideon had. When the Ephraimites
complain that he went against Ammon without asking their aid,
Jepthah in counter-recrimination accuses them of not responding
to his call for help, and feeling runs so high that an inter-
tribal feud breaks out between Gilead and Ephraim.

The behaviour of Ephraim on both these occasions would
suggest that it laid claim to hegemony over the northern tribes,

and that it felt that its prerogatives had been flouted and acted out of a sense of wounded pride and offended amour-propre. Thus within the confederacy we see the fabric of unity threatened by the desire of one tribe for pre-eminence and we see how the strength of tribal pretensions and inter-tribal jealousies may lead to inter-tribal warfare within the confederacy.[17]

We may sum up by saying that the degree of geographical isolation to which the tribes were subject meant that in the face of an immediate threat the tribe nearest to the seat of danger was most seriously involved, since its interests were most immediately threatened. Thus Samson, a southern Danite, fights against the adjoining Philistines,[18] and the elders of Gilead believe that the countering of the Ammonite threat is in the first place their responsibility. But there were dangers which were not so localised, where matters of vital importance to the confederacy of Israelite tribes were at stake, and there was a sufficient awareness and recognition of common interests and common welfare to constrain the tribes to transcend the boundaries of their particularistic loyalties and to make the concessions and sacrifices which permitted common action. Hence the Song of Deborah celebrates those who honour their confederate responsibilities and reproaches those who repudiate them, and the hurt pride of Ephraim derives from a belief that

it must always take the lead in confederate action and that this
right has not been conceded. The case of Ephraim is interesting
because it illustrates the clash between tribal self-esteem
and confederate responsibilities. Ephraim seeks to preserve
both by acknowledging confederate claims and, at the same time,
asserting headship in confederate affairs.

It can also be seen that times of danger are propitious
for throwing up leaders who in more peaceful and quieter
conditions would have no title to leadership and would hardly
gain recognition. Gideon protests that he has no foundation
for leadership in the wealth or power of his clan, and, when
the people of Israel propose to vest rule in Gideon and his
posterity, he declines. Jepthah, on the other hand, knowing
that authority and leadership offered in time of danger may be
taken away when the danger recedes, seeks assurance that the
role to which he is called will be a permanent one. In
different ways both these instances illustrate how, in times of
emergency, prowess and valour outweighed more normal considera-
tions of material wealth and influential family connections in
the selection of a leader, but that both Jepthah and Gideon
in different ways gave expression to the view that in quieter
and more peaceful times the more normal social and economic
criteria are liable to re-assume their preponderant influence.
Jepthah voices the fear that in more peaceful times the

leadership will be decided by more normal economic and social criteria; while Gideon expresses the view that leadership must depend on the personal qualities of the leader and that the time is not ripe for dynastic rule. It can be observed too that in times of danger to the confederacy a war leader finds recognition and is obeyed beyond the boundaries of his own tribe, as with Deborah and Barak and also Gideon.

We come now to consider the relation of the account of Absalom's revolt to tribalism in Israel. There are several difficulties in this account and one is an apparent ambiguity in the meaning of the word 'Israel'. In 2 Samuel 19: 44 'Israel' certainly means all the nation exclusive of Judah.[19] If, however, we were to take the word to refer to the northern part of the United Kingdom elsewhere in the account of the Absalom revolt, we should be at a loss to understand why Absalom should have made Hebron in the south the focus of revolt, if he were counting on the support of the northern tribes. Thus 2 Samuel 15: 10("But Absalom sent secret messengers throughout all the tribes of Israel saying, 'As soon as you hear the sound of the trumpet, then say, "Absalom is king in Hebron") would suggest that 'Israel' is co-extensive with the United Kingdom. In 2 Samuel 17: 11 there can be no doubt that 'Israel' does mean the entire United Kingdom since it is defined by the words "From Dan to Beersheba." This would be supported by clear indications in the

narrative that Judah no less than the north has come out in
favour of Absalom e.g. 2 Samuel 19: 12 f., 15, 44.   Further the
place of Hebron in the revolt is inexplicable unless there was
support in the south.   In this connection it should be
remembered that, according to Noth,[20] Hebron was the focus of
the six-tribe amphictyony of which Judah was a member and that
David was first raised to kingship in Hebron.   What seems
probable is that Absalom was working on a discontent with the
centralised Jerusalem regime felt equally by the northern tribes
and the southern.   In other words, the tribes of the old Hebron
amphictyony were tending to be alienated from the pattern of
monarchy in Jerusalem in the same way as were the Shiloh
interests.   Hence Absalom could make his appeal in the name of
old and popular values to both the northern and the southern
tribes.   One is consequently forced to the conclusion that this
is not an alignment of the north against the south according
to the pattern of conflicting interests which subsequently led
to the division of the kingdom.   The clash seems rather to be
between David and his entourage, and the rank and file of the
nation.   The evidence for this view is very impressive.   David
in his flight from Jerusalem and in his fugitive wanderings
is said to have been accompanied by his "servants" (ᶜabādīm),[21]
e.g. 2 Samuel 15: 14, 18; 16: 6, 11; 18: 7,9. See especially
18: 7: "And the men of Israel were defeated by the servants of

David." These servants are royal officials, the priests
Zadok and Abiathar, the army commanders Joab, Abishai, Ittai the
Gittite, and an army which on all accounts was preponderantly
mercenary consisting of Cherethites, Pelethites and six-hundred
Gittites. The words which are juxtaposed with "servants of the
king", describing the elements upon which Absalom drew for
support, in addition to 'Israel' which we have already noted,
are "men of Israel" 16: 15, 17: 14, 18: 7 and "elders of
Israel" 17: 4. It has also to be noted that prior to the
rebellion Absalom had set himself up as an upholder of popular
rights who had deplored the passing away of the close contact
between the king and his people at the gate, where in hearing
their suits and giving his decisions he could keep his finger
on the pulse of national life and maintain himself firmly in
popular esteem.[22] The implication is that the king is out of
touch with his people and cares not to hear their grievances or
to redress them. Between him and his people there is a bureau-
cratic barrier, and the king's rule rests no longer on popular
support and general acclaim but on the pillars of state which
he himself has constructed and especially on his mercenary
soldiers. All this adds up to the conclusion that what
Absalom led was a popular uprising, and that David drew his
support from the bureaucratic machine which he had created,
through which, rather than through popular support, he now ruled.

The revolt would be an expression of repugnance at the pattern
of oriental despotism which David had woven into the Israelite
state. He now ruled through a body of professionals who were
technically his slaves and who provided the power element to
subdue those over whom he had formerly ruled as a primus inter
pares. The equalitarian instincts of Israel had recoiled from
the new regime. There is one other small point. In 2 Samuel
18: 25 there is the unusually phrased statement, "Now Absalom
had set Amasa over the army instead of Joab", which at least
suggests that Joab had gone one way and the army the other;
that Joab had stayed by David's aide, while the army[23] (possibly
the native Israelite militia) had espoused the popular cause.

It is also possible to discern that representatives of
the House of Saul availed themselves of this occasion of David's
discomfiture in order to strike a blow back at the usurper who
had wrested kingship from their midst. The case of Mephibosheth
is not straightforward, since he is first represented (2 Samuel
16: 3) as staying in Jerusalem at the moment of David's flight
anticipating that the time was ripe for Israel to give back
to him the crown of his father. It turns out, however, that
this testimony of Ziba, his servant, is false and that
Mephibosheth was forestalled by trickery from making common
cause with David in his retreat from the capital (2 Samuel 19:
25f.). Yet it is antecedently probable/that this crisis in the rule

of David would be an occasion for an attempt to revive the house of Saul, and we find other evidences that loyalists of the older royal house were anxious to rub salt into David's wounds.   As he was leaving Jerusalem a certain Shimei cursed him and stoned him and generally gloated over his present misfortune, and after the Absalom incident was closed, Sheba who was a Benjamite,i.e. of Saul's clan,,incited the north to secession from Judah.   These references lead to the conclusion that the Benjamites had not easily reconciled themselves to the snatching of the throne from their tribe and that David's usurpation of kingship and its establishment in Judah continued to fester as a deadly wound to tribal dignity and prestige, and as a cause for strife between Benjamin and Judah when the occasion presented itself.

From another point of view the Sheba incident marks the inauguration of a new alignment in this felt incompatibility between the demands of a larger corporate entity and the preservation of the older narrower loyalties and jealously prized tribal dignities.   The line of division now runs between Judah and the remainder of Israel, and the beginnings of this cleavage are seen in 2 Samuel 19: 42.   Here the "men of Israel", as opposed to Judah,are displeased with the arrangements for David's return after the Absalom revolt and charge the men of Judah with having made it a tribal monopoly instead of recognizing

it as a matter of common national moment. This resentment finds
its expression in the revolt of Sheba (2 Samuel 20: 1 f.) who
incites the northern tribes to leave Judah to their tribal king
and to be bound no more by the constraints of the United
Kingdom. Appropriately enough Sheba expresses himself in a
phrase (2 Samuel 20: 1) which breathes a calculated nostalgia
for the old days of unfettered nomadic or semi-nomadic freedom.
The grievance was that Judah dominated the king and claimed so
much in the way of special treatment and tribal privileges
that he was a tribal possession rather than, as he ought to
have been, a national figure. Such seems to have been the
complaint. This is consequently an appropriate place for
enquiring whether there are any good grounds for believing that
David meted out preferential treatment to Judah.

David's words in 2 Samuel 19: 12f. imply that he himself
acknowledged a specially close relationship to Judah over and
above his relationship to all the tribes as their king. He says
of Judah that they are his kinsmen, his bone and flesh. There
are powerful links of kinship between himself and Judah which
do not operate in the case of the other tribes, so that the
faithlessness of Judah is the more inexcusable. There is also
the point that David was first accepted by Judah as king and
anointed over the House of Judah [24] (2 Samuel 2: 4), so that his
kingship over Judah preceded his assumption of a larger sway

over the rest of Israel and beyond. It should further be
remarked that in 1 Kings 11: 13, 32, 36 the writer's point of
view is that Judah is a tribal community: "However I will not
tear away all the kingdom, but I will give one tribe to your son."
From this point of view it is understandable that the kingship
of David over Judah should have been difficult to harmonise with
his rule over a larger kingdom whose component parts, themselves
having tribal susceptibilities, were suspicious lest the
burdens of the kingdom were unequally distributed and they made
to carry heavy burdens, while the king's tribe occupied a
privileged position.

There is also the notice in 1 Kings 4: 7f. about the
administrative districts of Solomon, where it is said that
twelve officers were appointed over all Israel, each responsible
in his month (vv. 27-28) for supplying the king's table and
bringing barley and straw for the king's horses to focal points.
It is also stated in v. 19 that one officer was appointed for
Judah, but it is at least arguable that Judah could not have
had a place in the general taxation plan, since it was complete
without Judah, and that the demands on Judah may have been less
onerous than those made on the rest of the land. Albright,[25]
however, dissents from the view of Alt[26] that Judah was excluded
from the system of twelve administrative districts into which
all Israel was divided. Albright says: "If David and Solomon

really wanted to give Judah a privileged place in the state,

why did they select a new capital which, as Alt himself has

so convincingly pointed out, was entirely outside the old tribal

system? Moreover why did Solomon undertake to attach the

northern district-officers so closely to himself by ties of

marriage?"[27] Albright[28] holds that the list in 1 Kings 4: 7-19 is

not altogether intact. The upper right edge of the document,

from which the redactor of Kings or a predecessor copied it, was

torn off. This, Albright holds, is demonstrated by the absence

of the personal names of the first four officers whose

patronymica only survive. Further, Albright believes that

verses 13 and 19 should be treated as doublets. He finds the

explanation of the apparent exclusion of Judah from the general

scheme in the conjecture that the name of the district officer

of Judah has somehow been lost, perhaps through the bottom of

the document having been torn off, and has been replaced, in

order to restore the total of twelve, by the variant doublet

in v.19. What follows after this doublet, "and a district

officer who was in the land of Judah", Albright describes as a

"significant addition". By this Albright means that he takes

it to lend further support to his view that verse 19 is a

variant doublet of verse 13. The addition is "significant"

because it represents the partial preservation of a notice

concerning the district officer of Judah which originally made

up the contents of verse 19. This reconstruction is attractive
and it has to be acknowledged that something does appear to have
gone wrong with verse 19 as it stands.

Albright's argument from the site of Jerusalem is not,
however, equally convincing. The fact that the establishment
of Jerusalem as capital is to be attributed to the deliberate
attempt of David to centre national loyalty on a place not pre-
judiced through its previous association with any one tribe, is
not inconsistent with the existence of a special relationship
between himself and Judah. That David was intent on creating
a kingdom, upon which a larger loyalty transcending tribal
boundaries would be focussed, is certain. The establishment
of Jerusalem was a tactical move in this direction, as was also
the other fact mentioned by Albright - the marriage of two
northern governors to daughters of Solomon. This should
doubtless be interpreted as an attempt by Solomon to cement
together in loyalty to himself those parts of his kingdom over
which the governors in question were set and Albright has noted
the possible significance of the fact that these were the most
remote from the centre of affairs at Jerusalem and so most
subject to defection. But the possibility must still be
reckoned with that the particularity of the attachment between
David and Judah, founded upon a relationship and experience
which were prior to David's kingship over all Israel, may have

been a hard fact which not all the political astuteness or far-seeing statesmanship of David could have dissolved, even if he had so desired. Snaith[29] emphasises (perhaps exaggerates) this aspect of the situation, when he says: "It is not generally realised that for seventy-three years, during the time of David and Solomon, Israel was subject to and not the willing ally of Judah. There are no Messianic hopes of a united kingdom under a Davidic king, either from the old Israel or from the Samaritans.... All such dreams belong to the south, the dominant partner in the glory that was David's."

There are thus reasons for and against concurring in the view that Judah received preferential treatment under the administrations of David and Solomon. The biblical evidence itself is not all of a piece, since there are passages adduced above which seem to state that David was bound to Judah by special ties, while, on the other hand, our reading of the Absalom incident leaves no room for any special treatment of Judah in relation to taxation and corvée demands, since Judah, equally with the north, rebels against the heavy hand of David's bureaucratic regime. The next question which then suggests itself is: why then, if Judah and the remainder of Israel were all on a par in relation to the Jerusalem regime, did Judah go one way and the remainder of Israel the other at the division of

the kingdom? If we cannot derive Judah's choice from the fact
of preferential treatment, must we conclude that Judah was held
in a vice-like grip from which it could not escape? Or is it
possible to hold that these alternatives are not exhaustive?
We might then suggest that, while our reading of the Absalom
incident would tend to scotch the idea of preferential treatment,
it is not incompatible with an awareness on the part of Judah
that its history linked it with special intimacy to the House
of David. The acquiescence in the rebellion of Absalom did not
then principally imply disloyalty to the House of David, but a
repugnance to the oppressiveness of a despotic regime and
dislike of a king who held aloof from his people and ruled
through an army of officials. Absalom promised that he would
go in and out among his people as David had once done, and
would hear their suits at the gate. Hence we might explain
the choice of Judah at the division of the kingdom by acknow-
ledging its close ties with the Davidic dynasty and its
attachment to the royal house. The victory of Absalom would
not have entailed the overthrow of the House of David, but it
was otherwise with the programme of the northern tribes at the
division of the kingdom. They identified the oppressive regime
so completely with the Davidic dynasty as to equate their
liberation from tyranny with the disavowal of all allegiance
to the House of David and the discarding of its yoke. Judah was

not prepared to associate itself with these new objectives,
feeling too strongly the pull of old loyalties.

The discontent of Ephraim is expressed by Ahijah
(1 Kings 11: 30), a prophet of Shiloh,[30] who symbolically tears
a garment into twelve pieces - the tribal constituents of the
United Kingdom, and allocates ten pieces to Jeroboam in token
of his future rule over ten of the tribes. It should be
remarked that, while I Kings 11: 13 declares that one tribe
will remain to Solomon's son for the sake of David, Ahijah's
division leaves two tribes to be accounted for. Yet the
prophecy is (I Kings 11: 32) that one tribe will remain to
Solomon's son for the sake of David. On the other hand, in
I Kings 12: 21, 23 Rehoboam's kingdom is said to be compounded
of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. That Benjamin should
have remained with Judah rather than throwing in its lot with
the northern tribes is antecedently improbable. The overthrow
of the House of Saul was an old sore, not yet healed, and
inflicted by Judah in the person of David. We have discussed
the notices which record the hostility of the House of Saul to
David around the period of the Absalom revolt, and we have seen
how a Benjamite Sheba was in the vanguard of the movement of
the northern tribes to shake off the shackles of the despotic
Jerusalem regime. It is the case that these events lie in the
reign of David, while the division of the kingdom takes place

at the end of the reign of Solomon, but since it is generally
agreed that Solomon's reign was an essay in oriental despotism
on a grander scale than anything preceding it in Israel, the
natural supposition is that it would have brought about in
Benjamin an increase of the resentment earlier expressed by
Sheba, and that they would have found common ground in an
alignment with the Ahijah/Jeroboam movement.[30a]

Jeroboam, at the time when he was the subject of the
Ahijah prophecy, was in the employ of Solomon, as officer over
the corvée battalions of his own tribe Joseph. Jeroboam thus
became involved in a movement of rebellion centred in Ephraim
and backed by a spokesman of the former amphictyonic sanctuary,
and when Solomon became apprised of these manoeuvres in which
he was implicated, he found it necessary to get out and find
asylum in Egypt. On the occasion of the accession of Rehoboam,
Jeroboam returns to become the spokesman of the north, and his
main request is for the lightening of the corvée. That this
was the feature of Solomon's administration which aroused the
bitterest indignation and the fiercest resentment is shown by
the singling out of Adoram for savage treatment when the request
is contemptuously thrown aside by Rehoboam. Rehoboam had
threatened to increase the burden of the corvée and, when he
sent Adoram to implement his new policy of heavier oppression,
the northern tribes (especially Joseph) reacted savagely

and stoned him to death.[31] A curious feature of the whole story
is that Jeroboam, appointed to lead the movement of liberation,
should have formerly been the tool of Solomon in organising
the exaction of corvée in his own tribe. Since repugnance to
corvée is the main article of the revolt, one would have
thought that Jeroboam would have been regarded by his brethren
as beneath contempt and the least likely candidate for the
task of liberation. At any rate it is indubitable, as Alt[32]
has pointed out, that the division of the kingdom is the
culmination of felt friction and incompatibility between the
despotic trends and oppressive demands of the royal regime
centred on Jerusalem, and the retention by the north of a
pattern of tribal separatism, within which tribal interests are
not obliterated and which will not ride roughshod over the
dignities and liberties of freemen. That David was conscious
of the great difficulty of submerging the particularistic
tribal loyalties in the unity of a larger national loyalty has
been pointed out by Albright,[33] and the selection of Jerusalem
has been viewed as a move of political astuteness made with an
eye to securing a capital which would give the appearance
neither of favour nor offence to any tribe. In choosing
Jerusalem, David picked on a town near the geographical centre
of Israel which had been Jebusite till he conquered it, and which
consequently had never formed part of the territory of any tribe.

One may also see, as Albright[34] has done, in the choice of Saul
the operation of similar considerations and the recognition of
the difficulty and delicacy of welding a collection of tribal
communities into a nation.   Thus there is the emphasis on
prowess and stature – qualities which, as we have seen, ranked
high as qualifications for leadership during the period of the
Judges, and especially when danger threatened.   Saul was thus
the kind of warrior king who could appeal to the pattern of
tribal usage.   Further Saul belonged to the most central and
weakest tribe, and Albright thinks this was a deliberate policy
which sought to obviate the flaring up of tribal jealousy
within the confederacy;   it was an attempt to ensure that the
new king should not excite particularistic friction from the
first.   The strength of tribal scruples is also illustrated by
the resentment evoked by David's census.[35]   This numbering of
heads was thought to be an attack on individual liberty or
perhaps on tribal autonomy, threatened by the closing tentacles
of a centralized administration.   David's census was probably
ordered with a view to the administrative reorganisation of the
Israelite confederacy,[36] and its objective was to fix correct
tribal boundaries and to ascertain the population within these
boundaries.[37]   Albright[38] holds that, when Solomon came to under-
take an administrative reorganisation of Israel, he benefited
from David's experience with the centrifugal tendencies of the

tribes. The coincidence between the administrative districts
of David and the older tribal divisions had been a weakness,
since it harnessed the strength of tribalism against this
attempt at central control. Hence under the Solomonic reorgani-
sation we find that at least half of the twelve new admini-
strative districts diverge from the old tribal boundaries.
Albright notes that these changes were partly forced upon the
king by the addition to Israel proper of extensive new territory,
such as the Mediterranean coast from south of Joppa to Carmel,
much of the Plain of Esdraelon, and tracts in Trans-Jordan,
but he adds, " it was partly a deliberate attempt to break up
larger units in Northern Israel. For example, the tribe of
Manasseh was divided into three parts - or four if we count the
district of Dor (included in Manasseh according to the
tradition of Joshua 17: 11). Since the earlier Israelite king
was a Manassite and since Manasseh later became the focus of
Jeroboam's rebellion and the district in which the latter's
three successive capitals were located, this arrangement was
evidently a sound move politically."[39]

In these devious ways it is possible to trace the conflict
between the kind of political and social structure which commended
itself to tribal ways of thinking, with the emphasis on the
preservation of individual liberty and tribal prerogatives, and
the centralized state which David and Solomon created, based on

a totally different political philosophy and dependent for
its effectiveness on centralised power.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RELIGIOUS BOND OF COMMUNITY

THE RELIGIOUS BOND OF COMMUNITY

Noth[1] has argued that the organisation of the Israelite
tribes after the Conquest was amphictyonic, i.e. a system of
twelve tribes grouped around a central shrine. Noth[2] has sought
to emphasise the close parallelism between this institution
and the amphictyony which was a feature of other Mediterranean
lands. Albright[3] observes that numerous amphictyonies and
groupings of amphictyonic character are reported by classical
writers from both Greece and Italy, and that a number of them
are explicitly stated to have twelve tribes. The best known is
the Pylaean or Delphic amphictyony which can be traced back to
the eighth century B.C., but which may have been several
centuries older. The fundamental characteristic of these
systems was the function of the central sanctuary as a bond
holding together the political structure of the member tribes.

Noth[4] has rightly claimed that the bare proof of the
existence of such an institution among the Israelite tribes
during the period of the Judges would be of considerable
importance, since it would account for the existence of a bond
between them and would provide machinery for the keeping alive
of the consciousness of belonging to each other. Noth concedes
that contemporary reference to the life of this old Israelite
confederacy is to be found in only a few portions of the Old

Testament tradition, but he holds that these should be regarded as notices only of especially prominent and unusual features in its history. The implication would appear to be that what was normal and unexceptional in the amphictyonic practice and procedure was not registered by the tradition.

Noth has thus sought to establish that Yahweh was the focus of the alliance of the Israelite tribes and that the machinery of the confederacy was an amphictyonic organisation. According to Noth,[5] there was an older six-tribe amphictyony, composed of the Leah tribes (who occupied the leading role) together with Naphtali, Dan, Asher and Gad (or Gilead), centred on Shechem. The Israel twelve-tribe amphictyony is a development from this older amphictyony, and its formation is to be associated with the entry into Canaan of the Joseph tribes who had become worshippers of Yahweh, because of the experiences of the Exodus and the residence at Sinai. Thus Noth has it that with the entry of the Joseph tribes came the worship of Yahweh; the recognition of Yahweh as the exclusive God of the new confederacy followed, in the first place, in connection with the enlarging and reorientation of the older amphictyony at the convention of Shechem (Joshua 24), under the influence of the tribe of Joseph and the tribe of Benjamin (already allied with Joseph in the Rachel group). It was this communal recognition of Yahweh, and the communal obligations of the

amphictyonic cult inseparable from it, which created the bond
by which the Israelite tribes were bound to each other.   Noth
contends that, since Shechem was the centre of the old six-tribe
amphictyony, and since the Leah tribes were in the reign of
Shechem at the time when that area was falling within the
sphere of influence of the Joseph tribes, it is antecedently
probable that at the self-same place also the centre of the new
twelve-tribe amphictyony is to be sought.   Noth further
supports this view by reference to the Abimelech story (Judges 9)
which has its focus in Shechem, and he also notices the
connections between Shechem and Manasseh in Numbers 26: 31.
He is of the opinion that the removal of the central sanctuary
from Shechem to Shiloh may have taken place by way of inter-
mediate stations.[6]   This attempt by Noth to substitute Shechem
for Shiloh as the original amphictyonic sanctuary is unacceptable
to Albright,[7] who in this and other details disagrees with Noth,
but who in general accepts his work as standard.   Albright
notes that the uniform biblical tradition places the central
sanctuary of Israel at Shiloh, and discusses the archaeological
evidence.[8] Rowley[9] holds that the story of Joshua 24 (what Noth
called the convention of Shechem) represents the transfer to
Joshua of an older tradition of a covenant between Israelites
and Canaanites, but in an appropriately altered form. The older
tradition referred to a covenant between the Canaanites of
Shechem and the Israelite tribes of Simeon and Levi in the

Amarna Age, and in its altered form it has been given relevance
to all the Israelite tribes and has been brought into association
with the God Yahweh whom Moses had given them. Rowley further
notes that the evidence is scanty for the view that Shechem
was an amphictyonic centre in the time of Joshua, since its
capture by the Israelites is unrecorded and long after Joshua's
death the city is still in Canaanite hands. Rowley consequently
thinks it is unlikely that Shechem was the centre of an
Israelite amphictyony at that time.

At the central Sanctuary, where the ark[10] was the most
important cult object, there was an annual amphictyonic festival
whose most important item was the offering of the amphictyonic
sacrifice. Here the delegates of the several members of the
amphictyony assembled in order to deliberate on affairs of
common concern. Noth[11] holds that the Israelite amphictyony
must have had its amphictyonic law, regulating the communal
cult and perhaps legislating also in order to define the mutual
relations of the member tribes. Noth notes the weight of legal
material which the Old Testament contains, and thinks it would
not be surprising if it preserved a residue of ancient Israelite
amphictyonic law. In this connection the Book of the Covenant
would spring to mind or, at any rate a part of the corpus of
this law. Noth rules out the mispatim[12] on the ground that their
contents do not suggest that they are amphictyonic law, and also

the cultic regulations of the Book of the Covenant, since these
presuppose not a central sanctuary but local sanctuaries.
Noth, however, thinks it worthy of consideration that the
religious and ethical prohibitions given in the form of priestly
tōrōt stem from the law of the old Israelite amphictyony. He
believes that the occurrence of the term 'nāsī' in Exodus 22,
27 lends support to his view, and he holds that this is a
technical term denoting a man with special amphictyonic
functions. He also refers to the provisions for the gēr as a
probable example of amphictyonic legislation. The gēr[13] is,
according to Noth, to be primarily understood as the Israelite
who is separated from his kin and his tribe, and who lives in
association with another tribe. This would make the definition
of the status of the gēr a matter affecting the mutual
relations of the member tribes of the amphictyony. The origin
of the Book of the Covenant itself (i.e. as an entity,
irrespective of the ultimate provenance of its constituent parts)
is, in Noth's estimation, illumined and made intelligible if one
imagines it to have been consummated within the framework of
amphictyony. Noth is of the opinion that the acceptance of a
date at the close of the period of the Judges for the origin of
the Book of the Covenant squares with the facts. The difficulty
of conceiving the possibility of a single system of law at that
time is met by recognizing that the Israelite tribes had a

central amphictyonic structure through which the unification
could have been effected.

Noth[14] observes that the peculiarity of the Book of the
Covenant is the combination of Israelite and non-Israelite
elements, and he considers it probable that the latter derive
from the city-state polity of pre-Israelite Canaan. His
contention is that the old Israelite amphictyony was the soil
on which the Canaanite city-states first met with the Israelite
tribes in regulated intercourse.[15] As these city-states
recognized the law of the amphictyony, so the Canaanite law
must have found an entrance into the Israelite polity through
the Israelite tribes which had become sedentary in Canaan.
The amphictyony must have been the locus of this adjustment,
since such elements in the Book of the Covenant as the law of
persons and things are not amphictyonic law proper, and are to
be regarded as the Canaanite contribution. In this way Noth
seeks to establish that the Book of the Covenant was consummated
within the framework of amphictyony. The cultic regulations
which presuppose local sanctuaries and not a central sanctuary
are something of an embarrassment to Noth, and he proposes to
overcome this by suggesting that these cultic regulations go
back to the local traditions of one or other of the central
sanctuaries which, in addition to its significance as the
central sanctuary of the amphictyony, or prior to its elevation

to this distinction, had played the role of a local cult place.

Noth[16] reckons with unwritten, consuetudinary laws, obligatory upon the members of the confederacy, in addition to the written amphictyonic law. He takes the incident recorded in Judges 19, 20 to be an instance of an amphictyonic war undertaken against a member of the amphictyony, the tribe of Benjamin, in default of its willingness or ability to punish those of its tribe responsible for the outrage in question.[17]

Since the amphictyonic organisation which Noth[18] has sought to reconstruct was an association of twelve tribes, it took in the southern tribes of Judah and Simeon. Noth dissents from the view that until the time of the monarchy these southern tribes lived in complete isolation from the others. He admits that they did stand in a certain relation of apartness, but he explains this by asserting that Judah and Simeon belonged to two amphictyonies. Noth holds that David was not first head of the tribe Judah, before he became head of Greater Judah, and that it was because he was head of the wider community that his elevation to kingship is associated with the non-Israelite and Calebite city of Hebron. Hebron was the centre of a six-tribe amphictyony made up of Judah, Simeon, Kaleb, Othniel, Jerachmeel and Kain. Noth notes that the tree sanctuary of Mamre, with the associated Abrahamic traditions, is located in the plain of Hebron, and that such a sanctuary may be considered

as an appropriate centre for an amphictyonic confederation of
tribes, Judah and Simeon belonged to this Hebron amphictyony of
six tribes, and also to the Israelite twelve-tribe amphictyony.
Noth maintains that such an overlapping of the spheres of
distinct amphictyonies has nothing against it. This would mean
that the influence of the Israelite twelve-tribe amphictyony
extended to the Judaean mountains; and the relation of apartness
attaching to Judah and Simeon vis-à-vis the other members of
the Israelite amphictyony is explained by their closer involve-
ment in a six-tribe amphictyony, also Yahweh-worshipping but
partially Non-Israelite, which had to do with their special
sphere of territorial influence. Through the amphictyony of
Hebron, Judah and Simeon felt a firmer bond with the adjoining
non-Israelite tribes than, through the twelve-tribe amphictyony,
with the larger whole of the Israelite tribes distributed over
Canaan.

We have already attempted to explain the rift between
north and south in terms of the recrudescence of tribal
particularism. Noth makes the interesting suggestion that it
may also be considered as having its ground in the emergence of
circumstances which worked for the dissolution of the twin-
amphictyonic affiliation of Judah and Simeon. According to Noth,[19]
the secession of the two southern tribes[20] from the all-Israelite
amphictyony followed upon the death of Saul, and had its

ultimate ground in the allegiance of Judah with the old-established Hebron amphictyony. Noth contends that, in the absence of any tradition with regard to succession, David was a candidate for the throne not simply within the bounds of the special Hebron group but also beyond it.   But when the other Israelite tribes chose Ishbaal the son of Saul as king (according to Noth, he was the tool of Abner), the Hebron group elevated David as king in Hebron. The aspirations of David and Judah had become incompatible with their maintaining a double amphictyonic affiliation. The all-Israelite amphictyony had repudiated the claims of David and Judah, while the Hebron amphictyony had acknowledged them. In these circumstances Judah severed its bond with the all-Israelite amphictyony. So, according to Noth, fell out the contraction of the name 'Israel' to the ten tribes, and the antithesis of 'Israel' and 'Judah'. After the division of the kingdom, 'Israel' and 'Judah' became the names of two states separated from each other, while, before the time of the monarchy, they were the names of two amphictyonic confederacies whose spheres overlapped. Noth maintains that something of the old usage of 'Israel' (i.e. its meaning of an all-Israelite amphictyony) persists even with the advent of the new political usage, in which 'Israel' stands in antithesis to 'Judah'. According to the old usage, Israel still comprises all the amphictyonic

tribes and is characterized as worshipper and subject of
Yahweh, the covenant God of the community. The origin of the
wider significance of the word in an amphictyonic institution
makes it easily intelligible that just this religious meaning
clung to it, when in a political context the word had assumed
a special narrow sense. In spite of political division, the
consciousness of belonging to one and the same God persisted.

Pedersen's[21] concept of Israelite society as organised
in expanding circles of kinship has, according to Noth, its
parallel in religious forms. Noth[22] has argued that the Yahweh
cult laid claim to exclusiveness only as a covenant cult, i.e.
only on the basis of amphictyony. A great measure of freedom
thus remained to the constituent tribes, notwithstanding their
amphictyonic bond. The amphictyonic sanctions only operated
for the covenant cult as such and for proper amphictyonic, com-
munal statutes, but otherwise in cultic and other matters the
individual tribes could order their private affairs with a free
hand. Alongside the amphictyonic cult for the entire confederacy,
there remained room for the well-established obligations of
tribal and kin cults, and the amphictyonic central sanctuary
in no way proscribed the existence of other local sanctuaries.
Noth contends that side by side with the national Yahweh religion
there were other forms of religion among the Israelite tribes
in Canaan, tribal, sib and family cults,[23] as well as local cults,

and that the role played by them must not be under-rated.   The
inability of the Yahweh cult to suppress or absorb these
religious forms concurrent with it is explicable when we bear
in mind how closely intertwined were these with the life of
the individual tribes.   Noth asserts that the co-existence of
the Yahweh cult and these other religious forms is a co-existence
of forms not merely distinguishable but different in kind.
Neither should this co-existence be regarded simply as a trans-
ition phenomenon which ought not to have been, attributable to
the observable slowness of the formation of larger groupings
in religious matters.   Rather it indicates that after the
appearance of the newer religious configurations the older
forms are not obliged to capitulate.   Moreover, according to
Noth, the Yahweh cult recognized these other phenomena as things
of quite a different kind, and admitted their value ao long as
its own exclusive worth as the covenant cult was not infringed.
Noth includes among the particular cults which flourished
alongside Yahwism, Alt's[24] 'god of the fathers'.   Alt had held
that this type of worship arrived in Palestine with the
Israelite tribes and lived simultaneously with Yahweh worship.
According to him it had to do with a special kind of tribal
or sib cult.   Further, Noth is sympathetically disposed to Alt's
other thesis that, when the tribes and sibs who were the bearers
of the cult became settled in Canaan, the cult established

itself at primitive local sanctuaries, and thereby the 'gods of the fathers' came into connection with the local dieties worshipped at these sanctuaries. In the case of both these religious forms (i.e. 'gods of the fathers' and local dieties) we are dealing with particular cults which could establish a reciprocal relationship, because they were of the same kind, while the Yahweh cult as an amphictyonic and covenant affair lay on a different level. Noth contends that there was no reason to begin with why the sphere of interest of the Yahweh cult should interact with those of the particular cults, until a point was reached where the Yahweh cult through its own preponderance was able to absorb the particular cults.

Given the existence of these particular cults described above, our special task is to enquire how these would react upon the formation of a national community, the religious symbol of which was the Yahweh cult. From this point of view it does not seem to us that their co-existence with the covenant cult Yahwism can have been so devoid of friction as Noth's account would suggest, for these other cults were religious symbols of communities within the national community, and, when there was a clash between tribal and national interests, the tribal god would be employed to support and legitimate particularism. Noth's confident assumption that the spheres of interest were separate, and that each could pursue its own

goal unmolested by the other, does not appear likely from this point of view. Noth's own hypothesis has it that Judah ultimately found her double amphictyonic affiliation incompatible with the preservation of her particular interests and aspirations. If a clash were possible on the level of amphictyony, where both amphictyonies were presided over by the same God Yahweh, much more could it arise between covenant interests and tribal interests, where the religious symbol of the one was Yahweh and of the other a tribal god. It may be conceded that there were many respects in which the spheres of the covenant God and hîs cult, and the other cults, would remain separate, as dealing with spheres which need not interact, but in so far as these other gods were the foci of tribal, sib and family interests and loyalties, they must have tended to offset the potency of Yahwism as the symbol of Israelite nationhood. For in this case not only was there a religious symbol of nationhood and a Covenant God who authorised and demanded such submerging of particular interests as was indispensable to the creation of a larger corporate entity, there were other religious symbols which might be employed to legitimate and sanction disintegrating forces, and tribal particularism might find its religious authorisation to counter the claims of nationhood authorised by Yahweh. Thus it seems probable to us that, in so far as the centrifugal forces in

Israelite society, whether upholders of tribal, sib or family interests, could attach a religious sanction and give religious expression to their claims, the absolute efficacy of Yahwism as a symbol creative of nationhood was impaired.

The importance of the religious bond for the creation of community does not chiefly depend on the newness of legislation which it may inspire. Of more significance perhaps is the powerful legitimation and solidarity of sanction which it super-adds to customary maxims of corporate life. This is illustrated well by the case of Muhammad as a legislator at Medina,[25] striving to create an inter-tribal society by invoking the authority of Allah as the ultimate reason for obedience to what he demanded. The problem which faced Muhammad was that of creating a community which extended beyond the border of the tribe, and of extending to inter-tribal relationships the code which had hitherto been deemed inapplicable outside tribal boundaries. The significant thing is that Muhammad understood that the structure of use and wont which had regulated tribal life might through religious legitimation hold sway over a larger corporate entity and thus become a practical basis of nationhood. Muhammad was a shrewd legislator and he sought to legislate for a real community; he knew that well-established usage cannot be discarded in a day and some entirely novel and idealistic corpus of law substituted for it. He intended to

create a real community, and his primary aim was thus to incorporate customary tribal procedure and to use the new note of religious authority in order to escape from what up till then had been the impasse of Arabian society - the tribal boundary. In the name of Allah he demanded that there should be a community of believers bound to each other by the obligations which had hitherto stopped short at the boundary of the tribe. The real nature of his triumph as the creator of a new community was that he destroyed tribalism by mutually obligating the members of that community with the intensity of regard which until then had been marred by the narrowness of its tribal sphere, but which now was co-extensive with the community of Allah. In these circumstances the content of communal life might remain much as before, but the reasons for acquiescence had undergone a revolution. This would have been impossible without the note of religious imperative which the prophet sounded. Communal obligation was no longer defined by blood or commanded by kinship; it was the demand of Allah and its province was co-extensive with the faithful. It took the note of religious authority and the claim on religious devotion to overcome the chronic tribalism of Arabic society. If Allah commanded, then His servants must obey, and through this obedience a unified community came into being. As the prophet of Allah and by His authority Muhammad bound the Arabian

tribes into a nation as no leader prior to him had been able
durably to do, and he employed the dynamic of the new Faith to
destroy the chronic disposition towards internecine warfare
by creating through it a religious basis for nationhood. It was
in virtue of the discovery of this basis for corporate life of
national scope that the Arabian tribes were equipped for their
advance into sedentary life, and the Islamic state was able to
advance towards civilisation and culture. The same consideration
also holds good in the case of the Israelites, who likewise
passed over from nomadic or semi-nomadic conditions to a settled
way of life at the behest of a formative religious dynamic.²⁶

Noth has noticed that this fact of the religious
legitimation of what is old or what may have its origin in a
sphere outside that of positive Yahwistic inspiration, has to
be borne in mind in considering the case of the Israelites.
Thus he has suggested that the origin of the Book of the
Covenant (as an entity irrespective of the ultimate provenance
of its constituent parts) is made intelligible, if one regards
it as consummated within the framework of the amphictyony. In
the Book of the Covenant Noth has looked for legislation which
might be regarded as enacted by amphictyonic decree and so might
be described as positive amphictyonic legislation. But he also
recognizes non-Israelite elements in the Book of the Covenant,
which have been appropriated and made obligatory upon the

members of the amphictyony. Noth thinks that these non-Israelite elements stem from the polity of the Canaanite city state, and we shall have reason to examine this assertion more closely presently.[27] At present we shall say that they are proximately derived from Canaanite law and more ultimately they may have Babylonian and Hittite derivations.[28] But they are presented as Yahweh's demands and it is this religious authorisation which secures obedience for them.

In the case of Israel there is also redeployment of the old in the name of Yahweh. We may speak more particularly of this by considering the case of the šōpēṭ in Israelite society. The šōpēṭ has clearly a point of contact with the nomadic šaiḥ, both in his constitutional and judicial functions. We can usually discern that, as a ruler, the šōpēṭ is particularly linked with one tribe, although his rule sometimes extends beyond the limits of his tribe and his leadership is accepted by other tribes. This occurs where there is united action against some outside threat,[29] and would be described by Noth as the setting in motion of the machinery of amphictyony. The same machinery may also operate against a member tribe who has offended against amphictyonic obligations.[30] In these terms one would have to regard the šōpᵉṭīm, who are depicted as holding inter-tribal military Commands in the Book of Judges, as in some way commissioned by the amphictyony and supported by its

sanctions and authority. This new factor of religious authorisation would make intelligible the possibility of the extension of leadership and the submerging of tribal jealousies in the interests of common action. We have here an analogous situation to that described in relation to Muḥammad, where an inter-tribal society was created by the compulsion of a religious obligation. So with the šōpēṭ there is the point of contact with the limited nature of the rule of a nomadic šaiḥ, tribal in extent and subject to the consent of the ruled. Super-added to this, however, there is the special factor of religious legitimation and authority, and this secures an extension of the sphere of rule and an intensifying of authority. The result of the entrance of the religious factor is that it is creative of a notion of executive power, for which there is otherwise no room in a tribal society. The transcending of tribalism and the embarking upon a wider corporate society becomes possible through covenant with Yahweh and the bond between the several tribes which is thereby constituted.[31] Wellhausen makes the penetrating remark about bᵉrīt that it was the nearest approximation to the notion of law which the Hebrews had. He says: "The ancient Hebrews had no other conception of law nor any other designation of it than that of a treaty. A law only obtained force by the fact of those to whom it was given binding themselves to keep it".[32] Thus the

conception of Yahweh as a Covenant God, to whom the Israelite tribes were bound in obedience as a matter of religious devotion, created a kind of constitutional law and served to lay the foundations of a more comprehensive corporate society, where previously no mundane notion of subordination to law or voluntary limitation óf individual or tribal rights by contract in the interests of a larger corporate entity called a 'state' had been regarded as acceptable, or had even been conceived.

The šōpēṭ also had judicial functions, and here again we must take account of the tribal and nomadic background as well as the contribution of the element of religious authorisation. The šaiḥ presided over the disputes of tribesmen as an arbitrator rather than a judge, and not as one who could pronounce a verdict which was binding or enforceable on the litigants. The weight of the šaiḥ's ruling was not attributable to its being backed by the authority of a well-articulated body of law or a powerful machinery for penal enforcement. These notions were foreign and abstract; the šaiḥ's authority as a judge rested upon his own personal power and prestige. There was no question of his being backed by any abstract notion of authority; he must command authority in his own person and thereby win obedience.[33] His verdicts would be given in accordance with a body of customary practice firmly established on the basis of precedent. In pre-Islamic Arabian society the word sunnah, meaning the beaten

track, referred to this well-worn path of customary procedure
by which life was regulated. We have asserted that Muḥammad
appropriated this and made it more binding by backing it with
the note of religious authority.[84] It seems equally certain
to us that the šōpᵉtīm must also have decided cases through
applying the criteria of customary practice, although this had
now become Yahweh's word for his community and the šōpᵉtīm were
invested with this fresh authority. These remarks would apply
to the "able men" (ʾanᵉšē hayil) whom Moses chose from among
the people to assist him in the large number of cases which
came to him for decision. The account in Exodus 18 tells how
Moses was busied at his judicial tasks from morning to evening.
Moses describes his tasks to his father-in-law Jethro: "Because
the people come to me to enquire of God, when they have a
dispute they come to me, and I decide between a man and his
neighbour, and I make them know the statutes of God and His
decisions". "To enquire of God" points to the employment of
the oracle, and the remainder of the description with its
setting in the desert is in line with the judicial functions of
a šaih, plus the reinforcement of prophetic authority. Jethro
tells Moses that he must delegate some of his judicial authority.
He will preside over the great matters, but the smaller affairs
are to become the province of the "able men" who are appointed.
These men are "rulers" as well as "judges"; they are said to be

heads over the people, "rulers of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens", and in addition they are the magistrates in all ordinary cases. Pedersen[35] takes the view that the details of this scheme are "an abstraction of the late period." Elders were the representatives of the people in the cities and villages, after Israel had settled down in Canaan, and the state of affairs described in Exodus 18 is artificially foisted upon the desert period by a late writer. Elsewhere Pedersen[36] suggests that the scheme outlined in Exodus presupposes the existence of the Deuteronomic legislation, and its adaptation through pious imagination to the conditions of the desert period. Pedersen does concede, however, the possibility that the story of Jethro may contain relics of an old tradition. We would hold no more than that the functions of Moses and the appointed officers, as outlined in Exodus 18, are not incongruous with what might be expected to have obtained in the Israelite community during the period of the wanderings.

Albright[37] has pointed out that "šōpēṭ" is an old Canaanite word which is later found among the Carthaginians with the sense of "magistrate" or "civic leader", but this is without prejudice to the above discussion, since we must expect that the function which it described in Israelite society during the period of the Judges would be determined by the kind of society it was, and not by the role of the šōpēṭ in Canaanite society.

In his treatment of the term hopšī, Albright[38] has indicated his
acceptance of this principle, and has warned us that we must not
conclude that philogical equivalence is a guarantee of
equivalence of meaning in different societies. But the Israelite
šōpēt must be considered in relationship to Canaanite society,
for Israel was a society in transition moving forward to new
conditions of life, and in these circumstances there are life-
situations for which the customary guidance of the past makes
no provision. It can hardly be regarded as accidental that the
appropriations from Canaanite law are termed mišpātīm, for this
certainly suggests that it was the business of the šōpēt to
apply them. Thus Alt[39] has suggested that the institution of
the Judges (especially the Minor Judges)[40] was the medium by
which the casuistic law of the Canaanites, best known from the
fragments preserved in the Book of the Covenant, reached Israel.
This should be taken in conjunction with Noth's[41] suggestion
that the diverse elements of the Book of the Covenant were
fashioned into a corpus of laws within the framework of the
Israelite amphictyony. Both these suggestions taken together
remind us, on the one hand, that the legislation which was
promulgated in the name of Yahweh had to deal practically with
the actual life-situation of a real community, and, on the other,
that it had to be issued as Yahweh's command, it had to become
part of amphictyonic sanction before it could compel obedience

and so become a real factor in the regulation of communal life.
Further, if the šōpēṭ had to do with the appropriation and
application of Canaanite law to the needs of Israelite society,
and if this adjustment took place within the framework of the
amphictyonic institution, the conclusion that the šōpēṭ was,
in some sense, commissioned and authorised by the Covenant
God would follow as a matter of course.

Yahweh, we have argued, was the support of national life
and, since the earliest expressions of a corporate feeling
transcending tribal limits are particularly associated with times
of danger and the resort to arms, we should expect that the
sense of Yahweh's presence would be imminent on occasions of
warring.[42] This raises the question of the nature of the
religious experience characteristic of the Israelites at this
stage. Albright[43] has argued that it is proper to associate
with Moses a well-articulated statement of theological belief.
Wellhausen, on the other hand, has held that it is a mistake
to imagine that the religious interest of the Israelites was
of this kind. "For Moses to have given the Israelites 'an
enlightened conception of God' would have been to give them a
stone instead of bread; it is in the highest degree probable
that, with regard to the essential nature of Yahweh, as distinct
from His relation to men, He allowed them to continue in the
same way of thinking as their fathers. With theoretical truths

which were not at all in demand, he did not occupy himself,
but purely with practical questions which were put and urged
by the pressure of the times .... Whatever Yahweh may have
been conceived to be in His essential nature – God of the
thunderstorm or the like – this fell more and more into the
background as mysterious and transcendental; the subject was
not one for enquiry. All stress was laid upon His activity
within the world of mankind, whose ends he made one with His
own." We accept this, in so far as it means that it was in
the process of striving towards nationhood, and in the
confidence that Yahweh was involved with them in these events
and was directing them towards fruition, that the hold of the
Israelites on Yahweh was actualised. As they confronted events
and wrested from them those results which were demanded by the
aspirations of nascent nationhood and the dictates of national
destiny, their persuasion grew that Yahweh was with them in
the midst of their strivings. Now it was in times of military
enterprise that this feeling of exaltation was most marked and
the consciousness of a corporate interest most deeply inprinted
upon the Israelites. If in times of peace the fact of the
geographical separation of the several tribes somewhat weakened
the bond which was the basis of their march towards nationhood,
in a time of danger and emergency the tribes rediscovered their
common interest and their sense of belonging to each other, by

their united response towards the alarm of danger which had
been raised. The revival of national feeling and the revival
of Yahwism went hand in hand. When in times of peace the bond
grew somewhat slack, the awareness of the Covenant God was not
so intense. When danger demanded a drawing together and the
embarking on a common enterprise, Yahweh was in the midst of
Israel. It follows that in the early period, the aspirations
towards the expression of a larger corporate life were best
realized in the sharing of common military tasks in the face
of outside threats to the well-being of Israel. So that when
we speak of the religious bond of community, we have to acknow-
ledge that this bond was most effectual when common action was
constrained by danger. In the fray of battle and in the success-
ful outcome Israel was, at one and the same time, most fully
aware of its God and its nationhood. This is fully borne out
by considerations which we have already raised and which we have
still to raise. ᴸ·⁵ In the period of the Judges we catch a
glimpse of a corporate entity larger than the tribe, especially
when Israel unites under Deborah and Barak against the Canaanite
confederacy, and there too we are in the presence of resurgent
Yahwism; to a lesser degree we have the same thing in the
united action under Gideon and Jepthah. If it is once admitted
that the foundation on which Israel's sense of national unity
rested was religious in character, it cannot be denied that in

the early period the consciousness of this was most fully realised in war. Wellhausen expressed this well: "It was most especially in the graver moments of its history that Israel awoke to a full consciousness of itself and of Yahweh. Now, at that time and for centuries afterwards, the high water marks of history were indicated by the wars it recorded. The name 'Israel' means 'El does battle', and Yahweh was the warrior El, after whom the nation styled itself. The camp was, so to speak, at once the cradle in which the nation was nursed, and the smithy in which it was welded into unity; it was also the primitive sanctuary."[46]

This point is a suitable one to consider the place of the Ark of the Covenant in relation to the corporate life of Israel. In the phrase quoted above Wellhausen has advanced the view that the camp was the primitive sanctuary, and elsewhere he makes clear that he takes the camp to have been the home of the ark during the period of Conquest. It was a standard adapted primarily to the requirements of a wandering and warlike life; brought back from the field, it became the symbol of Yahweh's presence and the central seat of His worship. We do at any rate have conclusive evidence that the ark was carried into battle against the Philistines;[47] that great significance was attached to its presence,[48] and that its loss was in the nature of a major calamity.[49] There is a reference in Judges 20: 27 which suggests

that, at that time, the ark was stationed at Bethel and that
the Israelite army had to go there in order to consult the
oracle; but Shiloh[50] is given as its normal resting place.
The original character of the ark,[51] however, is favourable to
the view that it was portable before it became static, and it
is possible to see its developing significance through desert
conditions, to the conditions of conquest (where its natural
locus would be the camp), to settled conditions when it would
find a lodgment in the amphictyonic sanctuary, whence it would
be carried into war with the army of Israel. Thus Noth[52] has
noted that the connection between the ark and the amphictyony
is especially suggested by I Samuel 4, where the Israelites
rely on the ark for help on the occasion of a war with the
Philistines. Noth expresses the view that the significance which
the ark had for the Israelites at the close of the period of
the Judges is explicable only if it stood in relationship
with the central amphictyonic sanctuary. Noth is of the
opinion that the ark in origin is the portable sanctuary of
the desert period, and that it belonged originally to the House
of Joseph. Noth hazards the assertion that Yahweh the God of
Israel belonged together with the ark and that, in the amphic-
tyonic cult, the ark was properly the locus of the Divine.[53]
Noth in this respect attaches more significance to the ark
than to the location of the amphictyonic sanctuary, for he

argues that the latter was originally at Shechem and was
ultimately removed to Shiloh by way of intermediate stations.
What validated the claim of a place to be the amphictyonic
cult centre was the presence of the ark. While we do not
follow Noth in his assertion that Shechem was the original
amphictyonic sanctuary, we would point out that it is credible
that, in agreement with the account we have given of the
religious and nation-building significance of the military
enterprises of the time of the Conquest, the ark may have
enhanced its religious significance as embodying the presence
of Yahweh in the camp. We have argued that Israel's strivings
after nationhood and its grasp of Yahweh were most truly felt
in the shared experiences of the camp. The ark was the symbol
of Yahweh's presence in these times of danger and high
adventure; how then could it fail to have the most ultimate
religious value for Israel? We would thus add, to what Noth
has said, that the central place of the ark in the camp of
Israel in times of stirring corporate undertakings and pulsating
religious excitement would explain the veneration with which
it is regarded in the subsequent history.

We also notice as a minor point that the charismatic
figures of the Judges period, as well as the first two kings of
Israel, are men whose leadership isespecially associated with
war and warlike accomplishments. It is in connection with

military enterprise that the šōpeṭīm stand out as leaders with
accredited Divine powers. The physique and the warlike prowess
of Saul are important qualifications for the role of king, and
the ceremony of anointing points to the special religious
character of the office.[54] The talk in the market place of the
feats of David in war, whereby even the prowess of Saul is
dwarfed, constitute an especial threat to the throne, because
the 'anointed' is a warrior king and his feats in battle are a
typical expression of his Divine endowments and are an important
part of his title to his office.

There is yet another reason why the experience of common
military operations in the face of danger or in the march of
conquest should have tended at once towards the growth of
nationhood and the revival of Yahwism. The Israelites in the
process of settling down in Canaan were encountering a type of
civilisation and a pattern of life of which they had no previous
experience, and which was removed from the conditions and
experiences of their wilderness wanderings. It will be agreed
that the group which came out of Egypt under the leadership of
Moses was especially the bearers of Yahwism, and we shall confine
our remarks to it. The kind of communal life which the
Israelites knew during the period of wandering must, if we bear
in mind the origin of the group,[55] be conceded to have been of
a special and unusual character. It was a group simple in

structure, but the consciousness of community was intense, and
the focal place of Yahweh as creative of every aspect of
communal life was marked. In this setting the religion of
Yahweh was given to them, and it bore an intimate and realistic
relationship to all the details of their corporate life. But
the daily round and the common task in Canaan (particularly
agricultural Canaan) would assume a very different shape from
what they had previously known, and it would not be an easy
task, or one speedily to be accomplished, to integrate Yahweh
into this new communal setting in the total way in which He had
been integrated into the life of the wilderness community. The
acclimatisation of Yahweh would be a delicate task, and along
these lines we may understand why,when danger receded and the
high enterprise of war was not at hand,there was a definite
tendency for Yahwistic fervour to cool and for national feeling
to disintegrate.[56]   It was much easier to find a religious
expression for the daily round in agricultural Canaan in terms
of Baal than in terms of Yahweh. Indeed the integration with
Baalism was already fully worked out by the pre-Israelite
population, and, in entering into agricultural life, the
Israelites inevitably became involved in the religious aspect
of the new pattern.[57] The difficulty of expressing the religious
side of agricultural life in terms of Yahweh rather than Baal is
sufficiently demonstrated by recalling that as late as the eighth

century we find Hosea trying to impress the lesson that it is
Yahweh and not Baal who is Lord of the crops.[59]   Normality thus
spelled danger for the Israelites in this new cultural setting,
because it bore little resemblance to the old corporate
experience with which Yahweh had been thoroughly integrated.
It is consequently the more intelligible that war should have
had the significance for Yahwism and for Israelite nationhood
which we have ascribed to it.   Here was a sphere where Yahweh
was at home, at the centre of national consciousness, in the
midst of an experience which nourished national aspirations.
The reality of Yahweh might be difficult to discover amid the
operations of agriculture and the pattern of life associated
with them, but Yahweh's position in time of battle, whether at
the call of danger or at the call of conquest, was firmly fixed
in the centre of the camp, and Israel was one again because the
unifying grip of Yahweh was strong.[59]

The national community which the Israelites moved towards,
through the unifying bond of Yahwism, was a form of corporate
life larger in scope than that attained by their predecessors
upon the soil of Canaan.[60]   The typical unit in pre-Israelite
Canaan was the city-state, as exemplified by the 'Mother City'
with its agricultural environs or gebūl, dependent upon the
urban centre and subject to its administrative control.[61]   Holding
a recognized place within the city-state was its god, and the

rule and social organisation thus received their religious expression and legitimation. It may indeed be an over-simplification to regard the Baal of the city-state as a local god,[62] whose sphere of influence was co-extensive with the borders of the city which it served and whose interests coincided absolutely with those of the ruling caste of the city. Albright[63] has protested that Baal is a cosmic and not a local god. However this may be, it is undeniable that the significance of Baal as a factor creative of corporate life did not in Canaan exceed the bounds of the city-state, and this is the only aspect of the question with which we are concerned. It is hard to escape the conclusion that, within the political setting of rival city states, the political rivalries would be reflected on a religious level, and the Baal of each city identified with the interests of that city. From this point of view the Baal of a city-state is a local god, in the sense that it offers no inspiration for a form of corporate life transcending particular rivalries, but rather absolutises the city-state polity by lending to it a religious sanction.[64]

We should thus say that, while Yahwism could supply the inspiration and dynamic for a corporate life, national in scope, the Baal, as a religious symbol of a corporate entity, could not create a larger loyalty than the city-state; the Baal was imprisoned within the boundaries of the city-state, and could do

no more than reflect and legitimate the existing state of
political rivalries between neighbouring city-states each of
which had its Baal.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE GIBBŌR HAYIL IN THE COMMUNITY

The Gibbōr Ḥayil in the Community

The occurrences of gibbōr and gibbōr ḥayil in the Old
Testament admit of the following classification:

1. Physical prowess and martial valour: Genesis 6:4, 10:8,9;
Joshua 1:14, 6:2, 8:3, 10:2, 10:7; Judges 5:13,23, 6:12, 11:1;
1 Samuel 2:4, 14:52, 16:18, 17:51; 2 Samuel 1:19,25,27, 10:7,
17:8,10, 20:7, 23:8,9,16,17,22; 1 Kings 1:8,9; 2 Kings 5:1,
24:16; 1 Chronicles 7:5,7,11,40, 11:10,11,12,19,24, 12:1,4,9,
21,26,29,31, 19:8, 29:24; 2 Chronicles 13:3, 14:7, 17:16,17,
25:6, 26:12, 28:7; Psalms 19:6, 33:16, 45:4, 120:4, 127:4;
Proverbs 16:32, 21:22; Canticles 3:7, 4:4; Isaiah 3:2, 13:3,
21:17, 49:25; Jeremiah 5:16, 46:6,9,12, 48:14,41, 49:22,
50:9,36, 51:30,56; Ezekiel 32:12,21,27, 39:20; Hosea 10:13;
Joel 2:7, 4:9,10,11; Amos 2:14,16; Zechariah 9:13, 10:5.

For the most part the context is a martial one but there
are one or two examples of a more general meaning. Genesis 10:9,
for example, refers to prowess in the hunt, and Psalm 19:16
to prowess in running. Briggs,' however, would connect this
latter example with military prowess, by asserting that fleet-
ness of foot was part of the qualifications of an ancient
warrior.

But the setting in which the term is found is predominantly

martial. In 1 Samuel 16:18, for example, Saul is called a gibbōr ḥayil, and this is coupled with ʾîš milḥāmäh (man of war). In Joel 4:9 the parallel of haggibbōrîm is ʾanᵉšê hammilḥāmäh, while in Jeremiah 48:14 gibbōrîm is paralleled by ʾanᵉšê ḥayil. In Zechariah 9:13 gibbōr is coupled with ḥereb (sword). So also Jeremiah 50:36.

What is the status of this warrior gibbōr? Is he a rank and file soldier, or does he occupy a position of leadership, or is he otherwise marked out for his special qualities? Joshua 8:3 reads: "So Joshua rose,with all the fighting men, to go up to Ai; and Joshua chose thirty thousand mighty men of valour (ʾîš gibbōrê haḥayil) and sent them forth by night". This carries the suggestion of picked troops, of men outstanding in the arts of war. Similarly in Joshua 10:7 a distinction is drawn between "all the people of war" (kol ᶜam hammilḥāmäh) and "the mighty men of valour" (gibbōrê heḥayil). Such texts as 1 Samuel 16:18, Ezekiel 39:20, Isaiah 3:2, might also be mentioned as drawing a distinction between the "mighty men of valour" and the "men of war", although the intention of these texts is not so unmistakably clear as that of the first two examples cited. Further, in Judges 6:12 and 11:1, Jepthah and Gideon, chosen for their prowess and valour, are called šōpᵉṭîm and gibbōrê ḥayil. In 2 Samuel 17:8 David is described as a gibbōr ḥayil, and in 2 Kings 5:1 Naaman, a commander of the army

of the King of Syria, is described as a gibbōr ḥayil. Also in
1 Chronicles 12:21, and 2 Chronicles 26:12,13, those designated
gibbōrē ḥayil have military commands. 2 Chronicles 13:3 brings
out the meaning of a corps d'élite, describing the army of
"valiant men of war" (gibbōrē milḥāmāh) as "picked men" (ʾiš
bāḥūr); and against them Jereboam drew up "picked mighty
warriors" (ʾiš bāḥūr gibbōr ḥayil). The reference to a corps
d'élite, and not to a rank and file army, should also be seen
in 1 Chronicles 19:8, 2 Samuel 10:7, 2 Samuel 17:8. "The army
of the mighty men"[2] are to be equated with the body of soldiers
of fortune and mercenaries, renowned for outstanding feats of
valour and closely bound to the person of the king, and having
an association with David which went back to his freebooting and
fugitive days.

This brings us easily to the developed and specialised
meaning of "mercenary" which gibbōr carries in the Old Testament.
In 2 Samuel 23:8 to the end (parallel passage: 1 Chronicles 11:
10-41), the roll of David's gibbōrīm is given. There are two
degrees of honour: those who belong to the Three, and those
who beong to the Thirty. The chief of the Three[3] is Josheb-
Basshebeth a Tachmonite, and the other two are (in order of
merit) Eleazar son of Dodo, son of Ahohi, and Shammah the son
of Agee the Hararite. They both covered themselves with glory
in the fighting with the Philistines, and it is further told

how the three broke through the camp of the Philistines to procure water for David from the well of Bethlehem. At the head of the Thirty[4] stood Abishai the brother of Joab, the son of Zeruiah. His feats are described, he is named as the most renowned of the Thirty, but it is stated that he did not attain to the Three. Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, likewise renowned among the Thirty, was head of the king's bodyguard, but he did not attain to the Three. Thirty-one more names follow in the Samuel passage and these comprise the remainder of the "Thirty". They include the name of at least one foreign mercenary, Uriah the Hittite, and, taken together, the contents of this chapter would seem to refer to a group of professional soldiers gifted in the arts of war and noted for prodigious feats of courage and strength; in the case of some of them, at least, the association with David goes back to the days of warfare against the Philistines or even beyond, to the days when he was hunted by Saul or when he was in Philistine employment at Ziklag.[5] The titles "Three" and "Thirty" suggest that they are specially bound to the king's household and his person.

It should be observed that the name of Joab, the commander-in-chief, does not find an explicit place in the roll of honour. It seems to us, however, that the omission is apparent and not real, and that it is tacitly assumed that he occupies the topmost point of the pyramid. The reasons for this may be set down as

follows. Although Joab is not singled out explicitly for pre-eminence, he is alluded to indirectly in a way that bears witness to his position of lone supremacy. Thus Abishai, who himself is no mean person as the first in precedence among the Thirty, is designated not only as the son of Zeruiah but also as the brother of Joab.[6] Similarly in verse 26 Asahel is designated "brother of Joab". The usual designation of Joab is "son of Zeruiah" and never "brother of Abishai". We take this to mean that Joab was a more considerable person in the kingdom than Abishai, and that his place in this roll of honour and his precedence over Abishai is taken for granted. Again, it is recorded that Naharai of Beeroth, one of the Thirty, was the armour-bearer of Joab, the son of Zeruiah,[7] and this again points to the elevated position of Joab, as one having an armour-bearer from out of the ranks of the Thirty – men who themselves had been marked out for honour and advancement.

The office of Joab, as described elsewhere, was that of commander of the ṣābā. But Joab is also spoken of as the leader of David's gibbōrīm. 2 Samuel 3:22 reads: "Just then the servants of David arrived with Joab from a raid, bringing much spoil with them. But Abner was not with David at Hebron, for he had sent him away and he had gone in peace. When Joab and all the army (ṣābā) that was with him came ...." "Servants" (ᶜabādīm) describes the king's personal professional corps

(i.e. his gibbōrīm), and Joab is depicted at their head. "Sābā"
here is probably to be equated with the sābā' of the gibbōrīm
which is mentioned in 2 Samuel 10:7, where it is said that
David sent Joab and all the "s^{e}bā' haggibbōrīm". "s^{e}bā'
haggibbōrīm" would then be equivalent to the corps of
professional specialists considered above.[8]   Cf. 1 Chronicles
19:8, 2 Samuel 20:7.

What seems to clinch the matter is the reference to the
total number in the roll of honour in 2 Samuel 23:39.   There
stand the words "thirty-seven in all".   It has been noted as
a possible minor inconsistency that the numbers of the "Thirty"
exceed thirty.[9]   More curious, however, is the discrepancy of
one between the total number of names listed in Samuel, and
the figure given in verse 39.   Thirty-six names are listed and
the total is given as thirty-seven.   H.P. Smith[10] notes this
discrepancy, and it has also been noticed by Curtis and Madson,[11]
who make the suggestion that Zabad (taken as the first of the
additional names in Chronicles) may have belonged with the
list in Samuel, and, for some reason have fallen from the text.
This seems to us most improbable.   Smith has all the elements
of the solution before him but he does not stumble upon it.
He remarks: "First mentioned is Ishbaal, the Hachmonite chief
of the three, i.e. of the distinguished band which ranked above
all, except the commander-in-chief".[12]   We have noted the

indications that Joab is tacitly if not explicitly included in the list, and his inclusion is confirmed by the fact that the total number is given as thirty-seven. This is made up of Joab, the commander-in-chief, the Three, the two leaders of the Thirty plus thirty one others, yielding a total of thirty-seven. So that the degrees of honour are really three in number, the One, the Three, and the Thirty. Joab's place at the pinnacle of the pyramid is taken for granted.

