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Summary (Abstract).

This thesis sets out to determine the nature of the syncretism which characterises the early history of Israelite religion.

It begins (ch. 1) with an examination of the chief West Semitic goddesses, and comes to the view that it is in the goddess Ašerah and her relationship as consort to both Yahweh and El in different parts of the Levant that we find our first clue suggesting the line that the enquiry should take.

Ašerah in South Arabia was a sun-goddess, and the motif of the divine marriage is examined (ch. 2), in which it appears that in Ugarit too she retains vestiges of her original solar character, and that in the Abraham and Hagar narrative (Genesis 16) we have a debased form of the myth of the divine triad, in which the moon-god and sun-goddess become the parents of the deified planet Venus.

One of the Ugaritic texts, CTA 12, is then discussed further (ch. 3), its development into an atonement myth is examined, together with its connections with ancient Israelite atonement rites, and the possibility is explored that behind the traditions concerning Passover, the scapegoat rite, and the cult-legend of the Sinai theophany, we have an ancient lunar theology, suggesting that Yahweh himself may have had lunar connections, and that the chief 'patriarchal' deity (sc. El) certainly did.

This lunar hypothesis is tested (ch. 4) by an examination of various other theophany descriptions from the Old Testament. Many passages, in which Yahweh and El alternately appear to have been the original deity concerned, are found to contain elements which lend themselves to a lunar interpretation.

Various forms of El in the West Semitic world are then examined (ch. 5) and the case is presented for the likely nature of the god as
an ancient moon-god, albeit largely emancipated from this specific role in most areas from an early time. Particular attention is paid to the so-called religion of the patriarchs, and in the treatment of 'the god of the fathers', it is suggested that we have in the original formula a disguised reference to El.

The traditions concerning the origins of Yahwism are considered in ch. 6, in which the Kenite hypothesis is evaluated, and the etymological problems concerning the tetragrammaton are discussed. The original lunar nature of Yahweh is suggested as a reasonable interpretation of the evidence.

Ch. 7 discusses the interrelationship of the two gods on the basis of their similar nature in Judah and while noting their identification in the Jerusalem cult, suggests that the narrative of Genesis 3 preserves a hint of strong reservations in certain quarters. In ch. 8, a treatment of Hosea and such traditions as the golden calf and the Balaam oracles leads to the conclusion that in Israel it is El, not Ba'AL Hadad as commonly supposed, who is the great rival of Yahweh and whose cult is in fact the official religion of the northern kingdom, and that the original 'kerygma' of the exodus tradition regarded El as the god who saved his people from Egypt. This was then taken over by the Yahwist community in Israel.
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Note on spelling conventions.

To avoid pedantry, I have used conventional spellings of divine names and titles. They are as follows, with alternative forms in parenthesis.

- Anat (Anat, Anath).
- Ašerah ('Āšera, Asherah, Atīrat).
- Attar (Ashtar, Athtar).
- Attart (Astarte, Ashtart, 'Aṣart, Ashtoreth).
- Baal (Baal, Ba'lu).
- El ('Eil, 'Il, Il, Ilu).
- Ilyon (Ge'lyon).
- Ištar (Ishtar).
- Olem (Ge'lam).
- Shaddai (Šadday).
- Yahweh (YHWH, Jehovah, the Lord, etc., the vocalisation is of course conjectural).

I have not generally written the letter aleph where its presence is already clear, and I have left out the vowel length signs except where this is relevant to philological discussion. (e.g. Elohim for 'Elohim). Hebrew technical terms such as Piel, Hiphil etc., are written thus rather than as Pīl, Hīphīl, etc.
Introduction.

The scope of our discussion is a fairly narrow one - the determination of the significance of certain pieces of evidence from within the Old Testament tradition the importance of which it is my contention has not been sufficiently recognised. These concern the relationship of the two cults of El and Yahweh in the northern kingdom of Israel. It is generally agreed, as we shall see below, that in Judah the deities El Elyon and Yahweh were identified, perhaps from the time of David, and that this involved the absorption by the dominant Yahweh-cult of theological and traditional elements from the El-cult. In Israel however, it seems to me that we can make a case for the cult of El having been and remaining quite distinct from that of Yahweh.

In spite of the narrow scope, we cannot avoid dealing with areas of research which involve immense difficulties and cannot be said to have achieved any consensus in scholarly evaluation. Such areas are the historicity or other nature of the patriarchal traditions, the problem of the exodus, and the settlement of the Israelite tribes in Palestine. And these and many associated issues are in turn dependent to a large extent on such matters as the source-critical problem of the Pentateuch. In a sense we have in the whole field of Old Testament scholarship a skilful construction in which hypothesis is built on hypothesis. If the first principles be rejected, then we are faced with a collapsing house of cards.

However, the documentary hypothesis and its significance for Old Testament studies may be compared with the theory of evolution and its significance for animal sciences. It is at least a matter
of debate whether the process of evolution has ever been observed so far as fossil remains are concerned; rather we have in the fossil record a series of "stills" from which we can infer the "movie film" from which they seem to be excerpts. But the theory makes coherent sense of a mass of data which without it would defy analysis. The analogy cannot be pressed, of course, but the documentary hypothesis, for all the difficulties it raises, and for all the many instances in which it is not easy to be satisfied with its results, seems better than all alternative approaches to come to terms seriously with the whole array of questions which confront the enquirer in any serious approach to the Pentateuch. (As we shall note, recent discussion has led to considerable modification of some of the presuppositions and results of the hypothesis).

Likewise with regard to the associated problems we have mentioned, we shall try to base our approach on what seems in each instance to be the most coherent and comprehensive attitude to the problem in hand. Inevitably much of our discussion - like that in many of the works cited - can scarcely be susceptible of proof. However, it seems to me that I have been able to isolate and integrate into a reasonably coherent* framework certain traditions present in the Old Testament which have not hitherto been adequately explained.

* There is of course the danger of imposing a coherence from without. Cf. T.L.Thompson, HEN,7: "the primary test of our conclusions is not so much coherence as integrity, whether they correspond to or adequately explain the data given".
The Great West Semitic Goddesses

The three major goddesses, Anat, Astarte and Aserah, who appear in the West Semitic world all conform, more or less, to the pattern of 'mother goddess'. This has led at times to the view that they are identical. Morgenstern for instance states that 'the mother goddess was known most generally as Ishtar, Ashera or Astarte, all obviously one and the same name in varying dialectal forms'. His approach, in which the linguistic difficulties are ignored, is perhaps an extreme example, but the apparent interchangeability of Astart (as Astarot or Astoret) and Aserah in the Old Testament has led scholars to assume their identity in Israel, while in the Ugaritic material we may be witnessing the actual process of the fusion of Astart and Anat.

It seems appropriate to begin this study with an examination of each of these goddesses, since there is obviously a certain amount of confusion regarding their relationship, and we shall see in due course that there has been a corresponding failure to assess properly the character of Israelite syncretism.

a) Anat.

Aspelrud discusses several possible explanations of the name Anat, suggesting that it may mean 'destiny', 'providence', 'sign', or 'omen', or perhaps alludes to mourning or the singing of dirges, which is seen to be one of Anat's functions when she mourns Ba'al. But there is no evidence from the Ugaritic
material so far discovered which supports the former conjecture, while the latter may be secondary when compared with Anat's rather more obvious functions of love- and war-goddess. Albright considers the name to be an abbreviation of an original Canat-pane-Baal, meaning something like 'the turning of Baal's face', in the sense of the wrath of Baal; that is, a hypostasis of Baal himself. In view of Canat's independence from Baal, this seems unlikely. Three other possibilities, not hitherto discussed, seem to me to be more plausible.

1) The 'Consort'. There is a hapax legomenon occurring at Ex. 21. 10, meaning 'cohabitation'. North suggests that the term here refers to a woman's responsibility, i.e. her 'marriage duty'. This is in accordance with its classification by under 'to answer'. As alternatives North suggests 'to submit', i.e. submission in marriage and cohabitation, or again 'to dwell', in the extended sense of cohabitation. The first two suggestions from the form allow at least the possibility that the nominal would mean 'consort'. However, there is no evidence from Ugarit to support the idea.

ii) 'She of the well', or some such appellation. Cf. Ugaritic pl. meaning 'spring' or 'well'. If Anat is to be understood as of Semitic origin, then we can envisage a situation among pastoralists or bedouin in which the water-springs or the oases take on a tremendous importance as the source of life, the place where flocks and herds mate, and where skirmishes between rival groups, each eager to be first at the waters' side would be not infrequent.

iii) Astour's discussion of the etymology of the name Atargatis suggests another possibility. He takes the name to be derived
from West Semitic **Atar** > Aramaic **Atar** + **Atta** < **Anat** < **Ana**

'to crush, oppress', so that the name means 'Ašerah the oppressor'.

I disagree with the link with Ašerah that Astour sees here, because the theological justification he gives — that there is a semantic link with the treading and crushing of grapes, and grape-juice is referred to as blood — does not fit her. Furthermore, Derceto, whose he mentions, is more plausibly identifiable with Astarte< **Attart** than with Ašerah, and we shall see below that **Attart** and **Anat** are identified. And Astour's etymological linking of **Atar** and **Atar** is unconvincing. Herodotus refers to a town called **'Atar'pē'pg**<, of which the first part is taken by Godley to represent Aštar. Hathor makes a more likely trampler than Ašerah, and also shares this trait with **Anat**, while the etymological link between Aštar and Ašar looks convincing.

So I propose that the name Aštartis represents the fusion of Hathor and **CAnat**, while Astour's treatment of the morphology of **Atar** suggests that we interpret the name **CAnat** to mean 'the Crusher' or 'the Oppressor'.

So far as our evidence goes, **CAnat** is the least widely found of the three goddesses. She is of course most prominent in the AB cycle from Ugarit, where she is the consort of Ba'al and champions his cause over against the rest of the pantheon. Ba'Al is widely recognised to be something of an intruder at Ugarit, although he rises to supreme power, and the AB cycle is probably concerned in part to justify this development. While the gods at large are designated as 'the children of Ašerah' or 'the seventy sons of Ašerah', Ba'Al is called 'the son of Dagan'. Since the cult of Dagan is evidenced at Mari and
Tuttul on the upper shelves, perhaps Dam, and Ba'al with him, came to Ugarit in the context of some cultural/political take-over of the city (by Hurrians.) and with Ba'al came his consort Anat. The problem is that Anat is only referred to as regards her parentage, as a daughter of I (tr. Il ab y). \textsuperscript{19} This may however be simply a way of indicating the acceptance of the goddess into the pantheon. Indeed we may have the same parentage also attributed to Ba'al a couple of times. \textsuperscript{20} It appears that the title 'Dam's son' is a relic of a past age, fossilised in a stereotyped poetic formula; and perhaps Dagan too was tacitly understood to be a son of El if not El himself.

Rather surprisingly, Anat does not feature in Israelite religion. \textsuperscript{3} In all the tirades against cult-prostitution and sacroscopy from the pure worship of Yahweh, the only Canaanite goddesses named are Aserah and Attart. \textsuperscript{22} One of two developments may explain this; i, a normal procedure in the ancient world is for a son or other pretender usurping the father's position to take the father's wife/wives as his own. \textsuperscript{23} By taking over El's role as king of the gods, \textsuperscript{24} Ba'al quite possibly took over Aserah, El's wife, as his own. Thus Aserah and Anat might become identified. If the two standard cult objects of all Israelite sanctuaries, viz. a massebah and an aserah-pole, were understood to be the icons of Ba'al and Aserah respectively, then here we could see the identification in practice. However, two reservations must be made, firstly, such a take-over, understood by Pope for example as a deposition of El, \textsuperscript{25} is largely a matter of inference, and secondly, it is a matter for debate as to whether it is legitimate to extrapolate from the apparent situation in Ugarit a similar one in Israel, unless there is good evidence from the Israelite context.
ii) There is evidence of the beginning of an identification in Ugarit of Anat with Attart. The latter goddess in fact appears so rarely by herself that we may wonder, so far as textual evidence is concerned, whether she ever had any distinct cult of her own in Ugarit. Accordingly we shall deal with her mention in the Ugaritic texts here. There are four occasions on which she appears in the epic literature:

1) CTA 2 i 7, 8:

\[
\text{rîk} \, \text{c̱tṯrt} \, \text{(\"say bcl gdqdk\)}
\]

O Judge River, may Horon smash, yea Horon smash your head, Attart the Glory-of-Baal your pate! 27

Baal is speaking here and would most plausibly invoke his consort Anat here. 28

2) In the same episode we have a curious interruption of Ba'al's fight:

\[
\text{[ymnh } \text{c̱n]\t tuhḏ saalh } \text{c̱tṯrt } \, \text{(2 i 40)}
\]

Anat seizes his right hand, Attart his left....

Although most of the name of the first goddess is missing, and Ginsberg notes that either Anat or A'zerah (i.e. c̱tṯrt) might be restored, 29 in effect only the former is likely — a supposition which the example from the keret story (below) supports.

3) Again in the same episode Attart rebukes Ba'al (2 i 28), where it is most reasonable to see her as identical with Anat.

4) In CTA 14 i 145f., Hurriya the daughter of King Pabel is described thus:

\[
\text{(dk) } \text{ṉm } \text{c̱nt } \text{ṉm̱h}
\]

\[
\text{ka tsa } \text{c̱tṯrt } \text{ts[ah]}
\]

The beauty of Anat is her beauty, (and) as the loveliness of Attart is her loveliness.
thing pace Lapelrud, seems pretty obviously a case of what he calls 'identical parallelism', so that we are to see the same tacit identification as in ii). It is possible that CAttart had had a separate cult in Ugarit, which was wholly overwhelmed by the arrival with BaCal of OAnat. The relatively late Aqhat cycle (CTA 17-20) has been noted as being distinctive in that OAnat does not have there the intimate relationship she enjoys with BaCal elsewhere. It seems to me that we have here an example of assimilation: perhaps CAnat replaces CAttart in the text, having absorbed her cult. There is a remarkable parallel (even though with no exact points of contact) between OAnat’s words to Aqhat (CTA 17 vii.6ff., ANET 83ff.), and those of Istar to Gilgamesh (Gilgamesh vi 6ff., ANET 83f.), and in the consequent rage of the goddesses (OAnat’s can only be inferred from the sequel, the text being broken) when rebuffed. It is not unreasonable to suppose a distant connection between the two — a common theme adapted to local conditions — with Istar/CAttart the villain of the piece in both instances.

So far as Israelite religion is concerned, the fusion of CAnat and CAttart seems more probable than that of OAnat and Aserah.

b) CAttart.

A variety of etymologies have been offered. According to Lods, the name comes from /anaru 'with the specific Babylonian meaning "to assemble", "pass in review"' denoting the planet Venus, which 'in the evening passes the stars in review'. On this basis presumably we would have to suppose an infixed t to denote personal benefit, though we should then expect the form
cttrt instead of cttrt. Patai refers\textsuperscript{35} to the biblical usage in Dt. 7.13, 28.4, 18, 51, where it appears to require the force of 'womb', so that the divine name means 'she of the womb'. PATAI refers to the At. passages, suggesting a meaning 'even'. Possibly too the name simply means 'wife'.\textsuperscript{36}

These and other attempts to find a meaning behind the form of the name of the female deity fail to take into account the fact that while these senses may have been understood at times due to semantic developments or popular etymologies, the name represents a theological shift, being simply a feminine form of cttr, and reflecting the bifurcation of this deity. Attar was the Venus-star, and as we shall see, his evening and morning appearances led to his division into two deities. The etymology of cttr is obscure. Ryckmans drew attention to Attar's function in South Arabia as a god of irrigation and fertility, on the basis of a supposed derivation for cttr 'étre riche, irriguer'.\textsuperscript{37} However, it is more likely that this form, if connected with cttr, is derived from it as a result of the functional development of the god. Barton suggested Arabic catara 'to fall', with an infixed \textsuperscript{38} as the source. The cttr thus formed would, he argued, have both a transitive and an intransitive meaning, referring to a mother giving birth and to the offspring which falls from the womb. He referred to the Deuteronomy passages in support. The argument against Ryckmans applies here too, and the \textsuperscript{39} cannot be explained as infixed; since the expected form would then be cttr. Albright suggested that the name may derive from a stem (which he did not identify) 'meaning something like "sparkle, of a star"'.\textsuperscript{39} Possibly it simply means 'Venus-star' or 'star'.\textsuperscript{40}
It is probably in the South Arabian god that we find the oldest—that is least developed—form of the deity. Albright argues that CAttar was originally androgynous, and thus was simply rationalized into male and female forms. But it is more appropriate to look not at derivative forms, but rather to the context in which the South Arabian god appears. This is always in terms of the triad, the family group of the primal divine couple and their son. The triad of the Moon-god (father), Sun-goddess (mother), and Venus-star (son), is generally agreed to be the primary element in South Arabian religion, and is to be seen as lying behind all Semitic versions of the pantheon. In this context, it is incredible that CAttar should be anything but a son, given the importance of sons (over against daughters) and above all of firstborn sons, in Semitic society generally.

While in South Arabia the son performs both the direct functions of Venus as the evening and the morning star, and the indirect ones as deity of fertility and war, it appears that in other parts of the Semitic world he splits into two. As the evening star he becomes a goddess, whose best Semitic name is CAttart — perhaps by assimilation to a pre-Semitic levantine goddess, since we also find him as Salem while remaining himself as the morning star CAttar. With this development there may have been a division of labour, the fertility role going to the goddess, and the role of war remaining with the god, perhaps alluded to in the Ugaritic title CAttart the Terrible. It is not quite so simple as this, of course, since if our remarks on CAttart as a Canaanite goddess, in the context of the Aqhat story, are true, then she has a fierce aspect,
which is accentuated by her identification with Canat. Attar appears at first sight to have declined in importance, to judge from his rather curious role in the AB cycle. He is only found elsewhere in the Levant with this name identified with the Moabite national god Chemosh, as Attar-Chemoah. We shall see subsequently, however, that he can be discerned in many important episodes and rites both in Ugarit and in Israel.

In Mesopotamia a rather different development appears to have taken place. Attar (Att) becomes Ishtar (ēštar, then īštar). The masculine form of the name is preserved, but the deity becomes a goddess. This is probably to be seen as due to the influence of the Sumerian goddess Inanna, who has virtually absorbed Attar, while adopting an akkadianised form of his name. So pervasive is the influence of Ishtar in Mesopotamian society that her name, without the determinative, becomes the general term for goddess.

c) Āserah. As with the other divine names, there is no unanimity regarding the significance of the name Āserah. Indeed, scholars in the past doubted the very existence of the goddess, seeing in the use of the word Ēserah in the Old Testament simply a reference to a cult object, the sacred pole. In subsequent studies, a distinction has often been made between the cult object and the goddess, but of course this is very much a modern distinction; the goddess and her icon (i.e. the medium of her hierophany) are one in the ancient world. Only so can any sense be made of the prophetic satires of gods as in Is.44.9ff., 45.20, 46.1ff., and Jer.2.27ff., 10.3ff. (See also the much more archaic tradition in 1 S.5.1-4).
A goddess recognisable as Aserah is found in a variety of contexts, and explanations of the name have generally followed the pattern set by her apparent role, or her epithets, in each situation.

The goddess Aserah of Ugarit is almost certainly to be regarded as the consort of El. The myth of Elkmirsa (sc. il qny ars), Asertu (sc. atrt) and the storm god from Boghazkoy, undoubtedly derived from a Canaanite source, certainly regards the first two deities as husband and wife (and interestingly has an explicit reference to the motif of the storm god taking over as husband, which we mentioned above). One of Aserah's titles, il (ilt), is clearly to be taken as the pair to El (i1). She is the mother of all the gods of the pantheon, except for her consort El and the interloper Baal. As such she is called qnyt ilm, the 'progenetrix of the gods', seen collectively, as we have seen, as 'seventy sons of Aserah'. Almost always in parallel to this title we have another - rbt atrt ym. The usual translation of this is 'the Lady Aserah of the sea', or 'the Lady who walks on the sea'. Albright takes atrt to be an intransitive participle, from 'tr (a'tr) meaning 'to walk'). But taking this meaning it is possible that it is transitive in force, and reflects an ancient tradition in which Aserah took part in some cosmic battle with a sea-monster. Albright seems to have moved to this view in his later study. Bearing in mind the undoubted Semitic origin of Aserah, it is reasonable to ask if such an interpretation is plausible. At first sight it is not. The goddess is a desert figure of some sort, so instead of reading ym as 'sea' (yammu/i), perhaps it was originally 'day' (yom).

However, gods do develop new skills and functions in response to a changing environment, and Aserah quite clearly acquired
various connections with the sea in her levantine cult. At Ugarit she has a divine assistant, ad₃ wa₃mr₃, whose name is always accompanied by the god's role as d₃y at₄₃, ₆² 'the fisherman of Aserah'. Presumably this implies some maritime function, quite reasonable in view of the extensive sea-traffic using Ugarit, even though we are unable to discern it in the texts. She may also have been patroness of the sailors of Tyre, for Keret makes a vow when he comes:

\[ \text{lod₃} \]

\[ a[\text{frt}] \text{ frm wlt} \]

\[ \text{ad}[\text{yn}]m₃ \]

to the sanctuary of Aserah of the Tyrians, and to the goddess of the Sidonians.

The mention of Sidon is interesting, for in biblical allusions to Phoenician religion we meet only 'Attart of the Sidonians', ₆₄ (though of course these date from some centuries later). Perhaps we have here a fusion, since it seems gratuitous to assume that the biblical writers are confused. The inscription of Yehawmilk of Byblos ₆₅ referring to 'my mistress, the Lady of Byblos' may reflect the same process, though the name of the goddess is not given.

It should be noted that in the Canaanite/Phoenician context, there has been no dispute, so far as I am aware, of the name deriving from √str/ṣr 'to walk'; and at the same time, the goddess is left purely as a consort figure, her name not relating to any basic role she may play in her own right, as we have shown to be the case for 'Anat (whichever etymology be accepted) and 'Attart.
This is important, because it lends support to the view I shall present below that as with CAttart, so with Äserah we must look to her South Arabian form for an idea of her original role.

In Israel we meet the goddess, apparently, as the wife of Baāl. At least, that at first glance is the construction that seems to be intended to be put upon the descriptions of Israel's apostasy by the Deuteronomist. Thus Jg. 3.7 describes how the Israelites did what displeases Yahweh. They forgot Yahweh their god and served the Baals and the Äserahs ( plata).66

But Jg. 2.13 speaks differently:

they deserted Yahweh to serve Baāl and CAttart.

Now the writers are not likely to have confused the two divine names ḫēlēnām and ḫēlōwāy, though of course it is possible that they identified them. But then why use now one, now the other, especially if, as we have just seen, from biblical and other evidence, that the chief goddess at least among the Sidonians has become CAttart? If the two names are used, it would seem reasonable to assume that two goddesses were meant; and if CAttart (identified with CAnat) was Baāl's consort, then Äserah was probably not. She may of course have had an independent cult simply as a great Mother goddess. But there seems a better explanation.

If we turn for a moment to the icon of the goddess, the sacred pole, we find it usually paired with a standing stone, a massebah (e.g. at 2 K. 18.4). If the pole is for the goddess and she is not Baāl's consort, then the stone must be sacred to another god. Presumably at Israelite sanctuaries this was Yahweh or a deity who became identified with Yahweh in the post-settlement period. In other words, we must suppose Äserah to have
been or become Yahweh's consort. We shall see the significance of this later. This supposition would appear to be confirmed by passages in which we find special treatment reserved for the pole, but not apparently for the stone which it is reasonable to assume stood beside it. Thus in Jg. 6.25, Gideon is instructed to destroy an altar dedicated to Ba'al (לע"א) and the Aserah-pole which stands beside it, and accordingly he does so. No mention is made of the massébah. Possibly this was left standing, because being also the icon of Yahweh, it caused no offence. Again, in full enthusiasm of Josiah's reform, in 2. k. 23, there seems to be a careful distinction between the wholesale destruction of cult objects belonging to other deities (passem), or not conforming to the requirements of Dt. 12 regarding centralisation, (v. 4, pillars smashed, poles cut down), and the more selective treatment reserved for the temple. V. 6 reads:

> From the temple of Yahweh he removed the sacred pole right out of Jerusalem...

Again there is no mention of an accompanying massébah. The whole point, surely, is that the appropriate cult object of Yahweh is left intact, while all the syncretistic, idolatrous and other 'abominable' paraphernalia are destroyed. Asérah is then clearly the consort of Yahweh. But of course she brought as her dower all kinds of unacceptable traditions, and the following verse records the purging of these:

> He pulled down the house of the sacred male prostitutes which was in the temple of Yahweh and where the women weave clothes for Asérah.

Asérah in the Israelite context seems to have had much the same kind of cult as in the levantine coastal cities. She is primarily a Mother, and no doubt her cult derived much of its
panoply from the agricultural economy and settled way of life. In this respect it almost certainly assimilated the personality of the goddess (as also of Ētarrt-Ēnatt) to pre-Semitic mother-goddess types worshipped in the Levant for millennia beforehand. The sacred pole, which was set up, alongside its stone, 'on every high hill and under every spreading tree' (2 K. 17.10) was probably in origin a tree trunk which stood as surrogate for a tree (a 'tree of life'). From this derived, according to a Hebrew etymology, the name of the goddess, as well as meaning 'to walk, go', √穰穰 means, 'to be straight' (perhaps cogn. 'מע' 'if. Akk. אשור, אושר, אשור - perhaps from wasaru) and may have described the 'straight', or upright posture of the pole. Thus the epithet may have become the name of the goddess, replacing the older one. Perhaps linked to this is the √穰穰 meaning 'happy'. A masculine form of the adjective is preserved in the tribal name Asher (Asher), which may reflect the devotion of this tribe to the cult of the goddess. So Asherah has been understood as the goddess of good fortune.

These ideas may well have been present in the background to Israelite worship, but two principles oblige us to probe further into the past of Asherah:

1) The gods of the ancient world did not begin life, in their prehistory, as gods or goddesses of abstract principles, like good fortune, motherhood, or whatever; it seems to me that this kind of understanding must always be secondary - a 'theological overcoat', so to speak, which gives greater bulk to a function of deity which is slowly felt to be rather bare by itself. Rather are deities linked to some object or natural phenomenon, such as the sun, moon and stars, wind and rain, earth and sky, and so on.
Thus Aserah could be the Earth mother, or the sacred tree, or the
deified sanctuary - art - if we did not have a more likely form.
This is patently so in the Mesopotamian (i.e. Sumerian) context,
as also among all Indo-European societies, and in especially true
for the earliest Semites with regard to the stars and planets.

ii) The Semites do not suddenly appear in their various
historical locales, but have a prehistory which is most plausibly
seen as a common prehistory. This can be demonstrated at a
linguistic and cultural level, more tentatively on an ethnic
level, and so too possibly operates on a religious level. This
is the presupposition of recent studies on early Semitic pantheons,
and was already so for such earlier synthetic works as W.R.
Smith's Religion of the Semites.

We argued that we must look to the South Arabian pantheon for
the earliest form of Attart. Likewise with Aserah. It is widely
recognised that the religion which can be reconstructed from the
monumental inscriptions of South Arabia has many archaic features,
even though the most recent estimates of the dating of these
inscriptions bring them fairly well into the first millennium,
and therefore tends to weaken the argument. We find Aserah appear-
ing in South Arabia, as in Ugarit, in the form artr. A
goddess of this name appears in the state of Kataban. She appears
to be the consort of Wadd, the Katabanian Moon-god. Since
the general pattern in the South Arabian pantheons is that the
consort of the Moon-god is the Sun-goddess, it appears that
Aserah is here to be seen as a Sun-goddess, who has a variety of
titles throughout the different states, originating presumably as
epithets for the original name Sam. The etymology in the South
Arabian context points to ntr meaning 'brilliance', 'flush',
according to Nielson, Ryckmans, Jamme, and Caskel, and so artr
means 'the Brilliant', 'the Reaplendent'.

Caskel raises the problem of the provenance of the goddess. Is her home in South Arabia, or has she been introduced from the north? His question is rhetorical, and it does not seem to me that we can offer any certain proof one way or the other. But we can talk in terms of probabilities, and draw tentative conclusions in one area from patterns which emerge in another. While it is true to say that the incidence of one or two divine names does seem to indicate a penetration of Syrian religious ideas into the Arabian area, the general character of the religion of the south, in so far as it can be reconstructed, seems to owe very little to the 'civilised' influence of the north. Rather does it seem to share a far greater affinity with the religion characteristic of nomadic peoples, than with the more sophisticated product of settled communities.

This is where the late dating of the earliest inscriptions is of interest. It may very well reflect the fairly late settlement of nomadic peoples on the desert fringes in the south. And this in turn would imply that only a slight evolution of their religion to accommodate itself to new circumstances has taken place. In other words, it is likely that we have here, at least in the overall structure of the south Arabian systems, a far more archaic form of Semitic religion than is found in the rest of the contemporary Semitic world, where there has been, as well as longer settlement, a far greater cross-cultural fertilisation, by the confrontation and mergence with non-Semitic peoples in the areas into which the Semites moved in the Fertile Crescent.

Allowing all this, it is also interesting that the reconstruction of the pantheon suggested by Nielsen, i.e. the divine triad of the Father (Moon-god), Mother (Sun-goddess), and
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Son. (Venus-star), while subject to much criticism, has not in fact been shown to be false. All it requires is a slight modification to be plausible. And that is, the acknowledgement that while the triad is primary, it is not 'exclusive de tout autre élément divin', and sees the Venus-star not as the only-begotten son, but rather as the first-born, of many others.

Agreeing on an ultimate common source of all Semitic religion, it is tempting to look at the Ugaritic pantheon in the light of the South Arabian. Here the divine couple are El and Aserah (Atirat). Is it possible that here we have originally the moon-god and his consort, who have lost their particular functions, and become generalised in function, partly by a natural evolution in a new environment, and partly by a syncretism with the pre-Semitic cults of Syria? We shall in fact see that while the lunar and solar functions of the pair may have been passed to subordinate deities (or hypostases) in Ugarit, there is evidence from the texts - particularly CTA 12, 23 and 24 which we shall examine - that the connection was still recognised in Ugarit. Again, the mysterious episode in which Aserah has Attar proclaimed king in Da'el's stead suggests that Attar is to be seen as the first-born of the sons of Aserah. Does this scene hint at the takeover which appears to have been accomplished in the South Arabian context, where Attar is always addressed first of the triad? The other children of Aserah in Ugarit can presumably correspond broadly to the many other local gods and minor spirits of the South Arabian religious scene, but Nielsen's triad in no way lose their final authority by sharing it with others.

This treatment of the three major West Semitic goddesses, and the clarification of their distinctive roles and characters in the important period of the second millennium is not at first sight of
particular relevance to the question of Israelite religious origins. The goddess Aserah, however, was clearly of great importance in the Israelite cult, and therefore conclusions about her nature have some bearing on the nature of the gods associated with her. In Ugarit she was the consort of El, and there are elements in Ugaritic mythology which indicate, as we shall see, that something of her solar role persisted at least in some strata, and support the view we shall suggest below that El may have originally been a moon god.

The apparent pairing of Aserah and Yahweh in Israelite religion suggests that the same role may have once been fulfilled by Yahweh, or at any rate that aspects of his literary and cultic presentation are due to the influence of the cult of El in Palestine. The problems raised by these suggestions are those with which we shall try to deal in the following chapters.
Notes to Chapter One.

1. See p. 8 for note on conventional spellings.

2. J. Morgenstern, Some significant antecedents of Christianity, (1966), 83. Morgenstern has glossed over the difference between aleph and ayin, or has ignored it. Besides, as will be shown below, the names are quite different, quite apart from the goddesses.


4. See below.


6. The violent goddess, 27f.


9. CTA 6 1 2-10.

10. YCC, 117.
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11 BDB, under ḫayy, 773. Cf. KB, 720: 'marital intercourse'. There is another possible occurrence at Hos. 10.10, though this is better explained as √狒 11. 3

12 R. North, 'Flesh covering and response', VT 5(1955), 204-206.

13 This etymology has been suggested by V. Bérard, Les Phéniciens et l'Odysée (vol. 2, 1926), 401: cited by M. C. Astour, Hellenosemitica, (1967), 208. But as Astour notes, 'he understood it, of course, in the spirit of his toponymic theory in mythology, and saw in Ino [a Hittite manifestation of Anat] merely the personified abstraction of all numerous coastal springs which used to be visited by Phoenician seamen and purple-snail fishers'. This would not allow Anat to antedate the development of the maritime and purple-trade activities of the Phoenicians, presumably in the early part of the second millennium. My suggestion of a desert location at least sets no time-limit.

14 Amorite, according to Dhomé, 'Les Amorhéens', RB 37(1928), 165; Vincent, La religion des Jудéo-Araméens d'Éléphantine, (1937), 637ff.; both cited by Kapelrud, op. cit., 16. If Dagan is an Amorite god, (see refs. in n. 3), then this would support Anat coming from the same area. Of course, it is possible that Anat is not originally a Semitic goddess at all (which would explain the otherwise incongruous overloading of the pantheon). Lods, Israel, (LT 1932), 134, suggests a possible Hittite origin. This would find support in the interesting link discerned between Baal (i.e. Hadad, cf. the Ugaritic name ḫa occasionally used of him) and the 'Hurrian or Hittite weather-god' Tešušu, the two divine names being represented by the same ideogram ƙIM. (Kapelrud, Baal, 37).


17 'The children of Ašerah' (bn strt), CTA 4 iv 51 (cf. 4 iv 49, 6 i 41) etc.; 'the seventy sons of Ašerah' (šbn bn strt), CTA 4 vi 46 etc.; also 'the family of El' (dr 11), CTA 15 iii 19; and 'the circle of El's sons' (dr bn 11), CTA 30 obv. 2. On Bāal as 'Dagan's son' (bn d-n), see CTA 2 i 37 etc.

18 Lapelrud, Hašš, 53, 65. Dagan appears to have been originally a storm deity (see Roberts, *The earliest Semitic pantheon*, (1972), 18ff.) who naturally developed various chthonian functions, and eventually developed into a grain god. He supposedly had a temple at Ugarit, even though he does not appear actively in the mythical texts so far discovered. This possibility of gods surviving in a different situation by reemployment in another role is of course germane to our discussion as a whole. Since the so-called Dagan temple at Ugarit was identified simply on the basis of two votive stelae, I think it much more likely that it was an El temple (perhaps El absorbed Dagan?). Cf. C. V. A. Schaeffer, 'Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, 6e campagne', *Syria* 16 (1935), 155ff. He expresses hesitation as to the identification, made on the basis of the votive stelae.

19 E.g. CTA 3 v 7, 17.

20 CTA 4 i 4ff., restored from //4 iv 47ff.; which context we shall examine:

`lysh tr 11 abh`

`[i]l mlk dyknrh`

There is a problem of interpretation here, Ginsborg (*Anat*, 133).
has Ba'gal the subject of the sentence:

He cries unto Bull El his father,
to El the king his begetter.

See also Ahlström, ASIR, 71. This makes sense in the context, but it raises the issue of Ba'gal's paternity, and also manages to do without any preposition corresponding to 'unto/to' (though the verb syh can be construed without a preposition, according to I. Ohodera, in private communication.)

On the other hand, Gordon, UL, 32 renders:

loudly Tor-El, her father, shouts,' King El, who brought her into being.

This makes Aserah the daughter of El (as well, presumably, as his wife), but leaves us with the unedifying spectacle El replying to himself in line 58! Gaster, Theopis², 184, confuses the issue still more, by having Aserah speaking to El about Ba'gal:

Hearken, thou Bull-god, his father,
O sovereign El who didst call him into being...

The instances in which her name is found are: הַלְוָא הַלְוָא
Jg. 3.31, 5.6; הַלְוָא יְהוָה Jos. 15.59; הַלְוָא יְהוָה Jos. 19.38, Jg. 1.33;
לְוָא יְהוָה Is. 10.30, 1 K. 2.26, Jos. 21.18 and several times in Jeremiah and the Chronicler. These personal and place names indicate at least a former, if defunct, cult. The goddess' name also appears on a stela from Beth Shan, ANET, 250, and in the divine name כן Anath-Bethel in Elephantine.

^2 אֲטַתַּר appears in the form לְוָא הַלְוָא, usually explained as containing the vowels of לְו, though I am not convinced; and as לְוָא הַלְוָא, generally explained as referring to the many local manifestations of the goddess, but more likely in my view a plural of majesty like ilm or מִלְּוָא, or an example of אַ > או.

23 We have examples in the OT: Ishbaal takes exception to Abner appropriating Saul's concubine Rizpah, 2 S.3.7f.; David has Saul's wives, 2 S.12.8; Ahitophel advises Absalom to take his father's concubines, 2 S.16.20-22; and Solomon interprets his father's request for Abishag, 1 K.2.21f. See *CTA* 21.8; an ox for בָּאל and אֶסֶרְא - ap 1b1 wār't, which has been interpreted in this way - Kapelrud, *Baal*, 77. On אסֶרְא and עָנַת as identical with עָטַרְת, see Hvidberg, *Kings and Laughter in the OT*, (LT 1962), 57. The role of the queen-mother as consort is cultic, not political. See ch.8, n.2.

24 El is called king: *CTA* 4 lv 23f.:

\[\text{tgly dd 11 wtbu} \]
\[\text{qrb mlnk ab bne} \]

She enters the abode of El and comes to the habitation of the king, the exalted father.

See also passages in n.21. Ba'el is called king: 1b. 11.43f.:

\[\text{thmk mlkn aliy n b}\]
\[\text{tptn win d inh} \]

Your decree is 'Aliyan Ba'al is our king, (Aliyan Ba'el) our judge, and there is none above him'.
See also, ch. 3, nn. 29-41.


26 Kapelrud, *The violent goddess*, 39f., disagrees, and cites a text (Gordon 2008, 6-8) where the two goddesses are clearly distinct. This is fine. The text in question may be reflecting a conservative theology. On the other hand Patai, *op. cit.*, 53, does not really see an identification, since he seems to regard the two divine names as referring to the one personality: 'Her proper name was Anath. However, she was equally well known, far beyond the boundaries of Syria and Palestine, by the name Astarte...'. though immediately afterwards he expresses uncertainty. That is certain is that the two were originally quite distinct.

27 *C*tar is generally rendered as 'Gottart name of Ba'al'.

So Caster, *op. cit.*, 154; Ginsberg, *ANET*, 130; Gordon, *UJ*, 12.

I find this a singularly improbable name for a deity. The idea of a 'name' extends to the senses of 'reputation' (i.e. a well-known name) as in the biblical phrase כָּנָּה (Num. 16.2) or in the goal of the men of Babel ('to make a name -כָּנָּה- for themselves'; Gen. 11.4), and to offspring, who perpetuate that reputation, a man is 'remembered' in his sons. Cf. also *BDAG*, 1023, where כָּנָּה 'glory' is suggested for Gen. 3.19f.; Ezek. 39.13. The late circumlocution כָּנָּה may have this sense too.

Such a meaning for כָּנָּה would also make better sense of the so-called Deuteronomic 'Name theology' (e.g. Dt. 12.5 and passim). I find the notion of the Name as some kind of hypostasis dwelling in the chosen sanctuary rather implausible, at least in the eighth century, when such a theology must have been developed. But to see the כָּנָּה as something akin
to the 'יְהוָה of Yahweh makes satisfactory sense. On the extensive psychic field of 'יְהוָה, see the discussion in J. Pedersen, Israel 1-11 (1926), 247ff.

28 Later Anat claims to have beaten Yam herself, if we take the verbs in CTA 3 iii 35ff., to be first person singular, as do Cassuto, op. cit., 93; Ginsberg, ANET, 137; Gordon, UU, 19f.

Kapelrud, The violent goddess, 61f., follows Aistleitner in reading the verbs as second person singular, referring to Ba'al's victory.

29 ANET, 130, n. 8.


31 See Albright, 'Specimens of late Ugaritic prose', BASOR 150 (1958), 38 — a relative dating endorsed by Dahood in Moscati, op. cit., 71f.; AB cycle 'the earliest' — i.e. back to the third millennium; Aqht 'Middle Bronze' — i.e. 2100-1600; Krt 'between seventeenth and fifteenth centuries' — i.e. 1650-1450. Y. Kondra, in a paper at the 13th International congress of the IABR, Lancaster, August 18th, 1975, argued on the basis of the use of the 3rd. p. qaqtulu and yaqtulu forms, that the Aqht and Krt texts were from before the Amarna age, while the AB cycle, and CTA texts 12, 23 and 24 appeared later.

Cf. A. Herdner, 'Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras Shamra', RB 135 (1938), 76-83. The date of a text does not of course necessarily reflect the age of the tradition preserved.

32 Kapelrud, op. cit., 46. These sacrificial lists mention 'Atatt by herself in CTA 29 rev. 3; 33 obv. 1; 37.6; 38.1, 3, 4; 39.16. See also RS 24.252 obv. 2 ('Anat 11.6, 9); C. Virolleaud, 'Nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques', Ugaritica V, 551. For pairing with 'Anat see RS 24.258 obv. 9—11, 23—rev. 1, Ugaritica V,

Israel, 133.


BUNDB, 800.


YGC, 117.

Cf. Gk. ἀστήρ (perhaps < ἀστήρις 'unfixed?'), Lat. astrum.

Skt. -स्तर-. Of course the (prothetic) 𐤊𐤉𐤊 in might be thought to make this suggestion dubius. But see L. Yghuda, 'The meaning of the name Esther', JRA 1946, 174-178. On p. 174, he refers to a Talmudic tradition: '... we find in the Babylonian Talmud, Megilla 13a, that Rabbi Nehemiah was of the opinion that her name was Hadassah, but that she was called by the Gentiles Esther, after the 'star-venue' , which, in footnote 1 he observes, is Persian also, Greek ἀστήρ... 'Esther', subsequently identified with 'Istar', by P. Jensen, 'Elamitische Eigennamen', E Zh 6 (1892), 70, 209ff., is spelt 𐤓𐤊𐤉𐤊, where the equivalence of N- and Greek smooth breathing is no problem. Cf. also the equivalence of ἀστήρ/ Asteron which is described as 'certain' by E. Lipiński, 'La fête de l'ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melqart', Actes de la 17e rencontre assyriologique internationale, Brussels, (1970), 33, n. 10. On > s in South Arabic see
Ryckmans, 'Une grammaire des anciens dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale', *La Musée* 56 (1943), 142. An Indo-European origin is perhaps unlikely, though it cannot be entirely ruled out.

ARI, 81. Also Roberts, *op. cit.*, 39. For his pure masculinity, see Ryckmans, *op. cit.*, 130.

Nielsen, HAA 1, (1927), 213ff., and passim in his works. His general theory is summarised and criticised by Jamme, 'D. Nielsen et le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique', *RB* 55 (1948), 227–244, who sets out to indicate the shortcomings of Nielsen's sweeping theory, but leaves it almost intact at the end. See also Jamme, 'Le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique', *La Musée* 60 (1947), 11ff., Ryckmans, *op. cit.*, 327, and Brilliant in *Histoire générale des religions* (1957) iv, 256ff..

So Roberts, *op. cit.*, 39.


The inscription of Nezha (the Moabite Stone), 1.17. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic inscriptions*, (1971), i, p. 81, suggests that it was only at the sanctuary of Kerioth (יְרִיָּם), 1.13, that the identification was made. Elsewhere in the inscription the divine name ءُلُوُّاُ appears alone. Gray, *JNES* 8, p. 78, suggests that Chemosh may be an epithet or hypostasis of אָטָטָר. This would appear to be supported by the Gr. city-name Ἀρεσπόλις, given possibly to Dibon (Haussig, *op. cit.*, 292) or to

46 Roberts, *op.cit.*, 39.

47 Cf. Roberts, *loc.cit.*, 'one must suspect Sumerian influence'.

48 Jastrow, *Aspects of religious belief and practice*... (1911), 129.


51 Cf. the splendid assertion of A. Bharati, in 'Anthropological approaches to the study of religion', (*Biennial review of Anthropology*, 1971), ed. B.J. Siegel), 250, n. 'I am reminded of a belief of my Hindu friend; "the linga (phallus) is not the symbol of Siva. It is Siva". See also Patai, *op.cit.*, 293, n.13: 'the wooden image was Aserah...'. On hierophanies in general, and the problem of 'idolatry', see Eliade, *Patterns in comparative religion*, (ET 1958), ch.1 and passim.

52 See Kapelrud, *Paul*, 75, for discussion of this problem. With Gordon's translation of CTA 4 iv 47f., (see n.20) the 'her father' refers to Aserah. In CTA 23 rev. 45., we have the two (?) women/goddesses referred to as.
the daughter(s) of El, the daughter(s) of El (ditto graph?) and indeed are his wife/wives for ever more...

We shall look at this difficult text below (ch. 2). If there are two wives, it seems that at least one of them is to be understood as Aserah, who suckles the gracious gods (1.24), presumably as their mother.

