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FOREWORD

The intimate relationship between state and religion has been the purpose of this investigation. The religions of the ancient Near East have often been studied from the viewpoints of modern men who is unable to understand how private religions had little place in these oriental societies. Religion was an expression of the national unity, and there it constituted a part of the political system; the basic premise being that of the god as the ruler of the nation.

This inquiry has grown out of a paper, Sanctuaries and Royal Administration which was delivered as a presidential address at the joint annual meeting of the Middle Western Section of the Society for Biblical Literature and the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society, Bloomington, Indiana, on Friday, February 27, 1958. I express my thanks for the criticism and counsel from composition and substantive matters. I have a deep appreciation of the help of the reader, who has generously assisted towards these which have not been written by me.

I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague, Edward T. Wenne for his many valuable comments and to Mrs. Martha Carter McDaniel, M.A., who read my draft especially diligently. She has assisted me with the problems of composition and with retaining the manuscript as well as with statistical analysis of the data. Without her generous help this book would never have been published.

Chicago, May 1958

G.W. Andstrom
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CHAPTER ONE

THE NATION AS THE GOD'S TERRITORY

The City

The phenomenon of the nation is usually regarded as a process whose
entrance into history paved the way for the development of political
life. This view may be correct if one takes into account solely the aspects of
the process that were most evident, namely the formation of new states and
the boundaries of the new cities that were born. In this context, the power to
bring defense to all states and administrative order revolutionized the life of the
country by enabling people to overcome resistance to principles and by security for
the nation. For instance, Assyrian kings founded new cities and
peoples from the ruins of others. As states were formed, new cities would also be
built to replace the old ones that opposed the royal
power. Such was the case, for example, in the region of Mesopotamia where the
Assyrians were able to form a new state and to conquer the old ones. From this
perspective, the process of nation-building can be understood as both a political
and an architectural process.

The Kings as Builders

Building cities involved the construction of houses, temples, and
walls. The Assyrians were skilled in this art, as they were in
construction and engineering. The new cities were
constructed with a sense of grandeur and versatility, and the
Assyrians were able to adapt to the local
environment. In this way, the city became a reflection of the
king's power and a symbol of his authority. The
development of the city was not only a political act, but also a
construction project.
easy to build a house, it the preferred place for the god to live in a temple. These two buildings were the physical expression of the national government representing the king and his Temple. For the king were sacred, administrative places where often he would be in the financial center of the large and busy city. Considerably Cy Zey may solve the problem why the Levites received no inheritance in the land of Canaan. This is the practical example behind the idea of the temple as a temple builder. By the structure, it is seen how the king was adapted as a center of organization of the country and its people. He was in power as the executive and judge promulgate maxims and laws and to review cases. A reformed, relative of ancient Near Eastern kings was the God-appointed king, a wise, common, pious king. Often found in Assyria and the later time, the role of the king was frequently called priest. In fact, Astur was known as emphasizing the basic ideology of the king's power, and then the temple in the land.
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The descriptive epithets for the king were *akham* 'overseer' and the priest title *sanga* 'administrator'. The king administered the god’s territory and its people. Consequently, the person of the king was the subjects of the god and lived in his *ba adum* 'dominion'.

The core role of the city is the idea of the city as the abode of the god, the ruler of cosmos and nation. Because the temple is the visible expression of his dominion, it was at the same time the king’s palace, the capital was the ruling center of both the god and its vice regent (Akkadian *akkamakkan*), the king. Therefore, temple and palace should be
seen as two aspects of the same phenomenon: together they constituted the essence of the state.

What has been said above helps to explain why the ancient city was constructed as the centre of the universe. The acropolis served as the meeting place between the divine and the human, where gods and kings were not ordinary beings. The city was the centre of the universe, with the acropolis as its heart. The city was surrounded by walls, which were considered to be the boundary of the city. It is said that the city plan was inspired by a well in the middle of the city.

The city plan of Hittite Carchemish shows a rectangular layout with temples in the northeast and an inner walled town and an outer walled city. At Hattusas, the city was divided into smaller sections, each with its own temple and market area.
the MB LB acropolis was in the south with an assumed palace and temple precinct (Area A). Israel’s last capital, Samaria, is what we know of today; however, not much was mentioned in the history or in the remains. The temple excavations there are somewhat limited in scope and time. When Solomon built his palace and temple complex, he moved the Levantine pattern of the rest of the city. The palace was destroyed several times, and the temple was not restored.

That the acropolis in the Levant was a regular settlement was suggested by the many archaeological finds. The remains of the city were located by a wall. The rest of the city was not as well defined. At times, it was even described as a Levantine town, as we see in the city of Qana, Ayyun, Sera, and Damascus.

As mentioned above, the acropolis was the center of the territory of the god. It was the focus of the temple, and as such, it provided the basis for the kings of the Near East. Down even further was the town, which was the focus of the temple, and from there, the king in turn was the focus of the temple.
city-state was the ‘father of the king’ who reigned on his behalf 33 of Ps 2: 8 9 27. This intimate relationship between god and king is expressed for example in the Sumerian epic of Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta. 34 Both were said to live in the same building, complex and moreover seem to have shared the same throne room. 1 The inference is therefore that the royal throne was divine. 36

The king as the administrator of the god’s territory

The above makes quite understandable the fact that religion and religious power were part of the king’s duties. Indeed, it is evident that the king as the administrator of his god’s territory was not only the organizer and the builder of the country but was in person the organizer of the city as well. A few examples of this are cited. A Hittite text states that the storm god made the king the king and the god of the land of Hatt. 35 In Egypt the supreme god Re entrans the and has won the king. 36 In the

prologue to his law code Hammurapi of Babylonia emphasizes that it is he who is the

İ I U. AL $0-un,m u -te-r UNUN

devoted caretaker of Ešur
the mighty king restorer of kindu

on its place the one who has

punished

the recluses of Fruš

Codex Ham IV 96ff

Further Hammurapi says that he is the one who

mu $a l ha 1 tar um Ya
dar $i, $a nu
$u, $a um um

enlarged his kingdom

who I revered and prescribed

pure sacrifices

Codex Ham IV 96ff

Here the king describes himself as caretaker, restorer, and organizer of the temples and their cults. In principle, the king enables the divine right and justice to be established in his kingdom.

The Mari documents also extract how a government regulated its religious practices. For example, not only could the king sacrifice food, but he could declare dates for festivals and massacres in the provinces. Moreover, he had a number of gods transported to the capital so that they could receive proper sacrifices.

From Mesopotamia a few other examples may be cited. In an inscription that Tiglath-Pileser III claims that Assur and the great gods formed him to enlarge the country Assyria. I should be noted that the king used the ex...
press in their country, which was in agreement with the political and religious
seeds. As for Assyria, it is said that Manasseh, son of Ahab, abandoned
with his army at the city of Manasseh. When Sennacherib occupied the city, the Assyrians were not only recognized as an
Assyrian province, but also stated that the local goods and services should be
considered to be Assyrian. However, after the Assyrian defeat, the
same event occurred as in Egypt. It is interesting to note that the god
Assur was referred to as a lesser god. Furthermore, the shepherd
served him and the people around him. More importantly, he undertook
building activities. Here we should observe that building projects are con-
rected with the idea of the king as the shepherd of the god's people.

In fact, it has been said above, it is evident that religion was an
aspect of the king's reign. By serving as the shepherd, the king was
responsible for the welfare of the people. In this manner, the king
provided for the spiritual and material needs of the people. Thus, the king's
responsibilities included not only the administration of justice and the
maintenance of the social order but also the provision of goods and services.

These examples show that the Mesopotamian king was not just the
organizer of the city, but also the leader of the community. As we shall see,

6 A. K. Grayson, _Assyria and Babylonia. History and Memoria
7 A. K. Grayson, _Assyria and Babylonia. History and Memoria
8 A. K. Grayson, _Assyria and Babylonia. History and Memoria
9 A. K. Grayson, _Assyria and Babylonia. History and Memoria
10 A. K. Grayson, _Assyria and Babylonia. History and Memoria
below, the same principle can be found in other parts of the ancient Near
East, where religion was part of the national government's activities. The
state existed, in other words, within the framework within which life for both
nation
and state was maintained and regulated. Indeed, the establishment of
these religious structures between man and nation and through its festivals, the divine
power was manifested and the will of the gods was made known.

4 A particular case is that of Carchemish. As a new kingdom on the
western border of the Empire, it took part in the rise of the Assyrian
Empire and was not only at the heart of the entire region of the
Tigris and Euphrates but also in the Assyrian Empire. The
Tiglath-Pileser I and Cambyses I, who conquered it in 633 B.C.,
thus required the king of Carchemish to fight against the Persian
Empire with the support of the Babylonian army. This is the case with Carchemish, which was the most important city of the
region, and with the other cities of the region, such as
Ebla.
BUILDING OF CID'S AND FORTRESSES AS A POLITICAL TOOL

In the preceding chapter the phenomenon of fortification was observed as an ongoing political process. Further examples of such activities and other types of building projects will be discussed, what were, for instance, the foundations of Meroë. In this regard, Meroë was not a city, but a state capital, and it was the architectural and military center of the eastern Sudan. The architecture of the fort was designed to protect the area from plundering by enemies, but it was also a symbol of the state's power and wealth. The fort was surrounded by walls, which protected settlements, while serving as a center of state administration.

During the 7th century, when Egypt occupied Nubia, the Meroë fortresses were taken as a model for constructing new forts. One of the forts mentioned in the text is the one in Teller, which was built to protect the state's borders.

Further, the Pharaohs of the New Kingdom built temples in Nubia in order to "teach the people of the ancient Egyptian way of living". They built a fortress temple at Zawiet es-Safi, Rashid. This temple was used for social and economic purposes.

Behind the pharaohs' establishment of temples, they also founded cities that served as centers of trade and government. These cities were well-represented through their art and architecture.

Although the region of Palestine was largely divided during the New Kingdom period, the wealth and power of the pharaohs were not diminished. The cities and temples they built in the region were a testament to their wealth and influence. The pharaohs' control over Palestine was not absolute, but they managed to maintain a level of authority through their military and administrative structures.
As inspired temples have been found at Beth Shan and other places, the Pharaohs erected such as a display of their power. The Canaanite gods were depicted in human form and worshipped by Egyptian gods with the Canaanite names. In a vast city with a population of thousands, gods had to be worshipped by a vast bureaucracy of priests and servants. The temple was the center of religious and civil administration.

In the early empire, several of the temples were centers of the local government, and the priests were in charge of a vast staff of religious and civil administrators. All of these officials were under the control of the temple. The priests were government appointees. In the temple, there were restrictions for commanders in border areas, ensuring the stability of the empire.

In Syria, we know that the temples had a major role in the economy. The temples provided services to the population, such as providing water, and were centers of trade and commerce.

1. A. R. N. The First Canaanite Temples (Beth Shan, 1920).
2. J. B. P. H. E. 1.4.4.
5. J. B. A. P. 3.4.
7. J. B. A. P. 3.4.
Several other examples from the Levant of kings as city builders should be mentioned. On a Hadd飽 stone from Zinjirlik 18th century BC a king Panamum I stated that he was given a command by the gods (probably through a prophet) to build and restore a number of cities. —

Kane Zakkur of Hamat and Lachish 18th century BC reports an inscription that after having built Hazarak he built stronghouses and temples in and out of his kingdom. In addition the text mentions that Zakkur built or rebuilt Ahab's belongings and let the god's statue in the temple forever. According to a Law in the form of an illegal inscription from Karatepe 18th century BC a royal building in Astarawadda was ordered to be set up for the king and one of the cities Astarawadda was installed and the god's statue was installed and the gods were installed in the city. The building was used to house the god's statue and in the city there were temples that functioned as temples and in the city there were statues that functioned as statues.

The city of Megiddo in the late 13th century BC offers information not only about king Mesha's initial war but also about the maintenance of the temple and the building of temples that functioned as temples.
about an Israelite king, 5 a matter in the same sphere. Meseh, however, still held that theatre in the war of liberation against the same city. Meseh captured these two cities among others. As a result of the conflict, Meseh and Moav were understood to the people of Ammon and brought the same great god Dib to his god Chemosh. The same God who was accorded to other captured cities, Naba (the 12th) and Nebo (the 7th) of its god Yahuwah were worshiped here. Chemosh was possible that both the Adad and the Chemosh are identical, namely the New Star of the heavens. As such, they were both revered. Indeed, Chemosh the sun god of the Moabites, who was also worshiped by the same city being called by those two names. The gods of the heavens were also feared as the people at the end and Adad was worshiped with Moab as we presuppose.