Another question is that of the identity of the "ṣābā'" over which Joab had command. Ṣābā' can be used with the general meaning of a military force or an army. Thus, as we have noticed, the corps of gibbōrīm is designated $s^e\underline{b}a$' haggibbōrīm.[13] The same word is used for the army of Sisera (Judges 4:7), the army of Hadadezer (2 Samuel 10:16), and the army of the king of Syria (2 Kings 5:1). Further ṣabu, plural ṣābê, is a common word (mostly in the plural with the meaning "soldiers") in the Tell-el-Amarna Letters.[14] Sb occurs in Ugaritic with the meaning "army" or "soldiers".[15] In Arabic, saba'a (ᶜalā) means "to lead a troop against". Yet in spite of this widespread general usage of ṣābā', we still have the impression that the ṣābā' over which Joab is said to have command should be regarded as a well-defined Israelite institution. (See 2 Samuel 3:23, 8:16; I Kings 11:15,21; I Chronicles 20:1, 27:34.) It is not "a ṣābā'" but "the ṣābā'", and what is meant is a particular

Israelite military institution, the ṣābāʾ of Israel. Now we have
already argued at length[16] that the revolt of Absalom was a
popular movement based on the support of the people, while
David relied on the corps of specialist mercenaries who, within
the bureaucratic framework which he had created, were his ʿabādīm.[17]
2 Samuel 17:25 states that Absalom set Amasa over the ṣābāʾ
instead of Joab, and this appears to mean that the ṣābāʾ had
declared for Absalom. Since other evidence, previously adduced,
leads us to conclude that Absalom headed a popular revolt
against bureaucratic exaction and tyranny, it is probable that
the ṣābāʾ should be regarded as a broadly based, representative
force — a kind of national militia.[18] This would explain why,
while David had the support of his mercenary power group, the
gibbōrīm, the ṣābāʾ which was a popular force, the successor of
the peasant confederacy which fought under Deborah and Barak,
should espouse the democratic cause. Joab remained faithful to
the person of the king, in company with the gibbōrīm of which
he was the titular head. Absalom had an army without a commander
and so he appointed Amasa.

Interesting also are the rival alignments described in
I Kings 1:8f., where Joab and the gibbōrīm part company and are
in conflict. It is stated that Joab, commander of the ṣābāʾ,
and Abiathar the priest supported the pretensions of Adonijah,
but that David's gibbōrīm were not with Adonijah. In view of

the fact that it was Adonijah's rival, Solomon, who grasped the throne, it is not surprising that Joab was replaced by Abiathar. It is interesting, however, that Joab and the gibbōrīm should have been on different sides in the Adonijah/Solomon conflict. It is perhaps significant that in mentioning Joab's support of Adonijah, mention is also made of his command of the ṣābā'. Was it the pull of the ṣābā' which had eventually re-orientated his interests against those of the other gibbōrīm? At the Absalom revolt, Joab had remained with the body of the gibbōrīm faithful to David, while his ṣābā' went over to Absalom. When the strife arose over the succession between Adonijah and Solomon, was it that the ṣābā' favoured Adonijah, and Joab was carried over with it, while the mercenary power group chose to prop up the claims of Solomon? If this interpretation be possible (more than possibility cannot be claimed for it), the ṣābā' would once again be in conflict with the gibbōrīm, i.e. the citizen army against the mercenary group of specialists who are the military prop of bureaucratic exaction, and who are ʿabādīm of the king.

2. The problem of the ṣābā', however, must be considered further in relation to another O.T. usage of gibbōr, namely, as an attribute of God. Thus we have: 'Ēl gibbōr in Isaiah 9:5 and 10:21, Deuteronomy 10:17, Jeremiah 32:18, Nehemiah 9:32;

Hā'ēl haggibbōr in Isaiah 42:13; in Jeremiah 20:11 (cf. Psalm 78:65, Job 16:14), Yahweh is "like a warrior" (k^e gibbōr); in Zephaniah 3:17, He is "the gibbōr who saves" (gibbōr yōšīa'); cf. Jeremiah 14:9, Psalm 118:15,16 ("Yahweh doing hayil"), Psalm 59:12 (hayil = "power of God").

We would suggest that the primary meaning of gibbōr hayil in Israelite society is that which holds in the period of the Conquest, and that the concept 'Ēl Gibbōr belongs to the same historical context. The conjunction of gibbōr hayil and 'Ēl gibbōr[19] has to be read in the light of our remarks in the previous chapter.[20] God's presence was especially to be discerned in the camp, and the coherence of the nation Israel under the direction of a God who fought[21] in their midst was best realised in the common enterprise of war. Each enterprise and victory were at once a further cementing of nationhood and a powerful reassurance that God fought by the side of Israel in its march towards its destiny. Those upon whom the nation relied supremely at these times of high endeavour were the gibbōrē hayil (Joshua 1:14, 8:3, 10:7), and these especially were the henchmen of 'Ēl Gibbōr in bringing each cause to victory. Thus, if this relationship gibbōr hayil/'Ēl Gibbōr is regarded as established, it follows that the prestige and status of the picked warriors of the Israelite confederacy have a religious significance. They are the elect of 'Ēl Gibbōr, and His presence

in the midst of his people, guaranteeing them victory as they
fight for their heritage, is realised in the valour and strength
of His gibbōrīm. The charismatic endowment of gibbōrīm is
more clearly seen in a case like that of Gideon, who is both
a šōpēṭ and a gibbōr ḥayil. Gideon was thus a charismatic
leader, whose powers were most visible and whose authority was
most secure in war, even as the presence of Yahweh was most
easily entertained and most fully experienced then as ʾEl Gibbōr.
The authority of the šōpᵉṭīm was most supreme in war, and it was
the ability to command and to lead in battle which constituted
the most powerful title to leadership. For as long as this was
true – and we see it continued in the idéal of the warrior king
in Saul and David – military prowess and valour in battle were
the highest possible qualifications, and those who possessed
them were marked out for honour in the community, and afforded
the appropriate status. We should thus explain the martial
meaning of gibbōr in terms of the historical circumstances which
produced it. The martial meaning comes first, because it was
by wars that Israel established herself in Canaan, and there
was a period when victory in war was the route along which the
progress to nationhood lay, and in which consequently the main
energies of the nation were spent. Hence the God of Israel was
ʾEl Gibbōr, and those especially associated with him in the
strivings of Israel were gibbōrīm; and these, as the men upon

whom the destiny of Israel depended, were marked out for honour
and status in the community.

We would suggest that the relationship ṣābā$^{>}$ /Yahweh S^ebā$^{>}$
ōt[22] should then be regarded as parallel to that of $^{>}$Ēl gibbōr/
gibbōrīm, and that it belongs to Israel's interpretation of
the same historical context. Yahweh was over the entire
Israelite confederate force, and was the Lord of the hosts of
Israel. The especially gifted warriors were gibbōrīm and He
was $^{>}$Ēl Gibbōr, but all of Israel's ṣābā$^{>}$ was enlisted under His
banner; it was the ṣābā$^{>}$ of Yahweh (Joshua 5:14), and He was
Yahweh of the S^ebā$^{>}$ōt of Israel. We regard this as lending
some support to the view that the ṣābā$^{>}$ of Israel was properly
the peasant militia – the army which fought under Deborah and
Barak inspired by Yahweh S^ebā$^{>}$ōt, and later the citizen army
which offered resistance to the tyranny and exactions of a
despotic monarchy.

3. There is another kind of usage of gibbōr ḥayil in the O.T.,
where it has the meaning of material substance and social
status. Thus Kish is a man of wealth and a gibbōr ḥayil, and
the latter epithet would appear to derive from economic strength
and to have no martial connections. In I Kings 11:28 Jeroboam
is described as a gibbōr ḥayil, although, as Kennett[23] has noted,
his occupation is a civil rather than a military one. The
reference is probably to the status which he derives from his

position in the king's service, and to his general ability.
It is recorded in 2 Kings 15:20 that Menahem exacted a tax of
fifty shekels from the gibbōrē ḥayil of the land; this connects
the term with the possession of wealth and suggests a social
station based on wealth. The gibbōrē ḥayil were a social class
and were in a position to meet a financial exaction. Boaz is
described as a gibbōr ḥayil in Ruth 2:1, and the context is such
that the epithet must be interpreted in terms of wealth (he was
a landlord) and social standing, and not of martial valour.
The text of Psalm 52:3 is disputed by Kittel.[24] He would emend
haggibbōr to haggeber, or tiṯgabbar (with transposition of
ʾaṯnāḥ), and he thinks the whole verse is corrupt. It is,
however, possible to translate the verse, provided we emend the
words ḥesed ʾĒl to ʾel ḥāsīd (compare the Syriac Version). With
this one emendation, the verse reads: "Why do you boast, O
mighty man (gibbōr), of evil done against the godly?" It
would then be clear from verse 9b that gibbōr refers to one
who trusted in the abundance of his riches and sought refuge
in his wealth (reading hōnō with Syriac and Targum for ḥawwāṯō
(destruction) of the Massoretic Text). The portrait would then
be that of a rich person who employed the power which wealth
brought to him to evil ends, and in particular to oppress the
godly. Finally, there are a series of references in Chronicles
(I Chronicles 26:6,7,8,9.30,31,32) where the gibbōr ḥayil means

a man of great ability and hence one able to occupy a position
of responsibility and trust in the community, whether in the
service of the temple (6,7,8,9) or in other service for the
king (30,31,32).

We should also note at this point that hayil by itself or
in combinations other than gibbōr/ē hayil has the shift of
meaning from a martial to a social and economic context, which
we have noted for gibbōr/īm and gibbōr/ē hayil. The facts are
these.

(a) In combinations other than gibbōr/ē hayil, with the meaning
of "warlike prowess and valour": Numbers 24:18, Deuteronomy 3:18
Judges 3:29, 20:44,46, 21:10; I Samuel 14:48, 16:18, 18:7, 31:12;
2 Samuel 2:7, 11:16, 22:40, 23:20, 24:9; I Chronicles 5:24,
7:2,9, 8:40, 10:12, 12:22; 2 Chronicles 17:13,14, 26;17, 28:6,
32:31; Psalms 60:14, 76:6, 108:14; Isaiah 5:22; Nahum 2:4.

(b) Hayil with the meaning"strength": 2 Kings 2:16; 2 Chronicles
26:13 (where the phrase kōah hayil occurs - literally, "strength
of power"); Job 31:25; Psalm 33:17 (strength of a war-horse),
Psalm 33:16 (parallel to kōah); Psalm 18:33,40; Psalm 59:12
(power of God); Proverbs 31:3 (strength or physical pith);
Ecclesiastes 10:10; Habakkuk 3:19; Nahum 3:8; Zechariah 4:6
(parallel to kōah).

(c) Hayil with the meaning of army (the embodiment of strength):
Exodus 14:4,9,28, 15:4; Numbers 31:14; Deuteronomy 11:4;

I Samuel 17:20; 2 Samuel 8:9, 24:2,4; I Kings 15:20 (2 Chronicles
16:4), 20:1,19,25; 2 Kings 6:14, 11:15, 18:17 (Isaiah 36:2),
25:1,5,10,23,26; Jeremiah 32:2, 34:1,7,21, 35:11, 37:5,7,10,11,
38:3, 39:1,5, 40:7,13, 41:11,13,16, 42:1,8, 43:4,5, 52:4,8,14;
Ezekiel 17:17, 27:10, 29:18,19, 32:31, 38:4,15; Joel 2:11,25;
Psalms 110:3; 136:15; Esther 8:11, Daniel 11:7,10,13,25;
Nehemiah 3:24; I Chronicles 11:26, 18:9, 20:1, 24:23,24, 26:13;
2 Chronicles 14:8, 16:7,8, 23:14.

Hayil is used indiscriminately for:

(i) Israelite army, 2 Samuel 24:2,4.

(ii) Pharaoh's army, Exodus 14:9; Psalm 136:15.

(iii) Nebuchudnezzar's army, 2 Kings 25:1; Jeremiah 34:1.

(iv) Ben Hadad's army, I Kings 15:20, 20:1.

(d) Hayil with the meaning of material wealth (strength through
possessions): Genesis 34:29; Numbers 31:9; Deuteronomy 8:17,18,
33:11; Isaiah 8:4 (coupled with šālāl, spoil), 10:14, 30:6,
60:5,11, 61:6; Jeremiah 15:13 (coupled with 'oṣᵉrōṯ, treasures),
17:3 (hayil and 'ōṣᵉrōṯ to be given for bāz); Ezekiel 26:11
(Tyrian wealth derived from merchandise, and associated with
pleasant houses, i.e. having an economic and social setting),
Ezekiel 28:4,5 (note the connection with trade and foresight in
trade, cf. Proverbs 31:29); Joel 2:22 (produce of the fig and
vine); Obadiah 11:13; Micah 4:13 (parallel with bᵉṣaᶜ); Psalms
49:7 (parallel to ᶜōšer), 49:11; Job 5:5; Proverbs 13:22.

(ë) Hayil with the meaning of ability, status and character:
Genesis 47: 6 (Pharaoh speaking to Joseph asks that able men,
'an[e] šē hayil, be put over his cattle); Exodus 18: 21:27 (those
given positions of leadership under Moses are to be 'an[e] šē
hayil); I Kings 1:42 (Jonathan, son of Abiathar, is an iš
hayil; the reference may be to his reputable family
connections or to his personal character or probably to both:
he is a worthy or reliable fellow and his father is a man of
rank); I Kings 1:52 (hayil here has an ethical quality and
is contrasted with rā'āh, wickedness); Proverbs 12:4, 31:10,
29 (Proverbs 31:10-30 describe in detail what is meant by
the epithet hayil: there is an economic reference, thrift,
industry and foresight, but there are also ethical qualities
in the 'iššāh hayil; she is charitable, wise, virtuous and
dependable, cf. Ruth 3:11).

The question then arises whether any account can be given
of the range of meaning from martial connections to a social
and economic context, which we find in gibbōr, gibbōr/ē hayil
and hayil itself.[26] Why should the term gibbōr hayil be
capable of application equally to a warrior of prowess, and
a man of wealth and station or a man of ability and worth?
Why should the term hayil mean an army and also mean wealth,
standing and worth? We shall not speak of a transition in
meaning, because this would be to beg the question, but it is

curious that the above terms embrace the same range of not
obviously related meanings. What is the explanation of this?

[27]

Weber has sought to explain how it is that the martial
and economic and social meanings coalesce in the term gibbōr
hayil. He holds that the term gibbōrīm refers regularly to
the b^{e}nē hayil, the "sons of property", who are the possessors
of inherited land and who by reason of wealth and status
qualify as a military caste. The expensiveness of the armour
of the gibbōr is shown, Weber maintains, by the Goliath tale.
He required a shield-bearer and Saul is also mentioned as
having one. So only a wealthy man could equip himself as a
gibbōr, and the gibbōrīm, the warrior caste, were also those
with wealth in land and of superior social station. Hence
the coverage of meaning which we have noted. The practice of
arms, wealth, status, all converge upon the gibbōrē hayil.
The background against which Weber is interpreting the term
gibbōr/ē hayil, as it appears in the Old Testament, is that
of the Canaanite city state, and he holds that the armed
patriciate of these city states are typical examples of
gibbōrīm. The relation between wealth, social position and
the practice of arms, which Weber discerns there, he transfers
to the Old Testament and uses as a key to unlock the apparently
diverse Old Testament meanings of gibbōr/ē hayil and hayil.
From what we know of the social structure of the Canaanite city/
state,

the existence of an armed patriciate after the manner of Weber's
description would appear to be very likely. We have already
traced the lines of the Canaanite city according to Albright's
description,[28] and into it can be fitted a patriciate equipped
with chariots and other expensive equipment, a warrior
aristocracy economically predominant and socially pre-eminent,
sharply divided from the serf or slave element of the community.[29]
There is thus no difficulty in identifying the Canaanite
patrician with Weber's portrait of the gibbōr ḥayil. The first
serious objection, however, is that there is no evidence that
this warrior-patrician was ever called a gibbōr ḥayil. In other
words, there is no evidence to show that the term itself was
originally applied within the milieu of the Canaanite city
state and was appropriated thereafter by Israel. It is true
that in Joshua 5:13 (emended), 5:23, 6:2, the Canaanite armies
are said to be made up of gibbōrīm, but this is an Israelite
description and thus proves nothing. So far as we have been
able to discover, the root gbr has no history in Accadian which
would support Weber's interpretation.[30]   In the Tell-El-Amarna
correspondence,[31] which is between the city states of Canaan and
the Pharaoh, there is no mention of the gibbōr ḥayil, although,
if it were the word descriptive of the Canaanite patrician class,
we should have thought that it might have been expected to
appear in this correspondence. In Ugaritic there is a root ǵzr

which Gordon,[32] in one place, equates with Hebrew gbr; he suggests that ǵzr with the meaning of 'warrior, hero, is equivalent to Hebrew gibbōr. In ʿnt, 11, 22 ǵzrm (as a parallel term of ṣbim and mhr) is found with the meaning of soldiers, troops.[33] Philologically, however, the case for the correspondence of ǵzr with gbr is dubious, since only one radical is common to both and it is difficult to see how g can be related to ǵ and z to b.

Moreover, even if it could be proved that the Canaanite patrician was called a gibbōr ḥayil, it would not simply follow that we should use Canaanite categories to interpret the Old Testament term gibbōr ḥayil. We should then have a situation similar to that which prevails in the case of hopši, and we have already expressed our adherence to Albright's principle[34] that the same term may undergo a development or change of meaning as it is applied in different societies at different times. Indeed, as Albright himself recognizes, this development of meaning may take place within one society, due among other factors to historical conditioning, and to changes in social and economic structure.[35] It is along these lines that we shall endeavour to account for the range of meaning possessed by gibbōr ḥayil and ḥayil, and we shall hold that it is a question of transition from a primary martial context to an economic and social one, under the influence of historical circumstances

and changes in the social structure of Israelite society.[36]

Before proceeding to this task, however, it should be pointed out that there is a more fundamental objection to Weber's view than any we have yet raised. Weber's account cannot be integrated with the actual historical circumstances which surround the earliest appearance of gibbōr ḥayil in the Old Testament literature. Weber[37] himself concedes this when he says: "The Song of Deborah indicates that the ancient Israelite confederacy was, indeed, largely a peasant organisation .... Later,in the time of Kings, there is no more talk of peasants in the armies; at least,they are no longer the backbone of the army." Again, referring to his theory of economic disqualification, by which peasants were excluded from bearing arms, and discussing its operation outside Israel, he says: "In Israel the development was definitely similar, after the great Canaanite cities had been integrated into the con-federacy."[38] The operative words are: "after the great Canaanite cities had been integrated into the confederacy." This means that Weber admits that his interpretation of gibbōr ḥayil does not in any case apply in the event of the non-fulfilment of this stipulation. We have pointed out that during the period of the Judges the encounter between the Israelites and the urban civilisation of the Canaanite city states had hardly begun. At this point Israel must be regarded as a simple agricultural

society, whose structure is reflected by the property laws of
the Book of the Covenant,[39] still confined to the central hill
country and not yet prepared to pit its strength against the
cities, which were the centres of the kind of social organi-
sation which Weber has described.[40] But it is while the
Israelites were, as Weber admits, a peasant army, that we
encounter the earliest usages of gibbōr ḥayil in the Old
Testament. During the period of the conquest, those who are in
the vanguard of the ṣābāʾ of Yahweh are gibbōrē ḥayil, and the
war leaders (Gideon) are gibbōrē ḥayil. We have tried to
elucidate the significance of the term in this setting, but we
observe now that Weber's treatment of it offers no explanation
of its appearance in a historical setting prior to the integra-
tion of the Canaanite city states into the Israelite community,
when the categories which he applies are incongruous and
irrelevant.

In accounting for the transition in meaning of the term
gibbōr/ē ḥayil, the following factors should be kept to the
front:

1. When a nation is involved in wars of conquest, the position
of the warrior in public esteem is assured, and honour and
dignity and public acclaim are his portions. His profession is
the one which grips the imagination of the community, and it is
engaged in as the highest form of service and as offering the

most spectacular rewards. These remarks apply even in modern times; when it is a case of war and national emergency, the soldiers and especially the generals are the men of the hour. During the period of the settlement in Canaan, the main occupation of the nascent Israelite state was fighting, and those who were in the vanguard of the fray were the outstanding men of the community. The fate of Israel was in their hands, and because their prowess and valour were at that moment more highly prized than any other kind of virtue or distinction, a special standing in the community was granted them. Something of an analogy is the warrior aristocracy of the Arabs which was the top social layer of the Muslim community during the period of the conquests and up to Ummayad times.[41]

2. There are the special circumstances attaching to the accession of David to the throne of Israel. David had had his years in the wilderness, when his activities were a mixture of freebooting and professional soldiering, and in this role he had gathered around him numbers of soldiers of fortune, some of them non-Israelite.[42] Whatever were the reasons which prompted those men to flee the centres of civilized life and seek asylum in the desert or near-desert, they are described as expert in the arts of war and prodigious in their courage. The intensity of their devotion to the person of David is also underlined. When David won through to kingship, these men

followed him into his inheritance and became the nucleus of the
military strength which supported his rule. They were called
gibbōrīm, and this represented a twist in the hitherto prevailing
signification of the word. But their arrival on the scene may
have meant that henceforth they would be the aristocratic
military caste and competition with them would be impossible.
They were gibbōrīm, men of professional competence and of out-
standing personal valour, and they stood near to the king. It
would hardly be possible now to use the term gibbōrīm with its
old meaning of martial pre-eminence, without specialising its
application in David's gibbōrīm. We suggest then that the
advent of David's gibbōrīm upon the stage of Israelite history
may have modified the meaning of the term gibbōr/ē ḥayil.

3. The earlier martial meaning of gibbōr/ē ḥayil is not only
related to the strife of conquest, but also to the social
structure of the Israelite community at that time. We have
already argued that the army of Israel was the weapon of the
amphictyonic organisation through which the Israelite tribes
were bound in unity, and by whose sanctions they discovered a
religious basis for common action.[48] The amphictyonic community
and its army were dominated by Yahweh; he was the Covenant God,
that is to say, the community inhered in him and the army was
led by him. The element of religious inspiration looms large,
and community is basically a religious brotherhood. This meant

also an aversion to social or economic inequality, and an
unwillingness that any human figure should dominate the scene
to the prejudice of Yahweh. Those who were leaders in the
community must be so by virtue of commission from Yahweh and
charismatic endowment. Along these lines we may understand
Samuel's aversion to kingship.[44] With the advent of David,
however, there are changes in the social structure of the
Israelite community, and the interests of the king no longer
coalesce with those of the community. The experience of
brotherhood is threatened, and rule is by constraint rather
than by consent. The power element on which the king relies is
composed of his gibbōrīm and other mercenary elements. On the
civil side, a bureaucratic organisation comes into being, and
the king rules through paid officials and is detached from
living contact with his people.[45] He constrains them as serfs,
rather than leading them as a brother among brethren. With the
emergence of this pattern of despotic monarchy the old signi-
ficance of gibbōrīm could not survive, because it presupposed
an amphictyonic community without glaring social inequalities
or marked economic differentiation and with a real identity of
interests; where warfare was a popular cause, because it was a
religious duty. Thus the gibbōrīm were popular champions,
because they were the gifted members of a religious brotherhood
and the upholders of national aspirations. The transference of

the term from the primitive context to that of David's gibbōrīm is a reflection of the change from an amphictyonic community to a despotic monarchy.[4.6]

4. The thread of continuity in the meaning of gibbōr and hayil is supplied by the idea of status.[4.7] Whether we are considering the gibbōrīm of the Judges' period, or the gibbōrīm of David, or the gibbōrīm described in terms of wealth or ability or ethical distinction, there is the common idea of status, of the right to distinction and title in the community. Such title and distinction is won and asserted in different ways, according to historical circumstance, the degree of social development and the extent of economic opportunity. At the period of the conquest, the title of the warrior heroes to distinctive honour and rank was incontestable; the hour called for martial virtues, and they were the men of the hour. The path to glory was the practice of arms, and there above all other careers the recognition of the community might be won. But in the history of Israel war was followed by comparative peace,[4.8] and in the reign of Solomon the accent is upon social and economic development. There are new ways by which a man may aspire to status in the community, either by wealth in land or wealth in trade.[4.9] Those who engage in trade are the agents of the crown,[50] and in a changed atmosphere from the days when martial valour was at a premium, we can understand how skill

and foresight in royal trading operations would qualify a man
as a gibbōr ḥayil. In a new historical situation a revaluation
of skills may become necessary, and where the soldier may not
matter so much, the merchant may come into his own. Moreover
with elaboration of the social structure and increasing économic
differentiation, there are created new ways of expressing social
distinctions, and a man may stake his claim to belong to an
aristocratic caste by building a residence[51] in keeping with
his pretensions and by adopting the appropriate social pattern.
More generally, the term gibbōr/ē ḥayil is applied to men of
ability who can hold positions of responsibility in the
community, and ḥayil is applied in reference to ethical worth -
although here too, as we have noted, in connection with those
virtues which make for success in the management of affairs,
i.e. not detached from the acquisition of wealth.[52]

CHAPTER FIVE

PROPERTY AND THE COMMUNITY

Property and the Community

It has been pointed out[1] that property in water is older
and more important than property in land, and that in nomadic
Arabia, where there was no property strictly so-called, certain
tribes or families, by virtue of their possession of watering-
places, controlled the exploitation of the adjacent pasture
lands. If a man has dug a well, he has a preferential right
to water his camels at it before other camels are admitted,
and he has an absolute right to prevent others from using the
water for agricultural purposes, unless they buy it from him.
This is Muslim law, but it agrees with old Arabian custom and,
as appears from certain Old Testament passages,[2] with general
Semitic custom.

It is not difficult to discern a natural bond between
this priority of property in water and the social structure
and economic arrangements of a nomadic or semi-nomadic society.
Pasture land is the common property of the tribe which claims
it as its beat, and the flocks and herds themselves are
properly to be regarded as the property of the tribe, that is,
communally owned. No doubt, however, allowance must be made
for the emergence of more powerful families within the tribe
and the expression of their predominance in wealth; that is to

say, they will own their own flocks and herds and will be economically differentiated from families less affluent within the tribe. Yet, even if it be left an open question to what extent livestock is owned by the tribe and to what extent it is vested in the affluent families of the tribe, it remains true that the pattern of nomadic life and, to a lesser extent, of semi-nomadic life is such that the tribe is the natural family unit, so that there is a genuine solidarity of interest as between its constituent members. Geographically, the tribe is a unit and its members face common perils; socially and economically, there is an actual unification and identity of interests. The tribe thinks and acts collectively. Hence it is expedient and a reflection of social and economic realities that the pastures should belong to the tribe, and it would be a weakness and an inconvenience if there were a division of land into so many private lots among the smaller family units of the tribe. From the economic point of view of the tribe, the key to the exploitation of the pastures to which it stakes a claim is the possession of the conveniently situated watering-places and wells. Without access to these, the pastures are of little economic value, so that, in securing possession of the water and claiming priority in its use, the tribe ensures for itself the practical exploitation of the pastures. The water is the key to the situation and, in establishing a kind

of property right to it, the tribe secures the pastures safely.
Even where a family within the tribe acquires particular
economic interests, the situation is not greatly altered.   The
important consideration is to have some kind of title to water,[3]
since the utility of any pasture land depends on this.

It is only at the agricultural stage of cultural
development that property in land assumes a place of prime
importance in the life of a society,[4] and this was one of the
fundamental adjustments in the social and economic pattern of
life which the settlement in Canaan must have forced upon
Israel.   The nature of the ownership of land after the settle-
ment of Israel in Canaan - to what extent individual and to
what extent communal - is a difficult question whose resolution
is hampered by paucity of evidence.   Some kind of answer,
however, is possible, but it must be attempted in an indirect
way.

The Book of the Covenant is usually dated in the eighth
or ninth century,[5]   and it gives us certain information about
the Israelite community at an early stage of its development as
an agricultural society.

1. It witnesses to the private ownership of livestock (Exodus
21:28-37) associated with agriculture and the operations of
agriculture, as it also witnesses to the private ownership of
land, since it legislates against a man's responsibility for an

uncovered pit in his field (Exodus 21:33). It may not be
legitimate to read too much into the formula "if a man",[6] so
as to conclude that ownership of livestock must have been
individual; but certainly ownership is private. Further, it
seems likely that under the conditions for which the code
legislates the kin unit must have been contracted from the
tribe into something smaller; but we shall leave it open at
present whether this would be a family as we understand it, or
a larger unit. We would, however, suggest that there is
independent evidence from the custom of the levirate[7] that
the homestead did become a family as we understand the term;
and in such circumstances it would be legitimate to speak of
individual ownership, that is, the property of the master of
the household. More generally, it can be confidently affirmed
that the property enactments of the code are meaningless
without the assumption that livestock and land are privately
owned, for they aim at defining liability and fixing adjustments
in a society where land and livestock are in private hands
(since it is precisely for this reason that it is necessary to
define liability, and fix a scale of adjustments between a man
and his neighbour).[8]

2. There is social differentiation even at this simple
agricultural level of society, and the legislation takes into
account the presence of Israelite slaves; and, if there were

Israelite slaves, no doubt we must assume that there would be, a fortiori, non-Israelite slaves. A class of non-Israelites called gērīm[9] are also mentioned. It is, however, the provision for Israelite slaves to which we would call attention, since it is an early indication of the loosening of the ties of the Israelite community and the partial surrender of the ideal of religious brotherhood and closely-knit solidarity, under the impact of powerful new economic forces making for social reorientation. The clear impression is gained from the code that it is debt that brings Israelites down to slavery. Thus there is legislation to cover the case of the man who sells his daughter into slavery,[10] presumably as a way of escape from pecuniary embarrassment. Other provisions tell of the presence of poverty in the community; interest is not to be exacted from the destitute borrower, and the poor man's pledge, his security for borrowing, is to be returned to him before sundown (Exodus 22: 24,25).

Can we get behind this situation which the Covenant Code portrays, and reconstruct the developments leading up to it? We must begin by asking: what was the system of land tenure adopted by the Israelites on settling down in Canaan? Kennett[11] holds that there are three terms applicable to the ownership of land: yᵉruššāh, ᵓaḥuzzāh and naḥᵃlāh. The first need not necessarily apply to land, denoting property in general

acquired by inheritance or otherwise appropriated. ᵓăhuzzāh,
according to Kennett, is equivalent to freehold, but not
necessarily the freehold of an individual owner. Nāhal, he
notes, is a verb in frequent use in its different conjugations:
the causative, in the sense of apportioning land (Deuteronomy
I:38, 19:3, 31:7; Joshua I:6); the reflexive, both in the
primary nipᶜal and the intensive hitpāᶜēl (Exodus 23:30, 32:13;
Numbers 18:20; Deuteronomy 19:14), where it means to receive
land as apportioned. Kennett maintains that the common
renderings "inherit" and "cause to inherit" are misleading, and
he cites Deuteronomy 21:16, contending that the apportionment
there envisaged takes place in the father's lifetime, and
that there is nothing to show that the reference is to
inheritance after his death. Kennett observes that the
apportionment of land after the Israelite conquest of Canaan
is said to have been effected by the casting of lots (Numbers
26:55,56, 33:54, 34:13; Joshua 18:6, et al.); and he holds
that the same method was in continuous use in the centuries
succeeding the conquest, citing Micah 2:5, Joshua 18:6, Proverbs
16:33. According to Kennett, land so apportioned was nahᵃlāh,
and each of the parts into which it was sub-divided was a hēlek.
Kennett admits that hēlek originally meant a portion or share
of anything (e.g. Genesis 4:24, booty of war [12]), but he claims
that it had the specialised meaning of a share of land (Hosea

5:7, Micah 2:4).

Kennett bases important conclusions upon the metaphorical use of nāhal and nahᵃlāh in relation to Yahweh and Israel. He takes Deuteronomy 32:8,9 to be the locus classicus of the metaphor, and he prefers the reading of the Greek in verse 8 (suggesting the reading of bᵉnē ʾElōhīm) to that of the Massoretic text (bᵉnē Yisraʾel), on the ground that it harmonises better with verse 9. The meaning of verse 8, according to the Massoretic text, is that, when the Most High allotted to the various nations their respective territories, He made the division in such a way as to reserve adequate land for Israel. The reading of the Greek, Kennett would interpret to mean that the Most High set the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of their gods (bᵉnē ʾElōhīm = gods?). Verse 9 then develops this idea by saying that Israel is Yahweh's portion (hēlek), and Jacob the measure (hebel), literally line, of His nahᵃlāh. That is, Yahweh has allotted to each nation a nahᵃlāh, and has reserved Israel as His own nahᵃlāh. This interpretation requires the doubtful equation of bᵉnē ʾElōhīm with "gods"; ʾElōhīm ʾahērim is the typical Deuteronomic expression for gods other than Yahweh.

Kennett further argues that, since Deuteronomy is not earlier than the eighth century B.C., it is sufficiently far removed from the first allotment of land after the conquest of

Canaan to make it improbable that this was the source of the
metaphor in this passage;   and so he concludes that apportion-
ment of land was a recurring practice in Israelite life.   He
says : "A metaphorical expression may indeed be used proverbially
after the usage which originally suggested it has become
obsolete;   it will, however, scarcely survive indefinitely.
Accordingly, when we find metaphors derived from the allotment
of land used at a very late period, we may fairly conclude
that at such a period the usage on which the metaphor was
founded had not very long passed away.   The poet of Psalm 16,
whose language, by the way, shows Aramaic influence,[13] says
(verse 5) 'Thou holdest my lot' - that is, Thou insurest that
the lot which represents my claim comes out of the garment into
which the various lots are cast in such order that I get a good
share of ground (Proverbs 16:33, Isaiah 34:17) - and he goes on
to say: 'The cords (viz. those used in measuring, cf. Micah 2:5)
have fallen to me in pleasant places, yea I am pleased with my
naḥ⁽ᵃ⁾lāh'.   The frequent references to apportionment of land by
lot, in a document as late as the Priestly Code, certainly make
it probable that such allotment was the regular usage at least
as late as the end of the Jewish monarchy."[14]   From this Kennett
draws the final conclusion that the village communities of
Israelite Canaan held land in common, and that such land (naḥ⁽ᵃ⁾lāh)
was periodically divided into set portions and allotted to those

freemen of the village who had a right to cultivate it and enjoy its fruits.[15] He hazards the guess that the reallotment took place after the septennial year of fallow, and he cites the case of Jeremiah (37:12) who, while leaving Jerusalem to "receive his portion in the city of Anathoth", was arrested on a charge of deserting to the Chaldaeans. Kennett associates the incident with a reallotment of land in the township of Anathoth, in which Jeremiah had an interest, because he was entitled to a share. The year of release for Israelite slaves fell at the same time, and was a source of embarrassment to Zedekiah who tried to set aside the ancient custom (Jeremiah 34:8). But the threat of the Chaldaean army outside Jerusalem had extracted from him a promise of compliance, which he did not honour once there had been a temporary slackening of the pressure on Jerusalem, so that those who released slaves reclaimed them (Jeremiah 37:5, 11). From the first appearance of the Chaldaean army in Palestine to the temporary raising of the siege of Jerusalem was apparently less than a year, and hence Kennett makes the point that the refusal to release the slaves, the freeing of them under pressure, and the re-allotment of the land at Anathoth, may all have occurred within a twelvemonth. Thus Kennett holds that the year of release was also the septennial year of fallow and the year of re-allotment.

Kennett's argument is not convincing. If we take the late

usage of the metaphor as established, and overlook the doubt
which might be felt as to the accuracy of his dating of
Deuteronomy 32:8,9 and Psalm 16, we come to his fundamental
premise that the metaphor based on allotting land and measuring
it, could not continue to be employed in Israelite literature
long after the usage on which it was based had ceased to be
a living article of Israelite land tenure. It is possible to
deny this, and argue that an original allotment, chosen as the
means of land settlement at the time of the conquest of Canaan,
might be so deeply printed on the memory and imagination as to
furnish a metaphor for the succeeding generations. Especially
is this understandable, when the religious aspect of the
settlement in Canaan is taken into the reckoning. Canaan was
a Promised Land, and the recurring Deuteronomic formula tells
the Israelites that Yahweh had sworn to their fathers to give
it to them. The apportionment was the seal of this promise,
the material proof that Israel had entered into her heritage,
that Yahweh had given her a land. The apportionment is thus a
part of the total complex of the Exodus tradition: Moses, the
Exodus, the Conquest, and the apportionment of the Promised
Land. We do not then think it strange that the metaphor based
on the allotment of land and the measuring line, should persist
in Hebrew literature, nor that its persistence should support
the conclusion that there was a periodic re-allotment of

communally-owned land, and that this was a standing feature of the Israelite system of land tenure.

Concerning Jeremiah 32:6 f.,(37:12), on which Kennett had placed some stress, Weber [16] says that it is the one important passage adduced in support of the view that the open-field system (i.e. the re-allotment of communal lands described by Kennett) was the central feature of Israelite land tenure. Weber, however, thinks that the meaning of Jeremiah 32:6 f., (37:12) is uncertain, and he suggests that it may refer to the fact that the more powerful sibs (mišpāḥōṯ) had, in certain circumstances, disposition over land - either because it was land held in permanence jointly by the sib and periodically repartitioned, or because it was the heirless land of a sib member. Weber adds that, in any case, Jeremiah was not a peasant; at the most he would concede that the passage may refer to a re-allotment of land in special circumstances and applying within narrow limits, but he is not prepared to draw any conclusions from it as to the system of land tenure holding for the Israelite peasant in general. Of Micah 2:5, Weber says that it shows that landlots were measured with cords during the period of the settlement, but that it proves nothing for the periodic redistribution of land. With regard to the septennial fallow year or Sabbatic year, Weber [17] notes the absence of any specific reference to this in the Deuteronomic Code which

legislates for a year of release[18] (that is, the remission of
debts on the seventh year), but which makes no mention of a
Sabbatical year for the land. Weber inclines to the view that
the Sabbatical year was an interpolation from the Priestly Code
into the Covenant Code; otherwise, if its genuineness in the
Covenant Code is to be assumed, and it should indeed be part
of ancient custom, he offers two possible explanations:

1. It belongs to a setting of occasional agriculture practised
by semi-nomadic stock-raisers, and represents the time limit
in the holding of land as private property, after which it must
revert to the community and be subject to redistribution.

2. It represents a contractual arrangement between semi-nomadic
flock owners and a settled agricultural community, regarding
the rights of the former to pasturage on the fields of the latter.

Jeremiah 32:6 f. is also discussed by Pedersen,[19] who
suggests that the prophet was exercising the right of redemption
in respect of the property purchased, in order to prevent it
from passing out of the family. Pedersen takes the view that
Jeremiah's cousin had become poor and unable to maintain the
property; and, since property "follows exactly the same line as
kindred", and, since it is shameful that it should pass out of
the family whose heritage it is, Jeremiah hastens to fulfil the
duty of redemption.

The view that land was communally owned and periodically

re-allocated, conflicts with different strands of evidence from
the Old Testament, which combine to show that the land worked
by the Israelite peasant was ancestral and was bound to the
family by the closest possible ties, being properly inalienable.
This is well seen in the case of Naboth (1 Kings 21), whose
fears do not reside in the envisaging of a bad bargain, but who
is shocked at the very suggestion of Ahab that his plot of land
could possibly be the subject of a business transaction. In
fact, the king leaves it to Naboth to fix his own price, but,
in so doing, he does not touch the real core of the objection
felt by Naboth to the proposal. Naboth cannot entertain the
proposition that the property which he has inherited from his
fathers should be drawn into the sphere of a commercial bargain.
This would be a breach of a sacred trust and a crime against
his kindred, because the kindred and the ancestral land belong
together. It is clear that we are meant to understand that the
king, by making the suggestion, spurned ancient custom and trans-
gressed all propriety; he proposed the unthinkable, and
compliance would have involved Naboth in the betrayal of a trust
whose conservation was counted an axiomatic obligation. The
king threatened a value which the community believed to be at
the very basis of life and so the peasant retorts: "Yahweh
forbid that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto
thee" (1 Kings 21:3).

Similarly, the main reason why the prophets pilloried those who "joined house to house and field to field" (Isaiah 5:8), was not primarily because they took advantage of poverty and debt in order to acquire land at prices which bore no correspondence to its real value, although that was one of the counts in the indictment. The main charge, however, was that, in bringing land within the sphere of commercial categories and dealing in real estate, they were repudiating a fundamental value of Israelite society and striking destructively at its roots. It was sacrilegious that family property should be bought and sold and treated like a commodity on the market, for a family and its property belong together indissolubly, and land is inseparable from its ancestral owners.

The coherence of the family and its property is again well seen in the custom of the levirate. Its primary object is to get progeny for the dead man, but it also entails the taking over of his property.[20] According to the Deuteronomic code (Deuteronomy 25:5-10), "If brethren dwell together and one of them die and have no son; the wife of the dead shall not marry without (i.e. outside her husband's family) to a stranger; her husband's brother shall go into her. And it shall be that the first-born that she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not blotted out of Israel" (Deuteronomy 25:5-6). That is to say, the son is

regarded as the child of the dead uncle, and succeeds to the
share in his name. Miles[21] notes that in this Deuteronomic
passage the obligation is limited to the case where brothers
dwell together, and also that there is no mention of the
extension of the duty to the father-in-law (the dead man's
father). In Genesis 38, however, the father-in-law is involved
in the duty of the levirate. Judah took a wife named Tamar
for his first-born Er, who died childless. Thereupon, Judah
commanded his second son Onan to fulfil for Tamar the duty
which fell on a husband's brother in these circumstances; but
he evaded the duty, "and the thing which he did was evil in
the sight of the Lord and the Lord slew him." This shows that
the duty of the levirate was here regarded as obligatory.
Judah then instructed Tamar to remain a widow in her father's
house and to wait for Shelah, his youngest son, to grow up;
but when Shelah did attain to age he was not given by Judah to
Tamar. As a consequence she made up her mind to play the harlot,
veiling herself to hide her identity, and so enticed Judah to
have intercourse with her. When Judah learns afterwards that
she is with child, he orders her to be burned for playing the
harlot. The charge brought against her is not so much that she
has committed whoredom, as that she has been guilty of a breach
of the custom of the levirate, inasmuch as she was reserved for
the levir (Deuteronomy 25:5). Hence she was able to vindicate

herself by proving that the father of the child was Judah,
upon whom the ultimate obligation of the levirate lay. It was
for this reason that she was acquitted, and not because Judah
was a "particeps criminis". Consequently, when Judah discovered
the truth, his words were: "She is more righteous than I, in
that I gave her not to Shelah my son", for in the event of the
non-fulfilment of the duty of the levirate by his sons, Tamar
had, as a last resort, the right to obtain fulfilment by him.
Miles[22] suggests that in the Deuteronomic formulation, the
father-in-law is assumed to be deceased, since the brothers
are sharing the inheritance. He further notes that neither
in the Tamar passage nor in the Deuteronomic one (as opposed to
the Ruth passage) does the levir marry his brother's wife,
although in the Rabbinical tradition the connection was regarded
as marriage, even though no formality was required and con-
cubinitus alone sufficed.[22a] The question also arises why, in the
Deuteronomic passage, the duty of the levirate is limited to
the case of brothers living under the same roof. This has been
taken as confirmation of the theory that the levirate is a
relic of polyandry,[23] i.e. the residue of an old custom whereby
a woman was mated or married by several brothers at the same
time. Miles offers another explanation and suggests that the
compiler was copying old material and that he allowed these
words to stand, so that the law as formulated in Deuteronomy

points to a time when it was the general practice for brothers
to dwell together, because the typical kin unit was larger than
the family of one man. According to Miles, the Deuteronomic
compiler has permitted the phrase to stand either "per incuriam",
or because he wished to restrict the custom as far as possible.[24]

The duty falling on the levir (yābām), as understood in
Deuteronomy, was not absolutely obligatory,[24a] but he could not
evade its fulfilment without submitting to a ceremony called
the loosening of the shoe (hᵃlîsāh), and this involved him in
oppobrium. This is described in Deuteronomy and, in great
detail, in the Misnah.[25] In the Deuteronomic description,
the man is brought before the elders who remonstrate with him
and urge him to fulfil his duty. If he persists in his refusal,
the widow takes off his shoe and spits in (or before) his face,
and "his name shall be called in Israel the house of him that
hath his shoe loosed" (Deuteronomy 25:10). The procedure as
described in the book of Ruth is different. The widow does not
take part in the ceremony, neither is the oppobrious name
heaped upon the unwilling kinsman. He simply draws off the
shoe and gives it to Boaz, in token of the surrender of his
prior right to redeem the property.[25a] Thereby he conveys the
right of redemption to Boaz; and this, Miles[26] suggests, must also
be the meaning of the hᵃlîsāh in the Deuteronomic passage.

In his consideration of the custom of the levirate, Burrows[27]

proceeds differently from Miles. He argues that only the law
given in Deuteronomy is a source for the normal procedure in
levirate marriage. He notes that Deuteronomy 25:5-10 conforms
exactly to the style of a mišpāṭ; and, on this account, he
suggests that the levirate may be a Canaanite law which has
undergone Israelite revision. He draws attention to Alt's[28]
observation that Exodus 21:22f. is an apodeictic Israelite law,
inserted into the framework of a casuistic Canaanite law.
Burrows argues that levirate marriage cannot be subsumed under
the concept of inheritance, because the law as stated in
Deuteronomy does not have to do with the inheriting of a widow
as part of her husband's estate, but with the preserving of the
name and property of the dead man by securing for him a son and
heir. As Burrows remarks, there is inevitably some connection
between levirate marriage and inheritance, but "a property right
in a widow is one thing and the obligation to preserve the name
of the dead is another."[29] Burrows suggests that the Israelites
may have changed the purpose of the levirate: the Canaanites
like other peoples of Western Asia probably regarded the marriage
of the widow as a form of inheritance, whereas from the earliest
times the motive of preserving the dead man's name was a distinct-
ive element of the Israelite custom. He offers a conjectural
reconstruction of the Canaanite law, according to which the levir
takes off his shoe, indicating that he is surrendering a property

right, and suggests that it is thus the Canaanite form of the
h^{a}li̦sāh ceremony[30] which is preserved in Ruth 4:1-8. According
to Burrows the Israelite adaptation involved two changes:

1. Levirate marriage was taken out of the category of inheritance
and made a means of carrying on the name of the dead.

2. This made it a duty rather than a right, and so the h^{a}li̦sāh
ceremony was altered accordingly; in taking off the levir's
shoe, the widow was demanding fulfilment of an obligation,
refusal to comply with which involved disgrace.

We come now to consider in detail the passage in Ruth
which concerns Naomi, Ruth her daughter-in-law, the widow of
Mahlon, and Boaz, who undertakes the duty of a gō,ēl (the word
used for the levir in Deuteronomy is yābām). Elimelech and
his two sons had died while the family was resident in Moab,
and he had left a parcel of ground in Bethlehem. There is what
is surely a preliminary allusion to the custom of the levirate,
in Naomi's words to Ruth and Orpah (Ruth 1:11-13): "Turn back
my daughters, why will you go with me? Have I yet sons in my
womb that they may become your husbands? If I should say that
I have hope, even if I should have an husband this night and
should bear sons, would you therefore refrain from marrying?"[31]
Ruth, however, refuses to be dissuaded from her resolve, and
Naomi takes steps to bring her to the notice of Boaz, a kinsman
of Elimelech. Boaz is willing to fulfil the duty of gō,ēl, but

he tells her that there is a nearer kinsman than himself who
must be consulted and given the opportunity of undertaking the
duty. Boaz then goes to the gate of the town and brings together
the elders and the gō'ēl. Boaz informs him that Naomi is
selling the parcel of land, and asks him to redeem it. When he
agrees to do this, Boaz adds: "The day you buy the field from
the hand of Naomi you are also buying [32] Ruth, the Moabitess, the
widow of the dead, in order to restore the name of the dead to
his inheritance." Then the gō'ēl declines to go on with the
duty, and gives as his reason the fear that he will impair his
own inheritance, for he would be bound to reckon the land as
belonging to the son borne by Ruth, so that to undertake the duty
of the levirate would be all burden and no profit. So Boaz
marries Ruth and she bears a son who is called by the women
"the son of Naomi". [33]

The following difficulties have been detected in this
account:

1. Neither Boaz nor the nearer kinsman is Ruth's brother-in-law,
and the duty of the levirate is restricted to the brother of
the deceased. Moreover, in the account each appears as a gō'ēl
and not as a yābām. Nowhere else is there any indication that
the duty of the levirate might fall to a relative other than
the brother-in-law. This objection, which is raised by Burrows, [34]
assumes that Genesis 38:1-26 does not deal with levirate marriage

since, if it does, we have an example of the father-in-law
playing the role of the levir. We have noted above that Miles
counts this a genuine case of levirate marriage. Of Genesis
19:30-38 Burrows says that the procedure is irregular and not
sanctioned by law or custom.

2. It is agreed that the marriage of Boaz and Ruth has the
purpose of levirate marriage, namely, to raise up a son for the
dead (Ruth 4:5,6, cf. Deuteronomy 25:6f.), but it is remarked
that the child is not described as the son of the dead. Not
much weight is put on 4:21, where Obed is named the son of
Boaz, because there is general agreement that the genealogy is
secondary.[35] But in 4:14 the child is called "Naomi's gō'ēl",
and in verse 17 a son is said to be born to Naomi; and the
irregularity of these descriptions in relation to levirate
marriage, where the child was counted the son of the deceased,
is thought to create a difficulty. Burrows[36] thinks that we have
a combination of the institutions of levirate marriage and
redemption.

3. But there are thought to be further difficulties in the
position of the gō'ēl. The gō'ēl is the heir; how then, it
is asked, can he be made to buy the property of his deceased
kinsman? Pedersen[37] further objects that Boaz should be
represented as buying the field, and retorts that the field will
not belong to Boaz, but will remain in the possession of the one

who is dead, through the son whom Ruth will bear. Again, Pedersen objects to the distinction which is made between the buying of the field and the buying of Ruth, because he maintains that in the levirate law the two things, the maintenance of the property and the taking over of the widow, are inseparable,

4. There is thought to be a difficulty in understanding how Naomi can have come to possess the field of her dead husband, since in no Israelite law is there any suggestion of a widow being able to inherit her dead husband's property; such a proceeding, Pedersen[38] holds, would conflict with the general Israelite conception of the constitution of the family. It is held that, according to the old law of inheritance, property follows the normal way of the formation of the family through the kindred of the husband; if there are no brothers, then it passes to the father's brother and so on, but it remains in the family.

The difficulties felt by Pedersen and Burrows seem to us to rest largely on the interpretation which is put on the terms "buying" and "selling" and can, for the most part, be disposed of by placing on these terms a construction other than that which they choose. We would hold that the proper point of departure for the understanding of the incident is the distress of Naomi, and that this must, at all costs, be kept to the forefront.[39] Once this is appreciated, some of the questions raised

have a somewhat artificial appearance. Indeed, we should hold
that unless the financial distress of Naomi is assumed, the total
situation portrayed becomes unreal and unconvincing. What must
be meant by the statement that she is selling property, is
simply that it is passing out of the possession of Elimelech's
house because of debt (a mortgage) which cannot be redeemed.
And so "buy" means "redeem". This is a likely conclusion, when
we bear in mind that the one on whom the duty fell was a gō'ēl,
and that the verb g'l is used of the operation. Boaz says: "Buy
it in the presence of those sitting here and in the presence of
the elders of my people. If you will redeem (g'l) it, redeem
(g'l) it; but if you will not, tell me that I may know, for
there is no one besides you to redeem (g'l) it, and I come
after you" (Ruth4:4). It was for the very reason that the gō'ēl
was not buying it on his own account, and that the operation
involved financial outlay for the benefit of the dead man's
family, that he withdrew. He felt that his own immediate family
responsibilities were sufficiently onerous, and that this act of
beneficence was beyond his resources and would cripple him.
Thus it seems to us to be a case of Elimelech's property laden
with debt, so that the near kinsman has not only to assume the
responsibility of the levir, that is, preserve the name of the
dead man and his property, but he has also to fulfil the duty of
a gō'ēl by rescuing it from debt. The reason, then, for the

linkage of the functions of levir and gō'ēl is in the situation
itself, and it is not necessary to assume with Burrows and Peder-
sen that the account in Ruth derives from a conflation of the
levirate proper with Leviticus 25:25. Wherever there was a
mortgage on the property for which the levir was responsible,
he would also be a gō'ēl.

It has to be conceded that the alternation of qnh with g'l
is curious.[40] Qnh occurs in verses 4,5,8,9,10. But it is
further defined in a way which suggests that it is used
inexactly for g'l, e.g. verse 4 where Boaz says to the gō'ēl:
"Buy it", and then changes the verb and says, "if you will
redeem it, redeem it; but, if you will not, tell me that I may
know, for there is no one besides you to redeem it, and I come
after you." In verses 5,10 "buying Ruth the Moabitess" is
further defined as "perpetuating the name of the dead in his
inheritance." We do not thus think that Pedersen's objection
that Boaz is represented as buying the field for himself, is
supported by the substance of the passage. We see some support
for our position in the direction which Burrows'[41] argument takes.
He sets off by asserting that Boaz receives the property as a
purchaser, and that he redeems the land by purchase. He then
states that the usual meaning of qnh is "buy", and that mkr can
mean nothing else but "sell". But he goes on to say thereafter
that the transaction may have been a purchase only nominally

and formally. He adds: "Just as in our laws the transfer of title in real estate, even though it be actually a gift, requires some mention of payment in order to make the deed valid, so here it may be that the transfer of the property to Boaz had to be made in the form of a sale to be legal."[42] But why had the property to be transferred to Boaz? As we have indicated above, it is our view that Boaz was reclaiming the property from debt, in order that the name of the dead might be restored to his inheritance. In other words, the property would belong to the son borne by Ruth; why then should he transfer the title to himself (Ruth 4:5,10)? We disagree with the interpretation which Burrows puts on g'l here and in Leviticus 25:25f. (Our disagreement with Pedersen on the same count we discuss in detail below.) Burrows appears to say that, in redeeming the field, Boaz bought it for himself; while we hold that, in redeeming it, he reclaimed it from debt on behalf of the deceased kinsman and for the benefit of his house. Hence Burrows[43] says that Leviticus 25:25f. deals with the duty of redemption coming into operation after property has been sold to someone outside the family, and that it would be perfectly natural for Boaz to prevent such a sale by direct purchase from the impoverished relative. But Burrows from this point proceeds to a position which seems to presuppose our interpretation of g'l, and is not easily reconcilable with his own. He acknowledges that the

nearer kinsman refused to act, because it would have been
burdensome for him; and this must imply that it was not a
straightforward business transaction. He admits that the purpose
of the narrative is to portray the public-spirited action of
Boaz, in contrast with the selfish attitude of the nearer kins-
man. He makes a statement with which we entirely agree: "The
redeemer's obligation to buy the property, to assume support
of the widow and also, when possible, to raise up a son to
preserve the name of the dead relative, was a duty imposed by
custom and public opinion in the interest of the family, in
spite of its conflict with the individual's own interests."[44]

We should thus insist that the marriage of Boaz and Ruth
is a genuine example of levirate marriage.[45] Some of the
difficulties which have been felt may be due, as Miles[46] has
suggested, to the fact that the book of Ruth is not a legal
document and that we must not expect legal precision. Hence
the inexact statement that Naomi was selling the field and that
it was being bought from the hand of Naomi (4:5,9)[46a]; hence also
the distinction which seems to be drawn between assuming res-
ponsibility for the property and for the widow, as if these
were separable duties; hence, finally, the reference to the son
of Boaz and Ruth as the "son of Naomi" instead of the "son of
Mahlon", which would have been correct. Burrows[47] has called
attention to the special circumstances of Naomi and Ruth, and has

pointed to the unusual character of the situation. There were
such factors as emigration to Moab, the death of the father
and both his sons, and the return of one of the daughters-in-
law. All this, Burrows remarks, is credible, but the circum-
stances could hardly have occurred in combination very often,
and the procedure required by this situation may have gone
beyond what was customary in ordinary cases.

Pedersen [48] contends that the fate of the individual member
of the Israelite family was not a subject of concern, and that
the real matter was to ensure that, in the case of the needy
kinsman going to the wall, the family as a whole (i.e. considered
as a larger kin unit than the household of one member) should
not be impoverished, so that steps should be taken to keep the
property in the family. The fate of the weakling was a matter
of indifference. This may be questioned. It rests on
Pedersen's interpretation of Leviticus 25:25, of which he says:
"That section of the law of redemption which says that the
redeemer (gō'ēl) is to buy the field from the needy, contains
no unnatural or doctrinary demands." [49] Pedersen takes the law
to mean that the gō'ēl acquires the land for himself, and thus
preserves it for the family, while he simply allows the needy
kinsman to go down. But is this what the law says? "If your
brother has become poor and sells part of his property, then his
next of kin (his nearest gō'ēl) shall come and redeem what his

brother has sold." We should maintain that what is meant by
redeem is to buy back for the needy kinsman what he has been
forced to sell because of debt. So the law goes on to say
(verses 26-27): "If a man has no one to redeem it (sc. on his
behalf) and then himself becomes prosperous and finds sufficient
means to redeem it, let him reckon the years since he sold it
and pay back the overpayment to the man to whom he sold it, and
he shall return to his property." This law, therefore, cannot
be cited to show that "the law contains no sentimental regulations
that the kinsmen should assist the needy by keeping the property
for his person,"[50] since its intention is just to preserve the
bond between a given piece of property and the name of a given
man. The law means that if a man is in danger of being alien-
ated from the whole or the part of his ancestral property
through debt, it is the duty of the nearest kinsman to discharge
the debt, so that the impoverished one may not lose the ancestral
plot or part of it. If there is no one to fulfil the office of
gō᾽ēl, the man himself has a duty to restore the link between
himself and his ground, if ever he should be in a financial
position to do so. There is consequently no conflict between
the duty of levirate and this passage in Leviticus, since both
point to the fact that an obligation existed to preserve the
connection between the name of a man and his property, and not
just to keep the property in the family, understood as a larger

unit. The family of which the levirate treats is the family as
we understand the term -- the household of one man -- and the
obligation is to raise a son to that man and so to preserve his
name in conjunction with his ancestral land.[51]

Pedersen[52] seems to suggest that the very existence of laws
of inheritance in conformity with which property passes to the
next of kin, in itself implies that it is the preservation of
the connection between the property and the larger family unit
that really counts. But clearly the bare existence of laws of
inheritance in accordance with which property passes in a fixed
direction, would prove nothing as to the operation or non-
operation of the levirate, with its care for the individual
household of the family. Laws of inheritance would be
indispensable in any case, but they do not bear directly on our
problem. It is certainly true, as Pedersen asserts, that the
man who had not the strength or the ability to keep his property,
often in fact lost it; but it is not true for the reason that
Pedersen states, namely, that the fate of the individual
household of the family was a matter of indifference, and that
all that mattered was that property should follow the line of
kindred, and that the family, considered as a larger unit,
should lose nothing.

The reason for the submergence of the weak is rather to be
found in the gap between ideal values and cherished customary

sanctions, and the degree of practical attainment possible, bearing in mind the harsh and intractable realities of the total life-situation. The actual configurations of Israelite society became unfriendly to ideal values of a traditional cast, so that there was an element of incompatibility between the traffic and values of daily life, and traditional values, and this fixed the limits of practical realisation and necessitated a measure of compromise in the interests of realism. Nor do we have to wait for the later codes to see the divergence between ideal values and what is practically attainable in view of social and economic realities for which the customary obligations were never fashioned. In the enactment of the Covenant Code about Hebrew slaves (Exodus 21:1-6), we see compromise written into the legislation, for the existence of Hebrew slaves was a disrupting of the ideal that Israel was a religious brotherhood; but the legislation is conscious of the departure, and seeks to preserve something of old values in demanding the release of the Hebrew slave after seven years. The Deuteronomic legislation further requires that the slave should be furnished liberally by his master, so that the spectre of want may not make of freedom a hollow mockery (Deuteronomy 15: 12-18).

It is not difficult to envisage the causes of slavery among Israelites. As agricultural life brought greater opportunities,

so there was a corresponding increase in hazards and the need
to exercise new skills and calculate new risks. The pattern
was more complex than of yore, and when the natural social
and economic unit was the household (bēṯ ʾāḇ), it was not so easy
to shelter behind the solidarity of the tribe. A man who might
keep his level in tribal society might find the new scene
beyond his powers of adaptability and resource, and requiring
an acumen which he did not possess. But, apart from the con-
sideration that not everyone makes a good farmer, there were
factors beyond human control which operated, so that disaster
threatened even the efficient and the enterprising from many
quarters. Agriculture, at the best, is a perilous occupation in
Palestine.[53]

The passage in Ruth gives us an excellent example of how
harsh economic realities could prevent a kinsman from performing
the duty of the levirate, and there must have been innumerable
like cases; many Israelites would thus become slaves because
their kinsmen were powerless to retrieve the situation, however
much they may have felt the compulsion of the ideal demand.
The gō ʾēl in Ruth had his own family responsibilities, and he
knew that, if he attempted to fulfil the duty of levirate, he
would commit economic suicide. The natural economic and social
unit was the bēṯ ʾāḇ,[54] and the interests of this man's household
did not coincide at any point with those of that other household

for which he was being asked to assume responsibility;   in
these circumstances, the demand of the levirate was detached
from social and economic realities.   Frequent failure in com-
pliance was thus inevitable. The suggestion made by Miles[55]
that the provision in Deuteronomy, which limits the obligation
to brothers living under the same roof, may be an attempt to
contract the sphere of the duty, we then find interesting,
because it would be an attempt to mediate between the ideal
demand and practical realities.   For where brothers live
together, there is a basis of social and economic solidarity
which brings the demand of the levirate within the range of
practical attainment. Further, Miles' suggestion that this
stipulation concerning co-parcenary may be an old feature
retained by the Deuteronomic compiler, points to the conclusion
that, considered as a piece of practical legislation, the
levirate is more naturally fitted for a homestead comprising
more than one brother, because then the members of the household
are one social and economic unit and the arrangement is both
reasonable and workable.[56]

When we say that Israelite legislation is ideal, it is the
incompatibility between the old values and the actual shape and
alignments assumed by Israelite society which we should have in
mind. If the word "ideal" is used in order to convey the im-
pression that the legislators were toying with ideas in a vacuum,

and were indulging in pure theorising and speculation with no care as to whether their laws made any difference to the life of the Israelite community, the use is illegitimate and produces a misleading impression. It may indeed be the case that the ideal is at a further remove from life in one case than in another,[57] but, in every instance, the legislator is giving expression to deeply held values which he believes should be incorporated into Israelite life. What he does not realise always is that life has moved on, and the practical social and economic basis which gave the sanctions a natural fitness no longer exists. Thus Pedersen[58] is doubtless justified in asserting that the legislation concerning the year of yōbēl is further removed from life than the legislation about redemption in Leviticus 25:25. The basis of Pedersen's distinction, however, is that to which we have already objected. He repeats here the assertion that Leviticus 25:25-27 expresses a care for the family qua family and not for the individual household of the family, and so he perceives a contradiction between Leviticus 25:25-27 and the notice concerning the year of yōbēl in Leviticus 25:28. This latter says that property is to be returned to its original owner in the yōbēl year. Pedersen says that the two laws are fundamentally different. The first states that if there is a ne'er-do-well in the family, he is not permitted to involve his kindred in his ruin; the nearest of kin is to step

in and maintain the claim of the family, so that it will not be
weakened by strangers taking its property. The object of the
yōbel, on the other hand, is said to be the preserving of the
property for the ancestral owner whether he is worthy or not.
We have indicated how we depart from Pedersen in our reading
of Leviticus 25:25-27; and according to our reading, the
internal contradiction which Pedersen sees between Leviticus
25:25-27 and Leviticus 25:28 disappears. We do, however, agree
that the laws concerning the yōbel year (also Leviticus 27:16-25)
present some evidence of theorising, and we agree absolutely
with Pedersen's observations: "Thus, though these laws were of
small or, perhaps, no practical importance, they are extremely
interesting to us in that they bear testimony to the old
Israelite conception of kindred and property, being an expression
of the reaction against the forces counteracting it, which
forces, as we have already seen, were closely connected, partly
with city culture, and partly with the monarchy."[59]

Our conclusion is that the case of Naboth, the custom of
the levirate, the stipulations concerning the year of yōbel and
redemption in Leviticus[60] and also the legislation concerning
Hebrew slaves in the Covenant and Deuteronomic Codes, are all
bound together by a common intention. They give expression to
values which are typically Israelite. The Israelite ought to be
a freeman, but, if this could not be maintained absolutely,

enslavement ought to be terminable (hence the Deuteronomic year of release, Deuteronomy 15:1-3). Further, the Israelite freeman, according to the Old Testament evidence, is a propertied freeman. The Israelite peasant is bound to his ancestral land by ties which are held to be properly indissoluble; witness Naboth, the custom of the levirate, and the moral objections of the prophets to transactions in real estate. The peasant's land is inalienable from its ancestral owner. (This is expressed by the year of yōbēl, whatever theoretical overlay and elaboration it may contain, and even if it were enacted at a date when there was a hopeless irreconcilability between the ideal to which it gives expression and the realities of Israelite life.) These ideals could not continue to be of great practical significance, when the kind of community for which they were naturally fitted and in which they thrived passed away. But this tenacious and firmly held conviction that a peasant and his property belong together, can only mean that this was the actual basis of land tenure in the days of the settlement in Canaan. It cannot go back any further than this, because it must have its origin in settled agricultural conditions. This, then, the peasant and his plot, was the basis of Israelite land tenure, and it was the threatened destruction of this institution in later and changed days which prompted the prophetic protest. The continued inclusion of the ideal demand in the law codes was another way of

protesting against the departure from a customary sanction, and was an expression of unalterable attachment to the old values of land tenure.

It is in view of all the considerations raised in this chapter that we cannot accept Mendelsohn's [61] account of the meaning of hopšī in the Old Testament, because it involves the assumption that the traditional concept of an Israelite freeman was that of a tenant farmer or a day labourer on a rich man's estate.

