




Ex Libris

C. K. OGDEN



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES





BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE TRADITIONS AND BELIEFS OF
ANCIENT ISRAEL

A NEW STUDY OF GENESIS AND EXODUS

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price 15s. net.

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE
KINGDOM OF JUDAH

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net.

THE TWO RELIGIONS OF ISRAEL
WITH AN EXAMINATION OF THE PROPHETIC
NARRATIVES AND UTTERANCES

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price 12s. 6d. net.

CRITICA BIBLICA

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price 15s. net.

OR MAY BE HAD IN SEPARATE PARTS, VIZ.

- PART I. Isaiah and Jeremiah, price 2s. 6d. net.
,, II. Ezekiel and Minor Prophets, price 3s. net.
,, III. The Books of Samuel, price 3s. net.
,, IV. The Books of Kings, price 3s. net.
,, V. Joshua and Judges, price 3s. net.

THE MINES OF ISAIAH RE-EXPLORED

Demy 8vo. Cloth. Price 5s. net.

PUBLISHED BY A. AND C. BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON

THE VEIL OF HEBREW HISTORY

AGENTS

- AMERICA . . THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64 & 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
- AUSTRALASIA THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
205 FLINDERS LANE, MELBOURNE
- CANADA . . THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LTD.
ST. MARTIN'S HOUSE, 70 BOND STREET, TORONTO
- INDIA . . . MACMILLAN & COMPANY, LTD.
MACMILLAN BUILDING, BOMBAY
399 BOW BAZAAR STREET, CALCUTTA

THE VEIL
OF
HEBREW HISTORY

A FURTHER ATTEMPT TO LIFT IT

BY

THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT.

HONORARY D.D. EDINBURGH AND GLASGOW

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AT OXFORD

HONORARY FELLOW OF ORIEL AND WORCESTER COLLEGES

FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK

1913

D.S.
1910

TO
MY DEAR PUPIL, FRIEND, AND NOW SUCCESSOR
GEORGE ALBERT COOKE
AUTHOR OF *NORTH SEMITIC INSCRIPTIONS*
AND TO ALL FREE-MINDED AND YOUNG-HEARTED SCHOLARS
OF THE HEAVILY BURDENED BUT GREATLY HONOURED
TWENTIETH CENTURY

1910

PREFACE

VERILY through much tribulation of critical research must we of the present age enter into the kingdom.

Verily, when criticism hath had its perfect work, we shall see—as never before—how indifferent are critical results to spiritual kingship.

This work, like its predecessors, consists partly of certainties, partly of pioneering conjectures. Its object is to get behind the existing tradition, and so to recover, in an earlier and much more correct traditional form, what was believed by the Israelites respecting their past, or, as one might say, to dig down to the foundations of Israelite history. If the author's preceding works (since the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. ii.) be considered, the reader will have a tolerably complete idea of what the author regards as important, and, on the whole, trustworthy, for historical purposes.

The principal omission in this series of researches

is the reconstruction of the most essential parts of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel. That the original text of these portions ran differently from the later and now received text, hardly (in the author's opinion) admits of a doubt. But he has only been able to offer a few suggestions to the radical critics of the future.

He wishes, with all his heart, that he had been able to give a sketch of Israelite history in accordance with his present critical results. The sketch given in the *Historians' History of the World* is several years old; besides, the interests of popularity have dictated the omission of a critical substratum such as that which gives so much value to Winckler's study of Israelite history in the third edition of *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*.

If the author may express a preference for one part of the book above another, he would incline to favour the chapter on Solomon, though it may be true that no page in the present work is without some original suggestions, which point the way to historical reconstruction. The treatment of place-names in this volume calls, in the author's opinion, for much 'searching of heart.'

That fresh discoveries will confirm many of the author's most decried results, is to him a conviction. The Elephantine papyri should be a warning to his learned opponents (see *Mines of Isaiah Re-explored*). Egypt has done her best for us; it remains for Arabia to contribute fresh light where it is so much wanted. That Aryan tradition should have had some influence on the Hebrew stories, is not at all an unreasonable view, but the fact has hardly been made out by that enthusiastic scholar, Herr Martin Gemoll, for whose able work (*Grundsteine*), however, the present writer professes an unfeigned admiration.

But enough has been said about points of view in *Mines of Isaiah*. It is time to launch out into the deep in the same little ship—*la navicella del mio ingegno*—which has weathered so many storms. May the results find a fair, an intelligent, and even, if it be possible, a generous reception!

Advent, 1912.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
THE TRADITION OF EARLY N. ARABIAN INFLUENCE ON ISRAEL.	I

CHAPTER II

EARLY RELATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE ETHBALITES	13
---	----

CHAPTER III

JERUSALEM AND RABBAH; DAVID, A NORTH ARABIAN; HIS SIEGES OF JERUSALEM AND RABBAH	25
---	----

CHAPTER IV

DAVID AND URIAH; SIEGE OF RABBAH; DAVID AND ABSALOM; TRUE SITUATION OF THE BATTLE-FIELD	47
--	----

CHAPTER V

SOLOMON'S BUILDINGS—HIS EMPIRE—HIS COMMERCE— HIS ENEMIES—HIS RELIGION	63
--	----

CHAPTER VI

SHEKEM	93
------------------	----

CHAPTER VII

	PAGE
BAAL-GAD, MIGDAL-GAD, MIGDAL-EDER, MIGDAL-SHEKEM	97

CHAPTER VIII

SANARIA (?)	101
-----------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX

TIRŞAH	107
------------------	-----

CHAPTER X

SHILOH	109
------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI

BETHEL	113
------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII

HEBRON	115
------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIII

AKRAB, AKRABBIM	121
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIV

GIBEON	123
------------------	-----

CHAPTER XV

THE GIBEONITE CITIES	127
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVI

	PAGE
JERICHO AND JORDAN	131

CHAPTER XVII

GATH	137
----------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII

RAMAH AND RAMOTH-GILEAD	141
-----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIX

JEPHTHAH	145
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER XX

ON NAHASH, HAGAB, AH'AB, AND OTHER STRANGE NAMES	147
--	-----

CHAPTER XXI

EPHRAIM—YOSEPH—YEHUDAH	153
----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXII

ESCHATOLOGICAL GEOGRAPHY	155
------------------------------------	-----

INDEX	159
-----------------	-----

THE VEIL OF HEBREW HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE TRADITION OF EARLY N. ARABIAN INFLUENCE ON ISRAEL

THE strongest determining element in the Palestinian population and culture was N. Arabian. This applies, not only to the Israelites, but to the race which preceded them. The evidence of local and personal names is too abundant for us to deny this, supported as it is to so great an extent by the available evidence respecting religious ideas and practices.¹ To admit this is not to be blind to the influence of the cultures of Egypt, Crete, Babylonia, Iran, which was probably felt in Palestine in very early times, and the two latter of which cultures still exercised a fertilizing power at a later period. It would be a fascinating subject to collect the evidence for all these varied influences, but the

¹ See *T. and B.*; *D. and F.*; *Two Religions*; *Ps.*⁽²⁾; *Crit. Bib.*; and many articles in *Ency. Bib.* by the present writer.

time for this is not yet, whereas the N. Arabian influence can to some extent already be estimated, on condition that the traditional Old Testament texts—and we may add the Phoenician inscriptions—be treated more critically, and the necessary historical conclusions drawn.

I shall not now enter into questions of higher criticism, and shall leave it undecided whether any parts of our traditional material may belong to writers of the northern kingdom. It is, at any rate, safe to assume that if we had traditional sagas of the origins which undoubtedly came from the northern kingdom, and not merely from that kingdom's southern territory, though they would differ from ours in many details, they would agree in giving the legends a N. Arabian setting. For could they give better proof of their predominant interest in the 'Holy Land' than by fighting for it against such warlike competitors as the Arammites?

That the scenery of the legends of the early books of the Old Testament is largely N. Arabian, has been abundantly shown. I will however venture to mention a few illuminative facts. And first, as to the story of the origination of the first man. Of these the account of Adam and Eve is, of course, the most remarkable, because it contains the myth of Paradise. For our present purpose, this story is particularly important for the light which it throws on the origin of the Israelites and

their kinsfolk. A careful study of the description (Gen. ii. 10-14) of the four streams of the garden shows convincingly where the Israelites located their Paradise, and from whence they supposed themselves to have come. It was N. Arabia. This is expressed very clearly first of all in *v.* 10, which, treated critically, should probably run thus,— ‘A river goes forth from Eden to water the garden (that is, Ishmael of Arabia; that is, with reference to Arabia of the Asshurim).’ So an old tradition represented; Wonderland was still open to those who walked in heavenly light. In spite of the large amount of wilderness in N. Arabia, to seeing eyes a river still went forth to water the garden, and it should, in the latter days, again be objectively visible. Of Eden, the present text only says vaguely that it lay eastward¹ (*v.* 8*a*). Certainly, if this was correct, it made it all the more necessary for scribes to be more communicative in the sequel. It is extremely probable, however, that the original reading of *v.* 8*a* was, — ‘And Yahweh Elohim planted a garden in Eden of the Raḳmites,’² and that a scribe or redactor, whose copy of the Eden-story had become in parts illegible, changed this into ‘. . . a garden in Eden eastward.’ It may well have been the same too clever scribe who produced this substitute for the original but now illegible text

¹ עֲרָבָה sometimes, and קֶרֶם often, is corrupt. Cp. *T. and B.* p. 88.

² The Raḳmites are the Yeraḥme’elites. Cp. Ezek. xxxi. and see *T. and B.* p. 457; *Two Religions*, pp. 99, 164.

of *v.* 10*b*, 'and from thence it parts itself, and becomes four heads.' Evidently he had heard the tradition of the four streams of Paradise which were Pishon, Giḥon, Ḥiddekel, and Perâth.

The first three streams, it is hardly reasonable to doubt, were located by the redactor, and presumably also by the narrator, in N. Arabia. Of Pishon it is said, 'that is it which encircles the whole land of Havilah' (*v.* 13); of Giḥon, the same, except that 'Kush' takes the place of 'Havilah.' Since, however, Havilah is a son of Kush (Gen. x. 7), and Kush is placed next before Miṣrim (the N. Arabian Muṣri) among the sons of Ḥam (*i.e.* Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el), this is surely a distinction without a difference. Elsewhere Havilah is represented as the country of the Ishmaelites and of the Amalekites or rather Yeraḥme'elites (Gen. xxv. 18, 1 S. xv. 7), and the Kushites in Am. ix. 7 are parallel to the Israelites, the Philistines (Ethbalites), and the (southern) Arammites. The name of the first stream has been corrupted from Yishbon (= Yishmon) *i.e.* 'Ishmaelite stream.' The second is also corrupt, and comes probably from Ḥaggiyyon. Ḥag, which forms an element of some personal names (such as Ḥaggi, Ḥaggith, Ḥaggai, Ḥaggiah, Ḥagâgu¹) is probably a shortened form of Ḥagar, a spelling which we may assume by the side of

¹ Ḥagâgu (in Sinaitic and Palmyrene inscriptions) may be the original of Agag. On Ḥaggith, see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 256 f.

Hagar, just as Ḥaran co-exists with Haran, and Ḥadad with Hadad. The name Ḥagar (whence ultimately Giḥon) or Hagar was probably the designation of as wide a N. Arabian region as Kush (see Gen. x. 7). The statement that Havilah and Kush were surrounded by streams (wâdies?) need not here be discussed. Even prosaic supplementers, dealing with Wonderland, involuntarily indulged their fancy.

Of the third stream we are told (*v.* 14) in the gloss that it 'goes eastward of Asshur.' Critics are wont to assume that Asshur means Assyria, and jump at the conclusion that Ḥiddekel must be identical with Idiqlat, which is the Babylonian name for the Tigris. The difficulties are—(1) the initial syllable Ḥid, and (2) the incorrectness of the description of the course of the streams (if the Tigris be meant). But must 'Asshur' mean 'Assyria'? The ancient city of Asshur (which Gunkel thinks of) is not likely (even from a conservative point of view) to have been known to the writer, but a N. Arabian Asshur was, if I am not much mistaken, familiar to him,¹ and a perfectly regular explanation of Ḥiddekel can be given on this easy assumption.² The name is a compound, and means 'Ḥadad of Yerahme'el,' from the region through which it flowed. Ḥadad was the name of a section of the Ishmaelite race.

¹ *D. and F.* pp. xi f., xxix, 40, 57, etc.; *T. and B.* pp. 23, etc.; *Two Religions*, pp. 26 f. ² *T. and B.* pp. 92, 456 (n. 1).

The fourth was apparently too well known to need an explanatory gloss. Its name is Perâth. It is strange but true that even ancient students of the Old Testament went wrong here; they supposed Perâth to be the Euphrates, whereas there is no passage except Jer. li. 63, where such an identification is at all plausible. The familiar phrase, 'the great river, the river Euphrates' (Gen. xv. 18, Deut. i. 7, etc.), must give place to 'the river of Gilead, the river Perâth.' Apparently the Perâth was known as a Gileadite stream. Hence it is said of the Reubenites that they had their tents 'from the river Perâth,' their cattle being numerous in the land of Gilead (1 Chr. v. 9). It is a N. Arabian Gilead which is meant;¹ in olden times it was the realm of Akish, and the centre of that of 'Ishbosheth.' The fuller form of the name of the Gileadite stream was doubtless Ephrath. It denoted primarily a region, and may well be equivalent to Ephraim (a popular and very early distortion of 'Arâb-Yaman,' *i.e.* Yamanite Arabia²). Considering that one of the boundaries of the Joseph-tribe—including Ephraim—was the stream called either Yordan or Yarḥon,³ it would seem not improbable that Perâth or Ephrath might be this stream (see 'Jordan').

There is a striking passage in old Hebrew

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 91, 262, and cp. 197, 385 ff.; *D. and F.* p. 37; *Crit. Bib.* p. 374.

² *T. and B.* pp. 90, 472 f. ³ *Ibid.* pp. 228, 456 (on Josh. xvi. 1).

hagiography which throws fresh light on the Paradise streams. Paradise had disappeared, but some believed that the streams, or at least two of the streams, remained, and that their water had still an inherent supernatural virtue. The original story of Naaman (general of the king of Aram), most probably, simply related the command of the prophet to bathe seven times in the stream Yarden or Yarḥon, and the uttering by Elisha of a prayer-spell, and there stopped. The substitution of Yarden for Yarden or Yarḥon (?) required a corresponding alteration in the story, and the scribe was fully equal to the demand. The sacred streams, however, of which he had heard, were the Abana (Amana) and the Parpar.¹

One essential thing, however, in the original Paradise myth is not mentioned here, viz. that the divine garden was on a mountain with a city and a king.² And we cannot fail to recognize how favourable this is to the claim of N. Arabia to comprise within its limits the Holy Land. Surely the mountain must have been Ḥoreb, not indeed as it is, but as it was in the age when God communed daily with man. But where was Ḥoreb? Opinions differ, but most probably it was the famous mountain where Abraham was willing to offer up his 'only son' Isaac. That mountain was traditionally called Asshur-Yerahme'el.³ It is likely that 'Ḥoreb' has

¹ *Two Religions*, pp. 152, 154 f. ² *T. and B.* pp. 14, 72.

³ *Ibid.* p. 328.

sprung from the very similar name Ḥur-Rab, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Arāb, which we shall find to be virtually the name of the city best known as Hebron. It would be fitting that Abraham and Sarah should be buried at the foot of the holy mountain of God. For Abraham was the progenitor of the Yerahme'elite peoples, and, very possibly, in one version of the N. Arabian Paradise-story, he was the First Man.

It may indeed provoke dispute, but, as it seems to me, is a conclusion almost forced upon us by the textual phenomena, that there are several names of 'first men' or sons of 'first men' underlying the composite genealogies of the early chapters of Genesis. For instance, there is good reason to think that Enoch (Ḥanok) was originally represented as a first man,¹ and why should not the great comprehensive N. Arabian race have its own special first men, Aram-Asshur, Yerahme'el-Asshur, Ishmael, and—Abraham? The passages which seem to point to this conclusion are :

(a) Gen. ii. 23. 'And Aram said, This one is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh : this one shall be called Ashḥurah, for out of Ashḥur has she been taken.'²

(b) Gen. iii. 20. 'And Aram called his wife's name Ashḥurah.' (*Gloss*, for she has become the mother of (the race of) Yerahme'el-Ashḥur²).

(c) Gen. iv. 25. 'And Aram knew his wife, and

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 49, 116.

² *Ibid.* p. 99.

she conceived, and bore a son, and called his name Ashtar.¹ (*Gloss*, for he was the offspring of Asshur.)

(*d*) Gen. iv. 26. 'And to Ashtar² [he too is Arab] a son was born, whose name he called Eshmun' [Aram - Yerahme'el, with reference to Ashkar, Arab-Ishmael].

(*e*) Gen. xvii. 5. 'And thy name shall no more be called Ab-ram, but thy name shall be Ab-raham, for the father of Rahmon I appoint thee.' (*Gloss* on Rahmon, 'nations.')

It will be seen here that there are at least three 'first men' in the Hebrew traditions; I might indeed have reckoned six, for 'Lot,' *i.e.* Galoth, is no doubt the Gileadite 'first man,'³ and Hanok and Kayin have also claims not to be disregarded. Furthermore, all these traditions have to do with N. Arabia,⁴ for the Gilead, symbolized by Lot, is certainly the southern Gilead, *i.e.* the land of the benê Yarham or Yerahme'el. The only way to evade this conclusion is to show that the criticism which it presupposes is inadequate, or that the

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 110-112.

² *Ibid.* Ashtar (the masc. of Ashtar) is the equivalent of Asshur; the popular speech shortened it into Sheth. It is also = Eshmun; this we see by comparing the parallel passages Num. xxiv. 17, Jer. xlvi. 45. Sha'on (Jer. *l.c.*) = Shim'on = Ishmael. The name of the Phoenician god Eshmun has been greatly misunderstood. See p. 11, n. 1.

³ See *T. and B.* p. 307, and for the origin of Lot see *T. and B.* p. 211.

⁴ See *ibid.* p. 205. In fact, when we have once shown that the Paradise story is N. Arabian, the presumption becomes very strong that the legends in general are also N. Arabian.

books on Genesis which have appeared the last five years have strengthened the case of moderate criticism. This task has hardly yet been accomplished.

In this connexion I may add a brief statement respecting the first man Abraham and the first woman Sarah his sister. The true form of the man's name has obviously been altered. Ab-raham cannot be right. The alteration was the consequence of the corruption of *raḥmon*¹ (= Yeraḥme'el) into *hamon*. Nor can 'father of Raḥam' be the true meaning of Abraham, for numerous parallels show that Ab or Abi in proper names has come from 'Arâb' (*i.e.* Arabia). Nor can שָׂרָה (Sarah) be the right form of the name of the woman. Just as Ab-raḥam corresponds to Aram (restored for Adam), so whatever name has been corrupted into Sarah must correspond to some N. Arabian regional; and if Ab-raḥam indicates that the husband was the progenitor of Yeraḥme'el, the name which underlies Sarah ought to record a similar dignity for the wife. שָׂרָה (Sarah) therefore should be corrected into שְׂרָה (Shurah), a shortened form of אִשְׂרָה. We may compare שְׂרָן from אִשְׁרוֹן (Asshuron or Asshuran²). The son of Abraham and Shurah was, we may presume, originally Ishmael, just as the son of

¹ One may suspect that the Jewish and Moslem title of God, *raḥmân*, came ultimately from Raḥam, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el. An interesting evolution from Yeraḥme'el, the War-god, to the source of Pity and Compassion.

² *D. and F.* p. 141.

Aram and Asshurah was Ashtar and their grandson Eshmun,¹ *i.e.* Ishmael, Abrahāḡ, Ishmael, and Ashtar, all had the same meaning. They were personifications of the old home of the Israelites, *i.e.* of N. Arabia, or—which is the same thing—the mythical first man.

¹ We now see the origin of the Phoenician god Eshmun. Ishmael is the equivalent of Yerahme'el, who was the N. Arabian healing god (*T. and B.* pp. 37, 41 *f.*).

CHAPTER II

EARLY RELATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE ETHBALITES

By stages which we cannot pause to describe certain warlike Israelite clans had gained the mastery of a considerable part of the N. Arabian border-land. It is equally certain that their possession of the land was not uncontested, and that Saul and David (if these were really the names of early dynasts) were extremely hampered by the people wrongly called Philistines. Circumstances which can only be guessed at had favoured the development of the martial Ethbalite people, which was one of the many offshoots of the great Arammite or Yerahme'elite race.¹ It may be repeated here that the confusion between Pelethites (Ethbalites) and Philistines (Pelishtim), however early it arose, has been the greatest obstacle to the right appreciation

¹ *D. and F.* pp. xxi *f.*, 19. We now see how the so-called Philistines had such a fellow-feeling with the Geshurites and the Amalekites (1 S. xxvii. 8, 11), how a 'Philistine' king came to be called Akish (= Ashhur), and how an Israelite warrior could take service with a 'Philistine.'

of the story of Saul and David, and should be opposed by all the means in our power.

Now there was a favourite battle-field of the Arammites in a region which we can see from the recorded place-name (Aphelḵ¹ = Arabian Ashḥur) to have been long occupied by men of their stock. There, more than once, the Israelite army was defeated by the Ethbalites, and the second time the son² of the priest of Shiloh was slain, and the sacred stone, or one of the stones, symbolic of Israel's god, which had accompanied the Israelites to the battle, was carried away by the victors, and placed in Dagon's temple at Ashdod. This was not at all meant as an insult to the Israelites, as if this stone object was no longer a symbol and vehicle of divine powers, but only a serious and reverential degradation (so far as this was possible) of the god Yerahme'el-Yahweh from the first to the second rank. Ethbalites, indeed, were bound to think that Dagon had proved himself to stand alone in the first rank of deities—alone capable of directing affairs in the Ethbalite land.

¹ On the meaning of Al'ab, see *Two Religions*, pp. 228, 240, etc. Aphelḵ, like Aphiaḥ in 1 S. ix. 1, comes from this compound regional. On its situation, see *Crit. Bib.* p. 206. There may have been more than one place of the name. This one is in the southern border-land; evidently it is in the 'land of Hēpher' which is Gileadite (Josh. xvii. 3) and Ashḥurite (1 Chr. iv. 5 *f.*). Esarhaddon speaks of the city of Aḥḵu in Samena (*KAT*⁽³⁾ p. 89), *i.e.* in Ishmael (N. Arabia).

² Hophni is but a double of Phinehas; his name is a mutilated and distorted form of the name of his brother.

The tradition of the Israelites is that Dagon, unlike Yahweh, was worshipped under the form of the image of a man. This is probably correct; the Israelites were content with the symbol of rudely carved stones, and, at a somewhat later date, of an ox. But in spite of the attestation of a Babylonian god Dakan, I doubt extremely whether Dagon was really the cult-name; it looks much more like a title. It is not, however, to be explained in the light of the solar myth, as if Dagon were an Oannes (cp. Berossus). Previous experience with the titles of Ashtart suggests that it refers to the district in which the god was worshipped. And since there is no such regional name as Dâg, it becomes very probable that Dagon is a corruption of Gadon, *i.e.* 'one belonging to Gad.' There may have been southern Ethbalites, there were most certainly southern Israelites, who were Gadites.¹ The proof of this lies close at hand. From the fact (1) that there was an Asherite town Beth-Dagon (Josh. xix. 27; we should, however, most probably read Beth-Gadon), and (2) that the Israelitish Gad and Asher were brother-tribes, we cannot do less than assume that they had common tribal divinities, one of which was called Asher, and the other Baal-Gad or Baal-Gadon. The early importance of the tribe Gad is shown by

¹ Gad is of uncertain origin. It may be a divine name = Fortune. More probably it comes from a form Gadsham or Gashdam; cp. Gershon from Gashram. Gashdam = Ashhur-Edom; Gashram = Ashhur-Aram. Note also Ʒadesh from Ʒashdam. All primarily N. Arabian. Cp. Azgad, *i.e.* Ezer-Gad, Ezr. ii. 17.

the substitution of Gilead for Gad in the Song of Deborah (Judg. v. 17), and though Mesha, king of Moab, says, in his inscription, that the men of Gad had dwelt in Ataroth (on the other side of Jordan) 'from of old,' this does not exclude the possibility that a portion of the Israelite Gadites dwelt in the neighbourhood of Gad-worshipping Ethbalites.

But at this point some reader may ask, Are we to suppose that the armies on both sides were linked by the cult of a common divinity? Would not warfare between such be contrary to the general sentiment of the times? To the first question I reply in the affirmative. Ethbalites and Israelites alike worshipped a god, among whose names or titles were Gad, Asher,¹ and Dôd. To the second

¹ For the Israelites Gad and Asher, as divine names, may be inferred from the tribal names (Gen. xxx. 10-13; *T. and B.* p. 378), and Dôd from the Dôdah of Mesha's inscription (*T. and B.* pp. 46, 379). For the Ethbalites the former is warranted by the fact that some part of the southern Gilead formed one of the Ethbalite kingdoms (Gath = Gilead, see p. 137), and that Gilead is the domain of the deity called Gad. Also that Ashdôd comes from Asshur-dôd, a region where Asshur and Dôd must have been the protecting divinities. Aphek, also, was Gileadite, being in the land of Hephher (p. 14, n. 1). And Shiloh, too, may not improperly be so regarded. For it can hardly have been very far from Eben-ezer, which (as men probably said) was set up by the great Judge Gideon, the representative of the clan of Abi-ezer (Judg. vi. 11). At any rate, Gideon (whose name comes from Gileadon) raised an altar-sanctuary at Ophrah (Judg. vi. 4) which he called by a name almost agreeing with that of the god of Shiloh, viz. Yahweh-Shalem (= Yahweh-Ishmael). Ophrah was the name of a city of (the southern?) Benjamin or Yamin. In the same part of the great geographical list (Josh. xviii. 23 f.), next to Ophrah,

I would reply that the main difference between the opposing peoples was that, for the Ethbalites, the directing God in the Divine Company was Baal in the character of Gad, while for the Israelites he was Yahu or (in the expanded form) Yahweh. It was therefore really something like a holy war between Baal (= Yerahme'el) and Yahweh. It was no doubt a war for territory too, but the Israelite clans must have early come to the sense that neither the Mişrite nor the Ethbalite cults and religious practices were adequate to the highest wants of the people. The circle of cults referred to was not indeed entirely unprogressive, but was burdened with archaic elements which could not apparently be discarded.¹

We must not suppose that Gadon (= Baal-Gad) was really the only god whose image appeared in the Ashdod temple. There were also, of course, images of the god Asher or Asshur, and of the goddess Asherah or Ashtart² (also called, as parallel cases elsewhere indicate, Dôdah). And in the porch of the temple there would be two specially tall pillars,³ symbolically carved, and dedicated to the god Baal-Gad. Other smaller pillars there may also have been, devoted to those lesser deities, who had in

occurs the enigmatical name Kefar-haammonai, which it is now possible to explain. Evidently it is a transformation of Akrab-Aḥiman (Aḥiman is an Anaḳite name; the Ethbalites were Anaḳites).