53 ANET, 519. See Pope, op. cit., 37ff.
54 Occurring CTA 4 i 7f. = 4 iv 49f.
55 See above, n. 20.
56 E.g., CTA 4 i 23 and passim. This is an interesting contrast to 'Anat's title of ybmt limm 'the bearer of peoples'. Do we have some kind of division into a theogonic pair (El and Aserah) and a cosmogonic pair (Ba'al and 'Anat)? El's title of bny bmwt - 'creator of creatures' - seems to reflect the latter function, however. Perhaps the process of division of labour is still under way when fixed in the texts.

57 Ginsberg, ANET, and Gordon, Ul, 'Lady Asherah of the sea'.
58 Albright, ARI, 76 (omitting rbt), 'she who walks on the sea'.
59 YCC, 105, 'The lady who treads on the Sea(-Dragon)'. See also EJ, vol. 3, art. 'Aserah', 704.
60 Albright, ARI, 76; Smith, op. cit., 561, (note by Cook).
Patai, op.cit., 33 (by implication).

61 Co. Nielsen, quoted by Gray, op.cit., 73f. Read as 'Lady of day', the meaning of tr is still left indeterminate.


63 CTA 14 iv 197ff. Perhaps god is the divine name, in which case the two prepositions balance:

to Qudsu the Aserah of the Tyrians,
and to Elat (the Aserah) of the Sidonians,
taking as performing a double duty, on which technique see Dahood, Psalms 111 (1970), 435. We also have four hundred prophets of Aserah (1 K. 18.19) introduced by Jezebel from Tyre. Though her father is 'Ethbaal of the Sidonians' in 1 K. 16.31, he was in fact a king of Tyre.

64 1 K. 11.5, 2 K. 23.13. See also the inscription of Tabnit of Sidon (ANET, 662) dated early fifth century.


66 The plural form is generally explained as indicating diverse local manifestations of the deities (like the different village madonnas of today). Perhaps in view of the singular usage elsewhere (as in Jg. 2.13) this will not do. It may be that some editorial hand has made an incomplete attempt to contrast the plurality of these no-gods with the oneness of Yahweh (Dt. 6.4). As with the expression לֹֽאָ֥ תֹבֶל לְכֶם, the article may indicate a generic use of the term, meaning simply 'goddesses', without specifying who they are.
On the significance of the article (נְּבָה), see M. G. 316 (p. 405), where the article in נְּבָה is explained as the application of the general term נְּבָה 'lord' to the specific deity, 'as proper name of the god'. I would argue that on the contrary the name, as a divine title, was undoubtedly already in common use at the time of the tribal migrations into Canaan, as the Ugaritic usage implies, and that the Hebrew use of the article alters it from an appellative — surely it was never a 'proper name'? — to a general term. Even if this argument be rejected, we would require some kind of evidence from the OT to justify the view that the storm-god is referred to. I do not believe that there is any such evidence, so that the deity bearing the appellative Baal is still indeterminate.

I do not believe that this story was originally an example of Yahwism triumphing over Baal-worship, (see n. 67), since it is probably not till much later that the two cults became implacable enemies. In support of this, witness Gideon's sobriquet, perhaps in fact his real name: Jerubbaal. This does not of course alter the fact that it is a splendid piece of propaganda in the hands of the Deuteronomist.

We have, oddly, the opposite procedure in Samaria: in 1 K. 16.33 Ahab sets up a sacred pole in his newly-consecrated temple of his god (Keltzert? See ch. 3 127) in Samaria. No mention is made of a mansebah, though presumably one is set up, since it is removed in the 'reform' of Jehoram (2 K. 3.2) while the אֶּסֵרָה-pole is supposedly left standing. But here the cult is overtly not that of Yahweh, while perhaps even a reforming Jehoram assumed that אֶּסֵרָה would be happy with
Yahweh for a husband. It could mean 'that he did not touch it, because the worship of Aserah was considered, as in the days of Ahab, a legitimate religious pursuit even by those who objected to the Baal Cult' (Patai, op. cit., 41).

No criticism is levelled at the massebah at Shechem, obviously so important to the Covenant tradition (Jos. 24:26). Interestingly however, (deliberately?) the term is not used, but instead the neutral יִתְנָא לְבָן. Its real identity is however clear from Jg. 9.6. Here the stone is dedicated to El, a point of fundamental importance as will later become clear.

69 See, e.g., E. Anati, Palestine before the Hebrews, (1963), 256 and index.


71 This may explain the two mysterious trees in Gen. 3. While there may be some confusion as to which tree was originally the axis mundi, the tree of life or that of knowledge, it seems likely that the writer (J) has deliberately preserved both elements because of his anti-Canaanite propaganda; see below, ch. 7.

72 סדר, 80; לְבָן, 95.

73 See Lods, op. cit., 134. He also mentions the idea of Zimmern and Winckler (1902) — see his bibliography no. 93 — that the name could be dependent on Akk. 𒀀𒈹𒈨 (sanctuary).

Cf. "Ugaritic astr.

74 סדר, 81; Cohen, Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques, facs. 1 (1970), 35 (where the equivalence " Explicit/yes is suggested); Lods, loc. cit..

75 See Patai, op. cit., 293f., n. 15, following Reed, op. cit., 80f., 87. Lods, op. cit., 130, 134, mentions a hypothetical god Аесор (akin
to Ass. Assur) the consort of the goddess; in this case the
tribe might take its name from the god; but Reed's explanation
has the advantage of elegance, together with the likelihood
that a mother goddess was the obvious figure to invoke at Gen.
to a god Aser, a form of the moon-god who is an aspect of
Yahweh. The second part of this view is open to doubt, though
we shall see in the ensuing chapters that the cult of the
moon-god is the key to many aspects of early Israelite religion.

This is the argument of Moscati's study, _The Semites in
ancient history_ (1959).

76 E.g. Moscati (ed.) _Le antiche divinità semitiche_,
Roberta, _The earliest Semitic pantheon_.

77 See particularly _Jamee, op.cit._, _Ryckmans, op.cit._,
Caskel, in _Moscati (ed.), op.cit._

79 _Jamee, op.cit._, 109, cites _Heb._ 3534b 1 yd w'd r't; though
though he does not actually assert that As-rah is here a
Sun-goddess, he is dealing with her in his section on the sun.
Caskel, _op.cit._, 110, sits safely on the fence, describing the
couple _Cama_ and _trt_ as 'Mond und '!_ Ryckmans too seems
insecure, _op.cit._, 330, but refers to Ikodokanakis as endorsing
the idea. Hefner, too is cautious, in _Haussig, op.cit._, 497,
while quoting van den Branden, _EIT_ 16 (1959), 167, as taking
the goddess as a manifestation of the Moon. Jamee remarks
however, concerning the _Heb._ text, that Wadd and Atirat cannot
be the same deity since they are of different gender.

80 _Jamee, op.cit._, 109, n. 467, for references; _Haussig, loc.cit._

81 _loc.cit._

82 _Ryckmans, op.cit._, 312, mentions _Ba'al samān_ (< _Ba'al-samān_)
in Dedan, but that of course is considerably to the North-west.
Sin, the name of the Moon-god in Hadramaut, may derive from Mesopotamian influence, but this hardly makes the cult of the Moon as such a borrowing.

83 See above, n. 42. In *Le museon* 60, 112, Jamme summarises his presentation of Sun, Moon, and Venus deities by means of a chart of the triad and the various names used.

84 Ryckmans, *op. cit.*, 327. On *Attar, Yez and Asot as all represented as the firstborn and probably diverging from one deity*, see Wyatt, "*Attar and the devil*," *TSUOS* 25 (1972-4), 85-97.

85 *CIA* 61 59ff.
The divine marriage

In our survey of the chief goddesses, we argued that the earliest forms of the deities were to be seen in a pastoral culture, and that their nature and functions became modified as a result of the changing circumstances of migration and settlement. The same principle, if valid there, may operate here: if we find a myth, for example, current in Ugarit, with its established urban and agricultural economy, we may be able to peel off such layers as can be shown to have been applied as a result of the process of settlement. In the case of Israelite and pre-Israelite traditions the kind of metamorphosis of the tradition is of a rather more subtle kind, it is a result of a prolonged historiographical process, in which, for example, a collection of stories of very diverse kinds have been brought together as the quasi-historical patriarchal narratives, or have been conflated to produce the exodus, covenant and conquest narratives. Or again a mythical allusion is taken up by a prophet and directed against a contemporary political opponent, so that Rahab becomes Egypt, or the Morning Star the king of Babylon.

In this chapter we shall examine the motif of the divine marriage. We shall consider the comparative material which is available for our discussion, since when a direct cultural borrowing can reasonably be indicated, it is quite in order to use one version in the elucidation of another. I believe that we can draw some useful conclusions in the area of our concern with the religion of Israel's forbears.
a) The marriage and birth episode in CTA 12

In this text we have the moon-god Yarih invited to pay court to Dingaya the handmaid of Aserah, and in view of our discussion above, it is worth considering whether we have here the marriage between the moon-god and his consort (with the attendant problems of the substitute mother) which will lead to the birth of their firstborn (as. c'Attar). In fact, it seems that more than one child is born. The forms of the titles given to the children, aklu/¢qam, could of course be plural, but is best understood as dual. So two gods, called the 'devourers' (aklu) and the 'raveners' (¢qam), are born. These, it will be seen, are to be taken to be the twin hypostases (morning and evening) of c'Attar as the Venus-star. Gordon's translation makes a complete distinction between El and Yarih, for the former is addressing the latter in i 15. It can of course be argued that there is a distinction here which is the result of dissimilation between two hypostases of the same deity. But other translations have El addressing 'the handmaid of Aserah' (Gaster, Ginsberg, Virolleaud), or Aserah herself (Gray). In either case, we are clearly to understand that it is the same person who is addressed both as ant yrh and as ant atrt, and that there is therefore some equivalence (obviously a state of marriage), between Yarih and Aserah. But in the Ugaritic material at large, El is Aserah's husband, and so El and Yarih appear to be the same deity. Ginsberg is of this opinion, and so is Gray so far as the present context is concerned. The theogonic part of CTA 12 is very archaic and reflects an older mythological milieu than the AB cycle. As a cultic work, it was presumably concerned among other things with the generation of the herds of pastoralists, while
theologically it concerned the generation of the gods from their primaeval parents, and specifically of their firstborn ĒAttar.

The epithets in CTA 12 (i 26f., škînm, ē'attar) describing the two gods, and the description in CTA 23 (rev. 61ff., šp't larse šp't ūmm...) of the capacious maws of the 'gracious' gods Šahar and Šalēm, which so closely parallels the description of Mot's voracious appetite, raise the serious possibility that ĒAttar and Mot were originally the same deity, and at any rate that the twins of CTA 12 are to be seen as originally equivalent to those of CTA 23.

**b) The hierogamy in CTA 23.**

It is surprising that little has been made of the obvious parallel between CTA 12 and CTA 23. The latter is a text hardly less obscure than the former. The presence in the tablet of division lines, marking the text off into a series of different rubrics, has led to the generally accepted conclusion that we have here a liturgy, or directions for a temple festival. Our concern is with the myth underlying this: the begetting of the gods Šahar and Šalēm. We appear to have the same situation as in CTA 12; al is the god involved in a hierogamy with, apparently, two goddesses, one of whom is Ēserah, and the other of uncertain identity, though I believe that it is the goddess Šapsu.

In obv.13 we have the expression štrt wrhm, in obv.2b, štrt wrhm, and in obv.16 rhmy alone. Many commentators interpret rhym/rhym as 'Anat, on the basis of CTA 6 ii 27, where rhym, 'maid', is an epithet used of 'Anat instead of the more usual 'ahāt. But this is unlikely, for i) Ēserah and 'Anat are opposed in the AB cycle, ii) 'Anat, like Ba'al, probably represents a later addition to the pantheon, iii) this text probably rests on a
foundation older than the arrival of °Anat and Ba'Gal, and iv) °Anat nowhere appears as the consort of El.

The rha here means a 'maid', or a 'girl', presumably as in the case of CTA 6 ii 27 just cited, with the sense of 'virgin'. There is intrinsically no reason why att attm(y) should be construed as two persons, since ktr when, or in this text mi war (obv.8) are taken as single deities. So rhay could reasonably be taken as an epithet of Aserah. However, in the course of the liturgy, it seems that there are in fact two wives of El, denoted by attm (rev.39,46). Presumably we are to understand the ladies in the text as two hypostases of Aserah. On the virginity of Aserah, see CTA 15 ii 26f., where we have this couplet:

ynq hib a(t)rt

was td bttl[ ]

... who sucks the milk of Aserah, and suckles the breast of the virgin[ ]

Bordner restores °nt to the lacuna in 1.27, no doubt on the analogy of the title bttl °nt appearing at CTA 6 ii 14, iii 22f., iv 45 (and possibly at 13.19). Against the reconstruction is the fact that °Anat and Aserah are nowhere else linked in this way. Indeed the two are hardly on the best of terms. A better solution is to understand the bttl here to refer to Aserah, who is therefore a mother goddess, yet a perpetual virgin, a common motif. The lacuna in 1.27 could plausibly be filled by ēn (or less likely, by rbt or rhay).

In the invocation of the 'gracious gods' in CTA 23 obv.23ff., we have then referred to (11.24f.) as gods:

ynqm bap zd att [ ]

ēm myprt dlthm
who sucks at the nipples of Aserah's breasts while Sapsu makes fruitful their branches.\(^{17}\)

If Driver is correct in restoring the \(\text{Ismuna}\),\(^{18}\) then perhaps Sapsu in the following line is a new subject altogether. But the restoration is conjectural, and it is at least as reasonable to take \(\text{arit}\) and \(\text{ens}\) as being parallel one to the other and therefore indicating, that Sapsu is here the duplication of Aserah. In the AB cycle, Sapsu is of course quite distinct from Aserah, and is the messenger\(^{19}\) and luminary\(^{20}\) of the gods, or the assistant of Anat\(^{21}\).

But here the situation is very different, and since this text mentions neither Anat or Ba'al, it may therefore preserve a tradition effectively fixed before their arrival in Ugarit, when Sapsu and Aserah were still essentially the same deity, though already germinated and later to diverge completely.

Another line in the poem provides further reasons for seeing Sapsu as the twin of Aserah in CTA 23, rev. 54 reads:

\[ \text{nu} \text{db} \text{laps rbt wlkbbn kn[m]}^{22} \]

Bring and deposit (offerings) to the Lady Sun and to the fixed stars.\(^{23}\)

Firstly, it is interesting, and perhaps significant, that the title \(\text{rbt}\), normally in the Ugaritic texts given to Aserah alone,\(^{24}\) is here used of Sapsu. On the only other occasion when it is used of a deity other than Aserah, in CTA 16 i 36f., it is also used of Sapsu.\(^{25}\) Secondly, there is the question of the purpose at this point in the text of offerings made to Sapsu. The only reasonable explanation seems to be that she is one of the pair of goddesses who give birth, and is therefore the partner to Aserah. The offerings are brought immediately after the naming of the new born gods (obv. 53), and the most likely reason for them is thanksgiving on behalf of a mother newly delivered of her child, or a
purificatory rite. In either case Aserah rather than Sapsu should be the beneficiary, unless the two are regarded here as equivalent. Thirdly, the offerings are made to Sapsu and the fixed stars. These presumably are to be identified with the lesser deities, the 'seventy sons of Aserah', presumably born after the twins. But since the hierogamy is concerned only with the birth of the twins, which is reactualised in the cult, the other offspring merely become a part of the scene, an anachronism which can be ignored in the practice of the cult. This identification of the stars seems to be supported by the epithet kn[m], 'fixed'. The constellations are precisely fixed, and thereby contrast dramatically with Āttar, who as the planet Venus is not fixed, but wandered across the sky in a pattern out of direct gear with the sidereal heaven.

The two gods who are born of the union are undoubtedly to be taken to be the morning and evening manifestations of Āttar as Venus, rather than as deities of dawn and dusk in themselves. It is true that Āttar is not mentioned, but the identification seems inescapable. To start with, it looks as though we cannot avoid identifying Šabar and Šalez born at rev. 52 with the ilm nɔmm born at rev. 60. Some commentators have taken them to be distinct (i.e. with at least four gods born) but Gaster has shown that the text requires them to be the same. Not only are Šabar and Šalez, who appear in the dramatic part of the text, otherwise quite inexplicably ignored in the ritual part (which refers to the ilm nɔmm at obv. 1 and 23) but the words ytbn yspr lḥan... at rev. 56f. are probably to be taken as a rubric to the celebrants to mine the hierogamy five times for the edification (i) of the worshippers. It is of the 'gracious gods' that we then have the
description (or invitation)\textsuperscript{31} of their lips stretching to earth and heaven, just like Nott's, in rev. 61-64. We have seen in our discussion of CTA 12 how this corresponds to the epithets sklm and \textsuperscript{30}om used there. Another passage hints at a similar view of C\_Attar himself, where he says, in CTA 2 iii 20f.:

11\textsuperscript{a} t/\textsuperscript{a}rd bn[p]\textsuperscript{a}ny tr\textsuperscript{a}tn k\textsuperscript{a}trn [...b\textsuperscript{a}ht] [\textsuperscript{32}]

\[\text{[s\textsuperscript{b}\textsuperscript{1}] ym bhkl tpt nh[\textsuperscript{r}]...}\]

If the identification of C\_Attar and Nott is to be maintained, it may be argued that the words mt\textsuperscript{w}fr (obv. 1.6) which are generally taken to refer to Death and Dissolution or some such complex,\textsuperscript{33} raise an insuperable difficulty, since Nott is then present before the birth of the twins. But Gautier has proposed an alternative meaning.\textsuperscript{34} The identity of the deity who sits is uncertain from the text (except for those who take him as Nott). But I want to suggest that it is in fact El. The following lines (obv. 8b ff.) which refer overtly to a vintage festival,\textsuperscript{35} or to the pruning of the vines in Spring, fit ill with the otherwise desert locale of the action. Perhaps it can be explained in one of two ways. Either it represents the adaptation of the myth to a viticultural milieu in Ugarit, or perhaps it should be seen in conjunction with the last legible lines on the reverse of the text, where we seem to have the young gods, on the edge of the desert (pat m\textsuperscript{d}br, 1. 68) asking a m\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{r}}t m\textsuperscript{d}r\textsuperscript{c} (guardian of the grain)\textsuperscript{36} for grain and wine. We shall discuss the implications of the mention here of the desert more fully below. But here we should notice that it clearly presents a very different milieu from the settled environment demanded by obv. 8ff., and seems rather to be echoing the movements of tribes of pastoralists along the fringes of settled territory, begging those products of civilisation which
they must normally do without. Since these would, being rare, be all the more desirable, their availability here may be seen as a fulfilment of the offer\textsuperscript{37} made to the gods by E\textsubscript{2} their father in rev. 61ff., to help themselves to the earth's bounty. But it might be countered that the curious passage in obv.8ff., not only does not fit E\textsubscript{2}, but is essential to the ritual context. Perhaps it can be translated thus:

\begin{verbatim}
mt wār ytb
bdh ht tkl
bdh ht ulan
\end{verbatim}

The Lord and Master\textsuperscript{38} was seated:
in his hand the staff of childlessness,
in his hand the staff of bereavement.

The marriage is about to take place, but it has not yet done so, and E\textsubscript{2} has no issue. This is presented graphically (and dramatically; this is a liturgy) by him holding a staff (or possibly two), symbolising this unhappy situation, which may be compared with that of Abram\textsuperscript{39} and is clearly an integral part of the myth. It is significant that it is a staff (ht) that E\textsubscript{2} casts aside\textsuperscript{40} when he is about to consummate the marriage.\textsuperscript{41} It is reasonable to suppose that the same staff is meant. The following lines, with their undoubted viticultural sense, are much more difficult to cope with, if they are taken, with the other rubrics, as some rite for inducing agricultural fertility. But perhaps they are borrowed\textsuperscript{42} from an agricultural context because of their obvious allusions to castration (the final seal upon childlessness), as some kind of apotropaic rite which is to induce potency; that is, they are not to be taken literally at all, but as a figure of speech (or 'figure of dramatic gesture'). The
other two rites which are performed immediately afterwards make such an understanding plausible: an icon of the moon is placed on an seven times, and a kid is boiled in its mother's milk. These rites would seem to fit a pastoral setting.

It appears that in CTA 23 we have another recension of the myth of the moon-god, his marriage with the sun-goddess, and the birth of their firstborn. In this version, and in that of CTA 12, the nature of the underlying myth has to some extent been obscured by the overlay of theological language of a later period; and here the myth appears a little disjointed, and has possibly been reinterpreted to some extent to fit into an agricultural or viticultural context, though I am not convinced on this point, while in CTA 12 the introduction of Ba'al into the story has transformed it entirely into an episode in the mythical accoutrements of his cult.

c) Nikkal and the moon-god; CTA 24.

With the wedding of Nikkal and the moon-god we are on altogether more substantial ground, though here too the text bristles with difficulties. It deals of course with the marriage of the moon-god and his consort, and so presents a prima facie parallel to the material we have already examined.

However, the situation is still complex. The moon-god here is the Ugaritic deity Yarihu, and although we saw that there is evidence in CTA 12 to support his erstwhile identification with El, that is not to be assumed here. El appears here only in a secondary role (11.44f.) and nothing conclusive can be said of his relationship to Yarihu, though an identification is certainly not ruled out. Ba'al (1.27) and Dagan (1.14) are mentioned, indicating the accommodation of the pantheon to incorporate
these deities, no doubt with an attendant reorganisation of
genealogical relationships which were normally used to relate the
gods one to another in the divine economy. So ḫ Attar, whom we
have seen to be the (firstborn) son of ḫ Ll, offers to Yaribu his
sister ("his father's daughter") who should logically be Yaribu's
(i.e. ḫ Ll's) own daughter, a relationship which the apparent or
possible dissimulation of Yaribu and ḫ Ll has obviously blurred.
There is also the additional complication of the picture by the
occurrence of the divine name Nikkal (= Sum. NIN.CAL) for the
prospective bride. NIN.CAL was a name given to the consort of
Sin in Mesopotamia, and Nikkal is a Hurrian form of the name.
Virolleaud at first took Nikkal to be a god, but this error
was corrected by Dunnaud and Gordon. The cult of NIN.CAL is
attested in northern Mesopotamia at Harran, and it was
presumably in this area that it was adopted by the Hurrians.
Perhaps we should understand CPA 24 as an adaptation to the
sectarian needs of the Hurrian population of Ugarit of the more
familiar (and purely Semitic) divine marriage tradition of CPA
12, 23. If the Hurrians who settled in Ugarit brought with them
Nikkal as their chief goddess, it is natural that they would
substitute her for the city's mother goddess in their version
of the official city festival of Ll and ḫ Ašerah. CPA 24 also
betrays a knowledge of a Babylonian version, as will be seen
below.

One important issue that requires clarification in CPA 24
is the significance and reference of the word ḫ ib. This occurs
in 11. 1, 18, and 37. The use of the word—spaced—wedge in this
text is unusual. Sometimes we have two or three lines of verse in
between consecutive ones (e.g. from the end of 1, 23 through to the
beginning of 1, 26), and at other times individual words are marked
Coetce suggests that the wedges mark off sense units from one another, instead of words, with some exceptions, usually involving use of the construct. Be that as it may, the problem is whether the word \( i_b \) is in fact to be separated out. The letter clusters concerned are as follows:

1) 1.1: \[ \text{asrnklwibd/ht} \]

11) 11.17ff.: \[ \text{tnnklyrhytrh,ibt^c_{rbm}} \]

111) 11.37ff.: \[ \text{nkwbdaararyrh} \]

We shall examine each of these in turn.

1) 1.1. This is usually divided \[ \text{as nkl wib d/ht} \]. Virolleaud read the lacuna as a \( d \), and so made a verb, \( (ebd,sio) \), giving the couplet:

\[
\text{Je chante Nikal}
\]

\[
\text{et je glorifie Harhab...} \]

He was followed in this by Gordon, who later had second thoughts, and by Coetze. Herder suggested a restoration of \( bt \) in the lacuna, reading:

\[
\text{Je chante Nkl wib}
\]

\[ \text{[fille de]ibirhibi} \]

and was followed in this reading by Driver. The form \( nkl wib \) is taken by these and other scholars to be a binomial on the pattern of \( ktr wbs \). The divine title \( i_b \) is taken to represent a contraction of Akkadian \( enbu \), 'fruit', presumably being an epithet of the goddess - 'the fruitful one' or 'she who gives fruit'.

11) 11.17ff.: The space-wedge after \( ytrh \) marks off the following letters, which are then to be spaced as \( ibt^c_{rbm} \) or \( ib^c_{rbm} \).

Aistleitner preferred the former, and took \( ibt \) to be an epithet of Nikkal - 'die Glanzvolle'; 'the one full of radiance'. Others accept the latter, and take \( i_b \) to be a partial reference to the
This passage is variously interpreted in accordance with the line taken by scholars on 1.1, which it repeats. The only problem is the $d$ which if not linked to $ib$ must go with $nisr$, being taken as a relative. We would expect $dt$ after $nk\text{ib}$, but Tsevat and Gordon are quite happy to see the $d$ as doing service for $dt$ (feminine singular). We could argue alternatively, however, either that it is in fact a masculine singular form, referring back to the last antecedent (i.e. $ib$) and thus implying that $ib$ refers to someone other than Nikkal.

It seems to me that a good case has been made for $ib$ being a divine name, but that it has been assumed rather than demonstrated that it refers to the goddess Nikkal. It seems more likely that it refers to a god, and that the god in question is Yarihu. It is strange that no one has suggested that since the text is concerned with the marriage of Nikkal and Yarihu, it should most plausibly invoke both at the beginning rather than just one of them. We may therefore render two of the contexts, 11.1 and 37f., as references to the pair of deities whose marriage is celebrated:

I sing of Nikkal and Ib (1.1),

It is of Nikkal and Ib that I sing (11.37f.).

The passage in 11.17f., is rather more difficult to interpret. The most widely accepted grouping of the letters is as follows:

\[
\text{tn nk} l \text{ yrb ytrh ib trbm bbbth.}
\]

Various translations offered make perfectly good grammatical sense of the passage. Thus Gordon has:

Give Nikkal! Moon would wed Ib. Let her enter his house.

Driver renders it:

Give me Nikkal, Yarikh will bring betrothal gifts, that Ib may enter into his mansions'.
Aistleitner suggests:

Gib Nkl her! Jrh will sich erkaufen die
Glanzvöllle und wirbt sie für sein Hause. 65

This last avoids the difficulty of the first two translations, which have a different subject for each clause of the sentence, a rather unlikely situation in a poetic context. But yrh has to do double service to be subject in two clauses, not in itself impossible, and it requires the reading ibt crbm, which in view of the other occurrences of ib seems implausible, and the m of orbm, which is presumably enclitic, can hardly serve as a third person feminine singular objective suffix, unless it be taken as a scribal error.

Hördner’s rendering: 66

Donne Nikkal à Yarh, pour qu’il l’épouse,
Ibt, pour qu’elle entre dans sa maison.

reads too concentrated a meaning into the text; it implies a reading tnnkl (l)yrb, a l having dropped out through haplography, and the simple finite form yrb, with no relative or purposive particle, can hardly be ‘pour qu’il l’épouse’. This argument also applies to crbm.

Having found published interpretations of the passage to be unsatisfactory, we must try to find an alternative one which justifies my suggestion that ib represents Yarihu rather than Nikkal. It seems to me that there are three possibilities, though the first two raise difficulties of various kinds.

1) Inserting a l on the grounds that haplography has occurred, we may read:

\[
\text{tn nkl (l)yrb} \\
yrb ib
\]
Give Nikkal to Yarihū,
Ib will pay the bride price,
Let her enter his house.

This rendering still has different subjects in each clause—a feature to which we objected above, and the third subject has to be inferred from the apparent feminine preformative of the verb. We shall see more of this below. Furthermore there is a dividing wedge on the tablet between ytrh and ib. If this does imply a sense division as distinct from a rather haphazard word division, then it frustrates this approach.

[1] We may divide it into the following sense units:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{tn nkl} \\
\text{yrh ytrh} \\
\underline{\text{ib t}^0\text{rbm bhhth}} \\
\text{Give Nikkal:} \\
\text{Yarihū will pay the bride price;} \\
\text{Ib will bring her into his house.}
\end{array}
\]

This has the advantage of giving the sense of the parallelism of 11,18f.. There are plenty of examples of preformative t—having a masculine reference, and so there is no objection to the third line on this basis. However, we should expect a s-form of the verb, as is found, for example, in a similar context in the Keret story (CTA 14 iv 203f.):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{hm hry bth igh} \\
\underline{\text{as}^0\text{rb glat hzyy}} \\
\text{If I take Huxiya to my house,} \\
\text{and bring the maid to my court...}
\end{array}
\]

It is perhaps asking too much to amend the verb in CTA 24 to a
S-form, but the Keret passage draws attention to an important social aspect of the context, which suggests the kind of direction in which an interpretation should move. This is that the groom takes the bride to his house; she does not enter by herself. This is a further argument against the first suggestion which we rejected above. It might be possible to plead a pregnant sense for $t^G_{rbm}$, either as a $G$- or more plausibly as a $D$-form, but this does not carry much conviction, and still leaves the problem of the enclitic $m$, which we saw in discussing Aistleitner’s views cannot really serve as an objective suffix.

There remains a third possibility for the understanding of the passage which avoids the pitfalls of the previous suggestions. There is an alternative to taking $t^G_{rb}$ as a verb meaning ‘to enter’. Another verb of the same form occurs in Hebrew with the (unrelated?) meaning ‘to take on pledge, give in pledge, exchange’. Bearing in mind the commercial aspect of Canaanite marriage, with the paying of a bride-price, perhaps this sense may be understood in the Ugaritic verb here and the passage translated thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
tn & nkl \\
yrh & ytrh \\
i b & t^G_{rbm} bbbth
\end{align*}
\]

Give likkal to Yarihu will pay the bride-price, Ib will take the pledge into his house.

This rendering not only avoids all the problems mentioned, but fulfills all the expected demands of the passage, both in terms of the poetic structure ($Yarihu//Ib$, as we have suggested), and the expectation that the whole third line should constitute a parallelismus membrorum to the second, and also in terms of the
social context. This latter point seems to be further borne out by the immediate continuation of the text, where Yarihu himself confirms the statement:

\[
\text{watn mbrh}
\]
\[
\text{labh alp kap}
\]
\[
\text{wrbt hra}
\]

Yea, I shall pay her mohar - 
to her father a thousand shekels of silver,
ten thousand shekels of gold shall I send...

If the term \text{id} is accepted as referring to Yarihu, there remains the question of its significance. It is possible that it still has the sense referred to above, though that would be more appropriate to a goddess. And in the context of a sacred marriage text it is hardly convincing to fall back on the idea of the deity being hermaphrodite, or anything like that. If we reject a relationship with Akkadian \text{enbu}, 'fruit', there remain alternative explanations:

1) In CTA 17 1.27 and parallel passages the expression \text{skn ilibh} occurs, which may have the sense of 'the stele of his ancestral gods'.\textit{70} It is not clear whether we should explain the element \text{id} in this context in terms of \text{wb}, 'ghost' and therefore 'ancestor' - cf. also the sense of \text{1hym} in 1 S.28.13, or whether it should be explained by reference to the incidence of the divine title \text{ilib} occurring at BS 1929.17,1, where the Akkadian version of the pantheon list (BS20.24) reads \text{DINGIR a-bi} and obviously takes \text{id} to be the equivalent of \text{a-bi}.\textit{71} The \text{i} does not necessarily raise an insuperable obstacle to this sense, since we have \text{id} for \text{a-bi} in CTA 24.35,\textit{72} and it may be used in this text to distinguish the titular use of the word from its common
use in 1.27. If my suggestion above of the cognate relationship of El and Yarihu is tenable, then it is entirely appropriate that the idea of fatherhood should be attributed to Yarihu.

ii) The sense Mistleitner suggested for ib(t) on the basis of Akkadian ebbu, 'bright', would be very suitable as an epithet of the moon-god, taken as a masculine form: 'the radiant one', 'the brilliant'. In practice, of course, a scholarly etymology, however accurate, does not necessarily reflect the meaning, if any, read into a term like this by the society actually using it. The etymological sense of the term may have been quite unknown in Ugarit, while pious explanations with a greater or lesser approximation to etymological truth would be felt to be 'right' even if they conflicted with one another. This kind of 'rightness' of explanations is familiar to us from the Bible (e.g. Ex. 2.10, 3.13-15) and was undoubtedly familiar to the Ugaritians. Whatever the sense, however, I think we have been able to establish that the term ib is a title of Yarihu.

Another matter in CTA 24 which requires a brief discussion in the light of the mythological motifs we are considering is the meaning of the episode described in the first ten lines. Their fragmentary condition might be considered such as to make any firm rendering highly dubious. But attempts have been made, which perhaps on the basis of comparative material can be taken as possible, albeit still hypothetical. Goetze's reconstruction fills in many of the lacunae in a rather doubtful way, and his translation is based on many unexplained (and inexplicable!) interpretations of individual words, the very division of which it is sometimes impossible to determine. However, he understands the passage to describe the seduction of Nikkal by
Yarīhu. Enough remains to give some support for this, for example, 11.3-5,7:

It seems unavoidable from this that some kind of premarital adventure goes on in this version of the 'marriage' between Yarīhu and, presumably, Nikkal. There are two close parallels in Akkadian literature. One is the exorcism to counteract the pains of childbirth, cited by Astour, which recounts the love of Sin for a cow named Amat-; in. The other is a very terse fragment from the same source which is so similar to CTA 24 as to look like an Akkadian version of the same myth, especially in view of the equations NIN.GAL. Nikkal and Sin = Yarīhu. Just what we are to make of this outburst of divine passion at a theological level is perhaps difficult to envisage; but at the everyday level of the life of pastoralists it means a great deal, of course, and may be intended to present the divine archetype (in illo tempore...) in the most realistic way possible, by portraying the god as a bull, released among his herd at the commencement of the breeding season, and unable to restrain his ardour - a weakness which seems to have been entirely reciprocated!

d) The story of Abraham and Hagar.

To turn from the clearly mythological accounts we have
examined so far, to a tradition in Genesis, needs some explanation. In spite of the discouraging nature of the results of higher and form criticism in the attempt to reconstruct something of the pre-history of Israel from the patriarchal narratives, the extensive discoveries in Near Eastern archaeology have encouraged scholars to see in the history of the second millennium a background against which the patriarchs can be set with a greater or lesser degree of confidence, so that they emerge as historical rather than purely literary characters. Bright, for example, says that 'we can assert with confidence that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were actual historical individuals ... chieftains of semi-nomadic clans'; while Albright observes that 'Abraham, Isaac and Jacob no longer seem isolated figures, much less reflections of later Israelite history; they now appear as true children of their age'.

It seems an obvious first principle of relating archaeological data and historical traditions that the nature of each is already clear. If this is so, and an event is known to have taken place at a particular time and place, then the archaeological record can be drawn on to fill out the details. However in the case of the patriarchal stories (and also in the matter of the conquest tradition) this principle has not been observed by those who would maintain their historicity; this is precisely the issue which remains to be determined, and it is a literary rather than an archaeological matter. It can be decided only as the result of literary analysis, and not by recourse to any external 'facts', however 'objective' they may be. What they appear to be saying is that archaeological discoveries can determine the nature of the patriarchal narratives and this is absurd.

Quite apart from this, the extensive reconstructions of Albright, Bright, Speiser and others have recently been criticised...
by Thompson and van Seters, (see n. 85) not simply on methodical grounds, but also on the ground that in their interpretation they have misrepresented the true significance of both areas in their search for links which substantiate the truth (i.e. the historical truth) of the patriarchal tradition. This is not the place to go into the extensive argumentation of Thompson or Van Seters, but they have in my view fully justified the conclusions they have reached concerning the nature of the Genesis material. These are not in fact new at all, but represent a vindication of the positions of Wellhausen and Gunkel. They are briefly as follows: i) the biblical chronologies which have been used for determining various dates in patriarchal history cannot legitimately be so used. 87

ii) the evidence for Amorite movements in the second millennium has no bearing on the patriarchal migration-traditions. 88

iii) the legal and contractual texts from Nuzi in no way illuminate the context of patriarchal marriage, concubinage or adoption. 89

iv) the existence of names of patriarchal type simply shows that there is a common cultural background, and their incidence from every period only embarrasses any belief that they fix the patriarchs at desired times. 90

v) Various literary features, topographical and ethnic references in the patriarchal stories point to an origin in the first, not the second millennium, and in many instances to no earlier than the seventh or sixth century. 91

vi) the structure and function of the patriarchal narratives is not historical or annalistic, but 'sociological, political and religious.' 92
vii) they serve the needs of the community which produced them, and this was Israel (or Judah) at some considerable time after settlement, during the period of the monarchy. Clearly such conclusions, if valid, as I believe they are substantially, have far-reaching significance for Old Testament studies, and we shall see some of the implications later. Our immediate purpose is to determine the literary form of the stories about Abraham and Hagar. The results of the analysis of Thompson and van Seters leave little scope for seeing even remote historical memories in the traditions. They seem to be rather essentially fictitious, though of course that is not to deny that they emerge from the accumulated experience of and reflection concerning its origins by Israelite society, though this is to be understood as expressing itself through etiological narratives, folklore traditions and myths rather than through historical or even legendary recollection.

However, even if elements in the Genesis narratives be considered as having a historical basis, the onus would be on anyone to prove that the story in Gen. 16 - and the related materials in 18.1-15, 21 - is to be regarded as being of this kind. That it is not is generally agreed. There is a prima facie similarity between Gen. 16 and the traditions we have discussed above, that has been analysed by Astour. It seems that there is a common basis to the stories, which means that this particular folktale is mythical in origin. Greek literature is full of examples of erstwhile myths that have degenerated to the level of folklore or quasi-history, and it seems that we have a result of the same process here.

There appear to be two versions of the story in Gen. 16, the
second being found in 21.8ff., This is generally attributed to the E source, the account in ch.16 being J. VanSeters has argued convincingly that rather than being a completely independent account 21.8ff. in fact presuppose an immediate knowledge of the other. The first account is a folktale, fulfilling all Olrick's laws, while the second is opaque, unstructured, and full of blind motifs, showing it to be a literary construction deriving from it. On this basis, van Seters concludes that the account in 21.8ff., is a secondary Yahwistic construction. I do not feel that this conclusion is necessary. There is a great deal of material underlying and common to both J and E (e.g. the northern exodus tradition is found in J, and the southern Sinai tradition, albeit without reference to the name, is found in E), and this can adequately be explained by mutual influence and borrowing of traditions during the united monarchy. So while the account in 21.8ff., may have been constructed with ch.16 in mind, it is quite possible that it survived in a written form that became divorced from J at Jeroboam's secession. Besides, while the birth of Ishmael is the immediate solution to the childlessness of Abram and Hagar in ch.16, in 21.8ff., the existence of the older Ishmael is precisely to highlight the greater importance of Isaac, which could arguably make better sense in a northern context (i.e. with E as the source).

The Isaac of the pentateuch in its present form is a colourless figure indeed. He appears in eight episodes; but in every case but one, he is not the major character:

1) 17.15-22 (P) promise of Isaac to Abraham; Abraham concerned.
2) 16.1-15 (J) promise of Isaac to Sarah; Sarah concerned.
3) 21.1-7 (J) birth of Isaac; Isaac concerned (inevitably!).
4) 21.3-5 (P) circumcision of Isaac; patently late tradition.
v) 22. (E) sacrifice of Isaac; Abraham concerned.

vi) 24. (J) marriage of Isaac; much more interest in Rebekah - an acceptable bride - than in the groom.

vii) 26. (J) Isaac and Abimelech; doublet of 12.10-20 (J) Abraham and Pharaoh, which itself was duplicated by 20. (E) Abraham and Abimelech; however the problem is resolved, Isaac cannot win.

viii) 27. (J) blessing of Jacob; Jacob concerned.

And since the only episode (iii) in which Isaac plays the most prominent role in his own birth, we are obviously not left with much. E.H. Hooke remarks that 'Isaac is little more than a necessary link...' and 'behind Isaac there is nothing substantial'.

If Isaac were really the son of Abraham and father of Jacob, this would be rather odd, considering how seriously the traditions take these two. But if the genealogical links are artificial, and Isaac was originally a 'primary' ancestor of some group (the Leah tribes?) which later became absorbed and to some extent subordinated in a greater confederation of tribes, then his reduction to his present status is perfectly understandable, especially considering that the southern traditions are naturally enough concerned primarily with their own local and ancestral traditions.

The incidence of Isaac's name throughout the Old Testament bears this out. Anywhere where a (southern) historian's or redactor's quill has been at work, Isaac falls neatly into his inconspicuous place between Abraham and Jacob. Even in Gen. 24, the account of the covenant at Shechem, in which the northern Joseph tribes presumably took the leading role, Abraham holds the limelight, unless a case could be made for verses 2b-3 being a later addition. Loggin italicises 3b, 4a (which includes both references to Isaac, treating them as deuteronomistic, and therefore late).
We are thus left with the two references in the book of Amos:

7.9 The high places of Isaac are going to be ruined, the sanctuaries of Israel destroyed.

7.16 Do not prophesy against Israel, utter no oracles against the house of Isaac.

Though Amos was a southerner, he was clearly familiar with northern traditions, and was prophesying some decades before the fall of Israel, and therefore before northern traditions brought south (by refugees in 724-721?) were incorporated into the southern material. His paralleling of Isaac and Israel is very interesting. We could argue that both are simply names for the kingdom. Harper suggests that Isaac is a synonym for Israel which "may include Judah but not Edom". I think it refers to the northern kingdom alone. But both are also the personal names of patriarchs. Now in Gen. 49.2 (J) we read:

Gather round, sons of Jacob, and listen; listen to Israel your father.

Here Jacob and Israel are taken to be the same person. We even have an aetiological explanation of this at Gen. 32.26-30 (J).

On this analogy, perhaps Amos reflects a tradition in which Isaac and Israel were different names for the same (northern) figure - perhaps a fusion already? - who lost his own traditions to Jacob, now presented genealogically as his son.

If this is plausible, then we have the situation that Isaac, a patriarch of at least some of the northern tribes, loses out at first to Jacob, who even steals his name Israel, presumably as a result of the take-over by the Joseph tribes coming in from Egypt of the older Leah group of tribes and their territory or as a result of the appropriation by southern tribes of the Exodus tradition (in the time of the united kingdom). Then, at some time after 721, and
possibly as late as the exilic period, since the editorial stages of Deuteronomy indicate that northern and southern traditions were not fused by 621, all this patriarchal material was again subordinated to the great southern figure of Abraham. (The Jacob, originally a northern figure, is made prominent in southern tradition, or a minor southern patriarch Jacob takes on a greater stature by assimilating Israel (< Isaac) traditions).

This interpretation, of Jacob as a southern patriarch, appears to be supported by Gen. 28.13. This is in the J account of Jacob's dream, and Yahweh says to him, 'I am Yahweh, the god of Abraham your father, and the god of Isaac'. Here Jacob is clearly the son of Abraham, with Isaac an outsider, and the expression 'and the god of Isaac' in its present position looks like an addition. It is possible that the word order should simply be altered to read '... the god of Abraham and the god of Isaac your father', or alternative that 'father' relating to Abraham should be interpreted as 'forefather'. But there seems no need to amend or strain the obvious sense of the text, which reveals the artificiality of the formulaic Abraham... Isaac... Jacob, and points to Isaac being from a tradition originally independent of that dealing with Abraham and Jacob. It is not hard to see how they should be understood respectively as northern and southern eponymous ancestors.

Conserving at least some status by becoming the 'son of promise' of Abraham, the northern Isaac then perhaps usurped the place of Ishmael in the southern tradition. We can catch a glimpse of this at Gen. 25.11b (J) which records that Isaac 'lived near the well of Lehai Roy'. Since this is the location of Hagar's theophany and supposedly so of Ishmael's birth in the J account (not the E account: Paran -21.20f.) we may surmise that the allusion at
25.11b originally had Ishmael as subject. And this is confirmed by removing the P material in ch. 25 (verses 7-11a, 12-17), which then with the J text as it now stands would have Isaac the subject of 25.18. As this could be absurd, we should understand Ishmael as subject in both verses. Of course, it may be that all the J traditions in which Isaac features at all significantly originally referred to Ishmael, but that is beyond the scope of our present enquiry. My suggestion that this doctoring of traditions took place in the exilic period may point to political motivation behind the "outlawing" of Ishmael — perhaps a result of enmity with Edom.

A further example of Ishmael traditions being transferred to Isaac may be the narrative of the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22.1-14). A Qur'anic tradition (Sura 37.vv.81-113) seems to understand Ishmael and not Isaac as the son in danger of immolation. Bell considers this a corruption of the biblical tradition, but it seems gratuitous, as is so often done, to discredit the Arabian tradition whenever it differs from the Jewish — on the grounds that Muhammad garbled ideas received. As we shall see below, there is reason to suspect that in the mythology underlying the quasi-historical narrative of Genesis, Ishmael and Isaac were the twin sons of Abraham, who in the context of the stories under consideration appears to have links with the moon-god.