CHAPTER SIX

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE MONARCHY

The Beginnings of the Monarchy

The monarchy emerged through the constraint of external danger, just as earlier, in the days of the Judges, Israel had been most nearly a nation when the threat to her existence was sharpest, and the call to arms became the occasion for the recognition of the authority of a war leader. Hence Albright[/] observes that the Philistine conflict was but the continuation and the climax of the threats to which Israel had been exposed on all sides since the settlement in Canaan. The desire for a king arose from the felt need of a strong leadership to mount and co-ordinate the national effort against the Philistine menace. It expressed the determination to give a more permanent and firmly organised shape to the kind of national unity which was attained only fitfully, on occasions of great peril, in the earlier period. The connection between the envisaged rule of the king, and the temporary manifestations of leadership and authority attaching to the šōpᵉṭīm, is suggested by the phrase used by the people in advancing their claim for a king. They want a type of šōpeṭ (שֹׁפְטֵנוּ), but one more firmly entrenched in the structure of national life, whose office will be a per- manent and institutional feature of their polity. "To judge us among all the nations"[2] (I Samuel 8:5) means to provide us with effective leadership in a hostile world, with the implication

that the other nations have their organised political structures
inhering in a king and that Israel also must seek strength
through the knitting together and co-ordination of her resources
by such an institution. Albright[3] has pointed to Alt's observa-
tion that there was in fact this difference between Israel and
the surrounding peoples in the eleventh century B.C., and that,
whereas Israel maintained its loose confederacy on the amphic-
tyonic principle, depending for leadership on a personality
thrown up in the hour of danger, the nations encircling Israel
were all highly organised. "Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites
all had kings who were much more than tribal emirs, as we know
from such monuments as the Balu'ah stela of the twelfth century
and the Mesha Stone of the ninth, which confirm and illustrate
the biblical data. The Philistines had their seranîm "lords"
who seem to have been tyrants of the Aegean model. The Canaanites
of Phoenicia were still organised into city-states according to
the Bronze Age prototype, but freedom from domination and the
great expansion of their commerce in the Early Iron Age had made
Tyre, Sidon and Byblus powerful nations with authority central-
ised in the hands of the king, as we know from Egyptian and
biblical sources, supplemented by native inscriptions."[4]

The powerful persuasion of danger must, therefore, be seen
behind the demand for a king; and the sharpest danger which
threatened Israel was constituted by the advance inland of the

Philistines. There were other sources of danger, however, and
it was in dealing with Nahash of Ammon that Saul began to prove
his worth as a king. There were also the Moabites on the east,
the Aramaean tribes in the Syrian desert and the Midianites,
whose invasion of Israelite territory Albright dates about the
same time as the fall of Shiloh (c.1050 B.C.), and which he
associates with the domestication of the camel.[5] But the
Philistine menace loomed largest; after a period of consoli-
dation, the Philistines had begun to press inland and to threaten
Israel in the central hill country. It is commonly held that
it was because of Philistine pressure that the Danites were dis-
lodged, although the Bible (Judges I:34) attributes it to the
onset of the Amorites. Rowley[6] suggests that, even if the
proximate cause were Amorite pressure, the ultimate cause may
have been the Philistine incursion, which dislodged the Amorites
who, in turn, pressed on the Danites. Rowley observes that
Joshua 19:43 states that Ekron and Timnah once belonged to Dan,
and that the former became one of the five principal cities of
the Philistines; while, according to Judges 14:1, the latter
was occupied by the Philistines in the time of Samson. What is
reasonably well established is that the Philistines were ad-
vancing into the central highlands in the time of Eli, and that
Shiloh fell to them around 1050 B.C. At this stage of their
expansion, they were threatening to cut the very life-line of

Israel, and this situation was the immediate occasion of the request for a king. A recognition in retrospect that a massive external threat to the life of the nation serves to promote unity and demands the sinking of domestic divisions and differences, is found in 2 Samuel 19:9-10, where the "tribes of Israel" say: "The king delivered us from the hand of our enemies and saved us from the hand of the Philistines; and now he has fled out of the land from Absalom. But Absalom whom we anointed over us is dead in battle. Now therefore why do you say nothing about bringing the king back?" We take this to be a recognition that the unity which is eagerly sought in time of peril for the sake of strength may seem irksome when danger recedes; then only its disadvantages and disqualifications are remembered, and it is found to cramp sectional interests and aspirations, of which the different strands of a community become conscious in more leisurely days of security, when the constraint of danger from without no longer imposes unity and demands a closing of the ranks. McCown[7] makes this point well, and notes that once the Philistine menace had receded, the powerful impetus to Israelite unity, expressed and activated by one king, fell away, and that the effect of comparative peace and security must be numbered among the factors which promoted the division of the kingdom.

It might be thought that we have underestimated the

dominance of economic motives in the account we have given to date of the Israelite-Philistine conflict; and in this, our treatment would contrast with that of Wallis[8], who has ascribed prime importance to economic motivation. If we focus our attention on the period of Israelite history at present in view, we find that, while it would be reasonable to suppose that the Philistines were moved by economic considerations, it does not seem at all likely that the same can be said of Israel; and it would thus be misleading to suggest that the Israelites and Philistines were primarily engaged in a struggle for the trade routes[9] that ran through Palestine. A nation can afford to concentrate its energies on planning the acquisition of wealth and power through wealth, only after it has been accepted as a political fact and has secured for itself the more elemental satisfactions of secure borders and a reasonable degree of safety from outside enemies. It is a subtlety removed from life which would discern the pre-eminence of economic motivation in Israel in the time of the Judges, or during the Philistine conflict. Even at the stage when David was carving out for himself an empire, his manner of disposing of the spoil[10] suggests that the temper of his mind was still set towards destruction rather than construction, and that he had not yet moved beyond the determination to render his enemies impotent, so as to entertain the more positive prospect of harnessing their resources to

more constructive programmes for the acquisition and extension of wealth. It is a mental adjustment whose dimensions are not to be underestimated, which enables a nation to take the integrity of its borders for granted, and to divert its energies into the fresh channels of trade and commerce. The power of economic motives may more justly be discerned in the reign of Solomon,[11] but, at the time of the Philistine menace, Israel was fighting for her existence and could have little care for nice computations of profit and loss.

The thesis might more reasonably be applied to the Philistines who, in their quest for "lebensraum", doubtless had an eye to economic advantage, whether the rich corn lands of the Plain of Esdraelon or the lucrative carrier business along the trade routes, not to mention the exactions for toll and protection money. Thus we know that they were in occupation of Bethshan[12] at the eastern end of the Plain of Esdraelon, and that Saul's body was taken there to be exposed on the walls, after the defeat of Israel at Mt. Gilboa (1 Samuel 3:10, 1 Chronicles 10: 10). Yet considerations of strategy must be allowed to have influenced the Philistines in their conflict with the Israelites; they felt the presence of Israelites in the central hill country as a threat to their security which, they believed, would be better guaranteed if they pushed out their own borders to take in the territory occupied by Israel. Moreover the rigorous

control exercised over the manufacture of iron tools[13] and
weapons would seem to have been a systematic attempt to deny
Israel materials which were related to her war potential, and
so could be classified as strategically significant, rather
than a case of monopoly with a view to economic advantage. As
such, this piece of Philistine policy has a strangely modern
look and application, since in our present divided world the
free flow of trade is impeded by the unwillingness to make
available to a possible enemy materials which could be used to
strengthen the sinews of war. This is in fact economic warfare,
and it illustrates how strategic and economic interests may
have to be balanced against each other. The operation of
strategical considerations is again seen in the siting of cities
in Palestine; as Barrois[14] has noted, economic and strategic
requirements might compete so sharply against each other that
the one might have to be partially sacrificed to secure the
other. In the actual, imperfect conditions of life, what was
ideally desirable had to be matched with what was practically
obtainable. The desire for a strong defensible position might
prevail over the desire for a position athwart the trade routes,
and where both were not realisable at the same time, the choice
of one had to be set against the choice of the other. Thus,
while elevation lent strength to the position of Samaria (I Kings
16:24), the limitations of its water supply were a source of

weakness.[15]   Here we have unevenness and disadvantage, even
within the field of strategical considerations. Hence it may
not be simply a question of balancing the strategic against
the economic; what is available may be so far removed from the
ideal that, taking into account defensibility alone, it may be
necessary to decide whether elevation is so necessary as to be
an overriding requirement, even if the water supply is not all
that might be desired. At any rate, it is a fact that the
restricted capacity of the water supply of Samaria was a drag
on the development of the town, and set an upward limit to its
population.[16]   Similarly Jerusalem, which was an admirable
political centre, was at a remove from the trade routes and
so had commercial disadvantages.[17]

We return after this divagation to the main stream, and
propose to examine the attitude of Samuel to the request for a
king and, as a preliminary, the place and function of Samuel
himself in the Israelite community. S.R. Driver[18] held that I
Samuel 8-12 was formed by the conflation of two independent
narratives; the older narrative comprised 9:1-10:6,10:27b
(adopting the reading of the Greek[19]), 11:1-11,15 (nomination
of Saul as king by Samuel; his success against Nahash king of
Ammon; his coronation by the people at Gilgal). This narrative
is continued in chapters 13 and 14. The later narrative is
said to consist of Chapter 8 (request of the people for a king),

10:17-27a (election of Saul by lot at Mizpah), Chapter 12 (Samuel's farewell address to the people).

Driver maintained that in the earlier narrative it is as a seer, whose renown is confined to a particular district, that Samuel anoints Saul. He does so in accordance with Yahweh's instructions, that Israel may have a leader to deliver her from the Philistine yoke (9:16); and, at the same time, he endows him that Saul may do "as his hand will find" (10:7) when the occasion arises. The occasion presents itself in the peril to which Jabesh of Gilead is exposed a month later (Greek, 10:27b). Saul delivers it successfully, and Samuel's choice of king is ratified by the people with acclamation (11:15). In 13:2-7a., 15b-14:46 Saul fulfils the object of his nomination by his successes against the Philistines, and the narrative is brought to a close by 14:47-52. Driver is of the opinion that Chapter 11 does not presuppose the election of Saul by the people (10:17-27a), and that the messengers of Jabesh (11:4) do not come to Gibeah with Saul specifically in mind. Saul heard the tidings by chance on his return from the field, and his subsequent actions are in virtue of the onset of inspiration and not because of an office publicly conferred on him. Mindful of Samuel's injunction to do "as his hand will find", he assumes command of the people. Driver contends that throughout the narrative the appointment of Saul is regarded favourably (9:16b),

and that there is no indication of any reluctance on the part of Samuel to accede to the request for a king.

In the later narrative into which, according to Driver, an attempt has been made to incorporate the earlier, the point of view is said to be different. Samuel does not exercise the function of a seer or prophet, but those of a šōpēṭ, in agreement with the representations of 7:2f., and he rules the people in Yahweh's name. Here, Driver contends, the proposal for a king emanates from the people and is not a directive of Yahweh to Samuel. It is based not on the need for effective leadership in the face of the Philistine menace, but on the injustice of Samuel's sons in their capacity as deputies of their father, and in the desire of the people to have the same visible head as other nations.[20] Samuel is ill-disposed towards the request, treating it as a renunciation of Yahweh, and he seeks to persuade the people from persisting in their design by setting out the programme of exactions and tyranny which their king will impose on them. In the end he yields without being convinced of the wisdom of the policy (8:6-22). The same tone is held to prevail in 10:17-27a, and in the farewell address of Samuel (12:12,17,19).

Driver believes that 11:14, in which the ceremony at Gilgal is presented as a "renewal of the kingdom", is probably a redactional adjustment made for the purpose of harmonising the

two narratives, on the ground that in 11:11 Saul's actions have
not the character expected from one already recognized as king.
Driver further suggests that 11:12-15 may be an insertion, but
adds that the precise relationship of these verses to 10:25-27
is uncertain. The notice 9:2b (=10:23b) he takes to have been
introduced into one of the narratives from the other. He con-
cludes: "The second narrative is in style and character homo-
geneous with 7:2f. and this may be regarded, in a sense, as
forming the conclusion to the history of the Judges contained
in Judges 2:6-16. In both the general point of view is similar;
Israel's apostasy and obedience are contrasted in similar terms;
and the task of delivering Israel from the Philistines "begun"
(Judges 13:5) by Samson is continued under Samuel (7:3b,13f.;
cf.12:11). The earlier narrative is an example of the best
style of Hebrew historiography,... the later narrative has been
usually regarded as Deuteronomic; but the Deuteronomic style is
by no means so pronounced as in the case of the framework of
Judges and Kings. Budde (in Marti's Hd.-C., 1902, p.18f.) has
pointed out that it presents notable affinities with E, and has
made it probable that it is a pre-Deuteronomic work which, in
parts, has been expanded by a subsequent editor.²¹" Driver,
however, offers what seems to us a right way of approach to
these difficulties which he raises. He says: "It is not, of
course, necessary that the narrative [i.e. what he has designated

the later narrative] is destitute of historical foundations, but the emphasis laid in it upon aspects of which the other narrative is silent, and the difference of tone pervading it, show not the less clearly that it is the work of another hand."[22]

Wellhausen[23] observes that the account of the victory of Samuel over the Philistines in 7:2-17 is a pious make-up and full of inherent improbabilities, since it was just in Samuel's day that the yoke of the Philistines lay most heavily on the Israelites. Similarly Driver[24] held that 7:2-17 was a late passage, in which Samuel was represented as a šōpēṭ delivering the Israelites from their oppressors, after the fashion of the deliverances recorded in the Book of Judges. He adds that the consequences of the victory at Ebenezer are, in 7:13,14, generalised in terms difficult to reconcile with the subsequent course of events, since the Philistine ascendancy is emphasised immediately afterwards (10:5, 13:3,19f.).

Wellhausen[25] differs from Driver in his treatment of Chapter 11: whereas Driver adjudged that 11:1-11,15 were part of the earlier narrative, Wellhausen says of Chapter 11 as a whole that it was not originally designed for the context into which it is now fitted. Otherwise, Wellhausen makes the same main point as Driver: in Chapter 8 Samuel possesses legislative functions and speaks authoritatively against the proposal that a king should be appointed, whereas in Chapter 9 he is a seer without

legislative functions. He says: "The very event which,
according to Chapter 8 seq., involved the removal of Samuel
from his place and his withdrawal to the background of history
is here [i.e. Chapter 9] the sole basis of his reputation; the
monarchy of Saul, if not his work, is his idea. He announces to
the Benjamite his high calling, interpreting in this the thoughts
of the man's own heart; with this his work is done; he has no
commission and no power to nominate a successor in the government.
Everything else he leaves to the course of events and the spirit
of Yahweh which will set Saul on his own feet."[26]

Wellhausen[27] held that the earlier narrative represented
the pre-exilic (including Deuteronomic) view of the monarchy,
which had no awareness of any hostility or incompatibility
between the earthly and heavenly ruler. This, he thinks, is
demonstrated by such considerations as the title, Anointed of
Yahweh, as applied to the king; also by the kind of mould into
which the ideal future of the prophets was cast, which would
have been incomplete without an earthly monarch. He adds that
the Israelites, in common with other peoples, had a sense of
gratitude towards the men and institutions by whose aid they had
been delivered from anarchy and oppression, and formed into an
orderly community capable of self-defence. The later concept of
monarchy is, according to Wellhausen, the child of exilic or
post-exilic Judaism, and could only have arisen in an age which

had no knowledge of Israel as a state and which had no experi-
ence of the actual shape of existence under such conditions.

Somewhat similar is Kennett's interpretation of 8:10-18,
of which he says: "Samuel's rebuke of the people for asking
to have a king is clearly the work of one who, perhaps, belonged
to the age of Nehemiah and who desired that the government
should be in the name of the priestly class.*28.*"

Regarding the rupture between Samuel and Saul, Wellhausen[29]
takes the view that 13:7-15, which includes the account of the
rejection of Saul, does not originally belong to its present
context and is a later insertion. There is cumulative evidence
of this, Wellhausen believes, in the fact that 13:7-15 contains
a reference to 10:8, which Wellhausen suspects, because its
schoolmaster tone is thought to be inappropriate after the words
of 10:7, which allow Saul perfect freedom of action. But he
holds that 13:7-15 is based upon the older account contained in
Chapter 15, and he notes that in both passages the cause of
dispute is sacrifice and the place is Gilgal. He maintains
that it is just because Gilgal actually was the scene of the
dispute, as depicted in Chapter 15, that it is adhered to in 13:
7-15, although it was an impossible location in connection with
the new context into which the account of the dispute had been
dovetailed. According to Wellhausen, the history of Samuel and
Saul has been reconstructed by priestly interests along the

following lines. From the first, Samuel felt towards Saul
as a legitimate priest would towards a usurper, and contrived to
discover an occasion which would declare unmistakably the
position of both. Strictly speaking, the occasion did not
materialise, since Saul observed the appointed time, but the
opinion is implicit that the king was not entitled to sacrifice,
either before the expiry of the seven days or at any other time.
"His sacrificing is regarded as sacrilege; and thus the auto-
nomous theocracy stands all at one before our eyes, which nobody
thought of before Ezekiel."[30]

Haldar[31] is undismayed by the difficulties which may be
thought to have been created by the older critical analysis,
and discounts the possibility that the portrait of Samuel is
composite, and the consequence of development guided by the
retrojection of later ideas and dogmas into earlier history.
Thus Wellhausen[32] had discerned four stages of development in the
depicting of Samuel and maintained that, instead of concluding
that a historical Samuel gathered into his person all these
functions and took his place in history in these roles, we
should see in the narrative how succeeding generations of
dogmatic historians tailored Samuel to a cut which represented
the man and his times, as they thought they ought to have been.
Haldar cuts the knot by asserting that "Samuel is a figure after
the Mesopotamian pattern, where there were priests who were

temple-watchers, sacrificers and diviners."[33]   There was in

Israel the exact counterpart of the Accadian barū corporations

and their ritual.   The hōzē, rō'ē and mᵉsappē performed these

rites (centring in divination through the machinery of the

oracle), and these functionaries belonged to associations of

priests.   Samuel is both a kōhēn and a rō'ē, and these titles

assign him to the class of priests which ranks inspection of

omens among its functions.   Haldar says further of rō'ē that it

is the equivalent of diviner, and is applicable to a seer class

of priests.   Samuel is attached to the cult (I Samuel 9:10), and

is described as a member or leader of the cult corporation.

In another place, Haldar[34] suggests that Samuel is an example of

a kōhēn assuming the role of leadership, which might be occupied

by a king who is the leader of the cult and who gathers into his

person functions of both the barū and maḫḫū priests.   According

to Haldar, the Israelite nᵉbī'īm correspond to the Accadian

maḫḫū priests, and the Israelite kohᵃnīm (hōzīm, rō'īm) to the

Accadian barū priests, so that, in exercising leadership over

both prophets and priests, Samuel is conforming to the Sumero-

Accadian pattern of sacral kingship.   With this calculus-like

device, Haldar solves the problem of Samuel with mathematical

precision, but everything hinges on the legitimacy of fitting

Israelite history, and the person and functions of Samuel, into

Sumero-Accadian cultic categories.   The methodology of this

procedure does not seem above suspicion,[35] and the results look too neat and tidy to correspond to historical verisimilitude. Haldar, however, is impatient with those who would make qualitative distinctions between the Samuel traditions and asserts: "Since the tradition draws Samuel to this pattern [i.e. the Sumero-Accadian cultic pattern described above] there seems little reason to divide up older and younger strata and sources; it can be considered unitary.[36]" Again: "It has been asserted that certain features of the Samuel traditions are of inferior value and that Samuel was not a functionary of the type I have been describing. Such objections themselves are of inferior value. The type is represented both in Mesopotamia and Ras Shamra and, since tradition describes Samuel on the same lines, it seems certain to me that priests of this kind must have existed. Moreover the Old Testament contains further evidence that they did.[37]" (Haldar cites the case of Aaron who is chief of a priestly guild and who, in addition, is called nābī·.)

Further, the recorded wanderings of Samuel are, on Haldar's[38] view, a "cult phenomenon". Samuel, originally a Ramahite, is met with at Bethel (I Samuel 7:16), Gilgal (I Samuel 10:8, 11:4f.) and Mizpah (7:16, 10:17). Haldar is of the opinion that Samuel's visits to these places were pilgrimages in connection with one of the annual festivals, and that on these outstanding occasions he went in the capacity of oracler; so that I Samuel 11:4, which

speaks of the renewing of the kingdom at Bethel, refers to the
renewing of the kingdom rites at the New Year Festival (a New Year
Festival after the Sumero-Accadian pattern[39]). Similarly, in I
Samuel 10:17f. Haldar discerns references to the New Year Festival;
and, while he believes I Samuel 13:4f. to be connected with
divination, because of its association with the Philistine war,
he thinks this does not exclude a possible association with the
celebration of the New Year Festival as well.

We do not feel disposed to adopt Haldar's schematism as a
solution of the problems set by the older critics with regard to
the status and functions of Samuel. We do, however, incline to
the emphasis which underlines the persistence of the bottom layer
of old traditions, even where there may have been considerable
subsequent over-laying and schematising in the interests of
historical theorising and / dogmatic predilections, or development
with a view to didactic efficiency.[39a] The tendency of such a
critic as Wellhausen, on the other hand, is to depreciate the
persistence of the basic tradition, and to conclude that it has
been changed out of all recognition through its being made to sub-
serve the dogmas of a succeeding age. Hence it is a pious make-
up,[40] and the consequences of an attempt to portray how past history
in fact conformed to present theoretical speculations and dogmas.
The redactional element is held to be so overpowering as to be
normative, while the traditional bais is reduced to the point of

extinction. The newer point of view is well represented by
Pedersen,[41] who suggests that it would be unwise to assume that
Samuel, as he is portrayed in the so-called "later narrative", is
largely a figment of the imagination of later writers, but never-
theless allows that later theories and dogmas have operated to
reshape the original traditional deposit. Hence Pedersen admits
that the elaborately detailed account of the pattern of despotic
monarchy contained in I Samuel 8:10-18, makes it look like a post
eventum prophecy, based on the kind of despotism which did in fact
develop under David and Solomon. But the possibility must not be
dismissed that Samuel may have foreseen, in some measure, the kind
of pattern which monarchy would assume, since, as has been already
mentioned,[42] the states surrounding Israel had well-articulated
and firmly organised monarchic structures, and Samuel's conclusions
could have had an empirical basis in his observations of the
trends and effects of monarchy outside Israel. From this point
of view, I Samuel 8:10-18 becomes, not the pure invention of
late writers finding support for a priestly theory in the mal-
practices of Solomon's reign, but the expression of a fear, native
to Samuel, that kingship in Israel would go the way of kingship
elsewhere, elaborated and given precision by late writers, so that
the final effect is that of a post eventum prophecy dealing with
the shape of Solomon's administration.

What we would emphasise, however, is that we do not propose

that the critical assumption that there is a sound basis of credible tradition in those passages which have been labelled "later", and which certainly bear traces of having been worked over by later theorists and theologians, should bear all the weight of our reconstruction of Samuel's place in history. The direction of our argument is rather that this kind of critical assumption brings Samuel into an intelligible connection with the preceding course of Israelite history, as it is set out in our earlier chapters; and since this method is cumulative, greater probability attaches to its results. Our immediate task, then, is to place Samuel in what we take to be the right historical perspective.

Albright[43] has pointed out that the insignificant part played by the high priest in the pre-exilic Jewish monarchy has encouraged the belief that the office was non-existent in the time of the Judges. The underlying assumption of this reasoning is that the institution of the high priesthood evolved from less to greater without setback or retardation, until the era of priestly dominance in post-exilic times, when the high priest was virtually the head of the state. Albright, on the contrary, holds that the development of the high priestly office was oscillatory in character, adding that this type of development has at least as much a priori probability as the unilinear variety.

We are more concerned with Albright's attempt to relate the

temporal power of the high priest to the structure of the Israelite
amphictyony, than with his comparative approach through an examina-
tion of high priestly functions among contemporary neighbours of
Israel.[44] The high priest was the chief executive of the amphic-
tyonic organisation, and as Albright observes: "while the sanctuary
at Shiloh was the religious focus of the amphictyony, it was only
natural that the high priest should enjoy considerable prestige
in Israel, which tradition recognized in the case of such out-
standing personalities as Phinehas and Eli, both of whom were
remembered as important political figures."[45] Elsewhere, Albright[46]
argues that since Eli is represented as a feeble soul (this is not
consistent with the statement just quoted), it is more probable
that he inherited power than that he built it up. Albright is of
the opinion that the development in the temporal power and influence
of the high priest is to be associated with Phinehas, because of
the energy and vigour with which he is represented as having
prosecuted the Benjamite war. He suggests that, after the atrocity
perpetrated on the Levite's mistress (Judges 19:20), the Levite
used his influence with his fellow Levites of Mt. Ephraim, where
Shiloh lay, in order to avenge the dishonour. The high priest
Phinehas took up the call, and the men of Ephraim and Manasseh
were roused to vigorous action. Albright continues: "Whether all
Gilead or only Jabesh declined to aid in this righteous vengeance
is not certain, but the latter alternative is more probable. It

is hardly likely that the tribes of Galilee were involved in a movement which probably affected only Central Palestine."[47]

We suggest that the office of the high priest, as outlined above, should perhaps be regarded as a development of the office of šopēṭ, showing more firmly defined institutional features. The šopēṭ, we have argued,[48] was also an officer of the amphictyony, authorised to carry out its policies especially as commander of its armies in time of danger, but probably also as an administrator of justice. Moreover, Gideon is said to have/an ephod and appears possessed to have discharged priestly functions,[49] while Deborah was a prophetess (nᵉbiʾah) as well as one who was "judging" Israel (šopᵉṭah). If the šopᵉṭim were nominees of the amphictyony, their place as charismatic figures can be understood; at this early period the charismatic endowment is general, covering the area of the three charismatic functions subsequently specialised into three channels of king, prophet and priest. As amphictyonic war leaders, the šopᵉṭim performed the task which became the specific role of Saul, and in addition, they appear to have functions later regarded as priestly and prophetic. From this point of view, it is intelligible that Samuel should be portrayed as šopēṭ, seer, and priest, gathering into his person and office roles which were later to run into the specialised channels of king, prophet and priest. With respect to his temporal power, he is an interim figure between the šopᵉṭim and the kings; because of the well-

defined institutional character of his office, his authority may
have had an aspect of permanency not possessed by the šōpᵉṭîm,
but, as Albright has reminded us, it seems to have been only
exceptionally that the early high priests became military leaders.[50]
This is to assume that Samuel was high priest, which is not at all
certain, although Albright appears to make the assumption. He was
certainly not, in the view of the tradition, high priest de jure,
since it is on record that the office continued in the line of
Eli during Samuel's period of leadership, and into the reigns of
Saul and David (I Samuel 14:3, 22:20). He may have been high
priest de facto. It was a time of grave national emergency, and
the resistance of Israel against the Philistine menace had its
focus in him. Moreover, although he did not come of any recognized
priestly line (I Samuel 1:1), and is never called a kōhēn, he had
a lifelong association with Shiloh, the central sanctuary and the
seat of the Elide high priests until its destruction by the
Philistines around 1050 B.C. In view of this, there can be little
doubt that he was a priest as well as a rō᾽ēh, nābî᾽ (once, I
Samuel 3:20) and šōpēṭ; and, in the narrative, he is depicted as
carrying out priestly functions. A notable consideration is that
he performs the anointing of Saul and David, a ceremony at which
the high priest would naturally have officiated.

Just as the functions ascribed to Samuel can be viewed as a
development of the tasks set the šōpᵉṭîm by the amphictyonic

directive, so the election of Saul can be interpreted as the
emergence of a more specialised type of amphictyonic officer than
had hitherto existed. That the historical understanding of the
period of Saul is illumined by setting it against the background
of amphictyony, has been vigorously contended by Noth.[51] He holds
that such an amphictyonic association in the background makes
intelligible the common action of the tribes under Saul. In
particular, he believes that the detailed character of the incidents
which mark the introduction of Saul as a public figure, is strongly
reminiscent of the account of Judges 19:29f., which Noth explains
as the joint action of the members of the amphictyony against an
offending member. There is the phrase common to both accounts
(beḵol geḇūl Yisrāēl) which, according to Noth, "denotes the joint
sphere of the old Israelite amphictyony".[52] Saul summoned the
tribes, in the time-honoured way associated with amphictyonic
usage, by dividing up a pair of oxen and sending the pieces, along
with a curse operating in the case of non-compliance. In so doing,
he constituted himself charismatic leader of the amphictyonic
tribes. All this, Noth thinks, should be compared with the be-
ginning of the amphictyonic war against Benjamin, as recorded in
Judges 19:29f., where the summoning of the tribes takes the same
form. The king's place as an executive of the amphictyony,
endowed with a special charisma by Yahweh, is expressed by the
ritual act of anointing (I Samuel 10:1, Saul; I Samuel 16:13,

2 Samuel 2:4, 5:3, David; 2 Samuel 19:10, Absalom). This charis-
matic endowment is further suggested by the statements (I Samuel
10:9,10,11; 11:6) that Saul's power in action was derived from
religious experience of an ecstatic kind; with this is to be com-
pared David's behaviour on the occasion of the return of the ark
(the chief amphictyonic cult object) to Jerusalem. If this
anointing[53] marked out the king as Chosen of Yahweh, it also set
him under the authority of Yahweh and so fitted him into the frame-
work of amphictyonic ideas and values, and harnessed him to the
furtherance of amphictyonic ends - the implementing of Yahweh's
will for His Covenant community. This secured practical con-
stitutional consequences of the greatest importance, because it
meant that the kind of monarchy envisaged was virtually a limited
monarchy. This was achieved not by constitutional law, as we
understand it, but by a kind of safeguard similar in spirit and
purpose, although in such terms of religious concept and function
as were suitable for a community with an amphictyonic basis. Hence
anointing, as a mark of charisma, at once marked out the king for
distinction in the community and stamped him as the servant of
Yahweh, by bringing him under the obligations of the covenant[54]
in company with his brethren. The king was not a law unto himself,
because there was a standard of amphictyonic values regulative of
the life of the community, and by this norm the performance of the
king might be measured and appraised.

We are arguing that, having acceded to the request for a king,
Samuel did his utmost to hedge the new office with safeguards,
by integrating it with the general scheme of amphictyonic procedure,
and thus limiting it through its subordination to the well-being
of the Covenant community.   What were the dangers which Samuel
saw to be inherent in the innovation?   We have suggested that,
from his observation of the shape of kingship in the countries
surrounding Israel, Samuel discerned, if not incompatibility, at
any rate tension between amphictyony and kingship. The Israelite
understanding of community based on covenant, and so on the central
place of Yahweh as the One in whom the community inhered and whose
demands determined its social and ethical texture, marked Israel
off from the pattern of despotic kingship. Constitutionally,
there was the difference that the Covenant community was ideally
a religious brotherhood, whereas the society created by kingship
rested on power rather than brotherhood, with solidarity enforced
by the effective despotism of the king rather than by the voluntary
co-operation and willing allegiance of his subjects.   Israel was
further marked off by its distinctive aims and aspirations, and
by its functions as Yahweh's community.   All this might seem irre-
concilable with its involvement in the struggle for power and with
the proposal, which the request for a king seemed to imply, that
it should enter the lists and compete strenuously for the prizes
of temporal power and empire.   In short, were the unique role of

Israel as Yahweh's community and the character and interests which this had impressed on it, compatible with its self-preservation amid nations differently organised and motivated, or with a nascent yearning after empire on its own part?

Samuel did his best to bridge the gulf, but the two conceptions so diverged in nature and interests that there was no way of reconciliation. The structure and the aims of amphictyony could not assimilate the pattern of kingship. Kingship would not submit to the strait-jacket of amphictyonic regulation; it would escape and follow its own programme and bent. Noth sees this clearly: "Something new in the history of Saul begins first at the point at which, on the ground of his victory over the Ammonites and in consideration of the severe Philistine peril, the amphictyonic tribes made a permanent position out of the temporary leadership of Saul and elevated him as king. This is then, so to 'speak, the beginning of the end of the amphictyony itself."[55] This hints at what we believe to be true, namely, that the choice before Israel of amphictyony or kingship was not altogether a real choice. Israel could not escape from her actual historical situation; she was a nation set alongside other nations, and she had little alternative but to accept the scene as it had been set, and to play her part on the historical stage. The Philistine threat to her existence was only too real, and she had to organise herself to resist, even if the cost of effective strength might be a departure

from amphictyonic ideals. Israel had to accept her place in the general historical context, but in so doing she became involved inevitably in the general struggle for security and power, so that aims which threatened to crack and undermine the foundations of amphictyonic structure became dominant in shaping national policies. It is true, of course, that in assessing the shape of subsequent events we must not neglect the personal contributions of David and Solomon. It so happened that David was cut out for the march of empire, while Solomon was disposed to imitate oriental despotism on the grand scale; with his grandiose building projects, royal excursions into the field of international trade and, as factors of domestic policy, taxation and corvée, Solomon left the constitution of amphictyony far behind. Thus the tension between amphictyony and kingship may have been aggravated by David's particular military genius and the absolute departure from amphictyony connected with Solomon's airs and ambitions; apart, however, from these personal factors, there was tension in the historical situation itself.

The same tension is found in Islam which, like Israel, emerged from simple beginnings and arrived at the status of a power. Thus there is the Muslim tradition which puts these words into the mouth of the Prophet Muḥammad: "For thirty years my people will tread in my path; then will come kings and princes." Hence the first four caliphs are called "the rightly guided" (ᵓarrāšidūn),

and they are reverenced as having sought to conserve the theocratic basis of the Islamic state as faithful stewards of the Prophet. But with the advent of the Ummayad dynasty, the centre of Islam was transferred from Medina, replete with memories of the Prophet, and the place where there had been much activity aimed at developing the theocratic basis of Islam, to Damascus. Of the Ummayad dynasty and Mu^cawiyah, the first king, MacDonald says: "He and they were Arab kings of the old type that reigned before Muḥammad at Al-Hira and Ghassan, whose will had been their law. The capital of the new kingdom was Damascus; Al-Madinah became a place of refuge, a cave of Adullam for the old Muslim party. There they might spin theories of state and of law and lament the good old days; so long as there was no rebellion, the Ummayads cared little for those things or for the men who dreamt them."[56]

The historians who reflect the attitude of the purists at Medina accused Mu^cawiyah of having secularised Islam and of having changed the hilāfat 'Al-Nubū'ah (the prophetic, that is, theocratic succession) to a mulk - a temporal sovereignty[57]. It is the case that the shape that the Ummayad rule assumed can be traced to the pre-Islamic ideals of honour and chivalry, to which Mu^cawiyah and his successors subscribed. Thus despite the theoretical equality of all believers in the brotherhood of Islam, we find the Arabs asserting themselves as a dominant aristocracy over the subject peoples. The Ummayads exhibited as much pride of race, and boasted

as much of their genealogies, as did their forefathers in the days
before Islam. But the transition from the primitive simplicity
of Medina to the temporal sovereignty of Damascus was, in the last
analysis, simply a recognition of realities, for Islam was on the
way to becoming a great power; and while the purists might continue
to legislate in Medina, their systems were condemned to recede ever
further from life and from the effective canons of government.
Arnold expresses this very well: "The unprejudiced student of
history can realize how unjust was the judgement which these
theorists and the historians of the Abbasid period who accept
their point of view passed upon the Ummayads; they were under the
delusion that the life of a patriarchal and primitive religious
society, such as the Companions of Muhammad had lived in Medina,[58]
could be reproduced in a vast empire that had absorbed countries
accustomed to the civilised administrative methods of the Roman
world; they could not recognize that the larger sphere of activity,
such as primitive Muslim society during the lifetime of the Prophet
never dreamt of, demanded methods for which the inspired Word of
God offered no guidance.[59]"

The tension and incompatibility, in the case of both Israel
and Islam, were created by their developing role as nations in the
world of nations. The tension and incompatibility were between
the primitive constitutions of their respective societies as
religious brotherhoods, and the parts which both were assigned to
play, when they emerged as nations on the stage of history.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ECONOMICS OF THE UNITED MONARCHY

The Economics of the United Monarchy

It has been pointed out that the weakness of Assyria and Egypt around the middle of the tenth century B.C. afforded Israel a rare opportunity for political expansion. Albright' notes that from c.1150 B.C. onwards, Egypt was without real political strength, and that she did not emerge as a force in international affairs again until the reign of Shishak (c.935-915 B.C.). Assyria had suffered a period of declension after the notable reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.), and reached the full ebb of her power during the long and feeble reign of Asshur-rabi II (1012-972 B.C.), during which Assyrian outposts along the upper Euphrates were occupied by Aramaeans. Under Tiglath-Pileser II (966-935 B.C.), the Assyrian king contemporary with Solomon, Assyrian power remained at a low ebb and it was not until after 875 B.C. that the Assyrians regained the Upper Euphrates Valley. Hence the times could not have been more propitious for the Israelite expansion which took place under David (c.1000-960 B.C.) and Solomon (c.960-922 B.C.).

In David's day, circumstances conspired to provide that there should be no economic difficulty. David had impressively exhibited his power as a soldier, and had dealt rigorously and even ferociously with nations who had crossed his path and resisted him, while he was bent on the march of empire. While

his strength was still fresh in the memory of those who had

suffered from it, rebellion was not yet a prevalent mood and

the extent of the empire was unimpaired, providing an impressive

increment to the national income. The distinctive feature of

David's economic strength was the fullness of his war chest

and the boost to his exchequer administered by the annual

injection of a considerable tribute revenue. A somewhat

analogous situation existed in the case of the Ummayad dynasty

in Damascus, who fell heirs to the spoils of the Islamic

conquests, and who had at their disposal the economic resources

of a vast empire which was still firmly held in the clamp of

military strength. It has been recognized that the commercial

and cultural efflorescence which manifested itself under the

Abbasids in Baghdad, drew on the massive reserves of wealth

which had been amassed in the course of conquest and husbanded

by the Ummayads. Similarly, much of the wealth which Solomon

spread about so lavishly to realize his royal pretensions was

found conveniently at hand in David's war chest.

It is likely that there was no grandiose royal establish-

ment in the reign of David. Albright[2] has stated that there is

no evidence of David having made any attempt to establish a

centralised state. We agree with this, in so far as it means

that there is no evidence of elaborate building projects in

David's time, or that his bureaucratic organisation had swelled

to such dimensions as to give an appearance of top-heaviness to
the Israelite state. It seems likely that David's officialdom
was contained within bounds sufficiently decent to prevent it
from being a source of economic disbalance or pecuniary
embarrassment. With Solomon, there is a significant change in
this respect. His ambitious building programme was centred for
the most part around his own pretensions, and added nothing to
the productive potential or economic strength of the country.
Quite the reverse was the case, because his building projects
required numerous additions to the ranks of non-productive
officialdom. Hence the burdens were cumulative; capital was
expended in the erection of the buildings, and officials were
appointed both to supervise the building operations and to
administer the establishments after they were built. None of
these burdens was a charge on David's exchequer. We would hold
then that, while there were no economic difficulties in David's
day, the same is not true of social tensions;[3] and, from this
point of view, the tendency towards centralisation, with its
consequences for the Israelite community, was already well under
way during David's reign.

The reserves of wealth which David had amassed, and which
had appeared to be so substantial as to leave a good deal to
spare, proved, in the event, to be insufficient to balance
Solomon's extravagance. Solomon had made up his mind to stake

his claim to a place among the great,[4] but Israel was not a
great country, and the price she had to pay for this exhibition
of ostentation and monarchic pretension in the grand style was
the wastage of the reserves of wealth garnered by David.

The drain on the national resources of Israel may be
considered, first of all, in relation to the dimensions of the
royal establishment. We have already suggested that the
creation of the complex of buildings in Jerusalem bears directly
on Solomon's determination to become a royal personage of the
first rank, who could hold up his head in the presence of the
kings of Egypt and Assyria. In this connection it should not
be overlooked that the temple itself is not in dimensions the
largest building of the Jerusalem complex, and this certainly
suggests that it is an ancillary of the total scheme and should
be regarded as a royal chapel. It is a worthy embellishment of
monarchic dignity and the focus of the cult of the king.[5]

In order to give effect to these designs, Solomon had to
seek technical assistance from Phoenicia, since there were not
the resources of artisan skill in Israel for the carrying out
of such a programme. This in itself is a testimony to the
essential foreignness of what he was aiming at, and to the motive
of imitation of elaborate foreign building designs[6] which he
conceived as a way of impressing his royal dignity on those
outside Israel. Hence we are told (I Kings 5) how Solomon

communicated with Hiram of Tyre, indicating his intention of
building a temple in Jerusalem and requesting that a supply of
cedar and cypress from Lebanon might be made available to him for
the purpose. In so doing, Solomon was following a precedent set
by David, whose house was built (doubtless on a modest scale in
comparison with Solomon's ambitious scheme) with Lebanon cedar by
Tyrian carpenters and masons (2 Samuel 5:11). Solomon undertook
to send a supply of labour to Lebanon to assist in the cutting of
the wood - which process, however, was to be supervised by the
Phoenicians, who had the skill. Solomon further undertook to pay
for the Phoenician labour which was made available for this work.
The timber was to be brought down from Lebanon to the Phoenician
coast, and to be lashed together into rafts which were to go by
sea to Israel. On arrival they were to be broken up and trans-
ported to the site of the operations. The expenditure involved
in all this (if we leave aside the corvée for the moment) is the
cost of the timber itself, the cost of the Phoenician skilled
labour and the cost of transport to Israel - which, doubtless was
also a Phoenician operation, since the Israelites could have had
little experience of assembling rafts or of sailing them. This
must have made up a formidable total, but so far we have only
reached the point where a part of the building materials have
reached the site. We shall deal, under the head of corvée, with
the quarrying operations and the transportation of the stone to

Jerusalem; at present, we ask whether the debt to Phoenicia incurred by Solomon extended beyond the items with which we have dealt. There is one other considerable item, namely, the cost of employing skilled Phoenician artisans on the Jerusalem buildings. These included builders of Hiram and "men of Gebal"[7] (1 Kings 5:18) besides native Israelites; and if foreigners were needed to hew and prepare the timber and stone, we may be certain that the delicate and elaborate work described in Chapter 6 of 1 Kings must have been done by Phoenician craftsmen. It would be slow work, and would demand payment commensurate with the skill involved.

However the cost of keeping up such a royal establishment may, in the long run, have proved a more crippling burden than the initial capital outlay involved in building. The complex of royal buildings became the habitat of a host of royal officials, all of whom had to be paid. The king lived on a lavish scale, and the court had to be proportionately provisioned.[8] It does not seem likely that much of this came from tributaries, although it is plausible that tribute may have been paid in grain, and 1 Kings 5:4 might be thought to hint that Solomon drew upon the resources of his empire to support his table. At any rate, it was part of the duty of the officials set over the fiscal zones each to assume responsibility for supplying the king's table for one month of the year, and from this it is clear that Solomon was

devouring a disproportionate share of the limited agricultural
resources of the country. Again there is the record (1 Kings 8:63f.)
of Solomon sacrificing on a grand scale on the occasion of the
dedication of the temple; he is reported to have offered as peace-
offerings to Yahweh twenty-two thousand oxen and a hundred and
twenty thousand sheep. There was no question of a special levy
for the upkeep of the temple in Solomon's day, since it was simply
a part of the royal establishment and its priests a special class
of royal officials. The temple is lumped together with the
remainder of the king's establishment, and the cost of the upkeep
of the whole is reflected in taxation, corvée, and reduced living
standards.

All this expenditure may properly be described as "personal",
because it derives principally from the pretensions of Solomon to
grandeur. We may speak of Solomon's building programme as capital
works, but it differs essentially from the kind of capital equip-
ment programmes which are a feature of the modern planned economies
of, for example, Russia and China. Solomon's was not a five-year
plan. It did not depress living standards as a temporary and
beneficent measure with a long-term end in view, and the intention
of ultimately increasing the productive potential of the country
through capital equipment; it did not hold out the ultimate
prospect of better living standards, in exchange for a period of
frugal living and austerity. Solomon had no concern with questions

of economic viability. Doubtless it would be to think anachron-
istically to expect that Solomon could have had any ideas of a
planned economy, which is a very modern concept, but it is not so
unreasonable to have expected him to pause and consider whether
Israel had the resources to pay for the grand appurtenances of
monarchy upon which he had determined. For all of this was in
the nature of luxury expenditure, and we shall see that, by reason
of its snowball effect, it proved in the long run to be a
crippling burden which could not be carried by Israel's limited
economic resources.

It is a moot point whether Solomon's expenditure on chariots
and chariot-cities should be attached to the foregoing, or whether
this should be considered as a genuine case of defence expenditure.
The notices (1 Kings 5:6-8) report that Solomon had forty thousand
stalls of horses for his chariots and twelve thousand horsemen.
2 Chronicles 9:25, the parallel passage, reads four thousand
instead of forty thousand. Albright prefers the lower figure.
There are further references to Solomon's chariot-cities and to
the cities for his horsemen[9] in 1 Kings 9:15-19, and 1 Kings 10:26
states that Solomon had fourteen hundred chariots and twelve
thousand horsemen.[9] Albright[10] has pointed out that the biblical
notices are confirmed by the discovery of royal stables of the
tenth and ninth centuries B.C. at Megiddo,[11] which, according to
the estimate of the excavators, were intended to hold some four

hundred and fifty horses and perhaps about one hundred and fifty chariots.[12] Albright regards as trustworthy the tradition that Solomon had a powerful standing army and that he built a number of chariot-cities (Gezer[13], Tell-el-Hesi[14] and Taanach[15] are all archaeologically attested, in addition to Megiddo) and states that there is no reason to doubt the figures of fourteen hundred chariots and four thousand horses.[16]

What was the function of Solomon's mercenary army and chariotry? We are being reminded at present that Britain's con-script army is a serious financial burden, and the same must have been true of Solomon's defence expenditure. Partly it may be justified by asserting that, since Solomon had inherited an empire, it was his duty to preserve it intact, and that to do this he required an impressive show of military strength. The tributaries, cowed for a time after their bitter taste of the strength and firmness of David, would by a natural process incline to become restive, and to consider ways and means of throwing off burdens which they found irksome and humiliating. Solomon counted on the annual tribute income from his empire in order to finance his schemes, and it was a matter of first importance that there should be no shrinkage of empire, because he could not afford any shrinkage of income. That does not commend itself to us as the whole story, although in so far as his military forces and their establishments fulfilled this function, they justified themselves on economic

grounds. Yet it seems to us that these military forces must be regarded as yet another manifestation of monarchy in the grand style, after the oriental pattern with which Solomon conformed. The dimensions of the king were to be judged by these impressive military establishments, and they confirmed his status in the eyes of those with whom he would be equal. But we would also relate the mercenaries and the chariotry, to the general consequences to the Israelite community of Solomon's regime and his policies; that is to say, these forces have to be considered as pointing at the domestic situation in Israel no less than at the empire which Solomon had to maintain. They were the effective power elements by which Solomon's despotism was enforced on a populace which no longer had the characteristics of a true community willingly involved in the policies of its king, and freely bending its energies to his designs with a confidence in its developing nation-hood. With the constitutional and social consequences of rule through a mercenary power group we have already dealt, in our consideration of the Absalom revolt, and at the end of the chapter we shall bring these remarks up to date by considering their relevance to the reign of Solomon.

We come now to Solomon's trade in gold; and once again we are inclined to view this as a luxury trade which, far from being a source of real income, was yet another drain on the economic resources of Israel. The notices in the Book of Kings show that

the use to which this imported gold was put was decorative. 1 Kings
6:20 states that the inner sanctuary of the temple was overlaid
with gold, and in the following verses it is remarked that all of
the temple was overlaid with pure gold. Between the two sanctuaries
were chains of pure gold, while the altar of the inner sanctuary
was totally overlaid with gold. According to v.28 the cherubim
were overlaid with gold; so also were the two doors of olive wood
serving as an entrance to the inner sanctuary, and also two doors
of cypress wood.

Another decorative use to which Solomon put the imported gold,
was to make it up into shields. According to 1 Kings 10:16f., he
made two hundred shields of beaten gold, six hundred shekels of
gold going into each shield.[17] Also he made three hundred shields
(or bucklers) of beaten gold, three minas of gold going into each
shield.[18] These were put in the House of the Forest of Lebanon.
Solomon also made an ivory throne which he overlaid with gold
(v.19), his drinking vessels were all of gold (v.21), and all the
vessels of the House of the Forest of Lebanon were of pure gold.
These trading operations in gold are put in their right perspective
in v.22, where the shipping of gold and silver is coupled with that
of ivory, apes and peacocks.[19] All these imports are in the luxury
category, and their primary use was that of decoration. They
were brought in to enhance the lustre of Solomon's reign and to
magnify the dimensions of his person to fitting proportions.

It must also be borne in mind that the equipping of the fleet
which traded with Ophir, must have involved a considerable initial
capital outlay. 1 Kings 9:26 records that Solomon built a fleet
of ships at Ezion-Geber. Now it is certain that this fleet could
not have been built without Phoenician materials and skill. This
would involve the same pattern of outlay as we have already
detailed in our treatment of the king's building operations.
Imported material would have to be paid for, any Phoenician labour
involved in preparation and transportation of timber would be an
additional charge, and Israelite labour would again be diverted
from tasks more essentially productive, in order to play the role
of unskilled labourers to the Phoenicians. Even after the ships
were built (which must have been, in the main, a Phoenician
operation), they could not be operated without the aid of Phoenician
sailors (1 Kings 9:27f.); so that over and above the initial
cost of building materials and skilled labour, the running of the
fleet would involve a recurring payment to Phoenician sailors for
their services. Moreover 1 Kings 10:11 would seem to mean that
Solomon chartered the fleet of Hiram to assist in the importing of
gold, and this would be a further cause of indebtedness to
Phoenicia. If it were the case that Solomon did not use all the
gold which he imported, or even most of it, on decoration, it does
not seem to us that this would alter the true economic significance
of his gold imports in any important way. They would still be in

the nature of a luxury operation which may have resulted in personal aggrandisement on a great scale (i.e. Solomon may have amassed a huge personal fortune in gold), but which were a crushing burden upon the national economy. It is true of course that, if Solomon had a personal fortune in gold in addition to the realisable assets represented by all the decorative work in gold, here we have a reserve of wealth which, at some future date, could have been converted in such a way as to bring benefits to the national economy. The point, however, is that Solomon had no intention of converting it in this kind of way, and so long as the imported gold was the perquisite of the monarch and was employed to give sparkle and splendour to his person, it must be regarded as increasing rather than relieving the burdens on the strained Israelite economy. There is a notice in 1 Kings 9:11-14 which enables us to see the situation in its true light. Solomon was unable to repay to Hiram a loan of one hundred and twenty talents of gold,[20] and in order to settle his account he was forced to cede territory in Galilee to the extent of twenty cities. In the light of this, it would seem that we should not underestimate the quantities of gold that Solomon may have used in decorating the interior of his buildings, and it is perhaps significant that the gold received from Hiram is classed together with other building materials, cedar and cypress timber, received from Phoenicia. This notice certainly does not favour the view that Solomon had any gold

to spare, and indeed a possible interpretation of it is that, when Solomon at the end of his building operations and costly interior decorations came to square his account with Hiram, he found himself in financial difficulties. The notice further seems to us to indicate that the gold borrowed from Hiram was used for decoration, and this would suggest that Solomon's imports from Ophir[21] had proved insufficient for his decorative projects. At any rate the gold imported from Hiram was as much a luxury article as the other building materials, and to preserve national solvency Solomon had to cede territory.

What resources did Solomon have to begin with to finance his ambitious policies? There was the full war chest of David which he had inherited, and, at the beginning, his frequent resort to this would tend to insulate him from economic realities and hide from him the fact that he was spending more on himself than Israel could afford. There was also the income from tribute which must have been considerable, although it is unlikely that we can place any reliance on the massive figure of six hundred and sixty-six talents of gold which is given in 1 Kings 10:14.[22] These subject states would include the Philistines, as well as the border states in Transjordan and the new Aramaean states in southern and eastern Syria.[23] Then there were the sources of real income deriving from trade. 1 Kings 10:28f. refers to the importing of horses by Solomon from Egypt and Kue. Albright[24] contends that recent

archeological discoveries have cleared up the enigmatic terms of this notice; he offers the following translation: "And Solomon's horses were exported from Cilicia (Kue); the merchants of the king procured them from Cilicia at the current price; and a chariot was exported from Egypt at the rate of six hundred shekels of silver, and a horse from Cilicia at the rate of one hundred and fifty; and thus (at this rate) they delivered them by their agency to all the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Aram." Albright notes that the statement of Herodotus (iii, 90) that Cilicia was the source of the best horses which were used by official Persian couriers is confirmed by unpublished contemporary documents. He adds that the Egyptians of the New Empire became experts in the manufacture of chariots, for which they imported hard wood from Syria. The meaning of the passage is then that Solomon's merchants, by virtue of their control of the trade routes between Egypt and Syria, were in a commanding position and were able to exercise a virtual monopoly over the trade in horses and chariots. The Egyptians had to obtain their best horses through Israel, while the Syrians were dependent on Israel for the supply of chariots of quality. The standard rate of exchange was that of four Cilician horses for one Egyptian chariot.

We have discussed above the trade relations between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre, and have indicated that this was largely a one-way traffic, with Israel doing the importing and incurring the

consequent indebtedness. It has been pointed out[25] that after c.1050 B.C. the Canaanite Sidonians (Phoenicians) rapidly extended their sea power; by the end of the tenth century they controlled the Mediterranean sea routes as far as Spain, and possessed trading colonies and mining settlements in Cyprus, Sicily, Sardinia,[26] and probably also in North Africa and Spain. The Phoenicians reached the apogée of their commercial prosperity and trading enterprise under Hiram (c.969-936), whose reign coincided with that of Solomon, and it is understandable that Solomon's interest in the lucrative possibilities of international trade should have orientated his interests towards Tyre. The possibility must also be entertained that the northernmost Israelite tribes, Asher, Naphtali and Dan, had been drawn into the Phoenician sphere of interest and had shared in the benefits of maritime enterprise and commercial prosperity. Albright observes that the Israelite towns of Abel and Dan were less than twenty-five miles due east of Tyre, while the Danites are said to have taken service in ships as early as the third quarter of the twelfth century[27] (Judges 5:17). Albright remarks further that the Sidonian strip of territory along the sea, south of Ras-en-Naqurah, was directly contiguous with Asher. Albright adduces the case of Hiram, Solomon's master architect (1 Kings 7:13), and suggests that his parentage (he was the son of a Tyrian coppersmith and an Israelite woman from Naphtali) illustrates the close physical relationship between the

Phoenicians and the northern tribes. There is perhaps another
aspect to the trade relationship between Phoenicia and Israel[28] than
that which we have considered to date. So far it has seemed to
consist in the indebtedness of Israel for Phoenician goods and
services, without any word of exports to assist the balance of
payments. We have, however, noted that the grip held by Solomon's
merchants on the trade in horses and chariots is an indication of
the key position occupied by Israel on the trade routes between
Syria and the Hittite country in the north, and Egypt in the south.
Solomon's era witnessed not only a boom in maritime trade and
transporting of goods by sea, but also in the movement of goods
overland by caravan. Tyre was an emporium of the first rank, and
it is clear that there must have been a heavy overland traffic out
of and into this great Phoenician port. Much of this traffic must
have passed through Israel; and, in whatever way we conceive
Israel as partaking in it, it would be an important source of
revenue to her. This would be so even if it were the case that
Israel's share in the trade amounted to no more than the exacting
of tolls from foreign traders, for permission to pass along the
portion of the trade routes which ran through Israel. But we
regard it as extremely probable that Solomon's merchants were
engaged in this trade on their own account. We have noted their
insistence that the prerogative of playing the part of the middle-
man in the matter of facilitating the exchange of Cilician horses

for Egyptian chariots, was theirs.

Egypt was not the only terminus of the south-bound trade.
The possibilities of overland trade through the desert had been
opened up by the domestication of the camel,[29] since camels could
travel through deserts whose watering places might be two or three
days' journey apart. Albright remarks that, since the Arabs
appear in contemporary sources (cf. 1 Kings 10:15) in the ninth
century, and the Sabaéans appear on the Assyrian horizon in the
eighth, the caravan trade between the Fertile Crescent and Southern
Arabia must have been already well developed, and the Sabaeans had
extended their influence as far north as the central Hejaz. Al-
bright argues that, since it must have taken generations for this
evolution to have taken place, it is probably justifiable to trace
its start back to the twelfth century B.C., during the Aramaean
movements which led to the occupation of nearly all Syria. Tiglath-
Pileser's occupation of the oasis of Palmyra (Tadmar) is thought
to point to a nascent expansion of the caravan trade in the Syrian
desert, for it seems to Albright that otherwise the importance
which is attached to the oasis is difficult to account for. Albright
adds that even in the Syrian desert, camels were a much more con-
venient and efficient form of transport than the asses of earlier
days, because they could travel at all seasons of the year without
being much concerned about food and water. Further south, in the
deep desert, the caravan trade did not have its beginnings until

the domestication of the camel.

The significance of Solomon's control of the frontier regions of Zobah, Damascus, Hauran, Ammon, Moab and Edom, lies in the monopoly which he was thereby able to exercise over the entire caravan trade between Arabia and the north, from the Red Sea to Palmyra.[30] It would seem that the tradition of the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon may perhaps be construed as a picturesque reflection of the trade from South Arabia overland, in which Solomon had such a vital stake. The account in 1 Kings 10 represents the Queen of Sheba as paying homage to the wisdom of Solomon, because of the reports of his renown which had reached her. She is said to have come to Jerusalem with a retinue and a caravan of camels laden with spices, gold and precious stones. She was impressed with the wisdom of Solomon and the grandeur of his establishment to the point of being nonplussed, and she assured Solomon that what her eyes had seen surpassed the most glowing of the far-flung reports of his wisdom and opulence. That much of this derives from late elaboration and overlay, guided by the legend of Solomon's wisdom and riches, is an impression strengthened by v.9, where the Queen of Sheba is made to say: "Blessed be Yahweh your God who has delighted in you and set you on the throne of Israel. Because the Lord loved Israel for ever he has made you king, that you may execute justice and righteousness." She is said to have given Solomon one hundred and twenty talents of gold

and a very great quantity of spices and precious stones. It seems likely that whatever historical sub-stratum there is in all this, rests on a community of trading interests between Solomon and South Arabia.[31] Glueck observes that Israel avoided the contest for the control of the sea lanes through the Eastern Mediterranean, leaving them to Egypt and Phoenicia, and concentrating its energies upon the only important trade outlet for which it did not have to struggle with powers immeasurably superior to itself - the outlet upon Arabia. Glueck says: "Arabia was not merely a back door, but a front portal. The rich routes of commerce coming from Arabia led northward to Damascus, westward to Gaza and Egypt and eastward via Dumah and Teimah to the Persian Gulf. The nation that sat astride the trade routes to and from Arabia commanded the avenues of wealth and power. The wealth of the Edomites and the Nabataeans who succeeded them may be partially explained by their control of these trade routes. The prosperous periods of the United Kingdom and of Judah have a direct relationship with the periods when they controlled the Arabah and a port on the Red Sea."[32]

It is legitimate to assert, as we now do, that the natural resources or primary wealth of a country set broad limits to the production of wealth of which it is capable, without in any way subscribing to a doctrine of economic determinism. The situation here is somewhat analogous to the relation between the level of performance of which an individual is capable, and his native

endowment of intelligence. There is such a factor as native intelligence; and, broadly speaking, its level regulates the ceiling of attainment of which an individual is capable. But, given a number of people with the same intelligent quotient, it is impossible to predict how they will severally utilize and exploit the degree of native endowment which they possess. The possibilities for individual variation are countless, so that a knowledge of the extent of native endowment does not tell us a great deal of the possibilities of performance. The individual who has the advantages of education, and who responds with qualities of diligence and perseverance so as fully to realize his potentialities, will have a career very different from the individual whose endowment is undeveloped and remains in the sphere of pure potentiality. The individual who has a powerful interest in some pursuit or an intense dedication to some task, may attain to substantial results, even if he begins with limited resources of intelligence. So Israel, despite her limited resources of primary wealth did not, as Albright[33] has noted, bow before these initial handicaps, but, in agreement with Toynbee's "Challenge and Response" dictum, was spurred on to greater efforts, and stiffened in national resolve and national virtues, by the very difficulties of terrain and inadequacies of primary wealth with which she was penalised. Hence Albright observes: "It is, of course, idle to deny the tremendous importance of geographical environment for human history.

But the effect of such environment on peoples with different
organisation or cultural preparation is often entirely different.
White Europeans have succeeded where American Indians failed over
a test period of many thousand years."[34]   Yet it must be admitted
that the nature of the terrain of Palestine, the desultory rainfall
and the limited mineral wealth regulated the pattern of Israel's
economy.   There was scope within these limits for human ingenuity
and resourcefulness, but there was a ceiling of productive
achievement above which Israel could not go.   She could not become
a great grain-growing land, and she did not have massive reserves
of minerals to afford her basic wealth in sufficient quantity and
variety to provide the raw material of formidable wealth-producing
processes.

We have mentioned the sources of income, additional to the
wealth-producing capacity of Israel, which were available to
Solomon.   It is clear, however, that he found it necessary, in
order to pay his bills, to make heavy demands on the wealth
produced within Israel.   McCown[35] notes that a basic factor in
primary wealth is the soil, and that in this respect, Israel was
never meant to be the home of wealth and luxury.   McCown's statement
that agriculture and animal husbandry are the only significant
internal sources of wealth in Palestine needs modification, in view
of our knowledge of the copper workings of the Jordan Valley and,
more especially, the copper and iron workings of the Arabah.   Yet

agriculture was the staple form of wealth, and of the productive
capacity of Israelite agriculture McCown has this to say: "The
products of the land were therefore strictly limited. Aside from
the flocks and herds which must always have represented a con-
siderable proportion of its wealth, Palestine produced grain on
the rolling plains east of Jordan[36] and, on the western mountains,
wonderful grapes, olives and figs. Grain, no doubt, was always
grown on the plains and even the terraced wadies of Western
Palestine, but probably never in sufficient quantities to supply
the local demand. Vineyards and olive orchards, especially the
latter, have ever been the principal sources of wealth in the
mountains of Western Palestine. The export of wine and oil has
been the chief means of preserving Palestine's balance of trade[37]."

An illustration of the way in which Solomon used the agri-
cultural wealth of Palestine to pay his bills for timber procured
from Phoenicia, is afforded by the notice in 1 Kings 5:25. There
it is recorded that he paid for supplies of cedar and cypress by
annual exports of twenty thousand cors of wheat and twenty thousand
baths of beaten oil.[38] It may be thought that these figures cannot
be considered reliable, but without placing too much emphasis on
the quantity exported, the very fact that Solomon did export agri-
cultural produce to Phoenicia, in order to pay for timber which
was to be used in luxury building projects, is an economic and
social factor of great significance. According to the figures of

1 Kings 5:2, he was using up thirty-two thousand eight hundred
and fifty cors of grain annually for the provisioning of his
establishments, and this, along with the annual exporting of twenty
thousand cors to Phoenicia, yields a total of fifty-two thousand
eight hundred and fifty cors of grain. This drain on the country's
limited food-growing capacity must inevitably have been reflected
in a lower standard of life for the people.

Furthermore, when we examine the uses to which Solomon put
the mineral wealth which came to his hand, we find that Israel was
not in any better case. The main mineral wealth in copper and
iron was worked in the Arabah, south of the Dead Sea and north of
Ezion-Geber.[39] There was also copper in the Jordan Valley, and
the notice in 1 Kings 7:40-46 states that copper cult objects and
utensils used in the temple were cast between Succoth and Zarethan.[40]
Glueck's excavations at Tell-el-Kheleifeh,[41] ancient Ezion-Geber,
on the Gulf of Aqabah, have brought to light an extensive copper
refinery, first built in the tenth century B.C. and rebuilt at
later periods. The fleet based on Ezion-Geber took on cargoes of
copper and iron ore, and these exports were an important part of
Solomon's capacity to pay for the luxury imports, principally gold,
with which the ships returned to Ezion-Geber. With regard to the
boats themselves, Glueck[42] states that they would not be much
larger than the falukas in which fishermen put out to sea at the
present day from Aqabah. Glueck points out that the waters are too

shallow to take anything bigger and that, for this reason, even a
small steamer could not approach the north end of the Gulf of
Aqabah to-day. Glueck adds that the criterion in Solomon's time
would not be a deep draught, but a sandy bottom which would enable
ships to be drawn on shore; and this being so, it is significant
that the shore-line immediately in front of Tell-el-Kheleifeh is
free of rocks: these make the east and west bends of the north
end of the Gulf dangerous for boats and it was here that Jehosaphat's
fleet was wrecked (1 Kings 22:49). Glueck observes that the time
taken by Solomon's ships for the round trip was three years (1 Kings
10:22, 2 Chronicles 9:21); and he believes that while the ships
would be carried swiftly southwards to Ophir by the prevailing
winds from the north, it would take a painfully long time for them
to make the return journey with the winds against them.[43] Glueck's
view is that, on the return journey, they would hug the coast of
Arabia, making short runs by day and putting into shore every night,
trading wherever they could along the coast. Glueck observes that
the main articles of trade possessed by the Israelites were the
copper implements manufactured at Ezion-Geber.

Albright[44] argues that the refinery buildings at Ezion-Geber
betray Phoenician influence, and states that the earliest refinery
stood in the middle of a fortified rectangle surrounded by a
casemate wall of "typical Early Iron type".[45] Glueck's earlier view
had been that Ezion-Geber I belonged to the early part of the Early

Iron Age and was pre-Solomonic. He advanced the opinion that it was probably reconstructed by or for the Edomites, and was an eloquent testimony to the advanced character of Edomite civilisation in the early part of the Early Iron Age. This view was subsequently retracted by Glueck,[46] and he no longer believes that Ezion-Geber I was pre-Solomonic, so that he falls into line with the position of Albright outlined above. Glueck[47] has observed further that the excellent standard of construction of the refinery makes it clear that the builders were men possessed of great practical knowledge and long experience. He has also argued that the conditions of work must have been so grim that they would have been tolerated only by conscript slave-labour who had no say in the question of conditions of work. Albright[48] believes that the evidences of technical skill and experience in the construction of the refinery, together with the conscription of slave-labour, point to Phoenician influence, and he holds that "tarshish" is equivalent to "refinery".[49] Tell-el-Kheleifeh was a tarshish after the pattern of Phoenician stations with the same name in Sardinia and Spain, and is to be bracketed with the temple of Solomon and his stables at Megiddo, as an example of Syro-Phoenician influence on Israel about the middle of the tenth century B.C. Mendelsohn takes up the point of slave-labour in the mines and refinery, and referring to conditions of work at the latter, says: "The fumes and smoke from the smelter-refinery alone, coupled with the severity of the natural

conditions, must have made life there intolerable to the free-born and impossible for slaves. The welfare of the latter, however, would hardly be taken into consideration and the rate of mortality must have been terrific.[50]" Mendelsohn thinks that these tasks would not fall to Israelites under the demands of corvée, but that they would be reserved for captives of war and their descendants, and for free-born Canaanites and Edomites who had been reduced to slavery and who were also employed in the mines. It is, however, impossible to pronounce categorically on this; and if these conditions of slave-labour were in fact imposed on Israelites, we can understand the hatefulness of the régime to men deeply conscious of their degradation, and attached to the old values of community and rights of citizens so savagely destroyed by a pretentious potentate.