¹ *T. and B.* p. 37; *Two Religions*, pp. 18, 21, 23.

² Cp. I S. xxxi. 10, 'And they put his armour in the house of Ashtaroth.'

³ See *T. and B.* pp. 30 (with note 3), 369.

any way connected themselves with the life of the people. These would sometimes have been won in battle, and among them the Palladium of the Israelites of the border-land would naturally find a place.

The story of the triumphal carrying-about of Israel's god (cp. 1 S. iv. 7 *f.*) yields nothing to the historian, except it be the alliance against Israel of two Ethbalite tribes, the Baalites, also called the Ashḥartites (= Kerethites), and the Akrabbites.¹ The two former names may express the devotion of the tribe to Baal (= Yerahme'el) and Ashḥart (the feminine of Ashḥar or Ashḥur) respectively; the third simply means the inhabitants of the region or district of Akrah (= Ashḥur of Arabia). We shall meet with Akrabbim again shortly (see also p. 36, for Akrabbath).

For a long time the Israelites appear to have made no strong effort to recover their lost treasure. Doubtless it was not their only sacred stone. Not to mention the Kerūbīm² (which faith regarded as divinely inhabited), there were other carved stones, and especially perhaps one portable sacred stone, the counterpart of the lost one,³ with which those in quest of oracles on public affairs of moment, were forced to be content.

It was David—a native of the southern region

¹ The distorted words of the text are—עבברים, טהרים, עפלים.

² *T. and B.* p. 35.

³ Cp. the two great pillars in Solomon's temple, and see Winckler, *Ar.-sem.-or.*, p. 93.

of Dôd¹ (a part of the N. Arabian Asshur), but unlike his Ethbalite neighbours in his exaltation of the god Yahweh—who conceived the idea of recovering the lost sacred stone. As soon as the Ethbalites heard of the extension of David's kingship over other settled Israelite clans in N. Arabia, they came in great force and challenged him to a trial of strength. This time they spread out in the Valley (or, Plain) of Rephaim (cp. Isa. xvii. 5, and see *Two Religions*, pp. 325 *f.*). It is probable that this valley was not very far from Aphek, where the Israelites on a former occasion lost both the battle and their Palladium. The Ethbalites were Anaķites, and the Anaķites were Rephaites. Add to this that, as an analysis of the names shows, Aphek and Rephaites are equivalent words; also that the 'hold of Adullam' enters into the story. Now Adullam, or rather Armal, was certainly very near the centre of David's clan;² *i.e.* it was in Dôd, where (in one of the Ethbalite towns) the captured sacred stone of the Israelites was still, presumably, detained. Near by was a mountain, sacred in Isaiah's time to Yahweh (Isa. xxviii. 21), but in earlier times, no doubt, to the older god Yerahme'el.³ Isaiah calls it

¹ See *T. and B.* pp. 48, 432 (n. 1). He had Ishmaelite (N. Arabian) scribes, *ib.* p. 218.

² 'When his brethren and all his father's house heard it, they went down thither to him,' 1 S. xxii. 1. The place referred to must have been not far from Mişpeh of Maakah (so read, with Gemoll, in 1 S. xxii. 3).

³ See *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 192-194. The Peraşim are the same

Peraşim, from a widespread clan which had its centre in the neighbourhood. Very possibly it was the southern Hermon in the land of Mişpeh,¹ (Josh. xi. 3)—the mountain upon which, according to Enoch, the rebel angels descended.² Twice David fought the Ethbalites in the valley, and it was on the first occasion probably that he recovered the lost sacred stone.

That it was by force of arms that David recovered Israel's treasure, is clear from three ingeniously distorted statements of the traditional narrative. The first is the statement (2 S. v. 21) that the Ethbalites left their images on the field of battle, and that David and his men took them away. Even if the Ethbalites did not, according to the later tradition, bring the Israelites' sacred stone among the others, yet the tradition is right in asserting that David's attention was fixed on the humiliation of the Ethbalite deities, and, as a consequence, on the recovery of the symbol of his own god. For though the apparent differences between religions may be slight, yet the adherents of the respective parties are none the less embittered.

as the Perizzites. Note that both are connected by tradition with the Rephaim (see Josh. xvii. 15). Other current forms are Şorephim (1 Chr. ii. 55, revised text), Şippor, Sophar (*Two Religions*, pp. 92 f., 132; *E. Bib.* 'Zarephath').

¹ Mişpeh may be simply an expansion of Şarephath. As to the southern Hermon, it was probably known by several names. One of them may have been Şalmon (Judg. ix. 48), *i.e.* 'the Ishmael mountain.' But cp. Gemoll, p. 282.

² *T. and B.* p. 119.

The second is the statement, in 2 S. vi., that David gathered a force of all the grown-up Israelite men in the border-territory.¹ This really means that David and his people made a supreme attempt to put down the Ethbalite power. The true meaning however is obscured and distorted by the context (*vv.* 2, 12*b*). It is there represented that the object was quite different, viz. to go in procession, carrying the Holy Symbol, from Baalé (or, Baal) of Judah to the new capital. And whereas the original story indicated the places in the border-land whence the young warriors of Israel came, the later scribe has turned this into a list of the musical instruments used by 'David and all the house of Israel' in the procession² (2 S. vi. 5)!

The third is the statement in 2 S. v. 6-8 that an imprudent act of Uzzah's was punished by his sudden death, and that the place was therefore called Pereş-Uzzah. This is evidently a distortion of the tradition that the Ethbalites (the captors of the sacred stone) were punished by divinely-caused defeat. Peraşim and Pereş-Uzzah³ are clearly identical.

Certainly it was no mere superstitious dread which prevented David from at once depositing the symbol called Arman (misread 'arôn) in a permanent

¹ See p. 37.

² The clearest are *roshim* = Asshurim, dwellers in Asshur; *tupfim* = Paltim; *menā'an'im* = Kena'anim. See *Crit. Bib.* p. 270.

³ Uzzah, probably from the clan-name Ezer; so too Azgad = Ezer-Gad and Azzah (Gaza) = Azrah. Cp. Uziah = Azariah.

and honourable resting-place, but the slow progress which he made in the war with the Ethbalites. It is probably true that the Arman found its first home at Beth-Shemesh (1 S. vi. 12-15). This was a place of importance, and therefore provided with a sanctuary.¹ The name was originally Beth-Ishman² (*i.e.* Beth-Ishmael). It is noteworthy that the kine recognize the straight way (they must have been warned of God, like Balaam's ass), and still more so that, according to the Septuagint's text, when the cart with the Arman reached Beth-Shemesh, an attack was made on the town by raiding Kenites (Anakites?) or Ishmaelites.³ It is likely that David first of all placed the Arman in the Beth-Shemesh sanctuary, and that the attack of the raiders on the town hastened his bold and successful attack on Kiryath-Ye'arim. Whether the minister of the Arman in its temporary abode was called Abi-Nadab⁴ or 'Obed-Edom' matters not. In any case he would naturally be a N. Arabian and probably a non-Israelite. It should be added that 'Obed-Edom the Gittite' is corrupt,⁵ and should be read 'Yobal-Aram the Gileadite.'

¹ Hos. vi. 10 and C of Judg. ii. 1 (see *Two Religions*, pp. 248, 282).

² See the place-name, no. 51, in the list of Thothmes, which covers over the Hebrew Shemesh-Edom, *i.e.* not 'sun of Edom' but 'Ishmael-Edom' (*E. Bib.* 'Beth-shemesh').

³ On C 's text see *Crit. Bib.*

⁴ Nadab was a Yerahme'elite or Ashtarite clan (1 Chr. ii. 26, 28).

⁵ For 'Obed,' see 1 Chr. ii. 37, where this name occurs in the genealogy of Sheshan, *i.e.* Shemshan (=belonging to Shemesh or

In order to understand the narrative 2 S. vi. we must apply a keen criticism to the text of *v.* 2. The result, in my opinion, is in the main certain. The passage should run thus, 'And David arose, and went with all the band that was with him, to bring up the 'Arman from Ba'al of Judah to the city whose name is called Yabesh of the Akrabbites.'¹ This was one at least of David's objects; he was ambitious enough and unscrupulous enough, no doubt, but he was devoted to the more progressive of the rival deities, and could not rest till he had delivered the Holy Symbol from its state of humiliation. The only possible resting-place was the destined religious and political capital of the expanded kingdom. Of the campaign in which David made this acquisition we seem to have two accounts; one is in 2 S. v. 22-25, the other in *v.* 6-9. Both, when scrutinized critically, reveal important facts.

The former narrative centres in what God did for David; the latter, in what David, knowing that God was with him, did for himself. In 2 S. v. 23 *f.* a divine oracle is recorded. First, David is directed to make a circuit so as to come upon the Ethbalites, not 'opposite the *baka* = trees,' but 'opposite Akrabbim.'² (This, it should be explained, is one of the current alternative names of the

Ishmael). Like Ebed in Judg. ix. 26, Obed should be Yobal (= Yarbaal). 'Edom' should probably be 'Aram.'

¹ Methodically corrected text.

² Cp. *E. Bib.* 'Mulberry.'

intended capital; we have already met with it in the preceding pages.) The oracle further says that when David hears the sound of a 'marching' in the gateway of Akrabbim, he will know that Yahweh is going out¹ before him to smite the Ethbalite army. And so it was. The mysterious sound which encouraged David, produced a panic—so we may supplement the story—both on the Ethbalites of the plain and on those in Akrabbim. It was indeed a great victory; the whole district from Gibeon to the neighbourhood of Gezer² was occupied by the Israelites (2 S. v. 25), and among the walled towns in this district was Akrabbim or Yabesh of the Akrabbites (see p. 39), soon to become the capital of David's realm.

¹ The starting-point is the mountain of Hermon = Peraşim. For the 'marching,' cp. Isa. lxiii. 1 (*SBOT*), and contrast *Nala and Damayanti*, where the feet of gods are said not to touch the ground.

² It seems probable that the Gezer intended was within easy reach of Shekem or Shakram, which was probably another but equivalent name for the city best known as Kiryath-Ye'arim. See 1 Chr. vii. 28, and cp. Mt. Gerizzim.

CHAPTER III

JERUSALEM AND RABBAH ; DAVID, A NORTH ARABIAN ;
HIS SIEGES OF JERUSALEM AND RABBAH

It is certainly incorrect to say with Josephus (*Ant.* vii. 3. 29) that the original name of Jerusalem was Solyma. But it is more than probable (see p. 36) that there were shorter current names for the city now briefly called el-Ḳuds than Jerusalem.¹ Such shorter names must also have been current for the N. Arabian Jerusalem (rather Urushalem), and we may be sure that the migrating N. Arabians took both the longer and some at least of the shorter names with them, and attached them to the more northerly site of the city so dear to us under the name Jerusalem.

One of the shorter names of the N. Arabian Urushalem was most probably Shalem—a view which is not only too natural in itself to be neglected, but is confirmed by Gen. xxxiii. 18, which, in its original form, ran thus,—‘And Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shakram, when he came from Paddan-

¹ According to W. M. Müller, Rameses II. mentions Jerusalem as Ša-la-ma.

Aram,¹ and pitched his tent before the city.' Another was probably Ḥashram or Shakram, a name which, like a good many other names, was common to a region or district and to that region's chief town. From the gloss traditionally attached, in the passage here quoted, to 'a city of Shakram,' viz. 'which is in the land of Kena'an' (Canaan), we may infer that Shalem (*i.e.* Shakram or Urushalem) was near the border of the southern Cana'an, and in fact we find a Ḳadesh (*i.e.* Ḳashram or Ḥashram) mentioned as on the edge of the land of Aram² (Num. xx. 16; cp. xxxiii. 37). To make assurance doubly sure, we are told in two other glosses (*v.* 19) that Ḥamor is = 'Arabia of Shakram,' and that the ground which Jacob purchased from the Ḥamor-clan was in the region of Ra'amath Sukkoth.³

I have been reasoning on the assumption that the southern Urushalem was in the N. Arabian region called Shakram. Of definite and absolutely cogent evidence, there is a lack. But the assumption seems to me to make it easier to explain the course of events, especially when I add that among the other names of the southern Urushalem is, very probably, Kashmëron, which, in course of time, became cor-

¹ See *T. and B.* p. 357. It should have been added that *pad* is probably shortened from *paḥad* (cp. Şelopheḥad, or rather Salpaḥad, *i.e.* Ishmael-Paḥad). Paḥad is evidently a regional, and may, in accordance with analogies, come from Abḥad, *i.e.* 'Arabia of Ḥadad' (cp. Gen. xxv. 15).

² 'Aram,' as often, has been supplanted by 'Edom.' The southern Aram is meant (*T. and B.* p. 407).

³ Sukkoth is a popular corruption of Salekath (*T. and B.* p. 406).

rupted into Shimeon or Shomëron (see p. 101). It has often been wondered why the true Amos has nothing to say about Jerusalem. Now we can see that the southern Jerusalem—the leading city of the N. Arabian border—is more than once referred to by the prophet, not indeed under the name Uru-shalem, but under the equivalent name Kashmëron.¹

Among the many confirmations of our results is that supplied by the strange but important narrative in Gen. xiv. The present text of vv. 17-24 is certainly not reliable. But it is not so corrupt as not to present some traces of the original text; the apparent wildness of the scribes is not devoid of method. After repeated attempts I have, as I hope, recovered what must be very near the original, both as regards the narrative proper and as regards the interspersed glosses. It is this:

‘And the king of H̄ashram went out to meet him (*gloss*, after his return from the slaughter of Bar-dad-‘amral, and of the kings that were with him), in the valley of Ashh̄ur (*gloss*, that is, the king’s dale). (*Glosses on* ‘the king of H̄ashram,’ the king of Şedek, the king of Shalem; *glosses on* ‘Şedek,’ that is, Şib’on, Yerahme’el and Yavan.) Now he was a priest of the Supreme God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the Supreme God, creator of heaven and earth, and blessed be the Supreme God (*gloss on* ‘the

¹ It is of course not denied that the traditional text is opposed to this view.

Supreme God,' Ashhur - Yerahme'el) who has delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him of the riches of the kings. And the king of Hashram said to Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself. And Abram said to the king of Hashram, I lift up my hand unto the Supreme God (*glosses*, Yahwè; creator of heaven and earth) that I will not sin against thee, and that I will not take anything that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich. Only that which the servants have eaten [will I take], and the portion of the men who went with me (*glosses*, Yarba'al, Shin'ar, Ashkal, and Ra'aman), let them take their portion.'

This is the sequel of the account of Abram's warlike intervention in behalf of Sodom, or rather Hashram or Kashram (= Ramshaḥ). The name Hashram (= Asshur - Aram) or Ramshaḥ (*i.e.* Aram-Ashhur) attaches, we must remember, alike to a region of larger or smaller extent, and to a city. Two interwoven glosses state that we might with equal correctness speak of the king of Şedeḳ or the king of Shalem, and that both names are equivalent to Hashram. This is important, and presumably correct. Şedeḳ, for instance, was certainly a widespread place-name and clan-name,¹ as we see in part from the fact that it enters into the name of a king of Judah and a king of Ashkelon,

¹ Cp. Ben-ṣi-id-ḳi (*Am. Tab.* 125, 37). Şedeḳ was also probably a divine name (see *T. and B.* p. 194).

who both, presumably, laid claim to some part of the region of Şedeķ. It is probable, too, that it underlies place-names, such, *e.g.*, as Şidon (though this name was also a regional, 1 K. xvii. 9), and Şiklag (the Ethbalite city held in fief by David, 1 S. xxvii. 6). There is also convincing evidence that the southern Jerusalem (Urushalem) was at once in the land of H̄ashram and in that of Şedeķ. In Josh. x. 1 *ff.* we find mention of Adoni-şedeķ,¹ king of Jerusalem. Now this Jerusalem is certainly in the south, for it was near Gibeon, which the course of history as well as the glosses in Josh. x. 2² prove to have been in the south. It is equally certain that the southern Jerusalem is referred to in Judg. i. 7, as the place to which the captive king Adoni-bezeķ was carried to die. More definitely, this Jerusalem was in the district of Rabshaķ. For Bezek can be shown to be the short for Rab-shaķ,³ and Adoni-bezeķ implies that the royal bearer of the name laid claim to some portion of the land of Adon (= Addan, Ezr. ii. 59, and *cp.* perhaps, Eden) and of Şedeķ.

We are not therefore surprised to discover that the usage of Shalem ('king of Shalem' says one of the glosses) is analogous to that of Şedeķ and of H̄ashram. Shalem is probably both a regional⁴ and

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 193 *f.*

² See *Crit. Bib.* p. 411.

³ *T. and B.* pp. 57, 159; *cp. D. and F.* pp. 89 *f.*; *Two Religions*, pp. 181, 350. Gemoll (p. 173) connects Bezek with Kezib, but, according to analogy, Kezib = Akzib = Ashh̄ur-Zib'on.

⁴ *Cp. T. and B.* p. 414 (on Gen. xxxiv. 21).

a place-name. Şedeķ must have been an extensive region if it included both Şidon (in the south) and Ashkelon, and it must be mere accident that the scribes (who seem to have been partial to the form Shemen) have left us so little evidence of the wider use of the name Shalem. We need not doubt, however, that Shalem is really used in the wider sense in the gloss included in Gen. xiv. 18, just as it is used in the narrower sense—as a place-name in Gen. xxxiii. 18.

Shalem, as we have seen, was 'in the land of Canaan.' To illustrate this, we may compare Gen. xiii. 12 (cp. xix. 25), where Abram is said to have dwelt in the land of Canaan, *i.e.* of the Ethbalites¹ (Zeph. ii. 5), while Lot chose 'all Ashkar of Yarḥon,'² which in those early days is asserted to have rivalled Paradise in its fertility, and dwelt in 'Arabia³ of Ashkar.' Much has been written about the *Kikkar* (such is the word in the text, but it can hardly be right), but now that we have had our eyes opened, we see that a regional name is required. *Kar* has come from *Kerem*, and this, like *Reķem*, from Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el. The doubling of the *k* is in accordance with the analogy of Sisera, Shishaķ, Beṣaleel, and perhaps we may add Mamre, and the dropping of the initial *Ash* may be paralleled by Dôd for Ashdod and Ḥur

¹ *Two Religions*, p. 411.

² Cp. *T. and B.* pp. 228, 380; Gemoll, pp. 248-252.

³ יר is a corruption of אר, as in Judg. xii. 7.

for Ashhur. Thus 'Ashkar of Yarḥon' means that part of Ashhur-Yerahme'el (N. Arabia) which is bordered by the stream called the Yarḥon. We find it also referred to in 1 K. vii. 46, and by an extremely probable correction in 1 K. xvi. 24;¹ and archaistically in Neh. iii. 22, xii. 28; cp. Mt. iii. 5, Lk. iii. 3.

We have now the key to one class of the often surprising silences of the Old Testament. For a time one place-name is of frequent occurrence; it appears as if the place had been definitely selected as the capital city, or at any rate as if it was of great political or religious importance, and then suddenly it disappears. The explanation may be that the scribes, in quite excusable ignorance, have covered over some unrecognized place-name. Or again, it may be that the accidents of war have borne hardly on some formerly important city, and led to a transference of prestige to some neighbouring city. And to these possible explanations we may now add a new one. It may be that a city had several names, just as regions and districts had several designations, which were almost invariably equivalent. Evidently it often happened that when the full form of the name was a compound, the people shortened or contracted the form for greater convenience.

Thus the same city can be called Shakram (Shekem) as the political and religious centre of the tribes of southern Israel, especially of the Joseph

¹ Read, 'in Ashkar of Yaman [*gloss*, Kashram].'

tribe; or Urushalem, as one of the two residences of David and Solomon; or Ashhur-Yarham (or Yerahme'el) as having the greatest and oldest of the sanctuaries—that supported by the original Book of Deuteronomy, and yet all these three seemingly different cities are one. And though it may be doubtful whether any of the scribes knew that Shakram and Jerusalem were the same, yet now and then we do find a correct scribal interpretation of Shakram, *e.g.* in Gen. xlviii. 22, the original form of which probably ran thus (excluding glosses¹),—

‘And I give unto thee Shakram, which thou takest (shalt take) out of the hand of the Amorite (Arammite?).’

To this there are several scribal glosses, all indicating that Shakram (Shekem) was in Asshur, Yerahme'el, or Arabia.

I have called the city of Shakram (Shekem) the political and religious centre of the Israelites. This is sufficiently justified by 1 K. xii. 1, for the great assembly there spoken of was certainly at once political and religious. But we have also earlier evidence, for both Gideon and Abimelek are legendary heroes of the region of Shakram, though Gideon has 'Ophrah,² and Abimelek has the city of Shakram for his residence. The difference between

¹ See *T. and B.* pp. 494 *f.*

² Possibly connected with Ephrath.

Gideon and Abimelek, politically, is that Gideon is not represented, but Abimelek is, as a titular king, and religiously, that Gideon espoused the claims of Yahwè to be the supreme director of the Divine Company, and Abimelek those of Yerahme'el. Probably, too, Gideon altogether rejected certain elements in the ritual of Yerahme'el, accepted by Abimelek, and would have nothing to do with the worship of a goddess, whether called Asherah or 'Arbith (corrupted into Berith¹) or Şeba'ith (altered officially—see p. 34—at a later time into Şeba'oth).

We may perhaps be surprised to find Shakram on the side of the less progressive of the 'two religions' of Israel. But the fact probably is that, except for an interval during the rule of Gideon, the city called Shakram, Shalem, and Urushalem continued, as in the legendary period of Abram (Gen. xiv.), to be a centre of Yerahme'elite religion. When David conquered the city there was doubtless an alteration in the type of religion officially represented in it. But if the sanctuary of Shakram, like that of Bethel (Am. vii. 13), was under royal control, we may presume that the official religion altered even after David's time.

The religion of Gideon was the cult of Yahweh and Ishmael or Yerahme'el² (Judg. vi. 24); that of Shakram (Shekem) was the cult of Yerahme'el

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 34 f.; *Two Religions*, pp. 116 f.

² Gideon's altar in Ophrah was called Yahweh Shalom, *i.e.* Yahweh-Ishmael. (Shalom = Ishmael, as in Mic. v. 4; see *Two Religions*, p. 371.)

and 'Arbith (Judg. ix. 4). The latter had a strong fascination for most Israelites both in Gideon's time and after (Judg. viii. 33). We can still detect a reference to the N. Arabian goddess Aštart in the manipulated passage 1 S. iv. 4, where 'the ark of the covenant of Yahweh-Hosts' must originally have been simply 'Arman—'Arbith.' To this an early scribe appended the gloss 'Yahweh-Şeba'ith' (= Sib'onith), accepting the traditional goddess, but giving her a different title, which, for edification's sake, a comparatively early redactor altered into 'Yahweh Şeba'oth,' 'Yahweh Hosts.'

Perhaps the greatest monument of the city of many names is the Book of Deuteronomy in its original form (so far as this can be recovered). As I hope that I have shown, the full form of the name of God there used is Yahweh-Yerahme'el (or Yahweh-Yarḥam), and the place where was the great sanctuary of the Israelites was a city which bore the name of Ashḥur-Yarḥam. In the time of Josiah, no doubt, this religious metropolis still contained idols of the god Asshur,¹ but it is credible that the reforming king removed such, to him, objectionable symbols.

What, briefly, were the fortunes of this city and sanctuary? Most probably its history was a

¹ 2 K. xxiii. 8 (*D. and F.* pp. 26 *f.*), and for the pre-Josian period see Gen. xix. 26, where the present text has been devised by a clever scribe out of an earlier text which ran, 'and the abomination of Ashtor-Yerahme'el, that is, Sibe'on-Yerahme'el.' Apparently the city where the sanctuary was (two names of which are given) contained a noted idolatrous symbol of the great N. Arabian deity (*T. and B.* p. 306).

chequered one. Abimelek destroyed it; some other king or 'judge' rebuilt it; the Jebusites reoccupied it. David took it; Jeroboam refortified it; some N. Arabian foe destroyed it. Omri rebuilt it; a king of Bābel destroyed it, and a king of Ashḥur probably rebuilt it. Two prophetic writers in 'Isaiah'¹ anticipate great things for it (ii. 1, xix. 18*b*). It is probable too that some of the canonical psalms were brought to the best-known Jerusalem from the N. Arabian sanctuary.²

Among these Psalms, Ps. cxxii. deserves special attention. It will be noticed that *vv.* 3-5 do not cohere in the least with *vv.* 1, 2, and 6-9. A more methodical criticism, however, is rewarded by valuable glimpses of N. Arabian Israelitish tradition. Verses 3-5 are probably an extended gloss, which states that the city referred to in *v.* 2 had been rebuilt (*i.e.* by leave of the N. Arabian king 'Koresh') in the land of the Yerahme'elites; that the 'tribes' (an archaism) in the border-land used to 'go up' thither on the festivals of Yahweh, and that there were the 'thrones for judgment, the thrones of David's house.' The name of the city was 'Jerusalem,' *i.e.* Uru-shalem (= 'Asshur-Shalem'), a name which had been carried northward by the Yerahme'elites or N. Arabians, but which, as the literary evidence shows, still existed in the border-land.

¹ *Two Religions*, pp. 296 *f.*, 358 *f.*; cp. 213 *f.*

² *Book of Psalms* ⁽²⁾, ii. 184.

That David and Solomon most probably resided in the southern Jerusalem is a view which I have propounded before. The narratives are by no means always clear; there are different strata with various geographical representations, and great confusion has resulted. But the harder view is here, as often, more likely to be correct, viz. that David and his successor resided sometimes in the southern capital. There is little doubt that the city which, according to 2 S. v. 7-9, David conquered, had for one of its names Asshur-Dôd, and was regarded as the mother-city of part of the N. Arabian region called Asshur, and that it also bore the names 'Yabesh in Yaman,' 'Yaman of the Akrabbites,' and 'Kiryath-Ye'arim' (corrupted from either Ashhoreth-Ye'arim or Akrabbath-Ye'arim). But is it really the fact that David (and Solomon) often resided in a N. Arabian city? Can we complete the argument for this unpopular view?

Any lingering doubt must, I think, be dissipated by a keen criticism of 2 S. v., vi. The city in which David dwelt was called Asshur-Dôd (v. 9), and the same city or region was occupied by a 'multitude' of Israelite clansmen (vi. 19). Indeed, it appears from the narrative that the possession of a strong N. Arabian city was necessary to enable David to consolidate his power in the south-land. Residence was a condition of the permanence of his rule.