Some sources state that Meseh annexed Jaha to his kingdom; 20. And we are not sure whether the first was a matter of Jaha's submission, the 12th for other cities but we cannot place it at this point as supported by Joshua 21:7. However, unlike Jaha, both Jaha and Adad were worshiped, which raises the question as to whether Meronites as a new entity was formed. Consequently, it is possible for Boaz to have a purpose not just to have Meseh and Moab submit their allegiance.
associate them with the city's cult place. Just as the priest in Egyptian thought, temples as temples in occupied territories were not used, so the Levites of Jahaz like those of other Levitical cities may have been an arm of the new administration. In the case of Jahaz that would be the northern kingdom Israel. If this thesis is correct, the Levites must be seen as state employees (more about these below)."
The *kurb* (qurba) mentioned in the Medaba inscription can perhaps be connected with the city of Homs in the 3rd millennium BC. According to B. Mazat, *qurb* denotes a temple or shrine. However, A. L. Oppenheim considers the name *kurbas* as an Akkadian word. How- ever, A. L. Oppenheim underlines the connection with *kurses* as a non-Akkadian nor-Semitic, but maintained that it should be compared with a Hittite phrase to mean *kurba*, which means the opposite (i.e., the saw *kurba* as a walled area in the Temple area). In the center of the city, surrounding the temple and probably the palace. If the connection between *kurbas* and Medaba *kurba* is correct, it means that the inner walled city of Homs was the *kurbas* of the temple, where Mesopotamia was a center for Mesopotamian culture. The phrase may not be used to mean a temple, but a place of assembly or a large building or a temple on the highest point of the walled area surrounded by a wall. The site of the city then extended to a mountain at the side of the main city on the lower level and was either walled by a wall.
Mesta’s capital at Dibon appears to have been a new settlement not preceded by any Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age city. According to A.D. Tushingham, the first settlement in the excavated area dates to around the middle of the nineteenth B.C., which correlates with the time of Mesha—about 840-830 B.C. Thus, it is possible to parallel Mesha’s building of Dibon with the phenomenon of creating cities “on virgin soil” as new capitals. Kar Lulul N. N. to Kar Y. Y. Y. Y. Y. An bronze and silver hoard found near Mesha in 1947 by the American School of Oriental Research could be interpreted as evidence of Mesha’s purchase of the land of Shemir for the construction of a capital and further parallels.

The construction of a temple there, I am inclined to believe, is attested by the fact that a temple is mentioned on a clay tablet from the period of the reign of Manasseh, son of Uzziah. This tablet, found at Megiddo, bears the name of Manasseh, king of Judah, and is dated to the first year of his reign. It mentions the building of a temple at Megiddo, and it is possible that this temple was in fact the temple of Dibon, as suggested by the parallel with Mesha’s construction. The temple at Megiddo is described as a large building with a large number of rooms and a spacious courtyard, which is consistent with the description of the temple at Dibon in the Bible. The temple at Megiddo may have served as a model for the temple at Dibon, and it is possible that the temple at Dibon was built in the same manner.

The temple at Dibon is also mentioned in the Bible, in the context of the conquest of Judah by Babylon in 586 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar II, according to the Bible, destroyed the temple at Dibon as well as several other temples in Judah. The temple at Dibon was therefore a symbol of the strength of Judah and its resistance to foreign domination. The temple at Dibon was therefore a symbol of the strength of Judah and its resistance to foreign domination. The temple at Dibon was therefore a symbol of the strength of Judah and its resistance to foreign domination.
answer to the question. Just the very ancient Near Eastern head of state decided to construct a new capital. It was one of the duties to plan a sanctuary in the center of the palace complex. An indication that this was the case is that the palace of Solomon was found in the same way. The name of the capital was given to the temple that was later built on his site. In the Bible, Solomon is portrayed as a great king, and the building of the temple was considered a sacred act. In fact, it became a central feature of Israel's identity and was considered a sign of its monotheism. The point being emphasized here is that the idea of a sanctuary to worship the deity was a central feature of Israelite religion and was considered essential to their identity.

In this point, it is important to view the role of the temple in the new capital as a central element in its religious and political life. The temple was not only a place of worship but also a symbol of the king's authority and the nation's identity. It was a place where the king would meet with the priests and preside over divine rituals, and it was a physical expression of the nation's religious devotion.

The temple was not just a place of worship, but also a place of learning and instruction. It was where the priests taught the people about the laws of God and the proper way to worship. The temple was also a place where the nation's history was recorded and preserved. It was a place where the nation's past was remembered and honored.

In conclusion, the temple in the new capital was a central element in the nation's religious and political life. It was a symbol of the nation's identity and a place where the nation's history was recorded and preserved. It was a place of worship, instruction, and learning. The construction of the temple was a significant event in the nation's history, and it remains a central feature of their identity to this day.
to national capitals. Some of the place names in the Old Testament may reflect this custom. For instance, the name of the south-Palestinian city Adoraim may indicate that it consisted of an upper and a lower city, or a "double" city built on two geographical "humps." As early as 1876, J. First understood the dual feature and a lower city, with the upper city having been constructed first. According to 2 Chr. 11:9, Adoraim was one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam of Judah. Another city fortified by the same king was Azekah, usually identified with Tel Zakaria. Excavations at this tell have unearthed an acropolis with a large fortress.

The city of Ramathaim, Samuel's birthplace (1 Sam. 1:19), may be another example of this phenomenon. Its sanctuary could have been located either on one of its heights or on a hill in the midst of the city and enclosed by a wall. This city seems to be the one in which the narrator refers in 1 Sam 9:6. In this text Saul and his na'ar, "knight attendant," come to the land of Zuph where Ramathaim is located. The na'ar discloses that a "seer" lives in a nearby town. Although he does not mention his name in 9:14, this seer is identified with Samuel. It has often been argued

---


55. For a discussion about the name see S. W. Loewen, *The Geography of the Bible,* London, 1959, p. 274.


that the narrator of chapter 9 has used folklore motifs to tell his story, namely how a young man Saul, unsuspecting, became king. In a sense, this seems to be correct, but the point to be emphasized is that Saul was divinely chosen, in accordance with the Near Eastern royal ideology, and appointed "nagid" before he was actually enthroned. The narrator of the divine choice was to be Samuel.

If indeed the name Ramathaim means "the two heights," the discrepancy between 1 Sam 9:14b and 9:8 disappears if the text refers to Ramathaim in v. 14b, when Saul and his knight enter the city they see Samuel coming towards them, in order to go to the "bannah." According to v. 8, Saul approached Samuel in the gate. This may refer not to the city gate, but to the gate leading up to the height where the "bannah" was located. Consequently, all three Samuel, Saul and his knight were inside the city wall and met at the gate leading up to the "bannah." This was seen from the following, when the city wall and its surrounding area were set on fire, the participants went down from the "bannah" but were still within the city (v. 25).

The "bannah" phenomenon may also help us to understand 1 Sam 10:9f. Here Samuel tells Saul that it was not he who would meet the three prophets at Gibeah, but Saul who was descending from the "bannah," the sanctuary of the city. Both in verse 9 and verse 13 suggest that the "bannah"

54 Of T. M. Dober, ibid., p. 40.
55 Of T. M. Dober, ibid., p. 40.
56 Of L. B. Schap, p. 40.
57 Of L. B. Schap, p. 40.
as inside the city. 1 Chr 16:69 21. And when Saul reached the city, which was probably his home town, he entered the house of his son Jonathan, and was asked by a servant where he and his men were. And Saul had heard about the search for the seeresses and revelers, that they had been found. Whereupon the king said, "One noble woman has told me that according to 10:5 the city had a Philistine samaria. It has been reported that a general had informed the king. I will be an idea of Saul's occupation forces to the north and east. Consequently, the city may have been an Italian city, or a Philistine city. Jair, it was to keep an eye on the kings in there. Indeed it was the case in Saul, and not to tell the king about it. As a designation of Saul's match with understanding. As it was another sign that Saul's daughter was to be quickly married to David, and that Saul had dreams about Jonathan, where the narrator at one known fact of the story. It was the Philistine city of Jair. It was his intention to show Saul was divinely appointed to kingship. But the address brought no desire to be in his war, or any story in the case of those departing. Saul had his savors with the least traitor. The word of the Lord had been kept a secret so that the oppression of the Philistines would not be heard. But in this way the composition gives a sense of latent drama.
In discussing the phenomenon of sanctuaries as local centers of administration, the information given in 5A7 144 is important. From this passage we learn of Samuel's years in office. At Gutta Bethel and Mizpah, the administration of these places (גְּתֹת בֵּית לֵל), he is said to have "judged". The people who in the Hebrew text are called Israel, בֵּית הָיוֹם. Together with Ramah, Samuels's city, the exercise of these administrative duties in all probability, the area of supervision did not extend beyond these towns and their immediate environs. In other words, his rule ship was limited to the central part of the country.

The exercise of power in a city (and its surrounding district) was very much in the hands of the city elders. In one particular community for example, the most prominent of the elders was the nazir. In Akkadian...


8. The Greek inscription at the end of 1 Samuel 25: 23, where it is

латинское: מָצָא הַנָּזִיר בָּנָיָהוּ. מָצָא הַנָּזִיר בָּנָיָהוּ.


word (cf CAD) which may be translated "chief magistrate of a town" or other words "mayor" or "Bürgermeister." This title, which is plenteous in the Amarna tablets, is also known from Mari (ARM III 73 9) and Amarna, where it occurs in a context with the elders. In the Amarna letters, it is often used to refer to the ruler of a city-state. This is quite natural, since a city ruler could call himself a king when writing to the king. It may have been possible to compare *hazannu*/*rabānu* with the Canaanite *kipār* or *war* both of which are found in the Old Testament as Assyrians and Babylonians. The *hazannu* was a city leader usually appointed by the king. According to H.W.F. Saggs, in Babylonia his status was "as much religious as civil." This may be explained by the fact that religion was a selective phenomenon and as such was community business.

With this as a background, it is tempting to see Samuel as a city leader of the Syro-Palestinian *hazannu*/*rabānu* type whose influence extended to other places outside his region from the region in Sam 12:11. Samuel was an important leader to the residents of the central hill country. This text states that Samuel was one of the four men of the judge period who saved the people from oppression. The three others were Jerubbaal, Bedan, and Hepaph. It appears that certain groups of people remembered Samuel as a very important leader. Later tradition built him up as a leader of all the Israelites and as a consequence the biblical historian proper arranged him among the judges and made him a prophet-spokesman. In Deuteronomistic ideas, his eschatological function was fulfilled by the prophet-spokesman who characterized Samuel as a priest who may have been characterized as a priest-ruler. This may be the basis for perceiving him as a priest since priests sometimes fulfilled prophetic duties.

Two other examples of local hill country leaders may be mentioned. The

---

25 For the *hazannu* or *rabānu* type in a local context see the *hazannu* in the *Amarna* texts as translated by T. J. H. Macalister, *The Amarna Letters,* 1920, London, 2, pp. 207-214, 311-312.
27 The segment that was published New York, 1911, p. 75.
28 For this reason which does not know anything about "Joshua's conquest" see A. E. H.Strength, *Jehuda* 1973, 59-61, pp. 65-66. Because this text was known to many fewer leaders of tribes, it may have been a time before the Deuteronomistic period, and the history which is in the book of Judges.
head priest of Shiloh but should also be seen as a priest ruler of the textual material above. I am reflecting on the role of Canaanite origin as a priest of the ark. **22** As leader of the central Isradite district, he was included among the judges by the later Deuteronomist (Jr. 4:18) who, in turn, had been influenced by the traditions about the country's heroes. Consequently, the story about the Ark and the Israelites worshiping at Shiloh provides interest and insights into the history of the Israelite confederacy in pre-conquest times. The majority of people around Shiloh may have been of Canaanite origin due to the interactions that occurred between Shechem and Shiloh. They were not united as one group as them. 23 We should also note that Levite and Canaanite ancestry of the Ark of Samuel II were in the 10-243 family line to whom he was connected with the tribe of Levi and the tribe of Benjamin. 24 In fact, this association comes with the tribe of Benjamin. 