We come now to the appropriations of Israel's wealth through the exactions of direct taxation, which was an innovation of Solomon's reign. We have suggested above that the demands of the king's table on the agricultural resources of the land would be reflected in a lower standard of living for the people at large, and this becomes all the more indubitable when we reflect that this was exacted as a tax by royal officials, To facilitate its collection, Solomon divided the land into fiscal districts super-vised by royal officials. The question of whether any preference was shown to Judah in the matter of taxation has been discussed

above,[51] and Albright[52] has dealt at length with the problems of
ascertaining the geographical extent of Solomon's administrative
districts. Albright[53] is of the opinion that the census carried
out by David towards the end of his reign was with a view to fiscal
reform, but that he was prevented from implementing his intentions
when the onset of plague brought about a revulsion of popular
feeling. Albright's suggestion, then, is that the Solomonic
reorganisation may actually represent the carrying into effect of
the blueprint drawn up by David before his death. At any rate,
Albright holds that the statement of 1 Kings 4:7-19 shows that at
least half of the new districts diverge from the older tribal
boundaries, and this is to be accounted for partly by the addition
to Israel proper of extensive new territory, such as the Mediter-
ranean coast from the south of Joppa to Carmel, much of the Plain
of Esdraelon, and tracts in Trans-Jordan; also by the shifting
of the trade-centres. Partly, however, it was a political move
and a deliberate attempt to break up larger units in Northern
Israel and so destroy tribalism. Solomon had benefited from
David's experience with the centrifugal tendencies of the tribes,
at a time when the administrative divisions followed the old
tribal units.[54] Of more immediate relevance is the fact, which
emerges clearly, that this new fiscal organisation and the officials
who were to administrate it were the means by which Solomon proposed
to milch the country systematically. Each officer in turn was

responsible for exacting such taxation in kind as would provision
the royal establishments for a month, while the fodder adequate
for the needs of the king's horses had to be brought to the cities
where they were stabled.

The corvée was but another kind of exaction through which
Solomon ensured that the populace would pay for his schemes.
There were the battalions of forced labour conscripted to assist
in the hewing of wood in Lebanon, in its transportation to the
Phoenician coast and its subsequent passage by sea and land, until
it arrived at the scene of building operations. According to 1
Kings 5:27f., the levy of which Adoniram was in charge numbered
thirty thousand men in all, of which the number actually employed
at any one time was ten thousand, the period of service being one
month. This means that the thirty thousand men comprising the
levy would spend four months annually on corvée. Solomon is also
said to have had seventy thousand burden-bearers and eighty
thousand hewers of stone in the hill country, the task of the
burden-bearers presumably being to transport the quarried stone to
the site of the building operations. In 1 Kings 9:15f. there is
an account of the forced labour (mas)[55] which Solomon levied for
the completing of diverse building schemes throughout the land.
These included the complex of buildings in Jerusalem to which we
have previously referred, the Millo[56] and the wall of Jerusalem;
Hazor,[57] Megiddo,[58] Gezer,[59] Bethhoron the lower, Baalath and Tamar

in the wilderness;[60] "all the store cities that Solomon had and
the cities for his chariots and the cities for his horses, and
whatever Solomon desired to build in Jerusalem, in Lebanon[61] and
in all the land of his dominion." Verse 20, which states that
those put to the corvée were the remnants of the pre-Israelite
population of Palestine, and that Solomon did not subject Israelites
to forced labour, is in apparent contradiction with 5:27 and must
be regarded as owing to the subsequent resolve of a later apologist
to fit the reign of Solomon into the mould of his own ideals.[62]
The figure of three thousand three hundred chief officers employed
in overseeing the labour force, is given in 1 Kings 5:30; and in
2 Chronicles 2:1,17 (also in two manuscripts of the Greek)[63] the
number is three thousand six hundred. In 1 Kings 9:23 there is
another notice, which states that the number of chief officers was
five hundred and fifty. Montgomery[64] has suggested that the larger
number derives from an editorial expansion of the earlier and
smaller one, and is fixed on by "a nice piece of editorial
arithmetic". His view is that the one hundred and fifty thousand
of v. 29 (seventy thousand carriers and eighty thousand hewers)
has been interpolated as a later exaggeration of the original
figure of thirty thousand given in v.27.   In this way the total
number of labourers is increased from thirty thousand to one
hundred and eighty thousand, a ratio of six to one, and the increase
in the number of the chief officers, from five hundred and fifty to

three thousand three hundred, is in the same ratio. In any case,
we do not propose to base any argument on specific figures; but
whatever be the truth about these, it is clear that Solomon did
in fact carry out an onerous building programme and that, in order
to do this, he must have made heavy corvée demands upon his people.
We are apt to overlook the burdensomeness of these operations,
carried out as they were entirely by human labour. Before
machinery was thought of, the quarrying of stones, their trans-
portation, their handling and rehandling and the manipulating of
them into position in the actual operation of building, must have
involved immense drudgery and murderous toil. This was but one
aspect of the total programme, and altogether the expenditure of
human energy must have been vast. All this must be borne in mind,
if we are to arrive at an adequate assessment of the cost of
Solomon's building programme in men and man-hours.

State slavery in Israel has been discussed by Mendelsohn.[65]
He has observed that the provisions in the law codes (Exodus 21,
Deuteronomy 15, Leviticus 25) refer only to domestic slaves, and
do not deal either with temple slaves or state slaves. He has
noticed that state slavery was the latest form of slavery to
develop in Israel, and that its existence presupposes the arrival
of centralised power and the political machinery for its effective
expression. State slavery is further linked up very closely with
economics, since it is fixed upon as a suitable instrument for the

profitable exploitation of extensive crown properties. Mendelsohn
notes that state slavery was a feature of the Palestinian city-
states of the Amarna Age, and that these slaves were used by the
prince in the cultivation of the crown lands. Mendelsohn states
that the gifts sent by Syrian and Palestinian princes to their
Egyptian overlords were, in a large measure, slaves, and that
slaves in the Amarna letters have the names ardani (male-slaves),
amati (female-slaves), and asiru (captives of war). After the
collapse of Egyptian rule in Palestine, and during the subsequent
period of the Judges, there was no centralised power in Palestine
and so the corvée was non-existent.[66] It was reintroduced in the
reign of David, who had an officer of the corvée (2 Samuel 20:24),
and became a factor of economic importance after the conquest of
the Arabah. Mendelsohn observes in this connection: "Slave labour
is highly unprofitable, except when used on a large scale in un-
skilled operations. The slave has neither the will nor the skill
to operate with delicate techniques and expensive tools. The
natural operation for slave labour is a large latifundia - especially
mining industries, where rough tools are used, where skill is not
required, and where human beings can be expended to an appalling
degree without causing great loss to the employer - all this fits
the Arabah."[67] Mendelsohn[68] also remarks that Solomon used the profits
of international trade, and the productive capacity of his mining
industry, in order to finance his building programme, and that

corvée was the instrument by which he lowered his costs of
production. This assured him on the one hand, the profitable
exploitation of his mineral wealth, and on the other, lower con-
struction costs for his grandiose building ventures. Mendelsohn
says: "The harsh treatment meted out to both Israelites and
Canaanites was a result of the economic development of the country
under David and Solomon."[69] There is truth in this, but we do not
agree altogether, if Mendelsohn's meaning is that the total result
was entirely attributable to the inevitable unfolding of economic
processes. There is the matter of economic policy, and this was
framed and executed by Solomon, so that the economic structure of
Israel was made the tool of his pretensions to grandeur. Hence
the personal factor is important, and it would be difficult to
overestimate the responsibility of Solomon in determining the
economic and social structure assumed by the Israelite state. In
this connection we agree with Garstang's[70] dictum that the heritage
of Solomon was too great for his personality.

Solomon required to mobilise labour to give effect to his
building plans, and the effect of this diversion on the productive
potential of Israel must have been crippling. Solomon was employing
these battalions on luxury projects which he had to find money to
pay for, but by the very act of diverting these men from the
production of agricultural wealth,[71] he was impairing the source
upon which he had to draw both for provisioning his own establish-

ments and for his/ annual payment to Phoenicia. Clearly a peasant who can only devote eight months of the year to his holding, instead of twelve, cannot be expected to produce so much. It would be difficult to operate efficiently and to cultivate intensively in such circumstances, and the level of production must inevitably fall. It is clear from archeological attestation that the scope of Solomon's building operations was extensive and that the labour force must have been large, and on any reckoning, the consequence of these policies must have been a considerable loss of agricultural wealth. Corvée, then, was the expedient by which Solomon gained his immediate ends, but which, by the damage it did to Israel's agricultural production, contracted the very reserves of wealth upon which Solomon was depending to pay for his extravagance. Solomon's difficulties thus began to pile up, one on top of the other. Whatever wealth he was earning he expended on his building schemes and, since this was essentially a luxury programme, it was not the kind of capital expenditure whose final consequence is the raising of the wealth-producing power of a country.[72] The materials and services imported from Phoenicia were paid for partly by the export of agricultural produce, while the exporting of mineral wealth paid for the gold and other luxury goods acquired in the Ophir trade. Since the principal use of gold was decorative, it can properly be considered as a luxury commodity. Other sources of income are from tribute and trade, but Solomon needs all of it

and more; and in order to resolve a balance of payments problem vis-a-vis Tyre, he has to cede twenty Galilean cities in settlement. The level at which Solomon's economic difficulties are ultimately reflected, is the standard of living of his people. This is the terminus at which the spiral comes to rest. The consequences of Solomon's policies weigh on the shoulders of his people, and they have to bear the burdens. If corvée must have resulted in a ruinous loss of production for Israelite agriculture, if the king made excessive inroads into what there was to supply his table and fodder his horses, and if he needed all he could get for export to pay his debts, we can see that little enough must have remained for the people. So that besides slavery they must have known depressed living standards.

The social consequences of all this are not difficult to follow. This was what Solomon had made of the Covenant[73] community, and Samuel's fears of the consequences of kingship had proved only too true. It was no longer the case that the Israelite community moved forward united in purpose and resolve, seeking to establish within their society mutual relationships of such quality as would demonstrate the operation of ḥeṣeḏ, by which they were bound in obedience to the Covenant God and in brotherliness to each other. In the Covenant community every man was bound to treat his brother as an end in himself, not as a means to an end; all were under the Covenant and bound by amphictyonic sanctions. Some might be

raised to positions of special responsibility or marked out by the reception of charisma for special distinction, but all were servants of the community, and its life and well-being were greater and more important than they were. Ultimate authority was vested in the Covenant God, and in Him also was the source of the values which determined the quality and the direction of the community's life. This conception of community conserved the freedom and the dignity of the individual, and Samuel tried to fit kingship into this framework, thereby subjecting kingship to the community and to God. But Solomon had completely broken through the safeguards, and had degraded the community by reducing it to a means for the attaining of personal pomp and splendour. He had made the people subject to forced labour and had seriously reduced their living standards. He ruled them through a corps of royal officials and a power group of mercenary soldiers and chariotry. Community had been displaced by despotism, and the people of Israel reduced to chattels of the king, over whom he exercised absolute control and arbitrary powers of disposal. Thus we have both economic oppression and social tyranny. How the Israelites detested the corvée and were humiliated by its impositions, is shown by their savage treatment of Adoniram (or Adoram) after the death of Solomon (1 Kings 12: 18). In view of the treatment meted out by Solomon to his subjects, it appears likely to us that his mercenaries and his chariotry must be considered in relation to the domestic situation, as well as

to any potential threat to Solomon from outside Israel. In some
measure they were pointed against a people seething with indigna-
tion and provoked to the point of revolt. This foreign concept
of kingship exercised through bureaucracy and hired military
power, which treats subjects as slaves and exploits them
economically, had its religious as well as its social expression.
The religious expression of tyranny was the cult of the king, by
which the king's absolutism was invested with a Divine right. We
address ourselves to an examination of this in our next chapter.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CULT OF THE KING

The Cult of the King

The basis of the amphictyonic community was a covenant relationship with Yahweh. What is the connection of this older covenant, which determined the texture of Yahweh's community, with that other conception of a covenant: not between the community and Yahweh, but between the House of David and Yahweh? Does the latter represent the religious legitimation of royal absolutism in the ordering of the affairs of Israelite society?

Samuel[1], we have argued, saw the dangers of kingship and foresaw the possibility that a conception of kingship like to that held in countries surrounding Israel, might produce a fatal tendency to imbalance within the Covenant Community. Israel, as an amphictyony, was a community under Yahweh, whose charismatic leaders were themselves servants of Yahweh and subject to His revealed will for His community. The notion of amphictyony was that of a community which had its being in Yahweh and the goal of its strivings determined by Him. Hence, while charismatic leadership bestowed distinction and authority, those so marked out from their brethren were limited in their power by their subordination to Yahweh, and their performance was always measurable against norms which possessed authority antecedent to and more ultimate than their own.[2]

We have further argued that, in acceding to the request for a king, Samuel endeavoured to guard against despotism by containing

the office of kingship within the general framework of amphictyony, and thus limiting its power. The king would be a charismatic personage, but the prophet and the priest were also charismatically endowed, and each in his appointed way was a custodian of the values of amphictyony, so that the power of the king would be kept in bounds and the balance of Yahweh's community preserved. We have observed how the king broke through these safeguards and how king-ship in Israel assumed the same pattern as elsewhere, to the sub-verting of the values of amphictyony. We have argued that the tensions implied by the request for a king, result from Israel's situation as a nation fighting for survival among the nations and requiring to organise herself efficiently to this end; the diffi-culty, or even incompatibility, is between historical realities and the notion of amphictyony. Is Israel's role as Yahweh's community compatible with her survival in her actual historical situation?[3]

Samuel's plan to contain the threat to amphictyonic values represented by the emergence of kingship, presupposed that the one covenant - the Sinai Covenant - would continue to be normative in the Israelite community, and that the king would be obligated by this covenant equally with all the other members of the community. That the Sinai covenant was "the original and normative compact between God and people" has been argued by Wright,[4] who has said that this compact sets out the relationship between Yahweh and His

Chosen People, and determines the quality of Israel's institutions.
The constitution of amphictyony derives from this compact, the
parties to which are Yahweh and His community - every member of
the community equally.   There can be no room here for the notion
of a special covenant contracted between Yahweh and one individual
member of the community, since the whole point of this covenant is
that every member of the community should be equally obligated under
Yahweh.   The sealing of a special covenant between Yahweh and the
king was a notion which struck at the roots of amphictyony, because
it posited a relationship between Yahweh and the king, in virtue
of which he had no longer to give an account of himself in terms
of a covenant which obligated every member of the community equally.
The democratic or equalitarian character of the amphictyonic
community, depended on the elevation of Yahweh above every human
figure.   Every member of the community was chosen and so had full
rights;   every member of the community was subject to Yahweh's law
and so was equally responsible.   Every man in the community was
an end in himself.   The religious foundations of the community were
the guarantee of civic liberties to all its members, since the
acceptance of the absolute authority of Yahweh within His community
precluded the emergence of any human despot.   This being so, the
supplanting of the concept of a covenant between Yahweh and the
community, which lay at the basis of amphictyony, would be an
indispensable prelude to despotism.   Under amphictyony, the absolute

authority of Yahweh was the source of constitutional safeguards; because the covenant bound all the community equally, the amphictyony was a kind of limited state, within whose structure the liberties and dignities of each individual were secured. The political consequences of the notion of covenant between the House of David and Yahweh were the reverse. The new regime had to be supported by religious authority. A clean break with Yahwism or with the covenant conception would be out of the question, but the covenant conception might be used so as to give the illusion of continuity with the old, while yet the foundations of amphictyony resting on the Sinai covenant were being destroyed. This appears to us to be the significance of the attempt at religious legitimation represented by the royal covenant. Political authority in Israel must in any case rest on a religious basis. The old political structure of Israel had been that of amphictyony, and had been determined by the initiative and the authoritative legislation of the Covenant God. This was compatible with the kind of charismatic monarchy which Samuel sought to contrive, but it was incompatible with despotism. But despotism must justify itself in religious terms, and the illusion of continuity with the amphictyonic understanding of covenant must somehow be created. Hence we get the formulation of a covenant between the House of David and Yahweh, the effect of which is to confirm the king in his political absolutism and confer on his tyranny a Divine Right.

We must now examine more closely the claims of the king that his relationship to Yahweh is unique, marking him off sharply as a religious personage from every other member of Yahweh's community. We must also see how the political equivalence of the king's aloneness vis-a-vis Yahweh, is the notion of the absolute dependence of the Israelite community for its social wholeness and well-being on the king.

We take the formulation of the royal covenant as our point of departure, since this, as we have argued above, strives to create the illusion of continuity with amphictyonic society. 2 Samuel 23, which purports to record the last words of David, records the covenant between his House and Yahweh. David says (vv. 3-5):

The God of Israel has spoken,

the Rock of Israel has said to me:

When one rules justly over men

ruling in the fear of God,

(He dawns on them) like the morning light,

on a morning when the sun rises in a cloudless sky,

like rain that makes grass to sprout from the earth.

Yea, does not my house stand so with God?

For He has made with me an everlasting covenant,

ordered in all things and secure.

For will he not cause to prosper

all my help and my desire?

This royal covenant gives the king a unique status in two directions.
It states that he stands in a relationship of unshared nearness to
Yahweh. It also states that he occupies an absolute mediatory
position between Yahweh and the people. The people have Yahweh's
blessing in virtue of the king's standing with Yahweh, guaranteed
by an everlasting covenant. The term "Messiah" or "Anointed" of
Yahweh has thus come to mean something more than its original
amphictyonic signification,[7] because it has to be interpreted in
terms of a royal covenant and not in terms of a covenant concluded
with the community of Yahweh. No longer does the king's anointing
symbolise his charismatic endowment for the service of Yahweh's
community. No longer is he obligated by the same covenant and
covenant law as his brethren. Neither does he continue on par
with other charismatic personages like prophet and priest, who can
speak in the name of Yahweh with an authority equal to his, whose
standing with Yahweh is not inferior to his, and who can require
that he serve Yahweh's community in conformity with amphictyonic
norms. A mysterious and unapproachable sacral aura has been created
around his person, and he cannot be called to account by his
brethren. He is alone with Yahweh, and the nation is absolutely
dependent on his interpretation of a covenant with Yahweh, into
which none may enter but himself. But this sacral uniqueness of
the king's person is carried a stage further by designations more
extravagant than that of Anointed or Messiah, as, for example, in

Psalm 89, vv. 20-38. In this passage, Yahweh is reminded of His
former promises to David, and through David to his descendants on
the throne of Jerusalem:

> Of old thou didst speak in a vision
>
> To thy devotees and saidst:
>
> "I have laid help upon a strong man;
>
> I have raised a picked man from the people.
>
> I have found David my servant;
>
> With my holy oil I have anointed him.
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> He shall cry unto me: 'Thou art my Father
>
> My God and my safe Rock.'
>
> I on my part will make him my first-born,
>
> High o'er the kings of the earth.
>
> Evermore I will keep my devotion (hesed) for him,
>
> And my covenant true to him.
>
> I will establish his seed for ever,
>
> And his throne as the days of heaven.[8]"

This passage represents the Davidic king as a son of Yahweh,[9] a son
by adoption, and it seeks to establish the inviolability of the
Davidic dynasty because of the everlasting covenant sworn by
Yahweh to David. Johnson[10] has pointed out that two main comple-
mentary ideas are enunciated in this passage:

a) David, and so any member of the Davidic dynasty, is the "Son" of Yahweh.

b) In virtue of his status, he will have supremacy over the kings of the earth.

The same ideas occur together in Psalm 2, vv. 7-9:[11]

> I will declare the statute of Yahweh.
>
> He hath said to me: "Thou art my Son;
>
> This day have I fathered thee.
>
> Ask of me, and I will make
>
> The nations thine inheritance,
>
> And the ends of the earth thy possession.
>
> Thou shalt break them as with an iron sceptre;
>
> Like a potter's vessel shalt thou shatter them."

The two ideas enunciated above point to the absolute dependence of the people on the fulfilment by the king of his unique mediatorial role. It is through the king that Israel can possess Yahweh's blessing, and it is because of Yahweh's promise to him of supremacy among the nations that they have a future in the world. Johnson[12] has pointed to several passages which represent that the well-being of the nation as a social unit is bound up with the life of the king, and has stated that the continual burning of a lamp (the nēr tāmîd) within the royal sanctuary was, in the Jerusalem cultus, a symbol of the vital power possessed by the House of David, because of the everlasting covenant sworn by Yahweh to David. This nēr

tāmīd was also therefore, Johnson suggests, a symbol for the nation,
because it set forth the continuance of the relationship between
Yahweh and the king, upon which the nation depended totally for its
social wholeness and well-being. This kind of representation
appears in 2 Samuel 21:17. David had been in peril of his life in
a battle with the Philistines, and tragedy had been but narrowly
averted. In the Israelite camp there was a sense that disaster
had been very near; and, as a consequence of what had happened,
the men of David swore unto him, saying: "Thou shalt no more go
out with us to battle lest thou quench the lamp of Israel". Johnson
has pointed out that the same kind of relationship between the
nation and the king is implied in the description of the latter
as the "Shield" of his people. Thus Psalm 84:10:

> Behold our Shield, O God;
>
> look on the face of thine Anointed.

Similarly, Psalm 89:19:

> For our Shield belongs to Yahweh,
>
> Our king to the Holy One of Israel.

In all probability the full articulation of this cult of the
king should be associated with the reign of Solomon. Not until
his reign are the expected concomitants of such a cult fully
developed. The religious magnification of the king will be
accompanied by material manifestations of his royal grandeur and
elevation, and these appear in the reign of Solomon in the shape of

grandiose building projects which centre round the person of the king and are an extension of his personal lustre. It is, then, significant that one of these buildings, and not the largest one, is the temple which is properly a royal chapel,[13] the focus of the cult of the king. The king thus made supreme, in virtue of Yahweh's covenant with him, has absolute powers over his people, since they are completely dependent for their well-being on his sacral relationship with Yahweh. Tyranny and economic oppression can then be represented as part of a divine order, and both appear in the course of Solomon's reign.

Yet there are indications that this movement was under way during the reign of David; perhaps the most powerful of these is the connection which has been detected between the pre-Israelite cult in Jerusalem, and this concept of sacral kingship which we are examining. The bare mention of such a possibility is made by G.A. Smith,[14] and the view has been elaborated by Johnson and Rowley.[15] Johnson[16] concedes that the evidence for the pre-Israelite cultus of Jerusalem is meagre, but he believes that what there is of it is valuable. There is the tradition in Genesis 14:18f., which Johnson thinks may be reliable, that there was a pre-Israelite deity in Jerusalem known as ʾĒl ʾElyōn. After Abram's victory over the confederacy of kings, it is recorded that "Malkī-ṣeḏek, the king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, he being priest to ʾĒl ʾElyōn; and he blessed him and said:

Blessed is Abram of 'Ēl 'Ely̅ōn,

Possessor of Heaven and Earth,

Blessed is 'Ēl 'Ely̅ōn,

Who hath delivered thine enemies into

thy hand."

Johnson argues that 'Ely̅ōn is the name of a west-Semitic deity who appears on an eighth century B.C. stele near Aleppo and who is referred to in the first century A.D. by Philo of Byblus as "Elioun called Most High", in association with the same neighbourhood. He suggests that Aleion, the god of the upper air who figures prominently in the tablets from the latter half of the second millenium B.C., discovered at Ras Shamra, is a variant name of the same god. He discerns in Isaiah 14:4-21 "an obvious fragment from the circle of mythology associated with 'Ely̅ōn".[17] This passage is a song of triumph over the downfall of the king of Babylon, and 'Ely̅ōn is represented, like Aleion, as enthroned on the heights of Sapon. Johnson renders Helal ben Šahar (v.12) as "Day-star, son of Dawn", and traces in the passage fragments of a myth which told how a morning star strove to reach the zenith of the heaven, and was brought down to the depths of Sheol for its arrogance. Its ambitious resolve was to play the part of the sun (v.14, "I will make myself like the Most High"), and so 'Ely̅ōn was a sun-god. Johnson accepts the thesis, worked out by Hollis,[18] that Solomon's temple was a sun-temple, built on the site of an earlier

seat of sun worship. Johnson concludes: "Hence when we find that in the Davidic cultus Jahweh plays the part of a Sun-God and is Himself known as ʾElyōn, it is only reasonable to assume that He has become the focus for ritual and mythology once associated with his traditional predecessor in Jerusalem."[19] So Johnson[20] suggests that Psalm 89:28 may be a play on the divine name ʾElyōn:

> I on my part will make him my first-born,
> ʾElyōn to the kings of the earth.

The name ʾElyōn is that of a sun-god, deriving from the pre-Israelite cult in Jerusalem, but it is taken up into the cult of the Davidic king and used of Yahweh; the equation of the Davidic king with ʾElyōn belongs to the same order of representation as his portrayal as son of Yahweh.

A connection between the Jerusalem cult of the Davidic king, and its pre-Israelite predecessor, may also be traced through the name of the priest king of ʾĒl ʾElyōn, Malkī-Ṣedek. Tradition preserves (Joshua 10:1,3) the name of another Canaanite king of Jerusalem, in the form ʾAdōnī-ṣedek. Johnson[21] suggests that these two names should be rendered:

> Ṣedek is my Melek (i.e. king)
> Ṣedek is my ʾAdōn (i.e. Lord)

He suggests that both Melek and ʾAdōn are used here as divine epithets, and that Ṣedek represents a divine name. At any rate he holds that, since Malkī-ṣedek is priest to ʾĒl ʾElyōn, the latter

should probably be equated with the basic idea of sedek. Hence
'El 'Elyōn, besides being Melek and 'Adōn, was also the personification
of Sedek, i.e. he was the source of the social wholeness and well-
being of his community. Johnson would then argue that, after the
capture of Jerusalem, David found in the Jebusite cultus, with its
high-god 'Elyōn and its royal, priestly order of Malki-Sedek, a
"valuable means of emphasizing the ideal unity of his kingdom."[22]
In the ritual and mythology of the Jerusalem cultus, Yahweh as
'Elyōn, and the Davidic king as the "priest after the order of Malki-
sedek" (Psalm 110:4), unite to establish the sedek or right
relation of the people, and so ensure the national well-being year
by year.

It is possible also to trace a continuity between the pre-
Israelite Jerusalem cultus and that which came into being after
the Israelite capture of the city through the person of Zadok.
Rowley[23] has called attention to the sudden appearance of Zadok
beside Abiathar in the Jerusalem priesthood in the time of David,
and has remarked that the Old Testament gives us no reliable
evidence as to whence he came. In 2 Samuel 8:17 he is termed "son
of Ahitub", and so is represented as an Elide. In 1 Chronicles 24:3
he is said to be of "the house of Eleazar", which is contrasted
with the House of Ithamar to which Eli belonged. In 1 Chronicles
5:30-34, 6:35-38, he is provided with a full genealogy back to
Aaron. Rowley holds that it is certain that Zadok was not the son

of Ahitub, Eli's grandson (1 Samuel 14:3), adding that 1 Samuel 2:27-36 was written to explain the supersession of Eli's house by that of Zadok in the time of Solomon (1 Kings 2:26f.). In 2 Samuel 8:17, instead of the reading "Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech, the son of Abiathar", Rowley would emend to "Zadok and Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub." Zadok is then without genealogy. Rowley observes that Abiathar was discredited because he backed Adonijah (1 Kings 2:26f.), so that the successors of Zadok monopolised the priestly offices of Jerusalem down to the exile. Even the reform of Josiah did not interrupt their privileges (2 Kings 23:9).

Because the Chronicler was a priestly writer, his basis of legitimation for the priesthood was a genealogy in the line of Aaron, and so such a genealogy is created for Zadok. The corruption of 2 Samuel 8:17 had already taken place, so that Ahitub had to figure as the father of Zadok, but was now converted into a descendant of Eleazar.

Rowley notes that the first historical incident in which Zadok participates, is the flight of David from Jerusalem²⁴ on the occasion of the Absalom rebellion (2 Samuel 15:24f.). Zadok is associated with the sanctuary in which the ark is kept, apparently sharing with Abiathar the custody of the sacred symbol. Rowley remarks that Abiathar had considerable claims on David's loyalty and favour (1 Samuel 21, 22), and that one must look for some

special reason for the elevation of Zadok to equal status with him.
The compelling reason upon which Rowley fixes, is that Zadok was
the priest of the pre-Israelite Jebusite shrine at Jerusalem.
Rowley calls attention to the narrative in Genesis 14, with which
we have dealt above, which points to the existence of an ancient
shrine in Jerusalem; and he argues that the intention of the
tradition, which implies that David did not destroy the Jebusite
shrine when he captured Jerusalem, is to legitimate not the pre-
Davidic Jebusite shrine itself, but the priesthood of the shrine.
Hence in Psalm 110:4 the priesthood of Melchizedek is conceived
of as of eternal validity. Rowley argues that this priesthood can
only have come into Israel through Zadok, whose house is promised
the priesthood in perpetuity in 1 Samuel 2:35 and Numbers 25:13
(where, however, it is linked with Aaron and not Melchizedek).

Rowley[25] contends that a further indication that the Jebusite
shrine[26] was not destroyed is that David did not build a shrine in
Jerusalem. He had a priest Abiathar and he brought up the ark, so
that he had need of a shrine. The ark was a symbol having powerful
associations with Yahweh worship and with amphictyony, and so there
was need of a Yahweh priest, even if it meant no more than a
keeping up of appearances. But political wisdom required that the
Jebusites, who made up the majority of the population of Jerusalem,
should be conciliated, and so Zadok could not be deposed. The
solution was, therefore, that Zadok and Abiathar should be joint

custodians of the shrine and the ark; while 2 Samuel 15:25, which represents Zadok as the bearer of the ark, may be an indication that he took precedence. The absence of a genealogy for Zadok is thus explained. He is ἀγενεαλόγητος like Malki-sedek (Hebrews 7:3).

Rowley[27] thereafter examines, as Johnson has done, the possibility that sedek may be the name of a Semitic deity, and concludes that whether or not Sedek is the name of a god, the word has particularly close associations with Jerusalem. In addition to the examples which we have examined, he observes that Zedekiah was the last Davidic king in Jerusalem. In Isaiah 1:26 Jerusalem is "the city of sedek"; Jeremiah 31:23, "a habitation of sedek"; Jeremiah 33:6, "Yahweh, our sedek"; Psalm 118:19, "the gates of sedek", in a reference to Jerusalem. Hence, Rowley argues, even if Sedek is not a god, the concept "sedek" is associated with Jerusalem; and when we find the name Zadok (Sādōk) borne by a priest in Jerusalem a few years after its conquest by David, the probability is that he was already in Jerusalem before the Israelites arrived. This view, that Zadok is the priest who was presiding over the Jebusite shrine in Jerusalem at the time of its capture by David, ought not, Rowley thinks, to be embarrassed by the further assumption of Mowinckel and Bentzen, that Zadok was the Jebusite priest-king of Jerusalem, on the pattern of Malki-sedek, who was defeated by David.

Rowley[23] finds independent support for these conclusions through his consideration of the antecedents of "Nehushtan", the name of the Brazen Serpent before which the people worshipped in the Jerusalem temple prior to the reform of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:4).

Rowley argues that Nehushtan is of Canaanite origin, and is to be connected with serpent worship antedating the Israelite settlement of Palestine. It was already established in Jerusalem when David captured that city, and Rowley suggests that it was housed in the shrine kept by Zadok, whose principal cult object it was, until the Ark was brought in beside it. Rowley argues that, if this Jebusite symbol were subsequently transferred to the temple along with the Ark, it would not be surprising if mention of the circumstance were suppressed in the interests of later conceptions of orthodoxy. Hence Rowley is of the opinion that Numbers 21:8 is aetiological, being created to account for the presence of Nehushtan in the temple, so as to legitimate it as a Mosaic symbol.

We may, then, discern that with the capture of Jerusalem David was confronted with the incompatible claims of statecraft and amphictyony, and that the joint appointment of Abiathar and Zadok was a compromise solution. Yet it is doubtful whether we can assume that Abiathar enjoyed such an independence as to enable him to uphold effectually the law and the ideals of the amphictyonic community. He had been befriended by David who owed him a debt of

gratitude, but this very circumstance would tend to relate him to the king as to a beneficent patron, and would disqualify him from fulfilling his role as a vigorous and fearless contender for the amphictyonic tradition out of which he had sprung.[29]   In any case, the appointment of Zadok, if we accept Rowley's argument, would suggest that David was bent on a state cult which would be an instrument of political policy,[30] so that the centralised power which he required for state-building would rest on religious foundations, and would thereby be enhanced in stability and sanction. The fact that the statement of the royal covenant in 2 Samuel 23 is represented as the last words of David, does not necessarily give us reliable historical bearings;[31] the same applies to the elaboration of the dogma that the Davidic king is the son of Yahweh with reference to the first-born (Psalm 89:27), that is, David himself. Clearly, it would have been in the interests of anyone enunciating these dogmas, say in the reign of Solomon, to attach the claims to the first member of the dynasty. The royal covenant would naturally have to be represented as sworn between Yahweh and David, while the sacral elevation to sonship, since it was vested in the dynasty, must have been instituted with the first king. So that from these references we are not much helped in our enquiry how far the cult of the Davidic king had progressed in the reign of David himself. At any rate, we would expect the cult to be fully fledged in the reign of Solomon, when the temple, upon which

such lavish sums had been spent in adornment, would brilliantly focus its operation. The role of the temple of Solomon as an instrument of state policy, and a means of enhancing the religious credentials of the dynasty, has been illustrated by Scott's[32] elucidation of the names of the pillars, Jachin and Boaz. Scott observes the frequency of occurrence of the verb kūn in dynastic oracles (2 Samuel 7:12c, 13b, 16b; 1 Kings 2:24) and in royal psalms (e.g. Psalms 89:5a, 22a, 38a), and suggests that the pillar on the south side of the temple derived its name from the initial word of an inscription on it which ran in some such words as these:

Yākin(Yahweh) kisseʾ Dāwid ūmamlakto leʾzarʿō ʿad ʿōlām. With respect to the name of the northern pillar, Scott is not inclined to accept the view that Boaz is a dissimilation of Baʿal. He thinks rather that it is the opening word of a sentence, and that the pointing should be altered to give beʿōz. He notes that Codex A of the LXX reads Boós, and the Vulgate Booz. He believes that the translation ἰσχύς in the LXX of 2 Chronicles 3:17 suggests that the pointing should be sewa and holem. He notes that ʿōz is frequently employed in royal liturgies (Psalms 21:2,14, 110:2) and in psalms which celebrate Yahweh's enthronement and sovereignty (Psalms 93:1, 96:6,7,10, 99:1,4, 132:8), while kūn and ʿōz are found as associated ideas in Psalms 89:14,15, 93:1,2, 99:4. He suggests that the inscription on the northern pillar may have resembled the language of Psalm 21:2a: beʿōz Yahweh Yiśmaḥ melek.

We have traced connections between the Jerusalem cult of the
Davidic king and the pre-Israelite Jebusite cult in Jerusalem;
we have noted Johnson's contention that a key concept of the latter
is that of "sedek". The intention of the cult is to promote the
wholeness of the social unit, and its proper integration with
its natural environment. But this was the intention of cultic
acts associated with a pattern common to the Ancient Near East,
so that we have to consider the place of the Jerusalem cult of
the Davidic king in this wider setting. Henri Frankfort[33] has
observed that the greatest good which ancient Near Eastern religion
could bestow was the harmonious integration of man's life with
the life of nature, and that the king was the agent by which this
integration of society and nature was accomplished and annually
renewed through his role in the cult. Frankfort, however, denies
that this concept had any place in Hebrew religion. He says: "The
keeping of Yahweh's covenant meant relinquishing a great deal. It
meant, in a word, sacrificing the greatest good Ancient Near
Eastern religion could bestow - the harmonious integration of man's
life with the life of nature ... Here we must point out that it
bereft kingship of a function which it exercised all through the
Near East, where its principal task lay in the maintenance of the
harmony with the gods in nature ... The transcendentalism of Hebrew
religion prevented kingship from assuming the profound significance
which it possessed in Egypt and Mesopotamia. It excluded, in

particular, the king's being instrumental in the integration of
society and nature. It denied the possibility of such an integra-
tion. It protested vehemently - in the persons of the great
prophets - that attempts by king and people to experience that
integration were incompatible with their avowed faithfulness to
Yahweh."[34] Wright adopts much the same position, when he says:
"Hebrew kingship, therefore, never achieved the sanctity or the
absolutism which is encountered elsewhere. The office of the
prophet, the herald of Yahweh, was independent of kingship and was
therefore free to enter into open conflict with the monarchy. The
conception of Yahweh as the Covenant Lord of Israel, the Chosen
People, prevented the Israelite monarchy from presuming too much
and left independent religious leaders free to pronounce judgement
on the kings for doing evil in the sight of Yahweh."[35] The covenant
to which both Frankfort and Wright refer is the Sinai covenant,
and we agree with them to the extent that the amphictyonic structure,
and the values of pre-monarchic Israelite society based on a
covenant between Yahweh and the whole community, were incompatible
with the concept that society was absolutely dependent on the king
for blessing and wholeness.[36] But, as Wright makes clear, his view
and that of Frankfort do not take into account the consequences of
monarchy and the formation of the Israelite state for the amphic-
tyonic community and its covenantal basis. We believe that the
formulation of the concept of a royal covenant was a deliberate

device to undermine the foundations of the old Israelite community,
and so to pave the way for sacral absolutism. Wright and Frankfort
say that the prophet was always free to criticise the king.   It
is certainly true that the canonical prophets criticised the king;
it is not true that their protests were so effectual that they
could control the king or the policies of Israel, domestic and
foreign, which is a very different matter.   This would have been
so had the structure of amphictyony been preserved.   It is true
that tradition preserves something of this in Nathan's frank
outspokenness to David, but what Wright appears to overlook is the
apparent ominous prophetic silence in the reign of Solomon.   Nor
does Abiathar look like a vigorous contender for amphictyony,
while Zadok was probably an instrument of statecraft.   In short,
we would say that the Jerusalem cult of the Davidic king, as it
is fully elaborated in the reign of Solomon, is a deliberate
supplanting of amphictyony.   It is built on the foundations of the
pre-Israelite Jebusite cult, and preserves no continuity with
Shiloh.   It is a cult which approximates to the general ancient
Near Eastern pattern, even as the state which Solomon contemplated
was on the model of oriental despotism.   Sacral absolutism was an
indispensable prelude to political absolutism, and before Solomon
could embark on tyranny, he had to appear in a role of sacral
uniqueness.   He must have absolute authority, and the well-being
of the community must appear to reside entirely in his person. Hence

the claim to sacral pre-eminence is formulated in the shape of a
covenant with Yahweh, to which only the Davidic king has access,
and he becomes a numinous figure, a son of Yahweh.

Frankfort puts an altogether different construction on the
covenant between Yahweh and the House of David; but again his
argument assumes that the two covenants, the older one between
Yahweh and all the people, and the later between Yahweh and the
Davidic king, continued to exist side by side without the operation
of the former being impaired; and because of this, he seems to us
to miss the significance of the royal covenant. He says: "The
relation between the Hebrew monarch and his people was as nearly
secular as is possible in a society wherein religion is a living
force. The unparalleled feature in this situation is the independ-
ence, the almost complete separation, of the bonds which existed
between Yahweh and the Hebrew people, on the one hand, and between
Yahweh and the House of David, on the other. Yahweh's covenant
with the people antedated kingship. His covenant with David con-
cerned the king and his descendants but not the people.[37]" Far from
signifying the "dissociation of a people from its leader in
relation to the Divine", as Frankfort has asserted, the intention
of the formulation of the royal covenant is to make the community
absolutely dependent on the sacral personage and cultic functions
of the king, and to undermine the basis of the old covenant. The
king's unshared relationship to Yahweh and his divine sonship have

the intention of conferring on him alone mediatorial powers between
Yahweh and Israel, and vesting in him uniquely the ṣedek of the
community.

That this theology of the Davidic king was reinterpreted in
later times and linked particularly with Messianic expectations,
is agreed. The question at stake is the original setting of this
theology of kingship, and the intention with which it was originally
formulated. We do not wish to become involved in this question,
except in so far as it impinges on the position which we have
adopted in this chapter. The difference of opinion between Gunkel[38]
and Mowinckel[39] with respect to the "Enthronement Songs"[40], illustrates
this debate. Are these primarily eschatological, or do they belong
originally to cultic ceremonial? In Gunkel's view, the first
answer was the correct one; these psalms betrayed the influence
of the canonical prophets, and celebrated a day of grand eschato-
logical fulfilment. Mowinckel, on the other hand, placed these
psalms in the cultic setting of an autumnal New Year Festival, in
whose ritual the kingship of Yahweh was symbolised. The "Day of
Yahweh" was originally the cultic day of His enthronement, and
in the face of disappointment and disillusionment the term was
transferred from its original cultic setting to eschatology. This
theological reinterpretation, by which concepts which originally
belonged to the living cult were restated in terms of eschatological
hopes, was the fruit of disillusionment. If this is true of the

"kingship of Yahweh" concept, we should hold that the same develop-
ment took place in the case of the theology of the Davidic king.
It belongs in the first place to the living cult, but it is
restated along the lines of Messianic expectations and is con-
sequently metamorphosed.[41] It becomes the focus of pious hopes, but
the setting in which it was first formulated was altogether
different. It belonged to the Jerusalem cult of the Davidic king
which, certainly in the reign of Solomon, was an integral part
of the royal regime. In order to make out the argument which has
been advanced in this chapter, it is not necessary that all of
Johnson's detailed working-out of the place of the Davidic king
in the Jerusalem cult should be regarded as proven. Johnson[42] has
argued that the cultic occasion, on which the role of the king was
focussed, was the Feast of Tabernacles, which was held annually
in Jerusalem, and was a New Year Festival after the pattern of the
Babylonian counterpart and moving in the same realm of cultic con-
cept and representation. On its celebration depended the continued
gift of the rain. It therefore marked the annual renewal of the
social unit through the sole mediation of the king. As a background
to the king's recreative work on behalf of his people, the feast
celebrated the triumph of Yahweh over the forces of primaeval chaos,
His enthronement as a King over the floods, and His mighty works
in creation.[43] But the centre of the festival was the work of renewal
accomplished by the Davidic king in a representative capacity, as

the focus of his people. This work was set forth in cultic acts
in a kind of ritual drama. Salvation was accomplished through
combat, in the midst of which the king suffered and was humiliated,
but out of which victory came through the intervention of Yahweh.[44]
Yahweh thus vindicated the ṣeḏek of the king, and through him the
ṣeḏek of the corporate whole. What Johnson has at least proved
is that the sacral concepts which gather around the Davidic king,
belong originally to the living cult. They can therefore be
attached to the Jerusalem cultus as it was organised in the reign
of Solomon, and the political correlations of this theology of
kingship are those which we have stated above.

There is a remark by Pedersen concerning the monarchy which
is elucidated by the foregoing arguments. He remarks: "Solomon
installed royal officials (niṣṣābim) all over the country (1 Kings
4:7f.). But these officials did not do away with or replace the
inner organisation of the town. They merely represent the interests
of the king, i.e. to get taxes and corvée workers out of the towns,
but, as to ways and means, they were, as it seems, left to them-
selves. The king failed to shape a new order, so as to make the
kingdom and the old town centres organic links of a common whole.
In his self-conceit the king might try to encroach upon the rights
of a citizen. If so he would have to reckon with the elders; but,
because of his power, he might sometimes make the elders betray
those of their own community, as is shown by the stories of Ahab

and Jehu (1 Kings 21; 2 Kings 10). Monarchy remained an alien
institution in the social body of Israel and many circles would
not acknowledge it."[45] Pedersen has argued that the inner organi-
sation of a small Israelite town is nowhere better illustrated than
in the Book of Job. Matters of public importance are the subject
of discussion among the "elders" of the city, and the accepted
place of assembly is the gate.[46] This failure on the part of
Solomon to think constructively in terms of the entire Israelite
community betrays the characteristic tendency of despotic rule.
Solomon had a royal policy, brilliant and ambitious, but it began
and ended with his own self-glorification. All his thought and
all his efforts began with and flowed back to his personal
pretensions; his tremendous constructive energies were totally
expended in what was first and last a "royal" programme. The care
of Solomon was not for his subjects, but for the magnificent
realisation of his personal ambitions after monarchy on the grand
scale. The essential selfishness of Solomon's policies is reflected
in the projects on which he spent his energies; all of them were
meant to be a material confirmation of his title to a place among
the great. Hence when his policies impinged on the Israelite
people as a whole, it was in a negative way. As Pedersen has observed
he had no constructive proposals for the commonwealth of Israel;
indeed he had no interest in such proposals. The king failed to
shape a new order, so as to make the Jerusalem regime and the

provinces parts of an integrated whole. A town might benefit
accidentally through occupying a position on one of the trade
routes along which activity was intensified, because of Solomon's
entry into international trade.[47] But the benefit accruing to
any civic community was fortuitous; the programme of trade, like
every other, had its origin and its end in the royal will. The
Jerusalem regime impinged on the people as a whole through the
agency of paid royal officials who, now and again, presented
themselves to exact taxes and raise corvée. The regime of
Solomon was thus destructive of the community of old Israel. It
was constructive only along the lines of royal policies, only in
what coincided with an absolute royal will. Otherwise it destroyed,
because its assumptions were that the king was the only real
person; he was an end in himself, and all his subjects were a
means to that end. They were chattels of the king, to be oppressed
by crushing taxation, and degraded by forced labour. They were
to be denied ancient liberties and dignities.

But how precisely did Solomon contrive the destruction of
amphictyony? The constitutional basis of the amphictyonic
community was the Law of the Covenant God. It was the supremacy
of Yahweh in His community through his Law, which was the
bulwark of civil liberty and social justice. The amphictyonic
covenant was a covenant between the community and Yahweh, and
so it established the equality of all Israel before Yahweh. This

was an equality of privilege and responsibility, which special

endowment or charisma could not destroy, because those so marked

out by Yahweh were still accountable to the community according

to the terms of the Covenant. The Covenant was the backbone of

true community, and anyone desiring to destroy this community

would find it lay across his path. So the amphictyonic

foundations were undermined by the formulation of another

covenant, which concerned only the king and Yahweh, and whose

political consequences were that the king was made a law unto

himself. The king's title to be a despot was expressed in a new

covenant theology, and validated by his unique sacral status.

The king is a son of Yahweh, specially covenanted to Yahweh,

and having a substance which is more than simple creaturehood.

This religious otherness, this mysterious and unique relationship

between Yahweh and the king, with the assertion that the Divine

flows into the life of the nation to promote wholeness and

vitality only through the person of the king and his representative

role in the cult - all this is a suitable religious expression

of despotism. The old Covenant cult, once centred at Shiloh

and Shechem, had as its political correlative a true concept of

community. It too had an annual festival, at which there was

a Covenant sacrifice. To this festival went such representative

figures as Hannah and Elkanah.[48] It was a festival of the people,

for they were all Chosen, and all of them had to renew the

Covenant with Yahweh and pledge themselves to the Law of the
amphictyony.   The political correlative of the cult of the king
was tyranny.   In the cult, it displaced an equality and so a
community before Yahweh with sacral absolutism;   in the sum of
corporate relationships it replaced a religious brotherhood with
tyranny.

Hence it is that, at the division of the Kingdom, the protest
against the Jerusalem regime is made not only by Jereboam but
by Ahijah.[49]   The protest of Jereboam deals with the more obvious
abuses of the Jerusalem regime: the iniquitous imposition of
corvée, the weight of taxation and the consequent sense of social
injustice and offended dignity.   The deeper implications are
seen by Ahijah, while yet his protest and Jereboam's are one,
because life was one in old Israel.   Ahijah speaks up for the
Shiloh tradition, as a representative of the Covenant sanctuary
which the Philistines had destroyed.   He cherishes the values
of amphictyony and the sovereignty of Yahweh within His community,
through the operation of the amphictyonic Law.   He knows that
the consequences of Solomon's rule, against which Jereboam
protests, have proceeded from a denial of Yahweh.   This is the
deepest betrayal, and the greatest sin of Solomon is that he
has used Yahweh, as well as His Chosen People, as means to
gratify the ambitions of kingship.

There is a marked similarity between the Ahab regime in the

north, and that of Solomon, as it has been described above.
The buildings of Samaria reflect the same kind of royal policies
and aspirations as do those of Jerusalem, and both are inspired
by the desire to imitate a foreign culture. Thus Crowfoot
states: "The fine buildings at Samaria belong, on our reading,
to a short period when Phoenician influences were at their zenith;
Omri's friendship with Tyre is illustrated by the marriage of
his son Ahab with Jezebel."   The affinity of style between the
buildings of Solomon, and those of the reigns of Omri and Ahab,
is well illustrated by the debate over the date of the buildings
at Megiddo, which most archeologists assign to Solomon, but
which are assigned by Crowfoot to Ahab. The Phoenician building
styles characteristic of both regimes are the architectural
expression of the adoption of a foreign culture, with its own
values and ways of life - altogether different from those indigenous
in Israel. In the case of Solomon, we have to reckon with the
foreign influence mediated through his royal Egyptian wife,
while we gather that the Tyrian princess whom Ahab took to wife
was an enthusiastic missionary of Phoenician culture and values.
She had come from a city-state, where the concept of kingship
was akin to that built up by Solomon in Jerusalem, and was
similarly legitimated by an arrangement whereby the will of the
city-god Melcart and that of its rulers always coincided. She
was acquainted with a kind of polity where the will of the ruler

was the will of a god, and where the role of subjects was to
serve the pleasure of their king (1 Kings 21). Serfdom was
part of the divine order, whereas within the Israelite amphic-
tyony, civic liberties and dignities had been guaranteed to
every citizen by Yahweh, as the God of the community. We can
therefore understand the intolerance of Jezebel at the spectacle
of a peasant like Naboth resisting the will of the king, and
protesting that the surrender of his ancestral land both invades
his rights and invites him to betray his responsibilities to
his family. The complete antipathy of Jezebel to the institutions
of the Israelite community reminds us that they belonged to a
universe of social values to which she was a stranger, and which
she had determined to oppose bitterly and passionately. Her
attack on these values is seen in her suborning the elders of
Israel, by way of contriving the judicial murder of Naboth. At
one stroke she tramples on ancient Israelite values of landed
property,[56] and poisons justice at its source.

It does not seem to us that either Alt[57] or Eissfeldt[58] have
elucidated the cardinal issue of the Yahweh versus Baal contest
on Mount Carmel, because we believe that this belongs together
with the situation which we have sketched above.

We agree with Alt[59] that the account of the Yahweh versus
Baal contest on Mount Carmel should be considered independently
of those verses which introduce a rain-making motif. Alt

acknowledges that 1 Kings 18:17-40 connects without awkwardness with what precedes, but he notes that the rain-making motif, so prominent in vv. 1-16, is immediately departed from in vv.17-40. The point of departure of this latter narrative is the instruction of Elijah to Ahab that all Israel be gathered to Mount Carmel (v.19). This lies apart from the command of Yahweh to Elijah, already communicated (v.1) before the scene between Elijah and Obadiah (vv.7-16), that the prophet is to show himself to Ahab as a prelude to the sending of rain upon the earth. The narrative contained in 18:1-16 is fulfilled in vv. 41-46, while the narrative of the contest between Yahweh and Baal, contained in vv. 17-40, is originally altogether independent. The mention of a store of water (18:34f.,38) is due to editorial activity. Alt remarks that the editor perceived an inner connection between the two narratives. The decision of the people against Baal is thus followed by the return of the rain through Yahweh. Alt believes that this union between the two accounts might have been more thoroughly contrived and deliberately articulated, but that this was precluded by the fact that the resolve of Yahweh to permit rain to fall, communicated in v.1, occurred in a setting where the "contest" theme was not in view.

Alt[60] contends that the theme of the "contest" is the establishment of Yahweh's sole supremacy in the kingdom of Israel, but that the orientation of the narrative which secures the

identification of the Baal with Jezebel's Baal, that is the Tyrian
Baal (18:19f.), is due to editorial activity and does not preserve
the original context of the contest. According to Alt, the
purpose of this editorial reorientation of the narrative was to
give to 19:1f. an appearance of continuity with what preceded.
In the primitive account of the contest on Mt. Carmel, Baal
is to be understood in the sense of a fundamental alternative
to Yahweh. The context is localised and dated; but it has
intrinsic representative outgoings, and it presages symbolically
the struggle of opposed religions for the soul of Israel, because
the sanctuary in question on Mount Carmel had been a focus of
veneration from antiquity, and the blow delivered to the ancient
cult on this occasion was annihilating. Alt consequently does
not think it surprising that, from an early date, the account
was understood in the shape of a fundamental decision for the
exclusive worship of Yahweh.

Originally, however, Alt contends, the contest had to do
with the Baal of Carmel, who was a mountain god like to Baal of
Lebanon and Baal of Hermon. It was a contest between Yahweh and
the Baal who was the old inhabitant of the shrine. Alt, then,
considers that such an exchange of possession, at a date so late
as the middle of the ninth century B.C., needs to be accounted
for. To this end, he lays it down as self-evident that after
the Israelite settlement in Canaan there must have been some

degree of interaction between the worship of Yahweh transplanted by the Israelite tribes from the wilderness into the cultural milieu of settled life, and the religions which previously obtained there. The nature of this interaction was not according to the fashion which tradition depicts. It did not take the form of the complete subjugation of the old indigenous cults; its consequence was rather an undifferentiated amalgam between the two, with the result that, at the end of the process, the Israelite and Canaanite elements of the religious practice were no longer distinguishable.

Alt believes that the original significance of the Mount Carmel contest is to be found in the historical and geographical location of the incident. Carmel lay outside the original area of Israelite settlement in Canaan, and retained its non-Israelite population and its Canaanite culture and polity until c. 1000 B.C. While this state of affairs existed, the Baal cult of Carmel would maintain and even enhance its reputation, since it might appear as a kind of counterpoise to resurgent Yahwism; but with the institution of David's suzerainty over all Canaan, things were changed. To the kingdom of Israel, whose founder Saul had created it purely out of areas where the Israelite tribes were settled, David, in the interests of territorial completeness, incorporated the areas of Canaanite settlement in the plains, and Carmel became part of the Israelite state. Alt thinks that the

consequences of this would not be the deposition of the old Baal cult of Carmel in favour of the cult of Yahweh; for, he argues, if this had taken place under David, the recorded contest between Yahweh and Baal in the reign of Ahab would have been in the nature of a repeat performance. He acknowledges, however, that the possibility of such a precedent cannot be denied, just because there is no hint of it in the Carmel narrative. In Alt's opinion, general political considerations weigh against the view that David pursued so vigorous and uncompromising a cultic policy in connection with annexed Canaanite areas. It would, Alt maintains, appear that David did not purpose the most thoroughgoing humiliation of the Canaanites, but on the contrary intended that they should be fully entitled members of the kingdom of Israel, and should feel themselves to be such. Hence David would pursue a cautious policy towards indigenous cults, and on a sanctuary such as Carmel, he would permit the old Baal cult to remain and would establish at the side of it the cult of Yahweh, the symbol of his kingdom and his sovereignty.

But then, Alt[61] observes, our narrative presupposes that this state of affairs was not of long duration. Already, one century after David, the Baal prevailed again alone in his old sphere, and the altar of Yahweh was in ruins (18:30). How, he asks, did this relapse to pre-Davidic conditions come about? Alt replies that the efforts of the editor to convey the impression of

transition rather than relapse, and to explain the situation
with reference to the dominance of the Tyrian Baal, are out of
historical focus. It was not a new god who had contested Yahweh's
right to be worshipped on Carmel, but the old god who had again
gained the upper hand and was unwilling to make room for Yahweh
beside himself, as he had been forced to do during the reign
of David. Yet Alt does grant the possibility of an influx of
the Baal cult from Tyre. But he adds that this may be enter-
tained as a possibility only when it has been ascertained under
what circumstances, and on what grounds, the pre-Davidic
situation returned to Carmel.

The tendency towards renewed Baal predominance in the
Canaanite areas annexed by David, was conditioned by historical
circumstances; it was already present in the reign of Solomon,
but it gained increased impetus after the division of the king-
dom, particularly when the northern part was torn in two, after
the death of Baasha, by the struggle of rival contenders for the
throne. In these circumstances, Israelite kings were less able
to wring from their Canaanite subjects the cultic acknowledgement
of sovereignty and, with the return to the old order which had
never entirely been forsaken even under David, the Yahweh cult
on Mount Carmel and other similar places waned in importance
and the predominance of the Baal cult was re-established. In
particular, Alt associates the resurgence of the old Baal cult

on Mount Carmel with boundary changes which were affected during
the reign of Solomon, whereby the Carmel area passed from the
Israelite to the Tyrian sphere of influence. This transference
to Tyrian jurisdiction would account still better for the speedy
cessation of the Yahweh worship established by David on Carmel,
than would the suggestion already made that it was due simply
to the resurgence of the Canaanites themselves. The proposition
that the cult of Baal on Carmel fell under the dominant influence
of the religion of Tyre just at this time thus gains greater
probability through the cumulative support of political events.
As was the case when the Yahweh cult was imported to Carmel, the
arrival of the cult of the Tyrian Baal there had to do with the
cultic recognition of a new sovereignty. Alt leaves it open
whether a special altar was erected and a special cult dedicated
to the Tyrian Baal, or whether the worship of the two Baals was
in some way fused. He favours the latter alternative, since,
he asserts, both represent the same type of deity.

Under Ahab,[62] Carmel passed back again to the Israelite
sphere of power. It had no special importance to the Phoenicians,
and so long as a policy of friendship was being pursued with
Israel, they had no objection to the area coming under Israelite
control. The real significance of the Yahweh versus Baal contest
on Mount Carmel is, then, that through it Elijah intends to give
cultic recognition to this political transfer of Carmel back to

the sphere of Israelite sovereignty. Elijah, however, proposes a more vigorous re-ordering of the cult than anything contemplated by David. The decision which he demands is the wholesale removal of Baal, and the exclusive recognition of Yahweh. The claim of Elijah is for the exclusive recognition of Yahweh in every sphere of the public life of Israel, and it is this claim which gives a broad representative importance to a particular cultic issue linked to the political and geographical factors which Alt has adduced.

Eissfeldt[63] argues that the cult introduced by Omri or Ahab to Israel in the first half of the ninth century B.C., and which later found an entrance into Judah, was that of Baal Šāmēm. Eissfeldt contends that the relationship of Jezebel to this god was a purely personal one. Both she and her daughter Athaliah were fanatically committed to Baal Šāmēm and so must gain as many new worshippers for him as possible, but this god should not be regarded as the exponent of the political pact concluded between the Northern kingdom and Tyre. If this were so, Eissfeldt argues, the Baal in question would be Melcart and not Šāmēm. Since, however, the cult which comes into view is the personal cult of the two queens and their royal households, the Baal must be Šāmēm, who is not the god of a political community but a god who is at once universal and the god of individuals. Two further factors are adduced by Eissfeldt to support this conclusion. The

first concerns the exceptionally prominent role occupied by prophets in the cult under consideration; and this, Eissfeldt asserts, is shown by the Zakir inscription to be the case with Baal Šāmēm. Moreover the fusion of the Tyrian Baal with the Baal of Carmel presupposes, in Eissfeldt's opinion, a similarity between the two deities, and this points to Šāmēm rather than to Melcart. Eissfeldt then holds that the case for Baal Šāmēm is fully made out by an examination of the passages which deal with the continued life of the Tyrian Baal in Israel and Judah, and he offers a detailed treatment of these passages.[64]

We do not wish to enter into the question whether or not the Baal introduced by Jezebel into Israel was Baal Šāmēm.[65] We would observe, however, that Albright[66] maintains that Baal Melcart was as much a cosmic god as Baal Šāmēm. The name Melcart, according to Albright, characterises the Baal not as the god of a political community, namely the city-state of Tyre, but as having sway over the underworld in general. However this may be, we do not feel that it is possible to treat the Baal cult introduced by Jezebel as a domestic affair - the personal cult of the queen and her royal household, as Eissfeldt has proposed - for this cult had complementary political ideas. Wedded to it was a theory of state, and the treatment meted out by Jezebel to Naboth was an example of how this theory operated. Jezebel's cult was the religious symbol of a royal despotism which confronted

and threatened old Israelite values of community all along the
line. We would therefore submit that the evidence leads us to
suppose that this Baal cult had the most intimate social and
political connections, and that, as seen by Elijah, it constituted
a total threat to the amphictyonic concept of community. Yahwism,
as Elijah understands it, is a way of life co-extensive with
the entire structure of the community. This is a typical
amphictyonic conception, and it means that distinctions between
sacred and secular which may seem to have value for moderns have
no place here; nor is it useful to make qualitative distinctions
between religious, social and economic factors, because within
the framework of amphictyony, Yahweh's norms are as absolute in
respect of, say, property, as they are in the ordering of the
Covenant cult or the promulgating of Covenant Law. Life is one,
and the Covenant is creative of all the institutions and
relationships of the community. Hence, in the eyes of Elijah,
the palatial palace at Samaria with its affront to his sense of
sturdy equalitarianism, and its suggestion of the elevation of
the king far above his brethren, the compulsory acquisition of
Naboth's land with its contempt for Israelite values of property,
the judicial murder of Naboth contrived by a poisoning of justice
at its spring - all these were as much a denial of Yahweh and a
bowing of the knee to the Tyrian Baal, as was the idolatry of
the temple in Samaria raised to a foreign god, with its staff of

foreign prophets and priests, and its opulence proportionate to
the other manifestations of an alien culture. What Elijah sees
is a gigantic intruder, who challenges Yahweh everywhere. It is
the collision of two systems utterly disparate and irreconcilable;
everywhere the integrity of Yahweh's community is in jeopardy.
In our view, this is the essential character of the conflict
between Yahweh and Baal, and it is this issue which Elijah
would resolve once and for all on Mount Carmel. Is the integrity
of the old Israelite community to be preserved, or is Israel to
be changed into the image of the city-state of Tyre? Is the
king to become a potentate and a despot, and his subjects the
instruments of his pleasure? Or are Yahweh and His Law to have
sovereignty throughout His community? All this is intended by
Yahweh versus Baal.[67] Nor is it an objection to this representation
to assert that Ahab continued to be a worshipper of Yahweh. His
continued nominal worship of Yahweh would not alter the fact
that the pattern of Israelite culture and corporate life was now
being dictated by the Tyrian Baal, and not by Yahweh.

It might be argued that Elijah's antipathy to Baal cannot
simply be equated with the alien culture, and the abhorrent
notion of state deriving from Tyre and sheltering under the aegis
of the Tyrian Baal; that, hailing as he did from a pastoral
area, where the vigour of Yahwism had been fully preserved,
his aversion to Baal might be expected to extend to a rural culture

based on a Baal cult, no less than an urban culture like the
Tyrian one which Ahab had taken for a model. In other words, it
might be held that Elijah saw the inroads of the rural Baal cult
into Yahwism in those areas of Canaan where the Israelites were
settled as farmers, and were engaged in the operations of
agriculture; that his challenge to Baal was comprehensive,
including both the Baal cult which presided over rural life in
Canaan, and the cult of the Tyrian Baal which was emblematic of
a foreign urban culture. The association of the Rechabites with
the reforming movement might be thought to support such an
extension of the Yahweh versus Baal conflict, since they objected
to settled life per se, and traced to agriculture and settled
conditions all the evils that had befallen Yahweh's community.
In their view, the pristine vigour and purity of the community
could be preserved only with the continuance of a nomadic or
semi-nomadic way of life. The advance to sedentary conditions
of society was in itself a retrograde step. It could be argued
that, although Elijah was not a Rechabite, and did not propound
their solution for all Israel's difficulties, yet he discerned
that there was an issue between Yahweh and Baal, not only in the
capital but also in the areas of arable farming, and that the
rural Canaanite cult of Baal was in its own way no less a threat
to the integrity of Yahweh's community than the urban cult of the
Tyrian Baal.

This possibility, however, is not supported by the development of the reform movement under Jehu and Elisha. This was clearly directed against the foreign culture associated with the Tyrian Baal, and against the House of Ahab which had been responsible for introducing it into Israel. Hence the movement was bent, with iconoclastic fury, on removing the material symbols of a foreign cult in the capital and on slaughtering its prophets, priests and worshippers (2 Kings 10:18-27), while at the same time it operated with relentless hate against the House of Ahab (2 Kings 10:17). We would suggest that it is altogether misleading to say that these two directions in which the reform movement operated, represent on the one hand its religious, and on the other its political manifestation, because those who directed the reform recognized no such distinction. Their opposition was to the intrusion of a foreign way of life, symbolised by the cult of a foreign god in Samaria and implemented by the policies of Ahab, by whom Yahweh's community was being destroyed and supplanted by a regime modelled on Tyre (2 Kings 9:25f.).

There are two further considerations which would appear to support our point of view. 2 Kings 10:29-31 would lead us to suppose that Jehu, as Haldar[68] has remarked, was not a very good Yahwist. Pedersen[69] has called attention to v.29, which states that after having wiped out Baal from Israel (v.28), "Jehu did not

turn aside from the sins of Jereboam the son of Nebat, which he made Israel to sin, the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan." In this connection Pedersen says: "The exterminatory campaign against Baal which the legend of Elijah shows us in a special light, was continued by Jehu who was anointed by a prophet from Elijah's circle. He killed Ahab's family and Jezebel, and we know how he sent out invitations to a festival for Baal where the priests and prophets were gathered together, and then had them cut down in the middle of the feast. Afterwards, Baal's temple at Samaria was pulled down and desecrated. Thus 'Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel' (2 Kings 10:28). But this did not mean that the Canaanite cult was stamped out, as is testified by the later prophets. And, as a matter of fact, the story goes on to say that Yahweh was still worshipped as a bull (v.29).[70]" Pedersen says further that we do not really know what was the nature of the Yahweh versus Baal conflict in which Elijah and his successors were involved. One thing, however, he takes to be certain: that those who wage the conflict do not have in view the threat of the Canaanite cult to Yahwism in the setting of agricultural life. This is so, according to Pedersen, because they did not, like the later prophets, detest the cult in the "high places", and, more particularly, because "Jehu whose work was so pleasing to the Yahweh for whom these prophets fought, worshipped God in the shape of a bull, i.e. as a Baal,

just like the other Israelites who had adopted the Canaanite culture."[71]

Albright[72] advances arguments from comparative iconography to show that the "golden calves" were not direct representations of Yahweh as a bull-god. He maintains that the golden calf must have been the visible pedestal on which the invisible Yahweh stood, and thinks that in making the golden calves, Jereboam may have been harking back to early Israelite traditional practice. The point at issue, however, is not the academic one which Albright raises. It is not so much the correct iconographic significance of the golden calves that matters, as the popular understanding and interpretation of the symbol, appearing as it did in the general setting of the Canaanite cult. Albright concedes all that is indispensable to our position when he says: "It is hardly necessary to point out that it (the re-introduction of the golden calves) was a dangerous revival, since the taurine associations of Baal, lord of heaven, were too closely bound up with the fertility cult in its more insidious aspects to be safe."[73] Thus it seems to us that, even if it involved academic impropriety, as Albright has suggested, the worship of the golden calves would be popularly understood as part of the Canaanite cult, and this is the practical role which it would play. Albright himself advances some way in our direction when he notes that there is no indication of hostility towards the worship of the golden calves

in the pericope of Elijah and Elisha, and goes on to say: "This is easily explained by the fact that far greater danger to Yahwism was involved in the spread of the cult of the Tyrian Baal and Asherah."[74] We would explain the apparent incongruity between 2 Kings 10:28 and the following verse in just this way. The Baal which Jehu rooted out was the Tyrian Baal; it was against this cult, and its cultural and political concomitants, that the fury and hatred of the reform movement were directed. The decision to which Elijah called Israel on Mt. Carmel, was between Yahweh and the Tyrian Baal, that is, between two disparate and irreconcilable systems of corporate life. It was for the integrity of Yahweh's community, based on amphictyonic norms and values, that Elijah fought; and his fight was against the attempt of Ahab and Jezebel to create in Israel, in the name of the Tyrian Baal, a polity in the image of Tyre itself. The other threat to Yahwism, from the side of the rural Canaanite cult, had not yet come to view, and Jehu could combine in his mind without consciousness of contradiction, the detestation of the Tyrian Baal, expressed in v.28, and the devotion to the golden calves, expressed in v.29.