Even if van Seters attribution of 21.8ff. to J be upheld, it need not affect our argument, since the principle of mutual influence during the united monarchy can still be invoked to explain how the northern Isaac has been incorporated.

The interesting feature, which is important for our overall argument, is that the whole rather diffuse body of tradition about Isaac and Ishmael bears similarity to the features of the myths...
described above, and it is not unreasonable to suggest that the myth lies behind the tradition. This is not to say that such figures as Ishmael and Isaac (= Israel?) were entirely mythical rather than eponymous or even possibly historical characters. There seems to be nothing specifically mythical about the names (unless Isaac be linked to the use of the verb yshq of El (CTA 6 iii 16; cf. yzhq, CTA 12 i 12). But quite naturally the origins of the patriarchs are couched in the theogonic language of the prevailing religious tradition, which appears on the basis of the accumulation of evidence to have been the cult of the moon.

Apart from the linguistic affinities suggested by Astour (n. 95) we have the following features in common between the biblical and non-biblical materials:

1) the duplication of wives (CTA 12 i 9ff., 23 rev. 42, Gen. 16.2, 21.9; cf. the two goddesses of childbirth in the Babylonian account);

2) the handmaid motif (CTA 12 i 15ff., Gen. 16.2, 21.10);

3) the childlessness motif (CTA 23 obv. 8ff., Gen. 15.3, 16.1, 18.9ff.)

4) the desert motif (CTA 12 i 21, 23 rev. 68, Gen. 16.7ff., 21.15ff.);

5) the twin offspring (CTA 12 i 26ff., see further below; CTA 23 rev. 52; on the grounds for considering that the twin hypostases of Ḫattar lie behind Isaac and Ishmael see below).

The version of CTA 24 and the Akkadian myth to which it seems a close parallel are clearly dissimilar in many details from the versions we have here. But CTA 12 and 23 certainly show a similarity in formal structure with the Genesis tradition, which agrees in every major detail if it be recognised that the structure has here
been 'exploded', so that the individual features appear at various parts of Genesis, which are however to be linked by the common basis of the theme of Abraham's offspring.

We have mentioned the artificiality of the genealogical formula Abraham - Isaac - Jacob. That however in no way invalidates our observations here, for the tradition clearly tries to give expression to a variety of disparate themes. The function of the genealogy is to fuse together under the aegis of the common theological motif of divine promises given to the tribal forefathers the distinct tribal groups in Palestine. The function of the birthstories is to express the slightly different - though ultimately related - convictions of the purity of the national strain (the child of the legitimate wife is the channel), and of divine election.

I am not trying to suggest that Abra(ha)m, Isaac, Ishmael and their mothers are necessarily mythical figures. Isaac and Ishmael are better regarded as eponyms. However, it is significant that in the construction of stories to explain aspects of Israelite and Arab ancestry, recourse should be had to a framework which has survived elsewhere in purely mythical forms (CTA 12, 23). This suggests there is a common background in early West Semitic pastoral life with its religious presuppositions. On the basis of CTA 12 and 24, we have argued that the moon-cult is to be understood, and that this is also to be inferred in CTA 23.

Its relevance for Israelite religion will become clear later. Our case is cumulative, and it would be wrong to claim too much now. But we have seen in ch.1 that the goddess Aserah is of importance in Israel, and that in her earliest form she was a sun-goddess, consort of the moon-god. In the present chapter we have discerned echoes of lunar mythology lying behind the Genesis
tradition. This by no means proves that the Israelites worshipped the moon-god, as these may be ancient fossils preserved in an evolving cult. But even as fossils, they are of considerable use in an enquiry into Israelite religious origins.

We shall look at (so-called) patriarchal religion below in ch. 5. The relevance of our present discussion is that behind Gen. 16 appears the cult of El, and the tradition has later become part of the theme of continuity within the cult of Yahweh. So some kind of relationship must have existed at some time in Palestine between the two cults.

e) A note on the possible literary relationship of the various myths discussed and alluded to.

The similarities between the stories examined makes some kind of relationship between them a certainty. What is far more difficult to analyse satisfactorily is the nature of the relationship. Differences of type allow broad lines to be drawn, but the Greek versions, for example, appear to be familiar with elements of at least two types, and any one recension may of course be drawn not only from more than one strand here, but also from other at present unknown versions.

I suggest that the lines of descent may run like this (broken lines representing conjectural links):

(diagram over)
My reasons for the arrangement above are as follows:

1) I suggest a prototype lying behind both (2) and (6), rather than deriving (6) from (2), because (6) is clearly not as near to (2) as is, say, (5), and yet we have suggested that (5) also presupposes (6). The latter must therefore be substantially independent of (2).

(5) shows a close relationship to (2), particularly in its opening lines, as noted above.

ii) (5) is in turn divergent from (3), while giving evidence of a common source behind them, which is best understood to be (2).

iii) Since (3) is a development and 'loosening up' of (2), (e.g. the moon-god is replaced by the sun-god), and is from a milieu which has links with both Mesopotamia and the West Semitic world, the theme of Ba'al's bovine encounter with Anat may be a further
derivation through Hurrian mediation. Since the taurophorm S"god may however be independent of this whole milieu, the inclusion of (4) is tentative.

iv) If it is right to include it, it seems a likely source of certain features in the Io myth (e.g. Zeus is a storm-god, Io, like Anat, is a heifer), which however may also owe debts to (7) and even (8) - or a fluid tradition lying behind it.

Alternatively (9) may have reached Greece by way of Anatolia, so that (3) is a possible direct source though (9) appears to be familiar with the West Semitic versions.

v) Of the West Semitic forms (6) appears to be the oldest, in that it is less developed than (7) or (8), though it is already sufficiently independent of (2), as we have seen, to be seen as from a hypothetical prototype (1). The closest link between (6) and (2) is the duplication of El's wives, which may be the Western development of the two goddesses of childbirth who appear at the birth in (2).

vi) CTA 12 (7) seems to be best understood as a development of (6). The first column is clearly parallel to (6), but has been set into the context of the Ba'al cult, though we shall see in ch.3 that behind the greater whole there still lies a very archaic prototype.

vii) (8) has closest affinities with (6) and (7), and is arguably dependent on both of them, though since the twin deities of (7) have become malevolent, quasi-deemonic creatures, the link with (6) is perhaps primary.

In the West Semitic context, the interrelationship we have sought to clarify here is further complicated by the associated mythology of atonement, which we shall examine in the next chapter. This will, I believe, give justification to our
expression of an 'exploded' mythical background in Genesis (p.72), since what appears there as a series of stories which may at first sight seem to be unrelated is in fact a fragmented version of a tighter complex which survives in other Israelite cultic contexts.
I have used the phrase 'divine marriage' instead of 'sacred marriage' for this reason: that the latter term is always used in the context of the cult; even when reference is made to the archetype, there is a tacit allusion to the ritual reenactment of this in the temple cult. S. N. Kramer, writing of the theory of T. J. Meek regarding the cultic origin of the Song of Songs, remarks that 'this Sacred Marriage had been part of a fertility cult which the nomadic Hebrews took over from their urbanised Canaanite neighbors who, in turn, had borrowed it from the Tammuz-Ishtar cult of the Akkadians, a modified form of the Dumuzi-Inanna cult of the Sumerians'. The sacred marriage rite, (1969), 89. The idea that the hierogamy is agricultural in origin is quite reasonable. What we have in the present context, however, is clearly nothing to do with this, especially since elements are present which indicate a pastoralist origin. It could be argued it was derived from primitive agricultural rites, but we have no way of proving it. But of course the marriage in question is the prototype of all marriages, in heaven and on earth; it is the marriage which initiates the theogony.

2 Psa. 87.4, 89.11, Is. 51.9.
4 CTPA 12 i 16f. Literature on the text:
C. Virollesaud, 'Les chasses de Baal', Syria 16 (1935), 247-269;
R. Dussaud, 'Le vrai nom de Baal', RHR 113 (1936), 5-20;
H. L. Ginsberg, 'Ba'lu and his brethren', JPOS 16 (1936), 138-149;
J. A. Montgomery, 'A myth of a spring', JAOS 56 (1936), 226-231;
T. H. Caster, The haproming of Baal', Ao Or 16 (1937), 41-48;

Ibid., Thespi, (1950), first edn. only, 217-222, 405f.;

I. Engnell, Studies in divine kingship, (1967\(^2\)), 125-127;

C. H. Gordon, ULI, 53-55;

J. Gray, 'The hunting of Ba'al', JNES 10 (1951), 146-155;

Ibid., 'The legacy of Canaan', (1965\(^2\)), 76-81;

Ibid., 'Baal's atonement', UF 3 (1971), 61-70

C. H. Cordon, ULI953-55;

J. Gray, 'The hunting of Ba'al', JNES 10 (1951), 146-155;


Used of Mot; CTA 5 i 1 2. See also col. 1 14-22.

See Wyatt, TGUOS 25, p. 87.

Gray alludes vaguely to a link (op. cit., 153) but does not enlarge.

So Virolleaud, 'La naissance des dieux gracieux et beaux',

13 E.g. Driver, *Chal*., 121 n.9; Gaster, *JAss 66*, pp.50,52.


15 Herdner, *CTA* p.69.

16 Only in this context could it be explicitly construed of Aserah, and in fact we are arguing that the other mother in the passage, Sepeh, is directly referred to.

17 Taking *altha* as equivalent to Heb. נַגַּ֣ה, with Gaster, *JAss 66*, p.56, n.32; Ginsberg, *Notes on the birth of the gracious and beautiful gods!*; *JBras*, 1935, p.53. and Gordon has doors, *Ut*, 59, and gives that as the only meaning of *dit* in *Ut*, §668, p.385. So does Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch*, §752, p.78. With 'branches', we have the perpetuation of the vintage metaphor, confirmed by *bnba*, 'grape clusters', in 1.26. *The reading nytph fits the context, but is in doubt. See CTA, p.99, n.41* - Herdner reads nytph, for which it is hard to get any meaning.

18 Driver, *Chal*, 122.

19 CTA 2, iii 15.

20 Loc.cit.; Also 4 viii 21. 6 11 24. iii 24. iv 32. etc... ter.

21 CTA 6 i 13ff...

22 Driver restores the n, *Chal*, 122.

23 For this sense see Gaster, *op.cit.*, 54, 56 and nn. 53, 56;

Driver, *Chal*, 123.

24 E.g. CTA 6 i 16, 19, 25; 4 i 14f., 22, etc., in the formula rbt atyt.ym.

25 ... athe rbt...

*spa whgh nyr*

Cordon: *UL*, 78; - Lady Sun will be
setting; yea, the Lady
gleaming with glow...

Driver takes the second rbt in its numerical sense:
Do thou await the darkening of the
Lady Sapas, and the lighting of the
lamps of myriads (of stars)... op.cit., 41.

26 Cf. The Israelite procedure at Lev. 12.1–8. If roughly the
same procedure underlies Ugaritic practice, and nomadic
practice before it, then of course the seven and thirty-three
days (total forty) must be understood as being telescoped in
the myth and its ritual. We shall see in ch. 3 that cycles of
years are telescoped into days in the rites underlying CTA 12
and related passages.

27 CTA 4 vi 46, etc..

28 As Caquot remarks, 'Le dieu Athtar et les textes de Ras Shamra';
Syria 35 (1958), 53. He is concerned to cast doubt on the
identification of OAttar with Venus, making him out to be 'céleste' but not 'astral' (op.cit., 58), because he rejects
the view of Hommel, Nielsen et al, that the religion of the
early pastoralist Semites was essentially astral in character.
While the matter is extremely complex, I should have thought
that such a characterisation was nevertheless irrefutable.
One has only to look at the overwhelming evidence for
moon-worship from all parts of the Semitic world to see that
the High God was 'astral' rather than 'céleste' — though I
myself find this neat distinction invidious. As for Caquot's
discussion of OAttar in non-astral contexts (e.g. irrigation,
op.cit.,; 55,58), of course he was more than just a planet.
Indeed from prehistoric times all the major gods were deities
of many aspects...
29 Virolleaud, op.cit.,148; Caster, op.cit.,67j also cites Duessaund and Höcke. Largomont, op.cit.,15f., has seven gods born.

30 op.cit.,68.

31 Caster, op.cit.,55.

32 Caquot, op.cit.,46, reads the first two words as 1bun ard, and translates the couplet as:

Comme un lion je descendrai; dans ma gorge seront broyés les habiles (artsains qui travaillont) à la demeure de Yam, au palais du Juge-Rivière.

To this particular passage, cf. CTA 4 viii 15ff., describing Nat. The use of the verb yrd (ard) is also perhaps significant bearing in mind its usage in the phrase yrd are (e.g. at CTA 4 viii 7-9). This association of Attar with the lion appears in CTA 24, where I would interpret 11.28-30 as a chiastic structure:

\[ \text{ydr} \quad \text{citr} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{lk} \quad \text{ybrdm} \quad \text{bt} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{ybrdm} \quad \text{bh} \quad 1b\nu \quad \text{yt} \quad \text{r} \]

Attar would make supplication for a 'tirhu on your behalf with regard to Ybrdmy, his father's daughter, would the lion arouse (go with passion for you, Yarihu.)

\*cf. \text{r} \text{n} \text{v} \text{v} to supplicate on behalf of, EBR, p.601, KB,749.

\** Gordon has the a, UT, ad loc.

Though my translation is very different from Gordon's, he makes the identification, UL, 64n. Driver, on the other hand, identifies the Lion with Ba'al (CIAL,125,n.16), which seems gratuitous. In view of our discussion, the iconographical
feature of the lion as the vehicle of Istar is interesting. Mot is the 'son of Ašerah' at CTa 6 v 1, while 0-Attar is 'one of your sons' — and presumably the firstborn, at 6 i 46. This is another point in favour of the identification of 0-Attar and Mot (see n. 10).

33 Driver, CHAL, 121; Gaster, Thespis, 420; Kozmala, 'Mot and the vine, the time of the Ugaritic fertility rite', ASTI 3 (1964), 142. Ginsberg, JRAS 1935, p. 63; and Gordon, UL, 58, just transliterate.

34 Gaster, 'A Canaanite ritual drama', JAOS 66 (1946), 51, translates 'Lord and Master', and in n. 9 on p. 56, explains mt as Akk. mutu, Eth. met, Heb. mat (pl. matim), 'man', 'hero'. In Thespis he appears to change his mind, but that is no guarantee of improvement. See also D. T. Tsumura, 'A Ugaritic god, MT-W-ŠR, and his two weapons', UP 5 (1973), 407; for further references. Tsumura rejects the etymology from mutu. I take br to-šarru, 'king'. But could it be an error for tr, 'bull'?

35 Gaster, JAOS 66, p. 59, and Thespis, 420, with a host of classical daffodils!

36 Gaster, JAOS 66, p. 55; Gordon, UL, 62: 'guard of the sown'; Driver, CHAL, 125: 'watchman of the sown land'.

37 See n. 31.

38 See nn. 33, 34.

39 Gen. 15. 2. See below.

40 Following the interpretation of Gaster, op. cit., that El is full of vigour, rather than the alternative view that in his dotage he cannot even manage an erection (see Pope, El in the Ugaritic texts, 37-39. As Gaster remarks in Thespis, 429f., there may however be a coarse pun intended, whereby, while El
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is in fact sprightly, his consorts egg him on by doubles entendres on the 'dropping of his staff'.

41 Rev. 37:44.

42 Pastoralists on the edge of the desert-steppe might well be familiar enough with agricultural processes to be able to use this as a metaphor.

43 Reading šb’d yrhm at obv. 12, as do Gaster, JAOS 66, p. 52; Ginsberg, op. cit., 63; Gordon, UT, 174. Hardner reads šrmt (a reading already accepted by Gordon, UL, 58, and Driver, CTA, as well as by Gaster, 'The Canaanite poem of the gracious gods, line 12', JAOS 67 (1947), 326) see CTA, p. 98, n. 7. See also Largeman, op. cit., 22. If $g = y$ and $b = ?$, and either could be read. In fact any reading at all is conjectural! See CTA, cuneiform volume, fig. 67 and pl. 32.

44 Of course, if šrmt be read, this point is meaningless. But Gaster, op. cit., 60, takes it to be a cultic object (a pillar, or kind of altar?), and refers to Jos. 22.27-28, 34, where the 'altar' seems to have been called ?yw.

45 Obv. 14.

46 Though as Gaster indicates, it was later adapted to use in an agricultural context, op. cit., 61ff., Theopis², 422ff.

47 A further piece of evidence which should be mentioned in this context is text RS 24.258 (published by Virolleaud, 'Le festin du père des dieux', Ugaritica V (1968), 545-551). In view of the parallelism of štrt and ?nt in 11.10f., where the goddesses are closely paired and their essential identity seems a reasonable interpretation (cf. pp. 15f above), it is possible that the forms štrt (1.1) and yrhm (1.4) are to be similarly paired. The suggestion in isolation is merely conjectural, but the
evidence from CTA 12 strengthens the hypothesis.

48 C. Virolleaud, 'Hymne phénicien au dieu Nikkal et aux déesses Košarôt', *Syria* 17 (1936), 209-228.


50 Goetze, *op. cit.* See the stela of Nabonidus, col iii, *ANET*, 312.

51 P. 62.

52 Goetze, *op. cit.*, 354.

53 Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, 210; to expect Yarih to marry a god Nikkal is unfair.


57 *CLAL*, 124.


60 J. Aistleetner, 'Die Nikkal-Hymne aus Ras Shamra', *ZDMG* 93 (1939), 52, 54.

Gordon, UL, 64, Driver, CIAL, 124ff. Goetze goes to rather unnecessary lengths to get the sense 'would that at least'; op. cit., 366.

63 UL, 6.
64 CIAL, 125.
66 Semitica 2, 19. Contrast Textes Ougaritiques 1, 393, which follows Driver's approach.

67 Explained as carelessness by Gordon, UT, §9.12, p.73, and more plausibly as an alternative form by Herdner, 'Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras Shamra', RES 1938, 76-83.

68 Orb II, BDB, 786.
69 i.e., Nikkal.
70 So Gordon, UL, 86, Caquot et al, Textes Ougaritiques 1, 421.
71 See J. Nougayrol, Ugaritica V (1968), 44ff.
72 See Aistleitner, Wörterbuch (1962), §133, pp.14, &.
73 See n. 60.
76 ben 'eq: Gordon, UT, text 77, p.183; Driver, op. cit., 124.
77 ytkh — Gordon, UT, §2673, p.502, gives two meanings for tkh: 'to shine' (of heavenly bodies) — with a reference to this passage and 'to be passionate' (UT, text 132 = CTA 11.1, 1,2). The latter meaning seems possible here in view of the following word: (Aistleitner, Wörterbuch, §2863, p.334, has 'finden, treffen').
78 yb[hq]: Goetze, op. cit., 371; Herdner, CTA, p.102; and Driver, loc. cit., have yb[hq].
In view of the glint in 1.7 this seems perfectly justified.


Op Ningal zette hij zijn zinnen; de god Sin noodigde haar uit en hij naderde haar schoot. Zij luisterde naar hem, zij vroeg niet haar vader. (On NIN.GAL he set his heart; the god Sin invited her out and he approached her womb.

She listened to him and she did not ask her father.

A further Hurrianized version of the myth, diverging considerably from the lunar type which seems to lie behind the Semitic versions (still to be argued for Gen. 16 etc.) is found as text 3 in J. Friedrich, 'Churritische Marchen und Sagen in hethitische Sprache', ZA 49 (1959), 225-233.

J. Bright, A history of Israel (1964), 82. He seems to be more circumspect in his approach in Early Israel in recent history writing, (1956), 123ff.

The archaeology of Palestine, (1949), 236; cf. FBAC, 236, IOC, 56.

See, for example, J. Bright, Early Israel..., for a defense of Albright and Bright over against Alt and Noth, and H. Weippert, The settlement of the Israelite tribes in Palestine, (ET 1971) for the vindication of the latter.

This use of 'objectivity', is found in Bright, Early Israel... 91 'objective, external evidence is always required'. It leads Weippert to accuse him (and Albright) of positivism.
op. cit. 129, n. 5. Veippert speaks of the Albright-Bright methodology as 'positivist', not fundamentalist'. But the latter term is applied, along with 'historicism', by T.L. Thompson, HPM, (1974), 315. J. van Seters, ABT, (1975), 10 writes, in talking of the selectivity which has governed much of American scholarship in the field, and has influenced the choice of materials published in ANET, that it 'more closely resembles an apologetic than a scholarly investigation.'

87 Thompson, op. cit. 9-16. These pages and those cited in nn. 88-93 include all the relevant discussion in both studies.


89 Thompson, op. cit. 196-207; van Seters, op. cit., 55-103.

90 Thompson, op. cit., 17-51; van Seters, op. cit., 40-42.

91 Van Seters, op. cit., 43-64.

92 Thompson, op. cit., 315.


94 Van Seters describes Gen. 116 as a folktale, op. cit., 192ff.

95 Hellenosemitica, 82ff. In each cycle of stories he treats, Astour examines the etymology of personal and place-names, often adducing the most unexpected meanings to link up from one version to another. In this case he derives Io (911), who is changed into a cow, from ἱέβα: 'to wander', and equates it with Ugaritic ἵρ 'cow' or 'heifer', which is cognate with Akk. āru 'to wander' (Heb. בַּאֶשֶׁר). He remarks that 'some ancient authors presumed that Io signified "moon" in Argos', with a note to the effect that 'this etymology has no confirmation' (p. 84 and n. 4).

Interestingly however, there are grounds for such an
etymology. Stung by a gadfly sent by the wrathful Hera, Io fled, among other places, to Egypt. The Greeks identified her with Isis, according to Meyer (Geschichte des Altertums, (1953-837), iii, 430 - cited by Astour, op.cit., 80). The old Egyptian for moon was \textit{ih}, becoming in New Egyptian \textit{ih}, which in turn gave rise to the Bohairic \textit{ioh}, (N. Walker, 'Yahwism and the divine name Yahweh', ZAW 70 (1958), 264). Even if this provides no scientific etymology for Io, it does at least offer an explanation for the belief of 'some ancient authors'.

The name Hagar (חָגָר) is etymologically equivalent to Astour's explanations of Io and arh, being derived from Ar. \textit{Hagar} 'to flee', 'to emigrate', Astour, op.cit., 86, BDB, 212. Perhaps the verbal epithet \textit{atrt} in the N.W. Semitic context of Ugarit is an exact equivalent of what we have seen with Io, arh and Hagar. In this case, we still have to explain \textit{ym}. This can be done either by explaining it as 'day' (cf. ch.1,n.61), and not so much the object of \textit{atrt} (which after all should be intransitive) as a further title in apposition. This is plausible if we take Aserah to be a sun-goddess as I have argued. Alternatively, if \textit{ym} = day be rejected, it could be explained as an element becoming attached to Aserah when, by syncretism with pre-Semitic earth mothers in Syria, she takes on various maritime functions.

There are grounds, for example, for considering that the Oedipus 'myth', i.e. the story about the legendary character who as a Cadmid would on Astour's arguments have a very good claim to historicity, is a reduction into human terms (all the characters are human) of an original myth (in which the characters were divine) transplanted from Phoenicia to Greece.
98 See A. Olrik, 'Epische Gesetze der Volksdichtung', ZDA 51 (1909), 1-12; his laws are summarised and discussed in van Seters, op. cit., 160ff.


100 We shall discuss these allocations of traditions to north and south below.

101 See van Seters, op. cit., 191 on ch. 26 as a literary construction modelled on 12.10ff.

102 S. H. Hooke, In the beginning, (1947), 93ff.

103 J. A. Soggin, Joshua (ET 1972), 220.

104 W. R. Harper, Micah and Hosea (ICC, 1905), 166.

CHAPTER THREE.

The theology of Atonement

and related motifs.

In the present chapter we shall examine various ritual traditions, from Ugarit and Israel. At first glance there appears to be little connection between the rite underlying CTA 12, and the Passover and Scapegoat rites from Israel. However, there are many points in common, and I believe that we can reconstruct the common tradition which lies behind all three, and which in turn enables us to offer some comments on some parts of the Sinai tradition to which I do not feel adequate attention has hitherto been paid.

a) The problem of CTA 12.

Text CTA 12 was first published in 1935 by Virolleaud, and has been the subject of many studies, though without any consensus on its interpretation as a whole or concerning details. I shall offer what I believe is a coherent interpretation, as well as relating the cultic background of the text to the broader milieu of West Semitic religion in the second millennium.

The text falls into two parts; firstly the birth of the Devourers is described, and then Ba'gal comes upon them in the desert, is (presumably, in the fragmentary lines ii 1-44) overwhelmed, and perhaps restored. These two parts do not coincide with the arrangement in columns, since the second part already begins in i 34, and so their relationship on the tablet is obviously intentional. But there are reasons for thinking that Ba'gal has been introduced into an otherwise independent tradition, which has been adapted to accommodate him.
Gray has noted the parallel between the birth described in CTA 12, and that of CTA 23, but declined to make much of it. I have argued above that we have, in fact, the same birth described, and that we also have several other versions of the same myth. In discussing these, Astour also includes CTA 5 v 17ff., and CTA 10, though these must remain hypothetical. The point of most of the other versions, except the Greek, which has been modified by its adoption into a different religious milieu, appears to be that the moon-god is the father of the son(s) who is/are born. In our present context, the lunar element is made explicit, as we saw above, and so it seems that CTA 12 confirms the presence in Ugarit of the primordial 'Semitic triad', although in a rather disguised form. In CTA 23, and also in the present text, the process of the marriage and birth is complicated by the apparent duplication of the mother, and the certain duplication of the offspring. It may be that Tallē and Dimgaya are to be understood as parallel terms, forming a binomial on the lines of Kotar-w-Ḥasin. However, on both linguistic and theological grounds, I think two mothers are to be understood.

When the text becomes legible in 1 9, someone is speaking, and addressing El as 'our father'. A plural subject is implied, and I understand the speakers to be not worshippers, who implore El's help against 'hostile powers', as Caster has suggested, but the mothers-to-be, who complain that already their offspring, before their birth, are fulfilling their voracious potential by chewing their mothers' vitals:

\[ \text{[ti?] bdn il abn} \]
\[ \text{kbd kiš tikln} \]
\[ \text{tn km wrm tqrn} \]
[They are des]troying us, 6 El our father,
Our liver like a fluke 7 they are devouring,
our vitals 8 like worms they gnaw.

The suffix in abn suggests that more than one person is speaking, and we may suppose it to refer to the two mothers, there being no special dual form for the suffix. As for wives referring to their husband as 'father', CTA 23 again provides a parallel in obv. 32, rev. 43.

The forms [t]</t>bdn, tikln, tqrn may be understood as third masculine plural forms, preformative t—often taking the place of y—, but more plausibly they are to be taken as third common dual forms, 9 the subjects being the aklm/qqa as they are later named, also taken as dual forms. Apart from the mythological justification for this view, we may note the distinction later on between abh (pl., ii 47, 49), and 'abyh (du., ii 51) where, as we shall see, the latter two brothers are the Devourers. This interpretation also serves to explain better than a complaint would do, El's characteristic response — laughter — in i 12.

But how do we get from one mother and her son to mother-and-son pairs? The morning and evening appearances of Venus seem to have been very early recognised as the same heavenly body, and CTA 23 presents them as the twin gods Sahar and Salem. Both are hypostases of Āttar, and presumably the distinction allowed a division of labour among the gods. But since they are really the same principle presented mythologically, it is essential to safeguard their equality. We have examples of twins in Semitic tradition, such as Esau and Jacob, or simply brothers, Manasseh and Ephraim, in which the younger supplants the elder. So one mother will not do; two mothers can give birth simultaneously and safeguard the theological principle of equality. It may be
also that the doubling of the mothers is the expression of the
close relationship of each son with the aspect of the mother
closest to him; so that the morning star is the son of the rising
sun (cf. Helel ben Sahar, Is.14.12) and the evening star is the
child of the setting sun. It is also convenient to provide
handmaids, as we may understand Talis and Dimgaya to be, because
this safeguards the theological fiction of the 'virginity' of the
mother goddess. The term bilt is not certainly associated with
Aserah (though see my discussion of CTA 15 11 26f., above p. 43).
On the analogy of the virginity of °Anat, °Attart, and Isis-Hathor, it is quite plausible that such a paradoxical term also applied to
Aserah. Alternatively, Talis, the mat yrb, may be Aserah herself.
In this case we may have a parallel in the Genesis tradition, in
which it is possible that not just Ishmael is an avatar of °Attar,
but that Ishmael and Isaac are the twins as we suggested above (p.70).
We shall see a further reason below for associating Ishmael and
Isaac with the divine twins.

The twins are born then, and the promise they showed already in
the womb is symbolised by their names, the Devourers, the Raveners. Again the parallel with CTA 23 is apparent, for there we read of
their lips stretching to the heavens and the nether world. On
the basis of this and other features, I have suggested above the
identity of °Attar with Mot. So for purposes of comparison
with the AB cycle, we may say that the conflict of Ba °al with Mot
in CTA 4-6 is paralleled by the conflict between the Devourers and
Ba °al here. As we shall see, however, the present text contains
various features which can help us reconstruct a much more archaic
mythical tradition which survives only as a substratum in the AB
cycle.
The physical description of the Devourers is curious (1 30-33). At first sight they appear to be bulls, which does not accord well with the leonine iconography of ṬAttar-Mot, although we do find Mot described as a bull during his great fight with Ba'al in CTA 6 viii. But they are not to be thought of as bovine, in spite of certain similarities. The name 'Devourers' hardly fits bulls very well; this is not their most obvious characteristic (as strength, fierceness, or sexual potency might be). And the description is a simile; while 'like' bulls, they are clearly something else. We shall return to this problem below. Line 1 33 is often taken to be a part of this description – so that the allegedly bovine form of the Devourers is like that of Ba'al:

\[\text{wbhm pn b\textsuperscript{g}1}\]

And on them (is) the face of Ba'al.

But this is not the case, as we shall see, and it is better to take the b as 'against:

and Ba'al sets his face against them.\textsuperscript{12}

Ba'al chases the Devourers, and in the badly damaged lines at the top of col. ii, it seems that he is overcome, for we find him reduced to a sorry state in ii 37ff. He falls bana. Most scholars take this to be 'mire' or 'swamp'. It may well be the mud round a desert waterhole. But it is also more. The desert is the realm of Mot, and mud is his food. Indeed, Tromp has shown\textsuperscript{13} that the idea of mud is frequently symbolic of the nether world. So Ba'al is apparently to be understood as dying and going down to the nether world.

The theological reason for Ba'al's death is made explicit in ii 45-50. Here I feel that scholars have missed the main point, and mistranslated certain key words. I understand it as follows:
Seven years the god makes fruitful [the fields];
but the eighth is dried up, until
he is indeed covered as with a garment in the blood-guilt of his brothers,
as with a robe in the sins of his kinsmen.
For seven years he makes fruitful for his seventy brothers,
but the eighth is for eighty.

If we are to reject the sense which everyone else has read here,
that is the stock enumerative cliché of 7-8, 70-80, or 77-88,
then we must see if our alternative rendering can be justified. Now while previous treatments have made a perfectly good sense of the actual syntax of these lines, they have failed completely, to my mind, in their attempt to express anything meaningful in the broader context of the passage. The mention of seven years in 1.45 ought immediately to raise questions regarding the sabbatical against the seasonal interpretation of the Ugaritic texts. It seems to me that the present text provides a crux interpretandum of this, yet amazingly, de Moor in his exhaustive study of the problem, only mentions it in passing, and gives no discussion of it at all. The only commentator who seems to take it seriously is Gordon, who uses it briefly in his argument. Nor am I aware of any serious treatment of the theological as
distinct from social nature of the sabbatical cycle, its rationale or cultic application. I believe that the present text can help us. Most scholars come down on one side or the other in this argument — either seasonal pattern or sabbatical cycle. I feel that such an exclusive approach is wrong, and that historically we should perhaps envisage a slow evolution from the earlier (?) sabbatical system, probably to be seen as pastoralist in origin, to the annual seasonal pattern appropriate to an agricultural economy. And even this is in danger of oversimplifying matters, since in the pastoral environment there were naturally annual, seasonal festivals; while within the agricultural environment, the old seven-year pattern still had a place, as evidenced by the present text, and by the observance of the sabbatical year in Israel (Ex.23.10f.; Dt.15.1ff., 31.10ff.; Lev.25.1ff.).27 And any scheme must take into account the probability that the constant movement from nomadism to settled life was a gradual process, incorporating the intermediate stage of semi-nomadism — i.e. regular transhumance and limited cultivation of seasonal crops. But allowing for a mixed theology at large in the Ugaritic texts, there is every reason to see the present text as connected with the sabbatical rather than with the seasonal cycle.

Seven years form a perfect cycle. Possibly behind the number seven lies the idea that for each of the seven years one of the major planetary gods rules the cosmos. We have a somewhat attenuated form of this idea in our seven-day week, and the names given to the days. At the end of the cycle everything will begin again, unless something dreadful happens. As the cycle draws to a close, a time of crisis approaches. Rites must be performed to repel the powers of chaos which will otherwise break in and destroy the cosmos. It is just so at each New Year, but now the dangers so
carefully staved off during six successive festivals are overwhelmingly menacing. Israel's solution to the problem was the sabbatical year, which was presumably intended among other things to purify land and people from the accumulated profanations of the previous six, and thus prevent the eighth from reverting to chaos.

It seems that in Ugarit a different technique was used. The eighth year was dramatised in the downfall of Ba'al before the Devourers (so. Not, but the dual form is important, as will be seen), and something was accomplished which prevented the breakdown from occurring in the everyday world. The cult (the 'paradigmatic' level) concentrated into one moment of time (the illud tempus) the drying up of streams, decimation of flocks and herds, and destruction of crops by drought, and provided an answer to the disastrous effect such events would have on the pragmatic level, in the atoning death of Ba'al.

The 'eighty' in my translation (ii 50) raises a problem. The cliche term 'the seventy sons of Aserah' scarcely allows a balancing 'eighty (sons)' as some have suggested. But if seventy represents the divine order, ruling during the seven years, perhaps the eighty stands for the powers of destruction which are ready to burst in upon the world in the eighth year. There are no instances of 'eighty' being used in this sense, of which I am aware, but we do frequently have 'eight' over against a preceding 'seven' indicating the breaking of taboos which have hitherto prevented certain activities, as in Ex.22.28f., Lev.12.2f., 14.10, 23, 15, 3f., 29, 23.36. In each of these cases the eighth day activity is not profane, but is a climax resolving the problems implied in the preceding seven days. In the last example, it is the eighth day of the feast of Tabernacles, and may have involved
rituals paralleling or analogous to the rites of which CTA 12 forms the mythical foundation, since in both instances the autumnal feast is the occasion of the New Year. We also have the seventy years of exile foretold by Jeremiah (25.11,12,29,10). The resolution of this crisis, in the seventy-first year, would be the inauguration of the eighth decade. The seventy years evidently had an atoning function (cf. Is.40.2). 29

If my rendering of da (11.47f.) as a construct plural is correct, Ba'al is covered not in blood of brothers whom he has murdered, but rather takes upon himself the guilt of his (seventy) brothers. Since they are probably to be understood as the gods of the nations, (see n.20), and therefore represent the nations in the myths, Ba'al is the blameless one who suffers for the sins of the world, to effect its salvation:

He was pierced for our transgressions,
tortured for our iniquities;
the chastisement he bore is health for us
and by his scourging we are healed. (Is.53.5, NRS)

Just as the servant of second Isaiah anticipates a much later theology, it is possible that the prophet also applies to the servant of his own day a very ancient theology, 30 which had long ceased to play an obvious part in the cult of Yahweh. But my contention is that this ancient atonement theology did survive in the Israelite cult, albeit in a form so disguised as to be virtually unrecognizable. The purpose of this chapter is to attempt the reconstruction of a mythical and cultic prototype of both the tradition in CTA 12 and various Israelite practices.

It is important for the irony of Is.52.13–52.12 that those who are redeemed should at first consider the victim to be suffering for his own wrong-doing (53.4b), just as Job's
companions blame him for his suffering. If it is true that the passage draws on ancient traditions, we might expect to find evidence of just such a deliberate dramatic irony there too. Now there is one passage in the AB cycle which appears to bear some direct relationship to the present context: CTA 6 v 1 – vi 15. The normal seasonal interpretation of the preceding material is perhaps quite justified; Ba’al has succumbed to Mot at the cessation of the spring rains, and Mot has been effective ruler all summer. It appears from the beginning of col. v that Ba’al is restored, vanquishes Mot, and returns to his throne. At any rate it probably relates to an annual festival in Ugarit. But then we read that in the seventh year Mot addresses Ba’al and complains of the rough treatment Anat had given him. In the very fragmentary opening lines of col. vi, Mot seems to beat Ba’al again. This fight I take to be the same as the one dealt with in CTA 12. If CTA 1-6 represent the traditions – if not the actual liturgical texts – relating to the New Year festival in Ugarit, then I understand 6 v 1 – vi 15 to be a parenthesis which is only read at the conclusion of a seven-year cycle, in which Ba’al is beaten again, for a special reason. This becomes clear from Mot’s words in vi 11, 15f.: 

\[\text{spuy penn any kyy}\]

as a retribution for the destroyed son of my mother. In other words he interprets Ba’al’s renewed death as retribution paid by Ba’al for his crime; but CTA 12 takes the opposite view: retribution is due in fact from others – but Ba’al accepts it vicariously. In the two-sided view of the texts taken together (as I believe they should be, belonging to the same festival occasion) we then have precisely the dramatic irony preserved in the fourth servant song. Presumably the words of Mot do contain
a truth, that Ba\textsuperscript{a}al has destroyed some of A\textsuperscript{a}serah's sons. These are presumably to be identified with the Devourers, who because of their appearance only after seven years, have taken on an independent existence, though theologically speaking they are hypostases of \textsuperscript{0}At\textsuperscript{a}ar-Not. Although CTA 12 is damaged at the critical point, it is reasonable to assume that the Devourers are destroyed.

The following lines, ii 51f., read:

\begin{align*}
\text{sr} \text{ ahyh ms\textsuperscript{a}h} & \text{33} \\
\text{wm\textsuperscript{a}h} \text{ sr ylyh}
\end{align*}

The lord of his brethren found him;  
the lord of his kinsmen found him.

\textit{sr} - chief - is not just a reference to the eldest among his brothers. The impossibility of this is shown by the dual form ahyh (contrast ahh referring to the seventy in ii 47,49). The two brothers can only be the Devourers, and we have seen that they are equals, neither being the chief. So we must find some other personage who is called \textit{sr}. On the analogy of Akk. \textit{šarru}, the term probably strictly means 'king' here. The West Semitic equivalent, \textit{mlk}, is used as a title of three gods: Ba\textsuperscript{a}al, \textsuperscript{35} \textit{c}\textsuperscript{At\textsuperscript{a}ar}, \textsuperscript{35} and El. \textsuperscript{36} Here the idea of a king clearly cannot refer to either of the first two, and so probably indicates El. We have argued above that El is given this title in CTA 23, obv.8, where we have the divine title \textit{at\textsuperscript{w}ar}. So the 'lord' of 1.51 I take to be the father of the twin Devourers, El. So El comes into the picture again to pronounce a suitable peroration. If we accept Gray's rendering of the problematic lines ii 57f., \textsuperscript{37} the text concludes thus:
You are reconciled so that you may obtain help; I will desist. why will you yet be smitten? Let the king pour out jugs, let him pour out what is drawn from the well, let him pour out the wellspring of the temple of El, even the deep of the House of Divination.

So Ba’al has saved the situation, and is himself restored to vigour by the water-pouring rite which was in Israel long perpetuated as a part of the feast of Tabernacles. It is probably also to be understood as lying behind the deliberately distorted account of the feast (for purposes of highlighting certain propaganda elements) in 1 K. 18, and perhaps the Hebrew text of Num. 24.7.

The autumnal New Year feast, then, may have contained a rite every seventh year, which portrayed in mythic reenactment those horrors which would ensue if sin were not purged from El’s people (cf. 1 K. 8.37-39). And the rite also effected the purgation. Perhaps it took place on the eighth day of the feast, (cf. Lev. 23. 36). In this case we would understand the eight days of the feast (seven + one) to represent in the concentrated form of the cult (the illud tempus) the cycle of years (seven + one). The eighth year was not of course actualised: it began (as the consequence of sin) 'until...' (3d, ii 46). And then the necessity of it as a different kind of existence was obviated, and it reverted to its proper role as first in the next cycle of seven years.

The reasons for relating all these cultic events to the autumn is based on the relationship of the levantine climate to the mythical archetypes. The year began in Israel in the seventh month, and the ancient feast of Tabernacles was a combination of elements that later became separated out into distinct occasions in Israel.
New Year, the Day of Atonement, and Ingathering. The seasonal interpretation of the Ugaritic myth has applied them to the same time of year, because the same climatic pattern operates. 44

But the New Year in Israel's presettlement existence had been celebrated not in the autumn, but in the spring. The very enumeration of the months, with Tabernacles in the seventh month, (Lev. 23.23-36), but Passover in the first, (Ex. 12.2ff., Lev. 23.5ff.) is indicative of this. 45 It was the arrival of the first lambs and kids which marked the beginning of the year, which was located cultically by the spring equinox, the lunation which followed, or the relationship of the two. 46 This remained the case in Mesopotamia where, due to the fact that in spring the melting snows of Anatolia and Armenia fed the head-waters of the Tigris and Euphrates, and brought the floods which gave either promise of new life, or, when the gods were angry, devastation and death. The Babylonian New Year was marked by the Akitu festival and the sacred marriage. While in the context of settled life in Mesopotamia this involved complex theogonies and divine interrelationships the marriage celebrated in the Ugaritic texts CTA 12, 23 and 24, and the other parallels we have mentioned, point back to a pastoralist tradition, at one time independent (so far as we can tell) of external influences, and concerned solely with the moon-god, the sun-goddess, and the Venus-god, the primary Semitic triad.

In such a situation, Baal would clearly have had no place. In any case, of course, it is very likely, on the evidence of the texts, that he represents a later superstratum in the pantheon of Ugarit. So his presence in the context we are discussing is probably to be seen as secondary (see n. 20). An older tradition has been adapted to incorporate him. The problem is to find
whether there is any evidence to enable us to reconstruct the earlier framework into which he has been fitted.

When we quoted Is.53.5 above, we did so partly because of its powerful evocation of an atonement theology of which Christianity gives the classic instance. I suggested that CTA 12 pointed to such a theology, albeit of a primitive kind, in Ugarit. The theme is the purgation of sin – something or someone who 'takes away the sins of the world'. The evangelist John says that this is Jesus, the 'lamb of god', (Jn.1.29), deliberately evoking paschal overtones. And John appears to time the crucifixion to have Jesus die as the paschal lambs are slain (cf. Jn.13.1, 19.14, 36).47

b) The Passover festival.

It seems to me that an examination of certain aspects of the Hebrew Passover ritual and theology are germane to the problems we have encountered in our study of CTA 12. I do not think that either one is dependent on the other, but hope to show that both spring from a common source, and together with other materials, provide evidence allowing a tentative reconstruction of a very primitive theology.

1) Passover and the seven-year cycle.

Passover is of course an annual, not a seventh year, feast. But links between the two are implied in the biblical tradition, which may not be fortuitous. In Dt.31.9-12, we have the legislation for the covenant renewal festival. According to v.10, this is to take place in the autumn:

at the end of every seven years, at the time
fixed for the year of remission at the feast
of Tabernacles.

There is only one occasion in the deuteronomistic history when this
festival is described as having taken place. It is, in the context of Josiah's reform. Interestingly, however, we find that in the Chronicler's work, there appears to be a duplication, in that parallel to Josiah's activities we have a description of Hezekiah's cultic activities which is absent from the deuteronomist. This is not the occasion for an enquiry into all the problems of the two reforms, and the literary and historical links between them. Our concern is with the time of year of the covenant renewal. And the evidence of these passages does not accord with the statute of Dt. 31.10.

In 2 K.22.3f., the Book of the Law is found in the eighteenth year of King Josiah's reign. The regnal years would presumably be calculated from one (autumnal) new year to another. So if the finding of the book, which according to the deuteronomist prompts the whole reform (itself doubtful, but that is by and by), is within the eighteenth year, it is reasonable to suppose that the covenant renewal described at 2 K.23.1-3 could not have taken place at the beginning of that year. It might of course have taken place at the autumnal feast the following year, but if we give any credence to the sequence of events described, it is noteworthy that the great Passover described in 2 K.23 21-23 also takes place in the eighteenth year (v.23) and this follows the covenant renewal. But the only other time in the year when the covenant renewal might plausibly have been celebrated was the spring, and I suggest that this is in fact what happened, and that it was related to the Passover which perhaps marked its completion.