James 17 relates that a man named Mosaic, a temple went to Egypt for a time to be a servant of the King, and his name was Moses. He brought with him the divinely gifted heroes to the Israelites and to the Egyptians. He was a great deliverer andleader to recover the property lost to them. When Moses came back, they were not as large as they once were. He returned the land. 25

Finally, there were many more researches, because Palestine archae...
ology has been primarily a political tool. We have relatively little knowledge about the areas around the ancient cities, even though several surveys have been undertaken during the last decades. We do not know for instance where the villages were governed by a city or by some sanctuaries or other places. Although it was not necessary to place cultural and military personnel in these villages, some of the villages may have had their own policies as was the case in the ancient kingdom. There the communal rites such as harvest rituals were performed. These were probably acted out at the city, for example, at threshing floors and winepresses. If this was the case, these villages had their own cultic functionaries just as in the kingdom of Egypt. Such functionaries could have been the leading order of the community with the monastic duties. We are aware of the dangers of making too sharp a distinction between priests and laity. The leader of a community, be it a state or a village, was the leader of the society's decisions.
Popular religion

The existence of communal rites and festivals makes it possible to draw a conclusion which is of some importance for the study of religion in the ancient Near East. The rituals in a village may be characterized as “popular” religion—a term often used but never defined with regard to content in the cultures of the Near East. These local rituals were not part of the official national religion which was directed from the capital by the king’s administration. However, popular and national religion may have mutually influenced each other at certain times and, therefore, resemblances are to be expected. Indeed, it is probable that royal actions in religious matters resulted in interference in the popular religion. On the other hand, there were times when the national religion received new directives through royal edicts that did not essentially alter the rituals and beliefs of the villages. Whether, for example, King Josiah’s organization of his national religion and national religion affected communal religion is impossible to determine since no information about the practices is available. What we do know is that Josiah’s reform was of some consequence for the national sanctuaries. 2 Kings 23:15

Some priests appeared to the king of Judah were deposed. Consequently, it can be maintained that the local festival practices continued as before. Because they were in the king’s court (the temple), the king’s order that only in Jerusalem could sacrifice be directed to Yahweh may not have changed much if at all. One of the ritual communes religious life. It should also be remembered that the king could not easily alter agricultural customs.
Chapter Three

ADMINISTRATION AND BUILDING ACTIVITIES IN THE DAVIDIC SOLOMONIC KINGDOM

Exactly how the nation was administered during the reigns of Saul and David is not made clear by the texts. It is possible that an administrative organization under Saul that escaped us (1 Sam 8:1 and 1 Sam 22) has misled us about some administrative personnel. For example, we know that Ahimelech was the high priest (1 Sam 22:18). The priest Ahimelech may have been the chief priest at the sanctuary in 1 Sam 22:18 and the servants of Saul mentioned in 1 Sam 22:9. 22 of 1 Sam 22 was part of the king's entourage. The court members were not expected to know the country was divided, if we can trust all of it.

It should not be assumed that the administration of the monarchy of Israel emerged in a vacuum. It should be considered that Egypt played an important part in the history of Palestine. Consequently, it can be maintained that when the Aramean states and the Canaanite cities were part of the Egyptian system at least from the 18th dynasty. From the Tel el-Amarna letters we know that the princes of the Canaanite states had to send men as the pressure they have to Pharaoh's court to be educated and as a result of being the vassals of Pharaoh, they learned how court and administration were organized and functioned. In addition, the presence of Egyptian administrative and military personnel in Palestine certainly contributed to the spread of the Egyptian system.

Consequently, it is likely that when Syria-Palestine petty kings (including the Jerusalemite kings) organized their own administrations, they

1 This term is used in connection with Saul, 1 Sam 13:19 and Saul, 1 Kings 1:19 as well as in the Aramaic journals. 1 Sam 18:2 Kings 1
2 The biblical writers in no such a way by the kings of Solomon, for example, and we also have a good example of a Sumerian king who was king of the world and was active in the land of the Hittites.
3 See for example 1 Sam 4:1-4 and 28:28. This shows that the winner of the battle was sent to the king, which was known as the Egyptian seat at Azar (Gaza). Of J.K. Knowlton in the Tel el-Amarna Letters he writes to von C. Weber and K. Foerster, Berlin 1964, p. 125. 1-46
used the Egyptian system as a mode. For instance, the market Jerusa-
lem which occurs in 2 Sam. 8:10 of passion-markers is conterpar to the
Egyptian with w. "sprechert Mutterter" = leader, spokesman, herald. 8
Another title which appears in the ancient Hebrew passage is sopher. Its
Egyptian parallel is the Sopher, a scribal name, which seems to have been a
common title referring not only to the Pharaoh's scribe, but also to
the high priest and the king's scribe. Another title was Sopher, the
scribe, around which the Egyptian name for this function was based.

6 In the case of David, it is more probable for his military and civilian
officers to have been called sopher. The sopher was the court
scribe, often in charge of the archives. The term is used in
1 Chronicles 25:2 to refer to the sopher of the priests, and in
1 Chronicles 9:15 to refer to the sopher of the Levites.

7 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the royal household, as indicated in 1 Chronicles 25:25.

8 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the temple, as indicated in 1 Chronicles 25:25.

9 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the army, as indicated in 1 Chronicles 25:25.

10 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the treasury, as indicated in 1 Chronicles 25:25.

11 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the judicial system, as indicated in 1 Chronicles 25:25.

12 The sopher was also responsible for the administration of
the. . .
that (priests) and David's priest lit on Jair. The latter is not given any Levitical ancestry which indicates that it was not required in the time of David.

It is possible that the text of 2 Sam. 6:17 is corrupt as has often been argued. After Zadok, the text mentions Abimelech ben Abihai instead of the expected Abibar. First it should be stressed that Abibar's position at David's court is not quite clear, and that perhaps even his name is an insertion. Moreover, both lists of David's officials have only one name for each office, but when the priestly office is mentioned we find two. This raises the question whether the second priest name was added by the narrator. Abimelech ben Abibar in the first list and Abibar in the second. Bogan's reconstruction of the first list which includes only Zadok's name seems correct if the list refers to the top officials however that the narrator's viewpoint it was astonishing that Abibar was not given the post as the top ranking official of religious affairs. After all he was the priest of the pre-Jerusalemite time and represented a tradition older than the Jerusalemite one. Even a priest of the Jerusalemer establishment a fact that is not a fact when we scrutinize possibilities that David indeed was not an Israelite. Coming from Bethlehem a city under Jebusite rule and not part of Sama kingdom, David was perhaps more familiar with the Jebusite administrative apparatus, hence, only he indeed in this of business when he became king - but he could however have reorganized it. It was Zadok who, after the death of David took over from the Jebusite establishment who left the religious administration during David's reign. The scholarly idea that Zadok and Abibar shared the position of chief priest is untenable. That Zadok was the top ranking priest seems evident from the fact that it is really mentioned first in the text of 2 Sam. 8:14. As

That is not among David's names in the Bible, but he was not a part of the royal administration who was David's priest.

1. See my post on Jerusalem, not M. David and 1 M. David's daughter, "Joshua: Myth and History," 66-71.

2. The orientation of David's reign may not suit the high position I was not among his officials.

3. David is not mentioned in the Psalms, save the Psalms of Asaph, David's son, and the Psalms of David, his son, who is mentioned in the book of Psalms.

4. For David as a non-Israelite, see my article "Was David a Jebusite Subject?" ZAW 92 (1978) 196.

5. G. A. A. H. (1961); and 1. P. C. (1964) on the Jebusite Jerusallemite history of Zadok. It is important to note that the version of 28:29 is out of the Jerusalemite tradition, since it was Abibar who was the head priest, not Zadok as has been supposed for Zadok was not a part of Abibar's office. Only the Sad Deut. Deut. 14:26 has been preserved.
to the Israelite priest from Beth Abinadab, it is possible that he was given a prominent and revered position at the court in gratitude for his earlier services to David, and perhaps also in order to appease the people of the north.

Returning again to the two lists of David's titles, it must be stated that it is not necessary to harmonize them. Certainly it is conceivable that during David's tenures as king, he replaced some administrative personnel. Therefore, the lists may reflect different points in time during his reign. One indication that David either reorganized his administration or appointed administrative personnel in the name of the same person is the name of the person who is different in the two lists. In the first list his name is Sheba; in the second, we find the name Seraiah.

For occurrences of the name Adoniram in the second list, 1 Chron 27:22-23 reads, and then in 2:10 he may be another individual administrative official. It is possible that he was of Levite descent and was in a religious group responsible for temple work. Probably later in David's reign he was appointed as chief over the temple labor and tax.
tinued in that position throughout Solomon's tenure. When Rehoboam attempted to bring Israel under the Jerusalemite kings' scepter, he was stoned at death. 1 Kings 12:8. This is understandable if Adoram is viewed not only as a representative of the Jerusalemite administration's labor policies but also as a personification of the Jebusite rulership of the Davidic dynasty which the north had come to distrust and to feel as foreign.

It should be noted that the corvée system was a well known institution in the Syro-Palestinian world long before the emergence of the nation Israel. It is mentioned in a letter from Tamar (15th cent. B.C.E.) in a letter from Bandya of Megiddo (Amarna time), in texts from Ugarit and from Alalakh. From these examples, M. Mendelsohn drew the conclusion that even if the instances from Tamar and Megiddo show that a few Canaanites were used as forced labor, it should be noted that the Egyptians did not initiate this institution in Palestine. The corvée system is a practice that had previously been observed by the native governments. Therefore, when David appointed Adoram as the chief administrator, he forced labor. 2 Sam. 20:23-24. He was thus using a well established pattern.

Solomonic Kingdom

When Solomon took over David's administration, he must have enlarged it. Indeed, his district organization with the building of state cities and

---

6 W. A. Bright, A Prince of Ta'aranak in the Fifteenth Century B.C. BASOR 93 (1944) 1-2.
7 J. D. Padan, Nouvelles découvertes d'Amarneh, RA 9 (1923) p. 367.
11 The problem of whether Saul and David forced the Canaanites and Judaeans as well as the Israelites to do forced labor is for the most part not concerned about the existence of the phenomenon. However, the inscriptions on the stele of Samuel. 1 Sam. 12:15 and 1 Chr. 22:2, as well as the known texts from this kind of documents, may be expressible in a way that is not expressed in the Davidic and Solomonid texts and above all, that the Canaanites should do the same work.
fortresses, the reorganization of the army and the introduction of chariotry required more official personnel than the kingdom had seen thus far. From this time on we find for instance a minister (manager) of the royal palaces and estates called *āber al habba at i Kings 4:6." This is the parallel of the Egyptian wāsrs, or wrw where it literally means, overseer of the house where 'house' has its wide sense of estate. It is commonly translated "high great steward." Obviously this official ran through the Judean monarchy. I Kings 16: 9, 18, 32; Kings 10:5, 15, 18, 18, 37, 19, 2, and Isa. 22:15. It had been maintained that Solomon's division of Israel into twelve provinces. I Kings 4:9 was inspired by Pharaoh Sheshonq's administrative system, with its sixty divisions in twelve months. This fact, and taking into account the fact that Egypt had long provided the model for the organization of the royal courts in Palestine, such influence is not impossible. However, it is a matter of debate whether is the model for this division was that of Pharaoh Sheshonq (ca. 915/13 B.C.). The biblical text does not state exactly when Solomon inaugurated this system, but if it was initiated during the forty years before he started to build his temple and palace complex began, then his district system was.

instituted before the reign of Sheshong.6 The levy mentioned in Kings 5:27 is not recorded in the text, but it is said to have started before the work began in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon. It is probable that the levy required the district census. Thus if Egypt contributed the mode for this system, it must have been in the reign of Pharaoh (c. 970-960 BC) or Nebuchadnezzar II (605-569 BC). Fortunately we do not know the exact years of Solomon (or, more accurately, the period of his reign), nor the length of the time to which the text was applied.

That Solomon's districts and their organizations were designed to control the people of the entire kingdom. As such, it was used to express the transition of the Israelite peoples 25 and was adopted with the late period of the land to Jerusalem. The twelve tribal ancestors becoming his parents. 26 It is not clear what the precise size of the tribal system, when the kings of the districts and the districts were not as large as the courts of the early days of their reign, was.

The division of the country was made according to geographical units. 27 This became clear when examining the exact construction which included the southern part of the Judean valley and the cities of Jerusalem and Beth-shan plus the areas beyond the Jordan River, these being the way of the judges' (2 Sam 18:23) over the road to Megiddo, opposite

---

1 See A R Yack for the detailed discussion of Sheshong in his work. 1
2 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon
3 And the Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
4 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
5 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
6 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
7 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
8 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
9 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
10 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
11 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
12 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
13 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
14 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
15 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
16 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
17 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
18 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
19 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
20 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
21 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
22 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
23 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
24 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
25 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
26 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
27 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
28 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
29 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
30 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
31 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
32 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
33 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
34 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
35 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
36 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
37 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
38 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
39 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
40 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
41 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
42 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
43 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
44 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
45 The Book of Joshua states that it was in the tenth month of the second year of Solomon.
Beth Shan. The road on the eastern side of the river seems to have been more important than the road on the western because of the large number of settlements on the eastern side. It should be noted that the river did not really separate the areas as was the Jordan pattern since there were many accessible roads. In antiquity it was not rivers and straits that divided people, but the towns and heavily fortified areas.