There is a feature of the Samaria buildings mentioned by Crowfoot, which may be an archeological confirmation of this point of view. Crowfoot says: "The fine buildings at Samaria belong, on our reading, to a short period when Phoenician

influences were at their zenith ... But - and from the cultural standpoint this is of cardinal importance - the fine masonry is confined, as far as we can tell, to the first two periods; the new constructions which certainly date from periods III to IV are built in a very different style."[75] Periods I and II are, according to Crowfoot, to be identified with the Omri-Ahab dynasty, and period III possibly with the time of Jehu, "who is said to have worked havoc on the site." This evidence, so far as it goes, suggests that the movement of Jehu was directed towards the expulsion of Phoenician influence. The fine buildings in the Phoenician style were one manifestation of the inroads of a foreign culture into Israelite life, and one expression of the rejection of this culture and all it represented would be the resumption of native forms of architecture, which were artistically inferior in conception and execution.

Further support for our position comes through the examination of the statement by Pedersen[76] to which we have called attention above. Pedersen remarked that the victory which Elijah and his successors won could not be over the Baal of the Canaanite cult, since this battle remained to be fought by the prophets in the succeeding centuries. Here it should be pointed out that it is not unnatural that the threat to Yahwism represented by the rural Canaanite fertility cult should be less obvious and more difficult to detect than the blatant challenge

of the Tyrian Baal. The latter was a peril writ large, emerging in spectacular forms and possessing unmistakably foreign features. Whether it was the foreign architecture with its imposing and ostentatious lines, or the eviction of Nabot and his subsequent murder, or the temple of Baal with its colony of foreign cultic officers, the trespassing on old ways and values was flagrant and unpardonable. The threat of the Canaanite cult was, on the other hand, hidden, because it had won its conquests in rural Canaan among the Israelites, who had settled down to agriculture, without the conquered themselves knowing it. This was all the more so, since Yahweh was worshipped in name, while the cult was that of pre-Israelite rural Canaan.[77] The Israelites had won a military victory, but those who became farmers were thereafter vanquished by the culture into whose sphere they had entered, as has been the way with so many other military conquerors. The integrating factor in this agricultural society was the Canaanite fertility cult, as it had been before the Israelites arrived on the scene. This insidious, silent undermining of Yahweh's community in rural Canaan, does not appear to have been exposed in all its fatal ramifications before the emergence of Hosea.[78] It required a probing and sensitive diagnosis to alight on the cancer of the Canaanite cult in the vitals of Yahweh's community. Hosea called attention to the deadly opposition between the constitution of Israel, as a community sustained in effective

covenant relationship to Yahweh by spiritual attitudes of love and trust and ethical obedience, and the amoral naturalism of the Canaanite cult, which because it took no cognizance of moral values, might minister with the greatest indifference to the grossest immorality. Hosea's concern was to rediscover for his brethren the nature of Yahweh, and the quality of the relationship which He would establish with His community, and the level on which response was desiderated. By this analysis, he sought to demonstrate that the Canaanite cult which had been confused with the worship and service of Yahweh, belonged to another universe of religious belief inimical with the nature and purposes of Yahweh, because in it the demand for spiritual response through trust and love, and for obedience to ethical standards, had properly no place. Eissfeldt[79] maintains that the Book of Hosea, with its references to baalīm, should not be valued as an authentic and reliable description of the essence of Canaanite religion, and Albright[80] is arguing along the same lines when he asserts that Baal could never be merely a local vegetation deity. Hosea, according to Eissfeldt, uses the plural baalīm instead of the singular baal, because of the metaphor of adultery in which he clothes his message. Jeremiah takes over the plural baalīm from Hosea. Eissfeldt, however, concedes all that we require, in saying that this figure of speech employed by Hosea "sets forth an unrivalled diagnosis of

the religious and ethical malady of Israel and so certainly must be related to a specifically Israelite understanding of history."[81]   Patently, Hosea's concern was not with the official theology of Baalism, but with the popular apprehension of it among his contemporaries. They were the people he was trying to dissuade; it was their understanding of the Canaanite cult, the kind of value which they attached to it, the indispensable function which they believed it fulfilled in bringing the cycle of agricultural operations to a successful consummation each year, which were the foci of the prophet's concern. The attach-ment of these Israelites to the Canaanite cult has little to do with the theological definition of Baalism; it was a bread and butter concern. Hence part of Hosea's message is that it is Yahweh and not Baal who is the Lord of the crops.[82]   We would suggest, then, that Hosea speaks of the baalīm, because popularly his contemporaries did regard them as local vegetation deities; and it was because they regarded them as such that they set so much store on the fertility cult. They believed that the Canaanite cult was an integral part of the new cultural milieu into which they had entered, when they settled down to farm in Canaan, and that neglect of it would be as fatal to the harvest as would the neglect of any other essential operation of agri-culture. It is this tenaciously held belief which Hosea strives to demolish, but the conflict between Yahweh and Baal on this

level, as Pedersen has noted, was not in view in the case of

Jehu's reform.

CHAPTER NINE

PROPHET AND PRIEST IN THE COMMUNITY

Prophet and Priest in the Community

Life was one in old Israel, without division into sacred
and secular[1].   Yahweh's authority was equally distributed between
the total network of human relationships which make up corporate
life, because Israel was Yahweh's community. Out of this organic
unity, both prophet and priest spring, so that whatever
differences or tensions may subsequently have been disclosed
between the one office and the other, they belong together
originally as co-workers in the one community, with complementary
functions, each ministering to the well-being of an undivided
whole. It was this whole which Samuel tried to preserve unbroken.
Samuel himself was a charismatic figure, with functions as diverse
as the needs of Yahweh's community. He was at the helm of that
community during a period of crisis, rallying Israel in the
presence of the Philistine menace as the earlier šopᵉṭim had
done in comparable situations before him, and the resistance of
the nation was focussed in him as earlier it had been in them.
This general charisma of Samuel comprehends the spheres of
responsibility subsequently parcelled out into the offices of king,
priest and prophet[2].   Besides having the rule which was sub-
sequently the prerogative of the king, Samuel performs priestly
functions and has a close connection with the central sanctuary
at Shiloh; moreover he is called a nābiʾ once (1 Samuel 3:20)

and more generally a rō'eh.[3]

The fear of Samuel was that the appointment of a king would
result in the creation of a secular domain, that there would be
a shrinkage of Yahweh's authority, and that with the division of
Israelite life into sacred and secular, the king would be the
real power in the land. A sacred enclave, with its officers,
would maintain the fiction of Yahweh's direction of Israel, but
in fact the machinery of amphictyony would be reduced to impotence
by the assertion of the values and policies of monarchy. The
emergence of the monarchy is thus the proper point of departure
for the subject of this chapter, because as it had the most
radical consequences for the unity of Yahweh's community, so it
had the effect of disturbing the unity of prophet and priest
which had been grounded in that community.

It is now generally appreciated that it is not so easy as
had been formerly thought to draw a clear-cut distinction between
the respective offices of prophet and priest.[4] Porteous[5] has
reminded us that the tōrāh was a common concern of both prophet
and priest, and has argued with Östborn[6] that it is a general
word for law and that it comprehends both cultic or ritual, and
ethical matters.[7] Porteous observes: "That ethical instruction
was part of the priest's function is shown conclusively by Hosea
4:6, where the prophet reproaches the priest, because the latter
has forgotten the tōrā of God and has rejected knowledge

(da‘a<u>t</u> = da‘a<u>t</u> ʾElōhīm). But, though the word tōrā is
especially characteristic of the instruction given by the priests,
it is also found used of the moral and religious instruction
given by the prophets, as, for example, by Isaiah (1:10f.),
where he is calling for obedience to God's moral law which was
being neglected flagrantly by men who sought to appease Him with
a multitude of sacrifices; and once again by Isaiah for the
prophetic testimony which he was bequeathing to his disciples
(8:16), after he saw quite clearly that Ahaz was not prepared to
stake everything upon faith in God."[8]

This recognition of the common concern of prophet and priest
with tōrā means that they had their roots in the one community,
and that the basic material with which both worked was the well
of tradition by whose conservation and interpretation Yahweh's
dealings with Israel in the past became the grounds of Israel's
faith in Him and fellowship with Him in the present. Both prophet
and priest have a part in the one living community of faith,
and their interest in tradition is that it records the past
activity of Yahweh in the midst of His community, the gracious
acts by which He has declared Himself and evoked the response of
faith, the demands He has made and the values which He has fixed
for His community. The view that the ethical teaching of the
prophets has its basis in such a universe of religious faith and
values has been expressed by Porteous,[9] and has also been expounded

by Henton Davies,[10] who has examined the affiliations between the eighth-century prophets and Yahwistic tradition, and has shown that the prophets make their appeal to God's acts on behalf of Israel in Deliverance and Election, and claim for themselves a succession in this tradition.

The unity or community of prophet and priest which we have been discussing above, is not unrelated to another topic much discussed recently, the connection of the prophet with the cult. Johnson[11] has discussed 1 Samuel 9:11 - 10:16 which, he argues, makes clear that the seer could be consulted for the sake of his unusual and divinely gifted powers, and that to this extent he must have had them under control. It also emerges from this passage that Samuel had charge of the sacrifice at the local high place (1 Samuel 9:11f., cf. 1 Samuel 7:9, 13:8f.), and Johnson draws the conclusion that the rō'ēh was a cultic specialist closely associated with the sanctuary, and that this will also hold good for the early nābī'.

Johnson[12] also mentions the association of Elijah with a sanctuary of Yahweh on Mt. Carmel, which had been reduced to ruins, and suggests that 1 Samuel 19:10, in particular, points to the conflict in which Elijah was involved being one between two different cults and their respective specialists, the prophets of the Tyrian Ba'al on the one side and those of Yahweh on the other. Johnson also examines the evidence which seems to point

to the association, either temporary or permanent, of Elisha and the "sons of the prophets" in the Northern Kingdom, with various sanctuaries, e.g. Bethel, 2 Kings 2:3; Gilgal,4:38f.; Jericho, 2:5. He adds that Elisha seems to have been associated with the important sanctuary on Mt. Carmel for some time, and perhaps with another in Samaria (2 Kings 4:1-37, 5f.). He suggests that, in the Northern Kingdom,at least, the prophets were probably united under the leadership of one of their number, with his headquarters at some influential bāmāh, and that this would account for the apparent itineraries of Elijah and Elisha (cf. especially 2 Kings 2 and 4).

Johnson[13] then asks the question whether the canonical prophet, like the early nābī', rō'eh and hōzeh, had a standing in the cultus comparable to that of the priest. In particular he enquires whether the Jerusalem prophets were members of the temple personnel. He returns an affirmative answer, which he asserts is demanded by the numerous passages where prophet and priest are coupled together (Hosea 4:4f.; Isaiah 28:7f.; Micah 3:11; Zephaniah 3:3f., 8:1,10, 13:13, 14:18). Apart from Hosea, all these passages deal with the situation as it affects Jerusalem, and Johnson judges that they constitute overwhelming proof that in Jerusalem the prophets were an integral part of the cultic personnel. He cites Jeremiah 26:7 (cf. Jeremiah 23:11, Lamentations 2:20), where the prophet threatens the Jerusalem

temple with the fate of Shiloh, in the presence of an audience of priests and prophets. The point which Johnson makes is that the prophecy against the temple aroused the anger of prophets as well as priests. Johnson also thinks that Jeremiah 35:4 points to the existence of special quarters for prophets in the Jerusalem temple. He considers "man of God" ($\bar{i}\check{s}$ $h\bar{a}$ $\bar{E}l\bar{o}h\bar{i}m$) to be equivalent to "prophet" ($n\bar{a}b\bar{i}$), and detects a reference to a prophetic guild forming part of the temple staff.

Rowley[14] has commented on some aspects of Johnson's enquiry into the cultic prophet. He has noted that the term "sons of the prophets", denoting bands or guilds of $n^e b\bar{i}$ $\bar{i}m$, is only attested for the period c. 850-750 B.C., and only for the Northern Kingdom, so that it may refer to a specifically northern prophetic brotherhood. He has issued a warning against the danger of outrunning the evidence in relation to the cultic prophet and has said: "While there is much evidence of this kind to suggest that cultic persons of various kinds referred to under the general term prophets were associated with the shrines for individual or group consultation or for group activity, we must beware of outrunning the evidence or of supposing that a theory of cultic prophets is more than a theory."[15]

Rowley remarks that in the narrative which records Samuel's presiding over a feast at Ramah (1 Samuel 9:1f.), the seer or prophet bids Saul await him at Gilgal, where he would come to offer

sacrifice (1 Samuel 10:8). Rowley thinks this may imply that
Samuel was not necessarily attached, as a member of the permanent
staff, to the shrines where he appears. He adds: "Since prophets
were religious persons, devotees of their God, it is natural to
find them in the shrines where religion centred. That does not
make them members of the staff of the shrines."[16]   Hence Rowley
demurs at a statement by Johnson[17] that the prophets were
"stationed" at sanctuaries, because this gives the impression
that they belonged to the regular cultic staff, and Rowley thinks
that the evidence does not support such a conclusion. We have
noted above that, in fact, Johnson says quite explicitly, at
least for the Jerusalem sanctuary, that the prophets were part of
the regular cultic personnel.

Mowinckel,[18] who had given the original impetus to enquiries
into the relationship between the prophet and the cult, had been
seeking an explanation of the presence of apparent prophetical
elements in the Psalter. His central conclusion was that the
prophetical oracles in the psalms pointed to the presence of
cultic prophets among the staff of the Jerusalem temple.
Mowinckel held that, since it was their task to order the liturgy,
we should in all probability look to them for the composition
of many of the psalms. Mowinckel distinguished between two aspects
of the Israelite cult, the sacrificial and the sacramental, and
held that a balanced view of it had been debarred by such a

concentration on the first as had resulted in the under-estimating
or neglect of the second. The sacramental side of the cult
consisted in the dramatic representation in it of the things
which Yahweh had done and was doing for Israel. This mimetic
recapitulation of the great acts of Yahweh, by which His presence
as a present help was communicated to His worshippers, was,
according to Mowinckel, pre-eminently the sphere of the cultic
prophet.

Porteous[19] has fastened on to a statement of Mowinckel,[20] to
the effect that while nᵉbî'îm were undoubtedly associated with
the sanctuary, only certain of them were admitted to the regular
cultic staff, while the great majority remained representatives
of the congregation, that is of the lay element in the worship.
Porteous, on the basis of this statement, proposes a simplification
of the question of the cult prophet. Can we not economise, he
asks, so as to do away with the necessity of postulating two
different classes of prophets? "Is it then really necessary to
suppose that we have two classes of prophets associated with the
sanctuaries, namely, a majority of lay prophets and a minority
of cult prophets? May the supposed cult prophets not merely be
priests who, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were specially endowed to
undertake the sacramental side of worship, but unlike them, did
not feel forced into an attitude of criticism towards the cult?"[21]
If this suggestion were acceptable, it would mean that we have to

reckon with only one cultic official, and that what has been thought to be the function of the cultic prophet turns out to be simply the sacramental aspect of the priestly office, from which attention has been diverted by a too exclusive concentration on the sacrificial functions of the priest in the cult. At any rate we are led back again to the realisation that there is a good deal of common ground between priest and prophet. Nor is it necessary to resort with Haldar[22] to Sumerian-Accadian cultic categories, in order to illustrate this overlapping of the functions of prophet and priest in the Israelite community. The common denominator of prophet and priest is the unity of the amphictyonic community in which both have their roots. It is in terms of the oneness and wholeness of a distinctively Israelite way of life that we shall try to account for the functions and concerns common to prophet and priest, and not in terms of so extraneous a thing as a Sumerian-Accadian cultic form.

Part of the value of the work which we have been appraising is that it has instructed us not to insist on the wrong kind of distinctions between the canonical prophets and the cult. Whether or not prophets were "cultic" in the sense of being members of the staff of sanctuaries, what has clearly emerged is that all prophets have cultic connections, and that this seems to apply, for the most part, to the canonical prophets as well. Whatever be the distinctiveness which we may desire to claim for the canonical prophets, we must not make their non-cultic character

the criterion, and imagine that they were marked off obviously
from the remainder of the prophets through their separation
from all cultic associations. That is, we must not say that
the canonical prophets were true prophets because they were
non-cultic, as if non-cultic were synonymous with true and
cultic with false. Hence Rowley has maintained that sharp
lines of division cannot be drawn among the prophets. He says:
"Some functioned in the shrines but some quite certainly did not,
and the same prophet could sometimes function in a shrine and
sometimes not. All the prophets were probably cultic persons,
though not all seem to have been attached to particular shrines;
but, if some prophets were regarded as cultic officials and
sharp lines could not be drawn within the prophetic groups, we
must be cautious of converting any of the prophetic groups into
such root and branch opponents of the cultus that it would be
hard to understand why they and the officials of the cultus
should bear a common name."[23]   Elsewhere[24] he remarks that the
difference between the greater prophets and the men they denounced,
should not be exaggerated. To the outward eye there would be
no manifest difference, since the distinction was not one of
status and so not easily discernible. Rowley suggests that the
very vehemence with which the canonical prophets denounce their
false brethren, is a reflection of the lack of easily identifiable
outward forms of distinction between the one and the other. To

the average eye, they were an undifferentiated class, and so
ordinary people had no ready-made ways of distinguishing
between the true prophet and the false; both belonged to the
same milieu. This is underlined when we bear in mind that in
Jeremiah and Ezekiel we have examples of men who were in the
regular service of the cult as priests, who belonged to the cult
in this thoroughgoing way and who yet adopted that critical
attitude to it which aligns them with the canonical prophets.
In the case of Jeremiah this is especially significant, since
he is probably the most advanced critic of the cult, although
he is a priest in the Jerusalem temple. This makes the suggestion
of Mowinckel and Porteous, that the canonical prophets graduated
from the ranks of the cult, the more credible.

What then was the nature of the debate or conflict between
the canonical prophets and the cult? To this question, Rowley[25]
replies that the canonical prophets did not object to the cult
qua cult; their attitude to sacrifice was not one of root and
branch opposition. What they objected to was the confusion of
priorities, and the elevation of what could never be more than
a means of grace into an end in itself. Their ground was that
obedience took precedence of sacrifice, and that sacrifice was
of value only inasmuch as it was a material symbol of tendencies
of true worship in the heart and obedience in the will. Its
proper function was to show forth inward spiritual and ethical

bents; it was an aid to devotion. But if the symbol were divorced from that which it symbolised, it became a drag on true devotion and not an aid to it. Men then acquired a false religious confidence through a misguided devoutness; they retained the garment without the living body of faith; they confounded the apparatus of devotion with its substance. Rowley argues that such passages as Amos 5:21-24, Isaiah 1:11-17, Jeremiah 6:19-20, which have been alleged to betray an attitude of outright hostility to the cult, do not in fact carry this sense. The demand which they make is for obedience first and then sacrifice; "ḥeseḏ and not sacrifice" (Hosea 6:6) translated into the English idiom, means ḥeseḏ first and sacrifice afterwards; and the second half of the verse, "and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings", which is parallel to the first, makes it clear that the intention of the prophet is not to condemn sacrifice absolutely but to establish the priority of obedience over sacrifice. Rowley remarks that Jeremiah contemplated the destruction of the temple not because it was an evil in itself, but because men had polluted it (Jeremiah 7:14, 26:6). Hence a return to God in sincerity might be sufficient to avert its destruction (Jeremiah 7:3). Rowley thinks it improbable that Jeremiah 7:22 ("For in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices") is a denial that

sacrifices had any part in the religion of the Mosaic period.
He argues that sacrifice is attested by the oldest Pentateuchal
sources, belonging to times much earlier than Jeremiah, that the
Exodus story is intrinsically linked to the Passover sacrifice,
and that Jeremiah held Samuel in high esteem (Jeremiah 15:1),
although it is indubitable that Samuel offered sacrifices and
Jeremiah could scarcely have been ignorant of the fact. Of
Jeremiah 7:21-26, Rowley says that it is a passage with the
same intention as the others quoted above, and conforming to
the general pattern of the prophetic utterance on obedience and
sacrifice. "We may now observe that here again in this passage
we have a statement of the type 'not this but that', where the
intention is to stress the importance of 'that' against 'this'."[27]
Obedience is the primary demand, and sacrifice has value only as
a means to it.

Concerning Amos 5:25 ("Did you bring to me sacrifices
and offerings the forty years in the wilderness, O House of
Israel"), Rowley[28] says that this rhetorical question cannot be
thought to imply a denial that any sacrifices were offered in
the wilderness period. He argues that if it does mean this,
it implies further that this was common knowledge - that everyone
knew there were no sacrifices in the wilderness period; and that
the prophet's question would be greeted by a chorus of noes.
This does not fit the circumstances, because if Amos wished to

maintain there were no sacrifices in the wilderness period, a rhetorical question would be an inadequate and inappropriate way of doing it. This is so because he would have to argue his case in the face of the mention of such sacrifices in the early traditions. Rowley notes that the words z^{e}bahīm and minhāh stand in an emphatic position at the beginning of the verse, and that the verb used for "bring" (higgaštem) is unusual in connection with sacrifices. He therefore accepts D.B. MacDonald's[29] exegesis of the passage: "Was it only flesh-offerings and meal sacrifices that ye brought me in the wilderness?" The expected answer would then be the confession: "We brought more than this; we brought true heart-worship and righteousness."

Rowley[30] further maintains that there is no divergence between this prophetical allocation of priorities, and that characteristic of the Pentateuch. He states: "On the contrary the words of Jeremiah are but an echo of what we read there. For there God is represented as saying to Moses: 'If ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples ... and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation' (Exodus 19:5). In this passage, which is more fundamental to the Covenant of Sinai than the subsequent sacrificial legislation, there is no mention of sacrifice. For obedience was the first demand of God in the Law no less than the Prophets."[31] Rowley goes on to say that the

Law nowhere teaches that so long as men offer the right sacrifices,
they can live how they please.   He is of the opinion that the
Decalogue[32] which stands in the Law, may reasonably be ascribed to
Moses, and is an early expression of ethical religion.   "The
Covenant whose establishment is recorded in the Law called first
and foremost for obedience.   The principles of humanity so dear
to the prophets are expressed with power in Deuteronomy and there
we read the great word which was cherished by Jews of all ages
and was declared by Our Lord to be the first Law of life for all
men: 'Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God' (Deuteronomy 6:4f.).   In
the Code of Holiness we find that other word which has been lifted
to honour in the Gospels: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as
thyself'(Leviticus 19:18)[33]."

We take Rowley's sentence which sums up his position:
"For obedience was the first demand of God in the Law no less
than the Prophets."   The clash between the canonical prophets
and the cult arose out of the failure of the latter to observe
this priority.   The cult ought to have been concerned with the
authentic basis of Yahweh's relationship with Israel.   Its task
was to maintain and to expound the covenantal constitution of
Yahweh's community;   to elevate to undisputed supremacy those
spiritual and ethical attitudes which would make Yahweh's
direction of Israel actual, and his sovereignty over the whole
of her corporate life real.   The debate between the canonical

prophets and the cult, was over the failure of the latter to preserve what was essential to Yahweh's community and ought to have been the common concern of prophets and priests. Far from having any disagreement with the Law or the amphictyonic constitution of old Israel, the canonical prophets made their appeal to these and took their stand by them. The dispute between canonical prophets and cult revolved around the nature of the Mosaic heritage, and the quality of corporate life which should obtain in Yahweh's community.

This being so, we cannot believe that Welch[34] is right in his statement of the reason for the disagreement between the canonical prophets and the cult. While Rowley has gone near to the heart of the matter, Welch's account does not elucidate the conflict at its centre. Briefly stated, Welch's view is that the rituals of the Israelite cult, although influenced by the Mosaic reform, were inadequate mediums of the spiritual and ethical foundations of Israel's relationship to God, as these were mediated by Moses and preserved in a living tradition. The canonical prophets became conscious of the unworthy and misleading representation of God's nature and His ways afforded through the sacrificial apparatus of the cultus, of which they consequently became extremely critical, believing that this defective symbolism was having the effect of obscuring those features most intrinsic to the covenantal constitution of Israel. A secondary aspect of

the clash between prophet and priest, according to Welch, was
that it typified the incompatibility of outlook between men of
a conservative cast of mind and their more radical counterparts,
so that to some extent the conflict had its source in differences
of temperament. Welch[36] thinks it likely that the issue was not
that the priests were unwilling to accept change; rather the
question was one concerning the tempo at which reform should
proceed.

Our disagreement with Welch here can be simply stated. The
issue between the canonical prophets and the cult was a deeper
one than the defective character of the ritual apparatus of the
latter. It was not an intrinsic imperfection in the sacrificial
system against which the canonical prophets protested; it was
rather the abuse of the sacrificial system so that instead of
being a means to an end it became the terminus of devotion; it
was the divorce of the symbol from the realities which it
symbolised, the paying court to the symbol and the neglect of the
underlying reality. Or as Rowley has it, the canonical prophets
insisted on the priority of obedience, and required that the
sacrificial system should be the handmaid of a religious response
characterised by trust and obedience. It is therefore not clear
that it was the rituals themselves that the prophets calculated
to be imperfect and misleading mediums of devotion; their
complaint had more to do with the misuse of these rituals and

the vesting in them of a false confidence, as if they had
absolute value apart from a response to Yahweh in accordance with
His revealed Will in Israel. The canonical prophets were mindful
of the quality of the covenantal relationship, with its
requirement of spiritual response and its delineation of
covenantal responsibilities; these in turn involved ethical
demands co-extensive with the corporate life of Yahweh's
community. It was the kind of excessive attachment to sacrifice
which resulted in the jettisoning of all this, against which
the prophets inveighed. They could not suffer the shell to be
venerated, while the kernel decayed.

It will now be clear that although the understanding of the
relationship of the canonical prophets to the cult has been
modified as a result of recent work, the conflict between the
canonical prophets and the cult has not been explained away or
dissolved. It is one thing to assert that there were no obvious
external marks by which the canonical prophet could be decisively
distinguished from prophets aligned with the cult; it is quite
another to blur the distinctive positions adopted by the
canonical prophets, so as to soften the issue between them and
the cult to such an extent that it becomes difficult to see what
their protest is about. Jeremiah is a limiting case. If a close
association between a canonical prophet and the cult is made out
anywhere, it is here. Jeremiah was a priest at the Jerusalem

temple, and yet his differences with the prevailing emphasis of
the cult are deep and fundamental.   Jeremiah is thus an
illustration of the point of view which insists that the canonical
prophets belonged originally to the milieu against which they
reacted, and that their criticism of the cult was from the inside.
What must continue to be insisted/is that their debate with the
cult was real enough, and cannot be shown to be illusory.   Perhaps
in the present trend there is an over-anxiety to merge the
canonical prophets with the cult.   Having been delivered from
one extreme, and instructed that the canonical prophets are not to
be set against the cult in glorious isolation, we must be careful
not to proceed to the other.   There is perhaps something of this
in Johnson's [36] contention that the polemic against the n^{e}bi'im
in Micah 3:5f. is not directed against divination itself but its
misuse, and the consequent falsity of the oracles.   Johnson adds:
"Although the exact form or forms of divination practised by the
prophets may be uncertain, one thing is clear;   during the
monarchical period, at least, it was recognised as an authoritative
branch of prophetic activity." [37]   This judgement has perhaps some
support from Micah 3:11:

> "Its leaders give judgement for a bribe,
>
> Its priests teach for hire,
>
> Its prophets divine for money."

It could be argued, from the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, that

divination is acknowledged to be as legitimate a function of the
prophet as is teaching of the priest and judgement of the ruler,
and that consequently it is not the practice of ḳesem to which
Micah objects, but the false manipulation of the oracles. Again,
it might be argued that in Micah 3:6 [38] ḳesem is paralleled with
hāzōn, and both are implicitly acknowledged to be legitimate
functions of the nābīʾ. This conclusion, however, appears to go
somewhat beyond the evidence. The passages adduced above
demonstrate that Micah objected to divination, when it was a
ramp; they do not prove that he would have endorsed the practice,
even if the proceedings had been above board. Accordingly,
Johnson may be going too far when he says that ḳesem is
recognized by a canonical prophet as a valid method of securing
a decision in the affairs of life, and is placed upon the same
plane as the judgement of a civic leader or the teaching of a
priest. This argument rests very heavily upon the exactness of
parallelism. It could be argued against it that Micah did not
intend to concede the same validity to ḳesem as he did to tōrah
and mišpāṭ; all he intends is the recognition that, as a matter
of fact, ḳesem is considered to be a proper cultic function. But
there is no reason why we should assume that he was in agreement
on this point with the ordinary run of neḇīʾim. This is the
popular point of view; Micah states it and deplores the un-
fortunate consequences of its abuse by rapacious neḇīʾim. He does

not himself pass any value judgement on it.

Again, Johnson[39] states that Amos 3:7 ("Surely the Lord God
does nothing without revealing His secret to His servants the
prophets") is an admission by Amos that a close relationship
did exist between the professional $n^e bi'im$ and Yahweh, even if
he insisted that he was no professional prophet himself (7:14).
Here again there is room for doubt. Rowley[40] has suggested that
one of the two marks of the canonical prophet is his consciousness
of having been called by Yahweh; he has a strong sense of
vocation. The $n^e bi'im$ referred to here by Amos, who are
"servants of Yahweh", might with at least as equal propriety be
identified with those who felt themselves, as he did, under a
strong compulsion to serve Yahweh, as with the average professional
prophet. It may well be the case, as Johnson says, that "if
the work of the canonical prophets is to be understood aright,
it must be viewed against a wide background of prophetic activity --
particularly in Jerusalem. The canonical prophets themselves
testify to a large number of prophets forming a class of con-
sultative specialists and claiming to act and speak authoritatively
and therefore effectively in the name of Yahweh."[41] What remains
uncertain is the attitude of the canonical prophets to the
oracular procedures presided over by the $n^e bi'im$ in the cult.
Is it simply the insincerity and venal conduct of their counter-
parts in the cult that they criticise? We take leave to doubt

this. According to Johnson,[42] the oracular pronouncement of
the cultic prophet belongs to the universe of magical or quasi-
magical beliefs, so that if the canonical prophets had no doubts
about the machinery of kesem per se, they are identified with a
procedure whose effectiveness would seem to have no intrinsic
connection with ethics.   Johnson, however, does try to establish
a connection between the oracular utterance and ethics.   He says
it was the function of the cultic prophets to create šalōm, but
that we must be careful not to emphasise the magical or quasi-
magical aspect of this.   He remarks: "It remains to be seen
whether such apparent promises of 'peace' were given under the
recognition that they were morally conditioned."[43]   What he
therefore hints at in the end, is that magical or quasi-magical
concepts are united with ethical conditions in the oracles.

Rowley[44] makes a clean-cut metaphysical distinction between
the canonical prophets and those other prophets whom they denounce
(Hosea 9:7, Isaiah 28:7, Micah 3:5,11, Jeremiah 23:9f.).   He
observes that Amos insists that he is not a typical nābi', and
that he does not belong to a prophetic guild (7:14).   While
stressing that the differences between the canonical prophets
and the other prophets were not in externals, nor accessible to
the average observer, he goes on to say that the distinction
was that between false and true, and that it had its ground in
the realm of the spirit.   He says: "The fundamental complaint

made against the false prophets by the great prophets whose words have come down to us was that they prophesied smooth things, the things men wanted to hear, crying 'Peace and prosperity', when their message sprang but from wishful thinking and not from divine inspiration. It is not necessary to suppose that they were always insincere, though insincerity is sometimes laid to their charge. When Jeremiah accuses them of stealing one another's oracles (Jeremiah 23:30), a charge of insincerity would seem to be implied, since they were giving second-hand messages in a calling that professed to deal in the first-hand oracles of God. Micah charges them with giving oracles dictated by the fee they received (Micah 3:5f.), where again there is a clear implication of insincerity ... One mark of distinction of the canonical prophet was that he was a true prophet."[45]

This distinction between true and false has to be stated in ethical terms, since the protest of the canonical prophets moved principally on the ethical plane. Rowley,[46] Porteous[47] and Wright[48] have all in different ways been insisting that Israel's relationship with God was already understood as spiritual response and ethical demand as early as Moses, and that the encounter with Yahweh in Deliverance and Covenant determined the foundations of Israel's faith and fixed the quality of life in Yahweh's community. Porteous[49] has argued that the understanding of Yahweh's ways with Israel, stemming from the foundation acts of Election

and Covenant, is an important source of the ethical teaching of
the canonical prophets. If then we are to take the work of Moses
as seriously as these scholars suggest, and if we are to look on
the canonical prophets as seeking to maintain themselves in this
succession, we set them in a theological and ethical atmosphere
which is unfriendly to the presuppositions of kesem as stated by
Johnson.

Our own contribution to this debate follows from the
positions we have sought to establish in the previous chapters.
We lead up to it by quoting a remark of Rowley to the effect
that "they (the prophets) were not alone interested in the cultus,
however, but in political affairs. For politics and religion
were intimately related."[50] We shall argue that the great debate
in which the canonical prophets engage, arises out of the con-
sequences of the emergence of the monarchy for the old constitution
of Yahweh's community. Noth[51] has remarked that the beginning of
the monarchy was the end of the amphictyony; and this, we have
previously contended,[52] was the fear which exercised Samuel, when
he was confronted with the request for a king. The contingency
which Samuel foresaw had come to pass: the monarchy had been
unable or unwilling to subsist with the amphictyony; instead of
bearing rule under Yahweh, the kings had changed the nature of
Yahweh's community, so as to make it conform to the pattern of a
worldly kingdom. A large secular domain had come into being in

Israel, and a great sector of corporate life testified that
Israel had gone the way of the world and that Yahweh was no
longer in control. One way of understanding the protest of
the canonical prophets is to contrast the singleness of life in
old Israel according to the amphictyonic conception, where all
those departments of corporate concern, today labelled social,
economic, political and religious, were subject to the directives
of Yahweh's officers, with the dichotomy produced by the
emergence of the monarchy, when Yahweh was served in the cult
with external tokens of devotion, while life as it moved in
Israel at large had been released from His control and secularised.

Starting off from this point of view, we can understand that
the canonical prophets did not intend to write down all cultic
officers as charlatans. But even where there was no count of
insincerity against the officers of the cult, there was the
charge that those who served Yahweh there were insufficiently
aware of the revolution which had taken place in Israelite life;
that they did not realize that the sphere of Yahweh was now
confined to cultic enclaves, while the sphere of common life
had been surrendered to the claims of a secular kingdom.   The
canonical prophets object to a state of affairs where Yahweh is
honoured in sacrifice and festival, while the will of a secular
state is supreme in common life, to the destruction of the ethical
foundations determined by Yahweh for His community. There must

have been a large number of cultic officers who were serving
Yahweh with sincerity, according to the light which they had,
but were oblivious to the silent revolution in Israel enforced
by the monarchy – priests and prophets who performed the ritual
duties which fell to them in the cult, who persevered in their
teaching office and believed themselves to be honourable
custodians of the torah, and who thought that they were
adequately fulfilling their role in preserving the traditional
basis of Yahweh's community. We may think that the inability
of these men to discern that the old values were everywhere being
neglected and repudiated, dubs them as lamentably myopic. We
ought, however, to ponder before we pronounce this judgement.
If the officers in the cult were myopic in not discerning the
real shape of things, the canonical prophets would not then need
to be thought men of remarkable insight, with powers of penetrating
diagnosis. It takes ability of this kind to observe the kind of
dichotomy which had developed in Israelite life. It was an
achievement of penetrating observation for the prophets to remark
that the solidarity of the old Israel had passed away, and that
life had slipped away from the control of the torah into the
hands of a secular regime. The cultic officers, secure in their
sanctuaries, where Yahweh's predominance seemed everywhere
manifested, may be pardoned for their inability to realize how a
new political philosophy, with its social and economic concomitants,

which controlled the stuff of day-to-day life in the new Israel,
was a denial of the principles of corporate life contained in
the traditions of which they were the custodians.

There is, however, the aspect of royal domination of the
cult to be taken into consideration. We have tried to show how
complete this was in the case of the Jerusalem cult. Snaith[53][54]
has pointed out that the same tendency can be seen in the North,
where there were political motives at work in the establishment
by Jereboam of calf worship at the sanctuaries of Bethel and Dan
(1 Kings 12:28f.). Snaith observes that Jereboam was supported
in his revolt by Ahijah, a representative of the Shiloh priesthood
and a custodian of amphictyonic ways. It is likely that Jereboam
made his revolt in the name of the old values of Israelite life
once upheld by Shiloh; but after having secured power, he changed
his course, and incurred the displeasure of his original supporters.
Snaith submits that the priests with whom Jereboam took counsel
over the matter of the golden calves were those of Bethel and not
of Shiloh. He says: "Jereboam took care to see to it that the
religious life of the country was under his control, a policy
which has been characteristic of governments since the world was
young. He saw to it that the annual feast of the north was
observed with all the splendour of kings. He himself took a
leading part and thus he ensured that Bethel would be a leading
shrine and a royal sanctuary as long as the Northern Kingdom lasted."[55]

The status and function of Bethel as a royal sanctuary are
graphically described for us by Amos. His criticisms appear to
imply that in such a sanctuary as Bethel, which was a king's
chapel   and a temple of the kingdom (Amos 7:13), the cult had
been reduced to an instrument of royal policy. It no longer
fulfilled an independent critical function, that of confronting
Israel, including the king, with the demands of Yahweh, when
these seemed in danger of being contravened. Its function was to
fit into the fabric of the regime as a pillar of state; the place
of religion was now to lend stability to the king's rule and
authority to his policies. It was against this state of affairs
that Amos prophesied at Bethel. The leading actors at the festival
are the representatives of the regime which has spelled death to
brotherhood in Israel. It is against the people of rank and
responsibility in the land that his polemic is particularly
directed, and this is a feature of the prophetic emphasis in
general. Against the corn merchants who make the ephah small and
the shekel great (Amos 8:5), selling chaff for corn and charging
extortionate prices for it, earning their bonus through the
starvation of the poor. Against the dilettantes of the court
(Amos 6:4-6), who could not carry the responsibilities of rank
and were parasites rather than pillars of community, and, rubbing
shoulders with them, the judges who had dealt a death-blow to
justice by betraying what they were sworn to nurture and conserve

(Amos 5:1).

These men had destroyed Yahweh's community, and had promoted
a regime which repudiated Yahweh's sovereignty over Israel. Yet
these very men are the principal patrons of this royal shrine
at festival-tide, and make lavish sacrificial provisions for the
altar. Amaziah is a royal officer, part of the regime and
pledged to its support. The charge which Amos brings against
the cult at Bethel is that it delights in the patronage of the
very people who have destroyed brotherhood in Israel, and that at
such a fashionable festival as this one, it blasphemously offers
the blessing of Yahweh to those who have betrayed Him and destroyed
His community. The cult itself, whatever degree of consciousness
it may have of the fact, has succumbed to the pressure of the king
and his supporters, and is no more than a tool in their hands in
the upholding of an evil order.[56] In the very place where the
old values of society should have been proclaimed, the lavish
sacrifices of their destroyers are accepted with pomp and ceremony.
Hence, says Amos:

> "I hate, I despise your feasts,
>
> and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies.
>
> Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and cereal
>
> offerings,
>
> I will not accept them,
>
> And the peace offerings of your fatted beasts I will not
>
> look upon.

Take away from me the noise of your songs;

to the melody of your harps I will not listen.

But let justice roll down like waters and righteousness

like a perennial stream."

(Amos 5:21-24)

The prophets generally testify that the cult has fallen
into the clutches of the regime; this is equally true of the
Northern Kingdom and of Judah. Thus Amos 3:14 reads: "On the
day that I punish Israel for his trangressions, I will punish
the altars of Bethel." This is coupled with a prophecy of the
downfall of the great and elaborate residences of the principals
of the regime (v.15; cf. Amos 4:4, 5:4-6, 7:10-13). In Micah
3:9f. the rulers of the regime, the priests and the prophets
are all condemned together. The pressure exercised by the
regime on prophet and priest, is reflected in Isaiah 30:10,
Jeremiah 5:31, Micah 3:5-7, Micah 2:6,11. There is the story in
1 Kings 22 of the comfortable prophesying of the court prophets
of Ahab, whose mouthpiece Zedekiah son of Chenanah encouraged
Ahab and Jehosaphat to go up to Ramoth-Gilead against the Syrians.
Their concern was to anticipate the kind of prophecy which would
satisfy their royal master. Their function is to confirm the
desirability of policies already decided on by Ahab. In the midst
of these functionaries of the regime, there is one independent
prophetic voice. Micaiah is a forerunner of the canonical prophets,

in so far as he cares only for the truth, even if it should fall hard on the ears of a king. Concerning Micaiah, the persistent opponent of his policies, Ahab says significantly: "I hate him for he never prophesies good of me but evil"(1 Kings 22:8). And Jeremiah was plagued by the false prophesying of a certain Hananiah, who in tones of facile optimism acceptable to the rulers of the day predicted the speedy breaking of the yoke of the king of Babylon (Jeremiah 28).

Further, it is clear that the representatives of the regime had no further interest in obedience to Yahweh beyond the offering of sacrifice, so that it would be their policy to elevate sacrifice to a supreme place in the cult, and to make Yahweh's demands begin and end there. It was against their interests that Yahweh's demands should be stated in terms of ethics and social responsibility, since the community which these envisaged was the one which they were actively destroying through their reorganisation of Israelite society. This lies very near the centre of the prophets' criticism of sacrifice. Control in Israel has been wrested from Yahweh, and the cult is prepared to preside over His demise by accepting sacrifices from those who have broken up His community. The cult is a pawn in the hands of a secular regime, which is suited admirably by a type of religious devotion which requires no more than the stocking of the altar. Hence, if we ask why sacrifice tended to become

divorced from obedience in the cult, we must answer that it was
the policy of the regime that it should. It was contrary to the
interests of its representatives, whose enthusiasm for sacrifice
the prophets have described, that Yahweh's demands should be
stated ethically and brought into relationship with the situations
of corporate life. A religion which did not go deeper than the
providing of sacrificial victims was their requirement, and
where the cult was dominated by them, this was its emphasis.
Hosea says of the Northern Kingdom:

> "Because Ephraim has multiplied altars for sinning,
>
> They have become to him altars for sinning,
>
> Were I to write for him my laws by ten thousands,
>
> They would be regarded as a strange thing."(Hosea 8:11-12).

The prophetic protest against this state of affairs is further
registered in such passages as Amos 5:21-24, Isaiah 1:11f. and
5:24c, Micah 6:6-8 (cf. vv. 10-12). Amos 8:4-6 offers a
particularly revealing disclosure of the attitude which was
obnoxious to the prophets:

> "Hear this, you who trample upon the needy,
>
> And bring the poor of the land to an end,
>
> saying, "When will the new moon be over,
>
> that we may sell grain?
>
> And the sabbath that we may offer wheat for sale,
>
> That we may make the ephah small and the shekel great,

and deal deceitfully with false balances,

that we may buy the poor for silver

and the needy for a pair of sandals,

and sell the refuse of the wheat?'"

We propose now to follow out in somewhat more detail the criticism which the canonical prophets make of the established order. They testify to moral decay and to the rottenness of the body politic in both the Northern Kingdom and Judah (Isaiah 1:21; Amos 2:4, 3:9-10, 5:7, 6:12; Micah 7:2-6). There is a confusion of moral values (Isaiah 5:20), and this state of affairs is due to lack of knowledge[57] (Isaiah 5:13; Jeremiah 4:22; Hosea 4:1,6).

For this state of affairs, those who bear rule and occupy positions of responsibility in society are principally to blame (Isaiah 1:23, 10:1-2; Micah 3:9-11), for they have failed in their trust to the ordinary people of the land (Isaiah 3:12, Jeremiah 5:4-5). Hence the indictment of the leaders of society (Isaiah 3:14; Hosea 5:10, 7:3; Amos 6:1-7; Micah 2:1f., 3:1-3,9), who are oppressors of the poor, perjurers, tipplers and dilettantes (Isaiah 5:11-12,22). Responsibility extends to prophets and priests who have failed to supply "knowledge" for the guidance of the people, and who have been unfaithful in the discharge of their sacred offices (Isaiah 28:7; Jeremiah 2:8, 5:31; Hosea 4:4f., 6:9, 9:7f.; Micah 3:5-7,11). They have identified Yahweh with the established order, and created among the people a false sense

of security.

Hence the moral decay is intimately associated with the regime which has conformed Israel to the pattern of a worldly state, so that it is no longer Yahweh's community. The prophets object to the several manifestations of this, and that Israel has been entangled with foreign powers (Assyria and Egypt) and allied to them (Isaiah 30:1-5; Jeremiah 2:18,36; Hosea 5:13f., 8:9, 9:3). It is true that Isaiah came to terms with the fact of subjection to Assyria, and then made it his main concern to insist that there should be no intrigue with Egypt. His ideal requirement, however, was that made to Ahaz (Isaiah 7) to stake everything on Yahweh, and to have no dealings with Assyria (cf. 2 Kings 16). Israel has come to put her trust in the arm of the flesh, in horses and chariots and fortified cities, and not in Yahweh (Isaiah 2:7, 31:1,3; Jeremiah 5:17; Hosea 8:14, 10:3).

Further commerce has been established in Israel, and the prophets deplore the consequences. The lust after wealth has followed in its train, and it has encouraged a spirit of unbridled individualism which disregards the old sanctions of social justice and brotherhood (Isaiah 3:13-15; Jeremiah 2:34; Hosea 12:8; Amos 2:6-7, 8:4; Micah 2:2, 6:10-11). Men are utterly unscrupulous in their haste to get rich, and the integrity of the judiciary has been undermined (Isaiah 5:22-23; Jeremiah 5:27-28;

Amos 5:10-13).

This reliance on worldly armaments (Isaiah 5:12, 9:8-10, 22:8-11), and complacency with material wealth, have given rise to the major spiritual flaw of pride. Man is exalted instead of God (Isaiah 2:11f., 5:15, 28:1f.; Hosea 12:8; Amos 8:7). The vanity, pretentiousness and complacency of Israel's women are rebuked (Isaiah 3:16-17, 32:9f.; Amos 4:1). The true order of things has been turned upside down, and the creature has presumed to lord it over the Creator (Isaiah 29:16).

The idolatry of Israel stems from the pride fostered by material opulence (Jeremiah 5:7; Hosea 8:4b, 11, 13:6) and foreign imitation (Isaiah 2:6-8). It is a form of self-worship and self-glorification, since it involves men doing obeisance to the works of their own hands (Isaiah 17:4-9; Jeremiah 1:16, 2:2,8; Hosea 13:2f.).

On the positive side the prophets say that restoration can come only through ethical rehabilitation (Isaiah 28:6,17, 32:1f., 5f.; Amos 5:14,15,24). The prophetic ideal of reform is a return to the old amphictyonic constitution of Israel, with the simple society[59] that obtained during the first period in Canaan (Isaiah 7:15, 21-22; Micah 7:14), and without the complications of commerce or international diplomacy. The material symbols of the present evil order will be destroyed (Micah 5:9f.). Thus the prophets hark back to the great foundation acts of Deliverance and

Election by which Yahweh made Israel a community (Jeremiah 2:6; Hosea 2:16, 12:10, 13:4; Micah 6:4, 7:15).

Isaiah, in particular, emphasises that the restôration will be characterised by a new spiritual temper. Israel will see her Teacher and hear His voice (Isaiah 30:20-21), and the idols which were the expression of self-exaltation and pride will be defiled and destroyed (Isaiah 30:22, 31:6). Salvation will be accomplished by Yahweh (Isaiah 25:9, 26:3,18,21, 30:30-33, 33:2,22, 35:4, 37:35), in independence of all foreign allies and worldly armaments (Isaiah 30:15-16, 31:1-3), and Yahweh alone will be exalted (Isaiah 8:13, 10:20, 12, 33:5,10,13). He will be crown and diadem (Isaiah 28:5).

There is an ideal but not an actual attachment[60] to the Davidic dynasty. This is reflected in a preference for Judah over Ephraim (Hosea 1:7), although both regimes fall under the same condemnation (Hosea 5:5,10, 6:4, 12:3). It is seen in the repugnance which Hosea shows for the manner of kingship in the Northern Kingdom (Hosea 1:4-5, 5:1, 8:4, 13:10-11). Micah attributes the ills of Judah to the baneful influence of the statutes of Omri and the works of the House of Ahab (6:16).

On the other hand, the prophets carry over the Throne of David into their ideal future (Isaiah 9:5f., 11:1f., 16:5; Hosea 3:5), and envisage a Davidic king ruling over a united Israel (Isaiah 12:13). Yet Isaiah takes issue with the House of David,

in so far as the reigning king is part of the present evil regime
(Isaiah 7:13). Although he has dealings with the reigning
Davidic monarchs, he rebukes Ahaz for his refusal to stake all
on Yahweh and his preference for an Assyrian alliance, and he
delivers a stinging reproach to Hezekiah for his worldly pride
in his riches and his armoury (Isaiah 39).

The opposition between Isaiah and kingship, in the shape
it had actually assumed in Judah, is implied in Isaiah 32:1,
33:22. The kings and the princes remain in the new order of the
future, but they are to be reformed characters (cf. Isaiah 9:5f.,
11:1-5, 16:5). The king will reign in righteousness (sedek),
and the princes (sārīm) will rule in justice (mišpāt). Yahweh
will be Judge (šōpēt), Legislator (mᵉhōkēk) and King (Isaiah 33:
22) - that is, He will exercise total control over Israel's life,
which will be unified in Him as it was under the amphictyonic
constitution of pre-monarchic days, and Jerusalem will be called
the Throne of Yahweh (Jeremiah 3:17).

The canonical prophets were, therefore, from the point of
view of the existing regime, a disruptive element. They sowed
the seeds of doubt in men's minds; they stated roundly that
Israel was no longer Yahweh's community. They condemned the
established order in Israel by appealing to the Exodus and to the
understanding of Israel's place under Yahweh, communicated by
Deliverance and Covenant. They appealed for a return to the true

foundations of community, when the authority of Yahweh was

evenly distributed throughout all the sectors of Israelite

life. The canonical prophets were a disruptive element in so far

as their attachment to the old ways and their desire to return to

them caused them to set their faces against the new pattern of

society fostered by the monarchy.[61]

We have argued that, by and large, the canonical prophets'

protest and pattern of reform evince a desire to return to the

old amphictyonic constitution of Israel. Were there circles in

Israel other than the prophetic, which had the same interests at

heart? Von Rad[62] has answered this question in the affirmative,

and has argued that the aim of the final formulation of the Code

of Deuteronomy was to restore in Israel the structure of amphic-

tyony, and that the point of view it represents is that of the

country Levites. How is this view elaborated?

Von Rad's central contention is that the style of Deuteronomy

is such that we can be certain that the concern of its authors was

with homiletics, and that what it represents is the preaching

style of the Levites to whom was committed the exposition of the

Law. Von Rad endeavours to get behind the homiletic dress and sort

out the different kinds of material[63] with which the Levitical

preachers worked, and the result of this enquiry is to establish

the wide range of the book. Von Rad observes: "In this respect

Deuteronomy bears a strong eclectic stamp ... Apodeictic series of

commandments and cultic and ritual torōt of the priests, deriving
from the specifically priestly tradition; legal material, the
transmitters of which were the courts of the lay judges who sat
at the gates; ancient traditions and customs once observed by
the army in Holy War - all this and much else was available for
the Deuteronomic preacher and at his disposal for homiletic use.
In the face of this the complete Deuteronomy must be regarded
as a comparatively late document."[64] Comparing Deuteronomy with
the Book of the Covenant, Von Rad concedes that apodeictic and
conditional statutes, whose respective places in life lay far
apart, were already in the earlier code brought into literary
co-ordination. He holds, however, that Deuteronomy goes beyond
the Book of the Covenant in the broader basis of traditions which
it takes up, and in the freedom of homiletic interpretation in
which it indulges. Von Rad concludes that the writers of
Deuteronomy had access to traditions of extremely varied
provenance, and possessed an authoritative interpretation of them
and a way of communicating them suited to the times. He then
poses the question: out of what historical setting did this
document come?

In answering this question, Von Rad[65] has made use of the
work of E.Junge,[66] who submitted that the events of 701 B.C. marked
a clean break in the development of the Judaean army. In that
year, the mercenary troops who had supplanted the old militia

were surrendered to the Assyrian king. Junge contends that, in
the succeeding period, when Assyrian power was on the decline and
the time was propitious for the resurgence of a spirit of
independence in Judah, the rebuilding of a mercenary force was
precluded by lack of funds, and recourse was had to the old
principle of a citizen army. The old militia which had passed
into oblivion was recalled to life. It is with this movement that
the martial spirit of Deuteronomy is to be correlated, and since
the reconstitution of the militia is traced down to the time of
Josiah, we have, from a new angle, a confirmation of the connection
between the Code and the reign of Josiah.[67] Von Rad[68] holds that
the institution of Holy War is emphatically reintroduced by
Deuteronomy, and that it harks back to amphictyonic practice,[69] and
to the old militia which succumbed to the emergence of a
mercenary army during the period of the kings.

Von Rad[70] further maintains that the backbone of this revived
militia was "the conservative circles of the country nobility",
and that the religious ideas revolving around Holy War were held
by them. They aimed at the reconstruction of the community
according to old amphictyonic values and practices,[71] and the
country Levites were their spokesmen. Von Rad[72] thinks it signifi-
cant that the reform movement had this orientation, and that it
did not have as its ideal a return to the heyday of national
prosperity under David. He observes that the king is a subordinate

figure within the framework of the community envisaged by the
reform, that there is a complete absence of the tradition of the
Davidic covenant,[73] and that Deuteronomy's notable silence on the
important political functions of the king can only mean that it
originated in circles where the sacral conceptions of "the
Anointed of Yahweh" had perhaps never gained a footing.[74] Von Rad
concludes that there is general proof, in both form and content,
of Deuteronomy's provenance from the amphictyonic traditions.
He adds that with respect to content, Deuteronomy's adherence to
the amphictyonic traditions is shown chiefly in the fact that
when, in the later period of the monarchy, the corporate life of
Israel was threatened by disintegration, the Code makes a
comprehensive attempt to gather her into a new unity by recon-
stituting her a "people of Yahweh". This very designation
(ᶜam Yahweh) is given, in the older period, as a designation for
the amphictyonic militia (Judges 5:11, 20:2; 2 Samuel 1:12).

These conservative circles of free, property-owning citizens
are, according to Von Rad,[75] to be identified with the ᶜam hāʾāreṣ.
They it was who had already, two centuries before Josiah, backed
Jehoida in elevating Joash to the throne and in the sealing of a
solemn covenant between Yahweh on one side, and the king and
people on the other[76] (2 Kings 11:17). Von Rad says that while
we have little evidence to guide us as to what exactly was
involved in that covenant, there seems no doubt that it was a

harking back to the ordinances of the old Yahweh amphictyony.
As such, this earlier intervention in politics of the ᶜam hāʾāreṣ
was a prelude to their grander intervention in the time of
Josiah.[77] When Amon fell to a palace intrigue, the ᶜam hāʾāreṣ,
whose power had been enhanced through their important place in
the new military organisation, intervened and set Josiah on the
throne. The policy which Josiah pursued was largely their policy.
It included freedom from foreign entanglements, and the rebuilding
of community along the lines of the old amphictyonic structure.

Von Rad[78] calls attention to what he terms "Deuteronomy's
remarkable Janus-like character", its combination of what is
priestly and cultic with a national and martial spirit. One aspect
Von Rad has attempted to trace down to the ᶜam hāʾāreṣ, and the
other is identified with the country Levites, who were the spokes-
men of the movement whose programme Deuteronomy is. These Levites
possessed full priestly powers, but were not in the employment
of the cult. They lived here and there in the country towns
(Deuteronomy 12:12,18f.; 14:27,29; 16:11,14; 26:12),and had access
to a copious sacred literature which although diffuse in character,
was bound together by a unifying theology. The concept of Holy
War belongs with the Levites, since they were the custodians of
the ark which was the palladium of the Holy War.

Von Rad[79] is aware that an obvious objection to this account
is the retort that, if Deuteronomy represents the programme of

country Levites, they were planning thereby their own demise.
This, however, is not a serious objection, if it be conceded that
the demand for centralisation in Deuteronomy rests on a narrow
basis, and is a late and final adaptation of many layers of
material.[80]   Further, Von Rad, as we have noted above, thinks of
the Levites in question not as regular cult personnel, but as
working in a sphere outside the cult.[81]   They are the spokesmen
of a movement of reform, based on old traditions of which they are
the custodians and the transmitters.   This is an important part
of Von Rad's case, since it might appear less plausible, if the
Levites in question were thought of as regular cultic officials.
This is so because, as we have argued, the tendency was for the
cult to be pressed into the service of the regime, whereas these
Levites are thought of as aligned with a country party which
challenged the policy of the court and royal officials in
Jerusalem.   If, then, we think of these Levites as "turned
proletarian",[82]   that is, released from the narrower cultic sphere
and aligned with a movement of national reconstruction on the
basis of amphictyonic traditions, Von Rad's view, at least in its
general outlines, becomes easier to follow. We have already
suggested that the tendency in those centres of the cult which
were the instruments of royal policy, would be the stepping-up
of the machinery of sacrifice and the neglect of the teaching
office. The Levites whose functions are sketched for us by Von Rad

exhibit precisely the opposite tendency; detached from the sacrificial functions proper to the cultus, they concentrate on the teaching office. This emphasis on the old traditions which were the basis of amphictyony, fits them as framers of a document which purposes the reforming of the Israelite community on just such foundations.

There is, of course, nothing new in the view that a relationship exists between the prophetic standpoint and that of Deuteronomy. S.R. Driver[83] had characterised Deuteronomy as the practical legislative expression of the broad ethical principles for which the prophets contended. Error enters into this representation when it includes the assumption that the ethical critique of the prophets, applied to the relationships of Israelite society, was an entirely novel contribution;[84] that in this respect they were innovators, and were the first to make these demands. The best way of stating the connection between the prophetic position and that of Deuteronomy, is to say that both rest on amphictyonic foundations. The canonical prophets and the authors of Deuteronomy have their roots in the same world of amphictyonic values and practices. Hence, even if the Code does not immediately derive from prophetic circles, as Von Rad contends,[85] it would still remain true that it is the kind of product we should expect, were the broad prophetic principles reduced to legislative shape.

We single out two examples of this, since these have a special

bearing on the argument of preceding chapters:

1. There is the defence of old Israelite values of the family and of landed property, contained in the law of the Levirate (Deuteronomy 25:1-10). The situation against which this pointed, was that described by Isaiah, who deplores the adding of household to household, and the joining of field to field.[86] The connection between the peasant and the ancestral plot was being broken by economic pressures, and ancestral land was no longer inviolate. Dealings in real estate had begun, and a powerful new consideration affected agriculture, namely that larger units were a better economic proposition. But this was intolerable to traditionally Israelite views of the family and its ancestral holding.[87]

2. The bulwark of the amphictyonic constitution of old Israel was the Covenant, which subordinated all Israelites, without exception, to the will of Yahweh. The subsequent Davidic covenant was a device by which the kings escaped from the constitutional safe-guards of the original and comprehensive Covenant. The Davidic covenant raised the king to sacral pre-eminence, and created a unique and unshared relationship between Yahweh and himself. The political expression of this was absolute monarchy and a tyrannical regime.[88] Von Rad[89] has remarked that Deuteronomy's notable silence on the important political functions of the king is coupled with an absence of the tradition of the Davidic covenant. The king for whom the Code makes provision is not to set up court in the

oriental style, nor to entangle Israel in foreign ways. His
authority is to be limited by his subjection to the Law of Yahweh [90]
(Deuteronomy 17:14-20). The Book of the Law found in the temple
by Hilkiah is called, alternatively, the Book of the Covenant.
After its discovery, Josiah covenants with Yahweh in agreement
with its demands and, we read, "all the people joined in the
Covenant"(2 Kings 23:1-3). It is the authentic comprehensive
Covenant by which king and people are equally bound. The religious
basis of constitutional rule has been re-established.

Deuteronomy is out of touch with realities in much the same
way as were the prophets. It may be thought a novel doctrine to
deny that the prophets were realistic, but it seems to us that
they fall short of combating realities in much the same way as
the authors of Deuteronomy. Welch[91] has justly protested against
Hölscher's[92] contention that Deuteronomy is characterised by a
thorough-going detachment from the life of a real community, and
that the Babylonian scribes responsible for it were moved by the
pure pleasurableness of a train of theorising. According to
Hölscher, it is speculation removed entirely from the hard
actualities of government. But it is certain that the framers of
Deuteronomy were not playing this kind of game. They were
passionately interested in the government of a real community, and
they believed that they had a practical programme of reform. They
had seen the amphictyonic constitution of Israel breached on every

side, as had the prophets, and to this they attributed the disintegration of real community. They determined to build anew on the old foundations.

The prophets were men of insight, in so far as they saw that the new structure of Israel was a wholesale repudiation of the old social morality. They judged the organisation of social life in Israel by ethical norms which they held absolutely. If it were argued that great changes in social and economic structure had taken place, and that it was impracticable to apply the old directives concerning social obligation, they would no doubt have replied that whatever is wrong is wrong, in any kind of world. The question remains, however, to what extent the departure from the old values of communal life was precipitated by the inexorable process of political, economic and social change in which Israel was inescapably involved, when it accepted the role of a nation among the nations of the world. What was the ultimate answer to Israel's dilemma? In confronting this question, the canonical prophets and the framers of Deuteronomy face a profound antinomy, which has its ground in the conditions of Israel's existence as a nation in the world. The contradiction between the values of corporate life which the prophets uphold, and the actual state of affairs which they see, goes deeper than the ethical failings of individual Israelites. The contradiction was in the organisation of corporate life itself, in the presuppositions of social structure,

in the economic currents which affected Israel in common with neighbouring nations. In all this, there was a universe of values with which corporate life was shot through, and which was incompatible with the corporate ideals of amphictyonic Israel. The prophets and the framers of Deuteronomy were faced with an antinomy which they could not resolve. It was in fact not a real solution to say that Israel must be rebuilt on the foundations of amphictyony; that there must be a return to a state approximating to the simple patriarchal constitution of yore; that the complications created for Yahweh's community by political and commercial developments, and by the impact of economics on the old social structure, could be eliminated by a grand turning-back of the clock. They tried, indeed, to make some concessions to the realities of the situation. Ideally, Yahweh was king, and there was no need for an earthly king in a consistently amphictyonic society. But kingship was there, the king could not be deposed, but he must be made subordinate to the Law of Yahweh. Again it has been observed that Deuteronomy envisages a somewhat more advanced agricultural community than that catered for by the Book of the Covenant.[93] Essentially, however, the solution proposed was a return to yesterday. Those who proposed this solution were men of burning convictions. They were in deadly earnest, but they were out of touch with hard contemporary realities.

This failure, however, to find a practical, hard-headed

answer to Israel's predicament implies no censure, because there
was no possible solution. The antinomy was between the ideal
demand that Israel should be Yahweh's community, serving His
ends and moving in a special sphere of communal values, and
the business of living and surviving in a world which recognized
only its own very different aims and values. This antinomy was
deep-rooted and insoluble. The valid attainment of the prophets
and the framers of Deuteronomy was that, in the presence of
antinomy, they maintained the unconditional character of Yahweh's
demands on His community, even if these were not fully realisable
in the actual conditions of earthly existence.[94]

Appendix One

The question naturally arises; Who are the gerīm? It has been usual to illustrate the social position of the Hebrew gēr in the light of the status of the Arabic jār. Hence Robertson Smith observes: "From a very early date the Semitic communities embraced, in addition to the free tribesmen of pure blood(Hebrew, ˒ezrāḥ, Arabic, ṣarīḥ) with their families and slaves, a class of men who were politically free but had no political rights, viz. the protected stranger(Hebrew, gerīm, sing. gēr; Arabic, jīrān, sing. jār) of whom mention is made so often both in the Old Testament and in early Arabic literature. The gēr was a man of another tribe or district who, coming to sojourn in a place where he was not strengthened by the presence of his own kin, put himself under the protection of a clan or powerful chief."(R.O.S., pp.75-76). The gēr is thus defined as the protected or dependent foreigner settled for a time in Israel(S.R. Driver, I.C.C., Deuteronomy, p.126), and the exhortation to obedience, "Love then the gēr, for ye were gerīm in the land of Egypt"(Deuteronomy 10:19, Exodus 22:20) gives substance to this view.

Pedersen(Israel i-ii) agrees with this solution as far as it goes, but he does not think it goes far enough. He holds(pp.40f.) that the term gēr may be attached to anyone living in association with a community other than his own, whether he be an Israelite or a foreigner, and he observes that in Judges 17:7-9 Micah, a Benjamite of Bethlehem Judah, uses the verb 'gūr' of himself.