The details given in Chronicles may be seen to corroborate this interpretation, and thus give support to its essential historicity, at least with regard to the sequence of events. In the account of Hezekiah's reform, we do not in fact have a description
of a covenant renewal as such, but to my mind this is the most reasonable construction to put on 2 Ch. 29.18–36, the great atonement ritual. To believe that this took place in the autumn, as Yom Kippur, and then to give credence to the curious postponement of the Passover in 2 Ch. 30.1–14 on the grounds, v. 3, that the people were unable to celebrate it at the proper time, since ‘the priests had not purified themselves in sufficient number’, is asking too much. Far more reasonable is the conclusion, granting that such events as are described in 2 Ch. 29.18–36 would naturally be fitted into an appropriate place in the cultic calendar, that both atonement (= covenant renewal) and Passover occurred in the same spring, with an unwonted delay for the latter because the normal time-lag (of presumably seven days) was not allowed for between them on this occasion.

In the chronicler’s account of Josiah’s reform, the covenant renewal (2 Ch. 34.29–33) and the Passover (2 Ch. 35.1–18) follow immediately the one from the other, and both events clearly take place within the eighteenth year (2 Ch. 34.8, 35.19), so that the same argument that applies to the deuteronomist applies here.

So far as the historical accounts go, then, the covenant renewal appears to have taken place in conjunction with Passover. This clearly does not fit the requirements of Dt. 31.9–12, and the very discrepancy, which the historians have not seen fit to iron out (and be seen to have done so), suggests a sound historical basis for the descriptions. The passage in Deuteronomy I believe we can date to the exile, and may therefore reflect a change in practice which took place at the time – perhaps an attempt to counter the appeal of the national spring festival, the Akitu, in Babylon, by laying greater emphasis on Israel’s own autumn festival complex.
It is possible to detect a further link between Passover and the motif of seven years in the story of the entry of the Israelites into Palestine and its climax in the taking of Jericho. When the 'tribes' cross into the promised land in Jos. 5, they celebrate a Passover (vv. 10-12). This indicates the time of year of the entry. It does not matter whether this reflects a historical memory or a cultic handling of the tradition. For whatever reason, it must be understood to control the surrounding materials as well, and in particular the sack of Jericho.

While the Israelites may have appropriated a tradition of the destruction of the city, it is now clear that the events described cannot have taken place at the time of the historical settlement, during the period of change from the late Bronze to the early Iron age. Jericho had been a tell for some time by then. In any case, the whole description of the taking of the city, with its stately processions and strict order of personnel, smacks more of cultic than of military tactics and is widely accepted now as a cultic drama rather than a sober historical account. It is perhaps a dramatisation, with a convenient tell near the sanctuary of Gilgal as location, of the ideal pattern of conquest of the promised land. Jericho thus becomes the archetype of the holy war, always a cultic rather than a politico-military reality.

It may have been even more. That the destruction of the nation's enemies in the ancient world was always more than a purely 'political' matter, but also had powerful religious overtones, is well known. We have the assimilation of Pharaoh to Satan, and of Egypt to the primaeval sea-monster who symbolises chaos, Rahab. The language of Deutero-Isaiah frequently links the motifs of exodus and creation, so much so that creation
becomes almost a redemptive act, that is, a 'saving' of the people by ordering cosmos out of chaos. Now the Jericho narrative immediately follows the Passover. This is among other things a new year festival, as we shall see below, and so the Jericho festival must also have taken place at the spring new year. The blowing of the trumpets (vv. 16, 20), also indicates this, because it is primarily to be seen as an accompaniment to the new year.

In view of this, I think it reasonable to see the cult-legend as referring, among other things, to the overpowering of hostile (i.e., demonic, or at least chaotic) powers, and the (re)institution of cosmos. As to the seven days of the festival, these relate, I suggest, to the seven years of the perfect cycle. In Ugarit, we have seen how it is at the beginning of the eighth (first) year that a rite is performed which safeguards the situation, while in Israel the institution of the sabbatical year seems to perform the same apotropaic function before the end of the cycle; in the seventh and not the eighth year. This implies an evolution of the process, of which the Jericho legend at first glance appears to be an end-product, since the climax is on the seventh, and not the eighth day (vv. 15ff.). This seems a little unlikely at the very beginning of the settlement, and is rendered all the more so in view of the process of covenant renewal every seventh year, i.e., in a first year, then the eighth year of the series. This problem may be solved however if we recognise that all the episodes of the opening chapters of Joshua are cult-legends, and probably refer to a whole complex of rites which were performed collectively at Gilgal. Then the juxtaposition of Passover and the taking of Jericho becomes significant, because the Passover is in effect the first day of the feast, and the seventh day following, when the walls fall down, is in fact the eighth in
series. Jos. 5:11 refers to the beginning of a feast of Unleavened Bread, bound up of course with the Passover, and the Jericho story appears by its position to have been the mythos of the feast.

The whole of the immediately foregoing section on Jos. 6 is presented with some circumspection as a possible link between Passover and the seven year motif. If it is valid, then it suggests that the linking of Passover and Unleavened Bread is a permanent, if opaque, reminder in Israelite worship of this link. 53

It may be objected that while in the Jericho story the sack follows Passover, the corresponding covenant renewal ceremony discussed above proceeds it. How then can it be a useful exercise to discuss the two together? I am of course pressing connections between them, but the Jericho story probably dates from the cultic life of the Gilgal sanctuary in the period of the Judges, while the whole idea of covenant renewal may be a much later development from a period when the Jericho drama was no longer performed.

11) **Passover as a New Year festival.** 54

To say that Passover was a new year festival need not be understood as meaning that it was exclusively this; it also contained elements which were not primarily concerned with the cosmogonic function of the new year. Primary among these were two motifs which effectively controlled the form the Passover took – the offering of the firstlings of the flocks, and the biennial change of pasture (transhumance) which was and still is followed in many pastoralist societies. We shall examine these motifs in turn.

1) **The offering of firstlings.**

J.B. Segal raises many objections to the view that Passover
was ever designed for this purpose. The major ones are the fixed date of Passover,\textsuperscript{55} which would be very inconvenient with ewes dropping their lambs over an extended period, and the question of the smearing of door-posts\textsuperscript{56}—presumably tent doorways in an earlier situation. These difficulties are not insuperable. The problem is perhaps confused by the implied identification of all firstling offerings, and the redemption of the firstborn, with the Passover. This would certainly be straining the evidence too much. But it is still quite possible that Passover provided the archetype of all first-born offerings, and perhaps also, in the smearing-rite of all redemption of the first-born. The primary linking of Passover with the story of the exodus in the tradition may have been triggered off precisely by this element: the Hebrews, who knew the appropriate procedures, escaped the fate which befell all the firstborn of the uninitiated Egyptians. As an archetype, it is natural that the ritual should figure as a new year festival, since this was precisely the time when all the archetypes which affected (and effected) social and religious welfare were performed, in the sacred time of the cult. All other offerings and redemptions derived their pattern and their authority from this. Likewise, all sacrifices were justified by the primal sacrifice of the cosmogony, though it would be absurd to go on to try and identify all Israelite sacrifice with the Passover, or later with the autumnal new year festival.\textsuperscript{57}

I think that we can in fact make out the case for this understanding on other grounds altogether. J.B. Segal remarks that he considers the divinity of the Passover victim, a view put forward in the past, as unproven.\textsuperscript{58} But it is important to remember that in the myth lying behind any rite, at least in its earliest form if not in the state in which any given tradition has
survived, all the actors are probably divine. The gods performed in illo tempore that which we perform now. So at least in the myth which underlies Passover, the victim must have been considered divine — even if in the somewhat restricted sense that it was a substitute for the deity. The question remains: can we hope to recover any significant elements of the Passover myth? The explanation of it on the basis of the 'historical' exodus tradition is manifestly secondary, but I think we can recover something of the prototype.

In the legislation in Ex. 12, the worshippers are forbidden to eat any of the flesh raw (v. 9) or to break any of the bones (v. 46). Since there is no evidence that the Israelites ever did within historical times eat their sacrifices raw, it is possible that the strict instructions on the matter are an illusion to an ancient practice in Israel's prehistory, when the flesh was eaten raw, and the bones were broken. This has been taken as evidence in the matter of the divinity of the victim. But it gains considerable weight when we consider the comparative evidence. The idea of eating the victim raw — omophagia — immediately evokes the ghastly rites of the Dionysian cult, and of the gruesome fate of the various avatars of Dionysus who figure in Greek myth. Astour has made out a very strong case for considering Dionysus to have been originally a Semitic god, whose cult travelled to Greece with the Phoenicians in the second millennium. At the same time he has shown that Actaeon, an avatar of Dionysus, has his origins in the Ugaritic hero Aqhat. And the Aqhat myth, which implies that the hero is torn to pieces and devoured raw, also displays a considerable interest in the seven year cycle, with which we began our discussion.
Perhaps even more important, in being direct cultic evidence from Ugarit, is the small and highly cryptic text published by Virolleaud as RS 22.225. This begins as follows:

\[\text{cnt tlkt} \wedge \text{w smwt}\]
\[\text{tp abh w n q m abh}\]
\[\text{lymmn tspi sbrh}\]
\[\text{lb l hrb t t dnh}\]
\[\text{lb l ks...}\]

\(\text{Anat went along and admired}\)
\(\text{the beauty of her brother and the grace of her brother, for he was beautiful indeed. She ate his flesh without a (sacrificial) knife, she drank his blood without a (sacrificial) chalice...}\)

On the analogy of the primitive Passover practice that I have suggested is implied in Ex. 12.9, 46, it is not unreasonable to see this curious fragment as an adaptation to certain requirements within the cult of Ba\(\text{al}\) of an older ritual, in which the victim was a god more central to the cultic traditions of a pastoralist society.

To pursue this particular line of enquiry must lead us into purely speculative realms, the value of which may be open to doubt. But I hope that in the light of our discussion below, we shall be able to give some cogency to the identification I shall suggest here. On the lines of our enquiry so far, we might expect the myth lying behind such a rite to concern a 'firstborn' among the gods, and the obvious candidate is \(\text{O\text{-}Attar}\). We shall see below how \(\text{O\text{-}Attar}\) is the common link between various ritual practices which at first sight have no connection with him, but which in fact help us to understand the motifs which lie behind
2) The exodus motif.

The second particular aspect of the Passover ritual which is significant is the way in which the economic facts of life in a pastoralist society — the necessity of movement from one pasture to another in order to maintain viable pasturage — are sacralised and justified in the process of the ritual exodus. It seems that ritual processions out from the sanctuary, into the open country, were a feature of most great seasonal festivals in the ancient world. In Israel, the autumnal new year festival involves going out and dwelling in booths. The purpose of this was probably fairly complex, but it is interesting that when the theologians consciously set out to explain the tradition, they did so in terms of the exodus (Lev. 23.40ff.).

This feature seems to have dropped out of use at the Passover, though of course this may have been because the whole motif and experience of the 'historical' exodus was so powerfully evoked by the mythos, the bitter herbs, travelling clothes and haste in eating, that an actual procession became superfluous. And in the context of domestic observance, any meaningful procession is out of the question.

The whole tenor of the material in the book of Exodus is to link the festival with Israel's removal from Egypt, and in that unique (and therefore paradigmatic) experience the whole festival acquired its raison d'être for subsequent generations (cf. Dt. 6.20ff.). This linking by the narratives would strictly speaking have been quite meaningless had not the flight from Egypt out into the wilderness fitted so perfectly into what was a central motif in the ancient rite.
Indeed, Engnell argues, that the very formulation of the exodus and wilderness-wandering narratives is controlled by their original function as the mythos in a festival involving a ritual exodus, and this he identifies with Passover.

Deutero-Isaiah takes up the motif of the exodus in his message to his contemporaries. In view of our earlier discussion of the fourth servant song (52.13 - 53.12), it seems that it can scarcely be an accident that this song is immediately preceded by a passage which concludes (52.12):

*But you shall not come out in urgent haste nor leave like fugitives; for Yahweh will march at your head, your rearguard will be Israel's god.*

The ritual exodus was seen as somehow validated by the sacrificial meal which had preceded it. Deutero-Isaiah prefaces his hymn of the vicarious sufferer who shall bear/has borne the sins of the community with a startling picture of its efficacy: the old undignified haste is to be replaced by a triumphal procession. This appears to demand that the servant is somehow or other to be identified with the Passover victim, even though this may be only indirectly. This is not to say that Deutero-Isaiah himself regards the servant as divine or is even consciously mythologising. But the righteous individual, or remnant, or whoever the servant is, is performing on behalf of the exiles the role that the Passover victim or its analogues fulfils.

It is no coincidence that in the various myths we have examined, the motif of the 'exodus' or removal into the wilderness (מַדָּבָר) is generally present, as well as the way in which the deities are represented in terms of the animals of the flock or herd. Thus
in Gen.16.6ff. (cf. 21.14ff.), Ishmael and Hagar are sent into the wilderness; in CTA 23 rev. 65 Sahar and Salem go there; in CTA 12 i 24 the mothers are sent to the wilderness to be delivered, and there the encounter of the Devourers and Ba'al takes place; in CTA 5 v 18f., vi 6f., 29f., the location of Ba'al's demise, and therefore presumably of his encounter with Mot, and of Mot's subterranean kingdom of Horay, is said to be in dbhr // ṣd ṣhlmt.

The first term here has the same value as mdbr, while in the second, ṣd must have a similar sense of uncultivated land which may have value as pastureland but shades off into desert proper. 77

The forms of the personages involved in the marriage myths and versions of them are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Offspring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian version</td>
<td>cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurrian A</td>
<td>mother a heifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurrian B (CTA 24)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA 23</td>
<td>? (El Bull-god)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA 12</td>
<td>? (El Bull-god)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 16</td>
<td>humans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA 5, etc.</td>
<td>cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greek versions</td>
<td>mother a cow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the probable line of development traced above, some of the gaps in this table could be filled in tentatively. The variations are best explained not as inconsistencies but as adaptations to suit the particular literary or ritual purposes of each version. The suggested identification of the offspring in CTA 12 will be discussed below. It should be noted that the offspring are not necessarily of the same species as their parents.
iii) The sacrificial act.

The exact function of the sacrificial act at the Passover is not made clear in the biblical account. The only elements which seem to give a clue are the omophagia, which led Oesterley to understand that the worshippers hoped to absorb the life-force of the victim, and the smearing of the doorposts, which has been interpreted as an apotropaic rite, intended to avoid demonic visitations, such as affect the Egyptians in Ex.12.29f. Now this may be understood as an avoidance of the attentions of dangerous powers known to be abroad at certain critical moments of the year — and the new year obviously falls into this area — or it may be understood that the powers, malevolent but not demonic, are as it were turning up for their pound of flesh unless somehow or other a debt owed to them is paid. I think it probable, in view of the general complex of ideas we are developing in this chapter, that this is the case. The sequence of events in the exodus narrative, Passover and then flight, would appear to bear this out. Before the change of pasturage, all the old impurities and sins must be purged away, atoned for, and the sacrifice of the Passover accomplishes this. The point of the smearing then falls into place; it informs the avenging powers who has offered atonement for their sins. Since the Egyptians have not, they suffer the inevitable consequences. The fact that their firstborn die not only points to the element of 'redeeming the firstborn' that is present, but also to the role of the firstborn in the underlying myth, which we shall examine below.

That the Passover is to be understood as a rite of atonement is clear from Num.29.13:

If anyone who is clean, or has not had to go
Passover, he shall be outlawed from his people. He has not brought the offering to Yahweh at its appointed time, and he must bear the burden of his sin.

The fact that the punishment is so severe implies that the person who fails to observe it is guilty, not so much of the failure to observe (since there are escape clauses for just such a contingency in special cases - Num. 9.10-12) but of the condition which it is the purpose of the observance to remove.

Atonement is then the keynote of the Passover. This by no means conflicts with the element of omophagia. Rather do we have evidence of the role of a god as vicarious sufferer, taking upon himself the sins of society. The myth itself deals in purely divine terms, but in the cult it is harnessed to human requirements. This is the gist of CTA 12, if my interpretation is correct, and it is significantly the view of John in his presentation of Jesus as the paschal lamb. In the Christian eucharist, atonement and omophagia, the absorption of the divine essence, are happily combined.

The atoning function of the Passover appears to have been somewhat eclipsed by the transfer to the autumnal festival of the main emphasis on new year and its sacral treatment. It is perhaps because this has already happened by the time the earliest pentateuchal traditions are fixed, that they have nothing to offer by way of a theology of the Passover, beyond its indissoluble linking to the exodus tradition. It is of course possible that parts of the autumnal complex have been transferred from the older spring new year to the autumnal new year, and that the transfer has caused a further erosion of the former. In the scapegoat ritual,
I think we have an example of just such a transfer.

c) The scapegoat.

Central to the rites of atonement in the autumnal festival is the ceremony of the scapegoat, or more accurately the scapeгоats. Indeed, the concentration by scholars upon the animal sent into the wilderness has, in my view, prevented them from recognising the real significance of the ceremony. The scapeгоats are important on the Day of Atonement. But of course we have seen that atonement is a necessary element of the spring new year too, and it is reasonable to think that the scapegoat rite has been transferred from its original locus to the present one as the autumnal feast grew in importance after the settlement in Palestine, or perhaps duplicated in the autumn, if indeed it was not originally the Passover itself. In this case we would see the two rites evolving from the common 'prehistoric Passover' and becoming dissimilated in the natural evolution of the cult which took place after the settlement.

Two goats were involved, according to the priestly legislation of Lev.16. Their secondary inclusion in the autumnal Day of Atonement may be inferred from the fact that they duplicate the bull offered for atonement in verses 3,6, and 11ff. Indeed the verses concerning the goats can be excised from the text, leaving a perfectly adequate procedure, except that their inclusion has forced the writer into a contradiction, since in verse 6 he offers the bull on behalf of the priesthood, but is still holding the knife in his hand in verse 11. Even if two stages are recognised here, offering and then immolation, the whole chapter is nevertheless recognised as having a complex literary tradition behind it. The most likely recovery of the older atonement rite, concerning
the bull, seems best obtained by the excision of vv. 5-10, 15, 20-22, and 26. V. 27, which deals with the burning 'outside the camp' of the victim's remains, has had its verbs changed to plurals to accommodate the first goat as well.

This view of Lev. 16 is supported by Num. 29.7-10, where the procedure for the Day of Atonement makes no mention of the goats (plural), and the allusion to a solitary goat in v. 11 is shown to be secondary by the note 'this is in addition to the victim for sin at the feast of Atonement...'.

This is not to say that the scapegoat rite is late. Rather, it is of very great antiquity, and was perhaps (reluctantly?) incorporated into the priestly legislation precisely because it was an age-old practice which it was found impossible to eradicate and which could be rendered innocuous by its incorporation into orthodox Yahwist practice. By recovering, as I hope to do, the mythology lying behind it, we will understand why priests in the Yahwist-cult should want to purge it: it is essentially a superstition, a hand-over from an ancient theology long since passed, though interestingly preserved elsewhere also in the biblical tradition.

There were two goats, both male. The first was sacrificed (vv. 9, 15). The bull which was offered was probably a later development from this ancient rite, perhaps dating from Canaanite practice, though there is scarcely any evidence to support that, unless we point to the role of Baal the bull in CTA 12. The other goat was sent out into the wilderness (v. 21), led by the "ז"ב המ." It is widely held that it was taken out to be killed, to prevent its returning, and this would appear to be the gist of Mishnah Yoma 6. 2-6 where the "ז"ב המ is told to walk the goat to
the edge of a precipice, and push it over. Before it reached the bottom the shock of the impacts on the way down would completely dismember it. In practice, of course, it would take more than a few glancing blows down a cliff-face to dismember a goat (as distinct from breaking most of its bones), and so this would appear to reflect a cultic intention rather than the actual achievement. We have then two features, the dismemberment and a journey into the desert, which bear some correspondence to similar features in the primitive Passover, as well as to the associated mythology.

The Dionysiac rites, the Passover, and the scapegoat rites, all have 'a head of small cattle' in common. Kids as well as lambs are considered proper for the Passover (Ex.12.5). In the former two cases, we have reason to identify the god with the animal. Dionysus, who came to Greece from Phoenicia, as Astour has shown, is probably to be seen as a pastoral deity, perhaps identified with Astarte. The paschal victim(s) was likewise divine, and the same theology may lie behind it. It remains to be seen if we can detect any theological, as opposed to demonological, elements lying behind the scapegoat(s).

In her discussion of scapegoat rites in Greece, Miss Harrison quotes Plutarch's description of similar practices in Egypt:

'In the dog days they used to burn men alive whom they called Typhonians, and their ashes they made away with by winnowing and scattering them.'

There is a remarkable parallel to this in the AB cycle: after the demise of Ba'al, Anath comes upon Mot and treats him in a very curious way.
She says

the son of El, \( \text{\textit{\textsc{hot}}}. \) With a knife\(^6\)

she cleaves him; with a sieve\(^7\) she winnows

him; with fire she burns him;

with millstones she grinds him; in the field

she scatters him. The birds
devour his flesh, the fowls consume

his limbs. Flesh cries to \( \text{\textit{\textsc{sot}}} \) flesh.\(^8\)

Considerable debate has centred on the significance of \( \text{\textit{\textsc{ttren}}} \) in line 35. I have accepted the view of Dussaud, Loewenstein, Caster, and several other scholars.\(^9\) An even larger number prefer to take \( \text{\textit{\textsc{dr}}} \) here as meaning 'to sow'. It seems to me that a semantic discussion is rather futile in this instance, since 'scattering' and 'sowing' are essentially the same thing in the ancient world (cf. the parable of the sower). More to the point is an analysis of the mythological issues lying behind the text, and reference should be made to relevant comparative material. Those who take the sense of 'sowing' understand \( \text{\textit{\textsc{hot}}} \) to be not simply a god of sterility, but also, because he is primarily a chthonian deity, the corn-spirit, or harvest-god.

'We may infer', remarks Albright, for example,\(^10\) 'that \( \text{\textit{\textsc{hot}}} \) is
also treated as though he were a god of fertility. I would hesitate to reject this view completely; certain theological developments are taking place in the AB cycle; but if we are to accept such an interpretation, I think we should recognize that an aggiornamento has taken place, and an older theological and mythical situation has been adapted to a seasonal usage. But the view that Albright represents does show a curious indifference to the details of this text, which at least indicate that the agricultural application of the rite was not its original sense—and may be no more than a figment of modern scholarly imagination. Burning the grain in the fire, even if it means no more than parching it for safe storage, would make it useless for sowing purposes. And if the sense of the particle 1 in the verbs līkl līkly is intensive, rather than negative, a sense which the following words (šīr šīr ysh) appear to support, then even any viable seed which falls to the ground is quickly gobbled up by the birds. The location of this episode, ad, (1.34) may also be significant. While the word (and its Hebrew equivalent TRGL/TGW) can mean agricultural land, it is more often uncultivated land outside the immediate environs of cities and their dependent territory (see n.77).

While in its present context this passage may be no more than an elaborate metaphor, describing how Anat wrought a terrible vengeance on Mot, it undoubtedly draws on an ancient rite whose details correspond closely to the Egyptian practice, and may have had a common source. Anat as the performer of the rite is probably secondary (just as Ba'al is, I have suggested, in CVA 12) and it may antedate her arrival in the pantheon. If we want a deity to fulfill the role in the prototype of the myth, then Attart, with whom we have seen Anat to be identified, is the obvious candidate. She is of course a hypostasis of Attar-Mot himself.
We have encountered Mot in a variety of contexts. In the AB cycle we have argued for his identity with ĤAttar, clear also from Is.14:3 the twin-hypostases of ĤAttar in CTA 23 are apparently to be associated if not specifically identified with Mot, while in the present chapter, I have suggested that CTA 12 deals with him, again in the form of twins. His abode is typically pat-mdr, on the edge of the desert steppe-land, where the Devourers are born, where Hagar takes Ishmael, and where a part of the scapegoat rite is performed.

The inhabitants of the desert are usually seen as demonic, monstrous beings. I think this is a development of more primitive thought, according to which they are gods, albeit of a malevolent and hostile disposition. The Hebrew term used to describe them is חֹּף, a 'goat', literally a 'hairy one'. This term is employed of goats used for sacrificial purposes (e.g. Num.16ff, and several times elsewhere) and perhaps significantly every one of these instances (48 in P, 3 in Ezekiel, 1 in the Chronicler) is exilic or later, and in every instance the goat is a sin-offering. Other animals are also offered for sin of course, but the goat appears never (in this late literature) to be offered for anything else. This may reasonably be interpreted as indicating a process of 'demonisation' in view of the other passages we shall mention. We have noted that in the Passover legislation (Ex.12.5) a kid was as suitable as a lamb. The scapegoat rite was very old, we suggested, in spite of its incorporation in P, and represents the clear specialisation of the goat to the atoning function we argued also lay behind Passover. In this other P material it looks as though the goat has become the general (and perhaps progressively specific) victim for sin offerings. If it be argued that in the scapegoat rite so generally the P references are to a long-
established practice, then we may accept this; but since the only other references are exilic or later, it suggests a general development reaching its culmination at this time.

This functional development from a neutral to a pejorative sense may be paralleled in those instances where modern versions agree in translating the term as 'satyros'. The passages in question are 2 Ch. 11.15, 2 K. 23.26, Lev. 17.7, Is. 13.21, 34.12(LXX), 14, and perhaps Dan. 8.21. Though (if the Daniel passage be excluded) the latest, the Chronicles reference is clearly to an ancient situation; even allowing for a desire to present a perverted cult, it is of great interest that Jeroboam's cultic 'aberrations' (i.e. from a Judaean Yahwist standpoint) should be described as making images of satyrs and calves. Perhaps the satyrs were actually goats, and the later pejorative sense should be regarded as historically inaccurate, though obviously quite intentional on the part of the Chronicler. We shall examine the nature of the cult in (northern) Israel in ch. 8. The Deuteronomist records with satisfaction the destruction of a shrine to goats / satyrs at one of the city-gates at Jerusalem, during Josiah's reform (2 K. 23.8). This indicates that similar cultic practices were normal in Judah too during the monarchy. The reference in Leviticus represents the Priestly (exilic) legislation (placed in the mouth of Moses) against the cult, while the passages in Isaiah (34.12), 14 certainly late, and 13.21 probably exilic but possibly before) use the term in a neutral way, in that it may have no more than a zoological reference — though the presence of Lilith in 34.14 would support a demonic sense. The Daniel passage is of interest, if we are to retain the reference to a 'בָּטָוָא', in that here we have an implied presentation of Alexander of Macedon as a demonic being. This is the raw material of the later iconography.
of Satan in Christian art, and my point is that there is a continuity running right through from Israel's prehistoric cultic life to the Hellenistic period.

I have argued elsewhere⁶ that, behind certain elements of the Satan tradition in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature lies Not, that is, Satan, not in clearly a 'scapegoat' figure in Ex 6, as are the twin forms of Satan (the Ba'ashers) in Ex 12, who in this instance also draw Ba'al into their own fate, a theological development that may be echoed in Ex 22.225. We have suggested above that the Passover victim is a divine figure, and in the original context that underlies the biblical legislation, we should undoubtedly see the same mythical and cultic complex developing in a South Levantine/Northwest Arabian milieu, just as the Greek Dionysian tradition represents a Europeanised version. In two of the versions, goats feature (Passover, Dionysian rites) without doubt. The lack of evidence prevents us from being certain about the form of the victim in the other versions, except that: in Ex 12 we have noted the simile (i 30-32):

The DeVoulers are clearly not bulls, but are horned and humped.

It is possible that the simile is intended to conjure up a picture of imaginary monsters, but it is far more reasonable to conclude, since they represent deities and not monsters, that a recognisable iconographic form is being described. All the comparative evidence points to them as being goats. This then adds a piquancy to the names 'akla, sumim, since goats are notoriously omnivorous, and a pastoralist culture dependent upon flocks of goats would be vividly aware of the trait.

If this be granted, then we have every reason to believe that
the god 'Attar, in goat form, underlies the twins of CT 12, the prototype of Dionysus, and the victim of the Passover rite. And we have drawn the general background against which to set the mythology which underlies the scapegoat rite.

The two goats represent, I suggest, the twin gods who appear in CT 12 and 23. They suffer the same fate as the twins in the former text. As we have shown, the twins represent the single god 'Attar-Hot. And the various things done to Hot in CT 6 ii are shared between the two victims in the scapegoat ritual. The first goat is cut with the knife and burnt. The second is dismembered, and this is represented metaphorically by 'Anat's winnowing and scattering in CT 6. The devouring of the remains signifies the absolute destruction of the victim, which I have suggested was the intention behind the procedure followed with the second goat in Israel.

The second goat is declared to be 'for Azazel' (Lev. 16:8, 10). MT reads 'שִׁ ・ אָזָאֵל. The problem is, who or what was Azazel? A wide range of interpretations have been offered. BDB gives the meaning as 'entire removal', explaining the form as a reduplicated intensive of לַשֵׂס to remove. This would make sense from the context, except for its inherent implausibility on linguistic grounds. We would expect לַשֵׂס, on the analogy of the pe'al form described by CK, this is the original form, it suggests, with the first softened into an א. But as we have no other example of this development (בֵּית from בָּבֶל, cf. Ugar. ḫḫḫḫ, is hardly parallel), we may consider the theory unproven.

O.F. Driver thinks that לַשֵׂס is not the name of any supernatural being, but a place name, based on Ar. āsāsū (rough ground), with a post-formative ב. Cf. ב מָלָא מִסָּה with ב. מָלָא. On the vocalisation, he compares בּוּרֶם, 'cloud', and its
intensive form כנער, 'heavy cloud'. He observes that Sa'dy'ah translates כנער as כשער, 'to a hill of rough ground', while Abu Sa'id has לְנָא, 'to rough ground', and Targ. Onq. has כֶּנֶּר, 'showing that the נ is not an essential element in the root. All these late authorities in support of a rather laboured explanation seem unconvincing to me.

M.H. Segal mentions a talmudic tradition that the name is compounded of נער and כנער, the names of two fallen angels, and 'Azazel atones for the deeds of Uzza and Azor'. He also suggests that כנער may reflect a scribal alteration from an original כנער, to disguise the angelic origin of the demon. This possible original form is, in my view, more than likely. It was already noted as a possibility by BDB and first suggested by Cheyne. It is also supported by the Syrian text. If this were the original form, we could explain the change on these grounds: either that at some stage the text was deliberately altered, because כנער was believed (or assumed) to be a demon, and to make an offering 'to' (כ) him was considered impious, as Segal suggests; or that the נ has no phonetic vigour, so that its omission in כנער (perhaps כנער > כנער > כנער) is readily understood, while its use as a vowel later on in the previous syllable is also understandable because of the qameš; or it may have been simply a scribal error.

That כנער is the original form seems reasonable not only on account of the unlikeliness of any of the explanations of כנער mentioned above, but also on mythological grounds. Cheyne argued this, saying that the metathesis of נער for נער was on reverential grounds. But he insisted that כנער was always a (fallen) angel, and dated the scapegoat rite in Lev. 16 to the fourth century, 'regarding it as one of the very latest of the
additions to P. The character, he said, was of literary, not popular origin, owing his origin to the same school of speculative students of scripture to which we owe the other names of angels, good and evil, in the later literature... To resort to angelology as the explanation requires that not only the passage in Lev. 16.8ff., but also the rite lying behind it, be late. But we have argued that on the contrary, it is probably an ancient rite.

I suggest that a mighty one of All is in fact a title of Attar. We have argued that these are grounds for identifying the two goats with the twin hypostases of Attar, and here presumably we have a reference to him. Why only the second goat should be offered is not difficult to explain. The sacrifice of the first could easily be assimilated to the cult of Yahweh in its post-settlement evolution - we saw how it merely duplicates the offering of the bull - and by this means rendered innocuous. There was however no rite in classical Yahwism strictly parallel to the treatment of the second. Although we have argued that the whole exodus motif, integral to Passover, was originally the same thing, divergent development over the centuries had undoubtedly hidden this fact. So the dedication of the second goat could in fact be preserved, and no doubt various explanations grew up to explain an otherwise meaningless term.

This suggested explanation appears to be borne out by the parallel account in Num. 28.7-11. Only one goat is mentioned here, as we have seen, (and that clearly an addition), and this is the one that is sacrificed; that is, it is the one which could easily be assimilated to classical Yahwistic practice, while of the other there is no longer any hint.

There remains a problem in the interpretation of the phrase, and this is the exact significance of the preposition.
We have noted that in the myth which lies behind any rite, the protagonists are all divine. In the cultic performance, of course, representatives or substitutes are used. The victim in particular in the sacrificial acts of the Dionysiac, Passover, and scapegoat traditions is the substitute for the god who is killed, that is, °Attar. So the expelled goat may be not 'to Azazel' (or 'for Azazel' in the same sense), but rather 'on behalf of' or 'in lieu of Azazel', that is, as a substitute for him.

It is evident from the myths associated with Dionysus, such as those of Zagresus, Pentheus, Orpheus, and Actaeon, that as well as the traditional dismemberment of a goat there remains a memory of a similar dismemberment of a human substitute for the god. Consideration of this may lead us to a confirmation of our interpretation of °Attar. The West Semitic god Malik or Milk (Heb. מַלִּיק) is in fact °Attar. There is evidence of his cult in Israel at least until the late monarchical period, in the practice of the sacrifice of children to him. They are 'passed through the fire'. I suggest that in this we have the ritual counterpart to the mythical burning of Iot in CTA 6, with local variations, no doubt. The child in fact becomes, in the cult, the scapegoat, as °Attar—Not in the myth. This suggests that we should render the term יִטְחָלָה ה' not 'to Molech', but 'for/on behalf of Molech', as in 'on behalf of Azazel' above.

In our consideration of the variant forms of the myth of the birth of °Attar, we discussed Gen.16 (// Gen.21). Ishmael, we suggested, is in reality °Attar. In the present context there are grounds for bringing in Isaac as well. Perhaps the two half-brothers were originally twins. This has been disguised in the biblical tradition, because of Israelite concern to show that it was through
Isaac and not Ishmael that the election operated, and so the motif of the younger supplanting the elder has crept in and caused the twins to dissimilate into an elder and a younger, with a slur cast upon Ishmael as the son of a slave-girl. If they were originally the twin gods, then we have an explanation for the problems of Gen. 22. Ishmael, the second of the 'two-goats', is expelled into the desert (Gen. 16.6f., 21.14f.), while Isaac, the 'first', is sacrificed (Gen. 22.9f.). 115 The last-minute substitution of a ram is a part of the adaptation of the myth to a quasi-historical story, and an etiology justifying both the substitution of an animal-victim and the rejection of human sacrifice (though clearly this continued until fairly late in the monarchical period). 116

d) The dying god.

The idea of a dying god is generally associated with an agricultural context, in which the god symbolises or embodies the vegetation, or the corn spirit, or some other such Frazerian conception. A discussion of that whole area of research is beyond the scope of our present enquiry. But we have found that Attar is a dying god, dating from times when his worshippers were pastoralists. So while traditional expositions may be correct in so far as they detail beliefs and practices from a fairly late period, it is possible that the whole theological complex underlying the pattern began from different presuppositions altogether. If a temporal primacy were all that was required, we might accept May's view — that it all stems from Sumerian prototypes in the Dumuzi cult. 117 But apart from the probability that Dumuzi was originally a human figure, the death-and-resurrection interpretation of the Dumuzi and related cults is open to serious doubt. 118 And we shall see below, the resurrection motif is present with Attar.
But even if it were true for Sumer, it would hardly be of much relevance for pastoralist societies, whose cultic traditions would be fairly impervious to outside influence before they chose permanent settlement. It may be argued that such ideas would have very early affected even pastoralist societies by way of the cultural influence generated by the caravan trade and trading-posts. This may be true. But in the ensuing paragraphs I shall try to show that there is no need to resort to outside influence to explain the theology we are examining.

Apart from these considerations, the whole ethos of the material we have been discussing, particularly with regard to its earliest recoverable form, is alien to the seasonal and fertility mood that is alleged for agricultural religion. CTA 12 shows that the tradition could be modified by a considerable changing around and increase in the number of dramatistic personae. But our aim is to try to recover the theology underlying the prototype.

Why must the son die? What is the cause of death in the myth, as distinct from its function in the cult? We may suppose that a variety of reasons lie behind the presence of this motif, and it may be that they spring from different causes.

There may well be social reasons. The theological statements in any myth to some extent reflect and sacralise social patterns of behaviour. In this way we can say that such an act of devotion as 'lay behind' Ahaz's offering of his son (or in a different situation Jephthah's offering of his daughter), or as could lead to the end-product of tradition such as we have in Gen. 22, demanded expression in terms of a myth which would provide the archetypal justification of all such acts. An aspect of this which may be important in the present context is that of the propitiation of the deity at critical times; to guarantee his future benevolence. This could easily be
articulated later in terms of atonement for sin.

There may also be natural reasons for the genesis of the myth. Just as the interaction of natural phenomena to some extent at least lies behind much ancient Near Eastern mythology (e.g., the seasonal interpretation of the AB cycle), so some natural periodic sequence of events may have initiated a myth concerning the death of Catter. On the grounds that we are dealing with the cult of heavenly bodies, we should obviously look to celestial phenomena as our most probable source.

In the context of the "fall" of Catter described in the myth of Is. 14 and parallel passages, it has been suggested that the eclipsing of the bright of the morning star by the greater brilliance of the rising sun is the natural event being described in the mythical story. This would suit the cultic pattern of the early-morning sacrifice of a human or animal victim to Catter, which has been referred to by commentators. But there is no evidence from the description of either the intended sacrifice of St. Nilus or the sacrifice of a camel, that we have any atonement involved, let alone a theory of substitution. These seem rather to be offerings to the God Catter as recipient.

If the Passover is of great antiquity as we have suggested then we may perhaps look to some of its details for an explanation. There are two cardinal features — it takes place (1) "between the two evenings," that is, the sacrifice takes place at the time when the day ends and the night begins. This is of course exactly the time of the greatest brilliance of Venus; in the time between the departure of daylight and its own setting. And it is (2) at the time of the full moon. Because Venus's orbit is between the Earth's and the sun, it never appears high in the sky, because as the sun sets it must shortly follow. During the hours of daylight, its very
proximity to the sun renders it invisible. Now at full moon, moon and sun are in opposition, and so we have the close proximity in time of the setting of Venus and the rising of the moon. This situation seems altogether a more likely occasion for the genesis of the myth than sunrise, since the relationship of father (moon) and son (Venus; Ėṭṭār) is the dominant one, and not mother (sun) and son. (We shall see later that for certain elements in the myth, the new moon and the preceding period of obscuration must have been the original occasion). If we are to see the myth of Ḫelēl ben Sahar as having a common origin with the Passover, then the usual explanation of the myth as one of hubris will have to be understood as a secondary development. But to insist on the common origin requires an explanation of how the evening star has become the morning star. Possibly this happened fairly late, when the evening manifestation of Venus became habitually regarded as Ėṭṭār, the consort-sister of Ėṭṭār who remained as morning star. It may be that the myth became sufficiently independent of its natural context to be able to be attached indiscriminately to either. For we do have a version of the fall of the star in which the deity is Ėṭṭār, the evening star. Actually the accounts of this tradition are all late, and reflect a considerable change in the naturalistic explanation which seems to underlie the descriptions of Sozomenos and Zosimus (both second century A.D.). These imply a 'falling star', that is, a meteorite, and no doubt in the cultic reenactment of the myth a ball of flaming bitumen, naphtha, or some such inflammable substance was thrown down at the appropriate moment. It may have been to this mythical tradition or to its incorporation into first century Galilean demonology that Jesus alludes to in Lk. 10. 18. Perhaps it was the necessary speed of descent of any model star at a cult festival which disguised the original notion, which it seems
reasonable to consider as lying behind the myth — that some significant descent of Venus at sunset became instead of a divine death, the sign of a theophany or even a hierogamy.

e) The rising god.

That the CAttar myth involves the death of the god is clear not only from our discussion in the present chapter, but also from Is.14.9f., which concerns the arrival of CAttar as not in the nether world. But I think we have reason to think that it also involves the resurrection of the god, and in reconstructing the circumstances of this, we may be able to get even closer to the original mythical function of his death.

The oracles in Ezek.28 are parallel accounts of the myth in Is.14. Of particular interest is the allusion to the god Melqart in Ezek.28.12. We can make a case for CAttar = Hor = Melqart. Albright has suggested that the art element in the divine name refers not to Tyre, but to the nether world. And it is in the mythology of Melqart, identified with Herakles, that we find our clues. Lipinski has drawn attention to a festival of Melqart which involved a sacred marriage, the death of the god apparently by burning, followed by his resurrection. The remarkable parallel that this cultic complex shows to the myth of Ba'al's hierogamy, death, and resurrection in the Ugaritic material, is itself enough to explain why Melqart should have been thought by some scholars to have been Ba'al, and particularly the Ba'al involved at Mount Carmel (1 K.18). Since however we hold the two CDee, quite distinct, how then are we to explain the parallel? I have suggested that to turn to the myth of Tammuz is to beg the question. But in our examination of CTA 12 we suggested that though Ba'al plays a central role in the drama of the text as it now stands,
he is in fact a secondary addition; an ancient rite has been adapted to incorporate him, and that rite originally has as central character, and as dying, redeeming god, Attar there in the guise of the twin devourers, and at Tyre reappearing as Herakles-Helqart.

But do we have any reasonable explanation, granting the celestial milieu in which Attar and the other early Semitic gods were believed to manifest themselves, for the idea of the god dying and rising?

In the case of Venus, the planet disappears for considerable periods, according to its position in relation to sun and Earth. The closer in line are sun, Venus, and Earth, the narrower becomes the crescent effect of the planet (not of course discernible to the naked eye), until it disappears. When the planet lies below the setting sun (i.e. sets before it) or below the rising sun (i.e. rises after it), it is in any case not visible. But the periods of its invisibility do not fit the situation clearly. However, those of the moon do. Between the disappearance of the old moon and the reappearance of the new moon, there is a period of two or three nights of darkness. The moon has 'gone' or 'died'. On the third night (generally) it reappears. Now the motif of a three day, or more precisely 'three days and three nights' disappearance, or reappearance 'on the third day' is widespread. This period of time, however exactly it is to be interpreted, seems to be a stereotyped way of referring to death, and in certain circumstances to a restoration of the dead.

'So, in the Sumerian myth of the descent of Inanna into the nether world, Inanna leaves instructions with Ninshubur:

I am now descending to the nether world;

then I shall have come to the nether world;

fill heaven with complaints for me,'
in the assembly cry out for me!

There follows the description of the goddess' descent through the seven gates to the netherworld, and then she appears before Ereshkigal:

The sick 'woman' was turned into a corpse,
the corpse was hung on a stake.

After three days and three nights had passed,
her messenger Ninshubur,
her messenger of favorable words,
her carrier of true words,
fills the heaven with complaints for her...

Landes has argued that the time-lapse here cannot refer to a period after which death might be considered certain, nor to the duration of Inanna's stay in the netherworld, but to the time Inanna would have taken to reach her goal. This is not a convincing explanation, however. Rather may 1.3.3 quoted above ('when I shall have come to the netherworld') be regarded as equivalent to 'when I am dead', and therefore as implying in it a standard which is taken to certify death. But it is not strictly a certification of death on medical grounds. Rather, if our relating of it to the absence of the moon is correct, is it the period after which, in the mythic realm, restoration must come if it is going to come at all. The moon generally does reappear by the third night, thanks to the appropriate rites, and above all, perhaps, thanks to the particular ritual complex we are trying to reconstruct in this chapter.

The use of the phrase in Jonah 2.1, which Landes discusses, is almost a profane use of the old cultic term, which has probably lost much of its significance in Jewish thought; while still of
retaining sufficient 'metaphysical' overtones to fit well into such a tale, in which traditional symbols and motifs abound.

Another use of the motif is in Hos.6.2:

After two days he will revive us,
on the third day he will restore us. (NEB)

This might also be a 'profane' use of the idiom, except that in the context of divine wrath and forgiveness this may be doubted, and a phrase in v.3 seems to demand a fairly specific meaning for it.

v.3c reads: כְּלָשַׁר בְּכֶרֶךְ מָגְרוֹר As the dawn, so his coming is certain.131 There is a problem as to what the suffix of יְהֹוָה refers. RSV and JB refer it to Yahweh's coming. The Hebrew could mean this or the suffix could refer to the יְהֹוָה of Yahweh in v.2. NEB transposes 5c, so that it refers to יְהֹוָה. In the context, I am inclined to accept the view of RSV and JB. And it is not just a future showing of Yahweh's gracious forgiveness, but a specific theophany which is expected, and which comes on the third day. It is significant that the verb used is not יָבוֹא, but יְבוֹא; it is the 'coming out' of Yahweh. This verb may refer fairly generally to a divine epiphany, but the reference to the third day seems to fit it more specifically to a lunar theophany.132 I suggest that the passage means that the new moon's arrival is declared to be certain - as sure as the day dawns (though see n.131) - and that this is to be taken as signifying divine forgiveness. Furthermore, a specific new moon seems to be meant, since it heralds the spring rains (נַחֲלָת), coming in March-April.133 This is undoubtedly the spring new year, when the return of the moon is of essential significance as guaranteeing the cosmos for a further year. In view of all the overtones present in such a context, יְבֹא here must mean more than mere 'justice', but also contains the idea of royal authority; this is the original context of the proclamation.
of Yahweh's kingship. And so the term also contains within it, the idea of a royal epiphany - the ceremonial presentation of a monarch to his people. 134 Wijngaards argues 135 that it is not a dying and rising god who is celebrated in Hos. 6.2, but the restoration of the people. But it is precisely in the return of the god that the restoration of the people who are dependent upon him is to be effected. However, a very useful point in his argument is that language of death and resurrection is frequently technical to terminology for covenant breaking and renewal. He cites several Hittite passages which well illustrate the idea 136 but if we are correct in linking the Hosea passage to the material we are discussing in this chapter, it links back to a far more archaic stage of covenantal thinking than the Hittite material to which he refers evidences.