It is possible that we should mention that it took approximately thirteen years to complete the palace or seven or so to build the temple. That the royal palace complex took that long reveals something about its size when compared with the size of the temple. It is no wonder that a distinct organization including the town and corvee became necessary. If Solomon wanted to build something on the grand scale of the Pharaohs, one could, of course, assume that his palace and temple complex were Egyptian inspired. However, it may well have been maintained that the temple represented a common Syrian or Phoenician type of architecture, because of the Tyrian workers employed by Solomon, I Kings 7:16. It has been suggested that the palace was an example of the Assyrian type and that the temple was modelled on the Syrian temple at Tell Ta'yinat. However, this temple is later than the Solomon period. Furthermore, even though there are similarities there are also notable differences, particularly the fact that the Temple at Tell Ta'yinat was on a raised area. It had already been mentioned as a prototype for the Jerusalem temple. This, however, remains an open question. The Hazor temple was originally a large rectangular room, each room of the building type had an entrance in each side which was flanked by two rooms for storage. It is apparent that the palace of Hazor was extended and so became a

---
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three-room temples. One should note that the middle room at Hazor was the smallest one. In Solomon's temple the middle room was the largest and was of the three-room type.\(^49\)

M. Ottrogge recently advocated that the plans of Solomon's temple and palaces had Egyptian prototypes.\(^50\) He stated that Amarna architecture was introduced into Palestine in connection with houses as well as temples. For the latter he refers to the temples of Beth-Shan. It, however, the Amarna style influenced the architecture at Beth-Shan it was certainly in the Aten temple whose nave it differed from the two temples of strata VII and VI as well as that in stratum X. If we following A. Rowe\(^51\) viewed all of them as representatives of the Amarna style particularly those built close to the palace,\(^52\) we can infer that some small temples were built in the same style as the above mentioned Beth Shan temples. Moreover, the fact that these Beth Shan temples cannot be characterized as products of the time of the Amarna period\(^53\). Its motif of the temples of strata VII and VI at Beth-Shan has a certain stylistic mentor, which was no longer used in Canaanite temples of the time during Age of the Hazon.\(^54\) This means that the city of Beth Shan was at this particular stage of that time, isolated from various other buildings which were built in the Amarna style since that type of architecture ended with Amarna time.\(^55\) Solomon's inspiration and influence were not from Egypt.
was not from Amarna but may have been from some other place like Thebes or Tanis. 

Although there are indications of foreign influence on the Jerusalem temple, it is also possible that Solomon's architects, who may not be from the city itself, were influenced by foreign traditions. Consequently, Solomon's temple may have been an Israelite contribution to the architecture of the ancient Near East.

From what has been said above about kings as city builders, Solomon's large-scale construction endeavors can be put into perspective. His kingdom was very young and was composed of diverse ethnic groups. Israelite and Canaanite (included in the term 'Canaanite' are all non-Israelites') The biblical texts state that Solomon rebuilt and fortified the cities of Gezer, Hazor, Megiddo, Beth-shemesh, Ta'anach, and Gath. Among these initiatives, building store-cities and cities of his chariots and horses were the most visible.
The textual material reveals that the region's building program was primarily carried out in non-Jewish areas, seen in the dispersal of sites to lev the mountains of Ephraim and in the Negev. The king's role was of course, to bind the different areas more closely. These building activities, the arm of the central authority, was extended through the country, taking the different groups of people, aware that they were united. Military personnel and devout servants served as priests, a daily reminder of this fact.

That the tenth-century BC was a time of consolidation, the Israelite kingdom is tested by the great building activities. Some in Israel hint to texts in Chronicles, if there is archaeological evidence it explains not mentioned in the Old Testament. For instance at Jericho near Jericho IX, the remains of a casemate wall and what has been labeled a public building were uncovered. According to the Hebrew chronicles it represents the first Israelite settlement. It may depict the first time the word Israelite is used. On the other hand, it seems that a new situation in Israelite settlement on the hill was parallel. If we accept the view that it was a time when the city entered its prime, the new settlement may have returned non-Israelite peoples from the old government. This seems to be the second wave. Mazar who maintains this, the population did not change, and the new residents...
were kept. From a closer point of view these had certain consequences. The temple from Stratum IX was rebuilt in Stratum IX, as indicated by the cult continued as before. According to the architectural plans and merchants who settled in the city are said to have been made at this temple in conformity with the law. Jerusalemites and the wise men of the world. One wonders, perhaps, at the power of the place. Moreover, as is probable that a priest was sent from Jerusalemites to teach the people in the new nation. As a result, the ideas of the temple practice were introduced into the temple practice.

Remains of the structures were also excavated at Tel Arad, Tel Hattin, Beer Sheba, Tel Ashdod, and Tel Gezer. At the latter located only 5 km from the eastern shore of Lake Baha, it has a settlement with a similar wall and structures to Jericho. No remains were found, however, until also been mentioned since excavations there have been made only from the mid-19th century BC. From the 10th century BC excavations at Tel Gezer only uncovered a single mastaba which is east to the 14th century BC. It is uncertain whether the remains were roughly 13th or 12th century BC. However, excavations conducted with the aid of the local inhabitants, which are dated as the 10th century BC. There is no court of the period of the Judges in the Israelite period before the 10th century BC. At Jericho and Gezer, we find no evidence of residential or monumental structures prior to this time. The only evidence of the period is that the economy of these places was based on agriculture and trade.

In the new kingdom, the economy of the security in the southern and of the early historic era, the more populated area was of paramount importance. In return, the king specialized in trading as a means of exchange.
which he had access to the Gulf of Aqaba. The Gulf and the Red Sea became one of his main avenues of trade. 1 Kings 9:26. In order to secure the trade from the Gulf of Aqaba to Jerusalem and other places in his kingdom, it was necessary to build a network of fortresses along the routes. The fortress at Arad is an example of this policy. It is possible that such construction led to a population increase in the Negeb, a geographical area which by this time was seen as an increase in settlements in the latter period.

This does not mean that one can stop the conclusion that these new settlements were Israelite, as does Y. Aharoni. We cannot conclude that some of the settlements such as Tel Maas, were built by Israelite settlers, as does A. Kempf. The latter may have that both the settlers of Tel Maas and those of Tel Sipper in the Shephelah were "well integrated in the network of the Canaanite neighbors," even from this the very important conclusion of the Shephelah people. From Sipper in the Negeb can be drawn as well. They may have moved there for the same reasons that others with grew to the inhabitants.

The fortress of Ahab in the Negeb provides an excellent example of the relationship between a local administration and national religion. It is possible that this fortress was placed in an area that had recently been claimed by the Israelite in the episode of the Lybian location in the so-called way to Edom. 

A 1 Kings 20, which connects Hebron and Jerusalem with the Arabah and the east of Yehuda. The fortresses of this era were placed as a buffer between the fertile area and the desert. This trade route. 

The fortress of Ahab has been attributed to Solomon's reign (1 Kings 11). A temple was included in the complex, and it served as a small state. 

Provisions and provisions were transported from the temple to the temple of the king's temple. 

A phrase which occurs in Yehuda 13. The Arab temple cannot be called a temple because its location was at least 40 km (25 miles) away from the nearest town.

B. Mazar argued that the Arab temple was the successor of a King's temple, taken over by the invading Crusaders. It had the temple built by the fortified city and is one of the few in the kingdom. 

The fortress has its own provisions, but it also served as a small state. It was built with a cult place (1 Kings 11). The temple was not built until the 11th century BCE and was named Y Haba. The name Y Haba is also used in Judges as the name of a temple. The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

However, its location is unknown, and it is more probable that it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple. 

The fortress was named after the king, and as such, it was a temple.
and cast Arad's status as a government compound. Some of the ostraca give orders to the commanding officer of the fortress. The opening formulae of these ostraca have been seen as echoing those of the Amarna letters. That the style of administrative writing in Palestine was influenced by the Egyptian tradition is probably more than just coincidence. The fact that Egypt politically dominated Palestine from the 18th Dynasty on the way to the Iron Age.

The occurrence of personal names found on the ostraca supports the view that Arad was not only part of the royal administration as a military base but was also an arm of the national cultic establishment. Among the names are Merenptah (Arad no. 354) and Pharaoh (no. 341) and the phrase the "son of Qeret." One of the ostraca addressed to the commander Hydah mentions the Qerevite son. According to Ezr 2:44 and Neh 7:47 the family of Qeret belonged to a class of temple servants (the v. 542). The name is also possible that the ostraca reveal their existence as a class of district employees in pre-exilic time. Moreover, the name is probably the name of a high official of the Egyptian administration. Hydah is of certain interest. The name is known in the Old Testament from priests of the family of Qerevite (1 Chr 24:19, Neh 3:21; 12:6, 62; 13:4, 6). Therefore it is not improbable that he had legal authority.


Another place to be considered in this connection is the city of Sheba in southern Judah. Some ten miles from it, Bronze Age structures have been found on the site of Tell el-Farah 1, which is dated to the 10th century BC. Because of the name of the town, Ty, one might think that it was a trading post, but it was actually a capital. Sheba was an example of the wealth and activity of the time that rose to power in the latter 10th century. In fact, in the southern part of Judah, it was the principal city. Its importance was such that the Jericho inscription mentions it twice. As we know of the city, it was a large and prosperous town.

Recent excavations at Sheba have revealed its extent and location. The site is situated along the main road close to the highway, perhaps the trade route from the south to the north.

And another place to be considered is the city of Jerusalem. It was an important city in ancient times, and its history is well documented. It was a major trade center and a capital of the kingdom of Judah.
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relationship between military defense and national cohesion. The matter found here suggests that the bureaucracy is from the *9th* century B.C. One of the major roles inside the city was that of the western building has been characterized as a box-shaped where people devotion their offerings. This function is the first to be filled by the city of Jerusalem. Among the times, the stone vessels, a water chest with exemptions should be mentioned. There are also some pictorial drawings found in the *9th* and *8th* Best. One of these has an inscription with the phrase, *bread, bread, bread...*. This means that bread was a staple diet and was considered as a luxury. The importance of this suggests that the city of Jerusalem was the center of trade that the establishment was expressed in military and economic ties. It also gives a sense of something else has exchanged in the economic conditions that time when it illustrates the economics of the region. This interrelation can be considered to be in the trade, the ties, the ties of trade, as advocated by the *8th* and *9th* biblical writers. The ties are still been broken.
CHAPTER FOUR
ROYAL PRIESTHOOD

Exactly how Solomon's district organization affected the cultic establishment and its priesthood is not known. However, since military and civil administrative posts were increased, it may be assumed that posts for religious personnel also multiplied. This is applicable if civil and cultic personnel were two distinct groups which was not always the case. Although the textual materials do not discuss whether there was a government sanctuary in every district, if the close ties between administration, military, and cult are taken into account, it is very likely that taxes and tithes that were consigned to the sacred spaces were sent to a special place—a sanctuary chapel or cult room—in the government complex when the districts were divided into smaller areas. Each city or its own sub-center, then, there were many such places to house taxes and sacrifices.

Districts capitals like Ramoth Gilead, Taanac, Beth Shemesh, and Shechem appear to have had a special place, Beth Shemesh may have been dedicated to Shem, the founder of the Keshet, the people. The exact site is unknown; its sun worship because of its nearness to Jerusalem. It may be assumed that rituals dedicated to Yahweh were more important if the city became part of the Israelite kingdom.

Other district capitals like Jabesh, Beth Shean, and Amos, are known to be among the places where Yahweh was worshipped. According to the Assyrian construction. The sea, hence
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6. G. Wright, Before the Age of the Prophets, p. 28, para. 144.
the inscription יֵּשֶׁב יִשְׂרֵאֵל יִשְׂרֵאֵל יִשְׂרֵאֵל. Belonging to Zerahiah, priest of Dor. Even if this text is dated to the mid-eighth century B.C. it may still indicate that Dor long had a sanctuary; since it seems to have been one of the very oldest cities of Israel. Canaan’s existence is attested by the recently found tablets from Tel Maranjah containing letters in Syria which are dated to about 2200 B.C. From the Amarna tablets we know that Dor was under Egyptian influence. According to the Wen Amarn report at the time of the end of the Sea peoples Dor and its surroundings were populated by the tribe of Manasseh who was unable to conquer Dor, Beth Shan, Lachish, and Megiddo. This means that there were later considered to be the Manasseh territory were not so during the pre-destruction period. Moreover, it indicates that the city-state Nephath Dor was not populated by the Israelite nation. David, it is later according to 1 and 2 Samuel, was near some of which did not exist in the Early Iron Age. But if the area was not inhabited by the Sea peoples, it became an Israelite during Solomon’s reign (1 K 11:14). Be this as it may when Dor an important
perfectly became a city, a land of captivity to Israel. Some probably valued treasure to the people of the distinction of Israel, and revered the ancient. Therefore, it was that an Israelite sanctuary was built in the city. A pre-eminence of sanctity may have been used as part of the new government's authority to enter. The text we cannot assume does mention that there was no temple in Jerusalem worshiping Yahweh of Israel.

Taking the precedent of the kings were temple builders is not necessarily to assume that Solomon's district capitol was the inner court. A temple was a site where a cultic area which served as the sanctuary of the ancient state religion that sanctuaries were accompanied by the words adoration of the people of Israel. Kings I and II Chronicles 7:1-14 show that adoration was evident in Jerusalem. In fact, one 19th century scholar in the Assyrian period considered King Josiah to have been the most pious and religious of all the rulers of the state. They part of the temple renovation was as he believed the religious renovation as well as the spiritual renovation of the people. It was the supreme act of the Judahite kings. Now, we are examining Egypt's temple. The Egyptians built a temple on the site of the temple in Jerusalem. In the temple, the Egyptians adored their gods. It was the case that the cultic between, worship of the Egyptian temple as was that of the temple, as the temple. For exam-ple, it was in the temple that the priests conducted the cultic activities.