Of course, we need not suppose that the 'young

warriors of Israel' amounted to thirty thousand (vi. 1). 'Thirty thousand' can hardly be due to the original writer. There is a whole group of passages, in which ethnics have been disguised as numerals, sometimes with truly extraordinary results. In the present case, 'thirty thousand' should be simply 'Ishmael,'¹ which is a gloss on 'Israel,' intimating that the Israelite clans in N. Arabia are meant. Similarly with regard to 2 S. vi. 5, the parallel case of 1 S. xviii. 6 enables us to say that the seeming musical instruments (so stirring to the artistic imagination) are really ethnics and the like; it is the Israel of the southern border-land which is meant by 'all the house of Israel,' just as 'all the tribes of Israel' in 2 S. v. 1, xv. 10, means only 'all the Israelite tribes (or clans) which occupy the border-land.'

The care which the gloss-makers took to prevent misunderstandings is further shown by the original text of 2 S. vi. 19, which simply stated that David 'gave portions (of the sacrificial flesh) to the whole multitude of Israel.' To this was added, as a first gloss, 'Ishmael' (*i.e.* Israel in N. Arabia), then 'Arab-Ashhur,' next 'Ishmael,' then 'Ashhoreth-Yerah-me'el,' then 'Ashhoreth and Asshur-Arab,'² then 'Ashhur,' then 'Asshur,'³ then 'Ashhoreth.' Nor was this anxious care of the scribes confined to

¹ ישמעאל probably comes from ישמעאל אלה; either represents ישמעאל, or is due to the scribe.

² אשחור.

³ אשחור; see *Two Religions*, p. 229.

the story of David. The strange words 'and after Samuel' in 1 S. xi. 7,¹ should evidently be 'that is, Ashhur-Ishmael,' a gloss which correctly limits the meaning of 'all the Israelite territories.'

I have reserved for the close of this section that most interesting but difficult narrative, 2 S. v. 6-10. Restored to its original form, it should, I venture to hold, probably run thus :

'And the king and his men went against Urushalem, against the Yebusite,² and he said to David, Thou canst not come in hither, for it is the mother-city of Ashkar. And David took the stronghold of Şibyon. And David triumphed in that day, because of the defeat of the Yebusite. And he ruled in Şibyon, and the Pinhasites and the Asshurites David subdued. And David dwelt in the stronghold, and called it Ur-Dod. And David fortified Yabesh in Yaman, and its daughter-cities.'

To illustrate the view here taken of this ancient tradition, I will give another form of the same narrative, with the inserted glosses, and the disfiguring corruptions, so far as they are at least comparatively early :

'And the king and his men went against Jerusalem, against the Yebusites, *Ishbaal-Ashhur*, and he—*Yerahme'el*³—said to David, Thou wilt not *come in hither except* thou remove the blind

¹ *Two Religions*, p. 121.

² *T. and B.* p. 336.

³ A conventional name for a N. Arabian king (cp. Isa. xiv. 12).

and the lame, saying, *David will not come in hither.* And David took the stronghold of Şion; *that is, the city of David.* And David said on that day, *Whoever smiteth the Yebusites, if he shall win his way to the Şinnor. . . . The Pinḥasites and the Asshurites—Ishmael—David subdued. Therefore they say, The Asshurites and the Pinḥasites may not enter the house.*¹ And David dwelt in the stronghold, and called it *City of David.* And David built round about from Millo and inward.'

I could of course devote several pages to the textual basis of this revised version, but the digression might hinder the general effect. I may remark, however, that my own studies on the text have led me to a somewhat trying conclusion, viz. that the city, whose conquest is here related, was not the world-famous Jerusalem (the modern el-Kuds), but a N. Arabian city variously called Yabesh, Akrabim, Ur-Shalem, Şiyon (Şib'on), and Ur-Dod. Ur (represented by ירו and עיר) is a contraction of Asshur, and Shalem a formation from Ishmael. Its king (here called Yerahme'el) replies to a summons from David, that no invader can enter Ur-Shalem, because it is the mother-city of Ashkar² (= Asshur-Rekem), and therefore the city most secure from attack. Of the population we have two accounts,—according to one they were Yebusites (*i.e.* Ishmaelites); according to the other, Pinḥasites and Asshurites.³ We know the Asshurites best.

¹ That is, the temple.

² בְּי אִם אֶקְרָר.

³ פְּנֵהֵם וְאִשְׁרִים.

The N. Arabian Asshur is constantly spoken of (*e.g.* Isa. x. 5, Mic. vi. 4), and Saul's son Ishbaal¹ had Asshurim (2 S. ii. 9) for a part of his dominions. But Pinhas should also be known to us. Gibeah of Pinhas² is mentioned in Josh. xxiv. 33 as a part of Mt. Ephraim. Pinhas, it is true, is usually regarded as a personal name, and provided with an Egyptian etymology. That, however, is surely a mistake. Pinhas is properly not a personal but a regional name; it is shortened from נפתחם, *i.e.* Naphtaḥ-Ashḥur.³ The Naphtuḥim (referred to again elsewhere) were a Miṣrite tribe,⁴ and no doubt the Mt. Ephraim of Josh. xxiv. 33 was a N. Arabian region. We also find Pinhas in Jer. ii. 16, xlvi. 15; both passages show that the Pinhasites had strong warlike instincts. The writer of a later gloss thinks that such persons were excluded from the temple. Cp. Deut. xxiii. 2-4; *D. and F.* pp. 26 *f.*

Nor must I omit to refer to another strange but equally important narrative in which the name Shalem appears to do duty for Jerusalem (Gen. xiv.). The present text of *vv.* 17-24 is no doubt very faulty. But it is by no means so corrupt as not to preserve some traces of the original text; the apparent wildness of the scribes is not devoid of method. After repeated attempts I have, as I

¹ *Two Religions*, p. 279.

² נבעה in place-names is not 'hill,' but a corruption of אהאב = אהב; see p. 123.

³ *Two Religions*, p. 346.

⁴ Gen. x. 13; cp. *T. and B.* pp. 190 *f.*

hope, recovered what must be very near the original, both as regards the narrative proper and as regards the interspersed glosses. It is this :

‘And the king of Ḥashram went out to meet him (*gloss*, after his return from the slaughter of Bir-dad-‘amral, and of the kings that were with him), in the valley of Ashḥur (*gloss*, that is, the king’s dale). (*Glosses* on ‘the king of Ḥashram,’ the king of Ṣedeḳ, the king of Shalem; *glosses* on ‘Ṣedeḳ,’ that is, Ṣib’on, Yeraḥme’el and Yawan.) Now he was a priest of the Supreme God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the Supreme God, creator of heaven and earth, and blessed be the Supreme God (*gloss*, Ashḥur-Yeraḥme’el) who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him of the riches of the kings. And the king of Ḥashram said to Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself. And Abram said to the king of Ḥashram, I lift up my hand unto the Supreme God (*glosses*, Yahwè; creator of heaven and earth) that I will not sin against thee, and that I will not take anything that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich. Only that which the servants have eaten [will I take], and the portion of the men who went with me (*glosses*, Yarba’al, Shin’ar, Ashkal, and Ra’aman), let them take their portion.’

This is the sequel of the account of Abram’s intervention in behalf of Sodom, or rather Ḥashram or Kashram (= Ramshaḥ). The name Ḥashram

(= Ashhur-Aram) or Ramshaḥ (*i.e.* Aram-Ashhur) attaches alike to a region of larger or of smaller extent, and to a city. Two interwoven glosses state that we might with equal correctness speak of the king of Şedeḳ or the king of Shalem, and that both names are equivalent to Ḥashram. This is important, and presumably correct. Şedeḳ, for instance, was certainly a widespread place-name and clan-name, as we see in part from the fact that it enters into the name of a king of Judah and a king of Ashkelon, who both presumably laid claim to some part of the region of Şedeḳ. It is probable, too, that it underlies place-names, such *e.g.* as Şidon (though this name was also a regional, 1 K. xvii. 9) and Şiḳlag¹ (the Ethbalite city owned by David, 1 S. xxvii. 6).

There is also convincing evidence that the southern Jerusalem (Urushalem) was at once in the land of Ḥashram, and in that of Şedeḳ. In Josh. x. 1 *ff.* we find mention of Adoni-Şedeḳ, king of Jerusalem. Now this Jerusalem is certainly in the south, because it was near Gibeon, which alike the course of history and the gloss in Josh. x. 2 prove to have been in the south. It is equally certain that the southern Jerusalem is referred to in Judg. i. 7, as the place to which the captive king Adoni-Bezek was carried to die. More definitely this Jerusalem was in Rabshaḳ. For Bezek can be shown to be the short for Rabshaḳ,

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 193 *f.*

and Adoni-Bezek implies that the royal bearer of the name laid claim to some portion of the land of Adon (= Addan, Ezr. ii. 59, and perhaps 'Eden) and of Şedeķ.¹

We are not therefore surprised to learn that the usage of Shalem ('king of Shalem' says one of the glosses) appears to be analogous to that of Şedeķ and of Hāshram. Shalem is probably both a regional and a place-name. Şedeķ must have been an extensive region if it included both Şidon (in the south) and Ashkelon, and it must be mere accident (the scribes seemed to have preferred the form Shemen) which has left us so little evidence of the wider use of the name Shalem. We need not doubt, however, that Shalem is really used in the wider sense in the gloss included in xiv. 18, just as it is used in the narrower sense, as a place-name, in xxxiii. 18.

In the interests of geography it may be well to refer here again (see p. 30) to Gen. xiii. 12,² where (as if in preparation for chap. xiv.) Abram is said to have dwelt in the land of Canaan, *i.e.* of the Ethalites³ (Zeph. ii. 5). Lot, however, chose 'all Ashkar of Yarḥon,'⁴ which in those early days is asserted to have rivalled Paradise in its fertility, and dwelt in 'Arabia⁵ of Ashkar.' Much has been written about

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 57, 159; cp. *D. and F.* pp. 89 *f.*; *Two Religions*, pp. 181, 350.

² Cp. *T. and B.* p. 414 (on Gen. xxxiv. 21).

³ *Two Religions*, p. 411.

⁴ Cp. *T. and B.* pp. 228, 380.

⁵ ער is a corruption of אר, as in Judg. xii. 7.

the *kikkar* (such is the word in the text, but it can hardly be right), but now that we have had our eyes opened, we see that a regional name is required. *Kar* has come from *Kercm*, and this, like *Rekem*, from Yarḥam or Yeraḥme'el. The doubling of the *k* is a product of the popular wit, and the dropping of the initial *Ash* may be paralleled by Dôd for Ashdod. Thus 'Ashḳar of Yarḥon' means that part of Ashḥur-Yeraḥme'el (N. Arabia) which is bordered by the stream called the Yarḥon. We find it also referred to in 1 K. vii. 46, and by an extremely probable correction in 1 K. xvi. 24.¹

Let us now pass on to the narrative of the acquisition by David of the destined site of the temple (2 S. xxiv.). The story is full of interest, but highly imaginative. It is assumed that there is no officially recognized altar to Yahweh in Jerusalem, and so David, who has to offer an official sacrifice, must erect an altar for himself. The locality is selected by Gad, David's seer, and it turns out to be the threshing-floor of Araunah (Adoniyah) the Yebusite.² This reminds us of the equally imaginative tale in 2 S. vi. 6, where the name Pereş-Uzzah is accounted for by a sudden death which occurred at the threshing-floor of Nakon, or (as 1 Chr. says) of Kidon (Yarḥon?). It is probable that Pereş-Uzzah is really identical

¹ Read, 'in Ashkar of Yaman [*gloss*, Kashram].'

² See *E. Bib.* 'Araunah.'

with the sacred mount Peraşim, and that this mountain is identical with the southern Hermon.

It reminds us also of another altar erected in accordance with an oracle of Yahweh, the altar raised by Abraham for the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. xxii.). The original narrator probably identified this sacred mountain with that on which was the threshing-floor of Araunah (Adoniyyah) the Yebusite. This view is confirmed by 2 Chron. iii. 1, where the latter spot is placed on Mt. Moriah, *i.e.* it was on the mountain in the land of Moriah, referred to in Gen. xxii. 3 *f.*, and called in the original text Asshur-Yerahme'el.¹ These two passages are very suggestive. The Jerusalem of 2 Sam. xxiv. must have been in the N. Arabian border-land, and the old tradition was that David often resided there.

The story of David, Uriah, and Bathsheba confirms this view. It may indeed be partly based on some current folk-story of mythological origin (see *E. Bib.* 'Uriah'), but is mainly an imaginative record of David's unjustifiable attack on a city called (probably) Akrabbath benê Armon,² and also by the synonymous titles Ir (Asshur) Yerahme'el and Ir (Asshur) Yewanim. 'Unjustifiable' is hardly too strong a word, considering the kindness which David had received from the present king's predecessor (Akish). But ambition was too powerful

¹ *T. and B.* p. 328.

² 'Ammon' from Armon or, less probably, from Amalek. Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. iii. 13.

for lovingkindness and gratitude to have their due weight. This is expressed in the tale by the siege of the Ammonite (rather Armonite) Rabbah, and also by David's forcible seizure of Bathsheba, the wife of the faithful Uriah. Bathsheba is not indeed called an Ammonite, but the tradition probably considered her a Canaanite (Gen. xxxviii. 2, 12), and Uriah, as a Hittite or Ashḥartite, was obviously the same.

Now as to the two great place-names. Uriah was, although a Hittite, a man of Urushalem, which was an Urite or Asshurite city, and, according to my present contention, situated in N. Arabia. Rabbath of the benê Ammon is also N. Arabian, as may easily be shown, if Akish and Naḥash are the same. One of the strata of tradition represents Akish as ruling over the Ethbalites, and another represents Naḥash as lord of one of the Aḳrabbaths—that of the benê Ammon. It is surely certain that Akish and Naḥash are the same; the capital of the king so named must therefore have been called indifferently a city of the Ethbalites and a city of the Ammonites. The name Ammonites must be a mistake (most probably) for Armonites, just as Moab is sometimes miswritten Maakah; for the Ammonites can hardly have been regarded as Ethbalites.

CHAPTER IV

DAVID AND URIAH ; SIEGE OF RABBAH ; DAVID AND
ABSALOM ; TRUE SITUATION OF THE BATTLE-FIELD

OCCASION has been taken in the previous chapter to pass a severe judgment on the ungrateful conduct of David towards Naḥash. I have also ventured to propound the view that Ur in Uriah is the short for Asshur, which seems to me to imply that the faithful Uriah was a N. Arabian ; I will now add that 'Hittite' is the short for Ashḥartite, so that Uriah is doubly marked as an Asshurite. Bathsheba is also marked by her name as a Shebaite, *i.e.* an Ishmaelite. The people with which David and Joab waged war is called *benê Ammon* ; Rabbah—the name of the capital—is a popular corruption of Akrabbah. As to the *benê Ammon*, the phrase indicates here, at least, that the war is waged against N. Arabians ; it is probably a popular corruption of Armon (ערמון from ארמון), *i.e.* 'one belonging to Yerahme'el.' Two glosses (in 2 S. xii. 24 *f.*) confirm the accuracy of this view ; these are respectively 'in Yerahme'el of

Ah'ab,'¹ and 'in Arabia of Yerahme'el.' Their significance can hardly be exaggerated. In *v.* 26 we meet with the place-name 'Akrabbath of the benê Ammon' (rather 'Armon'); the glosses are best viewed as early and correct comments on this name. They belong to the large class of geographical glosses. It is therefore only natural to hold that David's starting-point was in N. Arabia.

The manifold interest of the story of Absalom's rebellion needs no showing. The scene is perhaps less obviously laid in N. Arabia. Ultimately, however, we shall be bound to assent to this view. The primary question is where David was residing, but, for the sake of David, the fortunes of Absalom too will have to come into consideration. That Absalom fled from either Jerusalem as far as the northern Geshur is incredible.² It is true that Absalom speaks of his place of refuge as being 'in Geshur, in Aram,' but as I have shown already,³ there was both a northern and a southern Aram. The district of Geshur, therefore, may have been in the southern border-land, and we may then compare the southern regional name, Asshur. The argu-

¹ Note how אַשּׁוּר (=Ashur of Arabia) is confounded by the scribes with אֶרֶם.

² See *E. Bib.* col. 1711 f. In Josh. xii. 5 the pre-Israelite king Og (=Agag) is said to have reigned 'in all Bashan unto the border of the Geshurites.' This legendary king represents a N. Arabian kingdom (*D. and F.* pp. 138 f., 141).

³ *T. and B.* pp. 17, 62, 179; *D. and F.* pp. 34 f.; *Two Religions*, pp. 161, 174, etc.

ment is that Absalom could not have been so unpractical as to go all the long way to the northern Geshur, and that hence the sanctuary at which (2 S. xv. 8) he vowed to offer a sacrifice must have been the chief royal sanctuary in the southland. Now it is implied in this that David dwelt from time to time near this sanctuary, *i.e.* at the southern Jerusalem.

It is true that in 2 S. xv. 7 Absalom is reported to have asked leave of David to pay the vow which he had vowed in Geshur, at Hebron. We should have expected the sanctuary to be at Gibeon, where, as we are told, was 'the greatest high place' (1 K. iii. 4). There, as Gemoll has well shown,¹ Solomon was most probably anointed king. Why, then, does Absalom to all appearance exalt Hebron above Gibeon? The answer is that Gibeon is identical with Hebron.

This identification has been waiting a long time to be made. The remark is natural, and may be the expression of more than one mood. There is no reason, however, why we should either take offence or be surprised at this delay. It was, in my judgment, a great step forward, and could not even have been suspected at an earlier date. It presupposes, in my own case, the twofold discovery first that Ashhur is a N. Arabian regional, and next that Ashhur in compound place-names regularly

¹ Gemoll (p. 343) would read in 1 K. i. 33 גִּבְעֹן, גִּבְעֹן for גִּבְעֹן. I would rather propose תְּבִינָן. The intermediate stage would be תְּבִינָן.

takes the form Aḥ (Aḥî) or Ak, and Arāb (N. Arabia) the form Rab or (by a common transposition) Bar.

The experienced eye of an early *sōphēr* (a member of the literate class) may have recognised Hebron as a popular distortion¹ of Aḥberon, 'belonging to Ashḥur of N. Arabia.' And what as to Gibeon? The answer—already perhaps given by an early scribe—is that this name is an early distortion of Agab'on. It has nothing to do with Gibeah ('hill'), but springs from Aḥ'ab = Ashḥur-Arāb (= Ashḥur of N. Arabia); the intermediary link is Akab or Agab.² Gibeon and Hebron are therefore equivalent, and we can well understand that the southern Hebron came to bear the second name Qiryath-Arba, originally either Ashḥoreth-Arāb or Akrabbath-Arāb.

It was therefore at the court of one of the small N. Arabian kings (he is called 'Talmai, son of Ammiḥur,' *i.e.* 'the Ishmaelite, son of Aram-Ashḥur') that Absalom sought and found refuge, and at the southern Hebron that he vowed to offer sacrifice. That David's home was in the southern Jerusalem is the implication of the whole narrative. And now, what as to the scene of Absalom's rebellion? We

¹ In *T. and B.* pp. 335, 439, I recognized that there was a distortion. I traced Hebron then to Reḥob, which, as I have now shown, is a witty distortion of Aḥbar.

² Cp. the clan-names Ḥagab and Ḥagabah (Ezr. ii. Neh. vii.), and the regional Argob (= Aram-Agab); also Agabus in the *Acts*. On Aḥ'ab see *Two Religions*, p. 240; *T. and B.* p. 63, n. 4.

have already found what light may be thrown on geography by glosses, and may hope that here too we may have the same good luck.

I make my appeal first to 2 S. xv. 11. As the text stands, there were two hundred men in Jerusalem, important enough to be invited to the sacrificial feast at Hebron, but entirely unaware of Absalom's designs upon the crown. Surely this is most improbable. The two hundred invited guests cannot have stood in ignorance of what every one else knew or suspected. 'The conspiracy was strong, for the fighting men increased continually with Absalom' (v. 12). For some time past Absalom had assumed royal state, and had a personal guard composed of fleet and strong Ramshahite warriors (v. 1). It is plain that those who accompanied Absalom to Hebron cannot have been simpletons who 'knew not anything'; they were in fact his N. Arabian body-guard. Any one who has attended to the phenomena of textual corruption will see that the present text of v. 11 has been produced out of an earlier one, relative to Absalom's band of men-at-arms, which ran, 'And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, that were Ashkarites and Hanokites (*gloss*, Ishmaelites¹).' In

¹ קראים ותלבים לחם. אשכרים ותנבים אתמלים. For 'קרי' cp. קראים, Ezek. xxiii. 23 (read אשכרים, and cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 101). For the correction תנבים, cp. תנביו, Gen. xix. 14, where both I (*T. and B.* p. 247) and Gemoll (p. 363) have traced the Anaḳim (Hanok and 'Anaḳ are connected). And for 'לת' cp. לתו, 1 K. xxii. 34, and מוה in בתושהלח.

the same context (*v.* 18) we are told of six hundred men, Ashḥartites (Kerethites) and Ethbalites (Pelethites), who accompanied David and formed the nucleus of his army. It is surely probable that the city where this considerable force of N. Arabian non-Israelite men-at-arms was assembled, was the N. Arabian Jerusalem, and not that which is now known as el-Ḳuds. That both at Samaria and at the more northern Jerusalem there was a royal body-guard I do not dispute, and whether called Ramshaḥites,¹ Ra'amathites,² Askarites,³ Ashḥartites,⁴ Ethbalites,⁵ Ḥanokites,⁶ Shalishites,⁷ or Porāṣites,⁸ it is certain from their ethnic appellations that its members were of N. Arabian race. But I hold also that such a large band as six (or eight) hundred is improbable except perhaps in the N. Arabian Jerusalem;

¹ מַשְׁחִים should be read for הַמְשִׁים in 2 S. xv. 1, 2 K. i. 5. The initial *ר* has dropped out. It seems to follow from Isa. iii. 1 (where the same correction is desirable) that Ramshaḥites also existed and were much thought of in Isaiah's Jerusalem. See *Two Religions*, p. 303.

² רַאמַתִּי, 2 K. xi. 4.

³ אַשְׁכָּרִי, 2 K. xi. 4, 19.

⁴ See pp. 18, 56. The Kerethites and Pelethites are familiar. See especially 2 S. xv. 18, where 'all the Kerethites and all the Pelethites' is followed by 'and all the Gittites, six hundred men who came after him from Gath.' Gath and Gittites are equivalent to Gilead and Gileadites (see 'Gath'); Gilead meant originally a district of N. Arabia.

⁵ Ethbalites, again N. Arabians. See p. 13.

⁶ Ḥanokites. See p. 51, note 1, and *cp.* p. 8.

⁷ Shalishites. *Shalish* means 'one who belongs to the Ishmaelite body-guard.' So Ex. xv. 4, 2 K. vii. 2, 17, 19.

⁸ In 2 K. xi. 4, for רַצִּים read פַּרְצִים. Another form may be Pathrasim (see p. 69).

it would constitute a perpetual danger rather than a protection to the reigning king.

Another textual argument: in 2 S. xv. 24 the narrative is suddenly interrupted by the statement, 'and Abiathar went up.' No satisfactory explanation of this having been given, I venture to suggest that the words are a corruption of a double gloss, which runs, 'that is, Ishmael; Beth-Arāb.' These are two glosses on 'the city' in *v.* 25. The place where the *Arman* (the Palladium of Israel) was deposited, was Beth-'Arāb, *i.e.* the southern Hebron, sometimes called 'Hebron of the Ishmaelites,' and perhaps also 'Ishmael.' Similarly in *v.* 29, the troublesome word 'and-Abiathar' (see *v.* 25, where only Şadoḳ is entrusted with the *Arman*) is really a corruption of 'that is, Beth-'Arba.' Klostermann has already bracketed 'and-Abiathar,' but without giving an account of its origin. This account I have now sought to give. The importance of these glosses can hardly be exaggerated. The resting-place of the *Arman* cannot have been far from Jerusalem. If the southern Jerusalem and the southern Hebron are meant, the course of the narrative is plain; otherwise it is obscure.

A further argument, at once textual and geographical, is furnished by 2 S. xviii. 23, 'And Ahimaaz ran by the way of the *kikkar*.' As I have shown elsewhere (p. 30), *kikkar* is a popular corruption of Ashkar, and a designation of the region which embraced, among other places, Shakram; it is

indeed, very possibly, equivalent to Shakram or Kashram, for these were not only place-names but regionals. But even if we keep the reading *kikkar*, and explain it as the circle of Jordan, *i.e.* the *Ghor*, one may ask with Gemoll (p. 246), how this region can have lain on the road to the Mahanaim of which conservative scholars tell us.

I do not deny that, as the text now stands, there are sufficiently clear traces of the view that the starting-point of both David and Absalom was the northern Jerusalem, and accordingly that the scene of the decisive battle was in the land beyond Jordan. Still the evidence that the original narrator took a different view is surely too strong to be rejected. I will venture to make some critical remarks on passages which may seem adverse to the N. Arabian theory.

(1) It may be plausibly asked whether 2 S. xv. 1-6, 10, 13, xvi. 21 *f.*, xvii. 4, 11, 13, 15, 24, xviii. 6 *f.*, xix. 9, 11, 41 *ff.*, do not imply that Israelites of the north not only were Absalom's partizans but actually formed his whole army. The answer is, By no means. As in the Samuel-narratives 'all Israel,' and 'the tribes of Israel,' simply mean the Israelitish clans which occupied a considerable part of the N. Arabian border-land. The redactor who brought the Absalom-story into its present shape may have taken these phrases literally, but there was no necessity for him to do so. Even 'from Dan to Beer-sheba' (2 S. xvii. 11) may quite well

have been used of the southern territory, for 'Dan' means, not some insignificant northern city,¹ but a Dan which once on a time was the capital of an extensive district bearing the same name, which even after the changes wrought by time, continued to have both political and religious significance for the whole community, for Dan may probably be identified with the royal sanctuary of Bethel. As for Beer-sheba, we may confess our inability to dogmatize. But so much we know, that Sheba (= Shema) is a Yerahme'elite name; David's opponent Sheba is expressly called (2 S. xx. 1, revised text) a man of Yerahme'el and a son of Arab-Rikmi. True, he is also styled 'a man of Mt. Ephraim' (2 S. xx. 21), but, as in the genealogy of Samuel, this undoubtedly means the southern Mt. Ephraim. There may therefore have been a Beer-Sheba in the highlands of the southern Ephraim. Another view, however, is possible, 'Beersheba' may be miswritten for Arâb-Sheba. This may be the name of a N. Arabian region, and Dan, or Dan-Ya'ar, admits of the same explanation. It may be helpful to add that in Jer. iv. 15 (as in viii. 16) it is the southern Dan which is meant, and that

¹ Dan and Kashram (Kadesh) seem to be equivalent (cp. Gemoll, p. 421). Note also the names דן (1 S. xii. 11) = ערב דן, 'Danite Arabia'; דן יערי (2 S. xxiii. 6; so read), 'Ya'arite Dan'; דן ירחמי (Judg. xiii. 25, xviii. 12; so read) 'Danite Yerahme'el.' It should be pointed out for the benefit of those who do not know my other recent works, that דן and דן are shortened forms of ירחמי (Yerahme'an, *i.e.* Yerahme'el).