It is right that attention should be drawn to the motif of covenant, though that term must inevitably be shorn of many of the overtones of the later fully-developed Israelite, covenant theology. The root idea of covenant is of course 'relationship', since cultic activity is essentially concerned to preserve or restore the proper relationship between the god or gods and his or their people. It is no accident that the later Israelite septennial festival of covenant renewal should, if my arguments be accepted, relate to the complex of the spring new year festival.


In an analysis of the features of covenant-making at Sinai, C. Barth has drawn attention to the link between the three day motif in Hos. 6.2, another prophetic allusion in Am. 4.4, and the presence of it in Ex. 19.137 Both prophetic passages apparently refer back to the pentateuchal tradition.
The source-critical division of Ex. 19 is extraordinarily complex. It is probably not possible to be confident that any analysis is entirely certain. On grounds of consistency, I am inclined to accept the division of Noth, which is broadly accepted by Beyerlin. The tradition that concerns us is attributed to J, and I quote this in full (JB):

9a Yahweh said to Moses, 'I am coming to you in a dense cloud so that the people may hear when I speak to you and may trust you always.'

(9b gloss)

10 Yahweh said to Moses, 'Go to the people and tell them to prepare themselves today and tomorrow. Let them wash their clothing and hold themselves in readiness for the third day.'

(11b gloss—because on the third day Yahweh will descend on the mountain of Sinai in the sight of all the people.)

12 You will mark out the limits of the mountain and say, 'Take care not to go up the mountain or to touch the foot of it, whoever touches the mountain will be put to death.

13a No one must lay a hand on him; he must be stoned or shot down by arrow, whether man or beast; he must not remain alive.'

13b 'Then the ram's horn sounds a long blast; they are to go up the mountain.'

14 So Moses came down from the mountain to the people and bade them prepare themselves; and they washed their clothing.

15 Then he said to the people, 'Be ready for the
16a. Now... on the third day...

18. The mountain of Sinai was entirely wrapped in smoke, because Yahweh had descended on it in the form of fire. Like smoke from a furnace the smoke went up, and the whole mountain shook violently.

20. Yahweh came down on the mountain of Sinai, on the mountain top, and Yahweh called Moses to the top of the mountain, and Moses went up.

21-24. are J according to Beyerlin,142 'secondary' according to Moth.

There are several points raised by this passage and by the other material which by juxtaposition modifies it.

1) The time of year of the Sinai events.

According to v. 1 (P), it was תֶּלֶת מַנְּסָח תַּשָׁבֶיחֶת through יְשֵׁרְתָּם. Here we have the events of Sinai presented as occurring during the summer, that is, three months after the Passover celebrated at the time of the exodus. There is the possibility that P here preserves an ancient tradition concerning the time of a Sinai festival,144 but it seems to me more likely that this detail is a part of P's plan to incorporate all the exodus and wilderness events into a theological time-sequence of his own making. We may also contrast Ex. 19.1 with Nm. 9.1, also P, which appears to regard the events of Sinai as taking place just a year after the exodus. It will also become clear from its use in other contexts that the technical use of נָ립ָל in Ex. 19.1 refers to the new year, and in particular to new year's day.

We have suggested that covenant renewal is to be associated...
with the Passover complex in Israelite tradition. If this is so, it
is fairly certain that the archetype, viz. covenant making, was also
originally associated with the same festival. Of course it is
equally certain that the events of Sinai and the exodus were
originally quite distinct anyway (quite apart from questions of their
historicity), being the traditions of distinct tribal groups, but they
were groups who may have worshipped the same deity Yahweh, or if this
is not the case, as we shall argue later for the community involved
in the exodus at any rate, at least gods of the same type; and so
while their association may be called a historical fiction, it never
the less represents a theological fact, that the principles which
underlie the two elements are ultimately identifiable. The one
tradition speaks in terms of a covenant made at the holy mountain
Sinai, though the covenant element is undoubtedly secondary, while
the other expresses the same conviction of an intimate relationship
with its god in terms of 'election' and 'calling out of Egypt'.

Another point raised by Y. 19 the exact sense of קָלָּא, we
shall deal with below.

ii) The three-day motif.

Several times the J passage we have quoted refers to three days
being taken up with the events described, the climax being on the
third day. This phenomenon undoubtedly ties up with the prophetic
passages cited above, and is curiously found only in this version of
the Sinai tradition. In all the other material concerned with the
'mountain of god' — to-use E's term — a different time sequence is
followed.

So in the E material here, the climax is on the second day, at
daybreak (v.16a — see below). This is also true of Ex.24:4(also E).
According to Ex.24,18b this begins a forty day and night sojourn of
Moses on the mountain, but as Beyerlin has shown, we have a fusion
of traditions here, and vv. 3-8 may have been added afterwards, with
the incorporation of B (the Book of the Covenant). 145

In another J tradition (Ex. 34.2,4) the climax, the giving of
the covenant, is also on the following day, contrasting very
surprisingly with Ex.19, especially when we consider that in the,
original J-source, 34.1a, 2-8, 27-28, may have followed on directly
from the J-material of ch.19. 146 In view of this volte-face within
the J tradition, we may argue either that J fuses two distinct
traditions of different ages, or that the second (ch.34) has been
modified to fit into the fuller context of 32-34. Since
inconsistencies and non-sequiturs do not usually cause any
embarrassment to the tradition, the former case seems the more
likely.

I think it probable that the three day sequence acknowledged
by Ex.19 (the J material) reflects the oldest calendar observed
with regard to the Sinai tradition. This is because it fits most
appropriately into the whole theological, mythical, and natural
complex of circumstances which surround the event, and also because,
it is clearly established practice in the time of Amos and Hosea.
The fact that they in the north should allude to these very
southern motifs suggests that it was known in the north from the
period of the United Kingdom.

iii) The time of the month of the Sinai events.

The fusion of traditions in 19.16 changes the entire character
of the theophany. It begins:

The caesura I have marked separates 16a and 16b, which fall
respectively into the J and E sources. Even if this source division
be rejected, the phrase לְדַּבֵּר הַבָּצָר looks tautological after the
preceding one, and its originality may be doubted. Also, as we have seen, it refers to a 'next day', that is, a second day, 'and has nothing at all to do with the three day sequence. The point which this serves to stress is that the theophany of the J account with which we are dealing occurs not in the morning at all, but in the evening. In post-exilic times, the Jewish day was reckoned as lasting from evening to evening. This is clear from the P account of creation, where the days are marked off. There is some debate about how it was reckoned in pre-exilic times.

But it seems to me that it must have been the same. The legislation for Passover requires that it be celebrated between the two evenings, the evenings in question being not twenty-four hours apart, but in effect the same evening, seen as belonging to the preceding day, and at the same time to the ensuing one. All passages where the phrase occurs are in P; but it would be rather doctrinaire to assert that not one of them could be preserving a pre-exilic tradition. If, then, the day begins in the evening, we may suppose the climax of the three day sequence to have taken place in the evening. And this is precisely when a new moon makes its appearance, being already in the sky, and gradually becoming more pronounced as the sunlight diminishes. Indeed the important feature of the new moon may be precisely that it is already visible before sunset. This could then explain why we later have an apparently inconsistent variation of the phrase: 'after three days'. Clearly 'on the third day' and 'after three days' are not synonymous; the latter expression means 'on the fourth day'. But with the day beginning at sunset, both terms could relate to the situation in question. We may present it diagrammatically:
If we are to envisage the reappearance of the new moon crescent after obscuration as the occasion of the passage we have cited, it may be objected that this can have no direct connection with Passover, since the latter, traditionally occurs on 14th. Abib/Nisan, and therefore must to two weeks later than the moment we are at present concerned with. This brings us to the problem of a new moon. This term is used in Ex. 19.1 (P), the detail concerning the time of year of the final events. Both argue that in view of v. 1lb, ‘that day’ (יָמִּיָּהְבּ הַיָּמִיָּהְבּ) new moon in v. 1a must mean ‘new moon’, i.e., beginning of the month, and not ‘just month’. Now while in several biblical passages the Passover is clearly to be celebrated on 14th. Abib/Nisan, there are two significant exceptions. The first is Ex. 13.3, 4 (J):

Moses said to the people, ‘Keep this day (יָמִיָּהְבּ הַיָּמִיָּהְבּ) in remembrance the day you came out of Egypt, out from the house of slavery... On this day, in the month of Abib (יָמִיָּהְבּ הַיָּמִיָּהְבּ) you are leaving Egypt.’ (JB).

This passage is concerned with the feast of Unleavened Bread, and traditionally observed from 15th. Abib/Nisan, and therefore immediately following Passover. But Both’s argument concerning Ex. 19.1 must also apply here, the phrase יָמִיָּהְבּ הַיָּמִיָּהְבּ, being without further qualification, can only refer to the new moon of Abib, i.e., the beginning of the month. The other passage is:

Dt. 16.1, 6 (D):

In keeping the Passover, you shall eat unleavened bread seven days... For in the seventh month, on the first day of the week, you shall observe a Passover to the Lord your God, since you went out of Egypt. (NIV)
Observe the month of Abib (אָבִּיב) and celebrate the Passover for Yahweh your god, because it was in the month of Abib (אָבִּיב) that Yahweh your god brought you out of Egypt by night... therefore you must sacrifice the Passover, in the evening at sunset, at the hour at which you came out of Egypt. (JB)

Here again, the failure to qualify הַיַּעַר by specifying the day of the month implies that the time of the new moon is meant. McKay agrees that this interpretation of הַיַּעַר is tenable, but argues that the first appearance of the new moon is unpredictable and therefore hardly allows adequate preparation, and in the earliest period any time during the first month was probably acceptable. In fact in primitive times little warning was probably required, and the two or three hours of late afternoon during which the new crescent was visible would be enough for preparing a rite whose approximate time was known anyway. Only a later priestly elaboration needed four days, for example (Ex. 12.3,6), between selection and killing of the victims. Besides, the whole point of the rite was, among other things, to affect the moon's resurrection, not to record it.

But I want to suggest that הַיַּעַר does not originally mean specifically the time of appearance of the new moon, but more generally the period of obscuration lasting some three days (and nights) approximately. And in this context, it seems pertinent to link to the feature of the third day in Ex. 19 the similar three day motif which occurs in Ex. 3.18, and 5.3 (both J), where Moses demands leave of Pharaoh to make a three days' journey into the wilderness to offer sacrifice to Yahweh. Whether this referred to any genuine rite, or was a ploy to get through the frontier posts, is not clear, though in view of the cultic motivation behind the
tradition as preserved, it may well point to the rite as already of some antiquity. If we take it that the tradition has telescoped the journey time (the arrival at Sinai is in any case not part of the original Exodus tradition), then the former appears more likely, since we have the ideal sequence (forgetting chronological problems) of Passover, followed by Exodus, followed by new moon theophany at Sinai. The three days of transhumance expressed cultically as the Exodus, have somehow become confused with the three day episode at Sinai, perhaps because each separately had three days devoted to it (i.e., the same three days whose climax was the appearance of the new moon). We have characterised Passover as, inter alia, a new year festival. This would fit in very well with it happening at the beginning of the month, but makes little real sense when the new year is already a fortnight old before its observation on 14th Abib/Nisan. The shift to this mid-month observance may have taken place in the Exilic period (see below).

Accordingly, I believe we can reconstruct the earliest sequence of events in this way: the disappearance of the old moon at the end of the twelfth month and of the entire year was the sign for the rites designed to effect a proper and auspicious beginning to the new year. So the Passover was celebrated. Approximately three nights later (since it averages out at three nights, this would explain the stereotyped formula) the new moon would appear, interpreted, naturally, as a theophany, and so the preparatory rites would be shown to have been effective. This complex is shown partially in the two traditions we noted in Ex. 3 and 5: the Passover and Exodus (three days' journey into the wilderness - the transhumance) and the three day wait at Sinai for the reappearance of the moon. (The fact that the traditions do not fall neatly between E and J, as one would hope, calls for further
analysis below). The presence of the three-day motif in both the (originally independent) traditions is not a cause for embarrassment, but rather an indication of the widespread observance of rites/association with the new moon marking the beginning of the new year.

iv) The blowing of the trumpet.

The blowing of the trumpet, mentioned in Ex.19.13b, is significant, I believe, in the new year interpretation we are offering. We have already noted its presence in the story of the taking of Jericho, and remarked on its significance. In the legislation for the seasonal festivals in Leviticus; 23.24 deals with חֹקָה הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, and requires that:

The first day of the seventh month shall be a day of rest for you, a sacred assembly proclaimed with trumpet call (וֹרֵץ הַמִּשְׁמָשׁ), (JB).

The usual terms for a trumpet are:

1) Num.10.10:

At your festivals, solemnities, or new moon feasts, you will sound the trumpet at the time of your holocausts and your communion sacrifices.

Here we see the general use of the term in cultic contexts. A specifically new year context is undoubtedly to be understood in Ps.96.6:

To the sound of trumpet and horn (הַשָּׁמֶשׁ וְהָרָכִּיב) acclaim Yahweh the king! (JB)

Verse 9 of this Psalm, referring to the coming of Yahweh in judgment, confirms this as a new year psalm.

2) This, as we have just seen, is paired with חֹקָה in
In another psalm, 81.4 (NIV 3), we have:

\[
\text{Sound the new moon trumpet,}
\]

at the full moon, on our feast day.

This can only refer either to the first or the seventh month, and in fact is probably to be related to the feast of Tabernacles, the autumnal new year. 160 נִזְגָּן is used to describe the trumpet-sound of the theophany in E's account in Ex. 19.16b, 19, and 20.18, and is frequently found as a military or civil instrument for rallying Israel in circumstances that are not primarily cultic. It is also used in conjunction with the third term, in what may be a doublet tradition in Jos.6.

3) מִזְגָּן. This instrument is specifically a ram's horn, and is found only in cultic contexts. In Jos. 6, vv. 4, 5, 8, 9 (bis), 13 (bis), and 20 (bis) use מִזְגָּן, while 4, 6, 8, and 13 use מִזְגָּן מִזְגָּן. The use of מִזְגָּן here enhances the cultic interpretation of the Jericho pericope. It is also used in the priestly legislation concerning the Jubilee year (בְּנֵיהוֹן יִשָּׁרָאֵל) in Lev. 25.8-19, 25-33, 27.17-24, and Num. 36.4. Finally, מִזְגָּן (without the vocal י) is the term used in Ex. 19.13b. All the evidence certainly makes a good case for, if not proving, the interpretation of the Sinai theophany of Ex. 19 (J) as a new year theophany.

But there are further reasons too.

v) The presentation of Moses.

Moses is presented in royal terms. Eichhorn draws attention to the total time taken up from the preparation on the tenth day, the Passover on the fourteenth, and its aftermath the feast of unleavened bread lasting until the twenty-first eleven days are involved in the
spring celebrations in later Israel, exactly the number devoted to the Akitu festival in Babylon. 161 The importance of this, he argues, derives from the fact that, "Moses is modelled after the figure of the sacral king throughout". He lists several features about Moses which lend themselves to such a view. The most important observation here is that the whole description of the victory achieved over Pharaoh is closely parallel to the struggle in the Enuma Eliš, Pharaoh being the counterpart of king Gilgamesh. 162

Widengren, too, argued that the motif of Moses receiving the two tablets from Yahweh on the mountain closely paralleled the alleged reception by the king, (or his representative priests) of the tablets of destiny in Semitic new year festivals—particularly the Babylonian Akitu. 163 Israel adopted the sacral kingship ideology from the Canaanites, (and probably more specifically from the Jebusites), and one of the functions of the pentateuchal traditions extant in the monarchical period was presumably the justification for later practices and developments by an appeal to their alleged—though often fictitious—archetypical occurrences during the illud tempus of the exodus and wilderness-wandering period. The attribution of all Torah to the mediatory role of Moses is merely the most obvious example of this process. Widengren argued that the two tablets given to Moses 164 were the archetypes of the urim and thummim, later worn in the royal pectoral, and perpetuated in the priestly pectoral. The implication of this for our present purpose is that royal authority was affirmed at the new year. There is a weakness in Engnell's and Widengren's arguments, in that the specific influences of which they speak would be applicable rather as a result of Mesopotamian influence during the exile than in the period of the monarchy, and as we have said, the direct source of Israelite royal ideology is Canaan, where Mesopotamian influence may be present,
but cannot be proven. There is a third aspect of the role of Moses, which comes out most clearly in the secondary handling of the tradition in the narrative framework of Deuteronomy. This is the redemptive role he performs, which is in accordance with the intercessory role of kingship, and which again is probably to be understood as being articulated primarily at the new year festival. Thus, Yahweh is angry with Moses, on account of the people, 1.37, 3.26. In particular, Moses deflects the divine wrath by his intercession on Mount Horeb, when the people make themselves an idol (9.15ff., 25ff.). Moses himself is sinless in Deuteronomy; the mysterious fault which lies behind Yahweh's refusal to allow him to enter Canaan (Num.20.12ff.) is suppressed. He foregoes the right of entry as an act of redemption for his people. Indeed we might say that by not entering the land flowing with milk and honey (the 'land of the living'), he undergoes a metaphorical death, and thus dies vicariously for his people. So, although at some remove, in its final presentation, there is a close parallel between the role of Moses and that of the various divine figures we have seen in CTA 12, the Passover, and the scapegoat rites. It would be absurd to jump to the conclusion that Moses is simply another avatar of Attar, but not at all absurd to point to the contacts between royal ideology and the functions of Attar. After all, as he is the son of the father-god, El or Yahweh, so is the king in Israel, from the time of his coronation (Psalms 2.7) and also in Tyre (Ezek. 28) and probably in other West-Semitic kingdoms. It may be that the king in Ugarit performed in analogous ceremonies (e.g. in CTA 12, 23) and was also ideologically son of El.

vi) The theophany at Sinai.

Several scholars have drawn attention to the description of the smoking, flaming and thundering mountain in Ex.19 (both J and L), and...
have understood this to represent a volcanic eruption. This interpretation is quite plausible, and has given ground for arguing that the location of the mountain cannot be its traditional site in the Sinai peninsula. That can of course be refuted on other grounds anyway. But more importantly, it might be held to confound any suggestion that we have a lunar theophany. However, there remains the possibility that we have metaphorical, cultic language. No one would seriously maintain that Isaiah had his inaugural vision during an earthquake (or that Mount Zion was volcanic!), and yet we find similar language there (Is.6.4):

The foundation of the threshold shook with the voice of the one who cried out, and the temple was filled with smoke. (JE)

Morgenstern has argued that Isaiah’s vision occurred on the occasion of the new year’s day festivities in the temple. Perhaps we are to understand the description as particularly fitting to a new year theophany, which takes place on ‘the day of Yahweh’. Such traditional usage may also lie behind Is.2.10, 19, 21 (refrains in the hymnic oracle of 2.6-22); Is.24.18f.; Joel 2.10, 11, etc., all of which refer to the day of Yahweh. This interpretation is supported by Beelen’s observation concerning Exodus, that the smoke is ultimately derived from the smoke of incense in the sanctuary during the autumnal festival. He refers specifically to the Day of Atonement, but this was probably only at a later date isolated from the rest of the new year complex, which, we have argued, was originally celebrated in the spring.

vii) The theology of the Sinai theophany.

How is the Sinai material relevant to the discussion of atonement theology with which we began this chapter? I have considered at some length the timing of the Sinai theophany and
covenant-making traditions as being at the new year, together with the question of the three days' absence of the moon between lunations, because it seems to me that the whole point about the death and resurrection motif as applying to 'Attar lies in the probability that the pattern has been wholly or partly transferred to him from his father, the moon-god. 'Attar himself becomes in the various atonement rituals we have analysed, the 'substitute' for his own father. In the cult he dies, in order that the moon-god may live perpetually. The three days of the absence of the moon need then no longer be feared as a threat, because the god may never return — for his return is guaranteed by the vicarious act of his son. The ancient title of Yahweh as 'גֵּיהֶת יָהָウェָה may refer not to any supposed contrast with Baal as a dying and rising god but rather to Yahweh's assured permanence, thanks to a mythology which safeguards his life. 'Attar's atonement is not just for the nation, via the (chief) god, nor just for the god's brethren — as gods of the nations, but even for the great father himself, for the entire cosmos.

This can be no more than a hypothesis. But some force may be given to it if we consider for a moment the motivation that lies behind the story of the 'sacrifice' of Isaac in Gen. 22. We have noted that the character on whom Abraham was modelled in this and certain other episodes was originally the moon-god; that such a story provided an archetype for practices of human sacrifice — particularly of their (eldest) sons by kings as a rite of atonement; and that there is undoubtedly a link between the sacrifice of Isaac and that of the first scapegoat: itself an analogue of the passover victim. Even in the heavily disguised, quasi-historical story we have in the present text of Gen. 22, the whole object of the sacrifice is the testing of Abraham, or, in other words, the
'justification' of Abraham (cf. Gen. 15.6 and Paul's comments in Rom. 4.1ff.). This I suggest, an attenuated form of the 'redemption' of Abraham. Isaac the victim is essentially a substitute for his father—and undergoes a passion which would otherwise be his father's. Likewise, the moon-god is 'redeemed' by his son CAttar, who vicariously suffers his fate.

In fact the substitution may only have been partial, since there is no evidence in the early material for the resurrection of CAttar (apart from the periodic reappearance of Venus, which does not appear as a feature in the mythology). In the late Tyrian version, Helqart is raised, and thus appears to combine in himself features still shared earlier. So perhaps the early myth would have told how the moon was dying, and CAttar offered himself as a substitute, or was offered by the other gods, and the moon-god was accordingly restored. This would fit my suggestion that Passover originally took place on the last night of the old moon as the moon-god was dying, or at any rate before the reappearance of the new moon. But when later the lunar character of the high god was lost to sight, the mediatory role of the substitute victim could either develop fully into a 'dying and rising god', as in Tyre, or simply lose its own divinity, as in Israel, according to varying local pressures. The death and resurrection allusions of Hos. 6.2 and elsewhere on the Old Testament may indicate that in Israel too the Tyrian pattern was actively perpetuated, and we have noted the perpetuation of 'satyr-cults' (i.e. probably the worship of CAttar) in both Israel and Judah.

There is one further point that requires explanation, and that is the change of date of the Passover from the 17th of Abib/Nisan to the 14th. As we have seen, the only passages which refer to
the latter date are from P, and may therefore reflect a development from an earlier time of observation. Thus Ex.23.15 (L) and 34.18 (Jt) merely speak of an 'appointed time,' which may reasonably be understood to refer to the timing of Ex.13.3f. (J) and Dt.16.1,6 (D) which we examined. If we are to suggest a date for the change, the period of the exile seems to me to be the most likely, though certainly no time earlier than the seventh century, in view of Dt.16.1,6. It can certainly have occurred only at a time when the theological traditions originally underlying Passover, which I have endeavoured to recover in this chapter, had become totally obscured with the passage of time.

The change in time of observation may have led to one development in the understanding of the myth. When the death of Ēṭṭār had occurred at the time of the dying moon, it was regarded as redemptive, and cultically potent infusing vigour to the chief god. When it took place on 14th Abib/Hisan, the 'fall of Ēṭṭār' could come to be seen as occurring at the time of the rising of the full moon, in opposition to it, and therefore be the punishment of hubris - the casting down of an insolent upstart. And so the later developments in the interpretation of Is.14 could begin to take place.

In this chapter we have examined a theological complex which is to be understood as originating in the new year festival of an ancient pastoralist moon-cult. I have tried to show that this lies behind not only Ėṭṭār 12, but also three important ritual traditions within Israel: the Passover, the Scapegoat, and the divine epiphany on Mount Sinai. The first two are undoubtedly of very great antiquity, and do not necessarily belong originally to the cult of Yahweh. With regard to Sinai, the tradition as it stands is strictly to be linked to it, though here too, it is possible that Yahweh appropriates the tradition from outside. The Sinai tradition too appears to be lunar
in origin, as the J version indicates. It is possible that the final form of the L material constitutes an attempt to disguise this, or at any rate reflects a changing conception of Yahweh. We shall see below that in the E version of the holy mountain tradition, El was the deity originally concerned.
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1 C. Virollesaud, "les chasses de Baal", *Syria* 16 (1935), 247-266.
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4 Hellenismos, 80f... There may of course be literary links.

5 See above, pp. 73ff...

6 Following the restoration of Gaster, *op. cit.* 219, 450. Contrast,

7 Ginsberg's suggestion 'moles', *JPOS* 16 (1936), 140, (followed by Gaster, *Thespia*, 219, 450), fits the idea of something inside, but the idea of moles eating your liver is a little bizarre.

8 Much more likely, in view of the parallel 'worms', would appear to be liver flukes. In an age of hepatoscopy, we may suppose that the ancients were familiar with them. Perhaps they called them 'liver-moles'?

9 Following Gaster, *ACOr* 16 (1937), 44. *Thespia*, 219, rather than 'breasts', since they are not yet born.


11 See p. 47.


My restoration.

Since 'šbō, (masculine form) is used for the cardinal with 'šnāt (f.), it is balanced by 'štn (m.) for the ordinal (though 'štn would be more correct; UT § 2698, p. 503); likewise in 11.49f., where 'šbōt is used (without 'šnāt), it is balanced by the normal form 'štn. In both cases, the gender agreement between the forms is clearly essential on poetic grounds.

The text reads ngpnt ('cycles' // 'years'). But what is required is a verb antonymous to mlā. The Hebrew noun 'šōpēr = 'to thicken, congeal', and BDB suggests that at Zech.14.6 we may have a piṭhal form, to be pointed 'šōpēr. I suggest that here we have the N-form of this verb in Ugaritic, 3rd. f. e.g., agreeing with the implied 'šnāt. The whole text exhibits curious spellings, e.g. 'mbr for 'mbr in 11.1 21, 35, and I think that here we may have a lapsus cunei, ni, having been written for 1i. Against this suggestion is the reading of CTA 23 rev. 67, ngpt, which most scholars translated, reading ngpnt, by 'cycle of years', 'seasons' or some such expression.

Gordon, UT, reads ngpnt in both instances. The full passages are:

CTA 12 'šbō 'šnāt 'l mlā [šdm] wtan ngpnt ʾd klēbd̄ km...

CTA 23 'šbō 'šnāt 'tāt nūm... tan ngpnt ʾd ʾilm nūm...tūn

As can be seen, the parallel in phraseology is by no means complete, though the same time-cycle is referred to, and in view of the different spelling, hardly counts as disproof of my suggestion of scribal error, which may be due to the latter passage echoing in the mind of the scribe as he wrote the formen.
Taking the k as emphatic, Gordon says that emphatic kl always involves post-position of the verb (UT §§ 9, 17, 13.51, pp. 76, 119), but the poetio structore makes that impossible here—the verb klbs would have to follow aryh. Besides, for fourteen cases of emphatic k with post-position of the verb, in the Psalter, Dahood gives an equal number of alleged cases without post-position, in Psalms 111, (1970), 403f.

I take dm to be construct plural. Cf. the use of D'st in Hebrew to mean 'guilt', or 'sin', in Ps. 51.16. By taking it his way, we reverse the meaning that Gray first obtained (JNES 10 (1951), 150), according to which Ba'al was guilty. Rather, his brothers are.

We shall see below that the father (i.e., the moon-god) himself is also clean and 'saved'—just as Abraham is justified by Isaac's 'death'. So the reading here could equally well be abb as abb.

The ab'sm. abb are of course the seventy sons of Aserah (CTA: 4 vi. 46), that is, the entire pantheon apart from the primal couple (El and Aserah). Since the nations are divided in biblical thought according to the number of El's sons, (Dt. 32.8), we may infer that the gods are held guilty for the peoples of whom they have charge, on the ground that a similar belief was probably found in Ugarit. In the myth, the gods are guilty, and have their guilt purged; the cult effects this purgation for mankind. It would appear from the wording that Ba'al is there included in this family, although he does not appear to be one of the seventy, and his normal status as son of Dagan is ignored, though 1.1. 39 uses the cliche. His role within a theological system in which he appears to be an interloper is evidence of his secondary inclusion in the myth. It has,
been subjected to a process of agorismata. The conflict of Ba'al and the Devourers (Gatari-Net) is perhaps an application to a particular rite of atonement of the struggle between Ba'al and Mot in the AB cycle. In the 'pré-Ba'al' version of the rite it was perhaps other elements, such as sacrificial death and/or expulsion into the desert, which effected the atonement. The possibility of this original form will become clearer as our discussion proceeds.

21 My restoration.

22 Meaning 'Ba'al' in view of 11.49, where the subject of the (restored) verb can only be 'Ba'al.

23 So, e.g., Ginsberg, JPOS 16, p.148; Gray, JNES 10, p.150; ibid., UPJ 3, p.66; Kapelrud, Ugaritica VI, 327.

24 So, e.g., Dussaud, RHR 113, p.16; Gaster, AOC 16, pp.47ff.; ibid., Thespias 7, p.221ff.; Gordon, UL, 55; Driver, CHAL, 73.


26 UL 4,11; ibid., 'Sabbatical year or seasonal pattern?' Orientalia ns 22 (1953), 79-81. See also Driver, who approves Gordon's approach, CHAL, 20.

27 See Kraus, op.cit., 70ff., for discussion.

28 Perhaps the seven day week is associated with this pattern of thought, too.

29 The references in Jeremiah were brought to my attention in this context by J.B.Frye. It may be that the theme of atonement in the original force of the phrase used frequently in post-exilic contexts (e.g., Is.23.15,17; Zech.7.5; Dan 9.2;24) though once the sense was lost (already in all these passages?) it became a fixed time to which various chronological data were
made to conform. See C. F. Whitley, 'The term "seventy years captivity"', VT 4 (1954), 60-72. J. Fennelly has pointed out to me that in Persian folklore seven represents good, and eight evil. The seventy gods/nations undoubtedly represent the full, perfect complement of the cosmic population. Any additional characters are beyond the pale, and automatically regarded as hostile, and a threat to the status quo.

Dahood suggests that the entire poem was composed in Phoenicia and argues that much of its style and syntax are best explained on these grounds; 'Phoenician elements in Isaiah 52.13-53.12', pp. 63-73 in Near Eastern studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright, ed. H. Goedicke (1971). If we credit a potent linguistic influence, it would be naive to deny at least the possibility of a theological influence.

See L. Hammershaimb, 'History and cult in the Old Testament', (pp. 269-282 in Goedicke, op.cit.), for the problems involved regarding the interpretation of the Ugaritic texts.


On the basis of the pair $m^\text{wy}/m^\text{za}$ in 1. 1 36f., I would prefer to read one of the $m^\text{wy}$ forms here as $m^\text{gw}y$ (or $w^\text{ym}gy$), taking the error as a further example of scribal carelessness.

Ba'al: CTA 3 v 40.
Attar CTA iii 18 (kaa mlk); cf. Yams CTA 9.9.
Li: CTA 4 iii 24 and passim.

As father of all, who stands apart from warring factions, he is in a sense the author of all, and has ultimate responsibility. Yahweh likewise is described as he who lifts up and casts down; 1 S. 2.7; Ps. 75.8 (LIV 7); 102.11 (LIV 10). See also Marduk in Enuma Elish iv. 8, ABET, p. 66.
39 Cf. Is. 1: 5.

40 Following Kapelrud, Ugaritica VI, 328, no. 34; from Ar. dann - jug. However, there may be a paronomasia; cf. Hos. 10:12.


42 Dussaud, RHR 113, p. 14; Kapelrud, op. cit., 332.

43 Perhaps, the intercalated days (Kraus, op. cit., 44), which made the 354 days of the lunar year up to the 365 of the solar year were somehow incorporated?

44 See, e.g., Gaster, Thespis, 2, 47.

45 Pace Kraus, op. cit., 44, who argues that the new year changed to spring because of the imposition of the Babylonian calendar. He offers no justification for this view.

46 See J. W. McKay, 'The date of Passover and its significance', ZAW 84 (1972), 435-446, for the problems involved, and see further below.


48 Cf. Num. 9:6-12, where the implication is of ritual uncleanness contracted within seven days of Passover (cf. Num. 19:11).

49 M. Noth, The history of Israel (1960), 149, n.2, followed by Kraus, op. cit., 159. See also K. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land (1970), 211. She argues that there is some slight evidence of occupation in the period 1400-1325. However, if we take a fairly late date for the exodus, say 1250, even this would be too early. There is the possibility of several exoduses of course, as well as of several settlements, but this would not
affect my argument. In any case, the significant absence of any reference to Sinai in the recital of Yahweh's saving acts immediately suggests that the tradition is northern, and therefore linked to the tribe(s) who came from Egypt. This is a more compelling argument for area of origin than the presence of Joshua in the story, since the northern hero has already become a national hero.

50 Krause, op. cit., 159ff.; J. A. Soggin, Joshua (ET 1972), 82ff., and references in both.

51 Wyatt, TJUCS, 93f.

52 See M. H. Segal, 'The religion of Israel before Sinai', JQR 53 (1962-3), 244f. See further below.

53 Most commentators assume that Passover is a pastoralist-nomadic festival, and Massot an agriculturalist-peasant (and therefore Canaanite) festival, the two being linked after the settlement by syncretism. See Noth, Exodus (ET 1962), 89; V. Rad, Deuteronomy (ET 1966), 112f. Contrast the approach of J. B. Segal, The Hebrew Passover (1963), 93, and of Engnell, Critical essays on the Old Testament (1970), 190, who both reject the idea that the Passover was 'primarily a nomadic festival'.

54 J. B. Segal, op. cit., 114ff., and especially 125ff.; Engnell, op. cit.; 183; Krause, op. cit., 44, though of course he sees this as a later development. Rowley gives references for and against, but remains non-committal: in Worship in ancient Israel, (1967), 49, no. 4.


57 The archetypal and paradigmatic role of the cosmic cosmic sacrifice is perhaps best illustrated in the Indian context; there was -
originally a human sacrifice which 'began the world', as is indicated by the Rig Veda 10.90, while the later Asvamedha (horse sacrifice) described in Mahabharata book 12 performed the same role.


Op. cit., 166, n. 1; see also 102f., 170f.


Loc. cit.

Hellenosemitica, passim, especially 176ff. Astour appears to be thinking of Ba'al as the prototype of Dionysus, though he does not actually say so. As will become clear below, I consider him to have developed from Attar.

CTA 19 iii 144ff.

CTA 19 iv 42ff., iv 177ff.

C. Virolleaud, 'Un nouvel épisode du mythe ugaritique de Baal', CHAIBL. 1960, 180-186. The following treatments have been given: Astour, 'Un texte d'Ugarit récemment découvert et ses rapports avec l'origine des cultes bacchiques grecs', RHR 164 (1963), 1-15; ibid., Hellenosemitica, 180ff.; K. Lipinski, 'Les conceptions et couches merveilleuses de Anat', Syria 42 (1965), 45-73; Albright, TGC, 114ff.

All but Virolleaud take this to be a lapsus censi for likht.

Following Astour, RHR 164, p. 5. He admits that the meaning is unknown, and this is an inspired guess which ignores his own references to Ar. sanā (vanu meaning 'shine, brighten, inflame'), and to Akk. sanū 'to roar'. Albright, op. cit., 114, suggests 'lamenting', and derives this from Heb. and Ar. šanw 'to irrigate'; 'here it would refer to the flow of tears'. Lipinski renders šanw as 'toujours s'enflammant' - in a sexual sense; Anat is a cow
in-season. Albright's suggestion would make sense if this were to be fitted into the context of the AB cycle, where at

GTA 5 v 30ff., 6 i 2ff., Anat comes upon the dead Ba'al and bewails him. But that is by no means certain, and is unlikely, since the rite of omophagia involves the rending of the living victim and immediate devouring of the flesh. I believe the rite to be far older than its association with Ba'al and Anat.

Astour takes tp to = Heb. נין, op. cit., 5; Helleno-... 160; but while this suits the cultic situation admirably, it ignores the poetic structure. Albright's rendering, from יָבֵא 'to be beautiful', makes much better sense, and is clinched by the parallel usage in Es 7.7; יבֵא יבֵא יבֵא יבֵא, to which he refers. Lipinski concurs, though in accordance with his somewhat over-Freudian interpretation of the whole, he turns omophagia into fellatio (!) and takes tp to mean 'le beau membre'.

The k could of course be emphatic. See n. 17 above.

One feature in favour of the Passover being essentially the same rite in origin as that described in RS 22.225 is the reference there to the meal being without a knife or cup. That is, it is not a sacrifice in common with others. J. B. Segal points out that the Passover is different from other Israelite sacrifices in that the worshippers eat the entire victim, except what is left over and therefore burnt; the priest gets nothing. (Op. cit., 157). This implies that priests were not originally involved. It is of interest that it is only in the eighth/seventh century legislation of Dt. 16ff., which changes Passover from a domestic to a centralised and therefore 'official' festival, that the term נַפּוֹל is used of the killing.

Eggin, op. cit., 75.
72 See J.B. Segal, *op.cit.*, 118-125 for examples.

73 *Inter alia*, we may presumably compare the Ḥeṭa with the Akitu house built for the sacred marriage in Babylon. See also Kraus, *op.cit.*, 63.

74 Engnell, *Critical essays*, 190ff., rejects the notion that Passover was ever a nomadic festival. He draws attention to the similarities with the Akitu festival, including the 'kinship' of Moses (see below), but it seems to me that he fails completely to explain where the festival came from, if not from Israel's forebears. These are often called 'nomadic' or 'semi-nomadic'. For a critique of this language, in which the Bedouin are treated as modern examples of the same culture, see O.E. Wendenhall, 'The 'Hebrew conquest of Palestine', *BA* 25 (1962), 66-87. He distinguishes between urban and village populations, the latter being of common stock with the transhumant pastoralists. Perhaps 'pastoralist' is the safest term to use, though the whole question needs a thorough reexamination.


77 Gordon is unhelpful in his Glossary in *U* (p.468). Cf. *DBB*, 961, 771. Biblical usage covers a wide range of meanings from the haunt of wild beasts: *Ps* 8.8 (*LXX* 7); 50.11; 60.14 (*LXX* 13), etc., and hunting ground: *Gen* 25.29; 39.2, 30; 39.16, etc., and cultivated land: *Hos* 12.12; *Dt* 32.13—all passages cited in *DBB*. The majority of references have the former sense of 'wild, unsettled, territory, rather than farmland. In *CIA* 14 iv 193 it appears to have this sense, as in *CIA* 24 obv. 22ff.
I shall make her open lands into vineyards,
the pasturage of her love into orchards.

(vineyard, orchard, may be age, with the m enolitic. It is tempting to see this passage as reminiscent of Ug., commenting on Ps. 4,16, Kramer in The sacred marriage rite, (1969), 152,n.17, suggests that the 'garden' is a euphemism for the vulva - of the 'perfumed Garden'. The same idea is probably to be discerned here, with the contrast between \( \text{ad} \) and \( \text{km/hrnq} \) as a cryptic reference to the virginity of the bride and the delights and fruitfulness of love which are to follow. On the former, cf. the English idiom 'virgin land').

Out of the forms listed here are given by Astour, op. cit., 84ff.

See n.60.

See Noth, Leviticus, (LT:1965),117ff., and especially.121. On p.125 he refers to the scapegoat procedure as probably a local rite, on the grounds that Azazel was a demon 'thought of as inhabiting and casting his spell upon a particular wilderness'.

(See below for discussion on this point). He draws the parallel with Passover: 'With this local limitation the "scapegoat" ritual will have been different in kind from the Passover... ritual; though comparable in its apotropaic purpose, it was... markedly different from it in its detailed procedure'. My point is that in fact the procedure shows remarkable parallels, and suggests that the two rites have diverged from a common source.

See also Noth, Numbers, (LT 1968),217, 219.

Cf. the reference to the 'shrine of the goats' in 2 K.23.8, the addition of 'satyr' as images set up by Jeroboam in...
2 Ch. 11.15, and the prohibition in Lev. 17.7. See also


84 See n. 62.

85 J. Harrison, Prolegomena to the study of Greek religion, (1903), 204, quoting Plutarch, De Iside et Caeride, 73.

86 Hrb here is probably the sacrificial knife, as in HS 22.225, rather than 'sword'.

87 Following de Moor, op. cit. (n. 25), 208, 210.

88 I take this to mean something like Gen. 4.10. Or perhaps the birds will cry, having absorbed the flesh (e la Ilkley Moor 'baht 'at').

89 CTA 6 11 30-37.

90 De Moor, op. cit., 210f.

91 Albright, ART, 84. So also Hvidberg, Weeping and laughter in the Old Testament, (ET 1962), 51.

92 Cf. this as an image of annihilation in Dt. 28.26; J S. 17, 44, 46; 1 K. 14.11; 16.4; 21.24; Jer. 7.33; 16.4; 19.7; 34.20; Ezek. 29.5.

From this evidence, we may suppose that we have a standard idiom here. For a similar idiom in Egyptian cf. this passage in pyramid text 292, contrasted with the (dead) king whose body remains intact, his foes come to a dismal end -

'their hearts fall to my fingers, their entrails are for the denizens of the sky, their blood is for the denizens of the earth...'

Cf. the gruesome treatment accorded the (alleged) murderers of Sennacherib by his grandson Assurbanipal:

The others, I smashed alive with the very same statutes of protective deities with which they had smashed my own grandfather Sennacherib—now as a burial sacrifice for his soul. I fed their corpses, cut into small pieces, to dogs, pigs, zibu-birds, vultures, the birds of the sky and the fish of the ocean. After I had performed these acts, this and made quiet the hearts of the great gods, my lords, I removed the corpses of those whom the pestilence had felled, whose leftovers the dogs and pigs had fed on them were obstructing the streets, filling the places, of those who had lost their lives through the terrible famine. (AMT 288).

Feeding to the birds and dogs, pigs etc., is evidently not just a symbol of total destruction, but an act of purification.

---

94 Above, p. 47.
95 BDB 972; KB 926.
96 All passages are in Lev., Num., and include the scapegoat instructions discussed above.
97 See BH3 appar.
99 BDB 736, followed by Lattey, *op.cit.*, 272.
100 CE 555e, p. 152.
101 Ibid., § 3 on, p. 102.
104 Loc. cit. The turgum form מ' ¬ מ mentioned above (p. 124) may offer indirect support, being perhaps an alternative solution to the problem the original form presented.
105 T. K. Cheyne, 'The date and origin of the ritual of the scapegoat', ZAW 15 (1895), 155.
106 BR 3 appar.
108 Following on from Cheyne, Cesterley, in Cesterley and Robinson, op. cit., 66, suggests that אֶרֶץ was originally a god of the flocks. He then says that finally he became identified with Satan, citing 1 En. 6.7, 9.6, 10.4-6. This supports my argument, op. cit., that Satan develops at least in some respects from אֶרֶץ. The names Аן and Satan(iz) are of course of the same type. It is worth noting that there is the term כָּנָה meaning a 'she-goat'. It frequently occurs in pl. form in the expression דָּעִי דָּעִי (note Daghest: forte, meaning 'a goat (of the flock - lit. she goats)'. We may conjecture that the term דָּעִי דָּעִי is not a divine title at all, but taking the reduplicated form דָּעִי to be an archaic form of which the daghest forte in דָּעִי preserves an echo, an expression, meaning 'a goat for El'. Since an א has already changed places in the received text, it is not impossible that a כ or כ has been omitted through haplography or garbling, or itself been shifted to the beginning (דָּעִי). It is also disprove any relative 'lateness' in Lev. 16.8f., (P).
109 The passage in Num. is also П, and most probably postdates the
This has to be modified, of course, in the 'historical' religions. The Hebrew Passover, like the Christian Eucharist, ostensibly involves the anamnesis of 'historical' incidents. Phenomenologically, however, they are the same.

Cf. Loos, Israel, 239, 'it may be that originally Arzal himself was driven out in the form of a goat'.

The Phoenician origin of these characters is demonstrated by Astour, Hellenosemitica, 163ff.

See Gray, 'The desert god Of, in the literature and religion of Canaan', JNES 8 (1949), 76-81.

Lev. 18.21, 20.2ff.; 2 K. 16.3, 23.10; Jer. 32.35.

Just as the son of Abaz is passed through the fire, 2 K. 16.3.

We have seen how Abraham - the moon-god, and Isaac - his son (Of). Perhaps Abaz was performing in the cult the mythic procedure which remains fossilised in Gen. 22.