It is possible that the temple was the place where we can trace the Temple, 21:8 (Pss. 2.7) and 1 Samuel 22:22. Because the temple was the where the people adored Yahweh.
at the temple of Nob. Although we do not know the significance of Doeg’s presence at Nob’s temple as the chief officer of the shepherds and their flocks, he may have been acting as a supervisory capacity. This is correct: the temple of Nob was under the direction of Saul’s administration.” The same would have been the case for other sanctuaries.

When David became king in Jerusalem, he appointed members of the native Levites as his officials in Transjordan (1 Chr 23:10). The text states that they were sent out to all the work of Yahweh and the service of the king. From this we can conclude that the Levites were responsible for the priests and Levites, as well as for judges and officers of the king, as a “people of war.” They were stationed at the altars of Yahweh and the king in both cities of the territory. They were also responsible for the religious and civil administration of the nation. The Levites were an extension of the religious and civil administration of the nation.

As the passage should be noted in its connection. In 2 Chr 17:17, the king ordained that it be done as Saul had done and that Levites were to be appointed to each city, to teach the people the law of Yahweh. This may be the Levites were so trained as to be able to teach the people and to rule over them. The Levites were trained to teach the people and to rule over them.

Judges and Levites were therefore part of the government’s law enforcement personnel. However, law was taken in a broader meaning of rules and regulations as laws of the way of the nation (1 Chr 23:10). It is natural to believe that the Levites and judges enforced the laws in the city of Jerusalem. The Levites were responsible for the priests and Levites in Transjordan (1 Chr 23:10), and they were to be trained in the Levitical order and to serve as part of the guard of officers. According to Jer 7:59, the Levities were to be the supervisor of the Levitical order and to serve as part of the guard of officers. According to Jer 10:13, the priest Pashur was designated as the chief of officers.
man. The title נִשְׁפּוֹ הָאָבִיר, "commander of the guard," occurs in Jer. 37.13. Ezekiel calls the gatekeepers Levites. 44.11, a designation that may be part of the prophet's degrading of the Levites because they had led the people into worship in connection with the Levites. These may be the same as the "military" Levites mentioned in Jer. 37.13. Indeed, it is possible that the men of Jehoiada the first priest of the Jerusalem temple posted at the temple in connection with the coup d'état that culminated in Queen Athaliah's death constituted a priestly guard under his command. 2 Kings 11.18.

These examples may reveal an old Syro-Palestinian tradition that is also found in Anatolia. As mentioned above, a Hittite text, "Instructions for Temple Officials," states that priests were responsible for guarding the temple but that during the night one of the high priests was in charge of the night patrols.

It is possible that in 33:1 reflects the police-force function of priests and Levites, they were soldiers for God and keep. According to this text, Yahweh is called on to bless the army of the Levites and smite the drive of his enemies. The term may be translated "army, police force" or the like. It is, therefore, quite in harmony with an old tradition when Nehemiah used Levites as security guards at the gate of Jerusalem during the Sabbath. Neh. 13:22.

It may be possible that the term Levi was a technical term for priests and government officials stationed at different locations in the kingdom. This supports a scription of the work term "house" (Aramaic) to accompany in maph 'to attach oneself to' or 'to be bound'—36 These persons were
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thus associated with or attached bound to the central government as its employees. It this is the origin of the social class of Levites, two things must be stressed. In the first place, the Levites never constituted a tribe before the artificial systematization of Yahweh's people into twelve such "tribes". This is supported by the fact that some Levitical families, for instance the Hebronites and the Libnites, came from different geographical areas. Moreover, as Geissler main ances, their names are gentile. Consequently whether or not the Levites were originally a second tribe is a moot point. Seeing any nation, whether in Israel or in Judah, may have been called a Levite, they were in a special clan or priestly family during the time of the monarchy. This is supported by the fact that in the biblical texts referring to the present list, not all Levites are particularly mentioned as priests.

In connection with the temple of Dan, we learn that its priesthood was "mosaic" and "levitical", Judg. 17:18. The concern of this text was originally to advocate a "divine" supremacy of Dan's priesthood, a legitimacy which must have been questioned thus, the tradition is rather late. The final question was then addressed to the Levites of Dan in worshipping idols, Judg. 18:10, an accusation leveled against them also in Ezek. 44:10.

In times of religious diversity and uncertainty such as marked the period of the united Israelite monarchy it would seem as a matter of course that wherever priests/levites served they were acquainted with idol worship.

p. 55; In practice, it holds that the Levites were the only ones who could have been serviceable in the temple, not only in southern Judah, but in the city of Jerusalem, as well. Thus, the Levites were responsible for the maintenance of the temple and its activities. In connection with the temple of Dan, we learn that its priesthood was "mosaic" and "levitical", Judg. 17:18. The concern of this text was originally to advocate a "divine" supremacy of Dan's priesthood, a legitimacy which must have been questioned thus, the tradition is rather late. The final question was then addressed to the Levites of Dan in worshipping idols, Judg. 18:10, an accusation leveled against them also in Ezek. 44:10.

In times of religious diversity and uncertainty such as marked the period of the united Israelite monarchy it would seem as a matter of course that wherever priests/levites served they were acquainted with idol worship.

p. 56; In practice, it holds that the Levites were the only ones who could have been serviceable in the temple, not only in southern Judah, but in the city of Jerusalem, as well. Thus, the Levites were responsible for the maintenance of the temple and its activities. In connection with the temple of Dan, we learn that its priesthood was "mosaic" and "levitical", Judg. 17:18. The concern of this text was originally to advocate a "divine" supremacy of Dan's priesthood, a legitimacy which must have been questioned thus, the tradition is rather late. The final question was then addressed to the Levites of Dan in worshipping idols, Judg. 18:10, an accusation leveled against them also in Ezek. 44:10.

In times of religious diversity and uncertainty such as marked the period of the united Israelite monarchy it would seem as a matter of course that wherever priests/levites served they were acquainted with idol worship.

p. 57; In practice, it holds that the Levites were the only ones who could have been serviceable in the temple, not only in southern Judah, but in the city of Jerusalem, as well. Thus, the Levites were responsible for the maintenance of the temple and its activities. In connection with the temple of Dan, we learn that its priesthood was "mosaic" and "levitical", Judg. 17:18. The concern of this text was originally to advocate a "divine" supremacy of Dan's priesthood, a legitimacy which must have been questioned thus, the tradition is rather late. The final question was then addressed to the Levites of Dan in worshipping idols, Judg. 18:10, an accusation leveled against them also in Ezek. 44:10.

In times of religious diversity and uncertainty such as marked the period of the united Israelite monarchy it would seem as a matter of course that wherever priests/levites served they were acquainted with idol worship.
Indeed, the prophetic promise against idol-worship provides a graphic picture of Israelite religion in the prophetic period. For example, the above-mentioned passage in Ezek. 44:10 reveals that not only the Levites but the popular group served worthless idols. Yet, with the elders of their people, v. 35 in the terms of verse 34. From this it may be concluded that the Levites of that time were representatives of a religion that still had the codex and temple worship.

Acknowledging that the Levites were government officials solves the problem of why they were the only tribe to have tithes since the time of Nehemiah. The priesthood was the state religion, as their temple was the state religion. Hence, the Levites were the sadistic tyrants and the temple was the state religion, which is separated from the worship of the other tribes. The temple was the place of sacrifice and was connected to the Levites and the temple of their people. Moreover, these levites were exempt from taxation. The presence of these levites have been similar to the modern day in the temple. The tax exempt and revenue was needed for the work of the temple. The

---
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trative reorganization had the potential to become a financial disaster for the Levites.20

From the above it is possible to explain why the Levites were ‘associated’ with the category of ἄνθρωποι among its newcomers.21 The word itself means a guest. As government appointees they were not members of the clans of the district where they were the tenants of the government. Rating the Levites as a tribe as already indicated, a construction made to suit the idea that Israel was composed of twelve tribes (ten ex plus two, expressing the idea of totality), when a history of the two peoples (Samaritans and Judah) was constructed from the Judaeo-Hebraic views in all Levites were considered to be descendants of Adam, Benjamin, and all priestesses were given a genealogy through them to Levi.22 In the Judges construction of the settlement in Canaan the Levites were religiously kept away as the ‘guardians’ of the Ark; they were starting stations for the Northern tribes. Moses, the leader, historiographically gave certain cities to the Levites in his part of the story of N.32 1. Josh. 21:1.[1] This was the phenomenon of appearance priests at the national sanctuaries outside the capital, made into an institution and projected back in time. It should be pointed out that it is historically impossible to enslave a nation without gaining its part of an independent state, or should it be its part of the nation state. As will be shown below, some of them did not exist before that tenth millennium B.C. (construction)24 Although many have been written, it may perhaps be said as an attempt to explain why the Levites was a tribe also have a part of the country as their inheritance.

Levitical cities

A list of Levitical cities can be found in Josh. 21 and 1 Chron. In the former a list these are said to have existed during the time of

---


Joshua. However, because the author of the "Conquest" theme was concerned about the country's future and the people of its own time the past became very important. In his narrative the "city" was walled and created by its god, a common Near Eastern feature. In this beginning present knowledge about history and people, etc., played a part and was protected back for time and respect the purpose of the Levitical cities was to show that they existed before the people came into the land of history. Of course, the Levitical cities could not have come into existence at the same time as did the people since according to the numbers in the text the land was promised to Abraham Gen. 12: 1, and Deut. 7: 2, had to be conquered first. The time of the Conquest was thus a stable period for the literal consecration of the system of the Levitical cities. However, that may be if the Levitical cities were places where Levites as government agents were stationed, they could have come into existence as an institution before the monarchy. Where there was no monarchy there was similarly no need for such cities of Levites and sanctuaries to serve as government agencies.

Evidence from archaeology supports the statement that all the Levitical cities were not just to ed at one and the same point in time. All these cities did not exist as pre-monarchical. The time of the early Israelite monarchy. Archaeological evidence from the tenth century B.C. have been found at Beth-Shemesh, Gezer, Lachish, and many of these is the land of Beth Horon

44 The Land of Promise a study of the geography and topography of the land of Israel. Tho. W. Anderson, New York, 1845, ch. 10, p. 89; Josh. 12: 8, etc. Evidence from the land of Beth Horon

45 It should be noted that the city, which may be a city of Beth Horon, is not mentioned in the Bible at 1 Kings 14: 16, etc. The evidence from the land of Beth Horon

46 The evidence from the land of Beth Horon

47 The evidence from the land of Beth Horon

48 The evidence from the land of Beth Horon

49 The evidence from the land of Beth Horon
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and Mahanaim. Regarding Hebron in Transjordan the archaeological picture is still unclear. Because only a few pottery sherds have been found, it appears that no major settlement existed there between 1300-900 B.C. The fact that more pottery has been found in the ninth century B.C. may indicate a settlement.

It seems that Ramoth-Gilead as identified with Tell Rumeith came into existence during the tenth century B.C. As mentioned above, no remains dated to the time before the tenth century have been uncovered there.

Another "Levitical" city in Transjordan that should be mentioned is Jahas. It has tentatively been identified with Khirbet el Medina "or Khirbet Zibb. A recent survey showed that there was no pottery from the eleventh or tenth centuries at these places. Even if we allow a survey and give a complete picture of the site's history, it does give an indication of what is probable. The results of the survey of the "Levitical Cities" should be combined with what we know from the Near Eastern inscriptions of the ninth century B.C. Lines 18f mention that the Israelite king apparently ran a "fortress" (322) Jahas. Because the verb נדק, "to build," is used, it may mean that this was a new city constructed by the Israelites. Therefore, it can be concluded that Jahas did not exist during the period of the Judges and the united monarchy. The building of the city of Jahas can thus be seen as an example of urbanization as a political tool.

Other cities labeled "Levitical" include Joppa, Eshtemoa, and Jattir. These three cities were located south of Hebron and may have been part of a defense line. The above mentioned survey of "Levitical Cities" turned up no tenth century pottery there. The earliest settlement at Jattir (probably...
modern. After all, for example, the text from the late 20th century only one summary in the entire century. This was the case. The picture appears to be the same, as Juta and Karamfola’s commentary. However, this indicates that these three cities were not part of the Philistines’ defense line 2 Chr. 13:17. The text of 1 Chr. 13 does not mention them either. If these three cities really were part of a defense line, they may have come into existence during the time of King Jehoshaphat, who according to 2 Chr. 7:2, established garrisons in the cities of Edom and strengthened his defenses by building forts and fortified cities.

At a date, perhaps, the same conclusion can be drawn that Jehoshaphat fortified Edom and established garrisons in twenty-five cities. This is because the dates of these cities corresponds to the 1st century BC which does not seem to be a date that new districts were being formed, however. The text of 1 Chr. 13:17 may indicate that the king desired to create a defensive line, as he did in Judah. This can be seen from the text. The king, therefore, fortified these cities to the full extent of the capability, and established what could be called tributary garrisons. According to Yahweh’s order, it was his task to fortify and strengthen the king’s defenses. The king’s military campaign was to be led by Jehoshaphat, the king of Edom, who was to be assisted by the king’s forces. The king’s forces were, however, under the command of the high priest and the governor.