² *Two Religions*, p. 119.

the har-Ephraim in the parallel line suggests that Dan is the name of a region or district.

(2) Several more geographical points favourable to a northern starting-point have to be considered. Thus the wâdy Kidron¹ is mentioned (2 S. xv. 23, cp. 1 K. ii. 37, xv. 13, etc.). This, however, is indecisive. The redactor was skilful enough to adapt the geography of the story to his own view of the scene. For 'Kidron' we should probably read 'Kerithôn'²; we know the wâdy Kerith³ from the story of Elijah. The origin of all these forms is Ashhoreth or Ashhart, and the country which the wâdy intersected was Asshurite or Ashhartite. It is in harmony with this that the direction of the march, when the wâdy had been crossed, was 'the way to Ashtar'⁴ (see below; *zaith*, like *sheth*, comes from Ashtar). For Ashtar I may refer to *Two Religions*, p. 195 (on Am. vi. 2, 'That have conquered Ashtar of the Gileadites').

(3) In 2 S. xv. 30, the 'ascent of the olive-trees' seems to point conclusively to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. But 'the ascent of the olive-trees' is by no means = 'the Mount of

¹ See *E. Bib.* 'Kidron.'

² קרתון. Perhaps we may compare קרתון Josh. xxi. 32.

³ ברית, see *Two Religions*, p. 130.

⁴ ⚡ (Luc.) has 'towards the olive-tree of the wilderness.' This is improbable. Read probably ררך אשתר 'towards Ashtar,' to which המרברד may be appended as a gloss. See above (on *zayith*), and cp. עומות = Ashtar-Ishmael (*methu*), and ברית = Arab-Ashtar (both in 1 Chr.).

Olives,' and if the latter phrase were used, it would be so extraordinary,¹ that one would be obliged to treat it as a corruption. As a rule, it seems to me that the mountains of Palestine were named after the races or clans which dwelt near them. Is it certain, therefore, that *zaiith* (olive?) is not a race-name or a clan-name? We have already met with one name (read Barzaiith) in 1 Chr. vii. 31, in which *zaiith* is a popular corruption of Ashtar.² And to this I may now add the personal name, *zêthan*, which occurs among certainly N. Arabian names in 1 Chr. vii. 10. The riddle which so long baffled scholars is now, I hope, solved. Zaith[an], like Tarshish (which follows it in Chronicles) comes from Ashtar. This famous name occurs fairly often in the true O.T., both as an ethnic and as a divine name. The Ashtarites lived near Mount Ashtar, and were the proud guardians of a sanctuary at which rites, abominable to Hosea, were constantly practised.³ This accounts for the reference in 2 S. xv. 32, to the worshippers of the divinity who *were wont to resort* thither. It is the same hill which is mentioned as 'the hill that is in front of Jerusalem' (1 K. xi. 7), where Solomon built 'high places' (*bāmōth*) for new Israelite gods, and which elsewhere (2 K. xxiii. 13) is called 'the mountain

¹ I may be told that צני comes from צנה, but I cannot believe it.

² See p. 56, and *T. and B.* pp. 362, 503.

³ *Two Religions*, pp. 241, 255.

Methukash.¹ There is no necessity, therefore, to suppose that the mountain which David ascended was in the neighbourhood of the northern Jerusalem. The Ashtarites being N. Arabian, one may assume that their sacred hill was so too.

(4) 'Baḥurim,' 2 S. xvi. 5. If Saul's clan resided in N. Arabia (and it did), there must have been a N. Arabian district called Baḥurim (see 2 S. iii. 13-16). And no wonder. The name probably comes from Ab-ḥurim, 'Arabia of the Ḥurites.' The Ḥurites were Kalebites (1 Chr. ii. 19). Saul's clan ('the Bikrites') dwelt there.

(5) 'And they passed over Jordan' (MT. Yarden), 2 S. xvii. 22. This, if correct, would point to a trans-Jordanic Gilead and a start from the northern Jerusalem. But it has been shown that the scribes and redactors are prone to confound 'Yarden' with the N. Arabian stream Yardan or Yarḥon.² It is probable that other names for this stream were Perath (Ephrath), and 'Gilead.'³ In *v.* 20, the stream is called Mikal, a fragment of Yerakmal (= Yerahme'el); 'the water,' is a gloss, indicating that a well-known stream is meant. In *v.* 22, therefore, we need not hesitate to read either 'Yardan' or 'Yarḥon' for 'Yarden.'

¹ Maktesh and Mashḥith (Zeph. i. 11, 2 K. xxiii. 13) have the same origin—מַתְּשׁ. On מַתְּשׁ, see *T. and B.* p. 107, and on the whole name, *D. and F.* p. 19.

² *T. and B.* pp. 228, 262, 456. See also 'Jericho and Jordan.'

³ Gen. xv. 18, 'from the stream of Gilead to the stream of Perath.' See p. 6.

(6) 'En-rogel,' 2 S. xvii. 17; 'Rogelim,' *v.* 27. Thus, the name Rogel meets us on both sides of the stream called Yarḥon or Yardan. Gilead, then, is intersected by the Yarḥon. Rogel ('fuller') is improbable. Read 'Gil'ad,' and for 'Rogelim' read 'Gil'ad-Yaman.' It was no doubt the sacred fountain of the Gileadites, just as En-kōrē was that of the Yerahme'elites (Judg. xv. 18 *f.*). Another name of Gilead is preserved in *v.* 26, where 'and Absalom' is a corruption of 'in Ishmaelite Arabia.' One may illustrate this by the name Barzillai, which means 'one belonging to Arab-zebel (*i.e.* Arabia of Ishmael.¹) Thus the 'iron-like' man disappears. 'Roe-like' man would have been more sensible (1 Chr. xii. 8). Such were the men whom Absalom used as messengers of revolt;² he sent Gileadites throughout Israel, to say 'Absalom reigns in Hebron.'

(7) 'And David came to Maḥanaim,' 2 S. xvii. 24. 'Maḥanaim' is generally supposed to be undoubtedly trans-Jordanic.³ Saul's son and successor resided there (2 S. ii. 8, 12), and one of Solomon's prefects ruled from Maḥanaim (1 K. iv. 14). It has, however, I think, been proved that the Israelite clans which recognized 'Ishbosheth' inhabited the N. Arabian border-land, and that Solomon's prefects (whose number must

¹ 'Beṣal'el' is therefore an equivalent (*T. and B.* p. 571).

² In xv. 10 for *בַּרְגִּילִים*, read *גִּלְעָדִים*. 'Spies' is unsuitable.

³ See *E. Bib.* 'Mahanaim.'

be fictitious) were also established in the borderland. There is, therefore, no obligation to follow the multitude.¹ We may indeed reject the story of the battle in its present form as a romance based on very little.² That is certainly my own view, but it depends in part on a keen criticism of the text, and an admission, in some form, of the N. Arabian theory. That Maḥanaim (originally perhaps Maḥan-Yam³ = Yerahme'el-Yaman) is N. Arabian, there is, I think, no serious doubt. It is probably the Ḳamon of Judg. x. 5, and the Ashteroth - Ḳarnaim of Gen. xiv. 5 (cp. Am. vi. 13,⁴ where the name is given in a shortened form). Gemoll (p. 83) defends a west-Jordanic site, appealing to the 'forest of Ephraim' (2 S. xviii. 6), and the monument of Absalom (*v.* 18). But the forest⁵ and all the details connected with it are probably fictions arising out of a misunderstanding of the word *ya'ar* which is really part of a regional name,⁶ and, as criticism shows, the monument was set up, not by Absalom, but by David.⁷

Thus, the David-stories which have come down

¹ See further *T. and B.* p. 392 ; Gemoll, pp. 83-85. *Ya'ar* is of course = *Ya'ir* (see Judg. x. 3-5).

² *Crit. Bib.* pp. 292 *f.*

³ Cp. Maḥaneh-Dan = Maḥan-Dan. See p. 55, n. 1.

⁴ *Two Religions*, p. 196.

⁵ See *Crit. Bib.* p. 293, and cp. *E. Bib.* 'Ephraim, Wood of.'

⁶ The full regional name is probably either Dan-*Ya'ar* (see on 2 S. xxiv. 6) or *Ya'ar-Dan*.

⁷ See *Crit. Bib.* p. 293, and cp. Klostermann's and Budde's commentaries.

to us are thoroughly N. Arabian in scenery. What would we not give for as complete a sketch of David as the founder of a South-Palestinian kingdom with Jerusalem (the familiar Jerusalem) for its capital city. It is only necessary to add that the much-debated sections on the 'numbering of the people,' and of the 'threshing-floor of Araunah,' in their original form, most probably related, the one to the N. Arabian empire, the other to the N. Arabian (Israelite) capital. We have had occasion to refer to these sections elsewhere.

CHAPTER V

SOLOMON'S BUILDINGS—HIS EMPIRE—HIS COMMERCE
—HIS ENEMIES—HIS RELIGION

AND now, as to the Solomon-traditions. We have seen already that Solomon was anointed king at a place near the N. Arabian capital of David, called, not Giḥon, but Hebron. This, certainly, was the original form of the tradition, but the text was subsequently modified. We have seen, too, that the account of David's transference of the *Arman* to 'Ḳiryath-ye'arim' has been worked over from a different historical and geographical point of view. It is painful to have to separate one part of the recovered tradition of Solomon from the rest, but it must be ventured.

Solomon is represented as a great builder. He had received from his father an extensive N. Arabian empire (as well as a moderate Palestinian realm), and he wished for correspondingly important buildings in his N. Arabian capital. By the dexterous help of a Ṣorite¹ named Hiram or

¹ 1 K. vii. 14. His mother was a Yerahme'elite—not an Israelite (see p. 77).

Ḥiram-abi¹ he had his wish. Just as Ahaz copied an altar which he had seen in the southern Aram, so Solomon virtually copied what Ḥiram described to him as the architectural ornaments of the southern Ṣor or Miṣsor. The earliest scribes fully grasped the situation. Thus in 1 K. vii. 46, a scribe explains where Ḥiram cast the bronze vessels. The text, in its original form, said that it was in the *kikkar* (= Ashkar) of Yarḥon. To this a scribe added that it was between Salekath and Ṣarephath (1 K. vii. 46). Similarly, the scribe wished to indicate where it was that the builders prepared the timber and stone; it was 'in Yeraḥ-me'el,' or 'in Ashḥur-Ishman' (misplaced in vi. 1, and then corrupted). And then, wishing to prevent any misunderstanding, the scribe inserted in the margin a statement that the Ṣion intended in viii. 1,² 𐤂 was 'in Ashḥur - Ethanim,' or 'in Ashḥur-Ishba'al.' The glosses, in a highly corrupt form, have got into the text.

But the chief point in our favour is furnished by a passage from a hymn preserved, in the narrator's time, in a collection of old records. We must remember that, according to our view of the original narrative, Solomon assembled all the elders of Israel (*i.e.* those of the southern border-land) to transfer the *Arman* and the sacred tent from their

¹ Ḥur-Ram-Abi. That is, Ashḥur-Aram or Ashhur-Aram-Arāb. Ab and Abi, in compound names, stand for Arāb.

² 𐤂 gives *ev Σειων*, where MT. has עֲשׂוֹן.

present home in Şion to the place appointed in the *debîr* of the temple. What really took place, we know not, but the narrator (which narrator, is unimportant) thought that a solemn speech of Solomon was called for, the introduction of the *Arman* being equivalent to Yahwè's taking possession of his house. Then follows an explanatory speech of Solomon as the builder of the temple, and after this a dedicatory prayer. ¶ it is true, places the hymn-fragment, in a fuller form, at the end of the prayer (after v. 53). This seems less appropriate, but we have no reason to doubt that ¶ is correct in its statement that the poetical quotation is taken from τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ᾠδῆς, *i.e.* (applying the gentlest of criticism) the Book of Shur¹—a collection of records or other literary monuments relative to the N. Ashhurite territory of the Israelites.²

The passage, restored, should, I think, run thus,—

‘Yahwè promised that he would dwell in Arbel ;³
Indeed I have built for thee an Ishmael-palace⁴

¹ שור (= אשר) for שיר. The collection was sometimes called ‘the Book of Yashar,’ אשר for אשר. See *E. Bib.* ‘Jashar, Book of,’ and ‘Wars of the Lord, Book of the.’

² In essentials this was already seen in *Crit. Bib.* pp. 326 *f.*, but several points of detail are here corrected.

³ יהובאל = ארבל. See *T. and B.* on ארבל, and *Two Religions* on Hos. x. 14. עפל, too, has sometimes had the same origin, *i.e.* where it means an Ishmael-tower (2 K. v. 24, Mic. iv. 8). This was pointed out in *Crit. Bib.* p. 326.

⁴ Cp. *T. and B.* pp. 315, 462 ; *D. and F.* pp. 39, 141 ; *Two Religions*, p. 317.

For thy sitting enthroned above Ḥarsham.'¹
 (*Gloss*, it points out Ḥarsham in Ishman.)

This is highly important for two reasons: (1) it shows that Solomon really built a temple of refined N. Arabian architecture in the region variously called Shakram, Ḥashram, and (as here) Ḥarsham; and (2) it makes it clear that, to Solomon, or to a poet who understood Solomon's point of view, Yahwè was the Director of the divine Company. The words generally supposed to be line 1 of the poetic fragment are really a gloss on the regional name Ḥarsham, stating that the Ḥarsham of the ancient hymn is in N. Arabia.

I lay no great stress on a late writer's account of the great festal multitude (1 K. viii. 65), though it may well be based on an earlier narrative. They came together, we are told, from Baal-Ḥamath² to the wâdy of Mişrim. Baal-Ḥamath may be = Ḥamath-Şobah, which Solomon is said by the Chronicler to have conquered and occupied (2 Chr. viii. 3 *f.*); Şobah, at any rate, is a development of Şib'on (= Ishmael). The 'torrent of Mişrim' is perhaps Shiḥor (= Ashḥur) which was on the east of Mişrim (Josh. xiii. 3). The parallel passage,

¹ MT.'s עֲלֵי־יְהוָה (= Yerahme'elites) is less correct than 𐤀's ἐπι καινοτητος, whence Prof. Burkitt deduces עֲלֵי־יְהוָה, 'at the new moon feasts' (*J. of Theol. St.* x. 442). This, however, is hardly the original reading.

² Cp. Num. xiii. 21, 'from the wilderness of Şin (= Şib'on) to Rehob (to) Baal-Ḥamath.'

2 S. vi. 19, confirms one in the view that the Israel in N. Arabia is referred to.¹

And now it must be asked, What was Solomon's realm? For, as we have seen, his buildings were but an attempt to consolidate his power. In this respect he was a typical Oriental despot. We only know anything, however, about one portion of his realm—that in the N. Arabian border-land. According to a traditionalist authority in its earlier form Solomon had twelve prefects of departments, but what the duties of these prefects were, we can only guess—they were surely not limited to the provisioning of the king and his household (cp. Neh. v. 15). There would also naturally be the levying of some elementary taxation to meet war-like expenses, and of course there was the representation of the king on the seat of judgment. A few critical remarks on this document are certainly not unnecessary. Several times it appears as if the personal name of the prefect (נָצִיר or נָצִיר) had dropped out, while that of his father was preserved. This, however, is an illusion; there is textual corruption in the case; בן (as in 'Ben-hadad') has come from בר, and this from עָרַב. 'Bar-ḥur' (v. 8) is therefore = Ḥurite (*i.e.* Ashḥurite) Arabia. Among the other parallels I would notice 'Ben-Geber' (v. 13); this evidently comes from Bar-Argâb (= Arabia of Argâb). The same name 'Geber' (*i.e.* Argâb²)

¹ See *Two Religions*, p. 204.

² Argab, that is, 'Arabia of Aḥ'ab' (see p. 123).

occurs in *v.* 19, but without a prefixed 'ben'; the 'ben' which follows has, of course, its usual sense.

It would be possible to doubt whether the departments assigned by tradition to these prefects were Palestinian or N. Arabian, but for four considerations: (1) the complex of traditions of which this list of prefects forms part, is permeated by references to N. Arabia; (2) we are expressly told elsewhere that David put *nešibim* ('prefects') in Edom, or perhaps rather in Aram (2 S. viii. 14); (3) two of the prefects are related to have taken N. Arabian wives,¹ apparently to promote the formation of a powerful N. Arabian realm under an Israelite, Yahwè-worshipping dynasty; and (4) the twelfth prefect is said to have been 'in the land of Gilead, that is, Šib'on-Ashhur'² (or, 'Asshur-Šib'on'), which shows that a reference is made to N. Arabian Gilead.

If we had the Solomon-traditions in their original form, there would be no doubt whatever, and the N. Arabian theory would be recognized in all its certainty. The earlier scribes, at any rate, knew the truth, as we can still see underneath the diaphanous

¹ 1 K. iv. 11, 15. 'Taphath' and 'Basemath' are both corrupt forms, the one of Naphtuḥith (see *T. and B.* pp. 190 ff.), the other of עִרְבֵי־אֲשִׁימָה, 'Ishmaelite Arabia' (*T. and B.* p. 571). שְׁלֹמֹה comes from יִשְׁמַעֵאל = יִשְׁמַעֵל.

² Here, as in *Critica Biblica* ('Kings'), I treat the names in accordance with rules which have been suggested by experience. See *Crit. Bib. ad. loc.*

veil of textual corruption. I cannot understand how scholars can still be satisfied with the trivial description of Judah and Israel in 1 K. iv. 20, and of Solomon in v. 2 *f.* The former passage ought surely to describe, not the Israelite aristocracy, but the subject peoples, naming the most conspicuous of them, such as Arabians, Ashtarites, Ramshahites. And the latter passage ought to be similar in character, as commentators might have guessed from the inexplicable word—*barbarim* (v. 3), which should evidently be '*arbin*, 'Arabians.' Soon after, we meet with more miserable statements, including the provision of barley and straw for the 40,000 cribs of horses. Is conservatism reasonable here? Criticism which pays heed to experience seems to me to point to this reading of v. 6, 8,—'And Solomon had four thousand Ashtarites (*glosses*, Ishmaelites belonging to Ramkab, Ishman, Asshur-Arbel, Pathrasim or Pōrāšim, and Asshurites, and Ethmannites belonging to Ishmael and Ashkar). They used to come to the place where the king might be, every man according to his charge.'

It will be seen that the scribes who are responsible for these glosses have aired their knowledge of N. Arabian ethnics. This may have been bad taste, but it helps us sometimes towards the solution of a name-problem. *Merkab*, for instance, in v. 6, is commonly supposed to be a collective term for chariots, but against Biblical usage. And if *merkabo* occurs among N. Arabian ethnics, we may naturally

expect that the consonants which form the nucleus of the word will represent either an ethnic or a place-name. Now one of the regionals most often represented in the O.T. is Ah'ab, which is sometimes shortened into Ḥab, Gab, Kab, and Bab; we often find Ram as an element in place-names. A combination of Mar (by metathesis) and Kab will produce Markab,¹ which is the nucleus of the puzzling name Beth-markaboth² (Josh. xix. 5). We cannot now, if we have made any study of place-names, miss the right solution of these two problems. We shall also be prepared to confront the parallel problems of x. 26.

The text of this passage states that Solomon 'gathered chariots and horsemen, and he had a thousand and four hundred chariots and twelve thousand horsemen, whom he placed in the chariot-cities, and with the king at Jerusalem.' But with the parallel passage (v. 6) to guide us, we may with much confidence restore the true text, and render thus,—'And he had four thousand Markabites (*glosses*, that is, Ishman, Arbel, Pathrasim), whom he settled in the cities of Markab, and with the king at Urushalem.'

This is hardly as correct a statement as the other (v. 6, 8). The original writer can hardly have said that Solomon settled Markabite warriors in the cities of Markab; 'Ashtarites' is more likely. Nor

¹ Cp. the place-name Akraḥbim (p. 18).

² Cp. *E. Bib.* 'Marcaboth'; Gemoll, p. 227.

can we think that the king's Ashtarite body-guard was always 'with the king at Urushalem.' The other account seems much more reasonable; they were for the defence of the king, wherever he might chance to be. Let me only add that 'cities of Markab' (for the improbable 'chariot-cities') suggests parallel corrections for phrases combined with this phrase in ix. 20,¹ viz. 'cities of Ramshāḥōn' for 'store-cities,' and 'cities of the Pathrasim' for 'cities for the horsemen.'

So much, then, must already be clear—that, according to the original writer, Solomon's main object was the formation of a strong N. Arabian empire. He must also have been interested in the creation of a territory of Judah, with a second Urushalem for capital. No trace of that is to be found in the primary narrative, but scribes may sometimes have heightened the colouring with a view to adapt the story to the later idealistic view of Solomon. Some of them may be responsible for 1 K. v. 1 and 4 *f*. It is probable, however, that they did not evolve it all out of their own consciousness, but adapted phrases of an earlier tradition which they misunderstood and filled up incorrectly. For instance, I see no reason why tradition should not have stated that Solomon's empire extended from the stream of Ephrath to the land of the Ethbalites, and to the border of Mişrim, or again from the place called in MT. Taḥapanḥes

¹ The corrections are—[ר]בשחון and פתראים.

(whence, by corruption, Tiphṣah¹) to 'Azzah or 'Azarah.² The boundaries may, of course, have fluctuated. In 1 K. ix. 13 we hear of twenty cities in the land of Galil (either the whole or a part of Gilead) being presented by Solomon to a friendly N. Arabian king. On the other hand, the Chronicler (2 Chron. viii. 2) speaks of the cities which Hiram restored to Solomon, as if there had been a struggle for the possession of this outlying part of the Israelite N. Arabian territory. The 'cities' appear from 1 K. ix. 13 to have been reckoned to 'the land of Kabul'; Kabul, however, is a shortened form of Rakbul, one of the current corruptions of Yerahme'el. To account for this name, a curious anecdote is reported; Hiram goes out to view the cities, and makes a polite but disparaging remark. To rely on this story would, I think, be unwise; it is so plainly suggested by the name Rakbul (as if 'only a stump'). The Chronicler also tells us (2 Chr. viii. 3) that Solomon conquered Hamath-Ṣobah, *i.e.*, probably, Ṣib'onite or Ishmaelite Hamath. We know from 1 K. viii. 65 that one of the boundaries of Solomon's kingdom was Ba'al-Hamath, and should hardly be justified in denying all credit to the tradition.

¹ I hope to be excused for calling special attention to this explanation. Cp. 'Tirṣah,' and *T. and B.* p. 554.

² 'Azarah would be the central town of the clan 'Ezer. From 1 S. vii. 12 we learn that a place called Eben-Ezer was between Mišpeh and Shen (= Ishman). There was a land of Mišpah at the foot of Hermon, which we have found reason to identify with Perašim.

There is also, in 1 K. ix. 16 (MT.), an interesting statement that Pharaoh king of Egypt took and burned Gezer, and gave it as a marriage-portion to his daughter, Solomon's bride. Was this Gezer the city, whose mound has been explored by Mr. Macalister, and which is no doubt the Gazir of the Amarna Tablets? I cannot think so. There were certainly more than one Gezer, as there were more than one Gibeah or Geba. It is usual to suppose that the most famous of the Gezers must be meant. But this is evidently not the Gezer of 2 S. v. 25, for the scene of that narrative, as we have seen, is N. Arabian. It is also evident that there was a widely extended pre-Israelitish tribe called Girzites or Girshites,¹ and from 1 S. xxvii. 8 it appears that these Girzites, or Gizrites, were traditionally identified with the Geshurites, and that tradition knew them best as dwellers near Shur (*i.e.* the southern Asshur) and the land of Mišrim.

Other passages equally important are 2 S. xxi. 18 and 1 Chr. xx. 4, a comparison of which shows that the Gezer known to David was in the region of Gob or Argob. It has been pointed out already that Gob is a corruption of Aḥ'ab,² which in its larger sense means N. Arabia. It may be helpful to refer also to 2 S. xxi. 15, and to an old discovery of the present writer's that **בגב אשר**³ should be

¹ *E. Bib.* col. 1736.

² See p. 123, and cp. *Two Religions*, pp. 228, 240.

³ בגב אשר should be בגב. See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 298-300.

attached to אֶשְׁשׁוּר in *v.* 15*a*, so that the full name of the region was Gob-Asshur. Consequently, 'Pharaoh king of Egypt' should be 'Pir'u king of (the N. Arabian) Muşri,' and what Pir'u did was to capture one of the cities of Argob, or (we may say) of the southern Gilead which the Israelites had not yet conquered, or at any rate not succeeded in keeping.

It still remains that we take up a position towards 1 K. viii. 65, the account of the festal assembly which came from all parts of Solomon's dominions 'from *lebo-Ḥamath* to the wâdy of Mişraim.' The account is doubtless based on an earlier narrative, the details of which the later redactor partly misunderstands. By this I mean that his geography is greatly at fault, the exclusive geographical reference of the traditions being to King Solomon's dominions in N. Arabia. As a consequence, *Mişrim* has been misread *Mişraim*, and *mibba'al-Ḥamath*¹ has been corrupted into *millebo Ḥamath*. Ba'al-Ḥamath may be = Ḥamath-Şobah, which, in 2 Chr. viii. 3, Solomon is said to have conquered and occupied. Şobah probably comes, through Şiph'on, from Şib'on (= Ishmael). The wâdy of Mişrim may possibly be the same as

¹ In *Two Religions*, pp. 204 *f.*, I have sought to throw some fresh light on *lebo*. *Lebo* in *millebo ḥamath*, like *abel* in *abel-mayyim*, comes from *b'al*. Other parallel passages are Num. xiii. 24 and Am. vi. 14. In the former passage the 'spies' explore the land (the N. Arabian Canaan) from the wilderness of Şin (= Şib'on) to Reḥob (Akrah) to Ba'al-Ḥamath. In the latter, the range of the oppression of Israel is defined as being from Ba'al-Ḥamath to the wâdy of Arâb.

Shiḥor (= Ashḥur), which was on the east of the N. Arabian Miṣrim (Josh. xiii. 3). The parallel passage, 2 S. vi. 19, confirms one in the view that the Israel in N. Arabia is referred to.

In the above discussions it has, I hope, been rendered highly probable that both David and Solomon resided as often as they could in one of the cities of their N. Arabian territory, famous alike in a secular and in a religious respect, and commonly known as Ur-shalem or Jerusalem.