So F. J. Vinnett, 'Re-examining the foundations', JBL 84 (1965), 1. Vinnett places Gen. 22 in E, as a supplement to J. However, van Seters remarks that 'the literary and thematic affinities are all with the Yahwist', AHT 238. The use of divine names can hardly be used as evidence for the division of the story into sources since it is obviously a unity in its present form. Yet the usual attribution of it to E on the basis of Elohim being used in vv. 1-10, is embarrassed by the fact that Yahweh is used in vv. 11-14. On this basis it is just as reasonable to attribute it to J instead, and it then becomes the counterpoint to ch. 16, which, my interpretation of the combined tradition as a single complex requires, in view of my remarks in ch. 2 on the handling of the Isaac
tradition, it is perhaps arguable that the story in its present form is late rather than early, and the etiology for the rejection of human sacrifice may then be regarded as the recognition of the achievement of this in exilic times.


118 For discussion and references see G. Wagner, Pauline baptism and the pagan mysteries, (AT 1967), 136-147. See also W. von Soden, 'Gibt es ein Zeugnis dafür, dass die Babylonier an die Wiederaufstehung Nardus gelaubt haben?', ZA 51 (1955), 130-166.


120 Harrison, op. cit., 486f.

121 Harrison, op. cit., 487.

122 Discussion of the traditions is to be found in W. R. Smith, The religion of the Semites, 107, 175; Pope, El in the Ugaritic texts, El; Assour, op. cit., 115f. We have a reference to the fall of the morning star in FT 1295. The whole text reads:

Anubis who presides over the God's booth has commanded that you go down as a star, as the Morning Star. May you traverse the mound of Horus of the Southerners, may you traverse the mound of Horus of the Northerners.

(Faulkner, op. cit., 205). Faulkner incorporates it with texts 1291-1297 as Utterance 536, which he describes as a Resurrection Text.

123 Wyatt, op. cit., 89.

124 ABL, 79; see also n. 29 (p. 90) if BASOR 87 (1942), 29; ICC, 126. See also H. Seyrig, 'Heraclès-Nergal', Syria 24 (1944-5), 62-80, for the identification of Heraclès, Belqast and Nergal. It seems Heraclès-Belqast was given the planet Mars (= Nergal) —
Seyrig, p.68. Against Albright, see G.L. Della Vida, 'Some notes on the stele of Ben-Hadad', BASOR 90 (1943), 30-32, and Albright's reply, ibid., 32-34. Dumand also supports Della Vida's view: 'A propos de la stele de Melqart du Musée d'Alep', BIF 6 (1942-3), 45, as does Conte du Meunil du Buisson, 'Origine et évolution du panthéon de Tyr', RHH 164 (1963), 157. They both reject the evidence of the Ugaritic material, where art is found meaning 'the nether world' in CTA 4 viii 1ff., arthary - 'his city' "Slushy" - the domain of Koth. See also Tromp, op. cit., 7, 54ff.

125 E. Lipinski, 'La fête de l'ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melqart', Actes de la XVIIe rencontre assyriologique internationale, (1970), 30-58. Lipinski prefers to see in both Melqart and Herakles deified eponymous heroes, pp.49-51. But I cannot accept this, and while in the case of Herakles certain legendary, quasi-historical memories may be preserved in the Greek tradition, these elements have been attached to an already debased mythology of a minor god.

126 Hierogamy, CTA 5 v 16ff., 10 and 11; death, 5 vi 5ff.; resurrection, 6 iii 20ff.

127 For the Ba'al of 1 K. 18 as Melqart (= Attar) see Lipinski, op.cit., 40, n. 2, 41; Rowley, 'Elijah on Mt. Carmel', BJRL 43 (1961), 193, 195, etc.; De Vaux, 'Les prophètes de Baal sur le mont Carmel', BIF 5 (1941), 8; according to Eissfeldt, it is Baal-Samael, 'Baal-Samael und Jahve', EAW 57 (1939), 20, n. 4; Der Gott Karmel, (1953), 23. So also Montgomery, Kings, (ICC 1951), 308. I take Ba'al Samael to be a late west Semitic form of El, in view of the identification of Yahweh with Zeus Olympios under the Semitic title Ba'al Yam in the Seleucid
period (2 K.6.2). The phrase בְּשָׁלוֹשׁ יָמָיָנִים is a lampoon on this title (Kostenlo, 'Der Greuel der Verwüstung', 2AE 4 (1884), 248).


129 Ibid., 55, 11.167-173. These episodes are lacking from the Akkadian version, ANET, 106-109. But that does not prove that the motif is non-Semitic. Kramar speaks of this text as the 'Predecessor and prototype of the Semitic myth...'. (Ibid., 52). But this is an assertion, not evidence.

130 G. Landes, 'The "three days and three nights" motif in Jonah 2.1', JBL 86 (1967), 446.

131 יַהֲנֹם here being simply 'dawn', and not a divine name. Or could the phrase mean, 'As the crescent moon, his coming is certain?'. (For יַהֲנֹם as 'new moon', cf. the Sabaean form: A. Janne, 'Le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique', Le Muséeon 60 (1947), 85).

132 See ch. 4, for discussion of theophany language.

133 EERB, 545, KB, 533.

134 I am not asserting that the 'physical' conception of the theophany was necessarily in Hosea's mind. He was probably drawing on traditional language. J. L. Hayes, Hosea, (1969), 94, says that 'it must be a song which was composed in the situation for use in a liturgy of lament and penitence in response to his prophecy'. As such it would be bound to use traditional hymn language. Hayes, op. cit., 74f., relates the passage 5.13-6.3. to the death and resurrection motif, current in the cultic life of Israel, which he attributes as we have seen to the Tammuz cult. We shall see below in ch. 8, that the cult Hosea attacks is rather that of 'Attar. In this case, the death and resurrection would rather be that of 'Attar.
S.V. McCasland, 'The Scripture basis of "on the third day"', JBL 48 (1929), 124-137, argues that there are discrepancies in the traditions concerning the time lapse between Jesus' death and resurrection. One such discrepancy he holds to be that between the phraseology of Jon. 2.1 and Hos. 6.2. But he does not justify this particular point. I offer an explanation of this below. And once the lunar context had been forgotten, which it probably was by Hosea's time (though see n. 131) and certainly was by the time Jonah was composed, the formula would be open to slight modifications which strictly changed the sense (i.e. 'after three days' cannot = 'on the third day'). But which still betray the formulary origin.

135 J. Wijngaards, 'Death and resurrection in covenantal context', (Hos. VI 2), VT 17 (1967), 228.


137 C. Barth, 'Theophanie, Bundschiessung und neuer Anfang am dritten Tage', Kythre 28 (1962), 539ff.

138 Noth, Exodus, 155ff.

139 W. Beyerlin, Origins and history of the oldest sinaitic tradition, (ZT 1965).

140 E. Noth, op. cit., 157; J. Beyerlin, op. cit., 111; F.1:1

Mügermännern, 'Biblical theophanies', PAA 15 (1911), 165.


142 Beyerlin, op. cit., 111; 'The later additions, Ex. xxix 20-24 and xxx 1lf also stem from the J tradition', 151.

143 Noth, op. cit., 160. Cf. D.M.G. Stalker, Exodus (Peake's Commentary), 226, where vv. 20-22 are allocated to J, 23-24a to Rje, and 24b-25 to J, etc.
Beyerlin suggests that the only other main block of intervening J material, 33.13-23, is 'later parts of the J source' - op. cit., 24. As for 33.1a, 3a, the only other material to require explanation, it is scarcely possible that its present position vis-à-vis chs. 19, 34, is original. It must originally have followed 34.28. If 24.1-2, 9-11 are to be attributed to J it does not affect this point, as it gives no time reference, but we shall in any case argue below that they cannot belong to J, but are rather E.

Cf. the two 'sults' (Laḫmu and Laḫamu) and the two 'horizons' (Ansar and Kišar) of Enuma Eliš 10,12. On this division of the day at Passover cf. H.H. Stroes, 'Does the day begin in the evening or the morning?' VT 16 (1966), 471.

It could theoretically appear just before dawn, but all the cultic preparations in the evening presuppose an evening theophany.


Both, op. cit., 155; also RSV, JB, NEB both have 'month'.

Ex.12.3-6; Lev.23.5; Num.9.1-5, 28.16. - all P. See also Jos.5.10; the date given for the first celebration in Palestine. One suspects, in view of the other passages discussed, that we have here an adaptation by the priestly writers of the earlier deuteronomistic tradition. Cf. also
Ex. 23:15, and 34:18 (J?).

155 E.g., Lev. 23:5; Num. 28:6 (P). Cf. Ex. 12:15-18. Here it is 'from the evening of the fourteenth day...'. Does this mean the fifteenth? Cf. also this passage (P), with Dt. 16:1,6.

156 So also von Rad, Deuteronomy, III.


159 s.3 implies an element of the atonement theology we discussed above.

160 JB ad loc., n.b.

161 Engnell, op.cit., 191.

162 Op.cit., 192. His conclusion, that this elaborate parallel 'proves' that the Passover can never have been a 'nomadic festival', is of course open to doubt. We have here a much later (post-settlement) elaboration of a tradition which, in its essentials was quite consonant with a nomadic or at any rate a pastoralist-origin.


164 Referred to at Ex. 24:12, 32:15, 16, 19, 34:1-5; Ex. 25:16, 22, 31:18, 34:29; P: Ex. 34:4, 28 - J; Dt. 4:13, 5:22, 9:9-17, 10:1-5 - D.

165 This does not of course mean that in every respect Moses is an 'archetypal king' figure. He is also the archetypal prophet (Dt. 18:15) and represented opposition to the monarchy - S. Nowinckel, He that cometh, (1956), 60; cf. Pedersen, Israel III-IV, 662f.

166 Cf. the splendid sarcasm of Pedersen: 'A search might with equal justice be instituted for the mountains that melted like wax when Yahweh passed over the hills of the earth'. Loc.cit.
On the problem of the location of Sinai see D. Nielsen, 'The site of the biblical Mt. Sinai', JEPS 7 (1927), 187-208 (Petra); J. Koenig, 'La localisation du Sinai et les traditions des scribes', RHPR 43 (1963), 2-31; RHPR 44 (1964), 200-235; Ibid., Le site de Al-Jaw dans l'ancien pays de Madian, 1971, (N. W. Arabia); and G. I. Davies, 'Hagar, El Hera and the location of Sinai', VT 22 (1972), 152-163, (rejection of an Arabian location); and numerous discussions listed in these studies. The traditional location of Jebel Musa in the Sinai peninsula seems rather out of favour. Lewy's identification would be very acceptable if i) the mount in question ('the massif of the full moon') were not so far from Teima, where Nabonidus revived the cult of Sin; and ii) if we could simply equate Teima ('El Hajar: job. 6.19; Is. 21.14; Jer. 25.23, etc.) with Teman ('Yaf: Jer. 49.7, 20; Ezek. 25.13; Am. 1.12; Gen. 36.34; Ob. 9; Hab. 3.3 // Paran).

BDB derives the latter from 'אֲרֵמָה, and in the examples cited it seems to be fairly specific as a location, but altogether too far north. Lewy himself identifies them, op. cit., 443, esp. n. 179. Koenig, Le site de Al-Jaw, speaks of two sites called Bedr (p. 42, n. 2). He does not cite Lewy, but it appears that while Lewy's choice is the southern one, his is the northern one, some 150 miles to the north west, though in the same lava massif. See map (fig. 3) p. 24, though he does not show the southern site. The area of Qadeh Barnea in the Negeb is also a serious contender. In the passages just cited Teman is found as parallel to Paran (Hab. 3.3 — perhaps an old psalm quoted) or to Edom (the other passages) all ca. 600 B.C. or later; and perhaps reflecting Edomite expansion into the Negeb with the destruction of the Judahite state in 597-582.
Paran is linked with Seir and Sinai in Dt. 33:2 (and according to some interpretations of the text, so in Jnach, see JE). Paran is the location in Num. 13:17a, 21, 25f. (P), glossed as Jedad in v. 26, according to Jotb, Kuibers, 106.

Two of the place names from the general area concerned may be relevant to the significance of the mountain as sacred to the moon-god. Seir is mentioned in two of the passages discussed above, Dt. 33:2, Jg. 5:4. In Gen. 32:4 (J) the land of Seir is glossed as the מֵתָנְיָה (cf. Jg. 5:4) which probably means the steppe-land of Edom. Clueck sees the gloss as a post-exilic identification of the area, ("The theophany of the god of Sinai!", JACS 56 (1936), 466ff.).

C.R. Gray long ago suggested that the name Seir should probably be interpreted as 'goat!', Studies in Hebrew proper names, (1896), 94. So long as the scapegoat rite was regarded as late, there seemed no good reason to maintain this view; but if my argument above regarding the antiquity of the rite, and above all its connection with the cult of the moon-god, is cogent, then this explanation of the place-name gains considerably in force.

Several times in the Priestly material dealing with the Exodus and wilderness wandering traditions, we have reference to a 'wilderness of Sin' בֵּית סִינָה (Ex. 16:1, 17:1, Num. 33:16f. - all P) or to a 'wilderness of Sinai' בֵּית סִינָי (Num. 13:21, 20:1, 27:14, 34:3, 41; Dt. 32:51; Jec. 15:1, 3 - all P). Viroilleaud suggests that the former is to be linked to Sinai, and to the cult of the god Sin! 'Les chasses de Baal', Syria 16, (1935), 253, and so does Burney, The book of Judges, (1918), 251. We may also mention in this context the term בֵּית סִינָה in Ex. 19:1, 2 (P), see also Num. 1:1, 10, 12 (P). It is hard to believe that this
is not the case as the of the preceding verse in P.
17.1,pace König, Le site de Al–Jaw, 28, n.2, in spite of
the problem of relating the contexts to one another.

As for the relationship of to , key notes ("Traces"
of the worship of the moon-god Sin among the early Israelites,
JBL 84 (1965),25) that Ex.15.22ff. (JE) (three days journey
to Marah, the bitter waters sweetened by Moses, and the
couplet of 25b 'There it was he charged them with Statute and
with ordinance, /There that he put them to the test' –JE),
Ex.17.7 (JE) (Manna and Meribah so named 'because of the
grumbling of the sons of Israel and because they put
Yahweh to the test' – מְנָה לְ – JE) and Num.20. 1-13, (1a, 2-4,
6, 7, 8b, 10, 12, 13 – P – locate the episode at Meribah,
v.13; 1b, 5, 8a, 9, 11 – E – locate it at Qadesh, v.1b) all
probably refer to the same episode. Now the final redaction
of the Pentateuch places P's location 'the wilderness of Sin';
Ex.17.1a, at the head of the JE narrative in Ex.17.1b-7, while
the priestly location of Num.20.1a ff. is 'the wilderness of
Sin'. So the two appear to be equivalents, even if the final
redaction, by widely separating the place references and by
expanding the one episode of the people's thirst into three
separate ones, is apparently unaware of this. This is itself
interesting, because the redactors have identified Sin (Num.20
1a: P) with Qadesh (v.1b: E), and we therefore find that this
sanctuary, seemingly linked firmly to the Exodus-conquest
tradition, and therefore knowing nothing of Sinai, is
nevertheless linked to the divine name Sin, if we are correct
in equating Sin and Sin. Grollenberg, Atlas of the Bible,
(ET 1965), 163,165 distinguishes between the two.
It is interesting to note, in view of my conclusions in ch. 8, n. 148 that the formula is associated primarily with El rather than Yahweh.

See n. 19.

See n. 154 above for references.

From the earliest stratum of Deuteronomy (12-26), and probably dating from the eighth century.
CHAPTER FOUR

Biblical theophanies

In chapter 3 I interpreted the theophany described in Ex. 19 (the J material) as being lunar in character, and also suggested that the appearance alluded to in Hos. 6.2 is to be similarly understood, at least as regards the underlying tradition which controls the choice of language. My conclusions there will be corroborated if we find other biblical passages which are open to a similar interpretation. I propose therefore to examine some passages which appear to have elements in them drawn from the same cultic milieu.

1). Ex. 24. 10.

The whole passage, vv. 1-15, is closely related to that in ch. 19, being separated from it by the decalogue (20.1-21) and the Book of the Covenant (20.22 - 23.33). There is the same uncertainty regarding the allocation of the material to the sources: Beyerlein attributes all of vv. 1-15a to L, albeit representing different stages in the development of L. 1 Stalker differs in taking vv. 1-2, 9-11 as J, 2 and Lissfeldt goes further in distinguishing their archaic character from the main J source, and classifying them in his source L. 3

It is this group of verses, 1-2, 9-11, which concerns us here. I do not see how they can be taken as southern, in spite of Nicholson's arguments for the secondary inclusion of Moses, 4 because there are three important pointers to the contrary. These are firstly the fact that Sinai is not referred to by name. Indeed, the verses in isolation do not even require that a mountain theophany be understood at all. Even if the verb הִנָּה (vv. 1, 9) be taken to
imply it, it would fit equally well into the surrounding context of a, which in v.13 refers to the mountain of God (cf. Ex.19, 2, and Ex.3, 2, where 'Horeb' in 3.1 is probably to be understood as a deuteronomistic gloss. Vs. 1-2, 9-11 are undoubtedly distinct from the immediate context, which without them gives a more coherent narrative - 20.18-23.33, 24.3-8, 12-13 (14,15 additional?) - and there is clearly a nonsense in the command to Moses in v.12 to go up the mountain if he is already understood to be up it in vs.9-11.

The second important feature is the reference in v.9 to 'the god of Israel'. We have seen that Israel is best understood to have been a name of Isaac - the old northern patriarch - later appropriated by Jacob. This is supported by the political usage of 'Israel' to designate the northern kingdom. In fact the expression can scarcely be understood in a 'patriarchal' sense - as for example 'the god of Abraham' or 'the god of Isaac' can - because the expression would in any case be unique to this passage, and a reference back to the patriarch would not be very natural in the context.

The third feature is the reference to the in v.11. This in fact suggests that we should read הָאָרֵי for הָאָרֵי in vv.1f., or alternatively that vv.1f., and 9-11 were originally independent of one another. We shall see below, in chs. 5 and 8, that behind the use of הָאָרֵי we should understand a deity other than Yahweh, and that this other deity was the god of the Exodus.

The fact that the present verses are later additions in the context is not in itself proof of their J-provenance, a solution which the observations above make impossible. However, the description of the theophany in v.10 does have close parallels in terms of its significance with the other theophanies we shall
discuss below. (in each case a southern origin being the most likely), which are more closely associated with Sinai, and therefore it is worth examining it here. The similarity is to be explained, as will later become clear, on the grounds that the two deities of the Exodus and Sinai traditions respectively are of the same functional type—that is, moon-gods.

If we examine v.10, we find a curious description of the theophany. And modern versions concur in being surprisingly coy about its very concrete flavour. The RSV, for example, reads:

\[\text{And they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a pavement of sapphire stone, like the very heavens for clearness.}\]

JB and NEB read very similarly, except that NEB concludes:

\[\text{clear blue as the very heavens.}\]

Even if this be regarded as highly metaphorical language, it is striking that it should have such a strongly visual nature. But I think that the translation of the first particle (in נַבֲעָה) as the rather apologetic 'as it were' is quite unnecessary. If this in an archaic tradition, we may expect archaic elements to survive. However, even if the view I shall now put forward be considered untenable, the versions referred to above are already strongly suggestive of a celestial, if not specifically lunar, appearance. Now the rendering of מַעַשֶּׁת יָסִיר כְּסֵת by 'as it were a sapphire pavement' sounds thoroughly unconvincing to me. It involves a rendering of two consecutive constructs and a genitive, which is itself suspicious, though perhaps not impossible, and all the more so since מַעַשֶּׁת does not appear to be a fixed expression in its present sense. Admittedly, LXX already took it in this way, but how inelegant is its own expression ἔσσειργόν πλάτος σάφειρον!
The appearance of six words forming a semantic unit, with the first and fourth both prefixed with, suggests a poetic couplet. If we treat the verse as though it contained a parallelismus, we get quite an interesting result.

If we take this as a bi-colon, of the form abcdabcd, then we may use the corresponding terms in each colon to aid in the interpretation of their opposite number, a perfectly normal procedure in the exegesis of Semitic poetry. (This is of course only one of several possibilities).

So in this example, parallels, and makes it perhaps unlikely that the latter should be taken to mean 'bone' or any such extension such as 'soul', 'substance'. There is another area of meaning for the verb 'be mighty, numerous'. On the basis of the parallel 'dead' or 'work', we may take it to mean 'might' or 'mighty act' or 'power', pointing it.

There is another area of meaning for the verb 'be mighty, numerous'. On the basis of the parallel 'dead' or 'work', we may take it to mean 'might' or 'mighty act' or 'power', pointing it.

The third pair of words, and, should also perhaps be taken as paralleling one another. The preformative and present a problem here. However, it seems to me that there are two possible solutions. We could take the words to be verbal forms. The suggests an infinitive construct, while looks like a hiphil form of. A hiphil of this verb does not appear in
Hebrew, though a corresponding shaphel does in Ugaritic. But no satisfactory sense seems to emerge for this, and in any case with a finite form in the first colon, we would require an infinitive absolute in the second, unless the could be explained as an asseverative lu-. We can alternatively take both words to be nouns, מַלָי meaning 'sapphire' or 'lapis lazuli', and מְנָקָה meaning 'clearness', 'lustre', 'purity', according to NDB, or more likely '(pure) gem'. However, the still presents a problem. A possible solution seems to be to regard it as an emendation to the text (from י) resulting from the loss of the original sense of the passage. If we therefore restore י, we may then translate the verse as follows:

```
And they saw the god of Israel, and beneath his feet
```

as the work of Moon was the lapis,

yes, as the mighty act of the Heavens were the gems:

The quoted fragment of poetry then refers to the locus of the moon-god's appearance: the heavens, no doubt studded with stars, or perhaps the mountain, if the location of the theophany, naturally identified as the cosmic mountain, and assimilated to the divine palace, appropriately studded with gems. And the very language with its mythological overtones alludes consciously or otherwise to the great theophany at the new year, which we have argued was the occasion in Ex.19. I offer this interpretation with some hesitation about its details; as an alternative I suggest the following translation, in which the two י particles are taken as emphatic, the expression מַלָי מְנָקָה taken as a construct and genitive with adjectival force. Since sapphires are found both blue and yellow, it may have here a reference to the colouring
of the moon:

"Oh, what a composition was the brilliant moon;
and how like the heavens for brightness!

If it be argued that this interprets the moon as a created object, and therefore not to be equated with the moon-god, we may counter that a) this is a logical alien to the ancient mind, and b) it is an under-estimation of the ancient mind, which was surely capable of distinguishing between the god in his essence, and the various forms of his self-manifestation. The moon was at once the means by which the deity showed himself (and was therefore an object in relation to him as subject) and was also, as such, divinised.16

There is no need to deal separately here with the E narrative of Ex.19. We noted in ch.3 that it was based on a different time sequence from the J version, and it was added secondarily. There is little in it of importance for our discussion except vv.13b, 19 which, the latter clearly independent of vv. 18, 20; nevertheless allude to the same new year cultic milieu, as evidenced by the reference to the blowing of the trumpet ( DECLARE). Its relation to 24.1-15 is obscure, since 24.2 contradicts 13b.

b) Dt.33. 2-3.

It is widely agreed that we have in Dt.33.2-5, 26-29 an ancient poem, into which has been inserted the blessing of Moses upon the tribes, in vv.6-25. It is also clear that it originally had nothing to do with Deuteronomy, since it names the mountain as Sinai. Deuteronomy refers instead to Horeb,1.6, 9,8.18

We have here a psalm describing a great theophany of Yahweh, reflecting the tradition of the southern tribes. V.4 seems to be a gloss, in which case the allusion to Moses is not original. V.5 too may be a later addition.19 The text does not make the easiest
sense, and there appear to be some corruptions. A considerable range of interpretations of the details have been offered. We shall look briefly at vv. 2f.:

These verses may be translated as follows:

(v. 2) Yahweh came from Sinai,
and rose from Seir...

He sent out his beams from Mount Paran
and came amidst the multitude of the Holy Ones,
with his warriors at his right hand.

This I regard as a 'safe' translation of v. 2, and for the purposes of this chapter, we need go no further. However, a couple of interesting possibilities do arise, which may be considered at least in keeping with the lunar element which I hope to show is here present, and also with the elements of lunar mythology we have already examined. So for the final bi-colon I offer two alternative renderings:

a) And the Lady Qodsu came with him?
and at his right hand (came) the Lion.

b) And the Lady Qodsu came with him?
and at his right hand (came) Asherah.
In the first case, we may ask whether הַלְּיָהוֹת hides a feminine form הַלְּיָהוֹת with a י lost through haplography, and suggest that the idea is a corruption during transmission of the text of חֶסֶד, which we meet as Ug. rḥt, 'the Lady', a title of אֶשֶרָה, consort of El. 30 Godsu is another title of אֶשֶרָה, the Canaanite gods are designated bn qdy 'sons of Godsu'. 31 (cf. bn ilm). I have bracketed 'with him'. If the text is corrupt, the prefixed to חֶסֶד may remain from a former (יִי) form. Beeston points out that Ar. 'līm means 'lion', although he notes that this may be a later development, since its Sabean counterpart does not appear to have this sense. 32 Miller however accepts the term as 'another animal name for a leader (in war)...' 33 and perhaps here, in archaic Hebrew, we have an instance of this use. The lion is a common iconographic form of אֲטָרָא, 34 and the lioness appears to figure more frequently than the male of the species, so the ל, taken as a feminine singular ending, causes no problems. 35 Furthermore, who should more appropriately come on the right hand of Yahveh than his (first-born) son? 36 According to this suggested translation, then, we have an explicit reference to the great triad of Moon, Sun and Venus, which seems to have underlain the earliest Semitic religions.

The second version would be slightly less imaginative, accepting the suggestion of Nyberg, 37 that for the difficult חֹזַר we read חֹזַר (or חָצוֹר) In this case, 'Aserah' would parallel 'the Lady Godsu'.

The following verse, 3, seems to support the mythological treatment of v. 2. We may translate this as follows:

(v. 3) Yea, the guardians of the nations, all your Holy Ones are at your hand; and they prostrate themselves at your feet, and rise up at your command.
Yahweh appears in a great theophany, accompanied by the other gods who acknowledge his lordship, in some illud tempus lying behind the cult of the tribes of the Arabah and Sinai Peninsula area, for whom Sinai is the holy mountain, and where Seir, Paran, and perhaps Qadesh, are the chief focal points of the environment.

It is the use of the verbs in v. 2 which is of particular interest here. The parallel verbs נָשָׁת (ם, see n. 37), are probably not of great significance in themselves; perhaps any divine appearance may be described in these terms, and especially if the appearance is associated with a festival procession, the epiphany of a god. But the other two verbs are by no means so neutral, and indeed, by juxtaposition with them, the verbs we have just mentioned may be argued to have a more specific reference. Within the chiasm of v. 2 we find the terms יָהְדָּאוּ and יָהְדָּא.

יָהְדָּא means ‘to rise’, ‘come forth’, of a celestial body. Most frequently in the Old Testament it refers to the sunrise, as for example, at Jg. 9.13, 2 S. 23.4, 2 K. 1.22, Ecol. 1.5, etc. In other cases we may suppose a metaphorical usage; but since night is involved, it would appear that behind the metaphor lies the rising of the moon. Such passages are the following:

Ps. 112.4: יָהְדָּא בְּמֶשֶׁךְ אֵל קֶלֶל יִרְאוּ
He shines rises up in the darkness,
a light to just men;

Is. 58.10cda: יָהְדָּא בְּמֶשֶׁךְ אֵלֶּה אֵל יֵשְׁכָּנָה אֵל אֵל בַּמֶּשֶׁךְ אֵל קֶלֶל יִרְאוּ
Your light rises up in the darkness,
and your setting is as the noonday (i.e. for brightness);

...and your setting is as the noonday (i.e. for brightness);
Is. 60.1f.: "Arise, shine, for your light has come, and Yahweh's glory has risen over you. For behold, darkness covers the earth, and gloom the nations, but Yahweh will rise up over you, and his glory will appear above you.

These are really quite striking passages in view of our argument. The said passage could be dismissed as just metaphorical, but in the case of the two passages from Trito-Isaiah, the metaphor is too sustained to be a mere figure of speech in origin and I suggest that the overt lunar imagery requires the supposition of some such milieu as we are discussing. Now while in the late-sixth century such language should almost certainly not be taken literally, it seems to me that a passage of such antiquity as Dt. 33:21. certainly does require a literal meaning. It refers quite clearly to a theophany, and the whole context, historical and poetic, seems to make the best sense in this way. If we reject a literal view, we are still left with the question of where such a stereotyped metaphorical image arose.

"Arise," found only as hiphil יָרֵא, has the sense of: 'shine out or forth, send out beams, cause to shine'. There is also an Ugaritic form יָרֵא meaning 'to arise', which Moriarty has linked with the form in Dt. 33:2. So it appears to have roughly the same..."
semantic range as דלתא, and appears in similar contexts. In Job 3.4, the term refers to the light of dawn, and at 37.15 to lightning. In Job 10.22, it refers to light shining in the dark, and in three psalms to a theophany context:

Ps. 50.2:

משה אכלל ליום

From Zion, the perfection of beauty,

God shines forth.

Ps. 80.2:

עון אכדיביק ומקים

לגרי אפרים וברים

(You who are) enthroned on the Cherubim, shine forth before Ephraim and Benjamin...

Ps. 94.1:

א-remove יד walks

An avenging god is Yahweh:

O avenging God, arise.

Again, we may accept a metaphorical interpretation of these passages, while recognising that the origin of the metaphor is to be found in a celestial phenomenon.

In conjunction with both of these words, we may also note the personal names נני and הני, which I take to be hypocoristic forms of theophoric names, containing these two verbs, and referring no doubt to the linking of a divine epiphany to the birth of the child so named. The former occurs at all stages in Israel’s history, from Gen. 38.30, 46.12 (both J; also 1 Ch. 2.4, 6); to Neh. 11. 24; it is also an Edomite name at Gen. 36.13, 17, 33 (all E; cf. also 1 Ch. 1.37, 44). We may take it to be an abbreviation of בנה ראה or both. The latter occurs as a Canaanite (Lachishite)
name in the twelfth century (Jos. 10:3), and also as the name of a son of David in the tenth (2 Sam. 5:15 = 1 Chr. 3:7, 14, 16). It is also a place name (Jos. 19:12). Again we may surmise forms מָעָןָר and/or (ך) הַמָּעָןָר, and the former form, as מָעָןָר, appears in Sabaean.47

As usual with the Psalms, a wide variety of dates have been offered for Ps. 68, ranging from the eleventh century down to Maccabean times.48 Among the majority of scholars there is now general agreement that it is in fact one of the oldest. In his treatment of the psalm as a catalogue of psalms, listing their opening phrases, Albright attributed parts of it to between the thirteenth and the tenth centuries, and the final product to the tenth.49 It is customarily held to be later than the Song of Deborah, in Jgs. 5, on the grounds that the verses we shall consider, particularly 8 and 9, are dependent on Jgs. 5:4, 5.50 But the dependence is in no way certain, either in one direction or the other. Rather we accept Weiser’s observation that such similarities as there are with Jgs. 5 and other passages (like Dt. 33.2, Num. 10, etc.) are due to all such passages arising out of a common cultic tradition, so that arguments about which is indebted to the other miss the point.51 On the dating, see further below.

The verses relevant to our purposes are 5-9, 18 (LXX: 4-8, 17).
Sing, 0 gods, hymn his name.

Extol the Rider over the Desert Plain, in Yah. rejoice, and be jubilant before him:

the father of the fatherless, the defender of widows,

is God in his holy dwelling-place.

God gives the desolate a home in which to dwell, and brings forth the prisoner to music.

But those who rebel must dwell in the scorching waste.

0 God, when you set out before your people, when you march across the wilderness, the earth quakes, yea, the heavens shake, before God, the one of Sinai, before God, the god of Israel.

The chariots of God are (twice) ten thousand, and his bowmen are thousands.

The Lord comes from Sinai into his sanctuary.

These verses are clearly to be understood as having the same general background as Dt. 33.2. Nowinckel linked that passage with the new year festival, which we have argued above took place originally in the spring, and the same context seems appropriate here too. Unless my suggestion for 5b be accepted (n. 55), there is nothing obviously to connect this passage with a lunar theophany; but if we can establish any one of these similar passages (all
dealing, it would appear, with the same festival occasion), as having a certain lunar character, then it is reasonable to consider the others as having the same. We should in fact probably see a lunar allusion in the divine title "יִתְבָּר רְאֵי", occurring both here and in Jg. 5.5. The important thing for the present is to establish that the desert allusions here, as in the other passages discussed in this chapter, derive not simply from an Israelite memory of its desert past, but from a religious and cultic framework entirely conditioned by such an environment. This is why we can confidently dismiss the fashionable link of the phrase "תַּנְבָּר רְאֵי" with Ba'al's title in the AB cycle. There is not a hint in the context to justify such a link, and it misrepresent the historical situation, in which the pastoralists of the southern desert could hardly be believed to be familiar with or well-disposed towards the cultic language of city dwellers and agriculturalists.

There is a problem regarding the provenance of the Psalm as a whole: Kraus takes it as containing the cultic tradition of the ancient sanctuary of Tabor, 66 which he suggests may have played an amphictyonic role, 67 though there is little enough evidence to go on. Certainly, as with Jg. 5 below, the mention of northern tribes hints at connections with the north, while the inclusion of Judah may indicate that it had an amphictyonic role (though see n.67). The important thing for our purposes is that the verses we have considered refer to a southern and not a northern tradition, and even if the psalm as a whole reflects the early fusing of cultic practice at a (hypothetical) amphictyonic shrine, the constituent traditions nevertheless remain distinct.

d) Jg. 5.4, 5, 20.

Jg. 5 is an early song 68 from the period of the Judges, many
of whose allusions relate to the new conditions of settlement in Canaan, including the beginning of the political fusions of tribes of diverse origins. The verses which concern us are the only ones in the song which reflect any particular elements of theology, and it is therefore significant that their character should be so similar to the material we have already examined.

Yahweh, when you set out from Seir,
when you march from the steppeland of Idom,
the earth quakes, even the heavens shake,
(even the clouds pour down water),
The mountains are as nothing before Yahweh,
the One of Sinai,
before Yahweh the God of Israel.
From the heavens fought the stars;
from their courses they battled with Sisera.

The first two verses here very closely resemble Ps. 68.8,9, though as we have seen this does not prove literary dependence either way. Both may derive from a common source, and we have already seen that Keiser supposes a common cultic background. Gray too considers the Sitz im Leben of the song in Jg. 5 to be the Covenant renewal, and since we have already argued that this must have been linked with the new year, then the theophany in Jg. 5.4,5 is to be seen as the same occasion as that of 2.19, etc.
This passage and Ps. 68 both lack the particularised language of Dt. 33.2 with regard to the journeying of Yahweh, but apart from the processional background which we may expect to be present in view of the cultic {Cultus im Leben}, it fits in very well with the idea of a celestial body. We have similar language in a bi-lingual hymn to Mammur-Sinn:

whose light goes from the base of heaven to the zenith, who opens the door of heaven and gives light to all people. 78

I have also drawn attention to v. 20, because the notion of the martial activity of the stars is not simply a rather original poetic device, stressing the inevitability of Sinser's doom, since all Yahweh's creation is rallied against him. Rather are we to understand this as a reference to the pantheon of gods, the {Ba'al}, which is a further echo of the ancient desert cult of Israel's past. 79

An important point in the texts so far discussed apart from Ex. 24.10 is the probability of their southern provenance. In the case of Jg. 5 the situation is rather more complex, as in Ps. 68, with the exception of Reuben (settled in Transjordan) all the tribes mentioned are northern. It is beyond the scope of our enquiry to examine the political situation that lies behind the tradition, except that we may note that the prose narrative in Jg. 4 refers only to Zebulun and Naphtali as involved (vv. 6, 10), as we would expect since it was the king of Hazor (sacked by Joshua?) who was discomfiting the Israelites. The battle tradition is clearly set in the north (cf. 5.19). But significantly, the heroine of the episode is a Kenite woman, Jael the wife of Heber, and 4.11 refers to the separation of Heber from his people and his settling in the north. The distinctive southern element in Jg. 5.4, 5 may derive from this involvement of a southern pastoralist in a northern war.
On the other hand, if the entire song of Jg. 5 has a cultic background, then this passage is of the first importance as being, along with Ps. 68, the earliest evidence of the mingling of traditions which was to find its culmination in the early monarchy, when the pentateuchal sources E and J, while remaining distinct, borrowed a considerable body of tradition from the other milieu, and began to forge a common Israelite patrimony out of diverse historical traditions. But however we assess the historical significance of the passage, I feel that we cannot understand Jg. 5:4,5 as having any other than a southern provenance, since in matters of credal summary, north and south were to remain distinct for centuries, and passages like those we have examined enshrine the southern counterpart to such northern creeds as Dt. 6.20 and related passages. Hayes' analysis of Jg. 5 into an early non-cultic song (vv.12-30) which itself cannot long antedate the unification achieved under the monarchy, and a later expansion (which if not immediate must date from within the monarchy) into a cultic framework, provides a convincing solution to the problem, in that the northern tradition, referring to the first concerted military action of the Israelite tribes (but excluding Gad, Manasseh, Judah, Simeon and Levi) is later treated as a national tradition, and fitted into a cultic framework which echoes the presuppositions of the monarchy (see n. 68).

It is the fact that it in a southern cultic tradition, that shows that in its present form it cannot really antedate the time of David, when the traditions of Judah would naturally come to dominate such expressions of national activity.

e) Other passages.

With the passages analysed above, I think we have sufficiently
indicated the kind of evidence which leads us to regard them as having as their background the same new year theophany of the moon-god, which I believe we established for Ex. 19. The same site in Lebanon seems to be required for Ex. 24. 10 as well in spite of its historical independence.

There are many other passages which we could analyse, and in each of them there are elements which I think we can argue stem from the same descriptive complex, even though in many instances, if not all, they have become opaque in their reference, and serve more as metaphors, or, as in the case of prophetic and eschatological usage, have become the stereotyped framework of a new coming, although of course it has its roots in the old.

Apart from passages already mentioned, we cite the following:

Pss. 18.8-16, 29 (ERV 15, 28) = 2 K. 22.6-16, 29; 42.9 (ERV 8);
43.3; 50.1-3; 65.9-11 (ERV 8-10); Mic. 1.3f; Hab. 3.3-15; Zech. 9.14.

There are further passages which deal with one particular aspect of this theophany, that is, the shaking of the earth. We have seen this in Jg. 5.4f., Pss. 66.9 (ERV 8), Is. 1, and in particular, Ex. 19, in the discussion of which we observed that the language is concerned primarily to convey the sense of the awful presence of Yahweh, rather than to give an account of local seismic activity.

Other examples of the use of this motif are Pss. 29.7, 8; 46.3f.
(ERV 2f.); 1 K. 19.11-13; Is. 2.10; 19.21; 13.13; 24.18; Hab. 1.5;
Ezg. 2.6, 21; and Joel 2.16. Because the elements in these passages are bound up closely with the function of the sacred mountain, it seems that we should distinguish them as a distinctly southern motif in the general descriptive arsenal of theophany accounts, contrasting them with the other major element in such accounts, the struggle of Yahweh with the sea, a cosmogonic
tradition which naturally lent itself to the accounts of the exodus, the crossing of the Red Sea, and so forth, and became the standard archetype to which the 'historical' event was assimilated. This was originally tied up with the experiences of those tribes who had come from Egypt, the 'Joseph' tribes, who settled in the north, and remained in many respects distinct from their southern neighbours.

The poetic allusions to this northern tradition are many, and are equally distinctive in the way they consistently ignore any allusion to the final theophany or covenant tradition. Examples in the Book of Psalms are: 77.17-20 (ERV 16-19); 78.12-20; 82.5; 93; 105; 106; 114; 135; and 136. Two of these are notable in that they represent to some extent the fusion of traditions, and yet still maintain silence regarding the mountain. These are 78, in which v.68 refers to Jerusalem as the seat of Yahweh, and 105, which mentions Abraham. Ex.24:10 may be argued not to involve a mountain on the basis of these arguments. Clearly certainty cannot be achieved in the analysis of this passage, which continues to be anomalous and obscure in many respects.

f) Theophanies in the 'patriarchal age'.

Since we are arguing that it was the religion of the so-called patriarchal age (by which we mean the antecedents of the historical Israel) that was lunar in character, we might expect to find evidence of lunar theophanies in the patriarchal narratives of Genesis. In fact, the occasions on which theophanies occur are treated with surprising restraint, and offer little evidence that by itself would give strong support for the view we are advocating. The verb usually employed in these contexts is the fairly neutral אֶל (עֶל Hiphil). It would be wrong to press the visual element contained here, and in any case, that would in no way help in the
characterisation of the appearance.

But there is one significant feature about the appearances, which being contained within the ancestral tribal sagas and concerning what the tradition clearly regarded as primary revelations to the forefathers of the tribes, contain no direct cultic points of reference beyond the link with later sanctuaries; this is the fact that in most cases they are understood as taking place at night. Here is a list, according to the normal source-division:

1) Gen.12.1: The first appearance of Yahweh to Abram. No time details. Location in the final compilation of Gen. is Haran (a cult-centre of Sin). But in J, with 12.1 following on directly from 11.28-30, it should perhaps be understood to be Ur (the other primary sanctuary of Sin).

Gen.12.7: Theophany at Shechem. No time details. (Perhaps originally Isaac was involved?)

Gen.15.3-18: Theophany at Hebron. No time details for the first part (vv.3-11). The second part, the covenant-making (vv.12-18) takes place after night-fall (11-16 originally to Isaac in E?)

Gen.18.1: Theophany at Hebron (oak of Mamre). This is explicitly stated to be during the day (זִיוֹת), but it to be distinguished from other appearances in that three men appear - the only reference to an anthropomorphic appearance, and even then the threefold appearance presents difficulties.

Gen.26.1: Theophany to Isaac at Gerar. No time details.

Gen. 28.13: Theophany to Jacob at Bethel. No time detail explicit, but cf. 28.11f. (E) below.

Gen. 32.26-33: Theophany at Peniel. Takes place at night.

This is the mysterious struggle between Jacob and an anonymous contender.  

ii) Ex. Gen. 15.1-2, 5: Theophany at unnamed location. That it takes place at night is clear from the reference to the stars in v. 5.

(Gen. 20.3: God appears to Abimelech in a dream; therefore at night).

Gen. 28.11f: Jacob's dream at Bethel at night.

Gen. 31.11-13: Jacob's dream in the East at night.

iii) Ex. Gen. 17.1-22: El Shaddai appears to Abraham. No location in space or time, but cf. 15.3-18 (E) above.

Gen. 35.9-13: El Shaddai appears to Jacob at Bethel. No time details, but cf. 28.11f. (E) above.

Even some of the appearances not specifically described as nocturnal may be seen to have been derived from a primary source in which it was. So it appears that the various divine forms treated by the sources, Yahweh, El Shaddai, El Bethel, are all of such a nature that their visitations are characteristically described as taking places at night. And this we found to be the case in Ex. 19.

Of course these once-for-all occasions are to be seen as generically distinct from the theophany tradition we have examined in such passages as Ex. 19, 24.9-11, Dt. 33.2, and so on. They do not have any immediate cultic reference, except indirectly in that they probably served as cult-legends associating a patriarch with a later sanctuary such as Bethel or Shechem. But of course they are inevitably conditioned to some extent by the cultic framework.
against which they are contrasted. We have argued that an essential feature in the events of Ex.19 (J) is in fact that the events take place by night. If that is simply the fullest account of a situation which lies behind the other passages we have examined, then it is reasonable to suppose that they too describe a nocturnal theophany even when this is not explicit. In fact it frequently is, as in Dt.33.2, Ps.112, Is.58.10 and 60.1f.

5) Theophanies in the wilderness-wandering tradition.

There are further passages too which show that the interpretation we are offering has a wider support from within the Old Testament. In these there is no direct evidence of the lunar character of the appearance of Yahweh, but it is significant that it seems again to be nocturnal, or at least only visible by night in normal circumstances. And the important group we shall consider now, in referring to the period of wilderness wandering, have behind them the same pre-settlement milieu in which we would expect archaic patterns of belief and expression to survive, though of course, like the patriarchal narratives, the wilderness narratives in fact date from after the settlement, and while purporting to report earlier ideas, tend unconsciously to portray contemporary ones.

The passages refer to the visible signs of the presence of Yahweh with the Israelites, the pillars of cloud and fire, and derivations of the theme. Here is a list of all occurrences, according to the normal source division:

1) J: Ex.13.21f. Yahweh went before them, by day in ... a pillar of cloud to show them the way, and by night in ... a pillar of fire to give them light, thus they could continue their march by day and by night. The pillar of cloud never
failed to go before the people during the day; nor the pillar of fire during the night.

Ex. 14.19b, 20b, 24a The pillar of cloud changed station from the front to the rear of them, and remained there.