Pedersen is of the opinion that gēr and gērīm, as used in the law codes, designate a large class of citizens who are not native Israelites and who can be no other than the former Canaanite population, extermination of whom was not extensive, although at the beginning of the conquest the population of a number of conquered towns was put to the sword. Pedersen considers what the other possibilities are. He admits that a large number of foreigners lived in Canaan, that David's guard consisted of hired foreigners, and that in Samaria certain bazaars were inhabited by Aramaean merchants(1 Kings 20:34), but he rightly insists that the gērīm, for whom provision is made in the several legislations, cannot be identified with these foreigners. The specific provision for the gērīm in the laws indicates that they were an integral part of the community. They formed a limited social class, closely allied with the Israelites(ʾezrāḥ). Pedersen continues: "This can only be the conquered, not wholly but nearly assimilated, early population. Just as the early population of the Peloponnese lived as perioikoi, with personal freedom and right of property, but excluded from the privileged society of the patrician citizens, thus also the gērīm of Israel occupied an intermediate position between the Israelite burghers and the slaves."

Pedersen maintains that poverty was the lot of the gērīm as a consequence of the Israelite appropriation of their land, and so they are frequently the subject of appeals to compunction and

charity. In the Covenant Code the injunction not to oppress the
gēr is twice repeated(Exodus 22:20, 23:9). In Deuteronomy it is
insisted that the gēr must be treated justly and kindly(1:16, 10:19,
24:14,17, 27:19), and, in company with the fatherless and the
widow, he is time and again commended to the Israelite's charity
(14:29, 16:11,14, 24:19,20,21, 26:11,12,13). cf. S.R. Driver, I.C.C.
Deuteronomy, p.126. Pedersen remarks that these admonitions occur
in writings otherwise hostile to foreign and especially Canaanite
influences, and from this he draws the conclusion that the gērīm
had been assimilated with the Israelites to such a degree that they
were no longer regarded as properly a foreign element in the
population.

This distinction between the native Israelite and the gēr is
further narrowed down in the Law of Holiness and the Priestly Code.
The same fidelity is demanded from the gēr as from the Israelite
(Leviticus 20:2, Ezekiel 14:7), and, on the occasion of many
important acts of the cult, it is expressly stated that they are
to be performed by Israelites and gērīm alike(Leviticus 16:29,
17:8-16, 22:18, Numbers 15:29, 19:10). If the gēr is circumised,
he takes part with the Israelite in the feast of the Passover
(Exodus 12:44f.,48f., cf. Numbers 9:14). See also S.R. Driver,
I.C.C., Deuteronomy, p.165.

This narrowing down of the distinction to the point of

nothingness is taken by Pedersen to reflect a situation where the difference between native Israelites and gērīm is only a social one, that is, between patricians or yeomen and plebians. The obliteration of the original racial significance of the term gērīm was facilitated by the emergence of a class of native Israelites who possessed very little and who were socially undifferentiated from the earlier gērīm, and so the Old Testament reckons with the śākīr(hired workman) — a class recruited not only from the gērīm, but from the Israelites also(Deuteronomy 24:14). The hired workmen are personally free but they are not much better off than the slaves; they labour without the enjoyment of the fruits of their toil(Job 7:1-2, 14:6), and they are mentioned among the defenceless section of the community which is not to be oppressed. They are to receive their due wages at the end of each day's work(Leviticus 19:13). Pedersen observes that it is to the changed social and economic situation of the days of the monarchy that we should refer the emergence of the Israelite śākīr. In Israel i-ii, p.505, Pedersen inclines to the view that there is no clear difference between the tōšāb and the gēr.

M.Weber(Ancient Judaism, pp.32-36) agrees with Pedersen that the gērīm had legal rights, and holds that the phrase 'gēr ʾašer bešaʿareḵā' describes the legal position and meant that "the gēr belonged to the bailiwick of the city and stood under its

regular protection."(p.33) In this respect Weber would sharply differentiate the gēr from the nokrī who was either a temporary guest or a permanent client under the protection of a single master. Weber also remarks that landlessness and impoverishment were normal criteria of the gēr, and he cites(p.71) Leviticus 25:23 in which Yahweh states that He owns the land and that it must not be sold in perpetuity. The Israelites are but gērīm and tōsabīm on it. This, according to Weber, is a further indication that the want of a right to land was considered to be a characteristic of the gēr. This, however, is the full extent of his agreement with Pedersen, for he gives an entirely different answer to the question: Who were the gērīm? He says that cattle breeders, iron workers and musicians, mentioned in Genesis 4:20-22 as descendants of Cain, may be considered as typical guest tribes (gērīm) in Israel(p.35). Also the byssus workers(1 Chronicles 4:21), the potters(1 Chronicles 4:22-23) and the foreign-born artisans in general were gērīm. There were different kinds of gērīm, "freemen and serfs whose position cannot be ascertained in detail."(pp.35-36). But there are two cases of gērīm thought by Weber to be typical and important, small stock-breeding herdsmen and the Levite priests. Both groups, according to Weber, have their landlessness in common — no agricultural land was assigned to them, but they were assigned dwelling-sites outside

the city gates. They were also granted pasture rights for their animals.

It is because the patriarchs belong, according to Weber, to the group of stock-breeders that he designates them gerīm. He says of Abraham: "He wanders as a gēr with contractual meadow rights between different places, and only at the end of his life does the saga have him acquire after long transactions(Genesis 23:16) a hereditary burying-ground."(p.42). Esau is "essentially a tent-dwelling stock-breeder, but, settling as a gēr in Shechem, he buys land."(p.42). cf. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.98-99. Albright likens the Kenites to the travelling smiths or tinkers of modern Asia, and notes that Cain's descendants were credited with originating the three occupational specialities of this class, namely, tents and herds, musical instruments, and copper and iron working. He suggests that among the ancestral Hebrews there were groups belonging to the same or related types, and that travelling craftsmen were closely associated with the Mosaic movement, and held a recognized place in Israelite society until much later times.

Appendix 2

A Note on Method

The presupposition on which the interpretation of Israelite religious beliefs and institutions in terms of Sumero-Accadian cultic categories rests, is well seen in Hooke's definition of "primitive" (S.H. Hooke, Myth and Ritual, London, 1933, pp.1-2; also A.R. Johnson, Labyrinth, edited by S.H. Hooke, London, 1935, p.75). Hooke asserts that to describe the myths and practices of Australian aborigines or Polynesian Islanders as representing the behaviour and mentality of primitive man is a "question-begging process". The only sense of "primitive" which he is prepared to accept is the historical sense of the word, and so he says: "The only kind of behaviour or mentality which we can recognize as "primitive" in the strict sense is such as can be shown to lie historically at the fountainhead of a civilization." Hooke takes "primitive" and "chronologically prior" as synonymous terms, and it is because he makes this identification that he decides that Egypt and Babylonia are the proper points of departure for his study. There have been many developments since Robertson Smith wrote, but he makes what we regard as a pertinent observation in this connection. He says: "That Babylonia is the best starting point for a comparative study of the sacred beliefs and practices of the Semitic peoples is an idea which has lately

had some vogue, and which, at first sight, seems plausible on account of the antiquity of the monumental evidence. But in matters of this sort primitive and ancient are not synonymous terms, and we must not look for the most primitive form of the Semitic faith, where society was not primitive" (R.O.S., p. 13).

Snaith (J.Y.N.F., p.193) attaches weight to the same considerations, and is perturbed by Hooke's proposal to relate beliefs and institutions bound up with an urban society to Israel - a society with a nomadic background, settled down to agricultural and pastoral life in Canaan. For this reason, Snaith is more impressed with Hooke's work in his "Origins" (The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual, Schweich Lectures, 1935) than with his earlier proposal in "Myth and Ritual" to relate Israelite religion to a myth and ritual pattern based on the urban states of Babylonia and Egypt. Snaith thinks that the agricultural milieu of Ugarit is culturally comparable with that pertaining in Israel, and that the myth and ritual pattern established there could properly be assimilated by the Israelite type of society.

Engnell (Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943, pp.71-72) inclines away from Hooke's disintegration theory, i.e. his view that the myth and ritual pattern traceable in the world of the Western Semites is the result of the adaptation, disintegration and degradation of the original Eastern Semitic pattern as it moved westwards. Hooke

holds that the break-up of the pattern in the west is the result of an attempt to adapt an urban pattern to agricultural and pastoral conditions. Engnell considers it more probable that the West Semitic pattern is an "autochthonous development", genetically related to the Babylonian pattern but lagging behind it in cultural development, so that it remains standing "halfway" and not yet urbanised. Engnell points out that this view is supported by our knowledge that the Accadian Akitu (New Year) Festival was urbanised from an earlier agricultural stage of development, and that the Ugaritic religious and cultic structures are more in agreement with the earlier form of the Tammuz religion in Babylonia than with the later urban pattern.

In agreement with this Jacobsen (Before Philosophy, Pelican Books, London, 1949, p.214) argues that the cult festivals centring in a marriage rite, or in a battle drama, or in a death and revival drama, which comprise the urban cultic structure in Babylonia, do not themselves originate in an urban environment. Jacobsen notes that in their urban setting these festivals were matters of state, and that frequently the king or ruler of the city state performed the chief role in the cult drama. He then asks the question why these festivals should be considered matters of state, and replies that their function was to establish an effective relationship between state and nature. (This is in agreement with Hooke, Myth and Ritual, pp.2-3.) Jacobsen,

however, goes on to say that the mythopoeic mode of thought which operates through these cult festivals, belongs to earlier times, when the view of the world as a state had not yet taken shape in Babylonia, and when gods were not yet anthropomorphic rulers of states, but were still directly the phenomena of nature. This consideration lends weight to Engnell's suggestion that what both he and Snaith call the "Tammuz religion" of the Ugaritic cultic structure, should be regarded as a stage through which Babylonia once passed and which it left behind, when Babylonian society took on urban characteristics. Hence Engnell goes on to say: "But, when, as happens, this older parallelism squares with the facts, why assume a stage of development behind the actual one, from which disintegration is supposed to have taken place, but about the existence of which we know nothing?" (op.cit., p.72). We agree with Engnell that Hooke's account is unlikely and unnatural, and it seems to us that its formulation is closely related to his confidence that his definition of "primitive" is the right one. We should hold that there are empirical techniques of a strictly scientific character, by the employment of which anthropologists can give a very precise meaning to "primitive" in a context which is cultural and not historical. There is thus, it seems to us, no necessary connection between what is primitive in a cultural sense and what is chronologically ancient.

In the light of the above discussion, it will be appreciated

why we view with considerable misgivings Haldar's attempt to interpret Israelite institutions and offices by the application of Accadian cultic categories. We believe that there was an essential correlation between the structure of the Accadian cult and the urban culture for which it functioned, and that to bring this cultic structure to the interpretation of the religious institutions and offices of a primitive agricultural community, such as Israel was in the days of Samuel, is a procedure whose validity may be seriously questioned. Hence we do not feel disposed to accept Haldar's statements that Samuel, as both nābī' and kōhēn, combines the functions of the Accadian barū and mahhū priests, and conforms, as Moses did (op.cit., pp.92-93), to the Sumero-Accadian pattern of sacral kingship. We have sought rather to set the office of Samuel, and the historical movements of his period, against the background of the Israelite amphictyonic structure. We believe that this is in agreement with the spirit of Anderson's remarks (G.W. Anderson, H.T.R., 43, 1950, p.253) that the characteristic pattern of Israel's faith and ritual is derived not from the common myth and ritual pattern of the Ancient Near East, but from the events of the Exodus as recorded in the Israelite tradition. Also the observation by C.R. North (Z.A.W., 1932, p.35) that Old Testament religion should be interpreted not by working inwards from the wide circle of a primitive and general Semitic Umwelt, but by working outwards from

the centre of the prophetic consciousness. See also A.R. Johnson,
E.T., 62, 1950-1951, p.41, n.3. In The Burden of Egypt,
Chicago, 1951, p.316, John Wilson expresses the view that
whatever is vitally essential to a society cannot be received
by way of cultural transmission. He says: "The inner essence
of a society is so individual to the time and place that it will
not fit anywhere else. The full expression of what makes an
Egyptian or a Hebrew or a Frenchman or an American comes out
of a unique experience in one place, one time, one set of
conditions ... the essential beliefs, ideas and attitudes of a
culture are factors of self-discovery rather than inheritance."

Appendix 3

B^erit

W.R. Smith, R.O.S., p.272, argues from the practice of pre-Islamic Arabia that the basic idea of b^erit is the extension of kinship. He points out that, where blood is the basis of social obligation, corporate life is co-extensive with kinship, and that under such conditions, there can be no inviolable fellowship, except between men of the same blood. This is the case because the duty of blood revenge has over-riding priority, and every other obligation is dissolved when it comes into conflict with it. Hence, as Smith puts it: "I cannot bind myself to a man, even for a temporary purpose, unless, during the time of our engagement, he is put in the kinsman's place. And this is as much as to say that a stranger cannot become bound to me, unless, at the same time, he becomes bound to all my kinsmen in the same way. Such in fact is the law of the desert; when any member of a clan receives an outsider through the bond of salt, the whole clan is bound by his act and must, while the engagement lasts, receive the stranger as one of themselves" (op.cit., pp.272-273; cf. the remarks on I Samuel 20:14-16 and v.42, pp.10-11 above)

Again (op.cit., 315), Smith remarks that while b^erit is primarily a compact between two individuals and has for its object the admission of a stranger to fellowship with an Arab

clansman, the obligation contracted is nevertheless binding on all the other members of the clan. The reason why it is so binding is that he who has drunk a clansman's blood is no longer a stranger but a brother, and included in the mystic circle of those who have a share in the life-blood of the clan.

The artificial brotherhood created by b^{e}rit is set forth symbolically by appropriate rites; and these rites, while they vary in form (op.cit., p.314f.), are uniform in intention. Their intention is to symbolise that the parties to the b^{e}rit have become of one blood. This may be done by opening the veins and sucking each other's blood. The normal practice in Ancient Arabia, however, was to use a sacrificial victim instead of human blood, and the ritual was that all who shared in the b^{e}rit dipped their hands in the blood, which at the same time was applied to the sacred stone that symbolised the deity or was poured forth at its base. In this way the god was made a party to the b^{e}rit. Where it was a case of a stranger being admitted to a clan by b^{e}rit, the god involved in the covenant would be the kindred god of the clan, and the smearing of the two bloods on the sacred stone would express symbolically that brotherhood can only be consummated with community of sacra.

This background is useful for the elucidation of the term b^{e}rit, as it is used to describe the compact between Yahweh and Israel. The relationship between Yahweh and Israel was not a

natural one based on kinship. Yahweh was a "God from afar"
(Weber, op.cit., p.130), and not a stock god. Yahweh's b^{e}rit
with Israel was in the nature of an ethical contract and this,
as Smith (op.cit., p.319) notes, is not an idea which had to
wait for the canonical prophets before it came to birth. Smith
says: "That Jehovah's relation to Israel is not natural but
ethical is the doctrine of the prophets and is emphasised, in
dependence on their teaching, in the Book of Deuteronomy. But
the passages cited (Exodus 24:4, Genesis 15:8f.) show that the
idea has its origin in pre-prophetic times; and, indeed, the
prophets, though they give it fresh and powerful application,
plainly do not regard the conception as an innovation. In fact
a nation like Israel is not a natural unity like a clan, and
Jehovah, as the national God, was, from the time of Moses down-
wards, no mere clan god, but the God of a confederation, so that
here the idea of a covenant religion is entirely justified." This
reference to Israel as a confederation is an adumbration of the
concept of amphictyony (see Chapter 3). Weber (op.cit., p.441,
n.22) also states that the right rendering of b^{e}rit is
"confederation".

The event which promoted the solemn b^{e}rit between Yahweh and
Israel was the deliverance from Egypt. Weber (op.cit., p.118)
says of this: "The uniqueness of this event, i.e. the deliverance
from Egypt, was constituted by the fact that the miracle was

effected by a god who until then was unknown by Israel, and who thereupon was accepted through solemn b^{e}rīt by Moses' establishment of Yahweh worship. The reception was based on mutual pledges bilaterally mediated through the prophet Moses." The compact was sealed by the formal covenant sacrifice at Mt. Sinai (Exodus 24:4f.): "And Moses wrote all the words of Yahweh. And he rose early in the morning and built an altar at the foot of the mountain and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the people of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed oxen as peace-offerings to Yahweh. And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and half of the blood he threw against the altar. Then he took the book of the covenant and read it in the hearing of the people, and they said: 'All that Yahweh has spoken we will do and we will be obedient'. And Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people and said: 'Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you according to all these words.'"

The question then naturally arises: what were the contents of this "book of the covenant"? How far is it permissible to associate with Moses positive ethical and social enactments? How much was there of intellectual and ethical content in the understanding of Yahweh which Moses imparted to the wilderness community? Albright (F.S.A.C., pp.196-207) has argued that Moses was a monotheist, and has described at some length the character

of his creed. He has summarised this elsewhere (A.R.I., p.116) in the following form: "Belief in the existence of only one God who is the Creator of the world and the Giver of all life; the belief that God is holy and just, without sexuality or mythology; the belief that God is invisible to man except under special conditions and that no graphic nor plastic representation of Him is permissible; the belief that God is not restricted to any part of His creation, but is equally at home in heaven, in the desert or in Palestine; the belief that God is so far superior to all created beings, whether heavenly bodies, angelic messengers, demons or false gods, that He remains absolutely unique; the belief that God has chosen Israel by formal compact to be His favoured people, guided exclusively by laws imposed by Him." Albright, following Alt (Die Ursprünge des Israeliten Rechts, collected in Kleine Schriften, vol. I, pp.278-332), distinguishes between casuistic and apodeictic laws. The formulation and spirit of apodeictic law are said by Albright (F.S.A.C., p.204) to be unique and original in Israel, and the best illustration of apodeictic law is said to be the ten commandments.

Rowley (From Joseph to Joshua, pp.155f.) ascribes to the work of Moses a place of supreme importance. Rowley takes as his starting point Israel's experience of deliverance, and the part played by Moses in bringing the people out of bondage into freedom. The covenant with Yahweh is a pledge of undeviating

loyalty, sworn in gratitude to the God who had helped effectually
in time of distress. To Meek's statement (Hebrew Origins, 1936,
pp.89f.) that there was nothing novel or unique in the adoption
by Israel of another religion, Rowley retorts that what
differentiates the b^{e}rit between Yahweh and Israel from the/cases ^{many}
of the adoption by a people of a foreign religion, was the back-
ground of deliverance and the awareness that through this
historical deliverance, Yahweh had already adopted Israel. In
faith and gratitude, Israel responded to Yahweh, but the prime
mover in the establishing of the b^{e}rit was Yahweh himself. Rowley
says: "Here Israel's adoption of Yahweh was the response to His
adoption of Israel, and the sequel of His achieved deliverance
of her." Rowley further thinks it probable that Moses gave to
the people the ethical decalogue contained in Exodus 20. He says:
"The tribes that were with Moses and that embraced Yahwism in a
historical moment of decision as the expression of their
gratitude for their deliverance from Egypt, might more naturally
be given a new and higher Decalogue (i.e. compared with the
ritual decalogue of Exodus 24, ascribed by Rowley to the southern
tribes who were Yahweh-worshipping, but were not involved in the
Exodus and were not at Sinai) by their great leader Moses."
Rowley adds that gratitude is itself an ethical emotion in a way
that fear is not, and that there is consequently nothing unexpected
in a religion which has this ethical basis being possessed of an

ethical character. "Hence Moses could well give the higher Decalogue to the Northern tribes that he led, as they declare in their traditions, at a time when the southern tribes that had already adopted Yahweh at an earlier date were still at the more primitive level."

Wellhausen, on the other hand, as we have already noted (p.68 above), has maintained that for Moses to have given Israel an enlightened conception of God would have been to have given them stones instead of bread. We have indicated our acceptance of this, in so far as it is a protest against the proposal to conceive Israel's relation to Yahweh in terms of a well-articulated credal statement in intellectual categories. We have written above (p.69): "It was in the process of striving towards nationhood and in the confidence that Yahweh was involved with them in these events and was directing them towards fruition, that the hold of the Israelites on Yahweh was actualised." See also Chapter 3, n.44.. We do not thereby intend to deny that Israel's understanding of Yahweh had some theological and ethical content, but in this connection we incline to Rowley's statement rather than that of Albright.

The significance of the b͏erit concept for Israel can be summed up under the following heads:

1. The compact on Mt. Sinai was Israel's response to Yahweh's adoption of her, and the assurance that Yahweh had taken the

initiative arose from the experience of deliverance. The profound
influence exercised by b^erit on the subsequent life of Israel
does not arise primarily from the fact that it involves an act
of choice on the part of Israel (pace Weber, op.cit., p.130),
but rather because it expresses Israel's free and glad response
to a God who has chosen her. Yahweh was the dominant partner
in the compact, and the contents of the b^erit were unilaterally
determined by Him. This means that the b^erit incorporates the
demands of revealed truth, and that it prepares the way for the
ennobling of ethical values.

2. Israel, in virtue of b^erit, becomes a covenant community,
and this opens up the possibility of corporate life across tribal
boundaries. Community is now based on religion and not on blood,
and the brotherhood of blood is transcended by the brotherhood
of Faith. In this way tribalism yielded to a wider basis of
corporate life, and Israel became a nation inhering in Yahweh.
See further, Chapter 3.

3. The organisation and machinery of amphictyony (pp.46f.) become
possible, because of the general acceptance of the concept of a
covenant community; i.e., b^erit paves the way for confederacy.
The amphictyonic legislation and directives command respect and
obedience, because they are guaranteed by the Covenant God. Since
the deliverance from Egypt and the mediation of Moses are the
primary setting of b^erit, it is understandable that the basis and

authority of b^erit should be referred back to these events.
Also, when Canaanite law is appropriated by the amphictyony, it
is brought within the sanction of b^erit, and its authority derives
from the fact that it is "the book of the covenant" (see above
pp. 49f.). Hence also the attaching of all subsequent legislation
to Moses - the fount of authority. Thus it is right to say
(Weber op.cit., p.130) that Yahweh was the God of social
organisation in Israel, and to call attention to the "collective
liability and ethical orientation of old Israelite confederate
law" (Weber, op.cit., pp.136-137).

4. As there was a Book of the Covenant, so there was also an
Ark of the Covenant; and we have argued (above, pp. 71f.) that
the ark was the symbol of Yahweh's presence in the midst of
Israel's armies. We have shown that the circumstances of the
settlement were such that the reality of community under the
covenant was best realised in the face of common peril, and in
the joint military enterprise by which Israel carved out for
herself living room in Canaan. And as war stimulated the sense
of community, so also it was the season of Yahwistic revival,
when Yahweh's vital presence in the camp was surely grasped, and
his continued leadership welcomed and accepted. Times of peace
and security, on the other hand, tended to encourage declension
and disintegration of community (above, pp.74-76). Thus Israel's
reception of the Covenant God as Yahweh s^ebaot (above, pp.90f.)

was of great religious and social significance during the
period of the settlement.

5. There was the considerable constitutional significance of
the b^{e}rit concept. This was at least twofold:

(a) It supplied the notion of a kind of central authority,
and opened up the way for a society approximating to a state,
as opposed to a tribal society, where the basis of community was
blood. Israel had no conception of a mundane authority called
a "state", which could demand obedience from its citizens, but
the b^{e}rit relationship, with the note of religious authority
which it possessed and the social obligations which it conferred,
directed Israel towards nationhood.

(b) If the consequence of the operation of b^{e}rit was a kind
of state, it was a limited and not an absolute state. It was
limited by the fact that it was subordinated to the will and
purposes of Yahweh whose creation it was, and by the further
consideration that it cohered in Yahweh and required religious
authority and legitimation for its continued life. This, we
have argued (pp.166-170), was the spirit of amphictyony, and in
accordance with this, Samuel acted in relation to the request
of the people for a king. Samuel feared that if a king were
appointed, he might try to subvert the foundations of the
Covenant Community. He might not comply with a conception of
monarchy limited by amphictyonic values, i.e. by the demands of

Yahweh on His Covenant Community. But if the king had to be appointed, he must be brought under the obligations of the covenant in company with his brethren, so that his power could be limited and his performance appraised by norms possessing ultimate authority. Thus it was through b^{e}rit that Israel approximated to the notions of constitutional law and constitutional monarchy. The reigns of David and Solomon were a departure from and a repudiation of these values (see Chapter 8).

G. Henton Davies ("Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth-Century Prophets", in: Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, Edinburgh 1950, pp. 41-42) notes "the virtual non-use of the term berith" by the eighth-century prophets. He observes that Hosea 8:1b, where the term "b^{e}rit" is found, has been suspected as a later addition. Although the term is used in certain of the traditions now incorporated in the J. and E. documents, Davies suggests that its absence in the eighth-century prophets may mean "that the relationship created by Yahweh's election of Israel came to be expounded through the medium of the term 'covenant' late in the history of that tradition."

Even if the term b^{e}rit is late, we should certainly hold that the concept of "Covenant" in Israelite usage has the creative significance for the Israelite community which we have attached to it above. Cf. G.E. Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, 1950, p.62.

The Old Israelite Community and the Rise of the Monarchy

Summary of Thesis

The egalitarian instincts of Israel, the emphasis on the rights o
the individual, and the loose organisation of corporate life owed
something to the background of nomadic existence prior to the settl
ment in Canaan. Tribalism continued as a factor in the Israelite
community after the settlement, and there was the consciousness of
tension between the wider loyalty required by an inter-tribal socie
and the old and narrower loyalties focussed intensely on tribal
prestige, and unable to transcend tribal boundaries. These centrifu
tendencies were counteracted by the functioning of amphictyony as a
cement. The organs of amphictyony were the central sanctuary with i
covenant cult and covenant law to which all the tribes subscribed.
Thereby it was possible to frame such legislation as would secure t
coherence of the wider society and determine the essential characte
istics of its corporate life, because the authority of Yahweh, whic
was behind the operation of the amphictyonic machinery, was accepta
to all.

Amphictyony knew of no division between sacred and secular, sinc
it endeavoured to bring the sum total of corporate relationships un
the aegis of Yahweh. With the advent of the monarchy the preservati
of this unity was no longer possible. Partly this was due to the
unwillingness of kings to subordinate themselves to the policies an
goals of amphictyony, and, partly, to the incompatibility between th
ideals of amphictyony and the survival of Israel as a nation among
nations. The kings resolved to organize Israel in accordance with
accepted worldly standards of strength and fitness for survival. Th
emergence of mercenaries may have been partly a consequence of this
although it was also connected with the failure of David and Solomo
to retain the sympathy of their people, and the consequent necessit
to rule tyrannically through power elements in their personal emplo
David and Solomon lost the support and confidence of their people
because, in creating a centralised kingdom, they invaded the libert
of the individual Israelite, wounded tribal susceptibilities, and
destroyed the corporate values of amphictyony which was ideally a
religious brotherhood. Great social and economic equalities were
created by the development of trade and commerce. The concentration
of wealth in the hands of the few marched with excessive poverty am
the many. In particular the peasant's plot, which was in the gift of
Yahweh and inalienable from its ancestral owner, ceased to be the
subject of religious demand. Instead it was exposed to the market a
treated as an article of commerce, so that the plight of the peasan
was desperate and a fundamental social sanction subverted. Solomon

ruled as an absolute monarch and used his people as means to his ov
personal ends. They paid for his pretensions to greatness and his
attachment to the pattern of oriental monarchy in the grand style,
forced labour, crushing taxation and reduced living standards. The
Jerusalem cult of the king,which flourished under Solomon, was a de
to invest his despotism with a Divine Right by declaring him to be
Son of Yahweh, and by asserting that the well-being of the people
depended absolutely on his effective fulfilment of his unique
mediatorial role.

The offices of prophet and priest are grounded in the unity of
amphictyonic community, and both ministered to its wholeness by
performing complementary functions. The great debate between the
canonical prophets and the cult was directly associated with the
effects on the latter of the rise of the monarchy. It was the poli
the monarchy to maintain the fiction of Yahweh's continued sway ov
the life of His community. The canonical prophets saw that in this
the kings were using Yahweh's cult as a tool for the securing of tl
own contrary ends, and that, while Yahweh was honoured in the cult
with festival and sacrifice, large sectors of the corporate life o
Israel had been wrested from His control, and ordered so as to
repudiate the corporate values of amphictyony.

THE OLD ISRAELITE COMMUNITY

AND

THE RISE OF THE MONARCHY

VOLUME II

NOTES

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A.A.S.O.R.	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
A.J.A.	American Journal of Archeology.
A.J.S.L.	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
A.P.	W.F. Albright, Archeology of Palestine, 1949.
A.P.B.	W.F. Albright, The Archeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1932.
A.R.I.	W.F. Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel, 3rd edition, 1953.
A.V.	Authorised Version.
B.A.S.O.R.	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
Enc. Bib.	Encyclopaedia Biblica, edited by T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black.
E.T.	The Expository Times.
E.Tr.	English Translation.
F.S.A.C.	W.F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd edition, 1946.
H.G.H.L.	G.A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 25th edition, 1931.
H.T.R.	Harvard Theological Review.
H.U.C.A.	Hebrew Union College Annual.

I.C.C.	The International Critical Commentary, edited by S.R. Driver, A Plummer and A.C. Briggs.
Israel	J. Pedersen, Israel; its Life and Culture, vols. i-ii, 1926, iii-iv, 1940.
J.A.O.S.	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J.B.L.	Journal of Biblical Literature.
J.P.O.S.	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.
J.R.	Journal of Religion.
J.Y.N.F.	N.H. Snaith, Jewish New Year Festival; its Origins and Development, 1947.
Kleine Schriften	A. Alt, Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vols. i and ii, München, 1953.
L.O.T.	S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of The Old Testament, 8th edition, 1909.
O.I.C.	Oriental Institute(Chicago) Communications.
O.T.J.C.	W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 2nd edition, 1892.
P.E.F.Q.S.	Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.
P.E.Q.	Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
P.S.B.A.	Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology.
R.B.	Revue biblique.
R.O.S.	W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, 2nd edition, 1907.

R.S.V.	Revised Standard Version.
S.J.T.	Scottish Journal Theology
Z.A.W.	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

Chapter One

1. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.96-101,132; F.S.A.C., pp.120-122, 196,219; A.P., pp.206-207

2. Max Weber, Das Antik Judentum, 1920, E. Tr., Ancient Judaism, Illinois, 1952, p.37f. Weber says that camel breeding is a necessary qualification for Bedouin status. Mr. J.S. Trimingham has told me that there are groups in the Sudan to-day who are certainly Bedouin, but who are too poor to possess camels. Weber's definition, accordingly, will not do, but his remarks on the difference between Bedouin and semi-nomadic stock-breeders are not affected.

3. A.P., pp.205-206, where Albright notes that the traditional stories of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis picture them as semi-nomads dividing their time between the care of flocks and herds,and agriculture. He compares them with the semi-nomadic Arabs('Arab) of recent times in Palestine, and sees the principal difference in the fact that modern Arabs(who are half-way between the true Bedouin and the settled fellahin) used to camp in the Negeb, the Coastal Plain, Esdraelon, the Jordan valley, the eastern desert of Judah and the wilder parts of Galilee, whereas the Hebrew patriarchs are depicted as roaming through the hills of central and southern Palestine, and as, only occasionally, moving down into the Negeb.

4. H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, London, 1950, (Schweich Lectures, 1948), where the problems of the Israelite settlement

in Canaan are treated exhaustively. Rowley suggests(p.109f.)
that there was a thrust from the south in the Amarna Age, made
probably from Kadesh-Barnea, and that the first notable victory
was at Hormah. He believes that this attack was carried out by
Judah and Simeon together with certain non-Israelite elements,
including Kenites and Kalebites. With this attack he also
associates Levi and Reuben, the latter having crossed to the
east of the Jordan at a later date. Rowley connects the Amarna
Age with the Age of Jacob, and suggests that the incident
recorded in Genesis 34 involving Simeon and Levi took place at
the time of the advance northwards, when these two tribes had
pressed on ahead of Judah. Having taken Shechem by an act of
treachery they brought down on themselves a curse, and were
condemned to be scattered in Israel.(Genesis 49:5-7). Rowley
believes the antiquity of the tradition in Genesis 34 to be
guaranteed by the fact that it is presupposed in Genesis 49:5-7
which itself must antedate the assumption of priestly status by
the Levites, and so goes back to a time earlier than the age of
Moses' grandson, when the Levites had already assumed a
functional character.(Judges 17:7-13; 18:30, reading מֹשֶׁה
for מְנַשֶּׁה with some of the Versions.)

According to Rowley's view there was, simultaneously with
this thrust from the south, activity in the north, where the

northern tribes were fighting to win homes for themselves, and where conditions similar to those in the south prevailed. Rowley holds that Zebulon and Asher were already settled in the north of the land in the fourteenth century B.C., and that the tribe of Dan was settled in the Vale of Sorek from which it was afterwards displaced by the Philistines. Rowley makes reference to Judges 5:17, "Why did Dan sojourn in ships." He thinks it improbable that this refers to the northern residence of Dan, and suggests the emendation of $\eta i'' \jmath \chi$ to $\eta i' \chi \hbar$, contending that this would be an appropriate description of the district occupied by southern Dan. He notes that, even if the reference could be shown to be to southern Dan, there is still the possibility that a migration of part of Dan to Laish may have previously taken place. Judges 5:17 would then refer to the part of the tribe which had not migrated. In any case Rowley believes that the relation of the migration of the Danites to the Philistine immigration is a more important question, and he suggests the middle of the twelfth century as a probable date for this. The dislodgement of southern Dan would thus be caused by Philistine pressure, whether direct or indirect. (pp.81-85)

Finally there is the entry of the Exodus tribes under Joshua which Rowley would date c.1230 B.C. These tribes, who had gone down into Egypt, were a constituent part of the immigrants who had entered Canaan in the Amarna Age, and the separate history

of a century and a quarter imposed by the descent into Egypt had
not obliterated their consciousness that they were of a common
stock with the tribes who had remained in Canaan. The question
then arises how the Levites could have been associated with two
separate waves of immigration; with the incursion into Canaan
from the south in the Amarna Age, and with the entry of the
Joseph tribes under Joshua. Rowley offers an explanation of this
by suggesting that, after the Shechem incident (Genesis 34), the
tribes of Simeon and Levi suffered dispersion in agreement with
the curse of Genesis 49:5-7; some elements of the tribe of Levi
fell back on Judah in the south, while others became associated
with the Joseph tribes and so went down into Egypt. Hence the
presence of the Levite Moses in Egypt.

Rowley has noted(p.140) that there is substantial agreement
that the Joseph tribes and Judah respectively entered into
possession of their territory at different periods. He observes
that agreement does not proceed beyond this point. A detailed
examination of these differences is not called for here, for there
is sufficient accord as to the general pattern of the settlement
to sustain the general contention that the tribes who came
together to form the Israelite confederacy had differences of
background in experience and way of life, while yet retaining
their awareness of a community of kin.

5, A.R.I., p.101, F.S.A.C., p.196. Albright contends that the

list of forty two stations which the Israelites are said to have
visited during their desert wanderings, however artificial it
may be, illustrates the kind of country to which they were
confined. He says: "This is still the land of disoriented groups
and individual fugitives, where organised semi-nomadic tribes
alternate with the flotsam and jetsam of sedentary society, with
runaway slaves, bandits and their descendants, like the
Ghawarneh and Budul of to-day."(A.R.I.p.101). cf. Judges 11:3
where Jephthah is said to have dwelt in the land of Tob and
gathered around him worthless fellows(אֲנָשִׁים רֵיקִים) with whom he
went raiding.

6. Max Weber, op. cit., p.45.

6a. See note 5 above.

7. R.A. Nicholson, A Literary History of the Arabs, Cambridge,
1930, p.72, 82f.

8. W.R. Smith, R.O.S., pp.32-33, 50-54.

9. Carl Brockelmann, History of the Islamic Peoples, E. Tr.,
London, 1949, pp.4-6; also P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs,
London, 1937, pp.23-29.

10. J. Pedersen, Israel 1-11, pp.46-60.

11. Pedersen, op. cit., p.56, notes that ʿam in Arabic stands for
the family of the father and its members, and that ʿamīt (kinsman),
which is a cognate of ʿam, is used in Leviticus 19:16-18 as a
synonym of ʾaḥ and rēaʿ.

12. כְלֹת ! for כְּרִית ! in v.16 is itself doubtful. R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, 4th. ed., emends the Massoretic text on the basis of the Greek. In vv.14-15 he twice emends the negative לֹא to לֹא and once to אִם .(why he does not emend to לֹא in the third case also is not clear). In addition in v.14 he transfers the silluk from after אָמֹת to after יהוה , and in v.16 he emends כְלֹת ! to כָּרֵת ! on the basis of the Greek ἐ ξαρθῆναι.(With the deletion of silluk after כָּרֵת ! ?). The passage then reads: "And if I am yet alive, and if thou dost deal to me the covenant love of Yahweh.....(with a suppressed apodosis). And if I die do not cut off thy covenant from my house for ever; and when Yahweh cuts off the enemies of David to a man from the face of the earth, let not the name of Jonathan be cut off from the house of David." See R.O.S., pp.272-273; also Appendix 3.

13. Exodus 20;22 - 23-33; cf. Israel 1-11, pp.378-392.

14. O.T.J.C., pp.340-341.

15. Exodus 21:12; this is true also of the Deuteronomic Code where(19:12) the man who commits premeditated murder is to be handed over by the elders to the avenger of blood(gōʾēl haddām) that he may die. See S.R. Driver, I.C.C., Deuteronomy, 3rd. ed., Edinburgh, 1902, pp.232-234. Driver(p.234) notes that the avenger of blood figures in many primitive or semi-primitive societies. He observes that in a society of this kind a murderer has to fear not public prosecution but the personal vengeance of the

relatives of the dead man. The gō>ēl and not the state executes
justice on the murderer. cf. Numbers 35:19-25, 2 Samuel 14:7-11.

Also Deuteronomy 21:1-9 has to do with the expiation of
blood spilt and unavenged, and moves in the circle of old
kinship ideas. The elders of the town nearest to the slain man
at once absolve themselves of blood guilt, while ritual provision
is made for expiation,that innocent blood may not cry out. On
this latter passage S.R. Driver, op. cit., p.241 reproduces an
interesting ms. note of W.R. Smith: "In the Kitāb >Al >Aghānī, ix,
178, 1.25f., the responsibility for a homicide is thrown on the
nearest homestead(dār). This is part of the arrangement made by
ʿAmr b. Hind as arbiter between the two tribes to prevent the
recrudescence of war between the Bakr and the Taghlib. Doubtless
in the Hebrew Law the original object was to prevent blood feud."
See also Kinship, p.263, where it is noted that when a man was
found slain the people of the place had to swear that they were
not the murderers.

16. O.T.J.C., p.340.

17. S.R. Driver, L.O.T., p.36; also I.C.C., Deuteronomy, note on
19:12, p.234.

18. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp.378-406; W.F. Albright,
F.S.A.C., p.204. For a discussion of the principles underlying
the Assyrian Laws and comparisons with the principles of the

Hebrew laws see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, The Assyrian Laws, Oxford, 1935, pp.264f.; also the statement by A. Alt that the mišpāṭīm in the Covenant Code represent not a local or provincial jurisprudence, but the common legal tradition of all Western Asia in the second millenium before Christ.(Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, 1934;collected in Kleine Schriften, vol. i, see especially pp.297-299).

19. O.T.J.C., p.341.

20. See Chapter 3.

21. J.P.O.S., iv, 1924, pp.169-170.

22. J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna Tafeln, vols. i-ii, 1908-1915, No.147.

23. J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.106-108.

24. J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.103-105.

25. So Dhorme, R.B., N.S., 1909, p.73.

26. Exodus 21:2,5,26,27; Leviticus 19:20; Deuteronomy 15:12,13,18; 1 Samuel 17:25; Isaiah 58:6; Jeremiah 34:9,10,11,14,16; Job 3:19, 39:5; Psalm 86:6(apparently a crrp.).

27. G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, vol. i, 1907, p.345. Smith holds that the reference of ḥopšī in 1 Samuel 17:25 is to freedom from a family tax. cf. H.P. Smith, I.C.C., Samuel, loc. cit., ḥopšī means freedom from exactions of service(corvée) or property.

28. J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.106-108.

29. Pedersen had observed in a footnote(J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, p.104) that this usage of ḫubšu occurs in Assyrian texts, but had suggested as the explanation a deterioration in meaning in this field.

30. As to the etymology of ḫubšu, Albright would derive it from habâšu, ḫubbušu, 'to bind', corresponding with the Arabic ḫabasa, 'to seize', or 'to capture', Aramaic h^{e}baš(with the same meaning as the Arabic), and Hebrew ḥābaš, 'bind'. Albright notes that the Arabic equivalent has generally been regarded as ḥabasa, 'imprison', but he thinks that this is a loan word from Aramaic h^{e}baš, 'imprison'. In J.P.O.S., xiv, 1934, p.131, n.162, Albright offers a fresh etymology for ḫubšu and now proposes to derive it from Arabic ḫbt, Ugaritic ḫpt, 'to be base or vile'. Similarly in F.S.A.C., p.330, n.13. With this Mendelsohn, B.A.S.O.R., 83, p.37 concurs.

31. So also F.S.A.C., p.217.

32. B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, pp.36-39.

33. pp.14-15 above.

34. B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, p.39.

35. This statement needs further justification and elaboration. The cases directly envisaged in the sixteen Old Testament occurrences are those of released slaves, and, at the time of release, these were doubtless landless freemen. But the question

then is whether hopš̄i has this specialised meaning or whether it is a more general word, equally capable of being applied to a landless freeman or a freeholder. Mendelsohn harnesses comparative material to support his view that hopš̄i has a specialised meaning, most nearly approximating to that of the Roman 'colonus', in the Israelite as in other fields. We shall argue below(Chapter 5) that there is sufficient Old Testament material to make probable the conclusion that the traditional Israelite conception of a freeman was that of a freeholder, not a tenant farmer or a day labourer.

36. See Chapter 5.

37. F.S.A.C., p.217.

38. A.P.B., pp.101-102; also C. McCown, Tell-en-Naṣbeh, Berkeley, 1947, p.202, where mention is made of a thin inner wall belonging to a very early period of Israelite occupation of central Palestine, perhaps the eleventh century; cf. A. Barrois, Manuèl D'Archéologie Biblique, vol.i, p.267, 295.

39. A.P.B., p.102.

40. A.P., p.119.

Chapter Two

1. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.102, notes that the "stereotyped filiation" characteristic of Israelite tribal organisation of subsequent centuries, where all the tribes are neatly divided into clans each with its patriarchal sub-divisions, is of later origin. Albright holds that this schematism must be subsequent to the settlement, "when the whole of Israel had been systematically grouped under twelve tribes and had been assigned to clans within the tribes, each descended from its putative founder according to very ancient north-west Semitic patriarchal formulas." Albright adds: "This tendency is well illustrated by the fact that Canaanite cities such as Shechem, Hepher, Tirzah and Zaphon were absorbed into the tribal system by the time of David, each becoming a 'clan' or a 'sub-clan' in the genealogical lists." Albright is of the opinion that the framework of the twelve tribes antedates the conquest, but that the variations in the individual lists prove that the individual names were never as important as the framework.

In J.P.O.S., v, 1925, p.19, Albright contends that the tribal divisions in Joshua 15 - 19 are a compilation of JE of the seventh century B.C., and that P's additions are slight and unimportant. He says: "The compiler did his best to reconstruct the pre-Davidic map of Israel." Albright holds that the tribal divisions were probably valid down to the time of David. In A.R.I., p.124,

Albright indicates his agreement with Alt and Noth(A. Alt,
Sellin Festschrift, pp.13-24; M. Noth, Josua, pp.xif.) that the
description in Joshua 15 - 19 reflects the tribal boundaries at
the end of the pre-monarchic period, towards the end of the
eleventh century. This, he points out, is not incompatible with
the assigning of a date within the reign of David to the passage.
More particularly Albright connects the fixing of tribal bound-
aries, as undertaken in Joshua 15 - 19, with the census
contemplated by David. The purpose of the census was to fix the
correct tribal boundaries and determine the population within
these boundaries. The 'correct boundaries' were those accepted
as valid during the previous two or three generations, i.e. at
the very beginning of the monarchy. Hence Albright also connects
with the Davidic census the two parallel lists of the population
of each tribe preserved in Numbers 1 and 26. These lists,
according to Albright, have been disassociated through misunder-
standing or accident from their connection with the history of
David, and have been erroneously referred to the numbers of the
tribes in Moses' time. Albright believes that the two lists are
garbled forms of a common original, and that the numerous
transpositions can only be explained on the assumption that the
original census list was handed down in tabular form for a long
period of time. See especially J.P.O.S., v, 1925, pp.20-25 and

A.R.I., p.123. The Joshua passage then fixes the tribal boundaries, while the lists in Numbers deal with the population within these boundaries, and these two kinds of information, Albright contends, are just what anyone contemplating a census would require.

2. We reserve our analysis of the basis and nature of the Israelite confederacy for Chapter 3.

3. F.S.A.C., p.215.

4. With regard to the question whether the reference is to northern or southern Dan, see Chapter 1, n.4.

5. See A. Alt, Z.A.W., 1941, pp.244-247(Kleine Schriften, vol.ii, pp.274-277).

6. From Joseph to Joshua, p.5, n.3.

7. History of Israel, vol.i, Oxford, 1932, pp.169f.

8. Also N.H. Snaith, J.Y.N.F., p.49, n.78: "This amalgamation of mixed Arab-Edomite tribes with a Hebrew nucleus was the tribe of Judah." The 'Judah' which, in Snaith's view, is politically significant is not the Hebrew nucleus but the amalgam of Israelite and non-Israelite elements, and so he says: "It is nearer the truth to say that Judah was of David than to say that David was of Judah."

9. Judges 1:27, Joshua 17:12. These verses cannot be reconciled with Judges 1:28 and Joshua 17:13, but there seems little doubt that we are to conclude that the Israelites could not displace the Canaanites in these parts. Joshua 17:11 would appear to refer to the

territory constituting the ideal allotment of Manasseh, while v.12 notes that the tribe had not been able to enter into its heritage. cf. H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, p.103.

10. Alan Rowe, Bethshan, Topography and History, 1930, p.41, n.72: "We know that Bethshan retained its Canaanite population for some time after the Israelite occupation of Palestine." Rowe(pp.38-42) notes that Bethshan was a Philistine fortress around 1200 B.C., when Saul was defeated at Mt. Gilboa and his body exposed on the walls of Bethshan(1 Samuel 31:10, 1 Chronicles 10:10). Rowe is of the opinion that the date for David's capture of the city from the Philistines should be placed somewhere around 1000 B.C. cf. Albright, A.P., p.113: "By the end of the thirteenth century they(the Israelites) were probably in the process of settling down throughout the hill country on both sides of Jordan. However they were not able to break through the Canaanite chariotry in order to storm the strongly fortified towns in the plains and the river valleys; we know from the excavations at Megiddo and Bethshan that these towns resisted the Israelites for generations." With regard to the archeological evidence from Megiddo, see R.S. Lamon and G.M. Shipton, Megiddo 1, Chicago, 1937, p.7. It is observed from the stratigraphic evidence that stratum V1 came to a sudden end. This is thought to have been due to an earthquake which was followed by a fierce

conflagration. In stratum V "distinctly new and different
attributes were predominant." Lamon and Shipton believe that, after
the destruction of Vl, there was a period — possibly a short one —
of inoccupation, and thereafter Megiddo was resettled by a people
of entirely new ideas, sometime during the middle of the eleventh
century. They note that the pottery from stratum V is closely
parallel to that of Gibeah 1 which was also characterised by
irregular hand burnishing applied over a red slip or on the
original surface of the vessel. They observe that Gibeah II is
dated in the last part of the eleventh century and is attributed
to Saul. Also R.M. Engberg, B.A.S.O.R., 78, 1940, pp.6-7. Engberg
holds that, in all probability, Megiddo and Tanaach were occupied
by the Israelites after the defeat of Sisera. He says: "To the
writer there seems every reason to believe that the Israelites
occupied Tanaach and Megiddo after Barak's victory, unless we
regard the Song of Deborah as a grossly exaggerated account of a
trivial incident." Engberg proposes to place the action com-
memorated in the song between Megiddo Vl and V, probably before
1050 B.C., rather than between Vll and Vl(which had been Albright's
view), because from V onwards there was in Megiddo a steady
exhibition of Israelite characteristics, as known from Israelite
contexts throughout Palestine. From Vl backwards, on the other
hand, there was a continuous Canaanite flavour going back far

into the second millenium. Engberg mentions the possibility that
the sweeping changes seen in Megiddo V may have been due to the
arrival of the Philistines and not the Israelites, but he
discounts this, because of the Israelite character of the materials
found in the city. Albright, B.A.S.O.R., 78, 1940, pp.8-9,
indicated that he was inclined to fall into line with Engberg.
Previously Albright had maintained that it was unnecessary to
assume that Megiddo V1 was occupied by the Israelites after
Sisera's defeat, since there was nothing in Israelite tradition
to demand it.

A. Alt, Megiddo im Übergang vom Kanaanäischen zum
Israelitischen Zeitalter, Z.A.W., 1944, pp.37-85(Kleine Schriften,
vol. i, pp.256-273) takes a different line. He holds that
Megiddo was not occupied by the Israelites until the time of
David, and that, during the period of Philistine hegemony, their
sway must have extended over the Megiddo area. The culture of
Megiddo V is, in Alt's view, Canaanite, since, although the
Philistines were dominant in the Megiddo area, they did not
actually occupy Megiddo. See especially Alt's remarks on p.271:
"eine schöpferische Erneurung aus eigener Kraft war dem
Kanaanäertum, auch unter philistäischer Führung, offenbar nicht
mehr möglich." If Megiddo were not occupied by Israelites before
the time of David, it would be in the same case as Bethshan.

11. Judges 17:16. This deficiency in armament, it has been
remarked, would not disadvantage the Israelites while fighting
was confined to the hill country, but it would seriously
disqualify them when they sought to extend their conquests to
Canaanite fortresses situated on more even terrain. Albright
(F.S.A.C., pp.153-154) has filled in the historical background
in relation to the appearance of horse-drawn chariots in Canaan.
In northern Mesopotamia around 1500 B.C. there was a powerful
kingdom called Mitanni which ruled the north from the Meditt-
eranean to the Zagros. This kingdom was Indo-Iranian, the royal
gods were well-known Vedic dieties, and the national sport was
chariot racing in connection with which Indo-Iranian technical
terms were used. There was an aristocracy of charioteers called
by the Vedic name 'marya(nni)', literally, 'youth', 'young
warrior(s)' The eighteenth century saw a great irruption from
the north-east into the Fertile Crescent, and Albright thinks it
probable that this was a part of the general movement which
brought the Indo-Iranians into India and Iran. Horse-drawn
chariots were used by the invaders in battle. Albright continues:
"The Cossaeans were forced from their mountains into Babylonia;
the Hurrians were pushed considerably further south in Mesopotamia
and inundated Syria; a congeries of non-Semitic peoples of
varied origins flooded Palestine. A. Hrdlicka has determined that

the dominant racial type at Megiddo also shifted about this time from long-headed Mediterranean to broad-headed people of Alpine affiliation.(P.L.O. Guy and R.M. Engberg, Megiddo Tombs, Chicago, 1938, p.192). Since many, perhaps most, of the invaders had already been exposed to Syro-Mesopotamian culture, there was no appreciable decline of material civilisation. On the contrary the northern invaders built new towns and castles everywhere, raising the density of the population in Palestine considerably. There was also a great improvement in the art of fortification." See also Albright, J.P.O.S., xv, pp.223f.

12. We have the same appearance of contradiction in the biblical notices here as we have already noticed in the case of the Canaanite cities in the Vale of Esdraelon. Judges 1:8 says that the tribe of Judah smote Jerusalem with the edge of the sword and set fire to it, while Judges 1:21 states that the tribe of Benjamin failed to capture it, and the Jebusites continued in possession of the city. Judges 19:11f. represents it as still foreign territory in the hands of the Jebusites which it evidently was until its capture by David, recorded in 2 Samuel 5:6f. cf. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, p.103.

13. Judges 1:19.

14. See n.2 above.

15. Judges 6-8; according to Albright, A.R.I., p.132, F.S.A.C, p.120, the incursion of the Midianites into Palestine in the

early eleventh century is the first known raid of camel nomads.

16. Judges 11- 12:7.

17. Albright would assign to the time of David the allocation of cities of refuge, and would relate their institution to the need for such asylums at that time, when private, clan and tribal vendettas persisted as a legacy from the age of the Judges. Albright discerns in the institution of these cities the workings of the sagacious statesmanship of David who, in the interests of stable monarchy, devised this plan for the suppression of blood feuds(A.R.I., p.124). Albright remarks: "But the selection of six Levitic towns which were so admirably suited for the purpose and so convenient of access demands a statesman as well as an administrative plan." Albright's contention is that the list of priestly and Levitic cities(Joshua 21 = 1 Chronicles 6:54f.) is intimately bound up with the list of cities of refuge. He argues that the selecting of six Levitic cities as asylums, along with the associated plan for forty eight Levitic cities should be attributed to the sagacity of David. For the details of the argument that the Levitic cities must have been founded in the reign of David see A.R.I., pp.121-125. Albright observes that Lohr, Asylwesen im Alten Testament, 1930, has arrived at similar conclusions. The contention which concerns us particularly is that the cities of refuge were established in the reign of David

in the interests of stable monarchy, and in order to counter the
waste of blood feuds in a society where the habits of tribalism
were still alive. This, however, as we have observed, is bound
up with the other claim that the institution of the Levitic
cities should be assigned to the reign of David. M.Noth, Josua,
1938, p.10f., assigns a post- Deuteronomic date to the list of
Levitic cities in Joshua 21.

18. Judges 13- 16.

19. See also N.H. Snaith, J.Y.N.F., p.77, n.29.

20. See p.47 below.

21. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.138, notes that official, retainers
and mercenaries who entered the royal service became juridically
slaves(ᶜabādīm) of the king. He adds: "Down to the end of the
Israelite state the term 'slave'(ᶜebed) which had been inherited
from the Accadians of the third millenium, and was employed by
Edomites and Ammonites as well as by Israelites, continued in
regular use as the class designation of royal officials." Also
J.B.L., vol. li, 1932, pp.77-106. Yet Albright maintains that
David made no attempt to establish a centralised state,(F.S.A.C.,
p.222) and that the rebellion of Absalom was a"palace revolt". In
A.R.I., p.120, however, Albright says that the officialdom of
David was organised on the Egyptian model, and this would appear
to be an admission of some measure of centralised control.

22. There are indications of the popular beginnings of David's reign. In 1 Samuel 18:16 it is said that all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went in and out among them. cf. 1 Kings 3:7 where Solomon confesses that he does not know how to go out or come in. David by way of his background and previous experience understood the ways of the populace and could mix with them naturally, while Solomon, having the sheltered and privileged upbringing of a prince, had little knowledge or understanding of the life of the common people. In 1 Samuel 18:18 David questions whether his antecedents warrant his aspiring to the rank of Saul's son-in-law. After his accession to the throne of Israel, David is reproached by Michal for behaviour which smacks of plebian enthusiasm on the occasion of the home-coming of the Ark. Michal feels that he has demeaned himself and has cheapened his royal status. She speaks as the daughter of a king. In 2 Samuel David is represented as doing the very thing with whose neglect Absalom subsequently charged him; he is said to have administered mišpāṭ and ṣ^edākah to all his people. Absalom's allegation is that David is no longer a king of this kind, with his fingers on the pulse of the nation, and with a ready and sympathetic ear for the grievances of the populace. He is now careless of his people and leaves them to the mercy of royal officials.

23. For a discussion on 'ṣābā' see pp.85-90.

24. On this see Snaith's remarks(n.8 above), and also pp.52-53.

25. A.R.I., pp.140-141.

26. Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina, 1930;(Kleine Schriften, vol.ii, p.44f.)

27. A.R.I., p.141.

28. J.P.O.S., v, 1925, pp.25-38, where Albright discusses the list in detail and gives an account of the geographical extent of the administrative districts.

29. J.Y.N.F., p.49, n.78.

30. We do not overlook the fact that Shiloh was destroyed around 1500 B.C. We use the phrase "prophet of Shiloh" or "priest of Shiloh" advisedly in order to call attention to the fact that the interests formerly focussed on Shiloh, which was the central amphictyonic shrine, are still alive in the person of Ahijah. Albright(A.R.I., p.138) makes the penetrating observation: "During the united monarchy Jerusalem was thus the symbol of the superiority of the crown to the old tribal amphictyony." Ahijah seems to have felt that this was so. The political dominance of Jerusalem had brought about the elevation of its shrine to prime place, and Ahijah must have calculated that the restoration of the central sanctuary in the north, with something of the political significance and prestige of the old amphictyonic sanctuary at Shiloh, could only take place after the liberation

of the northern tribes from the fetters of the Jerusalem regime.
30a. The resemblance between the words of Sheba in 2 Samuel 20:1
and those of Israel in 1 Kings 12:16 supports the view that the
second rebellion was a continuation of the cause which Sheba had
espoused. The first passage reads: "we have no portion in David
and we have no inheritance in the son of Jesse; every man to his
tents, O Israel!" And the second passage: "What portion have we
in David? We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse. To your
tents, O Israel! Look now to your own house, David." As Benjamin
was associated with the first unsuccessful movement against the
Jerusalem regime, so we would expect her to have been numbered
with those who sought to bring the cause to final victory.

31. 1 Kings 11:22 - 12:20.

32. Die StaatenBildung(Kleine Schriften, vol.ii, pp.1-65)

33. A.R.I., p.138

34. F.S.A.C., p.222

35. 2 Samuel 24:1-25(1 Chronicles 21:1-27)

36. So Albright, A.R.I., p.123.

37. See above n.1.

38. A.R.I., p.140.

39. A.R.I., p.140.

Chapter Three

1. M. Noth, Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels, 1930.

2. op. cit., pp.39-60. Rowley observes(From Joseph to Joshua, p.126, n.1): "The thought of an Israelite amphictyony after the pattern of a Greek amphictyony is already found in Sayce, P.S.B.A., xi, 1888-1889, p.347."

3. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.102-103.

4. op. cit., p.65.

5. op. cit., p.89f.

6. G.A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, 1946, p.46, says: "Shechem, which was originally Joseph's sanctuary, came to be the amphictyonic centre of Israel during the time of Joshua, if not before." Also, G.E. Wright, The Old Testament Against Its Environment, 1950, p.62; E. Nielson, Oral Tradition, 1954, pp.56-57. Meek, on the other hand, thinks that Shechem was the amphictyonic centre only of the Joseph tribes. (Hebrew Origins, 1936, pp.25f.) Similarly Snaith, J.Y.N.F., p.49, n.78: "The true centre of the northern tribes was Shechem..... What Hebron was to the south, Shechem was to the north." Möhlenbrink, Z.A.W., N.F., xv, 1938, pp.250f, holds that the fixing of the amphictyonic centre in Shechem is secondary. He

suggests that the seat of the original amphictyony was Gilgal,

and that this was replaced by an amphictyony of twelve tribes

based on Shiloh, to which more credence should be attached than

to a Shechem amphictyony which could hardly have antedated the

Abimelech incident.

7. A.R.I., pp.103-104; also A.P.B., p.162, where Albright

asserts that "according to the uniform biblical tradition" the

central sanctuary of Israel was first at Shiloh, and that Shechem

and Nob-Gibeon were later amphictyonic centres.

8. Hans Kjaer, J.P.O.S., x, 1930, pp.87-174. The result of the

excavations at Shiloh, according to Kjaer(p.109), is a "full

corroboration of the tradition of the Old Testament." The

destruction of the town by fire around 1050 B.C. is archeolog-

ically attested, and its desertion for centuries afterwards is

thought by Kjaer to be a strong confirmation of the well-known

passage in Jeremiah(41:5). Kjaer sums up: "We have caught a

glimpse of the town Shiloh destroyed by the Philistines around

1050 B.C. and thus we see a reason why the ark of the Covenant

did not return later to Shiloh; the town did not exist any

longer. The victory at Ebenezer could not recall the destroyed

town to life." (pp.173-174). Also in P.E.F.Q.S., 1931, pp.71-88,

where(especially p.78f.) Kjaer describes the attempts to

rediscover the sanctuary of the amphictyony. These did not

produce any definite results. Albright, A.R.I., pp.103-104, notes that the Danish excavations at Shiloh directed by Kjaer, Schmidt and Glueck have demonstrated conclusively that there was a very extensive settlement at Shiloh in the days of the collared store-jar rim, which was characteristic of all Palestine in the early eleventh century. This period of occupation terminated before the introduction of a new type of store-jar rim, characteristic of Gibeah of Saul as well as of contemporary deposits at Bethel.(Albright, B.A.S.O.R., 68, p.25, especially n.11). In several places the excavators found that the houses of this period had been destroyed by a great fire. Albright in agreement with Kjaer argues that the later removal of the ark of the Covenant to Nob and eventually to Kirjath-Jearim points to the destruction of Shiloh having taken place at the hands of the Philistines immediately after the battle of Ebenezer, or a little later, and agrees with Kjaer's date of c.1050 B.C.(rather earlier than later).

9. From Joseph to Joshua, pp.97f.

10. See pp.70-73.

11. op. cit., p.97f.

12. A. Alt, Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, 1934, (Kleine Schriften, vol.i, pp.278-332). Alt draws a distinction between two main types of Pentateuchal legislation, casuistic

law(pp.285-302), and apodeictic law(pp.302-332). The main locus of casuistic law in the Pentateuch is held to be the Book of the Covenant, and it is classed with the type of legal formulation characteristic of other law codes of the Ancient Near East. The apodeictic laws, on the other hand, are formulated categorically in contradistinction to the hypothetical form of the other class, and are held to be unique and original in Israel. The spirit of these apodeictic laws is best illustrated by the ten commandments. Also Albright, F.S.A.C., pp.204-205.

13. See Appendix 1.

14. op. cit., pp.98f.

15. See pp.98-99 ;May, J.B.L., lx, 1941, p.119, holds, on the strength of Joshua 24, that the association of Joshua with Shechem was the occasion of the adoption of Canaanite legislation as the basis for Israelite society.

16. op. cit., pp.100-106.

17. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, pp.45f. Discussing his excavation of Tell-el-Ful, identified with the biblical Gibeah, Albright argues that the pottery of the first fortress belongs to the same ceramic period as that from the second fortress, and cannot be separated from it. The first fortress was destroyed by fire and below the burnt level a few potsherds indistinguishable from Bronze Age sherds were found. Not a single , clear

Bronze Age sherd, however, appeared on the level of Gibeah $\bar{\text{I}}$ (the first fortress), and it is thus impossible to regard it as belonging to a pre-Israelite stage of culture. Albright consequently ascribes Gibeah $\bar{\text{I}}$ to the period of the Judges; it was built towards the end of the thirteenth century B.C. and burned near the end of the twelfth. Albright considers that the fixing of the destruction of Gibeah $\bar{\text{I}}$ between 1130 and 1120 is an important confirmation of Judges 19 - 20, and that, in the light of it, more credence should be attached to the confederacy of tribes alleged to have acted against Gibeah. Also A.P.B., pp.47-48; J.P.O.S., i, 1921, p.55; B.A.S.O.R., 62, pp.26f., B.A.S.O.R., 78, p.8f.

18. op. cit., pp.107-108.

19. op. cit., pp.110-111.

20. Judah and Simeon; see p.52.

21. pp.8-9 above.

22. op. cit., p.113f.

23. In 1 Samuel 20:6 David pleads the excuse of a 'yearly sacrifice' (zebah hayyāmīm) at Bethlehem for all his family (mišpāhah). It might be argued that, since this sacrificial feast is exclusively the business of the mišpāhah , it is evidence for the existence of a sib cult. So M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, p.139 . Weber says of this festival that it is one

concerning which "Yahweh's cult orders knew nothing." See,
however, Snaith, J.Y.N.F., p.45. Snaith holds that the zebah
hayyāmīm could not have been a purely local and domestic affair,
because it would be only on account of a high feast that David
would dare to absent himself from the royal court, especially
in view of the strained relations obtaining between himself and
Saul. Snaith notes that Saul also was keeping a festival at his
court(1 Samuel 20:5), and he concludes that, in both cases, the
festival in question was the harvest festival. If it should be
objected that the evidence is against the view that both feasts
were celebrated on the same day, Snaith would reply that there
is no necessity to assume that in these early times the annual
harvest festival would be observed uniformly on the same day
throughout the country. "There was no official calendar, and
the seasons vary considerably from district to district." See
also pp.96f. of the same work.

With regard to the question of household gods, Weber asserts
(op. cit., p.139): "Every Israelite member of a fully qualified
sib originally had a shrine in his house and a house idol(accord-
ing to the stipulations covering the ceremony of hereditary
enslavement in the Book of the Covenant, Exodus 21:6, and accord-
ing to the account of David's flight from the house, 1 Samuel
19:12-17)." With respect to Exodus 21:6, it is doubtful whether

the text supports Weber's view of a reference to a household
god. Thus S.R. Driver, I.C.C., Deuteronomy, p.184, holds that
the ceremony described in Exodus 21:6 is "a public and official
one". The slave is to be brought to God, and this, according to
Driver, means "to the sanctuary at which judgement is administer-
ed." The doorpost at which the ceremony is performed is not
clearly defined by the verse, and may be either that of the
sanctuary or of the master's house. Driver has pointed out that
the ceremony, as described in Deuteronomy 15:17, is a purely
domestic one, and it would seem that, if Weber desired to base
his argument for the existence of household gods on the ceremony
of the doorpost, he would have done better to have chosen the
Deuteronomic account.

Again the account of Micah's shrine and its furniture ('ēp̄ōd̠
and t^{e}rāp̄îm in v.5 might be classified differently from pesel
and massēk̠āh in v.4, and might be thought to refer to household
gods of some kind) does not easily fit into the category of
household gods — especially if these are thought of as non-
Yahwistic cults. For Micah's mother, in making the images,
intends to consecrate the silver to Yahweh, and the point of
Micah's installing the Levite as priest would appear to be that
he regarded him as a specially qualified Yahwistic functionary.
Hence his conclusion: "Now I know that Yahweh will prosper me,

because I have a Levite as priest."(Judges 17:13) Further Weber's use of 1 Samuel 19:12-17 to support his position is contested by Albright, A.R.I., p.114, p.207, n.63; Albright asserts that archeology can give a negative answer to the traditional view that the t^{e}rāpīm of this passage refers to "an image or images of idols". Albright adds: "That the word sometimes has this sense is undeniable, but the context absolutely precludes it in this passage. No idols of comparable size have been found in Palestinian excavations, and the representations of divinity from Canaanite temples are all carved outlines on stelae; all known copper or clay plaques and figurines are much too small. Since neither the true meaning of the word 't^{e}rāpīm' nor the expression translated "pillows of goats' hair" in the A.V. is clear, there is no reason to suppose that any cult object is referred to."