And how did Solomon deal with his N. Arabian subjects? Tradition speaks with a rather uncertain sound. In 1 K. ix. 20-22 it is said that Solomon levied a *corvée* only on non-Israelites; Israelites were the court-officers and warriors. This, however, is not quite in formal accordance with other statements. We know that non-Israelite mercenaries were much prized, and that they formed the royal body-guard, also that Yeraḥme'elite artificers and merchants were not hindered in their calling; in fact, mercenaries, artificers, and merchants were alike protected guests (*gērīm*) of the king. And in v. 27 (cp. xi. 28, xii. 4) it is expressly stated that Solomon levied a *corvée* out of 'all Israel,' *i.e.* all the Israelitish clans in the N. Arabian territory.¹ The subject Canaanitish population, therefore, may have been, in some respects, not worse off than those Israelite clansmen who were not expert members of the warrior-class.

¹ A frequent application of the phrase.

Solomon was, in fact, a typical Oriental king. He only carried out, however, the plans of his father. If there was to be an expanded south-Israelite empire, there had also to be suitable palaces for the king and his god, and an improved system of fortification. This implied the odious practice of the *corvée*, which as late as the time of Jehoiakim was opposed by conservative idealists like Jeremiah, and which is stated to have led to the separation between Israel and Judah. According to the traditional text (v. 28-32) Solomon had many thousands of labourers, mainly his own, but reinforced by builders from Şör or Mişşor. These were engaged in procuring and preparing timber and stones for the buildings, in the Lebanon mountains.¹ The best timber (sometimes called *almuggim*²) and the best stones (sometimes called *Yeķārōth*³) were to be found in this region, which the tradition represents as belonging to Mişşor. That the tradition is partly correct, we need not deny, but there seems to be some exaggeration in the details.

The skill which used the timbers and stone to the best advantage was at any rate Yeraḥme'elite. This seems to have made a deep impression on the Israelite mind. The names of the fictitious artificers in Ex. xxxi. (Beşalel and Oholiab, the

¹ See *Crit. Bib.* pp. 322 f. ; *E. Bib.* col. 4682 f.

² A corruption of *Yeraḥme'elim*. Cp. Gomer and Regem-Melek ; also perhaps Rogelim.

³ A corruption of *Ashkārōth*. The stones came from Ashkar = Ashḥur.

vowels are not original) are Yeraḥme'elite, and the bearers of the names are assigned to tribes (Judah and Dan) which must have been largely intermixed with pure Yeraḥme'elites. The name and origin of Solomon's chief artificer are also Yeraḥme'elite. His name in Kings appears as Hīram, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Aram; in Chronicles, as Hūram, which is virtually the same, but with the addition of 'Abi, *i.e.* Arabia, as if to distinguish the bearer from Israelites or Şidonians of the same name. With regard to his origin, his father was admittedly a Mişrite. His mother, according to the text of Kings, was a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, but, according to 2 Chr. ii. 14, of the daughters of Dan. The Chronicler seems to have thought it improbable that this specially wise and gifted man should belong, or even half belong, to a tribe not celebrated for wisdom; he therefore changed 'Naphtali' into 'Dan,' the tribe of Dan being famed for its wisdom (2 S. xx. 18, 6). But if we accept this, how are we to account for 'Naphtali'? The change is unjustifiable, and the original reading must underlie '*matteh Naphtali.*' In fact, the only likely emendation known to me is *ma'akath ethbalim*, 'Maakath of the Ethbalites.' By this is meant the district and city called 'Abel-beth-ma'akah,'¹ where 'Abel' is a corrupt form of

¹ Originally Maakath was reckoned to the southern Aram. It must have been near the southern Geshur. That it was not in the north of Palestine, is clear (see *E. Bib.* 'Maachah,' 'Saul,' § 16; Gemoll, pp. 56 f.).

Ba'al, *i.e.* Yerahme'el or Ishma'el. That this place was famous for its wisdom, is pointed out above. It was probably conquered by Saul and David,¹ and partly re-settled by an Israelite aristocracy. The new colonists were perhaps Danites, and one of the Danite towns or districts in this region was Dan-Ya'an (2 S. xxiv. 6) or rather Dan-Ya'ar expanded into Dan-Yarkon (cp. Me-Yarkon, Josh. xix. 46), and known also—the Ethbalites having preceded the Danites—as Ethbal, a place-name which was popularly re-coined as Beth-el.² The Israelite colonists were evidently well aware of the value of the Maakathite 'wisdom.' Such insight was the greatest gift of God, covering as it did both moral or religious lore and material or artistic. This is what a woman endowed with strong practical 'wisdom' is reported to have said: 'Men were wont to say in Asshur-Yerahme'el (*i.e.* in N. Arabia), "Let them ask (counsel) in Abel and in Dan." Have the trustworthy ones in Ishmael (*gloss*, Israel) come to an end [that] thou seekest to destroy a mother-city in Ishmael?'

Most probably, therefore, the artificer Hiram was not an Israelite, but a Yerahme'elite of pure

¹ See on 1 S. xiv. 47; 2 S. viii. 2. 'Maakath' may lurk under 'Moab' (Gemoll). On the text, see *Crit. Bib.*

² See on 1 K. xii. 29 *f.*, and cp. *E. Bib.* 'Sharezer,' 2. The name מִכַּיָּהּ, like Mika'el and Mikaiab, is a popular distortion of Amalek or Yerahme'el; see the textual facts collected and explained in *E. Bib.* 'Maachah.' Bethel for Ethbal is also a god-name (see *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 115).

race. We cannot venture to say much more. How far his architectural and artistic details were in accordance with N. Arabian models, and whether the Hebrew account of those details can be trusted, is beyond our power to divine. Even the place where his buildings were erected is by no means free from doubt. Probabilities seem to me to point to the southern Jerusalem.

These buildings, even if not so elaborate as is represented, must have involved a large expenditure. Commerce, too, had to be developed, if Solomon was to carry out worthily the rôle of a great Oriental king, and a supply of the precious metals had to be obtained to start the adventure. Three passages relative to Solomon's naval expeditions must here be mentioned—1 K. ix. 26-28, x. 11, x. 22. Let us take them in order :

(a) 1 K. ix. 26-28. A revised text may be rendered thus,—‘And king Solomon made a fleet in Şib'on-Argâb¹ which is by Elath, on the shore of the sea of Sūph in the land of Edom. And he sent rowers² in the fleet, shipmen acquainted with the sea, and they came to Urpal(?)³ with the servants of Solomon, and brought thence gold.’ (*Glosses*, ‘Arab-Ethmael, Asshur-Yaman, Ashkar.’) Compare 2 Chr. viii. 17 *f.*

(b) 1 K. x. 11. ‘Also the fleet of rowers, which brought gold from Urpal(?), fetched from Urpal(?)

¹ The familiar Ezion-Geber.

² Read הַתָּרִים (Jon. i. 13).

³ The better-known Ophir.

abundance of almug-timber and ashkar-stones.'¹
Compare 2 Chr. ix. 10.

(c) 1 K. x. 22. 'For the king had a fleet on the sea, a fleet of rowers; once in three years the Ashtar-ships came back, bringing gold and silver.' (*Glosses*, 'Shin'abbim,² Akrabbim, Ma'akathim.') Compare 2 Chr. ix. 21.

Here, as so often, the key to the problems of exegesis is in the names. Unfortunately, the names are commonly disguised, and much experience is needed to cope with the difficulties thus produced. Who would think, for instance, that, in 1 K. xxii. 47 *f.*, אדום נצב and עשיון גבר could cover over אדום צבעון and ארגב respectively?³ Yet there is no escaping from this result of criticism which is supported by so many parallels. In the passage referred to, the meaning probably is that Jehoshaphat's ship was constructed at a maritime town called Edom Šib'on. In 1 K. the same place, perhaps, is called Sib'on-Argâb, which, be it noted, is the place where Jehoshaphat's ship (אנייה) was wrecked. Solomon's fleet seems to have been more fortunate.

If the traditional text may be trusted, a friend and ally of Solomon helped him by sending expert seamen on the newly constructed ships. This was

¹ 'Precious (= ornamental, Ezek. xxviii. 30) stones' would be possible here and in x. 2, but not in v. 31, vii. 9-11.

² Cp. שֵׁנָב, Gen. xiv. 2.

³ Cp. *Crit. Bib.* p. 352. Is the modern Akaba a descendant of Kab = Akab?

Hiram, king of Şor, a place-name which may either denote Tyre in Phoenicia, or Mişşor in N. Arabia. It may be questioned, indeed, whether the text is correct. Expert seamen were surely to be had for the asking in the Edomite seaport. There is, however, something which we do expect to find mentioned, and yet is not mentioned, and that is the supply of rowers (cp. Isa. xxxiii. 21¹). I have ventured to restore such a mention, and suppose the original reading to have been obscured through the growing interest in the legend of Hiram, king of Tyre. The idea which led to the corruption probably was the same which the Second Isaiah expresses poetically—that kings should be Zion's 'nursing fathers' (Isa. xlix. 23). Hence, in 1 K. x. 22, the expert seamen are imagined to be supplied by Hiram, and the Chronicler (2 Chr. viii. 18), consistently enough, makes the Tyrian king supply both ships and shipmen. In reality, the king of Şor or Mişşor, having no seaboard, had neither ships nor mariners to lend.

And what was the goal of this bold naval enterprise? One of the glosses (probably) explains the name of the emporium as Asshur-Yaman, and one of the traditions describes the fleet of Solomon as a Tarshish-fleet.² Now Tarshish has been shown to be a perfectly regular corruption of Ashtar, which we know to be the equivalent of Asshur. We should expect therefore that one part of the name of the

¹ See *T. and B.* p. 362.

² Cp. *D. and F.* p. 155.

emporium might be *Ur* (a shortened form of Asshur), and that another part should be *bal* (the short for Ethbal = Ishmael). And the material furnished by Ophir¹ (אופיר) may without violence be rearranged as *Urpal* = Asshur-Ethbal (*p* and *b* are often interchanged). An alternative for Ophir is perhaps *Uphaz* (Jer. x. 9; Dan. x. 5), which may come from *Ur-Şib'on* (through *Ur-Ziphion*); one remembers that, in Jer. x. 9, *Tarshish* and *Uphaz* are parallel. In fact, we can well afford to leave the origin of 'Ophir' uncertain, knowing that *Ophir* and *Tarshish* (*Ashtar*) are virtually equivalent. The goal of Solomon's naval enterprise was some part of the N. Arabian coast where silver and gold were common objects of merchandise. According to Jer. x. 4 (cp. Ezek. xxvii. 12) silver came from *Tarshish* and gold from *Uphaz* (= *Ophir*). This may be correct, and yet both *Tarshish* (*Ashtar*) and *Uphaz* (*Ur-Şib'on*) may be districts of N. Arabia.

It is stated in 1 K. x. 11 that Solomon's fleet fetched not only gold and silver, but abundance of almug-timber and ashkar-stones. We may doubt whether this was really so. When mention is made of Solomon's building materials (1 K. v. 13-18), nothing is said of their being brought by sea. Indeed, why should the Lebanon timber be conveyed by sea? 1 K. v. 9 and 2 Chr. ii. 16 belong clearly to the *Hiram* legend.

There was, however, something which Solomon

¹ For other views see *E. Bib.* 'Ophir.'

coveted not less than silver and gold, namely, horses and chariots. Tradition states positively that his desire was gratified, and that the merchants with whom he had relations were those of the N. Arabian regions of Mišrim and of Maakath.¹ The breeding-ground is not expressly mentioned, but we may assume that the horses were reared in the highlands of Arabia.² In Ezek. xxvii. 14 another name is mentioned in connexion with the N. Arabian horse-traffic—Togarmah (*i.e.* Tubal-garmah).³ Altogether, there is no theory explaining the tradition respecting Solomon's acquisition of horses better than that which is here once more reaffirmed.

The passage 1 K. x. 28 should run thus: 'And the exportation of Solomon's horses was from Mišrim, and [from] Maakah were fetched the suḥirs⁴ (*gloss*, Maakah in Yarḥam,⁵ Ethbaal). And a chariot was exported from Mišrim for six hundred pieces of silver, and a horse for a hundred and fifty. And on these terms were they exported to the kings of the Ashḥartites⁶ and to the kings of Aram (*gloss*, in Yarḥam⁷).'

¹ On these regions see *T. and B.* pp. 167, 171. That סעבה may underlie סקה can hardly be denied. Cp. קיע (Ezek. xxiii. 23), עבק (Judg. vii. 1, 8, 12, xviii. 28; Ps. lx. 8), תקיע.

² See *T. and B.* p. 462.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 163 f.

⁴ On suḥirs see *Crit. Bib.* p. 334, note.

⁵ Read בירחם. So 2 S. xxiv. 24; Isa. xlv. 13, lii. 3; Jer. xv. 13; and cp. סכיר.

⁶ אשחרת = חרת = חת.

⁷ MT. בידם. See *Two Religions*, p. 333 (on Isa. x. 5).

I fear that many or most of my readers may be prejudiced on the opposite side. All the more do I urge the student to give a careful consideration to the Biblical evidence here produced. I will only add an argument from a book which, if not in any strict sense Arabian, is yet not uninfluenced by the old Arabian wisdom, and may perhaps have been represented (like Prov. xxv.-xxix.) as translated, or copied out, from a genuinely Arabian source.¹ In one of the very interesting passages inserted later into the original poem, there is a kind of picture-gallery of the natural wonders most familiar to the writer. They are wonders of the Arabian wilderness, and among them is the war-horse (Job xxxix. 19-25). Horses, then, were common sights in Arabia, and I can well believe the prophet's statement (Jer. vi. 23) that the Asshurites rode upon horses. But had they also chariots? Certainly. Asshur, Mişrim, and Aram all (according to tradition) had chariots; and how should Solomon have consented to be behind-hand? Naturally, he procured his chariots as well as his horses from N. Arabia. Ishmaelite chariots were famous;² the popular wit, however, altered the designation, so that 'chariots of Rabshal' (= 'Arabia of Ishmael') became 'chariots of *barzel*' (iron). But the notion

¹ That the Yerahme'elites were the models of the Israelites in the Wisdom literature is shown in *T. and B.* p. 40 (with note 3). The Babylonian influence which Dr. Langdon (of Oxford) traces, appears to be indirect.

² *T. and B.* p. 466; *D. and F.* p. 39; *Crit. Bib.* p. 449.

of 'chariot-cities' (1 K. x. 26) will not bear investigation, מרכבות being most naturally taken as a corruption of אַמְרֹבַת, 'Akrabbath.' I doubt if my friend Prof. Robertson Smith would have adhered to his old opinion about 'chariot-cities.'

One may perhaps wonder why Solomon did not send for model agricultural waggons. Certainly at a later time such waggons do appear to have been imported from N. Arabia¹ (Num. vii. 3). We can hardly think that this was the case in the territories which after Solomon's death formed the kingdom of (northern) Israel. But the culture of Israel in the border-land seems to have had a distinctly N. Arabian colour. That the king himself favoured the N. Arabian connexion is shown by the fact that he had a Miṣrite wife, and two 'sons of Shisha' as scribes (1 K. iv. 3; see p. 19²).

And yet the gravest political dangers which, so far as we know, Solomon had to encounter were from N. Arabia—dangers connected with the names of Hadad, Rezon, and Jeroboam. The first-mentioned of these was of pure Yerahme'elite descent,³ the son (probably) of the king of the same name whose record is in Gen. xxxvi. 39.⁴ While still young, this Hadad had had to flee to Miṣrim for his life,

¹ 'Šib'onite waggons' is the phrase; cp. צִנִּים, Isa. lxvi. 20.

² See *E. Bib.* 'Shisha.'

³ See *Crit. Bib.* p. 337.

⁴ *T. and B.* p. 432, and cp. *Crit. Bib.* (on 1 K. xi.), *E. Bib.* 'Hadad.'

after David's conquest of the southern Aram.¹ Here he was hospitably received, and married the sister of the queen-consort, by whom he had a son, whose name,² like that of his mother, suggests that he may have been admitted into the Mişrite tribe of the Naphtuḥim (Gen. x. 13). He lived quietly among the Mişrites till the deaths of David and Joab. Then his hour struck, and he returned to his old home, ready for any opportunity of damaging Solomon.

The second was Rezin (a form of Reşin, *i.e.* Arabia of Şib'on³), son of Eliada. He too was a Yerahme'elite, and may have had patriotic grievances against David and Solomon. He was not averse, however, to make capital out of his own king's misfortunes. He not only left 'his lord' Hadad-Ezer to his fate, but carved out a new kingdom for himself, the current name of which was Aram-Şobah or Aram-Ramshaḫ. From his strong capital (the border-city of Ramshaḫ) Rezin issued forth, defeating the Israelites, and raiding their N. Arabian land. This went on, we are told, 'all the days of Solomon.' Certainly this unmartial king was ill-chosen as a type of the Messiah!

A third enemy was a subject and a highly-placed

¹ Read 'Aram' for 'Edom,' as Cheyne and Winckler.

² *Two Religions*, p. 346. Genubath should rather be Nubath, a popular corruption of Naphtaḫ (cp. Nebat, below); the initial *g* comes from a dittographed *n*. Taḥpenes should be Taḥpanḥes.

³ Reşin is a curtailment of Barşin, where Bar comes from Arâb, and Şin, through Şiyyon, from Şib'on.

servant of Solomon himself (1 K. xi. 26). He is called 'an Ephrathite of Şeredah,' but it is the southern Ephrath that is meant. Şeredah (Σαρειπα) is hardly correct. Klostermann suggests Tirşah as the underlying name, but there is reason to think that Tirşah (which apparently means 'agreeable,' but is not at all likely to have such a commonplace signification) is a corruption of Şarephath. 'Şarethan' may also belong to the same group, and the name of Jeroboam's town, Şeredah, most probably has the same origin.¹ At any rate, on his mother's side Jeroboam was a Yerahme'elite, or more particularly a Mişrite, for there is no doubt but that the descriptive passage in 1 K. xi. 26 should continue thus,—'whose mother's name was . . . a Mişrite, a Yerahme'elite woman.'² I have left the patronymic of Jeroboam, and the name 'Jeroboam' itself, to the last, because of the great difficulties which they present till we have got the right key. Jeroboam has nothing to do with multiplication of the people; it (ירבעם) is simply a popular corruption of Yerahme'el (ירחמאל) through the linking form Yarba'al (ירבעל). And 'son of Nebat' comes from 'son of Naphtuḥim'³ (נבט from נפת; see p. 86, n. 2). This name, it will be remembered, is borne, in Gen. x. 13, by one of the sons (tribes) of Mişrim, and we know (from the

¹ See the chapter on Tirşah, also *E. Bib.* 'Tirzah,' 'Zarethan,' 'Zeredah.'

² See *T. and B.* p. 44 (top); *E. Bib.* 'Zeruah.'

³ It is a mere coincidence that נבט is the name for the Nabateans.

gloss in 1 K. xi. 26) that Jeroboam was, on his mother's side, a Miṣrite. Solomon, however, evidently regarded Jeroboam as an Israelite, and so did the Israelites in N. Arabia. The former, recognising his ability, appointed him superintendent of the whole of the forced labour of the tribe of Joseph.

Such at least is the traditional account, which presupposes that the *corvée* was exacted, not merely of subject Yerahme'elites, but of the Israelite clansmen. We have seen, however, that this view of Solomon's treatment of the Israelites is probably incorrect. It was perhaps dictated by the wish to account plausibly for the great rent between Israel and Judah (see 1 K. xii.). There are traces of another view, which confines the *corvée* practically to non-Israelites, and it is on the face of it a much more probable view that Jeroboam was royal commissioner for levying the *corvée* on the subject Yerahme'elites of the N. Arabian border-land.

If so, the question presents itself whether in the literary source from which 1 K. xi. 26 is derived, לנל ישבל בית יוסף should not rather be לנל ישבל בית ישפל. ישפל. בית ישפל will be a gloss on נל ישבל. (Ishbal or Ishpal is of course a shortened and corrupted form of Ishmael.) We may suppose, then, that Jeroboam's office was that of *pākid*, or governor, of all Ishmael, *i.e.* of all the N. Arabian territory occupied by the Israelites.¹ This accounts for his being able to fortify Şeredah (see the additional

¹ See *Crit. Bib.* p. 297.

passage in ⑤). It was Jeroboam's ambition to erect a new kingdom on the ruins of the old. This was indeed 'lifting up his hand against the king' (1 K. xi. 26; cp. 25, xx. 21), and accounts for his flight to Shishak (Ashhur), king of Mişrim. We shall have to return to this important personage presently.

It will be remembered that, according to a trustworthy tradition, the trouble with Rezon went on 'all the days of Solomon.' This casts a lurid and a painful light on the traditional prosperity of the early years of this king. One may even suspect that the king of Şôr (Mişşôr) was not nearly as friendly as he has been represented, at any rate after the first few years of Solomon's reign. Perhaps a new king arose who saw the difference in warlike ability between David and his successor. It may even be that he reduced Solomon to vassalage. The story of the twenty cities offered to Hiram (1 K. ix. 10-13¹) should perhaps, as Winckler has suggested, be taken in combination with a neighbouring passage (ix. 14) according to which (correcting the text) 'the king sent to Hiram six score talents of gold.' Surely this was not a friendly gift; it was tribute to Solomon's suzerain.

It was not therefore Solomon's asserted uxoriousness, but the bitter taste of misfortune, which turned away his heart from Yahweh as Guardian of Israel

¹ קָבַל from כָּבַל, 'no better than a stump.' Really, however, קָבַל is a corrupt form of קָבַל.

and Director of the Divine Company. It may have seemed to the king as if Yahweh were either unable or unwilling to give any further help to his servants. And so Solomon turned to the God of the Abrahamic peoples, to whom he erected two great pillars, called respectively Yakin (Yakman) and Bo'az (Azbul),¹ and intimating that the adjoining temple was dedicated to the N. Arabian or Abrahamic deity (see below).

And what was Solomon's religion? Not, certainly, of a very high type. His god and he had to be bound together by ties of mutual advantage. *His* advantage, however, and that of his people did not coincide. The *corvée*, if tradition may be trusted, pressed hard on the Israelites of the border-land, and cannot have been less felt by those in the northern realm (Israel and Judah). The favour of the priests and prophets, however, was doubtless bought by concessions to their wishes or demands; and to a well-built stone temple, such as Yerahme'elite kings were wont to have, there was added, presumably, a regular service of sacrifices. Yahweh, as the older prophets assured him, had, in his father's time, declared that he would dwell in Yerahme'el, and it was the privilege of David's heir to build a palace² for his divine father. Not that Solomon can have neglected either the ancient god

¹ See *E. Bib.* 'Jachin and Boaz.'

² See 1 K. viii, 12. בית ישמעאל = בית זבול. ירחמאל = ארפל. 'an Ishmael-house' = a stone-built house.

Yerahme'el, or the goddess, as great and perhaps even more ancient, Ashtart. Indeed, the two massive pillars in the porch of the temple were called respectively (according to the original form of the text) Yerakman (Yerahme'el) and 'Azba'al (Ishmael); *i.e.* both were dedicated to the ancient god of N. Arabia, under one or the other of his names.

That such a rich man as Solomon should have had a large harem was only natural, but no early writer would have made the palace-women amount to 10,001,¹ or asserted that they turned his heart away from Yahweh! For Yahweh was never Solomon's only god, nor was he indeed always even his chief divinity.

¹ See 1 K. xi. 3. The Miṣrite wife would stand alone.

CHAPTER VI

SHEKEM

THAT there was a land of Shakmi (Shekem) in N. Palestine in remote antiquity, which probably included the site of the modern Nablus, we know from one of the Amarna Tablets, but it may be added that before this there was a district and a city so called in the land of Yerahme'el, *i.e.* in N. Arabia. This follows from a careful criticism of several O.T. passages—Num. xxvi. 31; Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 12, xxxiii. 18, xxxiv. 2, xlvii. 1, 22; Judg. ix.; 1 K. xii. 1. Let us take these passages in order.

(a) Num. xxvi. 31. A tradition evidently stated that Shekem was a Gileadite city. This is not indeed the general view of the O.T. writers, but its singularity may be taken as a guarantee of its correctness. It also, when regarded in the context, implies the important fact that the original Gilead was in the land from which the Israelites migrated, *i.e.* the N. Arabian border-land. A tradition in the Book of Jubilees (xii. 1) confirms this; it states that it was into the land of Asshur that Jacob had entered,

when he started on the fateful journey connected with the name of Shekem. The importance of this passage (already quoted in *T. and B.*) will, I hope, be admitted.

(b) Gen. xii. 6¹ supplies a fresh confirmation of the preceding tradition. It says, if I mistake not, that the full name of Shekem was Meḵōm Shekem; Meḵōm, like Yeḵūm, comes from Yarkam. Now, Yarkam (= Yerahme'el) was that wide region, a part of which was called Kena'an (to be grouped with Anaḵ, Amaleḵ, Ḳain). This regional name signifies, not 'lowland,'² but (properly at least) the Yerahme'elite land, N. Arabia.³ In usage, however, it is applied to various parts of the region, such as Phoenicia. In one of these more limited Kena'ans was Shekem, originally Shakram.

(c) Gen. xxxiii. 18. Jacob, we are told, 'came to Shalem, a city of Shekem.' Evidently an important place. Possibly the same as Sukkoth (= Salekath), but much more probably the southern Jerusalem (Uru-Šalem). There is no reason why any reader should be surprised at this. Asshur-Ishmael or Asshur-Yerahme'el was a standing name in early Hebrew tradition for N. Arabia,⁴ and so it is quite credible that we should find such a name as this in

¹ *T. and B.* p. 408; *D. and F.* p. 67.

² This theory has been disproved by Prof. G. F. Moore.

³ Cp. Gen. ix. 18, 'Ham (= Yarḥam) is Arāb-Kena'an.' In Zeph. ii. 5, Kena'an is = land of the Ethbalites (*Two Religions*, p. 411; *D. and F.* p. 95).

⁴ *T. and B.* Index, 'Asshur-Yerahme'el.'

different geographical districts, either virtually in the fuller form or in a shortened and corrupted form such as Shalem¹ (*i.e.* Ishmael). Nor need we be perplexed if different equivalent names are used for the same place in our much-edited Biblical texts. Thus, in Gen. xxxiii. 18, the city which the Jacob-clan visits is called Shalem, and in allusion to this a glossator in xxxiv. 38, says, 'They were Shalemites' (or, Ishmaelites²). But in xxxiv. 20, 24, textual criticism suggests that the name of the city, concurrently with Shekem, was Asshur-Aram. It is true, this is but a translation of Shakram. For Shalem as an alternative for Ur-Šalem I refer, but not dogmatically, to Gen. xiv. 18, and Ps. lxxvi. 3,³ and to the at any rate plausible Egyptian evidence. We may also illustrate by the use of Yabesh (= Šalem), as a name for the southern Jerusalem, and perhaps by the mention (in the Gideon-Abimelek story) of a mountain called Šalmon near Shekem; *š* and *s* are doubtless different sounds, but in the ancient names, both regional and local, *š* and *s* are interchangeable.