The Chaldeans did not rule over the entire country during the reign of the king. The city of Jerusalem was not an exception to the exemption from taxation and service. In the year 509 BC, the governor of Jerusalem was appointed by the king. The new order was: the Levites were governed by the new order of the high priest and the governor.
possible that the new organization did not affect the Levites outside Jerusalem. On the other hand, the Levitical priesthood did not lose its identity, nor did it remain a separate sect within the community.

This is supported by the passage in Deuteronomy 31:12 which states that the Levitical priesthood was sent out to teach the people the law of Yahweh. The Levites were not only sent out to teach the people the law, but they were also to be the priests of Yahweh. This verse further emphasizes the close relationship between the Levitical priesthood and the people of Yahweh.

The Levitical priesthood was not only the religious authority of the nation, but they were also the political and judicial authority as well. They were the judges, the scribes, and the interpreters of the law. This gave them a great deal of power and influence.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the worship of Yahweh. They were the ones who offered sacrifices, burned incense, and prayed for the nation. They were the ones who interpreted the will of Yahweh to the people.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the education of the people. They were the ones who taught the people the law of Yahweh. They were the ones who interpreted the law to the people.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the administration of justice. They were the ones who judged the people. They were the ones who interpreted the law to the people.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the construction of the temple. They were the ones who built the temple.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the celebration of the festivals. They were the ones who organized and supervised the festivals.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the preservation of the law. They were the ones who recorded and preserved the law.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the protection of the temple. They were the ones who guarded the temple.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the education of the priests. They were the ones who taught the priests the law of Yahweh.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the administration of the temple. They were the ones who managed the temple.

The Levitical priesthood was also responsible for the administration of the priests. They were the ones who managed the priests.
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David's rule played an important role. It was according to the will of Yehwol. The Levitical cities played menorah to be seen as one expression of theocracy.

Turning to the reign of Jeroboam I, it should be noted that his first choice as capital was the ancient city of Shechem. In Kings 12:6, it appears that he began to rebuild it to return it to Moses' time (where the word "shechem" is used). It seems as if he intended to make it the capital of his kingdom. Jeroboam's intention to make Shechem the capital of Israel never materialized. The excavations at the Baalat-Shechem, show that the place was an insignificant village before Jeroboam's time. There are no remains of a city until the tenth century BC. Thus when Kings 12:28 continues saying that Jeroboam marched to Shechem, Shechem, Penuel in Transjordan and built a temple, it may mean that there was no time to build up or fortify Shechem. Because of its political situation, Penuel may have been a temporary place of refuge for the new government. According to 1 Kings 15:6, there was an almost permanent site in the area between Judah and Israel. This was the town of Machaerus, which Jeroboam of Judah chose as a more secure and distant place from the battles with Judah. Jeroboam could better organize his army and government apparatus. Moreover, Penuel was not too far from the Transjordanian tribes of the West.

A second and perhaps even more important reason why Penuel was chosen as a capital was that the Egyptians had to take control of all Palestine. This may have been to a large extent due to the establishment of the Syro-Palestinian Federation which was a major event in the history of the region. Jeroboam did not have the resources to take Shechem, and there was no time to build up his capital. This was because he was aware of the Egyptian army. Thus, in order to avoid a battle with the Egyptians, he left for Penuel and Machaerus.
As far as we know, the Roman campaign did not result in any lasting and possession. No text, as to whether the Palestinian states were reduced or became vassal states. It is possible, though, that the territories of Judah were divided or that Rome maintained a presence in the region. The exact location of Jerusalem and its relative size is not known. What we do know is that a site of Jerusalem was described by Josephus as a city that was occupied by the Romans in the first century AD.

According to the text, when Israel declared its independence, priests and Levites shared the same role. The Levites were responsible for maintaining the religious practices and rituals of the people. The priests, on the other hand, were involved in the offering of sacrifices and the administration of the temple. The priests were also responsible for maintaining the purity of the temple and its surroundings.

In addition to the priests and Levites, the text also mentions the presence of a Levite named Hillel. Hillel was a prominent figure in the history of the Jewish people, and his influence extended beyond his own lifetime. He is credited with compiling the Mishnah, the first written law code of the Jewish people. The text suggests that Hillel was a man of great wisdom and learning, and his influence extended far beyond his own lifetime.

In the context of the text, the priests and Levites played a vital role in maintaining the religious practices and rituals of the ancient Israelites. Their role was not only to perform the daily sacrifices and offerings but also to maintain the purity of the temple and its surroundings. The priests were responsible for the administration of the temple, while the Levites were responsible for maintaining the religious practices and rituals of the people.

The significance of the priests and Levites in the history of the ancient Israelites cannot be overstated. Their role was not only to perform the daily sacrifices and offerings but also to maintain the purity of the temple and its surroundings. The priests were responsible for the administration of the temple, while the Levites were responsible for maintaining the religious practices and rituals of the people. The influence of Hillel, a prominent figure in Jewish history, extended far beyond his own lifetime and continues to this day.
the capital, Bethel, a sanctuary to place in the land. Bethel was a natural choice to Jerusalem because it had been an ancient city long before Jerusalem came into prominence. Bethel was not Jerusalem's primary center because it was not in the northern part of the land. Bethel did not become a national sanctuary because it was the same city where the Ark of the Covenant was located. The Ark was in Jerusalem, and Bethel was not a religious center.

The location of Bethel is significant in understanding the importance of the city. Bethel was the capital of the northern kingdom. However, Jerusalem was the capital of the southern kingdom. The two kingdoms were in constant conflict. Jerusalem was the capital of the southern kingdom. Bethel was located in the south, near the borders of the new kingdom, and thus could be easily accessed by both the northern and southern kingdoms. The location of Bethel made it a strategic location for religious and political purposes.

To determine the significance of Bethel in the new kingdom, one could ask whether it was the capital of the northern kingdom or a central religious site. In other words, was Bethel the place where the Ark of the Covenant was located? Was it a religious center? These questions are important because they help us understand the role of Bethel in the new kingdom. The answers to these questions can shed light on the religious and political dynamics of the time.
efficient administration. From 1 Kings 11:28 we learn that Jeroboam had been one of Solomon's chief administrators. As such he was in charge of the House of Joseph, and occupied one of the most prominent positions in the northern part of the nation, the part which later became his kingdom. Consequently he was well acquainted with the districts, their functions, and the regal offices of the officials. It should not be assumed that the division of the organization ceased the function when Solomon ruled and the united monarchy was over. Thus Jeroboam had an organizational task to perform. This task he did not mean to perform without the risk of a new act. One thing that Jeroboam had done after Hezekiah's death to create an official center at the new capital was to dominate a palace on the place where the king's seat used to be. This palace was naturally refurbished after the final festivity at Jerusalem in 1 Kings 11:35. It is a possibility that Jeroboam intended to make Bethel the capital of an independent and strategically valuable kingdom.

Bethel never kept its status as a capital place. Israelites came from Amos 7:13, where it is not possible to place the prophet Amos that it was a place of religious services at Bethel, because of a king's sanctuary. Although Jehu, the prophet in 2 Kings 3:11, who was not in Israel's sight, threatened the temple of the king, the cultic process at Bethel was not officiate. This testament was natural pattern. After the final festivity at Jerusalem in 1 Kings 11:35 it is a possibility that Jeroboam intended to make Bethel the capital of an independent and strategically valuable kingdom.

The word new here in these verses may not be exact. Words such as אֶלָּה do not necessarily designate both royal properties and a center where they played an important role, as in 2 Kings 11. The other verse הַרְפָּעֵה יִסְפָּר may refer to other sanctuaries that he kept to the nation's local religion and was, as such, one of the royal administrative system. The sar,
narratives mentioned in Kings 12:3 and 2 Kings 23:9 may be examples of the second category. They are called 'bānāmī' by the later writers of the book. It should be noted that the latter passage mentions that the kings established bānāmī in their kingdom. These were sanctuaries of the kingdom.

The characteristic given to Bethel in Amos 7:3 shows that it was a temple of higher rank than any other in Israel, comparable with the sanctuary of the royal establishment in Samaria. As usual in the narratives, the prophet is the central figure. The interest of Israel is attested, but it is not dominant. Thus, Jeroboam I and the bānāmī are pictured as religious centers. However, the destructive power of God is evident, as He addresses the destructive nature of the temple. The temple was not expected to be a center for the government's religious affairs. The temple was a place for religious activity, and its prominence in the national scene was centered in the capital. Jeroboam I's replacement as a national cult place was very strong and continued to be so even after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. This is shown by the fact that the Assyrian king, who sentenced Jeroboam, was not sent to execute him. The temple was no longer a center for the nation's affairs. The destruction of the temple was carried out efficiently, according to the national instruction.

It should be noted that Jeroboam I erected a bānāmī in 2 Kings 11:15. This text states that Jeroboam I was able to erect a bānāmī in the temple of the Lord. The Hebrew text, however, does not support this. It was not mentioned in the destroyed temple. The Hebrew text, however, does not support this. It was not mentioned in the destroyed temple. The reason why the word bānāmī is used in this text is the belief that the writer who wrote Jeroboam I's history was the same as the writer who wrote 1 Kings. The religious and political activities required only...
one Yarwch temple as least rate Jerusalem. Thus the used as our devastating term for Beth is temple. No longer a sacred place. Beth had nothing more than one among many cult places in the now cremating Assyrian period. However, as a part of Yarwch, Beth was part of the province of Samaria. It was still an important, if modest, Solomon temple for the zealous Jerusalemites.

From what has been said, it is probable that both Lalah and Samaria had a sanctuary or a temple in the axial area of the palace itself. Indeed, at some point Samaria may have rivaled Beth as a cult.
center. That a sanctuary existed there is indicated by Hosea’s above-mentioned reference to the calf of Samaria, which may be the prophet’s tendency to term it the ark at the establishment of the capital. Therefore this was once called “Sanctuary,” and the temple hadn’t been dedicated to the Lord in the time of David. The temple was not a major temple but should properly speak be viewed as a part of a sanctuary. It was a building that was dedicated by King Asa. It had been a temple of Jehovah but with the addition of a sacred courtyard. This means that here may have been an officialical worship service in the city. Indeed, it is clear that the temple was not a national temple but a place of worship. As a result, the temple was not a national temple but a place of worship.

We can see very little about the temple itself, but the northern kingdom of Israel had its own temple. Because of its ideological orientation, the temple was not to be compared with other temples. As a result,
away from Yahweh of Jerusalem and the Davidic dynasties, the northern kingdom should not have existed. Indeed, from the narrator's viewpoint, the northern kingdom was to do only what was evil in the eyes of Yahweh.

One may assume, however, that the district organization Jeroboam I intended, and the administrative apparatus he must have instituted, continued with perhaps some necessary adjustments in connection with Ahab for example, we learn about the governors of the districts (1 Kings 22:49). That the kings were the masters of the nation's military affairs is evident from the reports of Amos and Hosea. Ahab and Jeroboam II not only did Ahab have the above-named temple built for the worship of the Lord, but he also erected a stele at Hazor in Samaria (2 Kings 3:27). That his son Joash erected it may be seen as a reaction against a god who was not originally part of the national religion of the country. If so, this stele may have been a symbol for the Israelites. Jeroboam II's removal of his stele may indicate that he was not made a traditional god in his domain by the forces to support the queen mother's activities as regards matters.

Joash's slaughter of Yahweh's priests and the priests of the Tobian Baal cult (2 Kings 11) reveals that his revolt was basically political and did not reflect any religious issues. Joash's first establishment as king in the kingdom was only the beginning of his dominance over a people who were already aware of it. In this way, the anti-Assyrian politics of Israel were terminated. The anti-Assyrian policy was part of the nation's desire to have political stability and security. Joash's policies were in line with his predecessor, Jehu, who faced the same political situation. He was not only a military leader but also a religious figure. He played a significant role in the spiritual and political life of Israel. He was not afraid to annnounce the death of the king from Jerusalem. This was a bold step for a time when the Israelite kingdom was in a state of flux.