There is a general statement by Albright(F.S.A.C., p.189) which might be thought to lend some weight to Noth's contention. Albright speaks of two conceptions which were current among the early Hebrews and were characteristic of their environment.

a. "A dynamistic belief in an undefined but real relationship between a family or clan and its gods."

b. "A recognition of the right of an independent man or the founder of a clan to choose his own personal god with whom he

is expected to enter into a kind of contractual relationship."
Albright goes on: "In combination these ideas must have led to
a form of tribal religion, where both the collective and the
personal aspects of diety were present, the former in tribal
acts of a religious nature and the latter in individual worship."
See G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Assyrian Laws, Oxford, 1935,
pp.77f, where it is suggested that the custom of the levirate
may have been directed towards the preservation of the ancestral
cult.

24. Der Gott der Väter, Leipzig, 1929(Kleine Schriften, vol.i,
pp.1-78).

25. P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London, 1937, pp.20-21.

26. W.F. Albright, A.P., p.119: "The archeologist with no
knowledge of biblical tradition would have to acknowledge
some binding and driving force in Israel which differentiated it
from ordinary invaders, like the tribes which overran Trans-
Jordan periodically and lived there in tents for centuries
without settling down." Also F.S.A.C., p.212: "The Israelites
were thus far from being characteristic nomads or even semi-
nomads, but had reached a stage where they were ready to settle
down, tilling the soil and dwelling in stone houses." Similarly
A.R.I., p.102. See also A.R.I., p.99, where Albright makes it
clear that "the binding and driving force" which he has in mind

is Yahweh.

27. See pp.98-99.

28. See Chapter 1, n.18.

29. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., pp.215-216.

30. See n.17 above.

31. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.99: "Their(Israel's) remarkable history and their religious zeal were undoubtedly the principal cohesive forces in their organisation. Under no circumstances must we underestimate the power of the religious factor."

32. J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, E.Tr., J.S. Black and Allan Menzies, 1885, p.218. See also Appendix 3.

33. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, p.410: "Towards the judge both parties stand in the relation of applicants for help, as the two women stand towards Solomon(1 Kings 3:16-28). They both deliver themselves into his power, he "lays his hand upon them both."(Job 9:33). When he has spoken, it means that he unites his will with the person to whom he adjudges the right. The opponent offends him by not respecting his judgement. It is a good thing to have the judgement of a powerful man on one's side."

34. A. Guillaume, Islam, 1954, p.92: "Law follows custom either by canonizing it or correcting and regulating it. Consequently we must look for its genesis and evolution in the principal

cities and centres of administration. The first four caliphs
carried on and adapted the practice of their master, but already
social and administrative problems for which there was no pre-
cedent confronted them, and they had to issue directives. To
some extent they were guided by the sunna, the old way of life
which they had inherited from their forefathers, and subsequent-
ly their decisions became part of the sunna of their successors;
and, later still, the practice of the Ummayad government was
also regarded as the sunna. Last of all, as we shall see later,
traditions were invented to show that everything that a Muslim
was required to believe and do was founded on traditions
purporting to prove that Muḥammad by example or precept had so
ruled. The sunna was first ancient custom, then contemporary,
immediate past practice, and finally the ideal behaviour of the
Prophet as enshrined in tradition." The persistence of the
term 'sunna' in changing contexts with the developing Muslim
society and its basis in ancient custom is well described by
Guillaume.

35. Israel, 1-11, p.37.

36. Israel, 111-1V, pp.103-104; A. Haldar, Associations of
Cult Prophets among The Ancient Semites, Uppsala, 1945, holds
that in Exodus 18:12 Moses is portrayed as the founder of a
cult described on "royal ideological lines". That is, he would

subsume Moses under the Sumero-Accadian type of sacral king
who is both leader of the ecstatic rites and of the rites
through which tōrōt are imparted. Haldar supports this view
by taking into account an associated passage, Numbers 11:16f.
Of this latter passage he says(p.141): "Here the role of Moses
as leader of the corporation is clearly indicated. Perhaps the
main interest lies in the schematic notion of the way that
ecstasy spreads from the leader to the others. Yahweh himself
takes the 'spirit' which is upon the leader and distributes it
over the corporation. Thus the spiritual influence which
emanates from the leader and the collective nature of the
rite are symbolised." The impression which is gained from
Haldar's work is that he is determined at all costs to fit
Old Testament material into Sumero-Accadian cultic patterns,
and to interpret Israelite history and religion by ascribing
pre-eminence to such cultic motives. See Appendix 2.

37. J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.106-108.

38. B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, p.39. In agreement with the general
principles of his approach Haldar(op. cit., p.154) takes
'mišpāt' to be primarily a decision imparted through the giving
of the oracle. He says(p.155): "Priests and probably prophets
as well decided legal disputes and this was, of course, done
by employing the usual divinatory methods." Haldar, however,

concedes that it is probable that, at an early stage, a legal
tradition arose which was transmitted by the "cult associations."
While it is true that legal decisions were imparted by oracular
devices, it is also evident that there was another and more
normal sphere of justice, where decisions were based on law
and were given in accordance with established custom, approp-
riated Canaanite law, and in terms of previous decisions
arrived at by the application of these legal bases. This last
aspect of precedent or case law would, it seems to us, be of
considerable practical significance. We are at variance with
Haldar, because we think it is to this background and not to
the cultic one that 'mišpaṭ' should be primarily referred. We
have already remarked that the mišpaṭīm of the Book of the
Covenant are appropriated Canaanite laws, and are representative
of the formulations which were common to Western Asia. There
is little connection between these mišpaṭīm and the manipulation
of the oracle. To the modern mind, at anyrate,(although
probably not to the Israelite mentality) the notions of
judgement by oracle and judgement by law seem to be unrelated
and unrelatable. If both co-exist(as was probably the case with
the Israelites), they do so, as far as we can see, as two
qualitatively disparate conceptions of justice which cannot be
brought into any reasonable relationship to each other. We

might say that the oracle was used to determine under which
law a particular case should be subsumed, where alternatives
could not otherwise be sorted out; or that resort was had to
the oracle only in cases of special difficulty.

39. Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts(Kleine Schriften,
pp.300f.); also M. Noth, Die Gesetze im Pentateuch, 1940, p.48;
also W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.217.

40. Judges 10:1-5; 12:7-15. See E. Nielson, Oral Tradition,
1954, p.48.

41. Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels, p.98.

42. G. Von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel, Zurich,
1951. Prof. Von Rad thinks it is possible to distinguish in
the early narratives of the Old Testament a conception of
warfare carried out in such complete dependence on Yahweh as
to deserve the designation 'Holy War'. We are not prepared to
follow Von Rad in his attempt to discover the origins of
Israel's faith in the eager waging of war at the time of the
settlement. We, nevertheless, maintain that the enterprise of
war tempered the spirit of Yahwism during the period of the
conquest.

43. A.R.I., p.116; F.S.A.C., pp.196-207.

44. J. Wellhausen, Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah,
3rd. Ed., London, 1891, p.16. Also a paper read at the

xxiiird. International Congress of Orientalists held at Cambridge in August, 1954; D.H. Baneth, The Original Meaning of 'Islam' as a Religious Concept: a Renewal of a Mediaeval Interpretation. Baneth argued that to interpret 'Islam' as meaning total submission or resignation to Allah was to frame a concept too abstract and sophisticated for the setting in which the message was originally proclaimed. Something less theological, according to Baneth, is required, and his suggestion was that 'Islam' connoted the exclusion of 'shirk' i.e. sharing other gods with Allah. The demand contained in 'Islam' was that Allah and Allah alone should be worshipped.

45. See pp.87-91.

46. J. Wellhausen, Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah, p.11.

47. 1 Samuel 4:3f.; other references to the ark in the field with the army are 2 Samuel 11:11 and 1 Kings 2:26.

48. 1 Samuel 4 - 6; 2 Samuel 6:12.

49. See especially 1 Samuel 4:18,21.

50. 1 Samuel 3:3, 1 Samuel 4:3.

51. J. Morgenstern, H.U.C.A., v, 1928, p.81f.; H. Lammens, Le Culte des bétyles et les processions réligieuses chez les Arabes préislamiques, in Bull. Inst. Fran. Arch. Or., xvii (Cairo), 1919, pp.39-101; W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.203;

C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Literature, Rome, 1949, p.5(reference to Krt.159.).

52. op. cit., pp.95-97.

53. 1 Samuel 4:3; "Let us bring the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord here from Shiloh, that He may come among us and save us from the power of our enemies." We have taken w^{e}ya$\bar{b}$o' to refer to Yahweh; the A.V. refers it to 'ar$\bar{o}$n and translates: "Let us fetch the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us, that, when it cometh among us, it may save us from the hand of our enemies." That the Ark is charged with the Divine Presence is the presupposition of 1 Samuel 4:21-22, 1 Samuel 5 - 7, especially 6:19-20.

54. See pp.164-165 and Chapter 6, n.53.

55. See pp.3-4.

56. M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, pp.155-156. Weber's remarks are intended to apply more generally than we should wish ours to be, but his line of thought is similar to ours. He says: "In cases of combination of Yahweh with the local diety, the Baal tended to become more important in times of peace and prosperity; Yahweh in great war emergencies. This actually happened and explains the fact that, when raising an outcry against Baal, puritanical Yahweh prophets had most to contend with in times of peaceful prosperity, whereas every national war and act of

foreign oppression and threat benefited Yahweh, the old God of the Red Sea catastrophe."

57. J. Pedersen, Israel, 1-11, pp.21-22.

58. Hosea 7:14, 14:9. The textual uncertainties present in both these verses do not obscure their general purport.

59. M. Weber, op. cit., p.130.

60. M. Weber, op. cit., p.131; cf. Albright, A.R.I., pp.117-119. Weber says: "Being considered a contractual partner, this God of the covenant could be viewed in Israel neither as a mere functional diety of some process of nature or of social institutions, nor as a local diety in the manner everywhere characteristic of oriental cities. He was no mere god of the land. Rather the human community of the Israelite confederate army had to be considered as His people, joined to him through common covenant. This was in fact the classical view of the tradition. The transfer of holiness to a political territorial holding, making it a 'holy land', is but a later conception."

61. A. Barrois, Manuèl d'Archéologie biblique, vol.i, pp.90-96; G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, vol.i, 1907, p.288; A. Alt, Die Land-nahme der Israeliten in Palästina(Kleine Schriften, vol.i, pp.100-107). Alt observes(pp.114f.) the differing effects upon the city-state polity wrought by the sucession of the Philistines, on the one hand, and the Israelites on the other.

The Philistine rule arose on the soil of the city states, while the Israelite settlements were to some extent in localities outside the sphere of influence of the city states. Consequently the Philistines, in a manner, perpetuated the city-state polity, whereas eventually the Israelites were to bring about its dissolution. See especially Alt's remarks on p.115: "Daher versteht es sich, dass ihre Auseinandersetzung mit den Stadtstaaten nich auf eine Fortführung der alten politischen Lebensform durch eine neue Herrenschicht, sondern auf die volle Einverleibung und damit auf die tatsächliche Vernichtung des politischen Eigenlebens der Stadte hinauslief. Nur als kleine administrative Einheiten im grossen Reichs-gefüge bewahren dann die Stadte noch einen Rest ihres einstigen Sonderdaseins; ihre Rolle als selbständige Staats-wesen haben sie ausgespielt."

62. M. Weber, op. cit., pp.154-155; also O. Eissfeldt, Z.A.W., 1939, p.16.

63. A.R.I., pp.73-74, 116, 156-157; J.P.O.S., 1932, pp.191f., 1936, pp.17f.

64. So W.R. Smith, R.O.S., pp.35f.

Chapter Four

1. C.A. Briggs, I.C.C., Psalms, 1906-1907, loc. cit.

2. 2 Samuel 10:7 reads 'haṣṣābā᾽ haggibbōrīm'.Kittel(Biblia Hebraica, 4th ed.) suggests 'kol haṣṣābā᾽ wᵉhaggibbōrim', or, alternatively(following Gᴸ and Targum),'kol ṣᵉbā᾽ haggibbōrīm'. The first emendation would detach the appellation 'ṣābā᾽' from the gibbōrīm and then it would refer to the force of which Joab was commander-in-chief. The second emendation would yield the reading: "All the force of the gibbōrīm." 1 Chronicles 19:8 reads in the Massoretic Text,'kol ṣābā᾽ haggibbōrīm' and this Kittel would emend, in agreement with the Greek, Latin and Syriac Versions, to 'kol ṣᵉbā᾽ haggibbōrīm'. cf. 2 Samuel 3:22, where the gibbōrīm are probably called a ṣābā᾽.

3. 2 Samuel 23:8. The Massoretic Text reads 'הַשָּׁלֵשׁ' which may be a corruption of הַשָּׁלִשִׁים , the reading of the Kᵉrē of 1 Chronicles 11:11, the parallel passage. The Kᵉtīb of 1 Chronicles 11:11 is הַשָּׁלוֹשִׁים . We emend with Kittel in both cases to הַשָּׁלִשָׁה , with the support of Gᴸ. The meaning of הַשָּׁלִשִׁים would be 'captains'.

4. 2 Samuel 23:18-19. In v.18 the Kᵉtīb is הַשָּׁלֵשׁ and the Kᵉrē הַשָּׁלִשָׁה . Emend to הַשָּׁלִשִׁים with the Syriac. Also, in the same verse, הַשְּׁלֹשָׁה is to be emended to הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים with

the Syriac. In v.19 הַשְּׁלֹשָׁה is to be emended to הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים .
In the parallel passage in Chronicles, 1 Chronicles 11:20-21,
emend שְׁלֹשָׁה (twice) to שְׁלֹשִׁים in v.20(with the Syriac)
and again in v.21.

5. See 1 Samuel 26:6, where Abishai and Ahimelech, the Hittite,
are mentioned as being with David during the days of conflict
with Saul. Since Abishai is here designated Joab's brother, the
latter should, in all probability also be regarded as one of
David's band then. In 1 Chronicles 12:1f. the numbers of men
from the tribes of Israel who came to David at Ziklag are noted.
The chief among them are detailed in vv.3-7, and none of these
names coincide with those of the Three and Thirty given in
the preceding chapter or in 2 Samuel 23:8f. Whatever be the
positive value of the detailed information given in 1 Chron-
icles 12, it does not, at least, conflict with the view that
the gibbōrīm who were so closely attached to David during his
reign were men who had a record of attachment to his person
stretching back to dangerous times of flight from Saul, and
adventurous days of freebooting and professional soldiering.

6. 2 Samuel 23:18.

7. 2 Samuel 23:27.

8. See n.2 above.

9. H.P. Smith, I.C.C., Samuel, loc. cit., has suggested

that the numbers may include replacements for those who may
have perished in battle, while the latter are yet retained
on the list. The excess over thirty in the Samuel list is not,
Smith believes, so large as to create difficulty. See also
n.53.

10. op. cit., p.387.

11. I.C.C., Chronicles, p.192.

12. op. cit., p.383.

13. See n.2 above.

14. J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna Tafeln, vol.ii, Leipzig, 1915,
p.1502.

15. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, Rome, 1947, Glossary p.264,
No.1709.

16. See above, pp.29f.

17. See Chapter 2, n.21.

18. So N.H. Snaith, J.Y.N.F., p.33; also Ehrhard Junge, Die
Wiederaufbau der Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia,
Stuttgart, 1937, pp.32f.

19. Even if ꜣÊl Gibbōr were a Canaanite term and it were
contended that Yahweh Gibbōr would have had more of an Israel-
ite ring, we should still maintain that the significance of
the term ꜣÊl Gibbōr for the Israelites was determined by their
own historical experiences. With regard to the place of ꜣÊl

in the Canaanite pantheon, see W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.72-73. The root ǵzr occurs in Ugaritic as an epithet of Mot (C.H. Gordon, Handbook, p.260, No.1560). In his Ugaritic Grammar, Rome, 1940, p.105, No.650, Gordon connects ǵzr with Hebrew gibbōr. The suggestion is not repeated in the Handbook. As we have noted, only one radical is common to the two roots and it is not easy to relate z to b or ǵ to g. Muss Arnolt, A Concise Assyrian Dictionary, Berlin, 1905, vol.ii, p.210, notes a possible occurrence of gabru as an epithet of Nebo. In the Ḳur'ān 'jabbār' is one of the ninety nine epithets of Allah, 'Almighty'. W.F. Albright, A.J.S.L., 34, p.235, suggests that gbr is a partial assimilation of the synonymous kbr, Arabic kabura, 'to be big, fat, stout', Accadian kabâru, 'to be large, fat, strong'. gabâru may be a variant of Accadian gapâru, which, according to Muss Arnolt, is a variant form of gašâru.

20. See above, pp.68f.

21. Note Exodus 15:3,6, where Yahweh is described as a man of war whose right hand, majestic in power, shatters the foe. cf. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.219.

22. There are one or two instances where the term Yahweh Sᵉbā'ōt is firmly associated with the army of Israel. In 1 Samuel 4:4 there occurs the phrase ' The Ark of the Covenant

of Yahweh S^ebā'ōt.' Since the Ark is known to have occupied
a prominent place in the camp of the Israelite armies(see
pp.71f. above) there are good grounds for holding that in
this instance 'Yahweh S^ebā'ōt' means 'Lord of the armies of
Israel'. cf. 2 Samuel 6:2: 'The Ark of God which is called
by the name of Yahweh S^ebā'ōt.'(šem is dittographed; delete
with the Greek). Even more explicit is the phrase in 1 Samuel
17:45, where Davis says to Goliath: "But I come to you in the
name of Yahweh S^ebā'ōt, the God of the armies(ma'ar^ekōt) of
Israel."

The formula Yahweh S^ebā'ōt occurs with special frequency
in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zecariah and Psalms. Weber(op.cit.,
p.111) takes Yahweh S^ebā'ōt to mean 'Yahweh of the Heavenly
Hosts.' He says: "The S^ebā'ōt were at first the heavenly
servants of Yahweh, above all, already in the Song of
Deborah, a co-belligerent army of star spirits and the angels.'
We are puzzled by this reference. The verse to which Weber
must be referring is Judges 5:20: "From heaven fought the
stars, from their courses they fought against Sisera." But
the Hebrew word for 'stars' here is 'kōkābīm'. Moreover, as
Weber himself has noticed, the formula 'Yahweh S^ebā'ōt does
not occur in the Book of the Judges. What must be admitted is
that 's^ebā'šamayim' occurs with relative frequency in the

Old Testament. e.g. Deuteronomy 4:19, 17:3, 1 Kings 22:19

(2 Chronicles 18:18), 2 Kings 17:16, 21:3(2 Chronicles 33:3),

2 Kings 21:5(2 Chronicles 33:5).

The meaning is (Deuteronomy 4:19) 'sun, moon and stars'.

In 1 Kings 22:19 the meaning may be 'angels'. According to C.H.

Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, p.264, No.1709, the primary

meaning of ṣb in Ugaritic is 'heavenly bodies', and this he

connects with Hebrew 'ṣ^{e}ba³ haššamayim'. The other meaning of

ṣb in Ugaritic, 'army, soldiers', is, according to Gordon,

secondary.

Notice also the occurrences of 'ṣ^{e}bā³ōṭ' in Exodus, where

it refers to the units or formations in which the Israelites

were organised(Exodus 6:26, 7:4, 12:17,41,51). A similar usage

is found in Numbers 1:3,52, 2:3,9,16,18,25 et al. Here ṣābā³

is used for ecclesiastical as well as for military service.

e.g. Numbers 4:3,23,30,35. Weber(op.cit., p.111) concedes

that where 'ṣ^{e}bā³ōṭ' is not used in association with Yahweh,

it does refer to the "old army summons of Israel"(cf. 1 Kings

2:5, 'the ṣ^{e}bā³ōṭ of Israel').

We would still maintain with Albright and Pedersen and

others that 'Yahweh Ṣ^{e}bā³ōṭ' means 'Yahweh of the armies of

Israel', and that the formula should be interpreted against

the historical background which we have tried to fill in. Thus

W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.219, referring to the period of the Conquest, says: "One can hardly be surprised if under such conditions Israel became martially minded and Israel's God became Yahweh, God of the Hosts of Israel, one of whose primary functions was to defend His people against foes whose only aim seemed to be to destroy it utterly and to devote it to their impure gods." Also J. Pedersen, Israel iii-iv, p.6i3.

23. R.H. Kennett, Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom as indicated in Law Narrative and Metaphor, Schweich Lectures, 1931, London, 1933, p.55.

24. R. Kittel Biblia Hebraica, 4th. ed., loc. cit.

25. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel i-ii, p.230.

26. The interpretation which we shall try to work out has been adumbrated by R.H. Kennett, op. cit., pp.55-56

27. op. cit., pp.16,18,24f.,47.

28. See Chapter 2, n.11; also O.R. Gurney, The Hittites, London, 1952, pp.104f.

29. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.31; A.P., p.91.

30. Muss Arnolt, Concise Assyrian Dictionary, vol.i, p.210.

31. J.A. Knudtzon, op. cit., vol.ii, Glossary, ad. loc.

32. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Grammar, Rome, 1940, p.105, No.650.

33. C.H. Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, Rome, 1947, p.260, No.1560. The earlier suggestion that ǵzr should be equated with Hebrew gibbōr is not repeated here.

34. J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.106-108; B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941,
p.39. See also Professor A.M. Honeyman's remark that
unfortunate results have ensued from the undue reliance placed
on root meanings to the neglect of semantic histories. Article,
"Semitic Epigraphy and Hebrew Philology" in "The Old Testament
and Modern Study", ed. H.H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951, p.276.

35. For changes in the meaning of English words see Henry
Bradley, The Making of English, London, 1937, pp.160f.
Albright, J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.106-108, gives the example
of the word 'manufacture' whose change of meaning in the
nineteenth century was contingent on changed industrial
conditions.

36. See n.48 below.

37. op. cit., p.24.

38. op. cit., p.25.

39. See Chapter 5.

40. This has been discussed in Chapter 2, n.10. A. Alt has,
in this connection, made an observation with which we are in
complete agreement. In Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Paläs-
tina(Kleine Schriften, vol.i, p.125) Alt says: "Hingegen
ergibt aus der territorialgeschichtlichen Untersuchung der
Landnahme doch wohl ein Schluss auf die Kulturgeschichte
Israels. Es war ein Fortschritt, als man die Nötigung

erkannte, den Gang der israelitischen Kulturentwicklung in der ersten Jahrhunderten nach der Landnahme in Verbindung zu setzen mit dem, was Ausgrabungen und sonstige Funde über die palästinische städtekultur des zweiten Jahrtausends lehrten. Aber jetzt sehen wir, dass diese Verbindung doch nicht/all zu eng und allzu unmittelbar wirksam gedacht werden darf. Israel wuchs mit der Landnahme nicht geradewegs in die städtische Kultur Palästinas hinein, sondern blieb zunächst sozusagen vor den Toren der Städte wohnen. Der kulturgeschichtliche Vorgang vollzog sich also gewiss sehr langsam, and etwas von der ,, Rückständigkeit" der besiedelten Gebiete wird jedenfalls noch lange nachgewirkt haben. Dass die fur die innere Gesundheit der israelitischen Entwicklung kein Nachteil war, versteht sich von selbst." The point noted by Albright that, because of the improvement in the art of constructing cisterns, the Israelites were able to settle on sites in the hill country, not previously occupied by their Canaanite precursors, is also important. This further accounts for the absence of direct encounter with Canaanite city culture during the early phases of the settlement. See Albright, A.P., p.113: "Thanks to the rapid spread of the art, then recent of constructing cisterns and lining them with waterproof lime plaster instead of the previously used limy marl

or raw-lime plaster, the Israelites were able to settle on any site where there was rain, whereas their earlier Canaanite precursors had been forced to restrict their occupation in general to sites near springs or perennial streams,"

41. P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London, 1937, p.231.

42. We have noted the names of Uriah and Ahimelech(n.4 above). From the days of his kingship a body of Cherethites and Pelethites were at the, immediate disposal of David.

43. See above pp.68f.

44. See pp.166f.

45. 2 Samuel 15:2-6; see above p.29-32; cf. Carl Brockelmann, History of the Islamic Peoples, London, 1949. Brockelmann compares the court of the Ummayads with that of the Abbasids. Of Muᶜawiyah(p.73) he says: "Muᶜawiyah did not rule his Arabs like an oriental despot but like the old time tribal sayyid. During Friday services in the mosque he used to discuss from the minbar(which was more of a magistrate's seat than a pulpit for him) his political measures with the heads of the nobility, with whom he generally kept regular counsel in his palace also. He frequently received delegations from the provinces too, in order to accept complaints and smooth over differences between the tribes. All such dealings displayed the chief trait of a sayyid, because it was otherwis(

so rare among the Arabs." Of the Abbasid court at Baghdadhe

says: "From the very beginning the tone of the new capital

was quite different from that of Damascus. Although Arabs

continued to keep going out and in of Mansur's court too,

they no longer approached the Caliph as in the time of Abd-

al-Malik, as though he were a primus inter pares. No tribal

shaikh resided in Baghdad, but a successor of the great

Persian kings."

46. G.A. Smith, Enc. Bib., Article, 'Trade and Commerce',

holds that in the Ancient Near East a native militia was the

natural accompaniment of an agricultural pattern of life, while

the transition from an agricultural economy to one where the

emphasis was on commerce and trade was invariably accompanied

by the rise of mercenary forces. Thus he says(col.5171): "The

considerable number of foreign names among his(David's)

servants is partly significant of trade; but, if they were

all military mercenaries, we have seen that in Western Asia

the substitution of such for a native militia — and this is

the first appearance of mercenary troops in Israel — was

always the consequence of an increase in trade." Also

Jerusalem, vol.i, 1907, p.295. The emergence of mercenaries

in Israel is too complicated a phenomenon to be accounted

for by the single factor of trade.

47. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, i-ii, p.36 and especially p.230, where Pedersen says: "When wealth is honour then it is because it is strength..... It is not only kābōd, 'heaviness', but also ḥayil, 'strength'. The word comprises both blessing and honour. It designates the capability of the soul, its strength, efficiency, valour. It comprises mighty deeds and wealth, all that in which strength manifests itself. A 'mighty man of valour'(gibbōr ḥayil) is the proper appellation for a man of honour of the old type. It is used both of Gideon , of Jephthah, of the father of Saul, of young David, indicating the men who possess the blessing and manifest it in courage and mighty deeds and in the power to succeed. It designates the nobility, those possessed of great property and having great obligations."

48. cf. Joel 4:10: "Beat your plowshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears; let the weak(ḥallāš) say, 'I am a gibbōr'". This illustrates admirably the revaluation of skills and worth which it is thought that changed times might enforce. The ḥallāš had no hope of distinction in the community when the call was for warriors, but if swords should be done away with and the community were to look for different talents, the right to the status of gibbōr would no longer be vested in the mighty warriors. In these changed

circumstances the ḥallaš might become a gibbōr.

49. 2 Samuel 14:30 attests that both Joab and Absalom were landlords. cf. 2 Samuel 9:7. The acquisition of land is a way by which an aristocratic Israelite warrior class could, in more peaceful times, settle down as landlords. cf. The constitution ofᶜUmar which legislated against this eventuality. In this connection Hitti, op cit., p.169, says: "The second cardinal point inᶜUmar's policy was to organise the Arabians, now all Moslems, into a complete religio-military common-wealth with its members keeping themselves pure and unmixed — a sort of martial aristocracy — and denying the privilege of citizenship to all non-Arabians. With this in view the Arabian Moslems were not to hold or cultivate landed property outside the peninsula. "

50. 1 Kings 10:23,28; see further Chapter 7.

51. Thus C. McCown says of Tell-en-Nasbeh: "There must have been gibbōrīm there, persons of wealth and doubtless influence who had their individual seals and who buried with their dead no small evidence of wealth and culture." (Tell-en-Nasbeh, Berkeley, 1947, p.99) Referring to certain buildings in Tell-en-Nasbeh, McCown says: "Building No.1 is at the side of the mound , where the best breezes of summer blow. It may have been the home of a rich Israelite. Buildings No.2 and

3 may likewise have been the dwellings of gibbōrīm whose
official position led them to wish to oversee the gate and
collect taxes." (op.cit.,p.211) The sense which McCown gives
to 'gibbōrīm' in his interpretation of his archeological
finds is illustrative of the development of meaning which
we have outlined.

52. See J. Pedersen, Israel, i-ii, pp.199f., 228-229, for
the argument that in Israelite thought inner worth was intrin-
sically connected with outward success.; that the man with
inner blessing ought to enjoy a corresponding measure of
outward success,i.e. wealth and station.

53. Additional note(continuing n.8) on the lists in Samuel and Chronicles. These may be compared as follows:

Samuel	Designation	Chronicles	Designation.
Asahel		Asahel	
Elhanan		Elhanan	
Shammah	of Harod	Shammoth	of Harod
Elika		Ahijah	
Helez	Paltite	Helez	Pelonite
Ira		Ira	
Abiezer		Abiezer	
Mebunnai	the Hushathite	Sibbecai	the Hushathite
Zalmon	the Ahohite	Ilai	the Ahohite
Maharai		Maharai	
Heleb	son of Baanah of Netophah	Heled	son of Baanah of Netophah
Ittai	son of Ribai of Gibeah.	Ithai	son of Ribai of Gibeah
Benaiah		Benaiah	
Hiddai	of the brooks of Gaash	Hurai	of the brooks of Gaash
Abialbon	the Arbathite	Abiel	the Arbathite
Azmaveth		Azmaveth	
Eliahba		Eliahba	
Jonathan		Jonathan	the Hararite
Shammah	the Hararite	Hashem	the Gizionite
Ahiam		Ahiam	
Eliphet	son of Ahasbai of Maacah	Eliphal	son of Ur
Eliam	son of Ahithophel of Gilo	Hepher	the Mecherathite
Hezro		Hezro	
Paari	the Arbite	Naari	son of Ezbai
Igal	son of Nathan of Zobah	Joel	brother of Nathan
Bani	the Gadite	Mibhar	son of Hagri
Zelek		Zelek	
Naharai		Naharai	
Ira		Ira	
Gareb		Gareb	
Uriah		Uriah	

Remarks on the above List

1. The designations are given where:

    a. The names are the same but the designations differ.

    b. The names differ but the designations are the same.

    c. Both names and designations differ.

2. The lists are kept parallel as far as possible, even if the agreement is only one of order, and the names and/or designations are different. Ahijah has been placed opposite Elika, although his place in the Chronicles' list is between Hepher and Hezro. Hashem precedes Jonathan in the Chronicles list.

3. The name of Sibbecai occurs in 2 Samuel 21:18.

Thereafter follow the sixteen additional names in the Chronicles' list giving a total of forty seven names for Chronicles against the thirty one names in Samuel, exclusive of Abishai and Benaiah, the two leaders, in both cases.

Chapter Five

1. W.R. Smith, R.O.S., pp.104-105; G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, vol.i, 1907, pp.289f.

2. Genesis 21:25f., 26:17f., Judges 1:15; Genesis 29:8 and Exodus 2:16 appear to illustrate joint ownership in a well.

3. The importance of water is suggested by the fact that it is a bone of contention who has a preferential right to it. Thus in Genesis 21:25f. Abraham, in his dispute with Abimelech, bases his claim on the fact that he dug the well. In Genesis 26:17f. there is the record of a dispute between the herdsmen of Gerar and those of Isaac over a well said to have been originally dug in the days of Abraham and restored by Isaac. The herdsmen of Gerar claimed the water and to escape from strife Isaac moved on and dug another well, calling its name Rehoboth and saying: "For now the Lord has made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land." i.e. with a secure supply of water the economic lifeline was made fast. cf. Exodus 2:16. Genesis 29:7-8 is an interesting passage, because it may suggest that watering of animals was a primary care and that pasturing had to be adjusted accordingly. Thus Jacob says to the shepherds: "Behold it is still high day, it is not time for the animals to be gathered together; water the sheep and go and pasture them." The reply comes: "We cannot until all the flocks are gathered together and the stone is rolled from the mouth of

the well; then we water the sheep."

4. W.R. Smith, R.O.S., pp.95-96, argues that personal property in land grows up gradually in human society and is first applied to a man's homestead. A man acquires rights in the soil by building a house or by 'quickening' a waste place, so that originally private rights over land are a consequence of the rights over what is produced by private labour upon the land(cf. the rights over water constituted by the labour of digging for it). Smith observes that the ideas of building and cultivation are closely connected and that the Arabic 'ᴄamara'like the German 'bauen' covers both.

5. See the table of dates of legal documents of the Ancient Near East in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, The Assyrian Laws, pp.xx-xxi.

6. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.204, points out that the casuistic law of the Book of the Covenant(i.e. the 'if a man' type of formulation) aligns it with the Code of Hammurabi(c.1750 B.C.), the Hittite Laws(c. 14th century B.C.) and the Assyrian Laws(12th century B.C.), and that it is a fragmentary legal code of the same type as these. All these codes go back in their basic formulation(provided that.....then) to the Sumerian jurisprudence of the third millenium B.C. See also Chapter 3, n.12.

7. See below pp.118f.

8. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, i-ii, p.85: "Further all laws pre-suppose that every man has his own property as divided from that

of his neighbours."

9. See Appendix 1.

10. Exodus 21:7.

11. R.H. Kennett, op. cit., pp.73f.

12. M. Weber, op. cit., p.73, holds that because ḥēlek has the meaning of 'share in booty' it is seen to have originated in military practice and not in agrarian communism.

13. A.M. Honeyman, Article, "Semitic Epigraphy and Hebrew Philology", in "The Old Testament and Modern Study", ed. by H.H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951, p.278, remarks: "Study of the relations of Aramaic to the Canaanite group of tongues, in the light of the increased comparative material, has shown that many of the alleged Aramaisms of the Hebrew Bible, on which, occasionally, far-reaching critical conclusions have been based, are, in fact, pure Canaanitisms or common north-west Semitic."

14. R.H. Kennett, op. cit., pp.75-76; cf. J. Wellhausen, Die Kleinen Propheten, on Micah 2:5.

15. G.A. Smith, op. cit., p.279, thinks there is some evidence (among the texts he adduces are Jeremiah 37:12, Micah 2:5 and Psalm 16:5-6) of communal or village/in land, the rights to the
property
tillage of which were disposed among individuals or families by lot. Smith adds that it is not clear whether the evidence is proof of the continuance of the custom throughout the later ages

of Israelite history, or is only the memory that such had been
the form of land tenure in the earliest times. We do not accept
the premise that division of land by lot entails communal property
in land.

16. op. cit., pp.23-24

17. op. cit., pp.48-49.

18. We are inclined to agree, however, with Pedersen, Israel,
i-ii, p.86, who says of the year of release in Deuteronomy, 15:
1-3: "There is no mention of landed property but this indeed is
implied, the object of the law being to prevent Israelites from
becoming deeply involved in debt and thus being ruined." Debt was
the major cause of the alienation of the Israelite peasant from
his land, so that a law which had to do with the remission of
debt may well by implication have involved the restoration of
a man to his ancestral land. cf. Ezekiel 46:17, where the law
concerning the year of release is applied to the restoration of
property to rightful owners, i.e. ancestral owners.

19. Israel, i-ii, pp.84-85.

20. This is held by Millar Burrows, Levirate Marriage in Israel,
J.B.L., 1940, pp.23f.; also by J. Pedersen, Israel, i-ii, p.93.
H.H. Rowley, on the other hand(The Marriage of Ruth, H.T.R., xl,
1947, pp.77-99) does not appear to accept this necessary/between
connection
the taking over of the wife and of the property. He says(pp.94-
95)

that Boaz brought in the matter of the property to make things
difficult for the next-of-kin so that he would be discouraged
from fulfilling the duty of a levir towards Ruth. This would
appear to imply that the property was something properly extran-
eous to the obligation of the levirate. Rowley's intention,
however, may simply be to stress the "property complications"
(pp.81,95) which were involved in this particular case and the
additional burdens which the levir would contract.

21. op. cit., p.243.

22. op. cit., p.243.

22a. So also H.H. Rowley, op. cit., p.178.

23. For the various theories of the origin of the levirate, see
Pedersen's note in Israel, i-ii, pp.509-510. Miles(op.cit.,p.240)
notes that the view which Frazer(Folk Lore, ii, pp.266-341)
advanced has gained most general acceptance, namely that the
practice of the levirate, in its original form, was derived direct-
ly from a type of group marriage in which the husbands were
brothers. The corresponding custom of marriage with the deceased
wife's sister(called by Frazer, 'sororate') arose from a similar
principle according to which sisters were potentially wives of
a group. It might be thought that the stipulation in Deuteronomy
25:5, namely that the obligation of the levirate is valid only
when brothers dwell under the same roof, lends some support to

Frazer's theory, but Miles points out(op. cit., p.240) that it is
embarrassed by the fact that there are clear traces in Hebrew
(Genesis 38) and Hittite(Hrozny, Code Hittite provenant de L'Asie
Mineure, Paris 1922, vol.i, pp.146-147,193; also O.R. Gurney,
The Hittites, London, 1952, pp.101-102) codes of a right or duty
on the part of the father-in-law to take his deceased son's wife,
 since this is inconsistent with the supposition that the levir-
ate is derived from a system of group marriage in which the
husbands are all brothers. Pedersen, in the note cited above,
concludes that the levirate cannot be satisfactorily explained
by adducing marriage customs extraheous to Israel, because it
has its natural place within Hebrew culture, and theories as to
what it has been under different conditions are of little use in
elucidating its meaning in Israel. Pedersen says: "The duties of
the members of the family, the conception of its property and the
position of the wife — all this can only be understood as links
of an organic culture that must be taken as a whole without
being split up by narrow explanations adopted from without."

Miles(op. cit., p.248f.) observes that the evidence that
can be extracted from the Assyrian laws is adverse to the view
that a form of the levirate existed among the Assyrians. Apparent
examples of the levibate are really examples of the 'ana kalla-
tuti' form of contract. This(op.cit.,pp.161-166) was an arrange-
ment whereby a prospective bridegroom's father offers another

man gifts to obtain his daughter in marriage for his son. The significant feature of the contract is that, if the prospective bridegroom disappears or dies, the father can give the girl in marriage to any other of his sons. Thus he adopts and so acquires another man's daughter "for the purpose of a daughter-in-law" ('ana kallatuti') 'Ana kallatuti' was, according to Miles, one of the ways in which the Babylonians and the Assyrians attained the ends which the Israelites sought to further by the institution of the levirate. The other methods which the Babylonians and the Assyrians employed were polygamy, the legitimation of the children of slave wives and concubines, the begetting of children by a wife's maid and adoption. Some of these methods were employed by the Israelites but they were subsidiary to the levirate. See also Millar Burrows, The Ancient Oriental Background of Levirate Marriage, B.A.S.O.R., 77, 1940, pp.2-15; cf. H.H. Rowley, op.cit., pp.81-82.

24. op. cit., p.243; H.H. Rowley, op. cit.,pp.84-86, suggests that we have in Deuteronomy a limitation of the duty of the levirate corresponding to a limitation which had been effected in the case of the duty of blood revenge.

24a. H.H. Rowley, op. cit.,p.86, thinks we can conclude from the tenor of the Deuteronomy passage that the custom of the levirate was then beginning to fall into disfavour.

25. Mishnah, Yᵉḇāmōṯ, xii, 1-6.

25a. So also H.H. Rowley, op.cit.,p.174. cf. Millar Burrows,
Levirate Marriage in Israel, J.B.L., 1940, p.30.

26. op. cit.,p.244.

27.Levirate Marriage in Israel, pp.23ff.

28. Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts(Kleine Schriften,
vol.i, pp.303f.)

29. op. cit.,p.28.

30. op. cit.,p.30; Miles, as we have noted, offers a different
explanation of the 'ḥᵃlīṣāh' ceremony, and interprets the Ruth
variant to mean not the surrender of a property right but of a
redemption right.

31. H.H. Rowley, op.cit.,pp.79,98, notes the specific reference
to Tamar and her son in Ruth 4:12.

32. Ruth 4:5, reading רות את גם with the Old Latin, Vulgate and
Syriac. The Massoretic text has the reading רות את מו of which it
is difficult to make sense. Moreover, as Miles has noted(op.cit.,
p.244, n.3), the emendation is confirmed by Ruth4:9-10, where
Boaz says that he has bought the land from Naomi and has purchased
Ruth to be his wife. See R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, 4th ed., ad.
loc.

33. Miles, op.cit.,p.245, n.1, says that it would have been more
correct if the child had been called 'son of Mahlon'. Miles
observes that the title 'son of Naomi' should not be pressed,
since the account is not intended to have the precision of a

legal document.

34. Millar Burrows, The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth, J.B.L., 1940, p.445. Similarly S.R. Driver, I.C.C. Deuteronomy, p.285. Against this H.H. Rowley, op.cit.,p.79, says that all probability is against those who differentiate Ruth's marriage from the levirate in kind and not merely in the degree of the relationship between Ruth and Boaz. He says(p.96) that levirate marriage with other than the brother-in-law was possible but uncommon and concludes
(p.97): "Levirate/was not, in early times, limited to a brother-in-law; it neither required nor excluded full marriage; it neither required nor excluded the unmarried condition of the levirate partner."

35. H.H. Rowley disputes this statement(op.cit.,pp.98-99). He says that from the point of view of the levirate Obed was the son of Mahlon; if, however, he adds, Boaz had no child hitherto, and, if,in addition to playing the part of a levir to Ruth, he also entered into a full marriage relationship with her, then Obed could also be reckoned his own child. Rowley contends that it is not only in the genealogy that Obed is counted the son of Boaz, but that the remarks addressed to Boaz by the people at the gate (Ruth4:11-12) are evidence that they considered that any child borne by Ruth would belong to the family of Boaz.

36. The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth, p.445.

37. Israel, i-ii, p.93.

38. Israel, i-ii, p.92.

38a. H.H. Rowley(op.cit.,pp.93f.) seeks the mainspring of the action in the desire felt by Boaz for Ruth.

39. Such questions as: Who held the field while Naomi was away in Moab? Why did Ruth have to go out and glean, and why did the pittance she brought home mean so much to Naomi, if she possessed the field? Gunkel's point(Reden und Aufsätze, p.81f.) noted by Burrows(Marriage of Boaz and Ruth, p.447f.) that Naomi would have had money, if she had sold the field , is also met. A more fundamental question is: Why did Naomi have to sell at all, if she had property which was a going concern? All these difficulties are avoided if we make the reasonable assumption that the land was laden with debt. This explains the distress of Naomi and also the call on the gō'ēl to discharge his obligation.

40. cf. Jeremiah 32:6 where g'l and qnh also alternate; see further n.50.

41. The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth, pp.445-454.

42. op.cit.,p.451.

43. op.cit.,p.446.

44. op.cit.,p.452.

45. Burrows(op.cit.,p.449) has noted the suggestion that by excising 4:5,10 it is possible to get rid of the levirate idea.

He comments that this in fact would not delete all traces of the levirate from the narrative. He calls attention to 'ḥese_d' in 3:10, and argues that 'the former ḥese_d' of which Boaz speaks must be Ruth's loyalty to the family of her husband(cf.2:11) and 'the latter loyalty' is the further devotion to her husband and his family expressed by her offering herself to Boaz for a union of the levirate type.

46. See n.33 above.

46a. H.H. Rowley, however, insists that Naomi must be considered as having had a legal title to the land(op. cit.,p.88).

47. The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth, p.453.

48. Israel, i-ii, pp.83f.

49. Israel, i-ii, p.84.

50. Israel, i-ii, p.84. We are less certain of our own statement now than we were when first we wrote it down. It is arguable that the law of redemption in Leviticus 25:25f. means what Pedersen says it does. His view gets some support from Jeremiah 32:6, if this is indeed an example of the law of redemption in operation. (so also H.H. Rowley, op.cit.,p.85) Hanamel, according to Pedersen, was poor and unable to maintain his property and he asked Jeremiah to take it over from him — presumably to redeem it from debt(g'l) — and then to accept responsibility for it. It could then be argued from this passage that 'redemption' means the

reclaiming of property for the family considered as a whole, and not for the needy kinsman in particular. Hence Jeremiah can be said to redeem property(g'l) and also to acquire it(qnh) for himself. It might then be argued that the appearance of g'l and qnh side by side in Ruth 4:4,5,8,9,10 is to be explained in the same way.

It is not certain, however, that Jeremiah 32:6f. ought to be subsumed under the law of redemption stated in Leviticus 25:25f. This passage has been otherwise explained by Kennett and Weber as we have noted above(pp.113,115), and it has seemed to the latter that its meaning is uncertain. Further, in order to sustain his view, Pedersen has to break up the continuity of Leviticus 25:25-28 and to write off the stipulation concerning the year of the jubilee in v.28 as a late addition which contradicts the intention of the legislation in vv.25-27. Finally the several considerations, each independent of the other, which we have raised in the course of the chapter lend cumulative probability to our conclusion that it mattered to the Israelites to preserve the bond between the individual household of the family and its ancestral plot, and that their concern was not simply for the larger family unit as Pedersen has argued. We are still therefore, on balance, inclined to stick to the positions for which we have argued.

51. Millar Burrows agrees with this in the two articles cited (J.B.L., 1940, p.32 and p.451). He says(p.451): "The requirement of continuing the name(we would add, 'and the property' to Burrows' statement) of the widow's previous husband presupposes the emergence of the small family as a distinct social unit and the conception of the necessity of continuing the individual's life and name as in the levirate marriage."

52. Israel, i-ii, pp.83-84.

53. C. McCown, Journal of Religion, vii, 1927, pp.530-534; especially p.534: "The uncertainties of rainfall were such that it was but a step in Palestine from prosperity to adversity."

54. Pedersen makes this point(Israel i-ii, p.85): "We possess no evidence of the family having had community of property in the sense that all members of the family had equal rights of property to a certain piece of ground..... It is true that the family forms a solid community and, in so far, its property may be called common property. But its members do not form a homogeneous mass. It centres in the fathers of the houses, each of whom has his own responsibility."

55. op. cit.,p.243.

56. Burrows interprets differently this Deuteronomic stipulation, and he also gives a different account from our's of the significance of the association of the functions of goʾel and levir (yā-bām) in the Ruth narrative. He says(The Marriage of Boaz and

Ruth, p.450) that the obligation to raise up a son to the dead
would be part of a gō'ēl's responsibility to his clan, just as
blood revenge was, before the emergence of the 'little family'
(bēt'ab) as the natural social and economic unit. But at this
stage, says Burrows, the interest of the clan would be satisfied
if the gō'ēl begat a son in his own name. With the emergence of
the bēt'ab as the natural social and economic unit something more
was demanded, namely the preservation of the name and property
of each household, and so the duty of the levirate was a further
development of the functions which attached to the gō'ēl, when the
clan was the effective social unit. Hence, according to Burrows,
(pace Miles) the stipulation in Deuteronomy is an attempt to limit
the responsibility of the levirate to the occupants of the bēt'ab
and this Burrows thinks is logical "because levirate marriage is
an affair of the family(bēt ab), whereas redemption is an affair
of the clan."(op. cit.,p.451) According to Burrows the Book of
Ruth represents a transitional stage between redemption-marriage,
as an affair of the clan, and levirate marriage, as an affair of
the family(bēt'ab). We agree with Burrows on, what is for our
purpose, the most important point, that the duty of the levirate
implies the existence of the 'little family' as the natural social
unit. We disagree with his elucidation of the collocation of the
functions of yabam and gō'ēl in the Ruth narrative.

It is the case that the duties of gōʾēl and yāḇām belong to
the same spheres of obligation and we think it likely that the
duty of the levirate represents such an extension and modification
of the functions of the gōʾēl as were required in the course of
the advance from primitive tribalism to agricultural conditions
of life. It is true that the occasions requiring blood revenge
would diminish under agricultural conditions of life, when there
would be less provocation for inter-tribal feuds, but it is worth
noting that the obligation of blood revenge on the gōʾēl persists
in both the Covenant and Deuteronomic codes. Moreover in
Leviticus 25:25f. the office of gōʾēl has assumed a shape which
presupposes the establishment of agriculture and the acquisition
of property. In other words the gōʾēl has a function which
assumes the existence of the bēṯʾāḇ and not the clan as the
natural social and economic unit, and this is damaging to
Burrows' attempt to conclude that the presence of the gōʾēl in
the Ruth narrative witnesses to a stage of transition between
redemption-marriage(as an affair of the clan) and levirate
marriage(as an affair of the bēṯʾāḇ). Burrows is inclined to say
that the duties of the gōʾēl passed into those of the yāḇām, when
the bēṯʾāḇ emerged as the effective unit. We should rather say
that there is a strong qualitative affinity between the two
functions, that both were probably in existence before the

appearance of the 'little family' and that both continued to
exist in settled agricultural conditions, when the bēt'ab had
become the proper family unit. We are inclined to the view that
the obligation of the levirate held prior to the establishment
of the bēt'ab. as the natural family unit, because, as we have
said: "Considered as a practical piece of legislation the
levirate is more naturally fitted for a homestead comprising
more than one brother, since in that case the members of the
household are one social and economic unit and the arrangement
is both reasonable and workable."

57. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel i-ii, pp.85-86: "We must not forget
that those preparing the later laws were not always those who
possessed the power, but those who thought that they ought to
possess it, because they looked upon it as their right to
represent the old traditions of Israel. The lawgivers are groping
in the dark in order to maintain the old traditions; but as a
matter of fact they were all vain endeavours to stem the tide."

58. op.cit., i-ii, pp.88-89.

59. op.cit., i-ii, p.89.

60. See also the passages in Ezekiel which aim at preserving
the old rights of the family against the depredations of the
prince(Ezekiel 45:8, 46:16-18). The two demands are:

a. That a prince is not to transgress on the property rights of

others.

b. That in conveying his own property he must have regard to the laws of inheritance. He is entitled to give his property to his sons who are his heirs, but, if he disposes of his property outside his kindred, it is to be regarded as a temporary arrangement until the year of release, when it must return to the kindred. cf. n.18 above.

61. B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, pp.86-89. See above pp.17-19.

Chapter Six

1. F.S.A.C., pp.218-219.

2. S.R. Driver, L.O.T., p.176, where Driver takes this request to express the desire of the people to have the same visible head as other nations. We are suggesting that the phrase "to judge us among all the nations" means more than this.

3. F.S.A.C., p.221; A. Alt, Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina(Kleine Schriften, vol.ii, pp.24-29.).

4. F.S.A.C., p.221.

5. F.S.A.C., p.219.

6. From Joseph to Joshua, p.84.

7. C. C. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, London, 1929, p.85.

8. So Louis Wallis, God and The Social Process, Chicago, 1935.

9. For a description of the trade routes running through Palestine see G.A. Smith, Article, 'Trade and Commerce', Enc. Bib., 5160f.

10. 2 Samuel 8.

11. See Chapter 7; W.F. Albright, in A.R.I., p.133, notes the economic significance of Solomon's occupation of the frontier districts of Zobah, Damascus, Hauran, Ammon, Moab and Edom. Economic motives may also have predominated in certain passages of the later history of Israel. It is probably the case, for example, that the wars between the Northern Kingdom and Syria were for the control of the trade routes(1 Kings 20:26f.). At anyrate after his defeat

by Ahab, Ben Hadad offered to Israel the trading facilities in
Damascus which Syria already had in Samaria(1 Kings 20:34). Similar-
ly the dispute between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms over
Ezion-Geber(1 Kings 22:48f.) arises from the desire of Ahaziah to
share in the facilities of the port and so in the Ophir trade.
Jehosaphat was not willing to share the trade in gold with the
North. See Nelson Glueck, The Other Side of Jordan, 1940, p.84.

12. Alan Rowe, Bethshan, Topography and History, Philadelphia, 1930,
pp.38-42; also W.F. Albright, A.P., p.113; for Megiddo see Chapter 2,
n.10.

13. 1 Samuel 13:20-21 states that towards the end of the 11th
century the Israelites were forced to resort to the Philistines
(Greek, 'land of the Philistines') for the purchase and maintenance
of agricultural implements. The Massoretic Text of 1 Samuel 13:21
is as follows:

$$\text{והיתה הפצירה פים למחרשת ולאתים}$$
$$\text{ולשלש קלשון ולהקרדמים ולהציב הדרבן:}$$

Bewer, J.B.L., 1942, p.45, emends so as to read: "And the price for
the plowpoints and the coulters was a pīm and a third of a shekel
for the sharpening of the axes and for the setting of the goads."

Notes on Bewer's Interpretation

psr̥   =   push, press, hence peṣīrāh = exaction, price.

pīm = 2/3 of a shekel(G.A. Barton, Archeology and the Bible,

7th ed., 1937, p.202, A. Barrois, R.B., 1932, pp.67f.,p.76) Also
E.A. Speiser, B.A.S.O.R., 77, 1940, p.19. According to Speiser
'šinipû' is a Sumerian loan word given the value of 2/3 in Accadian
because of an erroneous etymology. It is analysed into šina+ pu and
pu is understood as 1/3. In Canaanite the dual is used for any two
objects, hence the coinage payim = 2/3.

שׁלֹשׁ פִּשְׁלוֹן is emended to שְׁנֵי שְׁלֹשׁ ; haplography of שׁ. Bewer
then suggests that the reading of the Greek, ἐις τὸν ὀδόντα, is an
attempt to render לשׁן (per tooth) which represents an original
לשׁן (שׁן), sharpen. See also W.F. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vols.,
xxi-xxii, pp.45f. Albright is of the opinion that דרבן refers to
the straightening of the tips of the ox-goads. He would vocalise
dorbân or darbôn and says that the word was used to designate such
a metal tip as was put on an ox-goad(malmēd).

For an interpretation of this incident as economic warfare on
the part of the Philistines see R.A.S. Macalister, A Century of
Excavation in Palestine, London, 1925, pp.165-166: "The general
sense of the passage is plain enough. The Philistines were, at the
time, in complete domination over the people of Israel. As a modern
power prevents gun-running among subject communities so the
Philistines prevented their Israelite vassals from being possessed
of up-to-date weapons..... The Hebrews were permitted to purchase
agricultural tools of iron, but so absolute was the control of the

Philistines that they were able to prevent any one of the Hebrews from acquiring the art of the smith, lest he should reverse the prophet's dream of the millenium and beat these instruments of peaceful craft into artillery of war." cf. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., pp.221-222. Albright also stresses the aspect of commercial profit. He says: "The iron monopoly was not only a powerful aid to the Philistines' superiority in arms, but also a valuable commercial privilege, as the Hittites had found two centuries previously."
Also A.P.B., pp.111,155; A. Barrois Manuel D'Archéologie Biblique,/ vol.i, pp.21,371; J.A. Wilson, The Burden of Egypt, Chicago, 1951, p.260; H.H. Rowley in Record and Revelation, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1939, p.171. Concerning the date of the introduction of iron into Palestine see W.F. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.xxi-xxii, pp.32-33: "In the eleventh century iron plow-tips came into use and iron displaced bronze for all tools soon afterwards." Also G.E. Wright, A.J.A., xliii, 1939, pp.458-463.

Another example of economic warfare is the choice of spring as the campaigning season(2 Samuel 11:1, 1 Kings 20:22). H.P. Smith, I.C.C., 2 Samuel 11:1, says: "Joab and his army laid waste to the Ammonites in the well-known method of oriental warfare, where the growing crops are eaten off by the invaders." Similarly G.A. Smith, H.G.H.L., p.20,63f. In the latter place he remarks that the only possible significance of the timing is that the harvest fields might

be destroyed by the invaders, thus denying a potential food supply
to the other side; alternatively, Smith suggests, the crops might
be utilised by the army making the foray. It could also be argued
that, with the crops sown and through the ground and the harvest
still ahead, the spring brought a lull in agricultural activity,
so that it was a suitable time for a summons to a peasant army.

N.H. Snaith(J.Y.N.F., pp.32-34), however, has argued that
'tešūbat haššanah' (the phrase in both the passages cited above)
cannot refer to spring. He says that the time when the petty kings
of Palestine and the Near East went to war was the late summer
rather than spring, and he adduces 2 Samuel 17:9 and 1 Samuel 23:1
to show that the season for campaigning was after the harvest. He
adds that it was necessary for the harvest of the year to be
secured before the militia(sābā², see above pp.85-90) could be
called up, since it was essential to secure the food supply for
the next year, both for those at home and for those away on service.
Snaith contends that all the considerations of 'economic warfare'
attached to the spring of the year are better fulfilled, if we
assume that 'tešūbat haššanah'means the time of late summer after
all the crops have been gathered, corn, wine and oil. Snaith says:
"It was wise for the attacker, especially if he came up from the
wilderness, to attack settled lands when the food was ripened and
ready for the eating. This would be in the fullness of the summer
or even in the early autumn..... It would be in the highest degree

unlikely for hostilities to break out in the spring. At that time
not even the barley had been gathered, and the wheat was far from
ripe in the ear. In addition the needs of the winter would have
eaten into supplies which could never have been plentiful in those
lands which bordered on the eastern desert. There was never any
wheat crop to carry over past the next harvest." In short Snaith
has argued that all the considerations of 'economic warfare' which
we have attached to the spring of the year are better fulfilled
when 'tešûbat haššanah' is referred to the summer or late summer.
14. Manuèl D'Archéologie Biblique, vol.i, p.97. Barrois says that
more than anything else the Palestinian town has the appearance
of a strong place. Barrois notes the difficulty of combining an
assured water supply with a strong position. On the other hand
C.C. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p.63, is inclined to
account for the positioning of Palestinian towns in economic terms.
15. J.W. Crowfoot, The Buildings at Samaria, London, 1942, p.1:
"The nearest good springs are a mile away on the far side of a
deep valley and would have been cut off whenever the city was
closely beleaguered; the cisterns inside the city could not have
been sufficient for many thousand inhabitants plus their horses
and their donkeys."
16. See Buchanan's appendix('The Water Supply at Samaria') to
Crowfoot's work cited above. Buchanan states that the stored water

supply of Samaria(i.e. cisterns within the city area) could not have supported a population much in excess of twenty five thousand.

17. G.A. Smith, Jerusalem vol.i, p.313.

18. L.O.T., p.175f.

19. The Massoretic Text has at the end of 10:27 the words וַיְהִי כְּמַחֲרִישׁ which the R.S.V. renders: "But he [Saul] held his peace." Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, 4th. ed., would attach these words in an emended form to 11:1, and they then correspond to the Greek καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνα, attached to 11:1 in Swete's (4th) ed.,(1909) of the Septuagint.

20. See note 2 above.

21. L.O.T., pp.176-177.

22. L.O.T., p.176.

23. J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, E. Tr., by J.S. Black and A. Menzies, 1885, p.248.

24. L.O.T., p.174.

25. op. cit., pp.250-252.

26. op. cit., p.253.

27. op. cit., p.254.

28. Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom, p.90.

29. op. cit., pp.257f.

30. op. cit., p.260

31. A. Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, Uppsala, 1p45, pp.102f.

32. op. cit., pp.270f.

33. A. Haldar, op. cit., p.104.

34. op. cit., p.142. Haldar asserts that the tradition describes Moses as "the great cult founder in the manner of king ideology." Thus he is a 'nabi⁾'(Deuteronomy 18:15, 34:10, Hosea 12:13).Haldar takes the reference in Exodus 13:1 to Moses watching his father-in-law's flocks on a "mountain of God" as a demonstration that he was "a watcher of temple herds." Also Haldar maintains that, like the deified king, Moses is ⁾Elohīm.(Exodus 4:16f.,7:1). Haldar concludes that "the Hebrew priesthood was from the first linked to the sacral kingship, exactly as with the Sumero-Accadians, and, on this point, the tradition can doubtless be regarded as entirely reliable."

35. See Appendix 2.

36. op. cit., p.104.

37. op. cit., pp.142-143.

38. op. cit., pp.145f.

39. See further Chapter 8.

39a. W.F. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, 1922-23, pp.45-50. The way in which Albright here treats the narrative in Judges 19 - 20 is a case in point. He observes that many scholars have regarded this document as a forgery of the post-exilic age,but he contends that this is unjustified hypercriticism, since the tradition is plausible in itself and supported by archeological results. He says:

"I am convinced that these scribes seldom or never invented their facts, however much latitude they may have allowed themselves in interpreting and modifying them."See also E. Nielson, Oral Tradition, 1954, p.63. The development of the words of a prophet within the circle of his disciples with a view to giving them contemporary relevance is called 'actualisation' by Eissfeldt (The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley, 1951, p.117).

40. So M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, p.85, describes the tradition concerning Samuel as "completely useless.....The time in which these representations were revised clearly no longer had any certain knowledge of the actual conditions of the time of the confederacy."

41. Israel, vols. iii-iv, p.99. Pedersen says that the description of the king which we find in the law of the kingdom as set forth by Samuel is related to the criticism of the monarchy met with already in as early a document as the fable of Jotham(Judges 9:8-15), but elaborated in terms of the actual experience of despotic monarchy under Solomon. With reference to the Jotham fable and its caricature of kingship Pedersen says(p.40): "Such rulers the Israelites might learn to know in the Canaanite city communities." See also pp.123-124, where Pedersen suggests that the portraying of the figure of Samuel in the narratives is probably a drawing out of elements which were original to him. Hence Pedersen says:

"That does not exclude the presence in these narratives of old subject matter, and we may divine in it a prophetic figure of grand dimensions, a man whose ability gave him an activity extending from that of the prophet not only to the domain of the priest but also to that of the chief."

42. See p.142 above.

43. A.R.I., pp.107f., F.S.A.C., pp.79f.

44. A.R.I., p.108.

45. A.R.I., p.108.

46. A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, p.48.

47. A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, pp.49-50.

48. above pp.62-66.

49. Judges 8:24-28. The ephod is some kind of molten image, since it is made from the earrings which are the part of the spoil voluntarily surrendered at the request of Gideon. This was, in effect, a dedication of part of the spoil to Yahweh in order to adorn a shrine over which Gideon, doubtless, was to preside. Hence when it became the centre of (presumably) Baal worship instead of Yahweh worship, it was a snare to Gideon and his family.(v.27). Further the incidents recorded in Judges 6:36-40 have been interpreted as Gideon's employment of a priestly oracular device. Moreover Gideon has a priestly background. His father, Joash the Abiezrite, presides over a shrine which has a sacred tree(W.R.

Smith, R.O.S., p.185f.) (Judges 6:11). His father also presides over an altar of Baal which has an Asherah beside it(Judges 6:25). Gideon builds an altar to Yahweh and calls it 'Yahweh is Peace'. (Judges 6:24). He is commanded to build an altar to Yahweh after having completed the destruction of the altar of Baal and of the Asherah.(Judges 6:26).

Deborah was wont to sit under the palm of Deborah and the people of Israel came up to her for judgement(lammišpāṭ). Here again we have a sacred tree associated with decisions given by oracle(Judges 4:4-5; W. R. Smith, R.O.S., pp.195-196). Deborah summons Barak in the name of Yahweh, God of Israel, to assume command of the armies of the confederacy.

50. F.S.A.C., p.215. Albright says that only two of the early High Priests are credited by the tradition as being military leaders. The reference is apparently to Phinehas and Samuel. The Phinehas in question is the one whose activity is recorded in Judges 19 - 20, and he is assumed by Albright to have been an immediate predecessor of Eli. He is to be distinguished from Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, with whom he is erroneously identified in Judges 20:28.

51. op. cit., pp.109-110.

52. op. cit., p.109.

53.. On the other hand once the concept 'Anointed of Yahweh' was

interpreted by the Davidic Covenant instead of the authentic amphictyonic covenant, it became the instrument of absolute monarchy. (see Chapter 8). G. Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, 1953, p.62, appears to say that 'Anointed of Yahweh' was not a proper amphictyonic concept and that it originated in connection with the royal Davidic Covenant.(So also J. Pedersen, Israel, vols. iii-iv, p.123). It is possible, however, that it was wrested by David from its original amphictyonic framework. Its effectiveness for his ends would be enhanced if he could maintain the fiction, as he did in the matter of the concept of 'Covenant', that he was preserving the continuity of old institutions.

54. See Appendix 3.

55. op. cit., p.110.

56. D.B. MacDonald, Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory, London, 1903, p.88.

57. P.K. Hitti, op. cit., p.25.

58. Within Israel there is the similar contrast between the comparative simplicity of Saul's establishment at Gibeah and the ostentatious grandeur of the court of Solomon who set himself up as an oriental monarch in the grand style. For the modest proportions of Saul's establishment see 1 Samuel 20:24 which describes his table, and 1 Samuel 13:2 which accredits him with a standing army of three thousand men: "two thousand were with Saul at

Michmash and the hill country of Bethel and a thousand were with Jonathan in Gibeah of Benjamin." W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.224, says: "Even Saul was only a rustic chieftain as far as architecture and the amenities of life were concerned; a clear idea of his cultural status is given by the writer's excavation of his citadel at Gibeah." Of this citadel Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, p.51, says: "The fortress of the second period (11th century B.C.) which we excavated also served, in all probability, as Saul's residence; it was, at all events, considerably larger than the later fortress which rose above its ruins. The massive staircase implies that there was a capacious second story where Saul may have lived. The amount of fine pottery found in the debris of this period also indicates a certain measure of rustic luxury which is confirmed by the fragments of about thirty cooking pots, all of substantially identical dimensions. In the storerooms of the ground floor were kept large pithoi full of wine, oil and grain; an iron plough-tip suggests that farming tools and supplies were also stored in them, while numerous fragments of querns, rubbing-stones, spindles, whorls etc. bear witness to the practice of the homely domestic arts."

59. Sir T.W. Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford, 1924, p.26.

<u>Chapter Seven</u>

1. A,R.I., p.130.

2. F.S.A.C., p.222

3. Above pp.29f.

4. A.T. Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria, London, 1931, p.346: "In his own mind, at least, Solomon was the equal of the great monarchs and his temple must be like theirs. His palace must therefore be roofed and panelled with cedar and other sweet-smelling woods of Lebanon. But Solomon was no Thutmose <u>111</u> or Tiglath-Pileser <u>I</u> to receive the beams as tribute; he must come to an agreement with Hiram."