The first part of the name has to be consistent with this. As the text stands, it is Ur, but Ur is almost certainly, both in the name 'Ur-Šalem' and elsewhere (especially in 'Ur-Kasdim'), and in proper

¹ For Shalem = Ishmael, see Judg. vi. 24, Mic. v. 4 (שִׁלֹם), 1 S. ix. 4 (אֶרֶץ שְׁעִלִים).

² *T. and B.* p. 414.

³ *T. and B.* p. 250; *Ps.*(²) ii. 6.

names like Uriah and Uriel, the short for Asshur. We have had occasion to refer already to the Shekem-problems in the chapter headed 'Jerusalem,' where it is shown that Shakram and Shalem are the same, and I will only add here that, if we rightly understand the form Shakram (Shekem), we must be struck by its resemblance in meaning to the name of the great southern sanctuary, Asshur Yarham (the city indicated in the original Deut. x. as that of the appointed central sanctuary). See above, p. 34; and cp. *Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah*, pp. 115, 152.

CHAPTER VII

BAAL-GAD, MIGDAL-GAD, MIGDAL-EDER, MIGDAL-SHEKEM

BAAL-GAD (Josh xi. 17) and Migdal-gad (Josh. xv. 37) are place-names compounded respectively of the regional Baal = Yerahme'el and the tribal designation Gad, and of the regional Migdal (= Ramgal) and the same tribal name Gad. For Baal, we may compare Yarba'al (vocalized wrongly Yerubbaal, but really a popular distortion of Yerahme'el, the other name of the hero Gideon), and for Ramgal (*gal* or *gil* is an old regional,¹ cp. Gallim, Gilgal, Gilead) we naturally think, for a parallel, of Ramshaḫ (= Aram-Ashḫur). Baal I have often had occasion to speak of, but Ramgal is, I think, now recovered for the first time. It is true, the Migdal, or Tower, was a characteristic feature of Palestine from the earliest known times,² and to us it may seem plausible to suppose that these towers gave their names to places.³ But a sure parallel for such a place-name as 'Tower of El,' or 'Tower of Gad,' is

¹ *T. and B.* p. 389; *Two Religions*, p. 306.

² *E. Bib.* col. 1556 ('Fortress').

³ See *ibid.*

wanting, and experience suggests that in the Migdal of place-names we have rather an instance of the popular wit exercising itself on an archaic regional. It is no valid objection to this that the existence of Migdal as a place-name can be traced both in very early and in very late times, *i.e.* that we find Magdali in the Amarna letters, and מגדל in the Talmudic literature.¹ Our conception of historical time has been widened, and Palestinian matters must partake of the benefit.

We find a Migdol or Migdols, without any appendix to the name, in the traditional text of Jer. xliv. 1, xlvi. 19, Ezek. xxix. 10. It is, however, very improbable that a mere tower can be meant in any of these passages.² A careful study of the larger contexts to which the passages belong, shows that not Mišraim (Egypt) but Mišrim (the N. Arabian Mušri) is meant. 'Migdol,' as well as 'Migdal,' is surely a miswritten form of Ramgal.

We have still to refer to Migdal-Eder and Migdal-Shekem. The former occurs in Gen. xxxv. 21 and Mic. iv. 8. The first of these is in an account of the conquest of a N. Arabian district by Reubenites, which was attended apparently by circumstances of special offensiveness to more advanced tribesmen.³ The name of the district,

¹ See Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud* (index).

² See especially Jer. xliv. 11, xlvi. 14, where, at least as most think, Memphis is mentioned with Migdol.

³ See *T. and B.* pp. 421 *f.*

as given in the traditional text, was Migdal-Eder, but the scene of the narrative being in N. Arabia, we cannot avoid accepting the correction Ramgal. Eder might be = Edrei, the name of the district where Og resided (Deut. i. 4).¹ But the correction עֲרָב is easy, and yields a better sense. Another name, I may add, was probably Bilshan = Bashan. It is corruptly represented by בִּלְהָה פִּילָגֶשׁ.²

Mic. iv. 8 is hard. But it is clear that the 'hill of the community of Sion' is parallel to Migdal-Eder. It is hopeless to find a natural and suitable sense for Migdal-Eder. If, however, the Sion intended is that of the southern border-land, we cannot hesitate to read :

‘And thou, Ramgal of Arabia,
Hill of the community of Sion.’

The writer of this part of 'Micah' evidently regards the Sion, or Sib'on, of the N. Arabian border-land as having superior claims to be honoured as the religious and secular capital to those of the better-known Jerusalem.

Let us now pass on to Migdal-Shekem, and refer to Judges ix. 46 (Rev. Ver.). We read here that 'when all the men of the tower of Shechem heard thereof, they entered into the hold of the house of El-berith.' Clearly, however, 'the tower of

¹ *D. and F.* p. 138. E. Meyer (*Die Israeliten*, p. 276) compares Eder in the Negeb (Josh. xv. 21).

² עֲרָב יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל = אֲבֵי שֵׁלֶן = פִּילָגֶשׁ. Cp. *T. and B. l.c.*

Shechem' cannot be right; Shechem itself must have had not only walls and gates, but a tower. When Gideon 'broke down the tower of Penuel,' he also 'slew all the men of the city' (Judg. viii. 17). Similarly, when Abimelek 'beat down the city of Shekem' (Judg. ix. 45), he must inclusively have broken down any tower or fort there may have been at Shekem. Migdal-Shekem (if the reading be correct) must therefore be the name of some other place where the clan of Shekem dwelt, or rather Migdal should be Ramgal. Ramgal-Shekem (or, more correctly, Ramgal-Shakram) must therefore have been the name of a settlement near the city of Shakram, famous for a specially honoured and specially fortified temple of El-berith or Baal-berith, or rather Yerahme'el-Arbith. 'Arbith' is doubtless a title of the great goddess Ashtart, who seems to have been *par excellence* an Arabian deity.

CHAPTER VIII

SAMARIA (?)

THERE is evidence enough that the Shomeron or Shimron which plays such an important part in the history of Israel from the time of Omri to that of King Hoshea was not in the centre of Palestine, but in the N. Arabian border-land. Let us take the Biblical passages in order.

(a) 1 K. xvi. 24 (revised text). 'And he (Omri) acquired the mountain Kashmeron from Kashram (*glosses*, in Kikkar of Yaman; Kasrab), and fortified the mountain; and he called the name of the city which he fortified after the name of Kashram, the lord of the mountain, Kashmeron.'

The trivial origin assigned to Omri's capital must have surprised many readers. Textual criticism lifts the whole passage to a higher level. The possessor of the mountain Kashmeron was the lord of one of the minor 'kingdoms of Yerahme'el.' Omri, who felt the need of consolidating his power in N. Arabia, acquired—how, we know not—this strategically important site from its Arabian lord,

and turned the unwallled village, which he probably found there, into a fortified city, retaining the old name. In the popular speech, however, Kashmeron became Shimron, just as, in the same speech, the analogous name Ramshak became Meshek, and Shakram became Shekem. In the first of the two glosses *kikkar* is the expansion of *kar*, i.e. *eshkar* (see pp. 30, 52), and *yanu* is the short for *yaman*. In the second Kashrab (= Ashhur-Arâb) is analogous to Ashrab and 'Aḥberon (Ḥēbron). The city referred to is probably identical with Shekem.

(b) 2 K. xvii. 6. 'In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Asshur took Shimron (Kashmeron), and carried Israel away to Asshur, and placed them by Ḥalah and by Ḥabor (*gloss*, rivers of Şib'on), and in the cities of Madai.'

The 'cities of Madai' are not those of Media. There was a southern Madai as there was a southern Elam.¹ To this phrase corresponds 'the cities of Shimron (Kashmeron),' v. 24. 'Gozan' was no doubt written by the scribe under the influence of the name of the Assyrian province Guzanu, but it is most probably a corruption of Bozan, which has come from Zib'on, i.e. Şib'on; שחר בוני, Ezr. v. 3, vi. 6, 13. Şib'on must be taken here in a wide sense. The 'rivers of Şib'on' may perhaps be the same as the 'rivers of Ramshak' (2 K. v. 12), while 'Madai' may have originated in a literary error; מדין for מדי (Midyan).

¹ *Two Religions*, p. 165.

(c) Mic. i. 5.

‘What is the transgression of Jacob? Surely (it is) Shimron.

What is the sin of the house of Judah? Surely (it is) Ishmael.’

The reading owes much to **Ⲭ**, but we are in advance of our guide when we emend Yerushalem into Yishmal (*i.e.* Ishmael). We must be right, however, in taking this forward step. The prophecies of Hosea and Isaiah are full of reproaching speeches in which Israel or Judah is taxed with addiction to pernicious N. Arabian practices, and the case cannot be different with the prophecies of Micah. For ‘Ishmael’ we might perhaps read ‘Shalem.’ Both names (which really are but one) are designations of N. Arabia, where the most popular deity was certainly Ashtart. Shimron, one of the leading cities of the Yerahme’elite or Ishmaelite border-land—indeed, it was the leading city of the Israelite portion—was naturally one of the most conspicuous for loyalty to the great goddess¹ (Am. viii. 14). Note that in *v.* 13 Ashkal² (disguised as Lakish) is described as ‘the beginning of sin to the community of Şion.’ This need not mean that a city called Ashkal shall be punished

¹ *Two Religions*, pp. 212, 367. Note that, in Hab. i. 12, an early glossator affirms the identity of Asham and Ishmael (*ibid.* p. 400). **ⲡⲚⲚⲏ**, of course, is the feminine of **ⲡⲚⲏ**.

² A frequently used name for N. Arabia. See *Two Religions*, pp. 202 *f.*

for infecting Israel with impurity ; it probably means that a region so designated shall pay the penalty. The chief of the guilty N. Arabian cities was Shimron, which, in *vv.* 6, 7, is threatened with destruction. Yet not all the inhabitants even of the guilty city shall be a prey to the conqueror. See (*d*).

(*d*) Am. iii. 9-11, and 12. Most interesting fragments of prophecies of Amos.¹ It is remarkable that no religious offences are spoken of (cp. Am. iv.). Religion to him is the practice of the civic virtues, and in this the Shimronites are conspicuously deficient. Apparently Amos thinks the Ashdulites (= Asshurites) and Mişrites more righteous and humane than the Israelites of Shimron. The second fragment should run—

‘ Thus saith Yahweh : As the shepherd rescues
From the lion’s mouth (only) two shin-bones,
So (meagrely) shall the benê Israel be rescued—
Those that dwell in Shimron and in Ramshak of
Asshur.’

A very small remnant, then, shall be saved—enough, at any rate, to serve as the foundation of a new human race, of a new Israel. One of the glosses which have penetrated into the text of this fragment² states that ‘in Shimron’ means ‘in Ephrath of Hamath.’ Ephrath is the feminine of Epher, a place-name which lies at the root of the

¹ *Two Religions*, pp. 177 *f.*

² *Ibid.* pp. 181 *f.*

regional which came to be pronounced Ephraim, but we may shrewdly suspect that the original of Ephraim is Epher-Yam (= Yaman), *i.e.* Yamanite Epher. It will be remembered that 'Ephraim' and 'Shimron' are combined in ix. 9. The former name, in fact, belongs to the territory which was claimed by Israel in the N. Arabian border-land.

(e) Isa. xxviii. 1-4. I shall content myself with quoting the first verse in a revised text (cp. *Two Religions*, 32, 340).

'Ha! the proud crown of Ashḥur-Ephraim,
And the flowerage of Yarbel—his brave adornment.'

Certainly the text as it stands will not do. As in the case of Am. iii. 12 and many other passages, geographical glosses have made their way into the text. These glosses are of great value, but we can only recover the true text of the glosses by a keen criticism. One gloss relates to the situation of the doomed city; it is 'on the highest point of the valley of the Ishmannites,' which is as much (so the other glosses inform us) as to say 'the valley of Yerahme'el,' or 'of Yaman.' The text of the prophecy itself, however, gives all that it is absolutely essential to know. שכרי ('drunkards') should of course be ישכר, *i.e.* אֶשְׁחָר, *i.e.* a city in the southern Ephraim called Ashḥur. It is difficult to resist the conviction that Ashḥur-Ephraim is Isaiah's name for the southern Shōmērōn or Shimrōn. As we have seen, this city had two names, viz.

Shimron and Kashmeron; the former is a modified and corrupted form of the latter. We have also seen that Kashmeron means, it is 'belonging to Ashḥur-Aram.' On this analogy we may venture to postulate for the city a third name—Ashḥur-Ephraim. I may add that נבל, in *l.* 2, seems to me plainly wrong. We want a parallel to Ashḥur-Ephraim, and that parallel should underlie נבל. כ and ך are interchangeable. Should we not read ירבל? נבל for ירבל, as, in Judg. xvii. 3, לבני stands for ירבל (= ירחמאל), a gloss on יהודה.

Other passages bearing on Shimron are Am. iv. 1, vi. 1, 3-7, viii. 14 (already mentioned). Isa. ix. 10, x. 9 equally deserve attention. See *T. and B., Two Religions, Mines of Isaiah*. The Jewish papyri from Elephantine also attest *Asham* (for Ishmael). Recent scholars, forgetful of the present writer, are waking up to the existence of *Asham* = *Ashima*. Why not go a step further, and recognize the identity of *Asham*, *Ashima*, and *Ishmael*?

CHAPTER IX

TIRŞAH

THIS ancient city (see Josh. xii. 24) was gifted with a comparatively late prosperity by Jeroboam, whose home and, afterwards, royal residence it was. The authority, however, to which this statement is due, also indicates that the city of Tırşah is N. Arabian. Jeroboam, of course, made his home in the land with which he was officially connected, and though he is said, in our present text, to have been set over all the 'labour' of the house of Joseph (1 K. xi. 26), yet it is probable that the true text said something different (see p. 88), and implied that the *corvée* was only levied on non-Israelites. If so, Jeroboam naturally resided in that part of Solomon's dominion where the population was largely non-Israelite, *i.e.* in part of N. Arabia. Similarly, when we are told that Ben-Hadad, king of Aram, made a diversion to help Asa, king of Judah, and that Jeroboam consequently went and dwelt at Tırşah, we interpret this in the light of the fact that Ben-Hadad was a N. Arabian king, and that the

districts which he raided, though occupied largely by Israelites, were geographically N. Arabian. Most probably the name points in the same direction. It may seem indeed to mean 'the agreeable,' but this trivial, commonplace explanation ought surely to be rejected. Like Şarethan and Şeredah (the incorrectly written name of Jeroboam's city), it may be traced to Şarephath, which means the settlement of the Şareph-clan.¹ From Num. xxvii. 1 we gather that Tirşah was a Gileadite community, and from 2 K. xv. 16 that Tirşah was not far from Tiphşah,² the origin of which name may be traced to Taḥpanḥes,³ *i.e.* Naphtaḥ-ḥas (Naphtaḥ-Ashḥur). Another reading for 'Tiphşah' is 'Tappuah,' which is a corruption either of Taḥpanḥes, or, at least, of Nephtoah. Now, perhaps, we can see why Jeroboam resided at Tirşah. Tirşah was near Naphtaḥ or Nephtoah,⁴ and Jeroboam (see chapter on Solomon) was a 'son' of Naphtaḥ.

¹ The clan-name, in slightly different forms, was widely spread. See p. 19, n. 3.

² Tiphşah also occurs as the name of a border city in 1 K. iv. 24 (v. 4).

³ *Two Religions*, p. 346, and cp. *E. Bib.* 'Tappuah,' 'Tiphşah.'

⁴ We also find Naphath-Dor (1 K. iv. 11), if we should not read Naphath-Dod.

CHAPTER X

SHILOH

IN the composite article 'Shiloh' in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (cols. 4468 *f.*) I have advocated the view that there are two Shilohs, one of which was in the (relatively) northern territory of Ephraim, and to be identified with the modern Seilun, and the other in the N. Arabian border-land. The only interest, however, which we can have in maintaining the existence of a northern Shiloh is drawn from the assumption that the most sacred symbols of the Israelites were, at any rate for a time, preserved in the sanctuary of this city. This assumption I have myself expressly repudiated. It is, of course, not impossible that one or another reference to Shiloh may have been connected with a geographical error on the part of the narrator; but this is not much worth arguing for, considering how long the N. Arabian tradition persisted. I will, therefore, not deny the probability that there were two or more Shilohs, but will renounce the liberty of connecting any of the Old Testament traditions with a northern city of this name.

It is true, Prof. W. R. Smith held that the description in Judg. xxi. 19 'gives certainty' to the identification with Seilun.¹ 'Certainty,' however, is too strong a word. From our present point of view it would seem that the statement of the original narrator was as follows. 'Shiloh (שִׁלוֹ) is in the land of Kena'an (= Ethbal, p. 30), near the border of the (southern) land of Ben-Yamin, north of Bethel (Ethbal), east of the road from Bethel to Shakram, south of Libnah.'

That there was a southern Ephraim we have seen already; the name, however, is properly a distortion of Arâb-Yaman, so that Shiloh may easily be N. Arabian. And if any doubt as to the fact of this situation is still possible, it should be removed by 1 S. i. 9, where the seeming reference to drinking is really an intrusive and corruptly written gloss, stating that Shiloh is in Ashḥur or Ashtar;² *i.e.* in N. Arabia.

It is most strange that O.T. references to Shiloh should so abruptly come to an end. Herr Gemoll³ has already called attention to this, and suggested that the same place may often be referred to under another name. This may easily have happened, for the root of the name Shiloh is a popular contraction of Ishmael.⁴ Probably Shiloh was the

¹ *E. Bib.* col. 4468 (in 'Shiloh').

² *T. and B.* p. 362, n. 3; *Two Religions*, p. 120.

³ P. 188 (identifying Shiloh and Bethel).

⁴ Cp. *Two Religions*, p. 118.

same as Shalem, *i.e.* that sacred city in the south called Asshur-Ishmael (= Asshur-Yarḥam), and also Shiloh. It is, therefore, not necessary, though not unplausible, in Gen. xlix. 10, to emend שָׁלוֹ into שָׁלֵם; we need only correct שְׂרַט into שִׁפָּט, and רַגְלָיו into גְּדָדָיו, and יִקְהַח into יִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ, and render the whole verse thus—

‘Redressers (of wrong) shall not cease from Judah,
 And marshals from among his (fighting) bands,
 Until he entereth Shiloh,
 And the peoples do obeisance unto him.’

In Jer. xli. 5, too, no correction of the text is necessary. As I hope to have shown elsewhere,¹ Gedaliah was governor of the Judaite territory in Yerahme’el. Shekem, Shiloh, and Shimron² in that strange story are all N. Arabian Judaite cities.

¹ *D. and F.* p. 28.

² This is the most probable vocalization.

CHAPTER XI

BETHEL

ONE of the most important references to 'Bethel' is in 1 K. xii. 26-30. It is generally represented as a specimen of Jeroboam's political sagacity that he sought to divert the crowd of Israelite pilgrims from Jerusalem in Judah to Bethel in Israel (or Bethel and Dan). 'Long enough,' he is thought to say, 'have ye gone up to a comparatively distant city to worship your delivering god; Bethel (or Bethel and Dan) will do as well as Jerusalem; behold, there is thy god (Yahweh), O Israel, who brought thee out of the land of Mişraim.' A reinterpretation of the passage, however, is urgently needed. Bethel, as has been shown, is a popular form of Ethbaal; Ethbaal is in the N. Arabian borderland; Mişraim should be Mişrim; and the *elohim* spoken of are specially the two N. Arabian deities Yahweh and Yerahme'el (or Ashhur).¹ The new and most probable view is that Jeroboam set (or gave fresh

¹ *D. and F.* p. 106; *T. and B.* p. 16, etc. Another form is Asshur.

sanction to) two sacred symbolic carved stones in a place of primeval sanctity, originally called Ethbaal.

Verse 21, critically treated, should most probably run thus—

‘And he set Yah-Asshur in Yithbaal (= Ethbaal).’

A gloss on this runs—

‘Now Yah-Asshur is in Dan.’

Judaite redactors, however, were bound to look on this narrative with repugnance. One of them inserted this statement (*v.* 30)—

‘And this thing became a sin, for the people went before Yah-Asshur.’

To this two glosses¹ are appended: (*a*) Now Yah-Asshur is (in) Nathan (= Ethan); and (*b*) (In) Arabia of Dan.

That Beth-el was a N. Arabian place, should now be clear. Another gloss on the situation is in *v.* 3, where the very strange **אֲשֶׁר בְּרֵא מְלָבָר** covers over two glosses: (1) **אֲשֶׁר עִרְבָּ**, ‘Asshur of Arabia,’ and (2) **רַמְבֹּל**, ‘Rambūl,’ *i.e.* ‘Aram-Baal.’

¹ The glosses are geographical. Nathan comes from Mathan = Ithman; cp. נַחְמָנִים = Ithmannîm. עִרְבָּ = עִר (see on Isa. xlvi. 7, *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 142).

CHAPTER XII

ḤEBRON

ḤEBRON! Name of romantic sound, and apparently of easy explanation. But appearances are proverbially deceptive, and so it is here. Analogy requires us to derive Ḥebbron, either from Reḥobon,¹ or directly from the original of Reḥobon, viz. Aḥberōn or Aḥrebōn,² 'one belonging to Ashḥur-Arāb.' The alternative name of the same city is given as Kiryath-Arba, and that almost certainly comes from Ashḥōreth-Arāb, so that the two names are really equivalent. It may be interesting to see what Old Testament writers say about Ḥebbron, according to a thoroughly revised text.

(1) Gen. xxiii. 2. 'And Sarah died in Ashḥōreth-Arāb'; the rest of the verse is a gloss, 'that is, Aḥberon in the land of Canaan' (= Anaḳ). 'Ashḥoreth' is sometimes shortened into Ḥeth, and

¹ *Crit. Bib.* p. 438; *T. and B.* pp. 335 *f.*; cp. *E. Bib.* 'Rehoboth.'

² *Aḥ* is often the first element in N. Arabian regionals, and *Bar* and *Rab* are equally attested as shortened forms of Arāb. This throws a new light on the name Reḥab'am.

accordingly in *v.* 3 we are introduced to the citizens as 'sons of Heth.' The masc. form of this racial name is, of course, Ashhur. This appears in Isa. xiv. 12 as Shaḥar; but various other corruptions might be collected, and among them Şohar, for 'Ephron son of Şohar,' in *v.* 8, is presumably = 'Ephron the Ashhurite.' Hebron, then, was reckoned a N. Arabian city. There may, however, have been, in very early times, a second Hebron¹ or Aḥberon, on or near the site of the traditional Hebron, the modern el-Ḥalil.

(2) Num. xiii. 22. 'And they went up by Angab, and came to Aḥberon, and *there* were Aḥiyamin, Asshuri, and Ethmal (*glosses*, Yeraḥme'el, Anaḥ; Sheba of the Ishmannites). Now Aḥberon and its daughter-cities were on the east of Mişrite Şib'on.' For 'by Angab' the traditional text has 'by the Negeb.' אנגב, that is, was early altered into הנגב, and נגב was, perhaps as early, interpreted to mean 'the dry south land.' We may trace this theory in the common text of Judg. i. 15,² but it is an error. נגב should be grouped with ארנגב (Deut. iii. 13; 1 K. iv. 13), which means 'Aram of Aḥ'ab,' and with גרב (2 S. xxi. 18), which is a popular corruption of ארהאב³ (עקב). The initial נ in נגב is a trace of ענק; we know that Hebron was supposed to be

¹ *T. and B.* p. 230.

² The gift which Aksah asked for was not גֵּלְתַּיִם but גֵּלְעָד יַמָּנִים, 'Gilead of the Yamanites.' גֵּלְתַּיִם and (presumably) גֵּלְיָה are well attested corruptions of גֵּלְעָד.

³ See *Two Religions* and *Mines of Isaiah* (index, Aḥ'ab).

peopled with Anaḳites. That the region in which Hebron was, should have been reckoned as Ashhurite, is not surprising; both Hebron and Kiryath-Arba signify as much. Our old authority also informs us that Hebron and its dependencies were 'to the east of Miṣrite Şib'on.' No doubt there were more than one Şib'on; the one meant in Num. xiii. 22 was that in the N. Arabian land of Miṣrim (cp. Isa. xix. 11, xxx. 4; Ps. lxxviii. 43). Such geographical glosses are common in the O.T., whereas archaeological glosses are the reverse of common. We may compare Gen. xxv. 18, where Shūr is defined as being 'to the east of Miṣrim'; Shūr (Asshur), of course, is a regional, and Hebron (Aḥberon) a city name.

Hebron, as I have said, was Asshurite. According to Gen. xxiii. 2, it was in the land of Canaan. But there is no real inconsistency. There was a southern Canaan in the N. Arabian border-land, sometimes called Anaḳ. Now, we are expressly told (Num. *l.c.* gloss) that Hebron was an Anaḳite city, Yerahme'el and Anaḳ being equivalent.

But are not שבע שנים and נבנתה decisive as to the character of the gloss? By no means. We have no right to trust appearances, when our trustfulness involves our admitting an improbable pseudo-historical gloss. 'Seven years' is not, indeed, a purely imaginary detail. Underneath שבע שנים is שבע ישמנים ('Sheba of the Ishmannites'), and underneath נבנתה lies ונבנתיה ('and her daughters'). It

is noteworthy that among the 'sons' of Hebron, in 1 Chr. ii. 43, is Shema (= Sheba).

(3) Josh. xiv. 14 *f.* 'Hebron therefore became the possession of Kaleb (= 'Yerakbal'), the son of Yephunneh the Kenizzite, to this day; because he wholly followed Yahwè the God of Israel. And the name of Hebron formerly was Ashhoreth-Arāb' (*gloss*, Aḥrab-Gilead among the Anaḳim). The poverty of the thought in MT. is only equalled by the poverty of the expression. To correct both we must remember that a geographical gloss is to be expected; also that *ha-adam* in the story of the creation of man has most probably come from *Aḥram*, and that *gadol* in a group of passages has come from *gil'ad*. It should also be borne in mind that there was an extensive southern Gilead.

(4) 'And to Kaleb, son of Yephunneh, he gave a part among the benê Yehudah . . . Ashhoreth-Arāb (*glosses*, 'Arab-Anaḳ,' 'that is, Hebron'). And Kaleb drove thence the three sons of Anaḳ (namely), Ishmael, and Aḥiyaman, and Ethmal' (*gloss*, 'Yerahme'el-Anaḳ'), Josh. xv. 13 *f.* Cp. Judg. i. 10, where the conquest is assigned to Judah.