Ex. 14.19c ... the cloud was dark, and the night passed without the armies drawing any closer the whole night long... In the morning watch, Yahweh looked down on the army of the Egyptians from the pillar of fire and cloud. 92

(Ex. 19. J material. See above. Yahweh comes down in a cloud). 19

(Ex. 33.34. J material. See below. Ex. 34.5 reads: And Yahweh descended in a cloud). 20


Dt. 31.15: Yahweh showed himself at the tent in a pillar of cloud; the pillar of cloud stood at the door of the tent. 93

11) Ex. (Ex. 3, which is fused with J material, is dealt with below).

Ex. 19.16a b: There were peals of thunder on the mountain, and lightning flashes, dense cloud and a loud trumpet blast...

Ex. 33.9: The pillar of cloud would come down and station itself at the entrance to the tent, and Yahweh would speak with Moses. 94

Num. 10.35: In the daytime, the cloud of Yahweh was over them whenever they left camp.

Num. 11.25: Yahweh came down in the cloud; He spoke with him (Moses), but took some of the spirit that was on him and put it on the 70 elders. 95
Num. 12.5: Yahweh came down in a pillar of cloud and stood at the entrance of the tent. He called Aaron and Miriam and they both came forward.

Num. 16.35: A fire came down from Yahweh and consumed the 250 men carrying incense.

iii) Ps (Ex. 6.2ff): Yahweh appeared to Moses – no details given.

(See below)

Ex. 16.10: They turned towards the wilderness, and there was the glory of Yahweh appearing in the cloud.

Ex. 24.15b: The cloud covered the mountain; and the glory of Yahweh settled on the mountain of Sinai; for six days the cloud covered it, and on the seventh day Yahweh called to Moses from inside the cloud. To the eyes of the Israelites the glory of Yahweh seemed like a devouring fire on the mountain top. Moses went right into the cloud. He went up the mountain.

Ex. 40.34: The cloud covered the tent of meeting and the glory of Yahweh filled the tabernacle. Moses could not enter the tent of meeting because of the glory of Yahweh that filled the tabernacle.

At every stage of their journey, whenever the cloud rose from the tabernacle the sons of Israel would resume their march. If the cloud did not rise, they waited and would not march until it did. For the cloud of Yahweh rested on the tabernacle by day and a fire...
shone within the cloud by night for all the house of Israel to see.

(Num. 9.15–23 parallels Ex. 40.34–38).

(Num. 10.11f., the cloud lifts, and the tribes proceed).

Num. 14.10, 16.19, 17.7, 20.6: four occasions when the glory appears by day. See below.

(Lev. 9.4, 6, 23) deal with the glory of Yahweh appearing during an atonement sacrifice; cf. too Lev. 16.2, where the cloud appears on the throne of mercy on the Day of Atonement).

Morgenstern published an exhaustive study of these passages, and took the P material to represent the norm, and therefore the key of the other material. The first passages he treated were Ex. 24.15b–18a and 40.34–38. The former makes a clear distinction between the cloud, which is present for six days, and the fire, which appears on the seventh. If this means during the early part of the seventh day, it must refer to night time. The distinction is maintained in 40.38, where we have the explicit statement that the fire is visible only by night. (Cf. too the pillar of fire by night in the J source, and n. 92). Morgenstern argues that the cloud is 'merely the envelope and in no sense a part of the k'bhod Jahwe itself', which is visible in the appearance of fire, no doubt present within the cloud by day, but made invisible by its opacity, and appearing through the cloud by night. The P source also speaks of Moses as unable to enter the tabernacle because of the presence of Yahweh's glory (Ex. 40.35), in contrast to the face-to-face relationship of the two in J. Consequently, when the cloud is withdrawn from the tent of meeting, the signal to move on in P, it indicates the departure of the glory of Yahweh. The passage in Num. 9.15ff. combines these ideas, the movement when
the cloud withdraws, and the nocturnal visibility of the fire.

Passages where the fire is made visible by day are all ones in which extraordinary circumstances demand the immediate intervention of Yahweh. In all of them, Moses and Aaron are threatened by a hostile crowd. Rather than simply breaking the pattern of visibility by night only, these passages serve to highlight it in that they are extraordinary visitations, and have a devastating effect upon the community, instead of indicating the benevolent presence of Yahweh. It could also be argued that they serve to indicate the emancipation of the theology of Yahweh from its past, but since on this score too they highlight the other passages, this does not invalidate our argument.

In none of these passages, in fact, are there any specific elements which demand a lunar interpretation. But it is striking that the visibility of Yahweh's TBE by night only, in normal circumstances, is in keeping with the normal time for theophanies to the patriarchs. It seems then, that at least so far as Israel's understanding of its prehistory and early history are concerned, the night was seen to be the most appropriate time for Yahweh to visit his people. This in itself proves nothing, but does show that the traditions do not contradict the theory of a basis in moon-worship. And in some cases we have seen that there are clear indications of this.

b) The revelation to Moses of the divine name Yahweh.

We have three accounts of his self-disclosure by Yahweh to Moses. Two are the easily recognised accounts, generally assigned to J (Ex. 3.1-15) and to P (Ex. 6.2-13; cf. also 6.28-30). The third account is a very archaic tradition embedded in Ex. 33.14. On the source to which this is to be assigned we shall say something to
We shall deal later with the various historical problems involved in these three narratives concerning the origins of the cult of Yahweh, for which they are obviously key passages. At the moment we are concerned simply with the nature of the theophany.

1) **Ex. 6 (P)**.

This account is of no use in our present enquiry. In so far as it has any details of location, it is at variance with the other two, for in 6:9 we read of Mo. en delivering Yahweh's message to the Israelites in Egypt, and giving his account of this meeting to Yahweh in v.12. The implication is that Yahweh has appeared to Moses in Egypt, and this is made explicit in v.26 (6.28 - 7.7, appears to be a doublet of 6.10-13).

11) **Ex. 3 (JE)**.

This is fairly readily divided into J and E, though there is room for disagreement in details. Stalker divides it as follows: to J - vv.2-4a, 5, 7, 8; to E - vv.1, 4b, 6, 9-12 (we shall deal with vv.13-15 later). Both suggest that in the latter, the references to Horeb (v.1) and to 'the middle of the bush' (v.4b) are secondarily added from J, presumably by Eje. If this is so, we have in J a theophany from within a mysterious burning bush, and without any immediate reference to a location (though 4.19 implies that it takes place in Midian). In E we have the divine voice coming from the (anonymous) mountain of God - presumably the same mountain that is later parallel to the Sinai of JF - see Ex.19,2b. Both these features, the fire and the mountain, albeit here independent of one another, are common features of the material we have examined. The fire is of particular interest in that it implies (by its visibility) that the episode takes place...
at night, and if the mountain is even remotely connected with the Cinni tradition, though largely independent of it, then it is reasonable to see it as conditioned by the kind of elements we noticed in Ex.19 (J). Apart from these considerations, since the traditions themselves regard the divine appearance to Moses as within the "continues" entailing the patriarchs and the period of wilderness wandering, it is only reasonable to think of it in the same terms, however varied, or lacking, the details.

iii) Ex.33, 34.

Within these two chapters we have a complex fusion of sources, regarding whose differentiation there is no certainty. One very attractive reconstruction is that made by Morgenstern, who was of the opinion that a third account of the revelation of the divine name is to be seen here. This he distinguished from J, and called C2, being an ancient tradition that according to Morgenstern was subsequently incorporated into J. It consists of the following verses, there being doubt at times as to whether phrases should be included or not:

33.1,12,13,17-23; 34.6-9; 33.14-16. Here are the most important verses:

33.17: Yahweh said to Moses, 'Again I will do what you have asked, because you have won my favour and because I know you by name.'

18: Moses said, 'Show me your glory, I beg you.'

19: And he said, 'I will let all my splendour pass in front of you, and I will pronounce before you the name Yahweh. I have compassion on whom I will, and I show pity to whom I please.

20: You cannot see my face,' he said, 'for man cannot see me
21. And Yahweh said, 'Here is a place beside me. [You must stand on the rock,

22. and when my glory passes by, I will put you in a cleft of the rock and shield you with my hand while I pass by.

23. Then I will take my hand away and you shall see the back of me; but my face is not to be seen.' 110

34.6. Yahweh passed before him and proclaimed, 'Yahweh, Yahweh,
a god of tenderness and compassion, slow to anger, rich in kindness and faithfulness,
for thousands he maintains his kindness, forgives faults, transgression, sin; yet he lets nothing go unchecked,
punishing the father's fault in the sons and in the grandchildren to the third and fourth generation. 111

8. And Moses bowed down to the ground at once and worshipped.

Once this passage (and the other verses listed) has been isolated, the location at Sinai (34.2-3), ceases to apply, and indeed we are left not with a southern tradition at all, but with a northern one which parallels the E material in Ex. 33. 112. Furthermore, the implication that Yahweh is not going to accompany the people onwards is in keeping not only with Ex. 33.5 (E) but also with the northern tradition of 1 K.19 in which Elijah has to travel to the dwelling place of Yahweh to meet him. It is also apparently the idea behind Ex. 3 (E material) in which Moses is sent back (vv. 10f.). Although v.11 has Yahweh say 'I shall be with you'; this is immediately qualified by 'and this is the sign by which you shall know that it is I who have sent you...'. This is quite distinct from the southern approach, which regards Yahweh as living on a
mountain (or at least having it for his chief cult-centre) but leaving it to accompany his people (Dl.3.2 etc.).

Again, as with Ex.3, it would be hazardous merely on the evidence of this passage to press a lunar interpretation but it is at least in no way contradictory to the trends we have observed, and if my explanation of (n.109) be acceptable, then we do have something linking it in detail with the other passages.

In his excursus on the links between Yahweh and the moon-cult, Burney cited the description of Yahweh in 34.6b,7, as 'identical in conception' with the nature of Sin as known from Babylonian hymns. It also agrees with the nature of Il in Ugarit as expressed in his epithet ḫrid, 'of compassion'. Such epithets may well have been applied to other deities, but the point is that here we have a group of gods, who are either known to be moon-gods (e.g. Sin), or for whom I am arguing such an identification (El and Yahweh), of whom mercy and compassion are the dominant moral characteristics.

In all the passages we have discussed, the descriptive language is remarkably restrained. It is noticeable that it is in the southern tradition that the more transparent allusions to a lunar background are to be discerned. It was in the south, I believe, that there was a far greater continuity with the pre-settlement cult and its ideology. In the north, where the dominant theology was governed by the 'Mosaic revolution', there was continuity with the past, but it was largely overshadowed by a wholly new development, which in no far as the theology of Yahweh was concerned, (as distinct from the side-issues, adoption and adaptation of Canaanite ideas, and so on) led to a great diminution in the mythical and naturalistic conception of Yahweh, and an overwhelming emphasis on his moral nature and transcendence over the entire created order. We shall see in chapter 8 that this may
have been a deliberate rejection of ancient ideas which allowed or threatened a confusion of Yahweh with rival deities, and failed to do justice to his unique nature and his devoted servitude.

It is important to distinguish between the various groups of theophanies we have discussed. Some are clearly to be linked to Yahweh (all those listed in sections b, e, g, and h) while in other cases there is either room for doubt (c, d) or the god in question, as we shall see below, is more probably El (a, f). We have already seen that El can be shown to be a moon-god in certain Ugaritic texts.

The case for the original lunar character of Yahweh is not so readily made, but we shall examine the case for it in chapter 6. If the materials treated in the present chapter do not themselves amount to proof of it, they do have value in a cumulative argument for my thesis.

The conclusions reached by Thompson and van Seters regarding the historical value of the patriarchal narratives for the reconstruction of the presettlement era; that they are of no direct value but reflect the concerns of the early monarchy, means that the patriarchal theophanies we have discussed above are not direct evidence of the religious ideas of the earlier time. The same is undoubtedly true of the wilderness traditions. That is not to say that Israel had no inkling of its past, but rather that in attempting to say something about it it was bound to do so in terms of its own beliefs and customs. It would seem to follow, therefore, that if the lunar elements we have traced above were still considered important enough to have featured in Israelite historiography, then it is all the more likely that in the presettlement period they were central features of the ancestral cults.
Notes to Chapter Four.
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Cross and Freedman, op. cit., 202, n. 20.

H. Nyberg, 'Deuteronomy 33.2-3', ZAW 92 (1938), 320-344.


Or: 'shone forth'.

The $\gamma\delta$ of AT has been recognised as difficult, though Tournay defends it against suggested emendations to $\nu\nu\nu$ or $\gamma\gamma\gamma$, op. cit., 182. Cross and Freedman think something should be there for metrical purposes (to give a regular three stresses for each line; if we accept this, it precludes shifting the word to the following sense-group: 'he appeared to them from Mount Paran') but think no acceptable solution commends itself, op. cit., 193, n. 5. Seeligman accepts $\gamma\nu\nu$, following various earlier commentators, on the strength of Ps. 28.8, where $\nu\nu\nu$ occurs as $\nu\nu\nu$ in some mas. and versions; op. cit., 76, n. 4; Margulis, op. cit., 207, concurs. LXX reads $\nu\nu\nu$, presupposing $\gamma\gamma\gamma$, the reading accepted by Cassuto, 'Deuteronomy chapter XXXIII and the new year in ancient Israel', in Biblical and Oriental Studies, (1973), 1. 50, (pp. 47-70), R. O. 11 (1928), 233-253.

Or: 'from the mountain of Paran'.

Accepting AT $\gamma\gamma\gamma$. I see no need to correct to $\nu\nu\nu$ 'with him' read as $\nu\nu\nu$ (Cross and Freedman, op. cit., 193, 198, n. 8, following Targuma). Its reading as 'come' is further strengthened by the chiastic structure which we then have,
we may take seriously the retention of ∂ר as a place name: Sinai/ Seir/ Paran/ Kadesh. See Seeligman, op.cit., 76; Margulis, op.cit., 207. I certainly do not reject this view, although I shall explore alternative possibilities below.

without the sense of separation has been alleged by Dahood, Psalms 113, 395f.; he cites Psa. 18.7 (LTV 6), 68.28 (LTV 27), (both ancient) and 98.26, where it means 'in'. Cf. the antithetical uses of ב and 1 in Ugaritic. See also Cross and Freedman, op.cit., 199, n.10.

The 'Holy Ones' would be the seventy sons of Aserah, and therefore hardly 'ten thousand'. Hence my more general rendering. No doubt with the later rise of angelology the number was understood to be far greater; cf. Dan. 7.10, and Judg 14.

Accepting with Cross and Freedman, op.cit., 199, n.9, that a final ∂ has been lost through haplography. The pl. form ∂רר appears to support the emendation. Cassuto (following Bottcher, et al) reads שירפ 'from the steppes of Kadesh'. loc.cit.


Cf. Beeston, loc.cit. Sabean 'ad can mean 'warriors'. Also P. C. Miller, 'Two critical notes on Ps. 68 and Dt. 22', HTR 57 (1964), 241ff.

Cf. Ps in CTA 23.54, and CTA 16.36-37. We have noted above, p.499, the title is used only of these two goddesses in Ugarit, suggesting that they may have been originally one and the same.


Wyatt, TCUOD 25, p. 89.


Cf. Ps. 110.1.

Op. cit., 335. Another suggestion of Cross and Freedman, op. cit., 199, is to read פ(ך)ת (ך)ת (ך)ת 'proceeded the mighty ones'. This is fine, but they should then have kept and taken it as a plural: הנד and הנד make a good parallel pair. They do not in fact occur as such elsewhere, as far as I know (in HTR 1, 89, 80f., atw/atw and atw/nk are listed). This occurrence may thus be the first example of it to be noted.

Accepting the view of Cross and Freeman, op. cit., 200, n. 13.

We do have abrupt changes of person in the use of suffixes.

English syntax requires 'your'.

The best solution to the problem of בְּנֵי הַנֶּפֶת is that offered by Cross and Freedman, op. cit., 200f., n. 16. They take the two words as one, being a 'hiquatal conjugation of mk (mwk/nk) (Heb. יִתְנַכֶּה) 'to be low'. Cassuto accepts the same sense, though without any parsing, op. cit., 51.

This seems to be the most obvious sense of the verb נִנְעָל, meaning that the gods rise up to do their Lord's bidding. It provides a good antithetic parallel to לַמְדָא, and is to be read as הָנִנְעָל (BH 3 appr.), or as הָנִנְעָל (BH 3 appr.).

Taking נ in the sense of 'at'. Cf. n. 25. There is no need to regard it as enclitic as do Caster, op. cit., 58, and Cross and Freedman, op. cit., 201, n. 17.

This tradition that is present...
Koriarty, loc. cit., suggests that in all these cases, 'arise' makes better sense than 'shine forth'. In the case of Ps. 94 this certainly seems justified on the basis of the following colon: 

'Be lifted up, Judge of the world'.

But the two senses are essentially the same. I wonder if 'is a gloss in this passage, El having been the original addressee? See further below on the problem.

For the latter, cf. C. J. Ball, 'Psalms LXXIII, Exurgat Deus', JTS 11 (1910), 416ff.


So Briggs, Psalms (ICC), ii, 96.


Accepting that we have here a vocative lamedh, Dahood, Psalms ii, 135.

There is no need to follow Dahood further in reading 'O his heavens', op. cit., 135ff. Some ms. read, יָשָׁר , BH 4, appreh. Could this be another vocative, with יָשָׁר, 'his glory', being the gods? Cf. ch. 1, n. 27.

So NEB. Cf. RSV, Albright, op. cit., 36, 'bow down', and Fodechard, Psalms LXVIII, RB 54 (1947), 502. Taking לַעַנְּבָּה as the third sense of מִלָּה (RB, 699), = 'to lift up a song'. Cf. מִלָּה in v. 8. An attractive rendering in that of Dahood, op. cit., 130, 136, 'pave the highway'. He refers to Is. 40, 3 (which could be drawing on the theophany tradition that is present here) and Jg. 5, 20. Cf. JB and NEB, loc. cit., mng. 1, where
Ia. 62.10, Jer.18.15 etc., are cited. Since implies a journey (and see also n.55), there is good reasoning behind Dahood's suggestion.

Clouds: Briggs, op.cit., 97 (citing Ps.18.11, Dt.33.26);
E.Kutz, Die Psalmen, (1925),171 (citing Akk. 'Irpub and urpatu);
H. Bauer, 'Die Gottheiten von Ras Shamra', ZP 51 (1933), 88f.;
de Vaux, 'Les textes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien testament', RB 46 (1937), 533; Albright, op.cit., 12,18; Dahood, op.cit., 136;
Cassuto: 'Psalm LAVIII', in Bibl. and Or.Stud..,243, and n.11;
RSV, JB etc.. This rendering has seemed particularly attractive to scholars since the discovery of Ba'al's title "khyrpt. 'The link is quite possible philologically, in view of the interchange of b and p in Northwest Semitic;
Desert plain: not EBD,787(cog. בָּעָר 'Arab, steppe-dweller');
Ball, op.cit., 418 (cites Is.40.3, 57.14; 62.10); Podechard, op.cit., 505, N.B.

This second alternative is more in keeping with the immediate context, with its obvious connections with the desert (see also v.8). The citing of Dt.33.26 by Briggs is misleading: the term there in נַרְפָּא (//נַרְפָּא), which could possibly = 'rainclouds', as in Is.45.8, but more probably has the sense of 'dust' or 'dust-clouds', since there too we have a desert-context. Furthermore, if we are right in considering the desert milieu in these theophany descriptions to reflect the pre-settlement era, then it would be implausible to attribute to Yahweh an epithet of Ba'al. The main objection to the first sense is thus theological, not meteorological!

A possible sense which has not apparently been taken
seriously by modern scholars is given by LXX (Ps. 67):

\[ \delta β \rho \eta \nu \sigma \alpha \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \beta \rho \eta \iota \kappa \varepsilon \tau \iota \varepsilon \mu \mu \nu \]

'Prepare the way for the Rider on the dusk'.

Podeschard notes it, op. cit., 505, but offers no comment.

The word for 'dusk, sunset', is אָרְעָב, from the 'going in' of the sun. Clearly LXX understood הָעִיר in the same way, which suggests that we have here a hapax which is a form of מְדַבְּר. We need not take it as pl... I suggest that we may have here a further example of a sync in a form of אָרְעָב. A f. value for the evening is to be expected, since the evening star in לְשֹׁעַר.

'Atart; cf. too Europa, < ḫr ḫṣtou, op. cit., 120f... As to the vocalisation, it is perhaps to be derived from the verbal rather than the substantive form. As to the sense, this is straightforward if we accept a lunar character for the context, and also consider that the great theophany referred to in this psalm, as in Dt. 33.2, is a new year one. In this case, as we saw before, p. 142, the moon which appears is new, and appears, about sunset, moving westwards with the setting sun.

56 Following Dahood, Psalms 1, 136; he reads נְשָׁב instead of יִנְשָׁב. We need a verb before הָעִיר, unless we resort to wholesale textual emendations. Is this reference to Yahweh an interpolation?

57 See Dahood, op. cit., 137. The reference to music does not however involve the exodus tradition, as Dahood suggests, because this Psalm, like that in Dt. 33, dates from a time before the fusion of northern and southern traditions. On this psalm as southern, see Lipiński, 'Juges 5.4-5 et Psalms 68.8-11', Biblica 48 (1964), 199. He refers only to v.30, but it applies to the whole psalm. Gaster, The esp., 189, takes it to be an allusion to the Ugaritic Kotoret. There
seems no need for this identification.

Perhaps this is to be linked to יָשָׁר, with a similar sense, by extension of the radical mng. 'to turn aside'. It is significant that terms for obedience and apostasy stem largely from the pastoral background of the pre-settlement era.

Perhaps this to be linked to יָשָׁר, 'with a similar sense by extension of the radical mng. 'to turn aside'. It is significant that terms for obedience and apostasy stem largely from the pastoral background of the pre-settlement era.

ятנ here could mean the nether world (as the foundations of the world), since it is parallel with יָשָׁר. Cf. Dahood, Psalms ii.232, and Tromp, Primitive conceptions of death..., 23-46.

Cf. too, the passages cited by Lipinski, op.cit., 187, where the term iraitu should be so translated.

Cf. Lipinski, loc.cit. I am not sure that the idea of rain is appropriate here (or, if appropriate to the occasion, not to the text!) we require a parallel to יָשָׁר, and Albright has derived יָשָׁר from יָשָׁר 'meaning "toss" or the like' — op.cit., 20. בּוּד, 381, has for יָשָׁר 'trip', 'take quick little steps'. Perhaps we have the same image here as in Pss.29.6, 114.4,6 (where the term is יָשָׁר).

Not to be corrected (as by Podechard, op.cit., 506, Seeligman, op.cit., 80, n.1.), but recognised as an ancient divine apellative; see H. Grimm, 'Abris der biblisch-hebräischen Metrik', ZDMG 50 (1896), 571, 573, n.1; Albright, op.cit., 20, and id., 'The song of Deborah in the light of archeology', BASOR 62 (1936), 30; also J. W. Allegro, 'Uses of the Semitic demonstrative ז in Hebrew', VT 5 (1955), 311. Dahood, op.cit., 139; Lipinski, op.cit., 198ff., nn.1-3. Cf. Ugdrid as a title of El, and the many examples, both m. (d) and f. (dt) cited in James, 'Le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique', Le Musée 60 (1947), passim, esp. 64ff.

Pointing יָשָׁר as a dual, as taken by everyone. In it perhaps
another example of the use mentioned in n.26? On its rendering cf. ESV, JB, NEB. The יָרָקֶת - 'thousands of repetition', BDB, 1041 - looks like an interpretative gloss on יָרָקֶת, and may explain the subsequent dual pointing of the letter. But a far better sense is achieved by taking יָרָקֶת as 'bowmen'; see Albright, Op. cit., 25; Clifford, The cosmic mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, (1972), 117, n.19; Gaster, Myth, legend and custom in the Old Testament, 761.

They draw attention to the incidence of the term at Alalakh (texts 145, 183, 352), to תְה in Ug., (CTA 14 ii 91, cf. IN § 2708, p.504), and to אנNi - 'bowmen who fight from chariots'.


Nowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's worship, i, 154, n.136.

Cf. G.W. Anderson, 'Psalms, in Peake's Commentary, § 3730, p. 426. So also Gaster, Thescts, 73, 87ff. Neil, 'Exegese du Psalme 68', RHR 117 (1938), 74, associates it with the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem in 1 S.6.10–7.1, 2 S.6.1–10, a tradition probably to be linked to new year cultic processions.

Kraus, Worship in Israel, (ET 1966), 168ff.

Op. cit., 166ff. If there was a northern handling of the psalm at some stage in its development, then in the light of our discussion below, I would prefer to see the יָרָקֶת(twice) of v.9 as an amendment from יָרָק, so that the original read:

On the unlikeliness of Tabor as an epiphany sanctuary see A.D.H. Kayer, Israel in the period of the Judges, (1974), 41–53. He discusses the sanctuaries with a much more likely claim
(Shechem, Bethel, Gilgal, Shiloh) and concludes that for none of them can a strong case be made.

68 Albright dated it in the second half of the twelfth century, **BASOR** 62, p. 29. After comment by R. A. Engberg, "Historical analysis of archaeological evidence: Megiddo and the song of Deborah", **BASOR** 78 (1940), 7; he reduced it to the eleventh century, before 1050; "Reply to Engberg", **BASOR** 78 (1940), 9. Craigie prefers a twelfth century date; "The song of Deborah and the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta", **JBL** 88 (1969), 255. While not specifically dating it, Mayes regards the battle of Aphek as a Philistine reaction to Israelite expansion, first indicated in the battle against Elam, and dates this to late in the eleventh century, **op. cit.**, 94f. Since he regards the song in its present form as the end product of a process of expansion (**op. cit.**, 86) this can hardly antedate the monarchy.

69 Cf. n. 59. For כְּפָלָה as 'steppeland', cf. ch. 3, n. 77.

70 See n. 60.

71 See n. 61.

72 This appears to be a gloss, interpreting the previous line. The verb here is clearly לָעַל, while we agreed in n. 61 that the earlier occurrence is of לָעַל (niphal). While still reckoning it as a gloss, I wonder if לָעַל is נָשָׁע 'cloud', (**BRD**, 728, **KB**, 670) or is not rather the obscure נָשָׁע (**BRD**, 712, cf. **KB** 1, 670) which appears to be an architectural term (it appears in 1 K. 7. 6 and Ezek. 41. 25) and may perhaps mean 'the ceiling of the world', viz. the firmament. Then we have the result of this cosmic quaking; the very firmament (note the emphatic נָשָׁע) leaks, and the waters begin to burst in.

73 Hardly נָשָׁע (in the gloss, above), but נָשָׁע 'to be light,
worthless, insignificant', (BDB, 272, cf. KB, 258); i.e.
the mountains are reduced to insignificance at Yahweh's
presence. NLE: 'shock in fear'; Albright: 'were rocking';
JASCR 62, p. 30. Lipiński cites some very interesting passages
from Akkadian sources, which have the same threefold re
ferences to heaven, earth (or nether worlds, isitum),
and mountains:

K 4614 (from Kuyundjik):

10 be-lum ina a-ge-gi-su sa-nu-ú i-ta-na-ar-ru-su
11 Adad ina e-ri-li-su er-se-tun i-na-as-su
14 sa-du-ú ra-bu-tu nu-uh-hu-nu-nu

which he translates:

Le seigneur, quand il s'irrite, les cieux frémissent
devant lui;
Adad, quand il se met en colère, la terre vacille
devant lui,
les grandes montagnes s'aplatissent devant lui.

Text K 9759 11.8f., has a similar structure, and Lipiński
also cites Isa. 49.13 and 44.23 ('surchargé'), and from Egypt,

74 See n. 62. If there is any overloading here, I prefer to see
it in the double use of ה' , perhaps indicating a late
identification of this particular god ("ז"כז) with ה' .

Cf. the older forms of divine name, e.g., El Onam, El Roi,
which are much older than their identification with Yahweh
in the J source of Genesis. On this problem see nn. 46, 67 above
and 85 below.

75 See also Weiser, 'Das Deborealied', ZAW 71 (1959), 67-97. See
particularly 74ff., 95ff. Hayes qualifies this interpretation
op. cit., 95ff., regarding only the final product as cultic, with
vv. 12-30 belonging to an earlier non-cultic stage (op. cit., 90).


Above, pp. 103f.

ANET, 386.

There may be a further mythological allusion in 5.31:

"So may all your enemies perish, Yahweh, but those who love you (reading יֲהֹוָה יַעֲזֹּב תּוֹרֵךְ) appear as the sun coming out in its strength."

This is taken by Schnutenhaus, 'Das Erscheinung und Erkennen Gottes in Alten Testament', *ZAW* 76 (1964), 3, to be an allusion to Yahweh as a sun-god. Rather would it be the solar consort of Yahweh, to whom Yahweh's lovers are compared.

So also Lipinski, *op. cit.*, 199.

This is supported by 15.7. But it should perhaps not be pressed.

If we understand the pericope to be continued from 13.18.

J. Dus understood the location to be shechem, placing 15.8ff., after 12.7, and attributing the tradition originally to Jacob - 'Der Jakob und Gen 15 8ff.', *ZAW* 80 (1968), 35-38.


The three men of 18.2 have become two angels by 19.1! See Skinner, *Genesis*, 296f., 306. In that the men appear as emissaries of Yahweh, this is not a true theophany. See also van Seters, *ANE*, 202f. He regards the appearance of these figures as a folktale motif, and indeed the whole episode as a folktale.

Obviously it is at night, because Jacob's opponent must depart by day-break (vv. 24, 26, 31). Whether he was the local form of El, or a djinn (see Lindblom, *Theophanies in holy
places in Hebrew religion', 

Westernack), or a river-god (Caster, Myth, legend and custom,
referring to Frazer) is not clear. The important
thing is that in the handling of the tradition, the figure has
been assimilated to Yahweh/El.

Face Lindblom, op. cit., 95. This allusion to his offspring,
being as numerous as the stars, gains considerably in force if
we remember the mythological antecedents of the tradition, in
of
which Abraham, as an avatar/the moon-god, is himself the
father of the stars. See above, ch. 2. I am not entirely
happy about treating this episode as E (though for present
purposes it is not vital). It is one of the more obvious
weak points of the documentary hypothesis that in the first
episodes in E, supposedly divided on the basis of divine
names, the name Yahweh is used in the first two verses, and
attributes vv. 1f., 4f., to E in the text of his commentary
('Genesis', in Peake's Commentary, §§157e, p. 190) but omits
v. 4 in the chart on p. 176. Vv. 1, 4 must undoubtedly belong
to the same source, in view of the formula of which variants
occur in each:

\[ \text{v. 1: } \text{יְהוָה לֶבֶן יִבְרְאֵל לְכַלְכֵּל} \]

\[ \text{v. 4: } \text{יְהוָה לֶבֶן יִבְרְאֵל לְכַלְכֵּל} \]

Van Seters points out
that we have here a prophetic technical term first appearing
in Jeremiah, (though added in later superscriptions to earlier
prophets), AHT, 253. The whole chapter is exceedingly complex,
and contains a variety of features which point to an exilic
date; it is also best seen as a unity.

On the lunar connections in this story, see L. R. Bailey, 'The
golden calf', HUCA 42 (1971), 108f.

Paddan-Aram, according to J (31.18). In the vicinity of Haran.

References to God in P are usually to הַנִּירָן, or, when the
is identified, to הַיָּהָה. The reference to Yahweh in 17.1 is to be seen as redactional: 'a slip' — Speiser, 
Genesis, 124.

90 A veritable illud tempus for P. This is the archetypal covenant, to which all future covenantal traditions are related and subordinated, even the priestly material in Exodus. Does this mean that Sinai is understood to be the location here? It is striking that there is otherwise no linking at all of the patriarchs to Sinai, the home of Yahweh.

91 Text from JB corrected at times.

92 Morgenstern assigns to J: 'Biblical theophanies!', ZA 25 (1911), 154f. — Note that we have here a single pillar: this seems to be the idea lying behind the P passages (see below): the fire is present in the pillar of cloud, which persists by day and night, though the fire is visible only at night.

93 Perhaps E? There seems to be no certainty on the origin of this passage; see Kissfeldt, Introduction, 200f., Driver, Deuteronomy, 388. Morgenstern, op. cit., 160, assigns it to J with no qualms.

94 Morgenstern assigns to J, op. cit., 171, which is at least consistent with Dt. 31.15 above. But if the present passage is E, as Beyerlein holds, Origins and history of the earliest Sinaitic tradition, 23f., then: Dt. 31.15 must be E. To indicate just how complex the problem of source allocation is here, cf. Neth, Exodus, p. 1254. He calls 33.7-11 'an old pre-priestly, pre-deuteronomistic tradition, traces of which also meet us elsewhere! — obviously regarding it as neither J nor E, nor 'JE'.

95 J, according to Morgenstern, op. cit., 163; Neth, Numbers, 83 (an addition). A 'group', discussed above, could not be
96 J, according to Morgenstern, op. cit., 164; Noth, op. cit., 93.

97 Op. cit., 139-193. Also in EA 28 (1914), 15-60. All references here are to EA 25.

98 Cf. op. cit., 14ff.

99 Above, p. 143.


101 Morgenstern, op. cit., 143.

102 Morgenstern, op. cit., 144-146.

103 See Noth, Exodus, 58. Against a location in Egypt, see S. Herrmann, Israel in Egypt, (ET 1973), 76, n. 46.

104 'Exodus', in Peake's Commentary, p. 211. He thinks that 9a may be J, but Lewy observes that the phrase never occurs in J: 'The beginnings of the worship of Yahweh: conflicting biblical views', VT 6 (1956), 432.

105 Noth, op. cit., 28, 38. See below, ch. 8 n. 142.

106 Lindblom simply identifies it as Sinai, op. cit., 103.


108 Vv. 18, 19a redactional? Note, that v. 18 uses הָעַלְּדֹת, but v. 19

109 So JB, following LXX. So 6α. Heb. 'goodness', with n. 'or "character". 'Goodness' sounds terribly weak, and I wonder whether LXX is not right in its approach. In the various passages in which the word occurs, the senses listed in BDB, (p. 375), such as 'good things', 'goods', 'property', 'prosperity' etc., apply quite well. There is one passage, however, where like Ex. 33.19, a stronger sense seems to be intended. The passage is Hos. 3.5, where the של msec of Yahweh appears to be absent, and Israel looks for its return. The idea of the 'glory', discussed above, would suit the

You/I crushed fire, the bitch of the gods (or: divine bitch),
You/I destroyed flame, the daughter of Ll (or: the goddess).

Both Kaleprud, The violent goddess, 61f., and Cassuto, The goddess Anath, 93f., translate 'flame'. Gordon, UT § 719, p. 388, connects it with קָלָק - 'fly' (following Virolleaud), but does not actually translate it.

Aistleitner under גַּֽרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְr

Aristotle under גַּֽרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְr

Cross, 'Yahweh and the god of the patriarchs', HTR 55 (1962), 249. ג > ת in one example cited in UT § 5.24 (p. 33):

Vergote cites examples of ג, ג being related to ת in Eg.-Heb.

Equivalents: Eg. גג, Heb. tabbat, and Eg. גג-ג.

v. 22, for example, is it Yahweh himself or his glory that passes by? The former recalls P, and in the light of n. 108, should be cut.

111 Either 6b-7, or 7, or 7b a gloss, according to Morgenstern, op. cit., 180. But see below.

112 Cf. C. F. Whitley, 'Covenant and commandment in Israel', JNES 22 (1963), 41. He argues that the language of Ex. 34 is deuteronomistic.


114 CTA 6 111 4 and passim.

115 See pp. 64f. above.
CHAPTER FIVE.

1) The West Semitic gods of 'El-' formation.

2) The god El in the patriarchal traditions.

We can no longer take seriously the ideas about the primitive nature of patriarchal El-worship that were commonly entertained by scholars forty years ago. Of course the word 'primitive' is somewhat relative. It is used of the early Christian Church to indicate, presumably, an early simplicity of belief before the rot of sophistication set in. There are primitive elements in all religions in that they preserve elements belonging to the remote past, but of course reinterpretation, 'reformation' and so on serve to make them relevant to the later age.

The term 'El' is used not only of a particular god, but of gods in general. According to Alt, the various divine names of Genesis, El-Colam, El Ro'i, etc., being linked in the narrative to various localities, represent local numina. The trouble with this view, which seems to me to be little better than the animistic approach of other scholars of the period (see. n.1) is that it is unable to account satisfactorily for El Q'dyon, who cannot simply be linked to Jerusalem, in spite of Gen.14, or El Shaddai, who is not clearly associated with any one sanctuary or locality.

A different approach has been more common in recent years, stress has been placed on the specific reference in compound El-names, so that they are understood to refer to the Semitic high god El, giving him various cultic titles, rather than being the predicate representing an individual divinity who is given the
general appellative 'El'. Thus the various forms are held to be different hypostases, in different localities or at different times, of the one god. This is not of course an attempt to sustain a monotheistic theory; the El in question is the same deity of this name (El, Il, Ilu) we meet elsewhere in the Semitic world as one god among many. Cross speaks of 'Canaanite El' as distinct from Amorite El (Shaddai), although he admits to doubt as to whether the distinction is merely one of name, or of actual cults. Oldenberg however and de Vaux speak of a new departure: the patriarchs changed from ancestral forms of worship to the cult of El upon their arrival in Palestine, though this view is not recognised by the Genesis traditions, and misreads the relationship of the divine names in Genesis; in so far as this can be supposed to have any historical (as distinct from tradition-historical or theological) basis.

Oldenberg's view is of interest, since he takes it for granted that Abraham and his family were moon-worshippers, before adopting the cult of El, whom he refers to as the prime divinity of the Semites. In view of the literary nature of Genesis, this kind of historical reconstruction is of course largely futile. However, in so far as the tradition itself, for whatever reason, reflects apparent differences of cult, it is worth examining the character of El in further detail.

El in Ugarit.

I have argued above that El in Ugarit was a moon-god, although it seems from the separate mention of Yarihu in certain contexts that the two have begun to diverge in the latter part of the second millennium. Of course the divergence or coalescence of gods, or the divergence and separate development of different
hypostases or, even cult-forms distinguished only by an epithet or local tradition of one god, was undoubtedly a continuous process in the ancient world.

It is this point which makes a comparative treatment tantalising and yet quite inconclusive. The South Arabian god El (Il), for example, has been argued by some scholars to have been a moon-god, while such a view has been denied by others. We might expect a continuity of worship in South Arabia unless good reason were provided for a break in continuity and since the moon-god featured in the later dominant triads in various guises. However, our information is simply insufficient to be of use in this discussion. Likewise the archaic deity Ilu isolated in certain early Babylonian names appears to have been of a very similar character—regarding his compassionate nature and involvement in human generation to Ugaritic and biblical El. Yet we cannot simply equate the two. It is possible that El (Il, Ilu) in all these milieux was a moon-god, but it is also possible that originally he was another type of god who in certain areas, for instance among the Western Semites who came to populate Syria-Palestine, coalesced with or developed into a moon-god, while in others he remained distinct. We simply cannot tell.

However, in Ugarit, the connection of El with the moon is demonstrable both in terms of the identification of the two in CTA 12 i 15 (the wife is ant yrâ, yet El is clearly understood to be the husband) and also because the marriage and procreation myth present here and in CTA 23 is clearly related to the Babylonian myth of Sin and the cow and its other derivatives, as we have seen.

III) The patriarchal epithets of El

Various forms of El are found in Genesis. We have noted that
they are to be regarded as hypostases of the same deity. This is undoubtedly the situation in Genesis, even though they may have diverged later in different parts of the Levant. They reflect of course various titles of the one il worshipped in early Israel.

The forms are as follows:

1) El Bethel (לשםבה לכול)

This name is one of the most puzzling issues in the book of Genesis. Several scholars have concluded that 'Bethel' is a divine name. As far as the biblical evidence is concerned I am not convinced of this, although it is not a priori impossible for a sanctuary to be divinised, just as mountains are in the ancient world.

There are two passages which give ground for supposing there to have been a god Bethel. In Gen.35.7 (E) Jacob calls a place at which he builds an altar: 'El Bethel' (לשםבה לכול). It is true that this can be construed as 'the god Bethel'. But it need not be; the first ב for ב can be taken as construct of the divine name, by ellipsis, 'El of Bethel' or even as a straightforward construct of the common noun, El here serving as the equivalent of יְהֹוָה: 'the god of Bethel'. But on the other hand, the versions all suppress the first ב and several other references to Bethel in the same narrative 35.1,3, (L) cf.35.6 (P) all omit it. The naming of 35.15 (P) also contrasts with v.7.

We may prefer to retain the ב in view of 1 S.10.3, but I do not think that it can be used as an argument for an independent deity Bethel. The term ב could be understood either as a meaning, 'sanctuary', (as distinct from the town at large), or as a (late?) euphemism for יְהֹוָה cf.28.18 (E), although the tradition of the anointing of a massebah in 28.18 is not necessarily to be understood as being a reflection of an animistic cult, and is
probably aetiological rather than historical anyway, so that the whole linking of Jacob with Bethel, and with the messahab in its sanctuary, probably dates from after the settlement. There is evidence of the cult of El-at-Bethel in the monarchal period. Its earlier incidence is perhaps to be found in the reference in 1 S.10.3, where Saul is told to meet three men who are going up to God at Bethel. The phrase is governed by a preceding הָלַע (they are) going up—and so the first הָלַע must obviously be construed as the preposition 'to'. But the expression as a whole looks suspiciously like the full expression of which we have suggested the construct הָלַע הָלַע is to be taken as an ellipsis. It is possible that we should assume another הָלַע to have dropped out through haplography, so that we should read 'going up to (בָּלַע) El the god of/at Bethel'. would then be taken either as construct with an enclitic, or absolute with Bethel taken as locative. The ה which occurs in the text looks suspicious anyway, being unnecessary, unless it is intended to specify the deity at Bethel as distinguished from other local deities. As we shall see below, Bethel (as the name suggests) was a major cult centre of El in the divided kingdoms. There is however no reason to distinguish him (as 'Bethel') from the head of the pantheon found at Ugarit and elsewhere. In view of the apparent allusion to an independent deity Bethel in Jer.38.13, discussed by Byatt, we should perhaps not press our arguments too far anyway, since this usage certainly reflects the widespread incidence of this deity from Elephantine to North Syria. We may conclude that so far as the present discussion is concerned, it does not matter very much either way. We argue either that it is El, the specific deity who is worshipped in as
particular sanctuary, or alternatively that the sanctuary itself has
been divinised, being however in origin the sanctuary where El
manifests himself, and therefore being derived from the same cult.
This is about as far as a discussion of this particular patriarchal
form can take us.

2) \text{El °Caln ( כלאנל לארשי).}

This title occurs only in Gen. 21:33 (J):

Abraham planted a tamarisk at Beersheba;

and there he invoked Yahweh, the everlasting god. (Jg)

The \text{יהוה} looks suspiciously like an identifying gloss here; being
added by the compiler of J when incorporating this tradition into
his narrative. Cross has listed the various parallel uses of the
term \text{Caln}.\textsuperscript{23} It is applied to Yahweh in Dt. 33:27 (by implication
\text{יָהָהָא לארשי//לארשי }),\textsuperscript{24} Is. 40:28 and Jer. 10:10.\textsuperscript{25} It appears in a
place name \text{bt °Cln(m)} (probably - \text{bt °Cln}) in the list at Karnak
of conquered cities by Sheshonq I,\textsuperscript{26} and also at Serabit el Kādēm
in the inscription deciphered by Cross \text{1 d °Clm}.\textsuperscript{27} This is of
particular interest in pointing to the same Sinaitic milieu in which
so much of Israel's prehistory ought perhaps to be placed. Cross
also finds the title used in CTA 10 iii 6f.:

\text{lm k qyn \text{°Cln}}

\text{kār(w) dykn [ ]},

which he translates '... our creator is \text{eter[nal]}
indeed from age to age, he who formed us'.\textsuperscript{28}

He implies that this refers to \text{El}, which is quite possible,
but hardly certain. So it would be hazardous to link it with the
biblical epithet. Nevertheless, the idea of longevity applied to
the patriarchal \text{El} is certainly in conformity with the widespread
idea of his paternity of the gods and of men,\textsuperscript{29} although it can
lead us no further in the present enquiry.

3) El Roi (אֵל רוֹאִי).

This expression occurs in Gen. 16.13 (J).  בדס construes הָרְאִי as a noun, 30 which would demand that הָרְאִי in either generic, or that the expression is an ellipsis for הָרְאִי הָרְאִי. However, since the participle (דָּרָא) occurs twice in vv.13ff., we may wonder if this should not also be taken as participial (archaic or regional for לֵרָא). The name is curious, although Castelles points to Qur'anic parallels, 31 and it looks from the context as though it may, at least in the sense in which it is usually taken, derive from the need to find an etymology for the name of the well הָאָרֶץ לוֹאֵי רוֹאִי (v.14). Needless to say, the identification with Yahweh is patently artificial. We do have the verb לְרָא used with God as the subject several times in the Old Testament, 32 in what appears to be a characteristic usage. Typical is 1 Kgs. 16:7:

For (God does) not see as man sees, for man sees the outward appearance, but Yahweh sees into the heart. 33 An insight into men's secret motivations, and a constant moral judgment upon them, is implied. Cf. also Jer. 23:24:

For can a man hide in secret places,

so that I cannot see him...