Concerning Jehu, the biblical writers considered the earth as a battle of the Judean kings and Israel's Josiah to be in harmony with their
Ideas 1 Kings 5:15-17 2 Chr. 14:17 Both kings attempted to put an end to cultic prostitution in the country and in Jerusalem. However, because they were banned for not having stopped the cult of the baalot, their "temple" cannot be seen as part of a contemporaneous movement to return to the national cult of Yahweh. No thought has yet been given to the idea of cult centralization in Jerusalem. The conclusion one can draw from the biblical texts is that both kings certainly made changes in cultic affairs and because the later writers appreciated these actions they were seen as examples of temple reforms

According to 2 Kings 12:5-17 2 Chr. 24:4-11, king Josiah of Judah who ascended the throne after the reign of Ahaziah, tried to collect money in order to restore the temple of Yahweh. Although he ordered the high priest Jehoiada to send priests and Levites to the cities of the nation to collect money for the work, 2 Chr. 24:4ff. The project was obviously hindered by Jehoram for 22 years. 2 Kings 12:7. After a revocation by the king, however, he made a great effort to which all the money brought to the temple was deposited and work began. The reign of queen Athaliah is viewed in this context of respect of the temple in certain and in some ways it was natural. She was more interested in her own newly built temple for the Syrian Baal. For example, according to 2 Chr. 24:8 the queen Athaliah (Ithael) may refer to her servants as well. It is said to have broken into the temple of Yahweh and taken vessels from it. For this, the new Baal temple was

Two things would be nice. First, that the temple was not held in great reverence to collect money in the temple indicates that it was not in a bad state of repair. Second, as long as the priest lived, the king did "what was right in the eyes of Yahweh." When the priest died, however, Josiah is said to have observed other gods. It is also said that he took money from the temple in order to pay tribute to the Assyrians. This is given as an excuse for his murder. 2 Chr. 24:17-25 89 According to the Chronister, the king 2 Chr. 24:18-19, 100 who should be the king, but the tribe in verse 19:7 when Jerusalem was taken. 2 Chr. 24:20 I do not have the information about Jehoram's death
torted to reflect the writer's preconceived idea of what should have taken place.

The Chrismarter's version of the reign of king Uzziah of Judean should be noted. It is the positive aspects of a king's reign that determine how he is evaluated and how the material is arranged. Thus the Chrismarter fails Uzziah as one of the most successful kings of Judean. He was both a warrior and a builder. According to the narrator, however, because he became great, he was forced to be something wrong. Therefore, it is said that this year grew large destruction, and that he was a co to Yahweh. The only sin the narrator can pin on the king is that he burned incense to Yahweh in the temple of incense. However, this may be the Chrismarter's writing in a time when there was no king in Judean and when the tensions between Judah and Israel were a thing of the past. Since the Chrismarter was a representative of a deaened and reserpent view of the past, it is necessary to consider the sacrifice and its sacrifice is but a poor excuse for the king's sin. Kings were heads of state and as such they were leaders of the national religion and they could influence the religious system (see S. David and, Jeroboam). They did also make changes in the religious system and appoint the priests of the national sanctuaries. God, as the one-officer of this nation, appointed them to set the law in place. In this case, however, it could not do it because he had become the people's other words, he was truly the cas.

Administrative and cultic reforms

King Uzziah was not known for his drastic changes he made in cultic matters. According to Kings 18:4, he removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent. He also removed the holy of the kingdom of Judean, the temple court of the altar, and smote the bronze serpent.
that here has been nothing like this in Jerusalem since Solomon’s time, 

The high places are the national shrines of the country. Just as king Josiah later removed the high places which were in the province of Samaria and which I Kings 13:10 states were built in the cities by the kings of Israel so too the high places removed by Hezekiah were the same shrines. The mention here of the house of God as the only place of sacrifice is a new feature in the text under every green sea area in the valleys until now was common elsewhere. W

What happened these high places. According to 2 Kings 23:12 a lot of royal and temple food was wasted and abhorred in the sight of the Lord. How is an example of this. The high places were not destroyed. They were removed (swapped) and abandoned. It may be that Hezekiah changed the function of these high places to that of cultic worship and its associated activities. In Hezekiah’s time it was stopped at these places and the temple was the only place for sacrificial activities. But in Manasseh’s time there was an effort to return to Manasseh’s ways. However, 2 Kings 18:21 says that during the time of Manasses the people again sacrificed at the high places. It means that the official Yahwist cult of Josiah was once again registered at the Jerusalem temple. 

What happened to Hezekiah is not known but with a large town there has been placed some evidence for the presence of a royal building activity. It is, however, seen as part of a larger period of larger saw in the Assyrians. It has been held that the support of Egypt was worked for an alliance against the Assyrians in continuing everything to the capital of Assyria.
2 Chr 31:1ff. He distributed the goods to the priests and the Levites of the cities of Jerusalem. 2 Chr 31:14ff. One should thus not underestimate the role economy played in Hezekiah's reform program. In order to efficiently supply the cult with the national sanctuaries and their economic importance, the king had to organize their divine symbols, the masch'hit and the 'abir'im. In this way he made it impossible to carry out further rites as well as collecting tithe at these places. 111

From a religious-political point of view several of Hezekiah's counter measures could maintain that the termination of the official cult at the house of Yahweh was a disastrous move 112 since it decreased the power of the god of the nation. Yahweh, and thus the power of the nation itself. According to Norbr. thinking, the king's action undermined his own position. He should have kept in mind when dealing with the reign of king Manasseh who revered his father's policies.113 This interpretation is supported by the information given in 2 Kings 18:22 and Isa 36:7. Here is a special reference to the people of Jerusalem (most of them were undoubtedly Jews) in Assyrian official, rabbō' qērā, mentions that Hezekiah's appointment of the tamóz and altars of Yahweh had a negative effect. It became clear how a new apes upon Yahweh since his power no longer relied on his people. As we know, Hezekiah's policies also led the conquering host of the Philistines to destroy Most of the territory of Judah was given over to the Philistines in 547 BC.

---

1 The phrase קִבְלֵזָה יְהֹוָה יִתְנַח with the stress at the end of the temple the liturgy. It is found in parallelism with קִבְלֵזָה יְהֹוָה יִתְנַח and were related to monuments. Concerning the reasons for its omission, see H. Wolff, DS 86: 94 ff. 18. 1. Is q. 132:8. 19. In my day 8 C. 9. 20. 114. 115. Concerning the connection between the king's actions and the Nabordian rebellion, see W. J. E. H. Wolff, DS 86: 94 ff. 18. 1. Is q. 132:8. 116. Concerning the connection between the king's actions and the Nabordian rebellion, see W. J. E. H. Wolff, DS 86: 94 ff. 18. 1. Is q. 132:8.
The fact that the rabshaq spoke Hebrew may indicate that he was an Israelite by birth. The aim of his words was to encourage criticism and opposition to Hezekiah’s actions. Indeed, to a great many people Hezekiah’s actions against their cult places may have been impossible to comprehend. From the rabshaq’s speech it is evident that the hamor and altars did by the reform were seen as legitimate Yahweh cult places. Further, they were not identical phenomena. Opposition to these arose at a later time and came from a group that had accepted and also propagated the idea of only one Yahweh cult place.

The reforms of Hezekiah seem to have been repeated by king Josiah. Both did something to the hamor, both destroyed the altars, and both inaugurated a new festival in the spring. Josiah is said to have made a passover the likes of which had not been celebrated since the days of the Judges. It was held for the first time in the king’s 8th year 2 Kings 23:22. Because the narratives in 2 Kings 18 and 23 are similar, it is difficult to establish what exactly happened.

One difference should however be pointed out immediately: Josiah is not said to have “removed” the hamor of Judah. He is said to have “destroyed” it (2 Kings 23:19) the hamor of the cities 23:23 because it was burned there to Baal and the constrictions, i.e. the heavenly host. Moreover, he deposed those priests who fulfilled this function, namely the yeled. Thus, a certain pash 1 priests was dismissed. 2 Kings 23:18 reveals that other priests were not completely put to of business. This verse states that the hamor priests could not “go to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem unless they had eaten unleavened bread among their brethren.” The phrase נָקְדִּישֵׁהוּ gives the condition under which they were permitted to officiate at the

116 See Chapter A
117 The title of the chapter is taken from a line in Isaiah 2:4, which reads, “There will be no more mountain of holiness...”
118 2 Kings 18:21
119 2 Kings 23:22
120 2 Kings 23:23
121 See W. B. Hartnack, The Spirit BM, in the Old Testament pp. 115
122 This verse does not mean that the covenant was not broken by his ancestors but that it was not broken by him.
123 C. B. S. Keil, "Hebrew and the Spirit BM, in the Old Testament pp. 159
124 See W. B. Hartnack, The Spirit BM, in the Old Testament pp. 115
125 C. B. S. Keil, "Hebrew and the Spirit BM, in the Old Testament pp. 159
altar of the temple of Jerusalem. From this W B. Barrick concluded that the
barnor priests were put "under the control of the Temple priesthood at
Jerusalem."

By changing the status of the national cult places the bamar in a disreputa-
sing position and by substituting the rest of the priesthood to more direct
Jerusalemite temple control, the supervision of the affairs was re-
tpleted. If this story is accurate the Jerusalemite priesthood gained the upper-
hand in the struggles between different priestly classes. This may be what
started the so-called Levite problem.

Not only did Josiah remove from the Jerusalem temple all the vessels
made for Asherah Baal and the constellations (the heavenly hosts) 2 Kin. 23:4,
but he also removed the images which the kings of Judah had placed in
the temple and he burned the pillars of the temple 2 Kin. 23:15. Further he
ordered the sacerdotal priests or at the temple of the Lord in addition to
the high priest (i.e. Yahweh Zebaoth) Asherai and the people had also worshiped the heavenly hosts.
The legend is thus of course that there was no heathen priest. This is a
purely speculative idea.

To conclude, as is usually done, that king Manasseh introduced foreign
cult phenomena and foreign gods while he was said to have been con-
trasted by Josiah is contrary to fact. The phrase "the wages of
Yahweh Zebaoth" (Yahweh of Hosts) shows that the people had worshiped the heavenly hosts at least for the time being. If one considers Josiah's view of the twenty-five priests warming the vestments of the inner court of the temple 2 Kin.

193 1Par. 17:15
194 2Par. 33:17
195 The Hebrews were governed in a prophetic and not in a secular
manner.

208 Then and now there seems to be a conflict. The status of the Levites is no longer what it was in ancient times. The Levites are no longer the priestly caste that they were in ancient times. The Israelites had known of the Deuteronomic Law for many years. This has had a great influence on the worship and structure of the temple.

208 Because the Levites make war and are hated and kill, but Yahweh
did not punish them because of the sin and made war against them but they
happened.

209 A great time goes for peace among men.
that the worship of the sun was reinstalled after Josiah’s death. Ezekiel 8:19. On the other hand it may be maintained that even if Josiah rejected all the symbols of the sun the people in any case may still have included a priestess of the sun which the priestess as was identified with Yahweh. 10

As was mentioned above Josiah did not enter the bounds of Judah but by the “temple of God” or the “house of the nation’s God” establishment. They were perhaps more likely to be carried from a way. Certain rituals were abandoned and the priests and temple were confirmed. It was however certain that all the seats and persons read the song, but not in the earliest period. This was the house of the Lord which was located at the entrance of the gate of Jerusalem the commander of the city to the east of the city gate. 2 Kings 23:8. It was true that this refers to the gate. It has been identified as Jerusalem. 10 However the sentence רְשָׁעָה רֵעֵץ וַיִּרְדֶּשׁ, and the priests down the hall may refer to Beer-Sheba. This was pointed by 2 Chr. 24 where Josiah’s story is compared. These were the sons of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Benjamin and in the days that Beer-Sheba was the capital Jerusalem was not well. But we are told the other cities were well. Josiah’s story is told in this passage. Thus we know that Beer-Sheba was also a center of religious place or the people in the north of the northern kingdom. Correcting this with the fact that Josiah destroyed the sanctuaries of the former kingdom and knew the Assyrian power of Samaria it may be concluded that everything associated with the temple as opposed to the temple which was not associated with the temple as opposed to the temple. Josiah’s story was suspect in the eyes of the people. It had to be trusted. Thus the above narrative was preserved at Beer-Sheba were not to be associated with Yahweh.
because they were placed on the border between Israel and Judah, according to 2 Kings 15:22. These cities were part of the northern kingdom of Israel. The purpose of these cities was to protect the border from foreign invasions.

In principle, a king could not simply order these cities to be destroyed. This would require the consent of the people who lived there. This reflects the importance of maintaining a balance between the authority of the king and the rights of the subjects.

In conclusion, the destruction of these cities was not justified by the actions of the kings. The sin of the people is reflected in the actions of the kings. The destruction of these cities was a tragic consequence of human sin and the struggles for power and control.

9 See, for example, 1 Kings 10:14; 2 Kings 4:24; 2 Chronicles 11:5. These cities were important in the history of Israel and Judah. They were used as military fortresses and as centers of political power.

10 See, for example, 2 Kings 10:29; 1 Kings 12:29. These cities were destroyed as a result of foreign invasions and internal conflicts. The destruction of these cities was a tragic consequence of human sin and the struggles for power and control.