(5) 'And the sons of Kaleb (Ashhur-Yerahme'el), Mesha-Rakbul¹ (*gloss*, Arāb-Ziph), and Mareshah (Arāb-Hebron). And the sons of

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 194 (on Gen. x. 15), 558 (on Ex. xv. 1); *Two Religions*, p. 251 (on Hos. vii. 6).

Hebron, Raḥ[am], and Naphtoah,¹ and Reḳem, and Shema,' 1 Chr. ii. 42 *f.* Kaleb, then, was not an Israelite by blood, and only a member of the Judaite community by adoption. But one may wonder how large a portion of the old Israelites could be said to have been strictly homogeneous. Even those who left the land of Miṣrim were, according to tradition, a mixed concourse of aliens² (Ex. xii. 38; Num. xi. 4), though it is presumable that they had a common stock. In this medley, however, the Kalebites or Rakbulites were distinguished by their martial zeal for Yahwè, and the community sanctioned their acquisition of Hebron and part of Gilead. But why was this solemn sanction necessary? Surely Hebron must have been immemorially a sacred city — sacred from ancient theophanies and from its containing the burial-place of the great Yeraḥme'elite patriarch Abraham.

(6) 'So he sent him out of the vale of Aḥberon, and he came to Shakram,' Gen. xxxvii. 14. See *T. and B.* pp. 439 *f.* 'Shakram' is a regional.

(7) 'And all the elders of Israel came to the king to Aḥberon, and king David made a compact with them *before Yahwè*. And they anointed David king over Israel,' 2 S. v. 3. The 'tribes (=elders) of Israel' is a conventional expression.

¹ Korah ('baldness') and Tappuah ('citron') are popular modifications of Raḥ[am] and Naphtoah.

² *T. and B.* pp. 545 *f.*

In the original Judaite literature it means the Israelite clans settled in the N. Arabian borderland. To one of these David belonged, a kinship which the 'tribes' fully recognise, using the characteristic Hebrew phrase, 'We are thy bone and thy flesh' (2 S. v. 1). The sanctuary of Hebron ('before Yahweh') may have included the traditional sepulchre of Abraham and Sarah; possibly, however, Hebron and Gibeon are religiously, and once were locally, one, and David and Solomon were both anointed as kings in the 'high place' of Gibeon. That the original Hebron was in N. Arabia is indicated by the gloss 'Yerahme'el' (2 S. v. 1) underlying the superfluous לְאַמְרָא (as in v. 6).

(8) 'If Yahwè shall bring me back indeed to Urushalem, then I will do service to Yahwè. . . . So he arose and went to Aḥberon,' 2 S. xv. 9. Surely Urushalem and Aḥberon are both N. Arabian.

(9) 'And cause Solomon my son to ride on my own mule, and bring him down to Hebron; and let Šadoḳ the priest and Nathan the prophet anoint him there king over Israel,' 1 K. i. 33 *f.* The sacred tent was at Gibeon, or rather at the sanctuary of Gibeon, which appears to have been in a part of the city—perhaps the citadel—called Aḥberon or Hebron. For 'bring down' read 'bring,' as in v. 38.

CHAPTER XIII

AKRAB, AKRABBIM

A MUCH more important name than might be expected, as we have already found (see 'David,' p. 50; 'Jerusalem,' p. 40; 'Gibeonite Cities,' p. 127; and cp. *T. and B.* 432, 447. Hēber and Hēbron may perhaps come from a (partly) more original form Aḥbar. אַרְךְ and אַרְךְ (Gen. x. 10; Am. v. 16) presuppose אַרְךְ. One Akrab seems to have been on the border of Aram, for a tradition (Judg. i. 36) states that the territory of the Aramites (so read) was 'from the ascent of Akrabbim,' etc.¹ In the following verse (Judg. ii. 1) אַרְבִּים has become בָּנִים, which Gemoll (p. 287) would correct into בְּנָאִים, 'Tränenbäume,' but unconvincingly. It is no tree that we have before us in 2 S. v. 23 *f.*, but a walled town (see p. 24). It is also more than probable that Akrab, or rather Aḥrab, comes from Ashḥur-Arâb.

¹ See *T. and B.* p. 247; *Two Religions*, p. 140.

CHAPTER XIV

GIBEON

THE site of 'the greatest high place' must have an interesting history. It is not, however, of this that I would now speak, but of the name, which seems to have been much misunderstood, but really comes from Agab (= Ah'ab; see p. 40, n. 2). It may also underlie several corrupt place-names, such as Nebo, Nob, Nobai, Gob.

It is usual to suppose that Nebo is the same as Nabû, the name of the divine associate of the Babylonian God Marduk. This view, however, though so popular, is far from probable. That certain isolated Reubenite and Judaite places should borrow these names from the Babylonian Pantheon, and in particular that a Palestinian mountain should acquire such a designation, who can believe this? The parallel (Sin) adduced for a mountain called Nebo (= Nabû) is unsound, for 'Sin' is one of the fragmentary and corrupt names derived from 'Ishmael.' To quote Isa. xlvi. 1 in support of the theory of the wide acquaintance of the Israelites

with the divine name Nebo is precarious, for the passage is corrupt,¹ and the larger context precludes us from expecting a reference to the God Nabû.

In Ezra ii. 29 (Neh. vii. 33) we find the strange phrase נברו אחר, which most (with MT.) render 'the other Nebo,' but contrary to C . As I have often shown, however, אחר represents אשחור (Ashḥur), *i.e.* there was an Ashḥurite Nebo, outside the limits of Palestine. Nebo, however, as a place-name is incorrect; it is probably a corruption either of גבעון or of סנבו.² The situation commonly given to Mt. Nebo is altogether untenable (*D. and F.* p. 183).

Mesha, king of Moab, is also reckoned among the authorities for a Reubenite Nebo. In lines 14-17 of the inscription he boasts of having taken נבה from Israel, and exterminated its people. It will be noticed that in 1 S. xxi. 2, xxii. 9 we also find נבה. Surely גבה (not נבה) must be a contraction of גבעה. The 'city of the priests' must have been called indifferently Gibeon and Gibeah (cp. 2 S. xxi. 6).

We pass on to Nob. The name occurs in the early story of David (1 S. xxi. xxii.), in a prophecy assigned to Isaiah (Isa. x. 32), and in a critically suspicious list of cities of Benjamin (Neh. xi. 32). A fuller form is probably 'Anāb; and both Nob and 'Anāb most probably come ultimately from Gib'on, but more directly from 'Agob or Gob (= Argob; see p. 80, n. 2). According to tradition, the greatest

¹ *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 135-137.

² See *D. and F.* p. 163; *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 47, 136.

high place was that at Gibeon (1 K. iii. 4). It was probably in the tent of Yahweh (not in *his* tent) at Gibeon that David deposited the sword of Goliath (1 S. xvii. 54, revised text). From 2 S. xxi. 6 we learn that Gibeon stood on or near a mountain of Yahweh. It would seem important to add that the act of vengeance related in 2 S. xxi. was probably called forth by the dreadful massacre of the priests related in 1 S. xxii. See *Ency. Bib.* 'Nob,' Poels (referred to in *Ency. Bib.*), and Gemoll (pp. 194 ff.).

Nobai is apparently an expansion of Nob, or rather Gobai is an expansion of Gob (= 'Agob or 'Argob).

CHAPTER XV

THE GIBEONITE CITIES

KIRYATH - YE'ARIM, or rather Ashḥoreth - Ye'arim or Akrabbath - Ye'arim, was one of a group of Hierwite or Ḥorite (*i.e.* Ashḥurite) towns in the N. Arabian border-land. The traditional statement (Josh. ix. 17) is, 'Now their cities were Gibeon, and Kefirah, and Mišpah, and Beeroth, and Kiryath-Ye'arim.' The people of all these places were in a large sense Gibeonites, *i.e.* they belonged to the pre-Israelite population of Aḥ'ab or Aḳrab (Ashḥur-'Arâb); and two of the place-names in the list are records of Aḳrabbite origin.

These place-names are disguised as Kefirah and Beeroth; the true forms are respectively Akrabbah (cp. Kefar-Ammoni, Josh. xviii. 75, *i.e.* Akrab-Ammonim) and Akrabbath (cp. Arubboth, 1 K. iv. 10, *i.e.* Akrabbath). The chief difficulty will perhaps be felt in the explanation here given of Beeroth. Note, however, that, in 2 S. iv. 2, one of the two assassins (both are Beerothites) is called Rekab, which is clearly a mutilated and adapted

popular form of Arkab (= Akrab). In such popular forms a letter is often let slip (*e.g.* Aḥer from Ashḥur). Note also that Beeroth was 'reckoned to Benjamin' (*i.e.* the N. Arabian Benjamin), and that it is in Gilead of Yaman¹ that the assassins seek refuge (2 S. iv. 3). Beeroth (Akrabbath), therefore, cannot have been far from the southern Gilead, just as the Gilead mentioned in 2 S. ii. 9 cannot have been far from Asshur-Yaman.²

There still remain Miṣpah and Kiryath-Ye'arim. I cannot help reminding the reader that there was a Gileadite Miṣpah; this fits in excellently well with the inference just now drawn from 2 S. iv. 3. Much more important is it, however, to sum up the traditional statements respecting 'Kiryath-Ye'arim,' in continuation of what has been said already. In 2 S. vi. 2 the latter place receives another name, *viz.* Baal-Judah, or, as another form of the same tradition (1 Chr. xiii. 6) has it, 'Baalah which belonged to Judah,' on which we may remark that Baal is shortened from Yarbaal, and that Yehudah must have been corrupted from Yerahme'el.³

That Kiryath - Ye'arim (= Ashḥoreth - Ye'arim) was in the N. Arabian border-land appears from 1 Chr. ii. 50, 52, where *abi* (prefixed to Kiryath-Ye'arim) means, not 'father' or 'founder,' but 'Arabia' (= עֲרַב). From the context we learn that

¹ גלעד ימן is a contracted form of גלעד ימן = גלעד ימן.

² 'Asshurim' should be 'Asshur-Yam,' *i.e.* Asshur-Yaman.

³ 1 S. xxii. 5; Am. vii. 12.

‘Arabia of Kiryath-Ye‘arim’ was equivalent to Shobal (*i.e.* Ishmael), the name of a member of the family of Kaleb, Ephrathah, and Hur.

There is also, as most think, a reference to Kiryath-Ye‘arim in Ps. cxxxii. 6, which, if MT. may be followed, runs—

‘Behold, we heard of it in Ephrathah ;
We found it in the fields of Ya‘ar.’

This obscure statement, however, cannot be correct; and we should almost certainly read thus—

‘Behold, ye Shimeonites in Ephrathah,
Ye Shimeonites (miswritten ‘Şimeonites’) in the
highlands of Ya‘ar.’

The speaker is some prominent Israelite in N. Arabia, who, being himself a partisan of the N. Arabian temple,¹ summons the Israelites in its vicinity to attend the solemn ceremony of the dedication consequent on its rebuilding.² It is implied that the temple was in Ephrathah, or, more definitely, in the highlands of Ya‘ar (see p. 134), and it is noteworthy that in *v.* 13 the holy city is called Şiyyon (see p. 39).

In Josh. xv. 60 Kiryath-Baal is expressly identified with Kiryath-Ye‘arim. The name is followed by Rabbah, *i.e.* Akrabbah. And in Josh. xviii. 28 Gibeath and Kiryath are combined. The former is = Gibeon; the latter, Kiryath-Ye‘arim.

¹ *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 14, 182.

² הָנֵה (*v.* 7) refers to ‘we will go’ in *v.* 8.

In Jer. xxvi. 20-23 we hear of an unfortunate prophet named Uriah, who prophesied destruction to the Judaite Jerusalem and the temple,¹ and who was of Kiryath - Ye'arim, *i.e.* of the N. Arabian Jerusalem. Whether this Uriah was in favour of the central N. Arabian sanctuary we cannot tell, but it would be only natural if he were.

¹ But cp. Gemoll, p. 342, n. 2.

CHAPTER XVI

JERICO AND JORDAN

ONE of the most important events in the period of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites was, according to tradition, the capture and destruction of Jericho. There are, however, good reasons for thinking that the account in the Book of Joshua (which is admittedly composite) arose out of the blending of two traditions,¹ one that of the capture of a city called originally (after its river) Yarḥon (modified into Yeriḥo), and the other Reḥōbōth, the city 'by the river,' from which came one of the older kings of Aram² (Gen. xxxvi. 35). To which tradition the supernatural crossing of the river belongs it is not easy to say. Both cities, as, from our present point of view, may be presumed, were in the N. Arabian territory conquered by Israel; and it does not greatly matter which city was originally mentioned in connexion with the semi-mythological³ crossing. Another point to notice is

¹ *E. Bib.* 'Jericho.'

² *T. and B.* pp. 429, 431.

³ *E. Bib. l.c.* The Yarḥon was probably one of the four Paradise streams.

that the city of Yarḥon was also called—probably by Judaites, ‘the city of Ramathites,’¹ which may remind us that in Jer. l. 21 North Arabia receives the similar title, ‘the land of Ramathites’; in both cases ‘Ramathites’ means ‘inhabitants of Ram’ (*i.e.* the southern Aram). It is true, Yarḥam and Rāmāh are not very much alike in their present forms. But the restoration of a single letter produces a marked difference; Raḥam is not at all unlike Yeraḥ!

The confusion of Reḥoboth and Yarḥon may seem, to some, improbable; but the fact is that Reḥoboth, written רַחֲבֹהוּ, can be quite easily mistaken for Yarḥon, written יַרְחֹן; and the name of the city Reḥoboth would readily suggest the otherwise mysterious figure of Raḥab (רַחַב). Indeed, Rāḥāb is the equivalent of Reḥōb,² which, in turn, is most probably a modification of Aḥrab.³

But why should Raḥab be called a *zōnah*? Was she really regarded as one of the class of harlots (זוֹנָה)? Or may not the strange reference to the harlot be due to a preceding corruption of the text?⁴ That the restoration of Yarḥon as the original reading

¹ Corrupted into ‘the city of palm-trees’ (עִיר תְּמָרִים). See Deut. xxxiv. 3; Judg. i. 16, iii. 13; 2 Chr. xxviii. 15; and cp. *T. and B.* p. 448; *D. and F.* p. 184.

² Hence, in Ps. lxxxvii. 5, Raḥab is coupled with the N. Arabian Bābel. See *Ps.*⁽²⁾ and *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 117 *f.*

³ Ed. König, however, considers רַחַב to be the short for רַחַב־אֵל (*Handwörterbuch*).

⁴ See p. 145, n. 2 (on Judg. xi. 1); *T. and B.* p. 19 (n. 1); *D. and F.* pp. 33 *f.*

for Yeriho is not really violent, I have shown elsewhere;¹ passages like Num. xxii. 1, Josh. xx. 8, appear incontrovertibly to prove it. And it is hardly less indubitable that *zōnah* has come from *ṣō'annah*, *i.e.* *ṣib'onah* (Ṣib'onitess). 'Ṣib'on' and 'Reḥōb' must in early times have been equivalent, so that *rāḥāb*, a modification of *Reḥōb*, might easily be used as a personification of the city, and be explained as *Ṣib'on* or *Ṣib'onah*. *Reḥōb* must originally have been a regional, but it would easily become a city-name. There must have been an important N. Arabian city, which, like Gibeon, submitted to the Israelites, and therefore escaped the fate which overtook other cities such as that properly called *Yarḥon*. The strong city of *Raḥab* we can now see to have been *Reḥōb*; it belonged to the region of *Ṣib'on*, *i.e.* Ishmael or N. Arabia (the original Canaan). For a similar combination of names, we may compare the description of Hadad-Ezer as 'son of Reḥob, king of Zōbah' (2 S. viii. 3), for Zōbah, like *zōnah*, is a popular corruption of *Ṣib'onah*. It remains an open question whether the Jericho so well known to us is, or is not, mentioned in the fragments of the old Judaite literature. At any rate, *Yarḥon* seems to have been chiefly known as a river-name,² though in Josh. xix. 46 we do find mention of a place called [Me]-*Yarḥon* and *Raḥḥon*, under which may perhaps lie *Yarḥon*.³ True, this place is said to be

¹ *T. and B.* pp. 229, 456.

² *Ibid.* pp. 228, 262, 456, etc.

³ There is an alternative view, for which see *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 54.

Danite, but the seat of the Danites must once have been N. Arabian, as we infer from the true text of Judg. v. 17*b*, 'and Dan—why did he remain in Ethan?'¹

Not much can be added here to the argument for regarding ירדן as a possible corruption of ירחון; but that little should be of interest. It was not a pure accident that the corruption of Yarḥon took the form of Yardan, because there seems to have been a district of the N. Arabian border-land occupied by the Danites, and called by the name of Ya'ar. This wild, rocky country was very probably bounded by a stream, which would naturally be called 'stream of the Ya'ar of Dan.' The evidence for this view being so slender, I do not offer it as more than a conjecture. But even if a conjecture, it is at least a very probable one. The passages are but two, but what can they possibly mean if my conjecture be neglected? They are 2 S. xxiv. 6 and xviii. 6. The former passage is in an account of the census of the inhabitants of the N. Arabian territory claimed by David. 'They came to Gilead, and to the land of Taḥtim-ḥodshi, and came to Danya'an, and made a circuit to Ṣidon.' Four places are here mentioned; of two, the names are rightly read, and of two wrongly. The two wrong names

¹ איתן for MT's אשית; 'Ethan' probably comes from 'Ethman,' *i.e.* 'Ishmael' (= N. Arabia). The parallel line should probably be read, 'Gilead abode in Arāb-Yarḥon.' The corruption of ירחון into ירדן was facilitated here by the circumstance that ירן follows. Note that Gilead and Dan were not far apart.

are 'the land of Taḥtim-ḥodshi,' which should be 'the land of Naphtaḥ-Ashḥur' (cp. 'the land of Tappuah,'¹ Josh. xvii. 8), and 'Dan-ya'an' which should be either 'Dan-Ya'ar,' or 'Ya'ar-Dan.' The latter reading—Ya'ar-Dan—furnishes a plausible origin for the name of the stream Yarden; in popular forms of names *y* is often omitted. It is true, in 2 S. xviii. 6 the *ya'ar* is said to have been in Ephraim. That may have been strictly correct, and yet the district may also have been in Dan, for Dan was probably once a much more important tribe than in later times.

There are also some other passages which, rightly explained, throw great light on the subject. The most important of all the illustrations is, of course, Num. xxii. 1 (Josh. xx. 8), which I have already more than once referred to. But, as it seems to me, Josh. iii. 17 and xix. 34 are almost equally significant.

(a) In Josh. iii. 17 the narrator tells us how the priests stood still on dry ground in the midst of Jordan till all the people had passed over on dry ground. The important words are *בְּתוֹךְ הַיַּרְדֵּן הָקֵן*, and before *הָקֵן* is a *Pasek*, indicating that the text is not free from doubt. In fact, *הָקֵן* would give by no means the right meaning for this context. No qualification of 'the priests stood on dry ground' is at all wanted, and if the narrator chose to give one,

¹ Tappuah ('apple,' 'quince') is a witty popular corruption of Naphtaḥ.

it would not be the obscure *הִקֵּן*. *ס* and Pesh. do not express the word, a neglect which on the part of *ס* is very significant. The remedy is plain. *הִקֵּן* is an imperfectly written *הִקִּינֵן*. If so the case is precisely parallel to that of *יִרְדֵן יִרְחוֹ* in Num. xxii. 1, *i.e.* the error and its correction are put side by side.

(*b*) The other passage occurs in a definition of the boundaries of Naphtali. The important words are *וּבִיהוּדָה יִרְדֵן*, out of which it is difficult to get a natural sense. Light streams in, however, when we observe that *יהוּדָה* sometimes in the Old Testament must have come from *יִרְחוֹ = יִרְחוֹמַאֵל*. The meaning is, 'and (it strikes) the Yarḥon on the east.' The reference is to the Israelite territory in the N. Arabian border-land.

CHAPTER XVII

GATH

WE have seen that the place-name גת (Gath) is not to be explained (however obvious the explanation may be) as 'Winepress-town,' but as a shortened form of Golath, or the like, and that Golath and its congeners have come by various stages from Gilead.¹ Let us see the consequences of this admission. The Ethbalite champion with whom David (or Elhanan?) contended, was not a native of an unimportant city, but of a region which we may presume to have been one of the most desirable in the N. Arabian border-land. It was, further, with the king of this district — Akish (= Ashkar) son of Maok (= Maakah),—that David took temporary service, and who in recognition gave to David the fortified town of Şiklag (*i.e.* Şedek-gilead). It was also from Gilead that Ittai brought six hundred men for David's service, after David had become king. One can easily believe that 'Gilead' was a place-name as well as a

¹ See p. 16, n. 1, and *Two Religions*, p. 166, n. 3.

regional; the fuller form of the place-name may have been Ramath-Gilead. The Chronicler (2 Chr. xi. 8) declares that Rehoboam fortified Gath (Gilead), presupposing that that city was in Rehoboam's possession. Yet in Uzziah's time the same writer represents it as a Philistine (Ethbalite) city (2 Chr. xxvi. 6). At an earlier period Hazael, king of (the southern) Aram, had made a devastating inroad into 'all the land of Gilead' (2 K. x. 33), and in another raid had besieged and taken the city called (most correctly) Gilead or (as in MT.) Gath (2 K. xii. 17)¹ on his way to Jerusalem(?).

An obscure statement may be added from 1 Chr. vii. 21. It is to the effect that certain 'sons' (=clans) of Ephraim were slain by the men of Gath that were born in that land, because they came down to take away their cattle. Clearly 'Gath' here stands for 'Gilead.'

But this is not the whole of our gains. Akish was king of Gath, *i.e.* of Galath, a name corrupted from Gilead (cp. Goliath); and Akish is equivalent to Naḥash. Therefore the Naḥash stratum of narrative must be interpreted on the supposition that the city spoken of in 2 S. as besieged by Joab (Rabbah) is Gileadite. A valuable corroboration of this view is disclosed by a keener textual criticism

¹ How *Gath* can have been on Hazael's way to Jerusalem, assuming the ordinary views of Old Testament geography, is not easy to understand (Gemoll, p. 321).

of the so-called 'Table of Peoples.'¹ See Gen. x. 11 *f.*, where the 'seeing eye' cannot fail to recognize the statement that 'Akrabbath, the city of Yewānah,' was in Gilead.'² See further, p. 46.

¹ See *T. and B.* pp. 185-7, but note the alteration of view now made, viz. that Akrabbath takes the place of Reḥoboth. In fact, Reḥoboth and Markaboth seem both to be popular alterations of Akrabbath, and Reḥob and Rekab to be transformations of Akrah (see Jericho chapter). Rabbah may be explained in like manner.

² Read 'that is the city of Gilead,'—a gloss on 'Akrabbath, the city of Yewānah.'

CHAPTER XVIII

RAMAH AND RAMOTH-GILEAD

THE latter name should rather be Ramath-Gilead. Ramah is most probably a contraction of Raḥamah, just as Abram is a contraction of Abrahām. It simply means, therefore, 'Yeraḥme'elite settlement,' and points to the pre-Israelitish time when the population was more purely Yeraḥme'elite than at present. There were doubtless several places which bore this name; the MT. mentions Ramath-Negeb, Ramath-Miṣpeh, Ramath-Leḥi, besides the Ramah in the tribe of Benjamin, near which was the tomb of Rachel, and the Ramah in the hill-country of Ephraim which was the home of Samuel, and of his father before him, and others. The latter may perhaps have been once called Ramath-Yaman, though the MT. gives its name as Ramathaim. It may there be identical with Ramath-Leḥi, *i.e.* Ramath-Yeraḥme'el.¹ It may, however, be purely accidental whether Ramah had a defining name such as Leḥi (Yeraḥme'el) attached to it, or

¹ See *T. and B.* p. 270.

not. And I must say that it seems to me very uncertain whether any of the Ramahs of the Old Testament were in Israel or Judah proper, except perhaps that mentioned in 1 K. xv. 17 as fortified by Baasha king of Israel with the view of isolating Jerusalem, 'that he might not suffer any to go out or come in to Asa king of Judah.' And yet even here the obvious explanation may not be the true one. For the context is about the N. Arabian land. Surely it is a N. Arabian king to whom Asa sends for help against Baasha.¹

It is also highly probable (see chapter on Tīrṣah) that the strong city, in which, after the collapse of his plan of fortifying Ramah, Baasha resided, was N. Arabian, because Jeroboam, who, before Baasha, resided in Tīrṣah, had an official connexion, first as governor and then as king, with N. Arabia. It is certainly even more than probable that some border-city would be chosen for the residence of Solomon's chief representative. In fact, one of that king's prefects did reside in Ramath-Gilead (1 K. iv. 13), which may perhaps be identified either with the Ramah of king Baasha or with Tīrṣah. Both

¹ The difficulty of harmonizing the non-Israelite notices of the kings of (the northern) Aram and the story of Aram in the Books of Kings, is well known. To those who have taken part in the controversy we may now add Luckenbill in *AJSL*, and Langdon in *Exp. Times*, both in 1911, and writing with reference to a newly discovered inscription. The way out of the trouble is to recognize that the Old Testament notices refer to the southern Aram (see *Crit. Bib.*). Ben-hadad comes from Ben-ḥadad. Originally, however, the name was surely Bar-ḥadad, *i.e.* 'Arabia of Ḥadad.'

Ramah and Tirṣah were probably border-cities; the former protected the Israelites of N. Arabia against the southern Jerusalem, the latter against the southern Aram.

It is very possible that Ramath-Gilead was the Gilead which under the disguise of 'Gath' is so indelibly connected with the story of David. It may at any rate have been a border-city in southern Gilead. A precise identification is as impossible from our point of view as it is from the point of view which is supported by the Massoretic text.

CHAPTER XIX

JEPHTHAH

As long as Iphtaḥ (Jephthah) was supposed to be the original form of the name, it was natural to interpret it mythologically as 'the opener of the cosmic egg.' In this case Iphtaḥ was originally the name of the divine creator, worshipped by the clan of the Iphtaḥites under the name Iphtaḥ (cp. *Ḳain*, which, if this means 'the divine fabricator,' will be the name of the tribal god of the *Ḳenites*¹). But in reality the name Iphtaḥ has most probably been filed down by the mouth of the people, and comes from Yaphlithah² (יפליתח), or the like, just as Yepheth (Yapheth) comes from Yaphlith; the root of all such forms is Ithbal (= Ishmael). His father, we are told (Judg. xi. 1), was Gilead, *i.e.* the clan or tribe represented by Iphtaḥ had been from the first settled in the district called Gilead. But the clan or tribe referred to had not been able to keep its racial purity, and other clans of purer blood (as

¹ See *E. Bib.* 'Cain,' 'Iphtaḥ-el,' 'Jephthah.'