5. J. Garstang, The Heritage of Solomon, London, 1934, notes that the temple was ninety feet long, thirty feet wide and thirty feet high, about half the size of the House of the Forest of Lebanon. The porch, which was thirty feet by fifteen, was additional(p.382). Garstang observes that the temple was neither the central nor the most imposing of the group of buildings with which Solomon adorned the capital(p.381). Garstang describes the complex of buildings as follows: "In the matured plan the temple itself is seen to have had a separate entrance from the east, but it could also be approached by way of the royal enclosure from the south. Here opposite the principal entrance with direct access from the city

stood the House of Lebanon, a building one hundred and seventy feet long, eighty six feet wide, and fifty feet high, having its roof supported by forty five columns in three rows; these were made with cedar logs and the building was roofed with cedar from Lebanon. Beyond the House of Lebanon rose a 'porch of pillars' eighty five feet wide by fifty feet deep, presumably of much the same height as before, serving as a portico to the Porch of Judgement; in the latter was the royal throne, embellished with ivory and gold. These three buildings, the House of Lebanon, the Porch of Pillars and the Porch of Judgement constituted a group and were presumably accessible to the privileged public and courtiers. An enclosing wall separated off the next group which was the most luxurious and costly. It comprised Solomon's house which took thirteen years to build(1 Kings 7:1), his women's quarters and a separate house with a portico, similar to those described, for his Egyptian wife, who clearly had a special status and exercised great influence upon the king and his court. A private door led from these buildings to the temple enclosure which as already mentioned, had also its public entrance from the east." (pp.381-382). Olmstead, op. cit., p.347, says: "In the midst of the imposing complex of buildings was the tiny royal chapel.'" See further Chapter 8.

6. See Albright's remarks noted below, p.196.

7. J. A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman, I.C.C., Kings, Edinburgh, 1951, vol.i, p.138, where 'men of Gebal' is said to refer to Phoenician master carpenters and masons who were citizens of the ancient and famous Gubl - Gupn - Byblos, on the Syrian coast.

8. 1 Kings 5:2 reads: "Solomon's provisions for one day were thirty cors of fine flour and sixty cors of meal, ten fat oxen and twenty pasture fed cattle, a hundred sheep, besides harts, gazelles, roebucks and fatted fowl." 1 cor is the equivalent of 364 litres so that the daily consumption of grain is 32,760 litres and the annual consumption 11,957, 400 litres. (For the equivalence 1 cor = 364 litres see I.C.C., Kings, vol.i, p.136.) The daily consumption of cattle is given as 30, that is, 10,950 annually. The daily consumption of sheep is 100, giving an annual consumption of 36,500. The possibility of exaggeration in these figures must be considered large, but they reflect what is true, namely that Solomon made heavy demands on the countryside to maintain his swollen establishments.

9. Or 'horses'; parāšīm could be a professional form, cf. gannābīm, ḥarāšīm; or it might be connected with the Arabic, faras, ꜣafrās . In the first case the meaning would be 'horsemen' and in the second 'horses'. It might be argued that 'horsemen' suits the sense of 1 Kings 5:6 better than 'horses', since 'sūsīm' has appeared previously in the verse. This has been countered, however

by W.R. Arnold, J.B.L., 24, pp.43f., who argues that 'paraš'
denoted a distinct breed of the genus 'sūs'. Arnold argues that
the professional form 'rakkāb' which appeared with the development
of the mounted rider, has influenced the vocalisation of 'paraš',
which has, as a consequence, been treated as a professional form .
He would therefore alter the pointing of the plural from parašim
to pᵉrašim. Arnold further adduces the appearance of 'prš' in the
Aramaic Zakar inscription with the meaning 'horse'. Also W.F.
Albright, B.A.S.O.R., 33, 1929, p.2. Albright states that 1 Kings
9:19 should be rendered "towns for chariots and chariot horses"
and notes that this was pointed out by Löhr(Orientalische
Literaturzeitung, vol.xxxi, col.925) before it was illustrated by
Guy's excavations at Megiddo.

10. A.R.I., pp.135-136.

11. P.L.O. Guy, O.I.C., No.9, 1931, 'New Light from Armageddon',
pp.37-38. Guy describes the stables as "well-planned structures
with much dressed stone laid and well-bonded by evidently skilled
craftsmen." He continues: "We have the use of datum lines by
masons and proof that weights were carefully allowed for by the
architects before building was begun. And we get all these things
occurring suddenly in a city apparently planned and built as a
whole, with its walls, its gate, its streets and a remarkable num-
ber of stables strangely similar to buildings discovered elsewhere

which have been independently dated to the ninth or tenth century
B.C." Guy points out the striking discontinuity between the
buildings of Stratum V and those under discussion of Stratum 1V of
which he says: "Altogether one feels, as I have said, that there
is something scarcely Palestinian about Stratum 1V, something
which suggests the Hittite work of North Syria, yet not precisely
the same — at anyrate something foreign. The building programme
of Stratum 1V is to be attributed to Solomon. Jerusalem buildings
were done by Phoenician craftsmen. Megiddo lies on the direct
route between Jerusalem and Phoenicia, so that it would be
perfectly natural if, after the completion of their work in the
capital, the same masons should be given the task of building so
important a city. I am unable to avoid the conclusion that Stratum
1V is their work."(pp.44-45) For a description of the two groups of
stables in Megiddo, the northern and the southern, see R.S. Lamon
and G.M. Shipton, Megiddo $\underline{\text{I}}$, Chicago, 1937, pp.32-61.

12. Lamon and Shipton, op. cit., pp.43-44.

13. R.A.S. Macalister, Gezer, London, 1912, vol.i, p.247; vol.ii,
pp.406f. Guy was able to interpret these discoveries in the light
of the stables excavated by him at Megiddo. Guy observes(op.cit.,
p.43) that Macalister found stone pillars like to those at Megiddo,
set out in a row about forty feet long. He connected them with a
temple and showed them in the plans of both his third and fourth

Semitic strata, the boundary of which he placed at 1000 B.C. Guy
remarks that the "long narrow courtyard" in which the pillars
stood appears to be of just the right dimensions for a horse-stand-
ing, and that both the drawing and the photograph of Macalister
show notches in the corner of one pillar which may well be broken
tie holes.

14. F.J. Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities, 2nd ed., London, 1898,
pp.90f. Guy observes(op. cit., pp.42-43) that Bliss found a row of
buildings giving a plan remarkably similar to the stables at
Megiddo. Bliss dated the building to around 1000 B.C., but, since
he was puzzled as to its use, made no definite statement about it
beyond the tentative suggestion that it might have been a public
building of some sort — perhaps a barracks or a bazaar of small
shops.

15. E. Sellin, Tell Taᶜannek, Vienna, 1904, pp.18(fig.10) and 104.
Sellin laid bare at Taanach a double row of standing stones which
he described as maṣṣēbōt and dated between 1000 and 800 B.C...
Guy(op. cit., p.44) noticed a striking resemblance between Sellin's
photograph and the hitching posts found at Megiddo and made a
visit to Taanach in search of the originals. He did not find much
left as the floor had been removed during excavation and the
weather had had deleterious effects on the remains. Elsewhere,
however, he made an important discovery. "In a building which

appears to be of late construction on the north side of the tell,
I found re-used three long stones just like those at Megiddo, all
with tie holes through their corners(Fig.32, p.45). I submit that
their presence here coupled with the finding of other not
dissimilar stones in situ tends to show that there was at Taanach
stabling like that at Megiddo."(p.44)

16. Lamon and Shipton, op. cit., p.44, prefer with Albright the
lower figure of four thousand horses. Their estimate of the
stabling capacity at Megiddo was four hundred and fifty horses and
one hundred and fifty chariots, that is, three horses to a chariot,
and they observe that the figures of fourteen hundred chariots and
four thousand horses are roughly in the same ratio. See also
I.C.C. on 1 Kings 5:6.

17. Three hundred shekels according to the Greek.

18. This has the support of the Greek, but the parallel passage in
Chronicles(2 Chronicles 9:16) has three hundred shekels. I.C.C.
on Kings(ad.loc.) has noted that the denomination in minas is
unusual. Three minas would equal one hundred and eighty shekels. If
we retain the six hundred shekels of the Massoretic Text and
emend the three minas to three hundred shekels(so Kittel Biblia
Hebraica, 4th ed.), we get a total expenditure of two hundred and
ten thousand shekels. If we then accept the equivalence of one
talent to three thousand shekels, we arrive at the figure of

seventy talents.

19. W.F. Albright holds that that the rendering 'peacocks' for 'tukkīyīm' cannot be justified. His view is(A.R.I., p.212, n.16) that 'ḳōpīm' and 'tukkīyīm' refer to two different kinds of monkeys.

20. The attempts noted in I.C.C.(ad. loc.) to give the equivalent value of talents in france or marks are quite valueless, because they work with the value of gold which was current when these reckonings were made. What we need are equations between the imported gold and, say, the agricultural produce which had to be exported in order to balance Israel's budget. We need a whole lot of information about prices and relative values of goods and services which we do not have. To convert talents into marks or francs on the basis of the value of gold at a date in the twentieth century tells us nothing

21. The location of Ophir has been the subject of much discussion. J.A. Montgomery, Arabia and the Bible, Philadelphia, 1934, p.38, n.5, observes that it has been located in all regions of the Indian Ocean even in far South Africa and India. He is of the opinion that it is not necessary to look beyond Arabia for the gold of Ophir and he mentions that Moritz has located Ophir in Asir, the territory between the Hijaz and the Yemen. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.133, suggests that Ophir was on the African coast in the general

region of Somaliland. cf. J. Garstang, op. cit., p.373. The
question has been dealt with at length by Father Francisque
Marconnes in the Southern Rhodesia Native Affairs Dept. Annual,
No.13, 1935. Father Marconnes identifies the Ophir of Solomon
with the modern port of Sofala in south east Africa. He argues
that Solomon had no need of ships to reach southern Arabia, since
there was a route overland, and that, in any case, had the
Phoenician sailors been bound for a destination in southern
Arabia, they would not have taken three years for the double
journey. Moreover he argues that Saba was no more than an emporium
for gold and that gold was not mined there. He further maintains
that the east African Sofala of gold was the place where in fact
the gold merchants of Arabia and obher countries of the East
located the Ophir of Solomon, because they knew that nowhere else
could Solomon have procured so vast quantities of gold(pp.61-72).
22. Montgomery and Gehman, I.C.C., ad. loc., suggest that the
figure of six hundred and sixty six talents of gold may have been
arrived at by adding the previous figures at 9:14, 9:28 and 10:10.
They consider that the notice in v.15a concerning the taxes on
traders is early and that it may have been a postscript to
Chapter 9. V.15b, they think, is late, and this view,they believe,
is supported by the appearance of the Accadian word for 'satraps',
namely, pahōt. 'Satraps' is the Greek translation. They note the
difficulties of the text in v.15a; 'men of merchants' is

impossible and they would emend on the basis of the Greek which
read or understood ᵛnšy for ᵛnšy. עֹנֶשׁ הַדָּלִים would then yield "taxes
of the merchants".

23. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.137.

24. A.R.I., pp.135-136. P.L.O. Guy, op. cit., pp.46-47, agrees
with Albright in taking Miṣr to mean Egypt in both v.28 and 29.
The Massoretic Text has 'Miṣrayim' in both instances. I.C.C., ad.
loc., would emend to 'Muṣrī' in both instances. The suggested
reconstruction then is: "And for the export(= import) of the
horses for Solomon from Muṣrī and from Kue, [Greek has ἐκ Θεκούε which
is thought to reflect the correct reading, ἐκ Κούε] the royal traders
would bring them from Kue at a(fixed)price. And a chariot came up
by export from Muṣrī at six hundred [Greek, one hundred] (shekel
weight) silver, and a horse at one hundred and fifty [Greek, fifty];
and so for all the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Syria
making export(= import) through their agency." Montgomery and
Gehman agree with Albright in identifying Kue with Cicilia and
note that Kue appears as one of the allies of Ben Hadad of Damas-
cus against Zakar of Hamath in the latter's eighth century
inscription. They observe that Winckler identified the first
Miṣrayim of the Massoretic text with the land of Muṣrī, the later
Cappadocia, lying north of the Taurus, and that later, with the
same correction in the Massoretic text, the kings of Muṣrī appear

as confederates of the invading Hittites.(2 Kings 7:6).'Mṣr' also appears in line 5, tablet 1 of the Aramaic Sūjīn text, Bauer's edition. Montgomery and Gehman conclude that Kue and Muṣrī refer to districts in Anatolia which were centres of horse breeding and from which Solomon procured his stock in trade. They do, however, entertain the possibility that the second Miṣrayim of the Massoretic text may refer to Egypt, in which case they accept the view that the notice deals with the exchange of Anatolian horses for Egyptian- made chariots, with Solomon's traders playing the part of middlemen. Otherwise(if 'Muṣrī' is read in both cases) Solomon's traders are the middlemen for the import of both horses and chariots from Anatolia into Egypt. Montgomery and Gehman also note that the rate of four horses to one chariot of the Massoretic text is changed to a ratio of two to one in the Greek. Albright, A.R.I., p.213, n.24, dismisses the objections of Lamon and Shipton(Megiddo I, p.44) to the ratio of four horses to one chariot. Albright says that the objections do not reckon with the fact that the manufacture of a chariot was then a slow and difficult process, requiring special technical skill and expensive imported materials, whereas "a horse simply grew". He goes on: "There is not the slightest evidence in the Hittite literature on horse-breeding and training that such things as pedigrees were yet known, and the only two elements to be considered by buyers were probably

the district from which a horse came and the animal's own appearance and qualities."

25. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.131-132.

26. W.F. Albright, B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, p.20. Albright observes that the Nora Inscription(Sardinia) and the Honeyman Inscription (Cyprus) belong to approximately the same age, not later than the end of the ninth century B.C. Hence the Phoenicians were erecting monumental inscriptions at Nora and Bosa in Sardinia not later than the third quarter of the ninth century and probably half a century earlier(875 B.C.), and this means that the first Phoenician settlements in Sardinia must go back several generations to the middle of the tenth century or even earlier. Thus we have evidence that there were two well-organized Phoenician settlements in Sardinia less than a century after Hiram I (c.969-936 B.C.), so that the credit for the great expansion of the Phoenicians in the Western Mediterranean should in all probability be allowed to him.(Albright, A.R.I., p.132)

27. See however H.H. Rowley, From Joseph to Joshua, pp.81-83.

28. W.F. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, p.52. Albright remarks that the century in which the reigns of David and Solomon fell, which saw the disruption of the kingdom and the emergence of the first separate rulers of Judah and Israel, was the one in whose course the material culture of the area of Israelite settlement

underwent a complete transformation. He says: "During this period Israel was metamorphosed&from a loose confederation of pastoral and agricultural clans in little contact with the outside world to a typical Syrian state through which the great trade routes ran, binding it most intimately to the prosperous centres of Syro-Phoenician commercial and industrial life. Material civilisation could not but follow the direction of commercial development, where Phoenician influence was paramount."

29. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., pp.132-133.

30. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.133. Also J. Garstang, op. cit., p.373. Garstang notes that Solomon, by occupying the garrison posts in Edom, was able to seize the controlling interest "in a prosperous and old-established business, in that he held the key to its main outlet." J.A. Montgomery, Arabia and the Bible, pp.175-178, remarks that the control of the Arabian trade-routes depended on possession of the land of Edom which was the locus of the later Nabataean state. Also A.G. Barrois, Manuèl D'Archéologie Biblique, vol.i, 1939, p.366.

31. Montgomery and Gehman, I.C.C., Kings, vol.i, pp.215-216. It is noted that there has been a tendency to regard the whole account of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon as legendary in character. e.g. A.T. Olmstead, op. cit., p.341. Montgomery and Gehman hold that the Queen of Sheba was a North Arabian and not

a South Arabian queen, and assert that, when this incident is alleged to have taken place, the Sabaeans were still in Northern Arabia and had not yet pressed south. This, however, is contrary to the generally accepted view that the movement of the Sabaeans was from south to north and that the original area of settlement was the south. P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London, 1937, pp.49-50, describes the Sabaeans as the "Phoenicians of the southern sea." Their capital was Ma'rib and their northerly expansion came about through the planting of colonies along the great south to north trade route which led through Mecca and Petra and forked at the northern end to Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia. Hitti points out that the main maritime route led from the Bab-'al-Mandab to Wadī'al- Hammamat on the coast of Middle Egypt, and that it was the inherent difficulty of navigating this sea, especially in its northern parts, which prompted the Sabaeans to develop land routes between'al-Yaman and Syria. That the movement of the Sabaeans was from south to north is also the assumption which Albright makes in his remarks in A.R.I., p.133, where he asserts that by the eighth century B.C. the Sabaeans had extended their sphere of influence as far north as the central Hejaz. Nelson Glueck, The Other Side of Jordan, New Haven, 1940, p.85, remarks: "Solomon's caravans must have penetrated far into Arabia. His ships plied the waters of the Red Sea. In both ventures he was, in

all probability, doing business with and, at the same time, competing with the interests of the famous Queen of Sheba. Her visit to Solomon involved a gruelling journey of some twelve hundred miles."(pace Montgomery and Gehman) Glueck continues: "It is hard to believe that she took this trip merely to view the brilliance of Solomon's reign. She came on business, partly to delimit spheres of interest and to arrange trade treaties regulating the equitable exchange of the products of Arabia for the goods of Palestine and particularly the copper of the Wadi Arabah." M. A. Montgomery, Arabia and the Bible, 1934, pp.175-178, also stresses that, besides having common trading interests, Solomon and the Queen were also in competition with each other, since Solomon's entrance into the South Arabian trade was a direct challenge to the northward expansion of Sabaean trading colonies along the north to south trade route.

32. The Other Side of Jordan, p.84.

33. F.S.A.C., p.72.

34. F.S.A.C., p.71.

35. C.C. McCown, The Genesis of the Social Gospel, London, 1929, p.56.

36. N. Glueck, B.A.S.O.R., 90, 1943, p.2, speaks of the East Jordan Valley as "exhuberantly watered and abundantly fertile" during the early Iron Age and, in this connection, he refers to the "misrepresentations of George Adam Smith" in his Historical

Geography of the Holy Land, London, 1931, p.482, pp.486-489.
Glueck says that during the Early Iron Age there were a large number of permanent settlements whose inhabitants dwelt in large and small villages carrying on an intensive irrigation culture, just as in the preceding Bronze Age.

37. op. cit., p.60.

38. The reading of/1 Kings 5:25 is twenty cors of beaten oil. The
the M.T.of
reading of the Greek would support the emendation of twenty cors to twenty thousand baths which is also the reading of the M.T. of the parallel passage, 2 Chronicles 2:9. A cor is approximately 364 litres and a bath is one tenth of this measure. See I.C.C., on 1 Kings 5:25, and Enc. Bib., Art., 'Weights and Measures'.

39. N. Glueck, The Other Side of Jordan, pp.50-88; B.A.S.O.R., 63, pp.4f. mentions iron as well as copper; W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.137.

40. Nelson Glueck, The River Jordan, London, 1946, pp.145-147.
Glueck says: "The furious activity in the Wadi Arabah and at Ezion-Geber was repeated on a smaller scale in the Jordan Valley. Plenty of water , close proximity to mines, accessibility to the then limitless wood supplies for charcoal and nearness to Jerusalem, made the region of Succoth the centre of widespread smelting and refining and manufacturing activities without parallel before or after the time of Solomon. The master

craftsman, Hiram of Tyre, had evidently approved of this part of
the Jordan Valley as an area where he could make the most
intricate castings(l Kings 7:46, 2 Chronicles 4:17). Clays for
his moulds abounded." For a discussion of the site of Succoth,
which Glueck identifies with Tell Deirᶜalla, see op. cit.,
pp.147-155 and B.A.S.O.R., 90, 1943, pp.14-19. Glueck identifies
Zarethan with Tell-es-Saidiyeh, near the western end of the Wadi
Kufrinji. For a discussion see op. cit., pp.155-158 and B.A.S.O.R.
90, 1943, pp.5-14. Glueck would emend Zeredah in the Chronicles
passage to Zarethan and thereafter he discusses the words
בְּמַעֲבֵה הָאֲדָמָה

בַּעֲבִי הָאֲדָמָה which he renders 'earthen foundries', that is,
clay moulds. The copper was poured in the foundries or moulds
which existed in the Jordan Valley where there was good clay
for the purpose between Succoth and Zarethan. Glueck says: "For
operations as large and for objects so numerous as those
required to furnish the temple , with all the various objects it
required, work would have to be carried on in numerous places at
the same time. These places, according to the present reading of
the Massoretic Text, were situated between Succoth and Zarethan.
(B.A.S.O.R., 90, 1943, p.13) Glueck observes that most scholars
have regarded Adamah as a place-name to be identified with the
Adamah mentioned in Joshua 3:16, and that consequently they have
emended the Massoretic Text in 1 Kings 7:46 and 2 Chronicles
4:17 by deleting the definite article from הָאֲדָמָה and

translating "in the foundries(moulds) of Adamah between Succoth and Zarethan." R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, 4th ed., 1949, would emend הָאֲדָמָה מַעְבֵּה בְּ to אֲדָמָה מַעְבַר בְּ , 'the ford of Adamah'. W.F. Albright, J.P.O.S., v, 1925, p.33, n.37, transposes the text so as to read: "In the foundries of Succoth between Adamah and Zarethan."

41. The Other Side of Jordan, pp.89-113; B.A.S.O.R., 79, 1940, pp.2-18. W.F. Albright, A.P., pp.127-128.

42. B.A.S.O.R., 71, 1938, p.8.

43. Father Marconnes, op. cit., pp.71-72, argues that the three year's duration of the voyage supports his view that Ophir is to be located on the south east coast of Africa. He asserts that this alone can explain how the expert Phoenician navigators of Hiram took three years over the double journey. This was so because the route which they took by way of India was the only feasible one in those days of small sailing vessels which were forced to hug the coasts and were unable to fight against winds and currents. Marconnes says: "The route to the Sofala of gold was via India. To come out of the Red Sea sailing-ships must avail themselves of the south-west monsoon and that will take them inevitably to the coasts of India and the Malay Peninsula. From there, when the monsoon has gradually veered north and north-west, with the help of the strong equatorial current going west or the smooth equatorial sea, they will in a

comparatively short time reach the eastern shores of tropical
Africa. That is the reason why the Arab geographers on the
information of ignorant but practical pilots placed the Sofala of
gold in what they thought to be the end of Africa not far from
India and China and due south of Eastern Asia."

44. A.R.I., p.136.

45. B.A.S.O.R., 71, 1938, pp.3f.

46. B.A.S.O.R., 72, 1938, p.10; The Other Side of Jordan, pp.99-
104.

47. The Other Side of Jordan, pp.93f., B.A.S.O.R., 79, 1940, pp.3f.

48. A.R.I., p.136.

49. A.R.I., p.136, B.A.S.O.R., 83, 1941, pp.20-22. Albright
remarks on the mention of Tarshish in the Nora(Sardinia) decree
and the interesting questions which it raises. He asserts that
this Tarshish is not Tartessus in Spain, but is the Phoenician
name of Nora itself or of a settlement in the vicinity. Albright
entertains the possibility that the biblical and Assyrian Tarshish
may have been in Sardinia and not in southern Spain, but thinks
it more probable that the latter location is the correct one in
view of the relatively early age of Gades and the tremendous miner-
al wealth of southern Spain in antiquity. Albright thinks it high-
ly probable that 'tarshish' was a Phoenician word meaning 'mine'
or 'smelting-plant', particularly since the form of the noun
tafᶜīl was common in Semitic. In Albright's view the word is

ultimately a loan from Accadian(Babylonian) meaning smelting-plant or refinery; Accadian, taršišu derived from rašašu, to melt, be smelted, and connected with Arabic, ršš, to trickle etc., of a liquid. Albright is of the opinion that Glueck's researches at Ezion-Geber, which have reconstituted a Phoenician copper refinery on the Gulf of Aqabah, have made it clear what a Phoenician 'tarshish' looks like. Albright then proposes that the meaning of 'ɔoni taršiš' is 'tarshish fleet', that is, refinery fleet. This was the fleet of ships which brought the smelted metal home to Phoenicia from the colonial mines. Albright therefore believes that it is not necessary to suppose that the city of Tartessus had yet been founded in order to account for the phrase 'ships of Tarshish'. He notes, however, that the Phoenicians must have acquired somewhere the art of building elaborate installations like the refinery complex at Ezion-Geber and he appears to suggest that they had probably acquired this knowledge through their penetration into southern Spain and their acquaintance with smelting techniques practised there.

The explanation of 'ships of Tarshish' more generally offered was that of 'sea-going ships', that is, ships similar in construction to those used by the Phoenicians in the Spanish trade, and intended for voyages of comparable range. J. Garstang, Heritage of Solomon, London, 1934, p.373, interprets the phrase more literally and says that it suggests a coasting trade within

the Meditteranean. Father Marconnes, op. cit., p.69, notes that
the reading of the Alexandrian Septuagint is πλοῖα θαλάσσης and that of
the Vulgate naves maris, and observes that both these readings
support the interpretation 'sea-going ships'.

50. I. Mendelsohn, B.A.S.O.R., 1942, p.14.

51. pp.34-40.

52. J.P.O.S., v, 1925, pp.25-28.

53. A.R.I., p.123.

54. A.R.I., p.140.

55. I. Mendelsohn, op. cit., pp.16-17, notes the twenty two
occurrences of 'mas' in the Old Testament. They are: Genesis 49:15,
Exodus 1:11, Deuteronomy 20:11, Joshua 16:10, 17:13, Judges 1:28,
30,33,35, 2 Samuel 20:24, 1 Kings 4:6, 5:27,28, 9:15,21, 12:18,
Isaiah 31:18, Lamentations 1:1, Proverbs 12:24, Esther 10:1,
2 Chronicles 8:8, 10:18.

Mendelsohn maintain that 'mas' is used in a threefold sense:

a. In relation to the Israelites it means corvée.

b. When the reference is to the conquered nations, particularly
the Canaanites, it means payment of tribute.

c. 'mas ʿōbēd' means total enslavement. Mendelsohn disregards ʿōbēd
after mas in Genesis 49:15 and Joshua 16:10. His argument is that
Genesis 49:15 is a "poetical exaggeration of Issachar's fate."
ʿŌbēd after mas in Joshua 16:10 is said to be inconsistent with the

numerous statements dealing with the same subject which use only

mas.(Joshua 17:13, Judges 1:28,30,33,35). This leaves 1 Kings 9:21

as the only genuine occurrence of mas ᶜōḇēḏ, and its meaning, accord-

ing to Mendelsohn, is that the Canaanites were reduced to total

slavery, in contradistinction to the Israelites whom Solomon

did not make ᶜaḇāḏīm, but simply made subject to the corvée(mas).

This conclusion at which Mendelsohn has arrived has involved a

somewhat drastic manipulation of the evidence. In effect he has

discounted two out of the three occurrences of mas ᶜōḇēḏ because

these did not fit in with his theory, and has rested all the

weight of his conclusion on the remaining occurrence in 1 Kings

9:21. Even here there is a lack of unanimity since the parallel

passage(2 Chronicles 8:8) reads mas without ᶜōḇēḏ.

56. Montgomery and Gehman, I.C.C., vol.i, p.206, note that the

Millo has been traditionally identified with the famous Akra of

Maccabaean and subsequent ages. cf. G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, vol.ii,

p.40f. Millar Burrows, What Mean These Stones, New Haven, 1941,

p.66, remarks that the repeated attempts of excavators to

identify Solomon's Millo have been without convincing results.

57. The archeological evidence for stables at Hazor similar in

construction to those at Megiddo is presented by J. Garstang,

Foundations of Bible History, 1931, p.383. See also W. F. Albright,

A.R.I., p.66. Montgomery and Gehman, op. cit., p.206, remark that

Hazor has been identified as Tell-el-Ḳedah, four miles west of
the Jesr Banāt Yaᶜḳūb, the bridge across the Jordan just south of
Lake Ḥuleh. They describe it as having an acropolis half as large
again in area as Megiddo, and regard it as having been an
important link in the chain of fortified camps of rectangular
form and earth-work defences on the route of the barbarian
irruptions of the eighteenth century B.C.

58. The concensus of scholarly agreement as to the Solomonic
date of the buildings of Stratum lV at Megiddo has been detailed
in n.11 above. For a different view see J.W. Crowfoot, The Build-
ings at Samaria, London, 1942, pp.5-8. Crowfoot would assign the
Megiddo buildings of Stratum lV not to Solomon but to Ahab, and
would associate them with the style of the Phoenician buildings
of the age of Ahab in Samaria. See also Crowfoot's review of
Megiddo Ī in P.E.Q., 1940, pp.143-147.

59. P.L.O. Guy's interpretation of the stone pillars at Gezer is
contested by W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.66, pp.105-106. Albright
holds that the alignment of rude pillars at Gezer is authentically
religious and represents the remains not of chariot stables but
of a mortuary sanctuary. 1 Kings 9:16, which records the sack of
Gezer by an Egyptian Pharaoh, is considered by Montgomery and
Gehman, I.C.C., ad. loc., to be "of original historical authority."
Against this see W.F. Albright,/p.213, n.29. Albright observes
A.R.I.,

that Macalister found no trace of destruction by fire in this
period when he excavated Gezer. Albright would substitute Gerar
for Gezer(J.P.O.S., 1924, pp.142-144).

60. For Lower Bethhoron, Baalath and Tamar see I.C.C., Kings,
vol.i, pp.207-208. Lower Bethhoron is described as a defensive
post on the road from the Valley of Ajalon to Gibeon, north of
Jerusalem. Baalath has not yet been identified, but it is grouped
with Ajalon, Ekron and Gibbethon, and is thought to be the
Danite Baalath. Tamar is the city placed by Ezekiel(47:19, 48:28)
at the southern border of the Holy Land, and is identified with
Kurnub, thirty five kilometres south-east of Beer-sheba and on
the route between Elath and Hebron. It is remarked that the list
follows geographical order and evinces excellent strategical
dispositions..Hazor in the far north is near an upper- Jordan
ford; Megiddo commands the great hollow between the Ephraimite
highlands and Galilee; Gezer, on the Philistine border, along with
Bethhoron and Baalath, control the easiest route into the interior
towards Jerusalem, while, in the south, Tamar is on the route to
the Dead Sea.

61. Montgomery and Gehman, I.C.C. on 1 Kings 9:19, suggest the
deletion of "in Lebanon". The words are omitted by two codices of
the Greek.

62. Montgomery and Gehman, I.C.C., vol.i, p.209, describe 1 Kings

9:20 as bombastic and late, seeking to give the impression that the Israelites were largely royal officers.

63. i.e. the Greek of 1 Kings 5:30.

64. J.A. Montgomery, J.A.O.S., 1938, p.135. The total population of Palestine in the days of Solomon is estimated by J. Garstang (Heritage of Solomon, p.367) at 750,000, of whom 350,000 would be males and 200,000 able-bodied. Also C.C. McCown, J.B.L., 1947, pp.425f.,W.F. Albright, J.P.O.S., v, 1925, pp.20-25. Albright estimates the total population in the Amarna Age to have been 500,000 and in the time of David 750,000.

65. op. cit., pp.14-17.

66. This perhaps leaves out of account Genesis 49:15, where it is recorded that Issachar was conscripted by non-Israelite neighbours for corvée.

67. op. cit., p.16.

68. op. cit., p.17.

69. op. cit., p.17.

70. J. Garstang, The Heritage of Solomon, pp.390-391. N. Glueck, The Other Side of Jordan, pp.98-104, is perhaps given to elegy in his estimate of Solomon. He points out that the translation of the Ezion-Geber project into a reality was a masterpiece of imaginative vision and practical organizing ability. He says that Solomon alone had the ability to undertake such a venture, and

that in virtue of his enterprise he was "a copper king, a shipping
magnate, a merchant prince and a great builder." All this, however,
does not absolve Solomon from a charge of fundamental economic
ineptitude.

71. J. Garstang, The Heritage of Solomon, p.368.

72. This is true also of Solomon's shipbuilding programme, since
the traffic in view was principally of the luxury class, and, as we
have argued, did not contribute to the country's economic strength.

73. See Appendix 3.

74. There is one probable consideration which we have not stated
in relation to the chariot-cities. R.S. Lamon and G.M. Shipton,
Megiddo I, p.59, suggest that the chariot-cities may have been
convenient assembly centres in connection with the trade in
chariots between Egypt and Asia Minor. They note that Megiddo is
situated just where the road from Egypt to "the land of the kings
of the Hittites and the kings of Syria" debouches from the pass
through the Carmel ridge on to the pastures of Esdraelon, and
could not but be a centre for this trade.

Chapter Eight

1. Above pp. 141f.

2. Walther Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, 1951, p.41; G.E. Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, 1950, pp.29, 57.

3. cf. Walther Eichrodt, op. cit., pp.17-18; W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, 2nd. ed., 1919, pp.76ff.

4. op. cit., p.57.

5. cf. 2 Samuel 7:8-17.

6. Reading לִמְקֹשֵׁר for מִמְקֵשֶׁר of the Massoretic text. Henri Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Chicago, 1948, p.344, translates v.4 without altering the Massoretic text:

   And he(i.e. the just ruler) shall be as the light of the morning,

   When the sun rises, even a morning without clouds,

   As the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining

   after rain.

7. See Chapter 6, n.53.

8. The translation is that of A.R. Johnson, 'The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus', in The Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke, London, 1935, p.78.

9. cf. 2 Samuel 7:14.

10. op. cit., p.79.

11. A.R. Johnson's translation, op. cit., p.108. Johnson suggests a possible emendation for v.7 whereby what is apparently the king's

speech is incorporated into that of Yahweh. Reading

אֶמְסָכָה / אֶל - חֹק יְהֹוָה / אָמַר אֵלַי /

for the Massoretic text

אֲסַפְּרָה אֶל חֹק יְהֹוָה

Verse 7 then reads:

Lo I have set up my king

Upon Zion, My sacred mountain,

I have taken him to My bosom and said to him:

"Thou art My Son, this day have I fathered thee."

Johnson observes that, according to this reading, the Davidic king is a Son of Yahweh by adoption.

12. op. cit., pp.73-81.

13. See Chapter 7, n.5.

14. Jerusalem, vol. ii, p.91; also Edouard Nielson, Oral Tradition, London, 1954, pp.90-91.

15. H.H. Rowley, J.B.L., 58, 1939, Zadok and Nehushtan, pp.113-131.

16. op. cit., pp.81f.

17. op. cit., p.82.

18. F.J. Hollis, Essay v, Myth and Ritual, ed. S.H. Hooke, 1933.

19. op. cit., p.83.

20. op. cit., p.79.

21. op. cit., p.84.

22. op. cit., pp.84-85.

23. op. cit., pp.113-131. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.205, n.46, says that Rowley's discussion is "learned but highly subjective." Albright says(A.R.I., p.110): "Zadok was not a descendant of Eli, but there is no adequate reason to consider him as not an Aaronid." 24. On 1 Chronicles 12:29 Rowley says(op. cit., p.118) that the Zadok who is represented there as an Aaronite, and who was in attendance with the twenty two captains assembled at Hebron to make David king, is not to be identified with Zadok the priest, and that the Chronicler, in all probability, did not intend this identification.

25. op. cit., p.126.

26. Rowley notes that according to 2 Samuel 6:17 and 7:2 the ark was kept in a tent pitched by David, while it is stated in 1 Kings 8:4 that the ark was transported from a tent to Solomon's temple. Rowley suggests that the final clauses in both 2 Samuel 6:17 and 1 Chronicles 15:1 are probably glosses on māḳōm, while in 2 Chronicles 1:4 māḳōm has been removed and hēkīn left without an object. Gerard Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, 1953, pp.39-44, suggests that the Tent belonged originally to the south, and was perhaps the sanctuary of the six tribes in or near Hebron(see p.47 above). Von Rad argues that Solomon's temple was built as a "dwelling temple", and that the Ark, with which the presence of Yahweh was closely bound up, was kept in its Holyes of Holies. Von Rad then says that

the old accounts of the Tent are meagre and not easy to understand
(Exodus 33:7f., Numbers 11:24f., Deuteronomy 31:4f.), but that it
is clear they do not fit in with the 'dwelling' conception. He
continues: "The Tent stands outside the camp, while the Ark was
always within the camp. It is not to be assumed that the Ark stood
in the Tent. One's general impression is that the Tent only served
as an oracular shrine for the reception of the divine decisions.
From time to time the cloud descends upon the Tent in which the ⟨...⟩
then old narrator imagines Yahweh to be present. The distinctively
alien character of the few passages about the Tent of Meeting
within the other old Hexateuch traditions prompts the question
~~prompts the question~~ whether an addition from some quite different
sphere of tradition is not present here."(pp.42-43) Von Rad says
that we hear a clear rejection of the temple in favour of the
Tent from the mouth of the prophet Nathan(2 Samuel 7:6) who is a
southern Israelite, and he observes that this protest could not
appeal to the actual practice of the twelve tribe amphictyony,
since the Ark had been resting in a temple for generations. Von
Rad thus comes to the tentative conclusion that the basis of
Nathan's protest and of the kind of reference to the tent found
in Psalms 27:5 and 61:4 must be a firmly established and well
articulated cultic concept. This, he argues, could not be derived
from the temporary housing of the Ark in a tent in the time of

David, pending the building of the temple, and may therefore go back to the practice of the Hebron amphictyony. With this cultic terminology he would link the name of Oholibah for Jerusalem, but he acknowledges that "in this investigation into the traditional backgrounds of the Priestly Document we do not yet move on solid enough ground."(p.44)

27. op. cit., p.131.

28. op. cit., pp.132-140. Rowley finds independent support for his conclusions through his consideration of the antecedents of 'Nehushtan', the name of the brazen serpent before which the people worshipped in the Jerusalem temple prior to the reform of Hezekiah(2 Kings 18:4). Rowley argues that Nehushtan is of Canaanite origin and is to be connected with serpent-worship ante-dating the Israelite settlement of Canaan. It was already established in Jerusalem when David captured the city and was kept in the shrine presided over by Zadok. It was the principal cult object of this shrine until the Ark was brought in beside it. Rowley argues that, if this Jebusite symbol were subsequently transferred to the temple along with the Ark, it is not surprising that, in the interests of later conceptions of orthodoxy, mention of this should have been suppressed. Rowley thinks that Numbers 21:8f. is "obviously aetiological", having been created to account for the presence of Nehushtan in the temple in order to legitimate it as a Mosaic symbol.

29. cf. H.H. Rowley, op. cit., p.139: "The placing of the Yahweh symbol and the Jebusite symbol side by side in a single shrine would make a single sanctuary the religious centre of the whole community. The placing of the two priests side by side would inevitably lead to human rivalry and jealousy, as in fact it did. But it was necessitated by the fact that the king had his own priest, who had shared his afflictions, yet found it politic to conciliate his new subjects, and to refrain from arousing their religious hostility by overthrowing their priest."

30. op. cit., p.130: "But though syncretism facilitated religious fusion and may have been dictated by political wisdom at the time of the Israelite occupation, it brought spiritual perils which took long years to overcome."

31. The same holds good of 2 Samuel 7:8-17, where Yahweh speaks to Nathan.

32. R.B.Y. Scott, J.B.L., 58, 1939, pp.143-149; cf. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.139; also H. and H.A. Frankfort, Before Philosophy, 1949, pp.237-241.

33. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Chicago, 1948; the sub-title is: "A Study of Near-eastern Religion as the integration of Society and Nature."

34. op. cit., pp.342-343; cf. H. and H.A. Frankfort, Before Philosophy, pp.241-248.

35. G.E. Wright, The Old Testament against its Environment, London, 1950, pp.67-68.

36. This is what both Frankfort and Wright are saying in the passages adduced in notes 34 and 35. cf. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp.278-279: "It is true that the Mesopotamians lived under a divine imperative and knew themselves to fall short of what was asked of them. But they did not have 'The Law'. The will of God had not been revealed to them once and for all, nor were they sustained by the consciousness of being a 'chosen people'. They were not singled out by divine love, and the divine wrath lacked the resentment caused by ingratitude." This assumes the persistence of amphictyony in Israel into the period of the monarchy. cf. Walther Eichrodt, op. cit., p.18.

37. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, p.341.

38. H. Gunkel, Ausgewählte Psalmen, 4th. ed., 1917, pp.24-29.

39. S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, Das Thronbesteignungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie, 1922. N.H. Snaith, J.Y.N.F., 1947, has asserted that Mowinckel's Coronation or Enthronement psalms have no connection with the New Year festival and are properly sabbath psalms. A.R. Johnson does not think this criticism is valid, but he agrees that Snaith has produced good reasons for dismissing the evidence which Mowinckel adduced from Rabbinical sources to support his theory.(A.R. Johnson, The Psalms, in The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H.Rowley,

Oxford, 1951, pp.193f.) Snaith argues convincingly that in Palestinian Judaism the association of the Kingdom of God with the New Year Festival, while certainly prominent in later thought and practice, is not earlier than the second century A.D., and is thus not valid evidence for the presence of such a feature in any corresponding festival of the pre-exilic period.

40. Thronbesteignungslieder; these are, according to Gunkel, Psalms 47, 93, 97, 99 and, annexed to these, Psalms 96:10f. and 98.

41. E. Nielson, op. cit., pp.90-91.

42. The Rôle, of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus, pp.85f.

43. op. cit., pp.86-98.

44. op. cit., pp.99-111.

45. Israel, vols. i-ii, p.38.

46. C.C. McCown, Tell-en-Naṣbeh, Berkeley, 1947, p.196.

47. W.F. Albright, A.A.S.O.R., vol.iv, Tell-el-Ful, p.52.

48. 1 Samuel Chapter 1.

49. 1 Kings 11:29f.

50. cf. W.R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel, p.76.

51. J.W. Crowfoot, The Buildings at Samaria, London, 1942, p.8.

52. See Chapter 7, n.11

53. J.W. Crowfoot, op. cit., pp.5-8; also his review of Megiddo I, in P.E.F.Q.S., 1940, pp.132f.

54. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.221.

55. This we would hold notwithstanding the remarks of W.F. Albright in A.R.I., p.196, n.29. See our remarks, above p.77.

56. See Chapter 5.

57. Albrecht Alt, Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel(Collected in Kleine Schriften, vol.ii, pp.135-149).

58. Otto Eissfeldt, Ba‛al Šamēm und Jawhe, Z.A.W., 1939, pp.1-31.

59. op. cit., pp.135-136.

60. op. cit., pp.136f.

61. op. cit., pp.142f.

62. op. cit., pp.146f.

63. op. cit., pp.19-20.

64. op. cit., pp.20f.

65. cf. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.55.

66. A.R.I., pp.81, 196, n.29.

67. cf. J. Pedersen, Israel, iii-iv, pp.129f.

68. A. Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, Uppsala, 1945, p.150.

69. Israel, vols. iii-iv, p.520.

70. op. cit., pp.520-521.

71. op. cit., p.521.

72. F.S.A.C., pp.228-230, A.R.I., p.136.

73. F.S.A.C., p.230.

74. A.R.I., p.156.

75. op. cit., p.8.

76. Israel, vols. iii-iv, pp.520-521.

77. W.F. Albright, F.S.A.C., p.218.

78. W.F. Albright, A.R.I., p.107: "There is no reason to suppose that the religious usages in vogue at the bāmōt in the time of the Judges differed in essential respects from the practice described by Hosea three centuries later....."

79. op. cit., p.17.

80. A.R.I., p.156.

81. op. cit., p.17.

82. Hosea 7:14, 14:9.

Chapter Nine.

1. cf. A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, 1924, pp.87, 202f.

2. See Chapter 6, pp.148f.

3. A.R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, 1944, p.12, says of 1 Samuel 9:9("For the nabī' of to-day was formerly called a rō'eh"): "The only conclusion that one can draw from the above note is that, in the course of time the term nabī' had secured a certain extension in meaning."

4. cf. S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien iii, Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen, 1923, pp.16f.

5. N.W. Porteous, The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of the Prophets, in Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, Edinburgh, 1950, pp.148-149.

6. G. Östborn, Torā in the Old Testament: a Semantic Study, p.109.

7. cf. A.R. Johnson, op. cit., pp.8-9, where the ethical meaning of torā is depressed. This tendency is seen in a more extreme form in A. Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, 1945, pp.99-100, 108.

8. op. cit., p.149; cf. A.C. Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, 1936, pp.135-136.

9. op. cit., pp.149-153.

10. G. Henton Davies, Yahwistic Tradition in The Eighth Century Prophets, in Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, 1950, pp.37-47.

11. op. cit., p.16.

12. op. cit., pp.27f.

13. op. cit., p.51f.

14. H. H. Rowley, The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, H.T.R., xxxviii, 1945, p.14.

15. op. cit., p.14.

16. op. cit., p.15.

17. E.T., xlvii, p.315a.

18. Psalmenstudien iii.

19. E.T., lxii, 1950-1951, pp.4-9.

20. op. cit., pp.16f.

21. op. cit., p.8a.

22. op. cit., pp. 102f; see our remarks in Chapter 6, pp.155f.

23. The Unity of The Bible, 1953, pp.37-38.

24. The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, p.17.

25. The Unity of The Bible, pp.40-41.

26. cf. A.C. Welch, Kings and Prophets of Israel, 1952, p.183: "What Hosea demanded was a closer union between the sacrifice and repentance."

27. The Unity of The Bible, p.41.

28. The Unity of The Bible, p.42.

29. J.B.L., xviii, 1899, pp.214f.

30. The Unity of The Bible, pp.43f.

31. The Unity of The Bible, p.41; cf. Walther Eichrodt, Man in The Old Testament, 1951, pp.9-20.

32. From Joseph to Joshua, 1950, pp.157-159.

33. The Unity of The Bible, p.44.

34. A.C. Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, pp.69-75.

35. op. cit., p.77.

36. op. cit., p.29f.

37. op. cit., p.32.

38. Reading ḳesem for ḳᵉsōm.

39. op. cit., p.49.

40. The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, pp.22-26.

41. op. cit., p.47.

42. op. cit., pp.35-44.

43. op. cit., p.44, n.2.

44. The Nature of Prophecy in The Light of Recent Study, pp.17f.

45. op. cit., p.18.

46. From Joseph to Joshua, pp.155,159.

47. The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of The Prophets, pp.152-153.

48. G.E. Wright, The Old Testament against its Environment, 1950, p.29, pp.49-50; also A.C. Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, pp.80,93,118,139,141,146-147.

49. op. cit., pp.152-153; cf. A.C. Welch, op. cit., pp.147-149.

50. The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, p.16.

51. M. Noth, Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels, 1930, p.110; also A.C. Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, p.120, n.1.

52. Chapter 6, pp.166-168.

53. Chapter 8.

54. N.H. Snaith, J.Y.N.F., pp.48-49; cf. G.E. Wright, op. cit., p.68, n.40.

55. op. cit., p.50.

56. cf. W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, 2nd ed., 1895, p.101.

57. N.W. Porteous, S.J.T., June 1954, The Old Testament and Some Theological Thought-Forms, pp.166-167.

58. H.W. Robinson, History of Israel; its Facts and Factors, London, 1938, p.109: "As we shall see in reviewing his important influence on public policy, he(Isaiah) was opposed to all diplomacy and all alliances, and advocated a purely religious mission for Israel in reliance on the sure protection of Yahweh, while politically she remained under Assyrian rule till Yahweh's kingdom came."

59. G.B. Gray, I.C.C., Isaiah 1-39, Edinburgh, 1912, pp.30-31, argues that 'curds and honey' in Isaiah 7:15 cannot refer to the fact that Immanuel will be brought up on the fare of nomads and
Judah
that, during his childhood,/will return to the nomadic life for its moral welfare, because 'a land flowing with milk and honey'

is the name given to Canaan in entering which Israel abandoned
the nomadic life. We would agree that the reference is not to
a return to nomadic conditions of life. It does seem to us,
however, that it refers to conditions of life in a simple
pastoral society. If this is so the chapter can be regarded as a
unity and it is not necessary to say with Gray that there is no
connection between vv.1-16 and vv.17-25. Gray decides this on
the ground that the tenor of vv.1-16 is that Judah has nothing to
fear, while vv.17-25 portend the most complete ruin for the
country. It would be very difficult to fit vv.21-22 into this
scheme. They read: "In that day a man will keep alive a young cow
and two sheep; and because of the abundance of milk which they
give, he will eat curds; for every one that is left in the land
will eat curds and honey." This, it seems to us, is a further
explication of what is meant by curds and honey in v.15 and makes
it clear that the reference is to a simple pastoral society.
Among the things that are to be swept away in the days of Immanuel
is viticulture (vv.23-25). These verses do not refer to the
complete ruin of Judah as Gray appears to suppose, but to the
removal of the vine which the prophet regards as a major source
of Israel's undoing. We are inclined to think that the vine here
typifies Canaanite culture. What vv17-25 then say is that the
simple pastoral society envisaged by the prophet in Emmanuel's

days will be untroubled by the great empires of Egypt and Assyria
and outwith the sphere of foreign diplomacy and culture(vv.18-20),
while it will also escape those insidious and injurious influences
indigenous to the land of Canaan and especially associated with
the culture of the vine.(vv.23-25)

60. Edouard Nielson, Oral Tradition, 1954, p.54.

61. cf. A. Causse, Du Groupe Ethnique A La Communauté Réligieuse,
Paris, 1937, pp.102f.,136,174.

62. G. Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, 1953, pp.60f.

63. Von Rad mentions five classes of material. These are:
a. Apodeictic,b.Conditional statutes; c. Conditional statutes
transformed into the personal style with additional homiletical
flourishes; d. Parenetic laws which have no discernible basis in
any old legal statute; e. Laws derived from old traditional
material which is not strictly legal in character, that is, not
formulated either apodeictically or conditionally. (op. cit.,p.12f)

64. op. cit., pp.23-24.

65. op. cit., pp.60f.

66. Ehrhard Junge, Die Wiederaufbau der Heerwesens des Reiches
Juda unter Josia, in Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und
Neuen Testament, ed. Albrecht Alt, Gerhard Kittel, Stuttgart,
1937, pp.21f.

67. H.H. Rowley, The Prophet Jeremiah and The Book of Deuteronomy,

in Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H.H. Rowley, 1950,
pp.157f. Rowley argues that Deuteronomy was probably written down
early in the reign of Manasseh and issued from a small group of
reformers who purposed to embody the lessons of Hezekiah's reform
in a plan for the next occasion that should present itself. Since
it would be dangerous to work openly for reform in the reign of
Manasseh(2 Kings 21:16) such a programme would necessarily have
to be kept secret. The document was found in 621 B.C by which
time it could not be traced to its authors so that its provenance
was unknown. The time, however, was propitious for implementing
such a programme and the Jerusalem priesthood was prepared to do
this except in respect of the provision in Deuteronomy 18:6-8
which would have worked to their disadvantage. The attitude of
the Jerusalem priesthood in this matter is expressed by 2 Kings
23:9. The requirement of centralisation may be the top stratum
of Deuteronomy superimposed on the document by the Jerusalem
priesthood.(p.164) cf. S.R. Driver, I.C.C., Deuteronomy, p.87.

68. op. cit., pp.45-49.

69. op. cit., pp.62f.

70. op. cit., p.61.

71. Also A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, London, 1924,
pp.186-187, 189-192.

72. op. cit., p.62.

73. See Chapter 8.

74. See Chapter 6, n.53.

75. op. cit., pp.63f; cf. E. Junge, op. cit., pp.31f. Junge holds that 2 Kings 25:19(Jeremiah 52:5) refers to the exercise by a functionary of a recognized practice of the state, namely the summoning to military service of the free land-holders(ᶜam hā'āreṣ). The ṣābā(2 Kings 25:23f.,Jeremiah 40) is not made up of professional soldiers but of farmers who have answered the summons. Hence they are mustered at/40:7 and again at 41:12, while in the intervening period they are busy at the tasks of husbandry (40:10). According to Jeremiah 40:10b this transition to farming was not an innovation, but signified a self-explanatory return to a normal occupation which had, for a time, been interrupted. Junge argues that we are dealing here with well-organised military arrangements and that the organisation presupposed must have been evolved prior to the fall of Jerusalem. The conclusion which he draws is that the militia of Judah had risen to new life during the reign of Josiah.

76. cf. G.E. Wright, The Old Testament against its Environment, p.56.

77. cf. A. Causse, op. cit., p.118. Causse's view is that assyrophile śārīm were responsible for the overthrow of Amon by a process of court intrigue and that this was the occasion of a

popular rising headed by the ʿam haʾāreṣ who put Josiah on the throne. cf. M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, p.184.

78. op. cit., p.66.

79. op. cit., p.67.

80. See especially A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy; also G. Von Rad, op. cit., p.68; H.H. Rowley, The Prophet Jeremiah and The Book of Deuteronomy, p.163.

81. cf. A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p.100; M. Weber, op. cit., pp.174f.

82. G. Von Rad, op. cit., p.68.

83. S.R. Driver, I.C.C., Deuteronomy, pp.lx-lxxii.

84. This is the fundamental assumption which Causse makes. It is expressed in the title of his work, "From the Ethnic Group to The Religious Community", and we regard it as fallacious. Causse argues that the prophets and the framers of Deuteronomy were disruptive influences, because they tried to apply ethical and rational criteria to the Israelite community which had formerly been held together by primitive sanctions of a magical-mystical character. We have argued that the ethical emphasis was not an innovation of the prophets or Deuteronomy, but an old foundation which they sought to uncover, and on which they tried to rebuild. See Causse, op. cit, pp.102, 126.

85. op. cit., p.69. We are, however, in agreement with Norman K. Gottwald(Studies in the Book of Lamentations, London, 1954, p.117, n.1) that Deuteronomy has a more direct connection with the prophets than Von Rad will allow.

86. Isaiah 5:8; see Chapter 5, p.118.

87. See Chapter 5; cf. A. Causse, op. cit., p.167.

88. See particularly Chapter 7.

89. op. cit., p.62.

90. A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, pp.123f.

91. op. cit., pp.16-17.

92. G. Hölscher, Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, 1922, pp.130-134; Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiuns, Z.A.W., 1922, pp.161-255; also R.H. Kennett, Deuteronomy and The Decalogue, 1920.

93. G. Von Rad, op. cit., p.62.

94. cf. W. Eichrodt, op. cit., pp.40-66.

LIST OF WORKS CITED.

W.F. Albright   Archeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1932.
From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed., 1946.
Archeology of Palestine, 1949.
Archeology and the Religion of Israel, 3rd. ed., 1953.
A.A.S.O.R., iv, 1922-23, Tell-el-Ful.
A.A.S.O.R., xxi-xxii, 1941-43, Tell Beit Mirsim: The Iron Age.
A.J.S.L., xxxiv, 1917-18, pp.215-255, 'Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology.'
B.A.S.O.R., xxxiii, Feb.1929, pp.1-10, 'Progress in Palestinian Archeology during the Year 1928.'
B.A.S.O.R. lxii, April 1936, pp.26-31, 'The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archeology.'
B.A.S.O.R., lxviii, Dec.1937, pp.22-26, 'Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo.'
B.A.S.O.R., lxxviii, April 1940, pp.7-9.
B.A.S.O.R., lxxxiii, Oct.1941, pp.14-22, 'New Light on the Early History of Phoenician Colonisation.'
J.B.L., li, 1932, pp.77-106, 'The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-exilic History of Judah, with some Observations on Ezekiel.'
J.P.O.S., i, 1921, pp.49-79, 'A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology.'
J.P.O.S.,iv, 1924, pp.169-170, "Canaanite hofši, 'Free', in the Amarna Tablets."
J.P.O.S., v, 1925, pp.17-54, 'The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah.'
J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, 'A Note on hofši.'pp.106-108.
J.P.O.S., xiv, 1934, pp.101-140; "The North Canaanite Poems of Al᾽ êyân Ba᾽al and 'The Gracious Gods'."
J.P.O.S., xv, 1935, pp.193-234, 'Palestine in the Earliest Historical Period.'

A. Alt   Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina, 1925.
(Kleine Schriften, i, pp.89-125)
Der Gott der Väter, 1929(Kleine Schriften, i, pp.1-78).
Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina, 1930(Kleine Schriften, ii, pp.1-65).

A. Alt	Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, 1934, (Kleine Schriften, i, pp.278-332). Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel, Festschrift Georg Beer zum 70 Geburtstage, 1935, pp.1-18 (Kleine Schriften, ii, pp.135-149). Z.A.W., N.F., xvii, 1941, pp.244-247, 'Meros' (Kleine Schriften, i, pp.274-277). Z.A.W., N.F., 1944, pp.67-85, 'Megiddo im Übergang vom Kanaanäischen zum Israelitischen Zeitalter' (Kleine Schriften, i, pp.256-273).
G.W. Anderson	H.T.R., xliii, 1950, 'Some Aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study,' pp.239-256.
W.R. Arnold	J.B.L., xxiv, 1905, pp.43f.
T.W. Arnold	The Caliphate, 1924.
Muss Arnolt	A Concise Assyrian Dictionary, 1905.
A.G. Barrois	Manuel D'Archéologie Biblique, i, 1939, ii,1953. R.B., xli, 1932, pp.50-76, 'Métrologie dans La Bible'.
G.A. Barton	Archeology and the Bible, 7th ed., 1937.
J. Bewer	J.B.L., lxi, 1942, pp.45-46, 'Note on 1 Samuel 13:21.'
F. J. Bliss	A Mound of Many Cities, 2nd ed., 1898.
H. Bradley	The Making of English, 1937.
C.A. Briggs	I.C.C., Psalms, i-ii, 1906-1907.
C. Brockelmann	History of the Islamic Peoples, E.Tr., 1949.
M. Burrows	What Mean These Stones, 1941. B.A.S.O.R., lxxvii, Feb.1940, pp.2-15, 'The Ancient Oriental Background of Levirate Marriage. J.B.L., lix, 1940, pp.23-33, 'Levirate Marriage in Israel.' pp.445-454, 'The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth.'

A. Causse	Du Groupe Ethnique A La Communauté Réligieuse, 1937.
J.W. Crowfoot	The Buildings at Samaria, 1942. P.E.Q., 1940, pp.132-147, 'Megiddo: a Review.'
G. A. Danell	Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, 1946.
G. Henton Davies	'The Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth-Century Prophets.'(Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed., H.H. Rowley, 1950, pp.37-51).
A. Dhorme	R.B., vi, 1909, pp.50-73, 'Les Pays Bibliques au Temps D'El Amarna.'
G.R. Driver and J.C, Miles	The Assyrian Laws, 1935.
S.R. Driver	I.C.C., Deuteronomy, 3rd ed., 1902. An Introduction to The Literature of the Old Testament, 8th ed., 1909.
W. Eichrodt	Man in the Old Testament, 1951.
O. Eissfeldt	'The Prophetic Literature'(The Old Testament and Modern Study,ed. H.H. Rowley, 1951, pp.113-161). Z.A.W., N.F., xvi, 1939, pp.1-31, 'Baʿal Šamēm und Jahwe.'
R.M. Engberg	B.A.S.O.R., lxxviii, April, 1940, pp.4-7, 'Historical Analysis of Archeological Evidence. Megiddo and The Song of Deborah.'
I. Engnell	Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, 1943.
H. Frankfort	Kingship and the Gods, 1948.
H. and H.A. Frankfort	Before Philosophy, 1949.
J.G. Frazer	Folk Lore in the Old Testament, ii, 1918.

J. Garstang	The Heritage of Solomon, 1934 Foundations of Bible History, 1931.
N. Glueck	The Other Side of Jordan, 1940. The River Jordan, 1946. B.A.S.O.R., lxiii, Oct.1936, pp.4-8, 'The Recently Discovered Ore Deposits in Eastern Palestine.' B.A.S.O.R., lxxi, Oct.1938, pp.3-18, 'The First Campaign at Tell-el-Kheleifeh(Ezion-Geber).' B.A.S.O.R., lxxii, Dec.1938, pp.2-13, 'The Topography and History of Ezion-Geber and Elath.' B.A.S.O.R., lxxix, Oct.1940, pp.2-18, 'The Third Season of Excavation at Tell-el-Kheleifeh.' B.A.S.O.R., xc, April 1943, pp.2-23, 'Three Israelite Towns in the Jordan Valley: Zarethan, Succoth, Zaphon.'
C.H. Gordon	Ugaritic Grammar, 1940. Ugaritic Handbook, 1947. Ugaritic Literature, 1949.
N.K. Gottwald	Studies in the Book of Lamentations, 1954.
G.B. Gray	I.C.C., Isaiah i-xxxix, 1912.
A. Guillaume	Islam, 1954.
H. Gunkel	Ausgewählte Psalmen, 4th ed., 1917. Die Psalmen(Handkommentar zum Alten Testament) 1926.
O.R. Gurney	The Hittites, 1952.
P.L.O. Guy	O.I.C., No.9, 1931, 'New Light from Armageddon.'
P.L.O. Guy and R.M. Engberg	Megiddo Tombs, 1938.
A. Haldar	Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, 1945.
P.K. Hitti	History of the Arabs, 1937.
F.J. Hollis	Essay V in Myth and Ritual, ed. S.H. Hooke, 1933.

G. Hölscher	Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, 1922 Z.A.W., xl, 1922, pp.161-255, 'Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums.'
A.M. Honeyman	'Semitic Epigraphy and Hebrew Philology'(The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley, 1951, pp.264-282).
S.H. Hooke	Myth and Ritual, 1933 Labyrinth, 1935. The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual, 1938.
B. Hrozný	Code Hittite provenant de L'Asie Mineure, 1922.
A.R. Johnson "	'The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus' (The Labyrinth, ed. S.H. Hooke, 1935, pp.71-111). The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, 1944. 'The Psalms'(The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley, 1951, pp.162-207). E.T., xlvii, 1935-36, pp.312-319, 'The Prophet in Israelite Worship.' E.T. lxii, 1950-51, pp.36-42, 'Divine Kingship and The Old Testament.'
E. Junge	Die Wiederaufbau der Heerwesens des Reiches Juda, unter Josia, 1937.
R.H. Kennett	Deuteronomy and the Decalogue, 1920. Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom as indicated in Law, Narrative and Metaphor, 1933.
R. Kittel	Biblia Hebraica, 4th ed., 1949.
H. Kjaer	J.P.O.S., x, 1930, pp.87-174, 'The Excavation of Shiloh, 1929.' P.E.F.Q.S., 1931, pp.71-88, 'Shiloh: a summary Report of the Second Danish Expedition, 1929.'
J.A. Knudtzon	Die El-Amarna Tafeln, i, 1908, ii, 1915.
H. Lammens	Le Culte des bétyles et les processions réligieuses chez les arabes préislamiques,1919.
R.S. Lamon and G.M. Shipton	Megiddo i, 1937.

M. Löhr	Asylwesen im Alten Testament, 1930.
R.A.S. Macalister	Gezer, i-ii, 1912. A Century of Excavation in Palestine, 1925,
C.C. McCown	Genesis of the Social Gospel, 1929. Tell-en-Naṣbeh, 1947. J.R., vii, 1937, pp.530-534. J.B.L., lxvi, 1947, pp.425-436, 'The Density of Population in Ancient Palestine.'
D.B. MacDonald	Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory, 1903. J.B.L., xviii, 1899, pp.214f.
Fr. Marconnes	S. Rhodesia, Native Affairs Annual, No.13, 1935.
H.G. May	J.B.L., lx, 1941, pp.113-128, 'The Patriarchal Idea of God.'
T.J. Meek	Hebrew Origins, 1936.
I. Mendelsohn	B.A.S.O.R., lxxxiii, Oct.1941, pp.36-39, "The Canaanite Term for 'Free Proletarian'." B.A.S.O.R., lxxxv, Feb.1942, pp.14-17, 'State Slavery in Ancient Palestine.'
K. Möhlenbrink	Z.A.W., N.F., xv, 1938, pp.238-268, 'Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua.'
J.A. Montgomery	Arabia and the Bible, 1934. J.A.O.S., lviii, 1938, p.135.
J.A. Montgomery and H.S. Gehman	I.C.C., Kings, 1951.
J. Morgenstern	H.U.C.A., v, 1928, pp.1-151, 'The Book of The Covenant.'
S. Mowinckel	Psalmenstudien, ii-iii, 1922-23; ii, Das Thron-Besteignungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie; iii, Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen.
R.A. Nicholson	A Literary History of The Arabs, 1930.
E. Nielson	Oral Tradition, 1954.

M. Noth   Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels, 1930.
Das Buch Josua, 1938.
Die Gesetze im Pentateuch, 1940.

C.R. North   Z.A.W., N.F., ix, 1932. pp.8-38, 'Religious
Aspects of Hebrew Kingship.'

A.T. Olmstead   History of Palestine and Syria, 1931.

G. Östborn   Tora in the Old Testament: a Semantic Study.

J. Pedersen   Israel: its Life and Culture, i-ii, 1926, iii-iv,
1940.
J.P.O.S., vi, 1926, pp.103-105, 'Note on Hebrew
hofši.'

N.W. Porteous   'The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of the
Prophets.'(Studies in Old Testament Prophecy,
ed. H.H. Rowley, 1950, pp.143-156).
E.T., lxii, 1950-51, pp.4-9, 'Prophet and
Priest in Israel.'
S.J.T., June 1954, 'The Old Testament and Some
Theological Thought Forms.'

G. Von Rad   Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel, 1951.
Studies in Deuteronomy, 1953.

H.W. Robinson   The History of Israel: its Facts and Factors,
1938.

T.H. Robinson   The History of Israel, i, 1932.

Alan Rowe   Bethshan: Topography and History, 1930

H.H. Rowley   From Joseph to Joshua, 1950.
The Unity of the Bible, 1953.
'The History of Israel: Political and Economic'
(Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson,
1939, pp.160-186).
J.B.L., lviii, 1939, pp.113-141, 'Zadok and
Nehushtan.'
H.T.R., xxxviii, 1945, pp.1-38, 'The Nature of
Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study.'
H.T.R., xl, 1947, pp.77-99, 'The Marriage of
Ruth.'
'The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deutero-
nomy'(Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed.,
H.H. Rowley, 1950, pp.157-174).

R.B.Y. Scott	J.B.L., lviii, 1939, pp.143-149, 'The Pillars of Jachin and Boaz.'
G.A. Smith	Jerusalem, i-ii, 1907. Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 25th ed., 1931. 'Trade and Commerce'(Enc. Bib., iv, 5145-5199).
H.P. Smith	I.C.C., Samuel, 1899.
W.R. Smith	The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 2nd ed., 1892 Religion of the Semites, 2nd ed., 1907 The Prophets of Israel, 2nd ed., 1919.
N.H. Snaith	Jewish New Year Festival, 1947.
E.A. Speiser	B.A.S.O.R., lxxvii, Feb.1940, pp.15-20, 'Of Shoes and Shekels.'
Louis Wallis	God and the Social Process, 1935.
Max Weber	Das Antik Judentum, 1920(E.Tr., Ancient Judaism, by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale, 1952).
A.C. Welch	The Code of Deuteronomy, 1924 Prophet and Priest in Old Israel, 1936. Kings and Prophets of Israel, 1952.
J. Wellhausen	Prolegomena to the History of Israel(E.Tr. by J.S. Black and A. Menzies, 1885) Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah, 3rd ed., 1891. Die Kleinen Propheten, Dritte Ausgabe, 1898.
J.A. Wilson	The Burden of Egypt, 1951.
G.E. Wright	The Old Testament Against Its Environment, 1950. A.J.A., xliii, 1939, pp.458-463, 'Iron: the Date of its Introduction into Common Use in Palestine.'