11 See, for example, 2 Kings 10:29; 1 Kings 12:29. These cities were destroyed as a result of foreign invasions and internal conflicts. The destruction of these cities was a tragic consequence of human sin and the struggles for power and control.
Josiah did not attempt to stop a rival. Yet he cut over which Jerusalem had no other power nor influence. His expedition to the north was punitive. No one mentions that Josiah reorganized the province as a part of his nation. Indeed, the historian would not have forgotten to record such an event, when it happened, would have been completely in one with his goals. If Josiah ever contemplated a campaign like that, it never came about. His annals do not contain a such plan. There is, perhaps, one indication that Josiah tried to extend his territory. If the fortress of Mesad Hashavaya (Monet Rabbah), a cert in south of Yavne Yam, was part of Josiah's defense system, it has yet to be maintained. The king was successful in extending Josiah's territory to the west at least.

The Old Testament presents as the literary phenomenon of the written document: "the law book." And in the language, 2 Kings 22:8 should be seen as a narrative construction that conceals the fact that the king himself took the initiative for the reconstruction. Indeed, through his temple restoration, he inaugurated the Law of the "law book." He is the one who gave instructions about what should be taken. In principle, any king could have had his command directed to take certain actions. As the god's revealer and caretaker, he was the one who revealed the will of God.

Nevertheless, because the narrator of 2 Kings 22 was against any close relation between God and king that was not sanctified by a priest or a prophet, it was necessary to give the reorganization divine authority via a mysterious reference. This is the role that the prophetess Huldah (2 Kings 22:20) played. There is an apparent contradiction in the text. The king, by himself, had given the king authorization to be revealed himself. There are, however, in the text and in the context, the king and his successor that with the help of Josiah and his successor, the king's realm is certain, now a part of the edict's text. 2 Kings 22:17 This account be
assumption that Josiah had already begun some some administrative reforms.

Consequently, the law book seems to have been a sort of container containing divine commands. Indeed, when the will of the deity was revealed through these writings, a Beinisch maintained that the phrase "I have given the law book in the temple of Yahweh" (King 2:34) is a formula used to give the highest authority to an undertaking. He points to the Egyptian parallel, a new letter text found at the feet of the god Thoth in his temple at Hermopolis. The text asserted the character of divine revelation. It mentions the instance of the writing on the wall that was usually given an archaic character.

As to the authenticity of the law book, the opinions of A.R. Schenscher would be noted. He states that nowhere in the textual material are there any hints that the temple was in such a deplorable state of repair that it needed to be renovated at the point in time. Rather, he points out that every such book contains elements that disappeared in ancient times and that its content and context were thought of especially when dealing with textual and social issues. People must have learned the type of material by the story that was preserved in early manuscripts while standing or while being channel by some ritual process. This indicates that there ever had been such a law book, which had disappeared, but would not have been difficult to reconstruct.

Neither's arguments are valid. It seems that there was still the reality behind the story. Perhaps, there is evidence that Josiah's so-called law book was a product of an oral tradition, probably that from his own era, to keep a book alive. In order to give the kings a valid authority for their actions, perhaps the raw text was written in a hieroglyphic pattern.

Very little is known about the administration of the kings who followed.
After his death the state may have changed and the religious life have changed in different forms. This can be concluded from the state mentioned above. Josiah's two sons Jehoahaz and Jehonadab. The narrator's source for these events is Deuteronomistic kil (SVT XXIV, Leiden 1971).

Special attention should be paid to the information given in 2 Chr. 33:14-17. A good example of royal activity in concluding the organization of a nation and its religion. For this passage, as well as for most of the biblical traditions about the Manasseh regime, we learn that king Manasseh does not rate very highly in the eyes of the narrators, cf. 2 Kings 21:1-2. As a matter of fact, he is described as a more evil than most others, 2 Kings 21:11f. and Chr 33:11. Taking into account the religious zeal of the narrator and their goals, it is not astonishing that Manasseh is pictured as one of the worst kings of Judah. What is remarkable is that most modern scholars have written off as accepted as historically, the biblical opinion about Manasseh. On the contrary, he accosts him as one being who goes arrogantly and is a phenomenon in Judah who inaugurating a period of rampant syncretism. It is a fascinating picture to say the least.

A more realistic portrayal of Manasseh can be found in an analysis of 2 Chr 33:14-17. This passage states that he was taken as a captive in Babylon. Upon his release and subsequent return to Jerusalem, he fortified...
the capital, and put "commanders of the armed forces in all fortified cities of Judah." The (chronicles) dates that he "took away the images of gods and the gods" 3 (a Judean god image) 4 from the Jerusalem temple, and he removed all the altars Solomon had built on the mountain of the temple of Yahweh and in Jerusalem. 5 Although the chronicle compares that the people were still sacrificing in the same places, 6 he adds the qualifier that they were only worshiped Yahweh there.

From this, we can only make a complete inventory of the altars, but we see he strengthened his defenses but that he
carried out a similar reorganisation around the same time. Here one should ask whether a connection exists between strengthening the defense system and the reorganization mentioned above. But attempting to answer this question, one must note that the fact is that the defense system, besides its military role, is also a complex of economic and administrative activities. It is evident that a change in the defense system and the reorganization mentioned above have been undertaken in connection with the need to strengthen the economic and administrative activities of the region as a whole. Therefore, it is not clear whether a reorganization of the defense system is a consequence of a change in foreign policy. The solution to this question must be sought in the complex idea of the region as a natural economic phenomenon, as well as in the complex idea of the region as a political-economic unit.

The text mentions that Manasseh is described as an efficient and capable monarch, the fact that he is described as such does not mean that the region was always peaceful and prosperous. The text also states that Manasseh was known for his military campaigns, and that he was able to maintain a large and powerful army. However, it is also noted that Manasseh was not always successful in his military campaigns, and that he was often forced to retreat. The text further states that Manasseh was a skilled politician, and that he was able to keep the peace for a long time.

Several references are made to other texts and authors, such as the book of Joshua, which mentions Manasseh in several places, and the works of other biblical scholars, such as Dr. Smith and Dr. Jones. The text also refers to the great king Hezekiah, and the prophet Isaiah, as well as to the region of Ashdod, which is mentioned in several places in the text. The text concludes by stating that Manasseh was a skilled and effective monarch, who was able to maintain a large and powerful army, and who was able to keep the peace for a long time, despite the challenges he faced.
return to these territories or a part of them. Meanwhile, however, the territory of Manasseh's restoration had been extended by an act of incorporation of those cities and lands that had been under the jurisdiction of Judah. This was accomplished by a formal act at Jerusalem, where troops and civil servants were dispatched to recover the territories lost.

The same was true of the territories that were lost to Benjamin. The task of reestablishing these lost territories was assigned to a group of men who were appointed to the task of recovering them. This group was composed of men who were skilled in military operations and were familiar with the terrain.

In the words of Nehemiah, who was instrumental in the reestablishment of these territories, "I set to work to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, because they had been torn down." (Nehemiah 2:17)

The people of Jerusalem were encouraged by the presence of Nehemiah and the other leaders who were involved in the reestablishment of the city. They worked tirelessly to rebuild the walls and gates of Jerusalem, and by the time Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem, the walls were almost complete.

Nehemiah's success in rebuilding the city was a testament to the determination and courage of the people of Jerusalem. The story of Nehemiah's work is one of inspiration and hope, as it shows that even in the face of great adversity, it is possible to overcome obstacles and rebuild what has been lost.
who escaped the war may have settled close to the new Jerusalem thus restoring subjects at the king of Judah. This may then be the beginning of the ministry of the second city that is mentioned in 2 Kings 15:14 and 16:1.

It is possible that Manasseh's wall was joined up with the one that his father Hezekiah had built outside "seen" the old city. 2 Chr 32:5. Hezekiah's wall may be the great wall referred to in a note that was unearthed on the Western Hill in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of modern Jerusalem. It is conceivable that the wall was on the southernmost side of the city, allowing the Jerusalem of Hezekiah's time to have been made possible in the 12th century BC. Manasseh's wall was connected with this wall. Hezekiah's wall had been made into a fortress.

Other fortifications were made after his death with Menashe. 2 Kings 20:18. This is an account made by 1 Peter 1:12 of the strength Hezekiah may have been able to instill in his cities. Manasseh retrieved the fortress situated by this king may very well have been under use around 625 BC. Having been now able to Asaian vessels to be inaugurated may be seen as a result of this activity.

In making Manasseh the wall that built for his city in the 12th century, the city appears as an example of the ancient Near Eastern society where a deity's display of his power to destroy the nation. He is to be seen, however, who the name was placed on Manasseh.
who after all 'converted' to Yahweh according to the Chronicler 2 Chr 33:12-13. Indeed one may ask why the blame was not leveled against Jehoshaphat.

We can attribute the unflattering evaluation of Manasseh given by the narrators of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles to the fact that he abandoned the policies of his father Hezekiah, a king whose works harmonized well with the narrator's own theology. According to the standards of their time, Hezekiah's reform was the best against which the religious custodians of the present era were to be evaluated. In Manasseh's case, however, the policies of Hezekiah had led the country to the brink of disaster. Therefore Manasseh's religious reform may have been nothing more than a return to the religious situation that existed before Hezekiah's innovations. 2 Kings 21:3 may thus be the narrator's personal view of Manasseh's cultic restoration program. If the above interpretation is correct, Manasseh cannot be called an apostate as may scholars prefer to label him. He was rather a traditionalist in religious matters, and as such he came into conflict with those groups who advocated the changes ideas and the moral impurity in many of his parents' days. Therefore, Manasseh had to neutralize these elements, they may be seen as enemies of the state.

This example from Manasseh's reign shows how intimately interwoven religion and state were. The king, as head of state, was also the head of the national religion as God's vicar. Fortress cities, fortresses, store cities

15 B. Malitz, Judges for Manasseh, in the Journal for the Defence and Promotion of Biblical Research, ed. by A. J. McKnight and D. W. A. Waddington (New York: American Bible Society), 1978, pp. 411-412. In his study of Manasseh's life, he states, "It is clear that Manasseh was not a typical Judahite, but rather a typical Israelite. He was a man of war, a warrior of the warrior class."


monarchy. That would have been understood as heaven in the care and as such come to present. That they were certainly keeping a period when there was no Judaean king there. And men who write I Kings, in using the history of Israel and Judah, and said again, by the king, quite even. III Kings the picture has been prospected and pressed together more. much by accidents in people who were consistently in tune with a particular view and thought the act which supported that view worth preserving. What comfort London 96 p 11
APPENDIX

It has been advocated on textual grounds that sanctuaries called בּאֶדֶת existed in many, if not all, of the Israelite and Judahite cities. That so few of these sanctuaries have been uncovered may be due to the fact that a tell is seldom completely excavated or many have not been dug at all. Moreover, some buildings may have been of too small extent. The number of sanctuaries may, however, be increased if the so-called "tells" found at Tell ed-Duweir and Kuntillet Ajrud are taken into account and there may have been more of this kind. Such a conclusion could also be drawn from 2 Kings 23:8, where a cult room may have existed inside the entrance of a fortress or in close connection with a city gate. In this connection the structure in the gate of Israelite Dan is illustrative. It has been identified as a "base for a throne" or a "portico." Perhaps this space served the dual purpose of cult room and meeting place at the entrance of the city, a place where both residents and visiting kings might meet. It has been suggested that benches were deposited in the benches where priests, who were Levites, may have officiated. These separate sanctuary buildings were not necessary everywhere. Whether these structures were part of business with the entrance of kings or acts of worship, they were not needed. In considering the fact that over half of the cities had been destroyed throughout the country, we may conclude that these benches did not exist for a purpose.

One more observation that we must make is that a place of worship may be made if one considers the Iron Age II, and another, the places that have been found in the so-called "Iron Age Palestine," one is struck by the great amount found in Jerusalem as compared with other sites. Thus, Jerusalem has contributed (up to 979) a total of 1303 figurines. These include 129 "pillar" figurines, 119 horse and rider figurines, and 258 animal figurines. Samaria has a total of 59 and 247; Bethel (Beit Alpha) has a total of 87; Hazor 44 (1309); Jerusalem's statuettes to the symbols of horses,

4. Bats, "Tel Dan," BA 37:74, pp. 45-47. For a possible "cult-installation" under Hazael, see 2 Kings 13:16-21. The text is difficult to read, but it is clearly mentioned in 2 Kings 23:8. It was destroyed by King Josiah. Thus, it must be considered a special case.

5. See the statistics in A. Headland, "A Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines," JCS 3:3 (1958), pp. 35-38. Concerning the figurines found in Jerusalem, it should be noted that Cave 1, the eastern
buls and nude women seems to be late pronounced and must be consi-
idered in any treatment of the reasons of Israel and Judah. Moral figures
for example are the same conceived in Jerusalem than in any
other place. Regarding the power against the Jews over the kingdom
of Israel found in both historical and prophetic books, one can't help
conclude that the picture drawn from such a source is even not reliable.
Furthermore the so called conservative Judaism which is
said to have predominated in Judah seems to have existed but in the
biblical writers' reconstruction of the history. How could it be possible
statement to maintain that all the reasons that have power over the
people are not connected with the reason about the
nation? We know for it that about the nation was built up those of the
Sons of the fatherless and orphans and all the other customs of the
Jewish nation. This comparison is proper to argue and the set that repel us must resist.
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