² The final *ḥ* is a fragment of אַח, *i.e.* אַשְׁחַר (Ashḥur). וַיְנַח still more certainly comes from וַיְנַחֵהוּ. See p. 133; *T. and B.* p. 19, n. 1.

was supposed) looked down on Iphtaḥ accordingly. Was not the mother of Iphtaḥ a Şib'onite,¹ or (an equivalent term) an Ashḥurite?² So Iphtaḥ (= the Iphtaḥites) had to seek a refuge where he best could. This would naturally be in his mother's country, called in 1 K. xi. 3 'the land of Tob.' No doubt this is the same as Ash-Tob (2 S. x. 18), *i.e.* Asshur-Tubal, or Asshur-Ethbaal. Recalled in time of need by the elders of Gilead, he became the head of the Gileadites, and eventually a judge of all the Israel in the border-land (xii. 7). His abode was at Mişpah (doubtless in Gilead, Judg. xi. 34), and he was buried in Arabia of Gilead (Judg. xii. 7).

The expulsion of Jephthah, like that of David, was equivalent to the summons, 'Go, serve another god' (1 S. xxvi. 19). Israel and Yerahme'el were closely akin, but they were parted on the great question, Who is the supreme in the inner circle of great gods?—the older nation being in favour of the god Yerahme'el, and the younger of the god Yahweh. See *Traditions and Beliefs*; it can hardly be necessary to repeat here the manifold grounds for this conclusion. I may add that the expulsion of Jephthah is parallel to the expulsion of Abimelech, who, like Jephthah, had a non-Israelite for his mother.

¹ אֲשַׁחֲרֵת from אַחֲרֵת.

² עֵרִי from עֵר.

CHAPTER XX

ON NAHASH, HAGAB, AH'AB, AND OTHER STRANGE NAMES

AMONG the most singular personal or clan-names in the Old Testament, and those which have most strained the powers of interpreters, are Par'osh (flea?), Huldah (weasel?), Hagab (locust?), Nahash (serpent?), Ah'ab (the Father is a Brother?). The two former of these I have already sought to explain ;¹ the two latter have now to be considered from the newer point of view. Much has been said about the serpent-clan among the Ammonites (see 1 S. xi. 1, 2 S. x. 2), but one can now see that Nahash and Akish are closely akin,² *hash* and *kish* both being popular abbreviations of Ashhur or Ashkar. The initial letters (*n* and *a*) are inserted, again at the popular will, to produce an expansion. We shall presently find other instances of this.

We now pass to the so-called locust-clan. This is really another case of the expansion of a popular

¹ *D. and F.* pp. xxv, 17.

² See *E. Bib.* 'Nahash' ; Gemoll, pp. 29, 348 (with n.).

regional name by the prefixing of another letter (*h*). Ḥagab (Ezr. ii. 46) and Ḥagabah (*v.* 45) are simply expansions of *gab*, which, in turn, is a condensed and modified form of *ah'ab*, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Arāb, a phrase for N. Arabia. It will be noticed that the ח in אַחַב often, in derivatives, appears as ק or נ (cp. עֵקֶב, עֵקֹב, גֵּבֹן, גֵּבֹה, גֵּבֹהָ). For the expansion of גב by the prefixing of ח, we may compare Ḥabakkuḥ.

We see therefore that names were modified, not only by curtailment, but by expansion. I may add that the object of such modifications was either euphonic or to produce a name of a more tempting or even perhaps a humorous signification.¹ Thus the class to which the clans of Ḥagab and Ḥagabah, and also that of Aḳḳūb belonged, is called Nethinim. This should mean 'given ones,' and allude to the fact that in the old days Yahweh had 'given up' the enemies of Israel before them as servants to Israel and its temple. But the true form of the class-name was Ethanim or more accurately Ethmannim (= Ishmaelites). And not to linger again on Naḥash (see p. 46), precisely similar is the case of Negeb, a tract which was not, in ancient times, the 'dry land' *par excellence*; surely the favourite view of lexicographers is not the correct one. The initial letter of נֶגֶב is, in my judgment, simply expansive, while גב is a fragment of אַחַב = אַחַב. Originally it was a

¹ An instance is Ḥamor (ass), which probably comes from Ḥamu-Rabu, *i.e.* Yerahme'el-Arab. Cp. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, pp 280 f.

transparent regional name, and indicated that the land to which this name was given, was the first part of the N. Arabian border-land to be conquered and occupied by the Israelites. The passage in Judges (i. 15) which may most plausibly be quoted in favour of the explanation of Negeb as 'dry land' has been inaccurately transmitted (see 'Hebron').

Nor is it only Negeb, but a large number of other names, primarily regional, but in usage often personal, which disclose their meaning to those who have assimilated the discovery of the true meaning of *ab*, *ah*, and—may I not here add?—*ham*. Among those names are Yo'ab, Yobab, Iyyob, Ḥobab, Yo'ah, Ḥamuṭal, Ḥamor.

(1) Yo'ab. There are four Yo'abs. One is the son of David's sister Şeruiah (a corruption of Mişriyyah¹). Another is closely connected with the personified Ge-Ḥarashim (1 Chr. iv. 14), a corruption of Ge-Ashhurim. A third is one of the two families of Naphtaḥ²-Mo'ab in the long post-exilic list of Judæan clans (Ezr. ii. 6). A fourth is an element in a compound place-name, though converted by the Chronicler (1 Chr. ii. 54) into a clan-name, Ashtart-beth-Yo'ab. We may assume that there were several clans which boasted of their sanctuaries of the great goddess; one of these was probably called 'House of Yo'ab.' And what is the origin of Yo'ab (יֹאב)? אב doubtless is a curtailed and otherwise modified form of אב, *ab*,

¹ *E. Bib.* 'Zeruiah.'

² *T. and B.* pp. 190 f.

'Arabia'; while יר (equally with ירהו) is an abridgment of ירחו (= ירחמאל).

(2) Yobab. This name belongs to one of the thirteen Yokbanite tribes;¹ also to a king of Edom, or rather Aram² (Gen. xxxvi. 33 *f.*), and to a king of Madon, or perhaps rather Midian (the N. Arabian 'Madai'), an ally of Yabin (= Ishmael), king of Haşor (Josh. xi. 1). Also to two Benjamites, one a son of Shaḥaraim (= Shaḥar-Yam, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Yaman), the other a son of Elpaal (1 Chr. viii. 9-18). Yobab is probably = Yo'ab. The doubling of *b* has well-attested parallels.

(3) Iyyob. It is pointed out in the *Ency. Bib.* (art. 'Job') that in all probability the name has its parallel in the name-lists of Genesis. If so, we have hardly any choice but to identify Iyyob and Yobab.

(4) Ḥobab, 'son of Reuel the Midianite, father-in-law of Moses' (Num. x. 29). As in the case of Yobab, the repeated *b* may be disregarded. There remains *ḥob*, which may be a contraction of Ashḥur-Arāb (through Aḥ'ab). It is noteworthy that, in ᠘ cod. A gives *ωαβ*, and Lucian *ωβαβ*.

(5) Yo'aḥ (2 K. xviii. 37) is clearly Yarḥu-Ashḥur, an intimation of the district of N. Arabia from which Yo'aḥ's family came.

(6) Ḥamuṭal (2 K. xxiii. 31) is Yarḥam-Ethbal.³ The impossibility of 'my husband's father is the

¹ *T. and B.* p. 200.

² *Ibid.* p. 430.

³ *Cp. D. and F.* p. 45.

dew' (see *E. Bib.* 'Hamutal') needs no showing. Cp. חן in compound place-names (Tel-Assur, Tel-Abib, etc.), which must be a short way of writing some popular form of Ethbaal or Ethmul (= Ishmael).

(7) Ḥamor (Gen. xxxiii. 19), from Ḥamu-Rabu (p. 148, n. 1). Cp. the Canaanite name of the Babylonian king Ḥamurabi, to which we have now at length the key.

CHAPTER XXI

EPHRAIM—YOSEPH—YEHUDAH

‘GATHER up the fragments that remain.’

It is natural to explain Ephraim as the fruitful land (cp. Hos. ix. 13), a fitting and natural expression for the Hebrew immigrants. Just so, it is observed, the Arabs called the fertile plain of Damascus the Ġuṭa, which has come to be used as a proper name.¹

The analogy of other regionals and clan-names, however, favours the view that אפרים is = עֵרְבָנִים. אבר may be a dialect form of ערב (see *Two Religions*, p. 259).

The tribal name Yoseph is clearly connected with Asaph (אסף). In 1 Chr. xxv. 2 Yoseph is the name of one of the sons of Asaph. See *T. and B.* pp. 381 *f.* Possibly both Asaph and Yoseph may be popular modifications of Eshbal and Yishbal respectively. Cp. on *bêth Yoseph* 1 K. xi. 28 the remarks on p. 88.

¹ *E. Bib.* col. 1311 (‘Ephraim’).

Yehudah is difficult. The masculine form יהוד is once found as a Danite place-name (Josh. xix. 45). It may possibly be (like Ehud) from אשחור ; cp. ישר from אשר. Or it may come from הוד or חוד. See *T. and B.* p. 376, and cp. *E. Bib.* 'Judah.'

CHAPTER XXII

ESCHATOLOGICAL GEOGRAPHY

ONE fresh point that has arisen out of these researches and those of Gemoll is that the same place often bears different names, and that the same name is often given to different places. An example of this is furnished by the leading people of N. Arabia, or the N. Arabian land, which is sometimes called Asshur, sometimes Babel, sometimes Paras, names which are really popular abbreviations of Ashhur, Rakbul,¹ Pathras² (= Sophereth or Şarephath) respectively. It is equally certain, in my opinion, though equally disputed by the majority, that N. Arabia is often designated by Yerahme'el, and that this is frequently shortened into Yaman (through Yakman), another form of which is Yawan. I have been struck, in reading Dr. Gray's *Isaiah*, by the esteemed author's failure to do justice to these discoveries, and I fear that the same may be said of Dr. H. Mitchell, author

¹ *Traditions and Beliefs*, p. 184.

² *Ibid.* pp. 189 f.: *Two Religions*, pp. 302, 354.

of *Haggai and Zechariah*, in the same series of commentaries. Thus, the former keeps the familiar but surely impossible reading of Isa. xxiv. 14*b*, 'cry aloud from the sea,' and the latter, while rightly retaining 'Yawan' (Zech. ix. 13), gives it the unsuitable meaning 'Greece.' A similar want of insight mars Dr. Gray's exegesis of Isa. xxiv.-xxvii. In fact, both he and Dr. Mitchell are astray on the question of Asshur, which has rather serious consequences.

It is, in fact, N. Arabia which furnishes the setting of this composite eschatological prophecy. Though seemingly it refers to the earth (ארץ), in reality the seer thinks of the peoples most nearly related to the Judaïtes, *i.e.* those of N. Arabia, and the city which is to be 'broken' (Isa. xxiv. 10) is the capital of the leading people of that region. Only thus can we understand the singular phraseology of Isa. xxiv. 5, 'because they have transgressed laws, overstepped statutes, broken the eternal covenant.' From the time of the patriarch Abraham God had communicated with these favoured peoples, but, with the very partial exception of the Israelites, they rejected His revealed will.

Yet the voice of later prophecy declared that N. Arabia was still, *par excellence*, the Holy Land, and one of its mountains was hallowed in a special degree. In the *Two Religions* (pp. 294-7) I have explained how the text of Isa. ii. 2-4 came to be altered, and how far it is, in its present form, from

representing the quatrains of the original poem. In that wonderful little poem the holy mountain is described as the centre of a great educational enterprise. All the neighbouring peoples resort to Mount Şion, or Şib'on (= Ishmael), to be instructed in the mode of life most pleasing to Yahweh. Truly a noble dream, and far nobler than that other dream of the extirpation of the oppressive peoples! No doubt there were two classes of religious thinkers among the Judaites. There were those who thought the N. Arabians irredeemably bad, and there were those who believed that they might become faithful subjects of Yahweh, who would, in the latter days, admit them to his coronation feast 'on this mountain.' Not perhaps all of them. So many of the N. Arabians would be destroyed that one might even say that the N. Arabian peoples, as vehicles of a true national life, had disappeared, or, in the words of the poet (Isa. xxv. 8), that 'he hath swallowed up (= annihilated) Ishmael for ever.' I am, of course, aware that many readers will object to what they will denominate the arbitrary tampering with the text of a most noble warrant for our faith in immortality. Isaiah xxv. in the traditional text has, in fact, been regarded as a miraculous flash in the surrounding darkness—a flash which, alas! found the Jewish race unprepared to receive it. But how can we possibly accept such a marvel? The context, at any rate, is opposed to this view, for surely the 'covering' and the 'veil' in xxv. 7

are thrown upon 'all the peoples' of N. Arabia as well as Judah by their conqueror (the N. Arabian Asshur), and the 'tears' in *v.* 8 are those which are drawn forth by the brutal conduct of the same foe. It must be plain, therefore, that the 'annihilation' spoken of in *v.* 8*a* must refer to the object of the later Israelites' most profound longing—the retribution of the N. Arabian oppressor. And so it more than probably does, for מוֹת, which *seems* to mean 'death,' is really miswritten for 'תמוֹת, *i.e.* תמול (= אתמול). Temul and Ethmul are among the current popular distortions of Ishmael.¹ Cp. the proper names Azmaweth and Ḥaṣar-maweth (p. 56, n. 4). In this connexion we may also refer to Eshtaol and Eshtemoa, both of which come from Asshur-Ethmael.

Such, in the main, is the Hebrew eschatological geography, apart from some unlooked-for contributions, especially in the Book of Ezekiel, at which I have glanced in *Critica Biblica*, but which require further study. I trust that some thoroughly sympathetic younger scholar may be able to undertake the task which will probably soon fall from my hands.

¹ Review of Gray's *Isaiah* in *Expositor*, June 1912, p. 556.

INDEX

(The Index is imperfect, owing to the author's ill-health, but may yet be helpful.)

- Abraham and Sarah, 9
 Abram, 41, 43
 Absalom, scenes of his revolt from
 David, 48 *ff.*
 his vow, 49
 his body-guard, 51
 Adam. *See* First Man
 Adoni-Bezek and Adoni-Şedeķ, 29, 42
 Adullam, 19
 Ah'ab, 50, 150
 Akish, 6, 13 (*n.*¹), 46, 137, 147. *See*
 Nahash
 Akrab, Akrabbath, Akrabbini, 16 *ff.*,
 23 *f.*, 27 *ff.*, 36, 45 *f.*
 Amarna Tablets, 28 (*n.*¹), 93, 98
 Ammon, 47 *f.*
 Amos on the Kushites, 4
 Anakites, 17 *f.*, 51 (*n.*¹)
 Apeķ, 14 (*n.*¹), 19
 Aram, the southern, 26, 48, 64, 128
 Araunah the Yebusite, 44
 Arbel, region of Yahweh's temple, 65
 Argob, Argáb, 50 (*n.*²), 67
 Arman, the Holy Symbol, 21 *ff.*, 34,
 53, 64 *f.*
 Asham-Ishmael, a god-name, 103 (*n.*¹)
 Asher, god and tribe, 15-17
 Asherah, 17
 Ashartites, 47, 52
 Asshur, a city in Assyria, 5; or in N.
 Arabia, 5, 48
 in compound names, 49 *f.*
 god-name, 17, 34
 Ashhur, god-name, 113
 -Ephraim, 105
 -Yerahme'el, 78
 Ashkal, 103
 Ashkar, 30 *f.*, 38 *f.*, 53, 64
 Ashtar, 56 *f.*
 Ashtart, goddess, 17, 34, 100, 103
 Azmaweth, 156
 Baal-Gad, 15, 17, 97
 Baħurim, 58
 Bathsheba, 46 *f.*
 Beer-sheba, 54
 Ben-Hadad, 107, 142 (*n.*¹)
 Bethel, place-name, 33, 110, 113 *f.*
 god-name, 78
 Beth-Shemesh, 22
 Burkitt, F. C., 66 (*n.*¹)
 Canaan. *See* Kena'an
 City-names, 31
 Dagon, 14 *f.*
 Dan, 55, 77 *f.*, 113 *f.*, 134 *f.*
 David, origin of, 18 *f.*
 recovers the Holy Symbol, 20
 his body-guard, 52
 his N. Arabian scribes, 19
 his conquest of Jerusalem, 23 *ff.*, 36 *f.*
 his conquest of Rabbah, 46 *f.*
 resides (sometimes) in the southern
 Jerusalem, 36, 39, 54
 Deuteronomy, the God of, 34
 Dôd, Dôdah, divine names, 16 (*n.*¹), 17
 a regional, 30, 38
 Eden, 3
 Egyptian list of place-names, 22 (*n.*²),
 25
 Eli, his son, 14
 Ephraim, the southern, 40, 55, 105
 origin of name, 8, 153
 Ephrath, 71, 87, 104
 Esar-haddon, 14 (*n.*¹)
 Eschatological geography, 155

- Eshmun, Phoenician god, 9 (*n.*²), 11 (*n.*¹)
- Eshtaol and Eshtemoa, 158
- Ethbaal, Ethbal, Ethbalites, 13 *ff.*, 52, 71, 113
- Evolution of concept of God, 10 (*n.*¹)
- Ezer, clan-name, 16 (*n.*¹), 21 (*n.*³), 72 (*n.*²)
- First Man, Biblical stories of, 8-11
- Gad, 16 (*n.*¹). *See* Baal-Gad
- Gadon, 14
- Gath, Gittites, 16 (*n.*¹), 52 (*n.*⁴), 137 *ff.*
- Gemoll, M., 19 (*n.*²), 20 (*n.*¹), 30 (*n.*²), 49, 51 (*n.*¹), 54, 55 (*n.*¹), 60 (*n.*¹), 70 (*n.*²), 78 (*n.*¹), 110, 147 (*n.*²)
- Geshur, Gesburites, 73, 86
- Gibeah, 50
- Gibeon, 49, 127
- Gideon, 32 (*n.*²), 97
- Gilead, the southern, 68, 145 *f.*, etc.
- Gilead-Lot, 9
- Gray, G. B., 155 *ff.*
- Hadad, regional, 5
enemy of Solomon, 85 *f.*
- Hagar, 4 *f.*
- Hamath, 72
- Hanok, 8 *f.*
- Hanokites, 52
- Haran, 5
- Hashram, or Kashram, 41 *f.*, 55, 66, 101
- Hebron, 49 *f.*, 115 *ff.*
- Hiram, king of Šor, 81
- Hittites, the, 47
- Horeb, Mount, 7 *f.*
- Horse-traffic. *See* Solomon
- Immortality in Isaiah (?), 157
- Indian folk-lore (*Nala and Damayanti*), 24 (*n.*¹)
- Jebusites. *See* Yebusites
- Jehoshaphat, 80
- Jephthah, 145 *f.*
- Jerahme'el. *See* Yerahme'el
- Jericho, 131 *ff.*
- Jeroboam, 87, 113 *f.*, 142
his mother, 87
- Jerusalem. *See* Urushalem
- Jordan, 7. *See* Yordan
- Joseph. *See* Yoseph
- Jubilees, Book of, 93
- Kena'an, 30, 43, 94, 110
- Kashmeron, 101
- Kashram. *See* Hashram
- Kerethites and Pelethites, 47, 52 *f.*
- Kiryath-Arba, 50
-Ye'arini, 128 *f.*
- Kush, 4 *f.*
- Langdon, Stephen, 142 (*n.*¹)
- Lot, 9
- Luckenbill, 142 (*n.*¹)
- Maakah, 77 *f.*
- Madai, 102
- Maḥanaim, 59 *f.*
- Marduk, 123
- Mesha, king of Moab, 16 (*n.*¹)
- Meyer, E., 99 (*n.*¹)
- Migdal-Eder, 99
-Gad, 97
-Shekem, 99 *f.*
- Miṣrim, 87, 113, 119
wādy of, 74
- Moore, G. F., 94 (*n.*²)
- Mountains named after races or clans, 57
- Naaman, 9
- Nabû, 123
- Nahash. *See* Akish
- Naphtuhim, 40, 48, 68 (*n.*¹), 86
- Nebo, Mount, 124
place-name, 124
- Negeb, the, 116, 148
- Nob, 124
- Og, N. Arabian king, 48 (*n.*²)
- Omri, 35, 101
- Ophir. *See* Solomon
- Palestine culture, influences on, 1
- Paradise, situation of, 2-8
- Pathrasim, 52 (*n.*⁸), 69
- Perašim, Mount, 19, 45
- Perath, N. Arabian stream, 6, 58
- Philistines, 13. *See* Ethibal
- Pinḥasites, 36, 40
- Porāšites, 52, 69
- Psalms cxxii., background of, 35
- Rabshaḥ, or Ramshaḥ, 42, 86, 97
- Ramath-Gilead or Ramoth G., 141 *ff.*
- Rangal, 97
- Ramshaḥites, 42, 51, 69
- Rephaim, 19
- Resin, 86
- Rogelim, 59
- Samaria. *See* Shimron
- Šedeḳ, regional and clan-name, 42 *f.*
- Shakram, 25 *ff.*, 31 *f.*, 96
- Shalem, 23, 27, 40
- Shekem, 93 *ff.*

- Shiloh, 14, 109-111, 119-122
 Shimron or Shomeron, 104 *ff.*
 Shur, Book of, 65
 Sinai, Mount, 57 (*n.*¹)
 Sion, the N. Arabian, 64
 Sodom, 41
 Solomon, anointed at Gibeon, 49
 his N. Arabian residence, 36
 his N. Arabian wife, 85
 his buildings, 63 *ff.*
 his prefects in N. Arabia, 67 *f.*
 his *corvée*, 75
 his naval expeditions, 79-81
 his horses and his chariots, 83, 85
 his chariot cities (?), 70
 limits of his empire, 67-75
 his religion, 90 *f.*
 Sor, the southern, 64
 Şorephim, 20 (foot)
- Talmi, king of Geshur, 50
 Tappuah, 119 (*n.*¹)
 Tiphseh, 72
 Tirzah, 107 *f.*, 142
 Ur-Dod, 38
 Uriah, 45-47
 Urushalem, 26, 30, 35, 38, 72
 Winckler, Hugo, 18 (*n.*³), 89
 Yahwè or Yahweh, 17, 33, 146
 Yahweh-Şeba'ith, 34
 Yardan or Yarhon, 7, 58, 132, 135
 Yashar, Book of. *See* Shur
 Yebusites, 39
 Yehudah, 154
 Yerahme'el, god-name, 19, 33, 113, 146
 ethnic, 47
 Yoseph, 153

THE END

OTHER VOLUMES BY THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D.

CRITICA BIBLICA

Demy 8vo. Cloth. PRICE **15/-** NET. (*By Post 15s. 5d.*)

OR MAY BE HAD IN FIVE PARTS

PART I. ISAIAH AND JEREMIAH, *price 2s. 6d. net. (By post 2s. 10d.)*

PART II. EZEKIEL & MINOR PROPHETS, *price 3s. net. (By post 3s. 4d.)*

PART III. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL, *price 3s. net. (By post 3s. 4d.)*

PART IV. THE BOOKS OF KINGS, *price 3s. net. (By post 3s. 4d.)*

PART V. JOSHUA AND JUDGES, *price 3s. net. (By post 3s. 4d.)*

THE TRADITIONS & BELIEFS OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

A NEW STUDY OF GENESIS AND EXODUS

Demy 8vo. Cloth. PRICE **15/-** NET. (*By Post 15s. 5d.*)

"This volume is a masterpiece of careful and scholarly exegesis. It will be attacked. It will rouse furious hatred. But in a generation's time it will be the standard text-book on Genesis and Exodus."—*Liverpool Daily Post.*

'THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

Demy 8vo. Cloth. PRICE **7/6** NET. (*By Post 7s. 10d.*)

"To give in a short review any idea at all of the immense amount of research and learning presented on every page is simply impossible."

Rev. Dr. W. O. Oesterley in The Church Family Newspaper.

THE TWO RELIGIONS OF ISRAEL

WITH A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE PROPHETIC
NARRATIVES AND UTTERANCES

Demy 8vo. Cloth. PRICE **12/6** NET. (*By Post 12s. 11d.*)

"The book, in short, is an honour to British scholarship, and one, moreover, which no one interested in Old Testament interpretation can afford to neglect."—*Daily Chronicle.*

THE MINES OF ISAIAH RE-EXPLORED

Demy 8vo. Cloth. PRICE **5/-** NET. (*By Post 5s. 4d.*)

"A learned contribution towards the solution of the many difficult problems that centre round the prophecies known as 'Deutero-Isaiah.'"—*Glasgow Herald.*

PUBLISHED BY

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, 4, 5 & 6 SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

“Worth reading more than once.”

THE VOICE OF ONE CRYING

BY

MRS. ELIZABETH GIBSON CHEYNE

ARRANGED IN CYCLES

By T. K. CHEYNE

*Large
Crown 8vo.*

PRICE **2/6** NET.

*Bound
In Cloth.*

(By Post 2s. 10d.)

EXTRACTS FROM NOTICES AND REVIEWS.

“That Mrs. Cheyne can touch lyrically and leave upon her lines the true impression of ‘sweet lyric song’ several slender volumes have already abundantly revealed. And though *The Voice of One Crying* is the voice of the preacher rather than the poet, it is in the sublime little poem of ‘Man and God’ that it weighs down most heavily the scale of precious price.”—*Oxford Chronicle*.

“We do not know whether it would have been possible to crowd these thoughts into any of the more recognised verse-forms; but if the writer had been able to do it at all successfully, she would almost have produced a masterpiece. As it is, the book is worth reading more than once; and, moreover, is worth a very great deal of thought.”—*The Academy*.

“Elizabeth Gibson Cheyne gives us a plentiful stock of practical philosophy in *The Voice of One Crying*. Many preachers will glean thoughts that will give point to their own reflections.”—*Sheffield Daily Independent*.

“A succession of gleams of thought is probably the best description one could give of the contents of this attractive volume. Brilliant gleams they are many of them, and ‘polished gems’ is not too flattering an estimate of some of them.”—*Aberdeen Journal*.

“Some of the sayings are striking and beautiful.”—*The Christian World*.

“A little book of moral reflections which might be dipped into at odd moments.”—*The Times*.

“If we are to bear with theology at all, we can best bear it in the fine form in which it is presented by Mrs. T. K. Cheyne. . . . Mrs. Cheyne’s chapter-ettes of thought are musical and strong.”—*The Literary Guide*.

PUBLISHED BY

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, 4, 5 & 6 SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY



3 1158 01058 7441

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 038 981 5