Do I not fill the heavens and the earth...?

The second colon here shows the universalist conception of Yahweh, to whom every aspect of his creation is visible. A more archaic conception may lie behind the similar expression of Job 28:24:

For he looks (וְלָא חִפָּל) to the ends of the earth 34 (And) sees everything beneath the heavens. 35

I would hesitate to claim a primitive nature for the conception of El Chaddai in the central chapters of Job, but we shall see below reasons for considering El Chaddai to have been a moon-god, and
this bi-colon looks as though it preserves something of the old idea, however much it may here be reduced to metaphorical status. 

Akkadian nabatu means 'to shine', so perhaps here the basic notion is the shining of the moon, extending from that to the idea that the moon is looking down on men, as in the Job passage.

We also find the term nabat appearing in several south Arabian theophoric names, in which the divine element is always of the moon-gods: 1ilmunabbit, Nabat-il, Nabat'ally (cf. γ ἡγὴ below) and Nabat'anna.

Of course any god can be said to 'see' what goes on in the world; indeed in various attacks on other cults, biblical passages scorn them as 'gods that neither see or hear', that is, as lacking essential characteristics of divinity, but the gods who 'see' most characteristically are the celestial gods, who (as heavenly bodies) literally 'look down from heaven' and observe all that goes on below. Implicit in the biblical usage is moral as well as compassionate concern, the hallmarks of the moon-god. Accordingly, while the biblical title El Roi is a hapax-lexemnon, it does fit the theological context which is appropriate to the culture; and apart from the historico-cultic context, we have established above that the story of Hagar is based upon a lunar myth, however demythologised it may be in its present context.

4) El 'Elyon (γ ἡγὴ).

The narrative of Gen.14 refers to 'Melchizedek king of Salem... priest of El 'Elyon' (v.18). This has given ground for the view that 'Elyon was the local hypostasis of El as head of the pantheon at Jerusalem, the city itself being perhaps dedicated to the god Salem ('the foundation of Salem'). The title 'Elyon is also applied to Yahweh (identified explicitly in Gen.14.22), in parallel usage in the Psalms, which very probably reflects
the fusion of cults in Jerusalem. But the epithet $\gamma \alpha \upsilon \chi \lambda \iota$ is found elsewhere. In the Sefire stela, the treaty between kings Barqayyah and Atarsamak is ratified in the presence of a large number of gods, invoked in pairs:

- Before... and Mullesh(?),
- before Marduk and Zerpanit,
- before Nabu and Tashmet,
- before Irram and Musuk,
- before Nergal and Las,
- before Shazash and Nur,
- before Sin and Nikkal,
- before Nikkar and Adh,
- 
- [before... Nadd of Aleppo, before Sibitti,
- before El and Golyon.]

Evidently by the time of this inscription (ca. 750 B.C.) Golyon had become a deity in his own right, quite distinct from El. But we have no evidence that the two deities were originally quite distinct, as maintained by Pope. His resort to the tradition of Sanchuniathon, the alleged source of Philo of Byblus (whom we meet himself at second hand in Eusebius’ Praeparatio Evangelica) as proof of his view, is unconvincing. Even if we give full credit to the existence of a work by Sanchuniathon, it probably dates from no earlier than the seventh century B.C., and therefore is later than the Sefire inscription. In any case, much of the theological speculation in the work is due to Philo himself, and is patently dependent upon the theomachy traditions of Hesiod’s Theogony. The sequence of divine generations in Hesiod and the Kumarbi myth is alien to the known structure of any Semitic pantheon. A shortened form of $\gamma \alpha \upsilon \chi \lambda \iota$, Golyon, occurs as an appellative of
Ba'\textsuperscript{50}al in CTA \textsuperscript{16} iii 6,8, and has been isolated in several biblical passages. \textsuperscript{50} It does not seem to have been used of El, however, unless we consider that the passages in Hos.7.16 and 11.7 both contain a reference not just to "\textsuperscript{52}\text{El most high}" but to  "\textsuperscript{53}\text{El most high}."

If these examples are valid, they indicate that the epithet is not confined to Jerusalem within Israel, though the incidence of the (shortened) form in the north may owe something to Jerusalem's influence under David and Solomon. But so far as the epithet is concerned, it does not do much to further our present discussion.

A further title, however, is included in Gen.14. In v.19, Melchizedek says:

\begin{center}
\text{Blessed be Abram by \textsuperscript{54}\text{El}} \text{, creator of heaven and earth.}
\end{center}

It does not matter whether the tradition has conflated two originally distinct titles here,  "\textsuperscript{52}\text{El} and \textsuperscript{55}\text{El} who are, which does not appear at Ugarit, but undoubtedly underlies the form Elknir\textsuperscript{53} occurring in the Hittite (< Canaanite) myth of El, A\textsuperscript{54}irtu and the storm-god. \textsuperscript{53} It also occurs in the Karatepe inscription, \textsuperscript{54} at Leptis Magna \textsuperscript{55} and at Palmyra. \textsuperscript{56} The term \textsuperscript{56}\text{a\textsuperscript{56}y/\textsuperscript{56}y\textsuperscript{56}r} probably means 'begetter' rather than 'owner' or 'acquirer', \textsuperscript{57} and as such is similar to El's other titles as progenitor of gods and men. Presumably the merismus  "\textsuperscript{57}\text{begetter}" here is an indication of the totality of El's parenthood, rather than a specific statement of his paternity of heaven-and-earth. These entities are not normally personified in Semitic thought in the same fashion as in Greek thought. \textsuperscript{58} It is characteristic of Israelite thought that it modifies the image in order to reduce the mythical dimension.
at least with regard to certain overtones. But the origin of the imagery is clear; it goes back to the fatherhood of El.

Is there any direct evidence that El was a moon-god? There is one interesting passage in the Old Testament. We cannot assert that it applies to El, since the incorporation of the (originally extraneous) exodus tradition into Yahwism in the early monarchy, which we shall discuss below, also brought a northern form of El into a syncretistic relationship with Yahweh. The passage is Ps. 19. The earlier part deals with El:

2 The heavens are recounting the glory of El,
   and the firmament tells of the work of his hands;
3 Every day pours out his utterance
   and every night declares his knowledge.
4 There is no utterance,
   there is no word—
   their voice is heard not at all
5 But throughout the nether world their voice goes forth,
   and to the ends of the earth their utterance,
   for the sun he has placed a tent in them.
6 And he as a bridegroom goes forth from his pavilion
   and rejoices as a hero to run his course.
7 His going forth is from (one) extremity of the heavens,
   and his completed circuit is at the other
   and nothing is concealed from his heat.

The accepted view of this passage is that God (i.e. El) comes out like the sun. If my translation is acceptable, however, we have an allusion to the hierogamy of El, who has prepared a wedding-booth for his bride the sun-goddess (sc. Aserah). The Hebrew word אשת is found with either gender, and I suggest that it is feminine here, and that the נשים of v.6 refers back to the antecedent אשת, and not...
to the sun as masculine. The title בְּנֵי is most appropriate here, since בְּנֵי refers to the sun-goddess, or her surrogate the queen mother in the ritual enactment of the marriage. The 'heat' referred to in v.7 may involve a double entendre, being the passion of the bridegroom, as well as solar heat, perhaps generated here by the bride. Perhaps we should read 'their' heat, as the bridal couple proceed to their booth.

The obvious conclusion on the basis of this interpretation seems to be that בְּנֵי (identified with Yahweh in the remainder of the Psalm) was still a moon-god in the early Israelite cult.

5) בְּנֵי שַׁדַּדְיָא

The term Shaddai, with or without ב, occurs forty-eight times in MT. Generally speaking, it is used in poetic and archaising contexts. It is the standard term by which P refers to God as self-revealing in the patriarchal period (Gen.17.1, 28.3, 35.11, 48.3, Ex.6.3). But its apparent lateness on that account is deceptive. Apart from its appearance in the ancient Ps.68.15 (LXX 14), it occurs twice in J, in the oracles of Balaam (Num.24.4,16) and twice in Gen. passages assigned to L (Gen.43.14, 49.25). It also occurs in theophoric names from the Mosaic period: Zurishaddai ("ןַרְשַׁדְאֹת, Num.1.6 etc.), Amminaddai ("אָמִּינְשַׁדְאֹת, Num.1.12 etc.), and Shedeur ("שֶׁדֶאַר, read as Shaddai--Or by May, 70 Num.1.5 etc.).

Since the name is used both independently and in conjunction with ב (Shaddai, ב Shaddai) it is not certain whether it was originally an independent divine name (or even an independent deity) or an epithet of ב, which in poetic contexts was used by itself. In prose contexts the two are always combined, but of course the prose contexts are all late, and so nothing can be said of that point. The usage in the theophoric names is probably the oldest material we have to work on, being pre-Mosaic according to May.
On the evidence of these, as far as it goes, we may perhaps tentatively say that it existed independently, but the matter seems to be beyond proof one way or another, and even granted that it was independent, provides no evidence regarding the matter of the god's identity, whether he was a hypostasis of El, or another god identified with him in the tradition.

A consideration of the meaning of the name Shaddai may, however, prove more fruitful. The etymological significance of the name was no doubt lost in antiquity, Albright argued, following Delitzsch and Hoernle, that the word derives from Akkadian šadu - 'mountain'; in a derived qattal form, we have šaddašu - 'mountaineer'. The š in the Hebrew form antedates a shift from šaddašu to šaddašu, which took place, Albright suggests, before the middle of the second millennium, and became the final letter with the loss of the case-ending. Albright's view has been accepted widely, for example by J. Leu, May, and Cross. Walker offered a rather less convincing Sumerian etymology. Geppert has broadened Albright's approach by suggesting that the basic sense of the term refers to territory outside areas of human habitation, which in Hebrew came to mean 'steppeland'.

It is pointed out that (El) Shaddai is not linked to any specific locality in the patriarchal traditions. Missfeldt attempted to link him with Hebron, but there is no evidence at all for this. Where we might expect a location, in his appearance to Moses in Ex.6 (P) where the parallel material in Ex.3 (J and E),
refers to some holy spot in Lidian (a mountain in E), it is embarrassingly placed by P in Egypt, which hardly suits our purpose! But if Shaddai means something like 'the one of the mountain' it is reasonable to suggest that a specific mountain may be understood.

Lewy suggests that the mountain must in fact be Sinai. He says that El-Shaddai was not a more or less unimportant tribal god but the moon-god Sin. He understands the mountain name Sinai to mean 'Sinian' or 'belonging to Sin', which seems a reasonable explanation of the name. Whether Sinai is to be located at Halat-l-Dedr, 165 km. south west of Tesa as he suggests, is open to question. In view of the inconclusive nature of all attempts to give a fixed location to the mountain, it seems safer to conclude—in keeping with the seasonal mobility of pastoralists—that a number of locations, including perhaps most or all of the candidates, were regarded as places where theophanies occurred and there may have been several sacred to the moon-god. All that we can say with any certainty is that the place or places lay to the south of Palestine. Clueck regards the passages we discussed above, Jg.5.4ff., Ez.33.2, Ps.68 as post-exilic, because they equate such places as Paran, Seir, Idom, Teman, with Sinai, which he tacitly locates in the peninsula, and he points out that only in the late exilic and post-exilic period was the land west of the Arabah considered as Edomite. But of course since he does not consider that Sinai may have been outside the peninsula, at least so far as any specific localisation underlying these traditions is concerned, his argument is vitiated.

The linking of Shaddai with Sinai can be no more than conjecture, even though I am inclined to favour it. Since this would clearly link the deity with the moon-cult, and from a different angle such a link may be inferred from the apparent
equating of Shaddai with El (it does not seem to me that the El in
the form ‘El shaddai’ is likely to be merely generic), we may say
that at least a reasonable case can be made for Shaddai being a moon-
god. It would appear to be supported by the evidence of Job 28:24
mentioned above.

b) The etymology of El.

There is no agreed solution to this problem. The most
widely canvassed views are that the form El derives from one of
the verbal forms ‘wl, ‘lyh. But even these have not carried
conviction. So no appeal can be made to the meaning or form of
the name as evidence for the character of the god.

c) The god of the father(s).

Alt argued that there was probably no historical link between
the various El forms discussed above, which as we saw were attached,
with the exception of El Shaddai, to sanctuaries in Palestine. For
him, the irreducible and distinctive element in the cult of
the patriarchs was the ‘god of the fathers’. On the basis of the
parallel usage in Habatean and Palmyrene inscriptions, he argued
that the cult was of a specific but unnamed deity, who was known
as ‘the god of X’, where X was the person to whom that deity was
supposed to have first appeared, and was therefore the cult founder.

In the case of the patriarchal cults, it is possible that the
divine titles יִבְרָאָל and בְּשַׁקַּר were the names of Isaac’s and
Jacob’s gods respectively. J. Lewy drew attention to various
formulae in use among the early Amorites settled in Assyrian
territory (Cappadocia) in which the god Ilabrat, ‘your god’ (ilka)
and ‘the god of your father’ (il abika) were apparently synonymous.

Ilabrat was apparently a fairly minor deity, whom those Amorites
who produced the texts Lewy quotes had accepted as a tribal or clan
patron. The name probably means ‘god of the dwellings’ according
Levy regards Ilabrat alone as the 'god of my your father' in the old Assyrian contexts, but the formula is attached elsewhere to various deities—Ea/Šamaš, Kalakbel and Zeus-Helios Aniketos. 96

The weakness in Alt's argument was his assumption that the patriarchal 11 forms represented nothing more than local numina,97 and that we have in the 'god of my father', in which the father was Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, three distinct 'personal cults' in which the named patriarch was the founder of the cult. In fact of course, the genealogical link of the three is artificial,98 and at a time prior to the linking (after the settlement) Abraham would not have been the father of Isaac; nor Isaac of Jacob, so that the link between the following generation and the cult of the former one is itself artificial and literary. Alt also took the cult of the 'god of the father' to be essential patriarchal religion, but there is no reason at all why the patriarchs should not have worshipped a number of gods, depending on circumstances.

Levy's argument, useful as a corrective, was weakened by his simple identification of the 'god of the father' with El Shaddai, on the basis of Gen. 49.25 where γαῖα and νομίζεται are parallel.99 I do not think that the interpretation he places on this bi-colon can be sustained. There is no need to ascend τῷ ΧΝ (MT) to τῷ Χ, as do many commentators including Levy.100 If we take the beginning the verse as an instrumental,101 then we have a perfect parallel:

By (τῷ) all your father, may he assist you!

and by (τῷ) Shaddai, may he bless you!102

Here El and Shaddai belong together, being a single divine name divided in the poetic structure. To have the identical structure in Job.15.25, 21.14f., 22.2f., 17, etc.103 If my view here is
correct, the 'god of your father' does not appear in this context after all.

A certain confusion in the discussion of the problem was corrected by May, 104 who made a distinction between the phrase 'god of my (your, etc.) father' and 'the god of your (their) fathers' (יְהוָה יַעֲקֹב). The latter (plural) expression was, he argued, a much later formulation, and pointed out that it was predominantly used in exilic or post-exilic passages (by the deuteronomist, 11 times, the chronicler, 29 times, and Daniel, once). It is clear from the usage in these passages, where the name Yahweh is usually also present, that it is the ancestral faith of Israel that is in question; in 21 out of 28 cases it is a matter of faithfulness to or apostasy from the traditions of the covenant people. So there is no question of an allusion to the patriarchs. There are four passages which are early where the formula is found, in Ex. 13 (E), 15(b), 16(J), and 4.5(J). May suggests that there may be late editing here, and certainly the formula is suspicious. In the L passages it is a deliberate use, intended to indicate the continuity between past and present 105 despite the change of name. It reflects the theological presuppositions of the writer(s) of L, rather than those of Moses and his time. It also contrasts with the singular expression 'the god of your father', occurring in 3.6, to which we shall return. In the J tradition of course we already have the presupposed continuity in the use of the divine name, and here Yahweh comes to rescue 'his' people (3.7: cf. 'the sons of Israel' 3.9 E), so that the 'fathers' of the formula need not be the three patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but simply the ancestors in general of the enslaved Hebrews. The addition of the three patriarchal names in both passages is artificial, and clearly
secondary. 106

It is the singular expression, 'the god of your father', which May argued is much more significant for our present purposes. This however is also surrounded with difficulties, and there seems no unanimity as to its proper significance. Even more important, no one, apart from Alt whose views do not appear to bear much criticism, has offered any kind of characterisation of the sort of deity involved. This leads to the suspicion that we do not in fact, in the form in which the formula has survived, have a genuine allusion to any patriarchal deity. It seems to me that there are two possible ways of making sense of it, which I shall now examine:

1) An attractive solution was put forward by Morgenstern, 107 with reference to the problems raised by the occurrence of the formula in Ex. 3.6 (E) where the voice from the bush (mountain) says:

   I am the god of your father... 108

Morgenstern cut the Gordian knot by suggesting that for **יִתְנַח* we should read an original **יִתְנַחא.** 109 The voice speaking to Moses would then have announced that it was the god of his father-in-law (so. Jethro, priest of Midian, 3.1) who was addressing him. This fits the Midianite (Kenite) hypothesis, which we shall examine below. But it leaves two questions unanswered. Firstly we are still left with the expression used in Genesis, unless we argue that once the change had been made - to avoid the impression that Moses' god was merely a borrowing from outside Israel - it became a popular expression for pre-Mosaic religion in general. Morgenstern does not offer any explanation. Secondly, it may be asked why Moses should have subsequently to be told the name of his father-in-law's god, since he ought to have known it. In a sense of course this kind of objection is pedantic, and fails to take into account the
popular story-telling tradition, working to the climax of the divine self-disclosure. But believe that we can find a more satisfactory solution which also deals with the various associated problems.

11) Several scholars have remarked on the fact that the phrase 'the god of your father' is never addressed to Abra(ha)m, or used by him. May suggested, that this is the result of interpretation by later Israelite tradition, which understood that Yahweh (not of course under that name for L and P) first revealed himself, so far as the election of Israel was concerned, to Abra(ḥa)m (Gen. 12.1ff.; J).

But there is no internal evidence in the patriarchal traditions of Genesis to support this idea of a new departure (apart from which 12.1ff. is not necessarily early). It is found only in Jos. 24.2.

Here we have a conflict between the understanding of J, the southern source, which we may take to have been primary as regards traditions about Abra(ha)m, and the Shechemite source lying behind the account of Jos. 24, which being northern must have borrowed Abraham from southern tradition. This it can probably have done no earlier than the united monarchy, so that it can hardly be taken as a control for interpreting J. Besides it is the only credal summary which mentions Abraham, and this itself suggests that it is a later expansion (dating from the exile?).

Another factor is the relative rarity of this term in J anyway.

It occurs at 26.24, and 28.13, where the name Abraham has been added; 31.53a is allocated by Alt to J but in any case is patently a gloss designed to solve the problem of the implied polytheism; 43.23 presents a textual problem, supported by Sam. and LXX, read for. and apart from the more awkward (pl.) reading 'being preferable,' the entire phrase should perhaps be treated as a gloss on the preceding
The last example is in Gen. 49:25. Alt. took this to be J. 115 Hooker prefers to assign 49.24b-26 to E. 116 In any case, the whole of ch. 49 is probably composite. 117 But we have already seen that there is probably no reference to the 'god of your father' here.

Contrasting with the rarity of its use in J, the formula occurs several times in E. Its use is straightforward in 31.5, 29 (תִּכְנָח יִשְׂרָאֵל, סָמֵא, LXX), 42; 32.10(bis); 46.1; 50.17; Ex. 3.6. In 31.53a (if E) we have seen it to be secondary and in 53b it may be abbreviated, or mutilated, in the reading קְרֵי תִּכְנָח יִשְׂרָאֵל. We have seen that in 49.25 (if that is to be assigned to E) there is in fact no case to be made. Now, this passage does not stand alone, and may give a possible clue to the curious usage at 46.3, which in turn may perhaps provide an explanation for the whole construction. In 46.3, we read יִשָּׁרְאֵל רָוָה עִבְרָאִי בַּגְּדָד. This is an unusual expression, and there seems to be an expansion of the text. The term which E uses fairly consistently for God is יִשָּׁרְאֵל. There is a highly artificial flavour to its use. Frequently it occurs where we expect a divine name to appear. It is as though an editor of the tradition has tried deliberately to suppress all references to a particular name. Occasionally this appears to lead to slightly ridiculous results. For example, the fragment of poetry quoted in 27.28, reads:

May Lohim give you dew from heaven... 118

A specific divine name would appear so much more natural here than the colourless יִשָּׁרְאֵל. Also, in 28.17, 22, where the narrative clearly locates Jacob at Bethel (cf. J, and 35.1ff., E) we have the curious expression לַחֲרֵי הָאָדָם, where לַחֲרֵי הָאָדָם would have
been so much more plausible, and I suspect was originally the term
used. This gives us our clue: הַלֵּא has apparently, with a greater
or lesser rigour, displaced 2א in the B source of Genesis. Further
evidence supports this supposition. In 32.31, for example, we
read that Jacob named the place Peniel ( 2א בֵּיתֵי אֶל ) 'because I have
seen God face to face' (כִּי רָאתי אֱלֹהִים פֶּנֶיהֶם). Why
has the writer not simply used 2א, as the whole explanation of
the name being offered really demanded? Somehow or other, he appears
to have a strong aversion to the term. At other times he is confronted
with theophanies of the deity at Bethel, and here we have the unusual
formula 2א בֵּיתֵי אֶל (31.13, cf. 35.13 2א בֵּיתֵי אֶל - note the pointing). 119
In view of his normal usage, we would expect 2א אֱלֹהִים (or דָּוִד 2א)
if one wishes to take 2א אֱלֹהִים as a divine name; see above). In
any case, 2א is not a normal prose usage for the generic sense of
the term. It seems to me, therefore, that the article has been
added in an attempt to destroy the titular use here, changing it
from 'El' to 'the god (of...'). If we now turn to 46.3 we find this
use of the article again: 2א אֱלֹהִים. This time, however (because
the context here allows it, which it does not in the other cases),
the writer has made quite clear that there will be no
misunderstanding, by adding גָּדֶל אֱלֹהִים. Some commentators have
argued that 2א אֱלֹהִים is a secondary insertion. But if my reading
of the situation is correct, this is hardly likely. But did the
tradition which has been deliberately modified read 'originally
just 'I and El', or something more? I suggest that the construct
form 2א אֱלֹהִים also a part of the editorial expansion, so that the
underlying formula, before modification, would have read (or been
recited, assuming that we are speaking of an oral tradition)

2א אֱלֹהִים

I am El your father.
This is the formula which we have found to be present in Gen. 49.25 and we have in such language an ancient expression of the intimate relationship felt to exist between El and his worshippers, and in particular of course between El and a tribal eponym.

The development of the tradition then, as I see it, was as follows: an archaic phrase, by which the deity El indicated if not his physical paternity, then at least his intimate relationship with tribal eponyms who were originally quite distinct, was felt to be offensive by the tradents of the E material. They therefore neutralised the phrase, as all other references to El, by reading בֶּן לֵוֶן, or by putting an article before לֵוֶן. This also led, perhaps quite incidentally, to the emphasising of the theme of continuity, so that בֶּן לֵוֶן became fixed as בֶּן שֵׁל .

The J source, for which it was clearly not a standard expression, adopted it (Rje) and in the long run it came to be no more than an archaic equivalent to the later expression בֶּן לֵוֶן. Its continued singular form was justified by the individual character of the patriarchal narratives: national prehistory is presented in individual 'biographies'.

It seems to me that if we analyse the material as I have suggested, then a certain amount of confirmation can be gained on internal grounds. For example, there is no consistency in the use of 'the god of my father'. In 31.4-9, Jacob speaks first of 'the god of my father' (v. 5), but subsequently of God (יהוה) vv. 8, 9. On any view which insists that there is something distinctive about the former usage, how is the change to be explained? If my interpretation is followed, El is referred to in all three cases, and in the first instance with the additional statement of his relationship to Jacob ('my father'). There is no inconsistency however in the omission of this word from vv. 8 and 9.
It may be objected that the external evidence cited by scholars proves the existence of (gods of the father(s)) of various identities, and that therefore it is probable that they were found among the patriarchal forebears of Israel. The first part of this is reasonable, but not the inference that follows. Certainly none of the three sources in Genesis ever overtly acknowledges a polytheistic cult among the patriarchs; and while the implied monolatry they describe is suspicious in some respects, it is not altogether unreasonable to acknowledge that the actual cults referred to (of the various el-gods, of Yahweh, and of the so-called god of the father(s)) do in fact have a common basis. (If the patriarchal narratives in fact reflect the concerns and ideology of the monarchy, this is scarcely surprising.) And even if the phrase: 'the god of my/your/his father' be defended, we must admit that in the minds of those who preserved the tradition it could mean, at the most, the same god as worshipped by the previous patriarch, joined genealogically to those following. To my mind, it did not even mean that originally, being a somewhat artificial expansion of the textual tradition wherever it occurred.

There remains the problem, why E should be so antipathetic to the very name El? This is a problem to which we shall address ourselves in the final chapter.

I believe that the evidence I have given above is sufficient to prove the case for the identification of El as a moon-god in Ugarit. With regard to Israel, the issue is not quite so clear-cut. El Shaddai has a possible link with Sinni, but this is really no more than supposition. As for the other El forms in Genesis, we have been able to indicate a homogeneity of their evidence for characterising the god, although perhaps this does not itself prove my case.
However, the mythical traditions and theophany allusions which we have examined form a cumulative argument leading to the conclusion that at some time in the prehistory of Israelite monotheism we have a moon-god. How late this survived it is hard to say. We have seen that the patriarchal narratives are to be seen as reflecting the concerns of the early monarchy and even later, and this means that they must also by and large reflect the religion of the same period. Yet they offer nothing apart from the elements referred to, which is specifically lunar. It may be that the editorial rehandling of the traditions has tended to eliminate any primitive elements, but more likely that the nature of the narratives simply required no detailed characterization of the cult beyond its main themes of election, land-promise, and covenant. Ps. 19:1 gives an account of the hierogamy of El and his sun-goddess consort, however, which points to something of the older structure surviving into the monarchy.
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103 Cf. also Dabood, Psalms 111, pp. xxxix - xli.

104 'The god of my father - a study of patriarchal religion', JBR
    9 (1941), 155-8, 199f.

105 Cf. Ex. 6.2f (P). On the secondary insertion of Ex. 3.13-15
    in the narrative, see below ch. 8, section 6.

106 Cf. May, op. cit., 155f. Levy, op. cit., (JBR 110), 54f. Dougherty,
    op. cit., (CBQ 17), 151f.

107 J. Morgenstern, 'The Elohist narrative in Exodus 3.1-15', AJSL
    37, (1920-1), 242-262.

108 The following threefold formula is of course later;


110 May, op. cit., 157.

111 See the remarks of Soggin, Joshua, (ET 1978), 232ff.

112 On the secondary nature of the names incorporated in the
    formula, see Andersen, op. cit., 175ff. In fact of course, the
    continuity of tradition emphasized by the inclusion of old
    patriarchal names is already to be inferred from the phrase...
'the god of your father', it suggests some kind of historical process.

113 Op. cit., 17, nn. 43, 44. v. 42 also J, see n. 43.
114 BH3 appar.
115 Op. cit., 20. So also Skinner, Genesis, 512: 'the passage is in perfect harmony with the presentation of J'. (He then concludes that it may be an old - southern? - composition inserted in the combined JE). Cf. Von Rad, Genesis, 417: 'to consider J the author is impossible...'
116 'Genesis', Peake's Commentary, p. 176.
117 Von Rad, op. cit., 416.
118 In view of what follows, and my suggestion that this verse would have read originally 'may El...'; it is perhaps worth noting that similar blessings in the Ugaritic material are also closely associated with El - see CTA 6 iii 4-7, 10-13. For another verse passage with יְהֹוָּלָא see 48.20, where the same argument applies. See also ch. 4, n. 67 (pp. 206ff.).
119 We have noted the expression at 35.7 (E) where the immediately following יְנַבֵּשָׁ should probably be omitted. Excluding this example, (the omission of which is to be justified quite independently of my argument here), we have the following statistics for the use of references to the deity in the E material in Genesis; Yahweh (in passages generally taken to be E1) 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Shaddai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פֶּהַּג יִסְפָּא</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God of Abraham (יהוה)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc. (יהוה)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El of Israel (יהוה)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(יהוה , etc.)</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are problems with the text - see BH3 appar. It seems probable that the should be omitted - cf. 35.7; Elohim 59; God of - father 9 (including 31.53b). If we continue this analysis further
into the Pentateuch, the implications become quite significant, as we shall see below (ch. 8).
CHAPTER SIX

Yahweh.

The episode which lies behind the accounts of Ex. 3.1-20 (E) and 6.2-13 (P), concerning the theophany of Yahweh before Moses, is regarded as being of central importance to our understanding of Israelite religion. Moses is frequently regarded as the founder of Israelite religion, and through it, of Judaism. His importance is recognised from the earliest times in the traditions lying behind the Pentateuch, and each of the four pentateuchal sources expresses various stages in the development of dogma regarding his significance. 1

Because Moses is seen through the eyes of faith, as it were, we are faced with a body of tradition of such a nature that it is impossible to recover with any certainty the historical figure who undoubtedly lies behind it. A quest of the historical Moses is as elusive an enquiry as that of the historical Jesus.

In no respect is this impasse more frustrating and intriguing, than as regards the problems it raises concerning the origins of the cult of Yahweh. What connections, if any, are there between Yahweh and 'the god of your fathers' with whom he identifies himself in Ex. 3.15, and with El-Shaddai with whom he does the same in 6.3? And what are we to make of the fact that the J source, as generally recognised, knows of no new revelation of the divine name to Moses, but records instead that men worshipped Yahweh, under that name, from primeval times (Gen. 4.1, 26, J)? In this chapter we shall examine these and associated problems.
a) **The historical problem.**

In considering the problem of the origin of the cult of Yahweh, some kind of prehistory is to be taken for granted. Quite apart from the evidence which we shall be discussing below, it is highly improbable, on *a priori* grounds, that Yahwism should have begun in the time of Moses, or whenever it became an Israelite cult, without any antecedents. Yet while a continuity of sorts is recognized by sources E and P, the former identifying Yahweh with the god of the fathers and the latter with El Shaddai, they are both quite explicit that Moses is the first to hear the name Yahweh.

Since both traditions in fact contain evidence which belies this interpretation, we may reject it on historical grounds, while acknowledging that they are making a theological assertion: that a new relationship is beginning as Yahweh now adopts the Hebrew slaves as his people, and initiates his relationship with them in the redemptive acts of the Exodus and conquest. This is the core of Israel's belief, and the credal statement of Dt. 6.21-25 significantly begins with this. In comparison, such other oracles as Dt. 26.5-10, Jos. 24.2-13, and Psalms 105, which all mention elements in the patriarchal tradition, give the appearance of being later expansions on the theme. A distinction is to be made between these passages, which make no reference at all to the events on Mt. Sinai, and passages which do refer to Yahweh's coming from Sinai (e.g. Dt. 33.2, etc.), where there is a corresponding conspicuous absence of any reference to the Exodus-conquest tradition. Since we have seen that the latter type of passage reflects southern (Judahite) traditions, it follows that these exodus allusions constitute the tradition of another group. It is probable that it is the tradition, in particular, of the Joseph
tribes, who undoubtedly constituted the core of the emigrant group(s) from Egypt who, (traditionally) under Joshua, irrupted perhaps in the late 13th century into Palestine from the south-east. This matter itself is of course exceedingly complex, and need not concern us here. The Joseph tribes appear to have become the dominant political force in the north (frequently called Ephraim, Manasseh, Joseph) and so their particular traditional past would naturally come to be accepted as the common past of all giving allegiance to the federation they dominated. So in effect, it became a 'northern tradition'.

The E and J sources of the Pentateuch are generally agreed to represent broadly northern and southern traditions respectively, though of course they do as usually isolated reflect a considerable amount of early borrowing both ways. It is the E document which represents the primary source of the tradition of a new departure under Moses, claiming that it was to Moses that Yahweh first made himself known; and it was the northern tribes, who produced it, who claimed in their credal formulae to have come from Egypt. On the other hand, the J document speaks of a primaeval worship of Yahweh going back to antediluvian times, and at the same time does not regard its version of the theophany of Yahweh to Moses as a first revelation of the divine name.

b) The 'Kenite hypothesis'.

A large number of scholars subscribe to the view that Moses first came into contact with the cult of Yahweh as a result of his contact with the tribe into which he married in Midian (whence it should perhaps be called the Midianite hypothesis). According to Ex. 3.1, Moses was tending the flock of his father-in-law the priest of Amalekite tribes. In any case it is that the Kenite was
father-in-law Jethro, priest of Midian, at the time of Yahweh's appearance to him. Later in chapter 18 (E) the refugee Hebrews under Moses meet with Jethro again and the latter offers sacrifices (presumably to Yahweh, in the composite tradition. However, v.12 reads 'God' — נַחֲלָה — and this does raise a considerable problem as we shall see). This has been understood to indicate that Jethro must have already been a worshipper of Yahweh, in order to be able to officiate, and that therefore Yahweh was a Midianite god whose cult Moses adopted.7

In all the pentateuchal references, the people with whom Moses mixed were Midianites. In view of later political struggles with the Midianites, we may give some credence to this tradition of contact (i.e., we might expect it to be suppressed, but not invented). In all E references (Ex.3.1, 4.18, and 18 passim) Moses' father-in-law is Jethro, the priest of Midian. In J references, he is either Reuel, priest of Midian (Ex.2.18, J) or Hobab (Num.10.29, J, Jg.1.16, 4.11). It is only the passages in Judges, difficult to date and to relate to the rest of our material on Moses, which even mention the Kenites. It seems to me that the evidence does not really allow any firm conclusion about the relationship of Midianites and Kenites. Were they two distinct tribal groups, or was one a part of the other group, or does 'Kenites' simply mean metal-workers, a general term covering people from various tribes, including Midianites?9

The 'Midianite hypothesis' assumes that the Midianites were worshippers of Yahweh; but as Howinckel remarks, with regard to both them and the Kenites (see below) there is no need to assume that either group (if they are distinct) had the monopoly of Yahweh worship. The cult was shared, according to Howinckel, by all north Sinaitic tribes.10 I.Lewy also says that the Kenites and
related tribes worshipped Yahu or Yahweh. 11

ii) Regarding Cain.

Quite independent of the tradition concerning the 'new departure' of the cult of Yahweh under Moses, we have within the pentateuchal source J the tradition that the worship of Yahweh goes back into the remote past. In Gen. 4.26b we read that men then began to invoke the name Yahweh. In the text as we have it, this appears to refer to Enosh, who is the immediate antecedent. Since his name means 'man', he may have been a first man, (later subordinated to Adam), in which case the cult of Yahweh goes back to man's beginnings. 12

But a very ingenious theory has been proposed by I. Lewy. 13 According to this, Gen. 4.26b has been displaced from following 4.16. 14 This makes Cain the first invoker of Yahweh, not Enosh. Cain of course is the eponym of the Kenites, and we would expect them, on the supposition that they were Yahweh-worshippers, to claim that they derived their cult from their ancestor. As a basis for this Lewy argues that Enosh in his present genealogical position is insignificant, and so hardly likely to be singled out in this way 15 and that anyway 4.25, 26a is to be attributed to P (he calls this source the 'Priestly Southern Elohist') since Adam is used as a proper name ( in P's fashion 5.1) and not as a common noun ( in J: 4.1). 16 I think this may be substantially correct.

Whatever view is taken of Gen. 4.26b, there remains the problem of 4.1, in which Eve says 'I have begotten a man with (the help of?) Yahweh'.

The produces a syntactical problem and the critical one. How can Cain's mother invoke Yahweh when Cain is later
said to be the first to do so? Lewy's answer is to emend the phrase to 'I have got a man and am still living'.

This is attractive. But we may consider an alternative. Cain, as the eponymous ancestor of all the Kenites, may have been originally considered by them to be the first man. Now Eve's title of 'mother of all being' (Gen. 3.20) would make a close parallel in its thought to Adah's Ugaritic title ḥm. Although the divine plane is meant there, the overall idea seems to be of 'total motherhood'. Cf. El's titles ply ה, bny bnw, ab ada, and Anat's title ybr. Skinner suggested that Eve was originally a serpent goddess, and if this was so, then in the oldest version of the story, Eve may have been the wife of Yahweh, and between them they would have begotten Cain, the primal man. The phrase which Lewy considers very awkward would mean just this: 'with Yahweh (as my husband)'.

iii) The nature of Kenite religion.

Are we in a position to characterise Kenite religion at all? We have already considered various aspects of Yahwism which lead us to the possibility, if my argumentation is cogent, that Yahweh was originally a moon-god. Can we say anything more in the present context?

We may remark at once that there is nothing inherently unlikely in such an interpretation, and in view of the stress laid on the pastoralist-nomadic existence of the Kenites (Gen. 4.16) we may say that it is indeed quite probable. There are other evidences too. As smiths the Kenites would be particularly sensitive to the relationship of their trade (dealing with fires and molten metal) to their cult. Out of this rise two points. Firstly the ban on
molten images is probably of Kenite origin. Secondly, it is significant that prohibitions on the use of fire are linked to the Sabbath. This may have been originally linked to the quarter-phases of the moon, and we have two passages (both P, but perhaps fairly old, reflecting a southern tradition and therefore possibly Kenite ideology) which are significant. In Ex. 35.3 a fire is forbidden on the Sabbath. It appears to be a domestic fire, but the ban on work (v.2) covers the melting fires. Then in Num. 15 32-36 we have the episode of the stoning of a man caught gathering firewood.

The enemy of Israel in the cycle of Gideon stories was a confederacy of Midianite chieftains (Jg. 6.33, 8.3) and it is of interest that when Gideon destroys them, he removes crescents (מָרָּמָשׁ) from round their camels' (8.21) and from their chieftains' (kings') necks (8.26) as a part of the booty. It is unlikely that these were merely ornamental. Most probably they had at least some cultic significance, and were probably emblematic of the protective power of the moon-god. However, if the Midianites and Kenites were distinct, this is irrelevant to the question of the Kenite cult.

A third piece of evidence brings us back to the question of Eve as possibly a serpent goddess. Rothenburg suggested a possible link between the bronze serpent found in the tent sanctuary of Timna and the narrative of the serpent in the wilderness. It is possible that the Midianites worshipped the sun (perhaps identified here with Hathor, the sky-goddess?) as the consort of their chief god, who would therefore most probably be the moon-god. Eve may have been this consort (see above) represented in serpentine form. Certainly a connection of some kind is to be made between the
sun-goddess and serpents, as is evident from RS 24.244\textsuperscript{30} from Ugarit. We also have the title dt bṭn — 'she of the serpent' — used of Aṣerah in the Sinaitic inscriptions.\textsuperscript{31} If then we have the sun-goddess worshipped in the area, and at the time, of the pre-settlement wilderness wandering of Israel, it is likely that the moon-god is also present.

None of these three points is by itself compelling, and their cumulative force to some extent depends upon the supposed link between the Midianites and the Kenites. In that they all involve a conjectural interpretation they cannot be used to further our argument. However, if it be regarded as proven on other grounds, the suggested interpretations would gain in force.

iv) The limitations of the 'Kenite Hypothesis'.

We have examined certain biblical texts which preserve a southern tradition of the coming of Yahweh from Sinai in a theophany (perhaps to be linked to a cultic procession). In discussing Jg.5.5 I suggested that the overloading of divine names may require the treatment of the repeated מָטָה as an identifying gloss\textsuperscript{32} (cf. Ps.68 9 (ENA 8) where the parallel MT reads מָטָה twice instead of מָטָה).

We also drew attention to the fact that in Ex.24.9-11 in what we suggested was a pre-Israelite theophany tradition,\textsuperscript{33} the name Yahweh is not used. Perhaps too in Dt.33.2 the מָטָה is an editorial emendation of an earlier name. It is possible that in these passages we have references to a tradition of the theophany on Mt.Sinai of a moon-god who is only later identified with Yahweh.

In the case of Ps.68 we must on this basis argue for a composite work, if we read the phrase לֹֽאֵל וֶאַֽלָּמֶּת 'in Yah rejoice' in v.5 (ENA 4). But when did the people who preserved these traditions, presumably their ancestral cultic traditions, and therefore
'fixing' them in the area of Sinai for some generations before their settlement in Canaan, adopt Yahweh as their god and identify him with 'the Lord of Sinai'? Was it at some tribal gathering such as is described in Jos. 24, at Shechem, or was that account a) limited to the northern tribes federating with those arriving from Egypt, and /or b) in any case a cult legend rather than an historical occasion? On account of the rarity of the Yah/Yo/Yeho element in Israelite theophoric names before the tenth century it is tempting to say that there was in fact no Yahwism at all in Palestine until the arrival of the Joseph tribes and perhaps not until later. But this would then leave us with the problem of how the traditions regarding Cain and his descendants and cult become incorporated into the J source-material. Weck's answer is that it was the tribe of Judah that was responsible for bringing Yahwism into Canaan, and this seems reasonable, although we need not accept the whole of Weck's case, which includes Moses being himself a southerner. The Leah grouping of Tribes as a whole was scarcely responsible, although other elements within it may have had something to do with the provenance of such passages as Ex. 24.9-11 (later incorporated into 2), Dt. 33.2, Jg. 5.4.5 and Ps. 68.5ff. (EYV 4ff).

We shall argue below in ch. 8 that the people who reached Palestine from Egypt (those who originated the exodus tradition) did not in fact worship Yahweh.

The Kenite cult of Yahweh, based on the tradition of Gen. 4, seems incontrovertible. The Midianite tradition is not nearly so clear cut. We shall see a particularly awkward feature in Ex. 18 in ch. 8 below, which in my view casts serious doubt on the Midianite hypothesis, while leaving the Kenite tradition intact. If we could identify the two peoples beyond doubt, the Midianite problem might recede, but as the evidence stands, it seems that by referring
to the Midianite hypothesis as the 'Kenite hypothesis,' scholars have assumed an identity rather than demonstrated it, and also assumed without demonstration that Gen. 4 provides corroboration for theories developed about Ex. 3 and 18. So while there are perhaps grounds for speaking of the Kenite Yahweh as a moon-god, it would be rather precipitate to use this directly in a discussion of the tradition of the revelation to Moses. The Kenites appear to have been the direct mediators of Yahweh (and possibly at first to the tribe of Judah). However, we shall see that the widely accepted view that Moses became a Yahwist through contact with the Midianites (≠ Kenites) is without foundation.

c) Etymology.

Although we must ultimately look to factors other than etymologies in order to ascertain the nature and function of any deity in the ancient Near East, we frequently do find that an etymological line of inquiry can help. In many cases, of course, the meaning of a divine name is transparently the key to his function, as with Yarihiu, Mot, Yam, Sapu, Samaš, and so on. In other instances, the name (or epithet) does provide theological information though of a degree limited by the relative certainty or doubt regarding the etymology. We have seen something of this with Cattar/Inšar, and Āserah, while with El, an etymological investigation does not appear to lead very far. With the divine name Yahweh the problem is compounded by the sheer volume of the suggestions made. It would be impossible to cover all the individual explanations offered, but I shall say something of a fairly representative number. To deal with this simply in chronological sequence would add to the confusion, and so we shall list them thematically.
Quite apart from the voluminous discussion of etymology, there is the related question of the original form or forms of the name. Some favour the tetragrammaton, others the short forms (or one of them) found in theophoric names. The conclusions reached on this matter must obviously affect judgments on etymology. Some discussion is vitiated simply because scholars have failed to offer any justification for accepting one or the other form as primary—thus leaving a question mark over all they offer. We shall look at suggestions, firstly for the tetragrammaton, and then for the short forms.

1) **The form הוהי**.

Most scholars who start from the presupposition that הוהי is the original form of the divine name take it to be a verbal form of some sort.

1) Miscellaneous views.

Goitein argued that the name is derived from the Arabic hāw, the equivalent of Hebrew הוהי, with the sense of 'to love passionately, jealously'. He pointed to Hos.12.6 and Ex.34.14 as illustrating his case. He also offered a reconstruction of Ex.3.14 to read הוהי יִּתְנַח 'I shall passionately love whom I love'.

There is nothing implausible about the linguistic arguments Goitein uses unless one argues that הוהי in his sense requires an א, but his explanation of texts cited does not appear to be convincing. More importantly, he began from the presupposition that from Mosaic times Yahwism was monotheistic, and that 'jealousy' was an intrinsic characteristic of Yahweh. Both are matters of some debate, and I myself believe neither to be true. He agreed however that before Moses, Yahweh was known as Yh, Yw, because these are implausible as contractions, and must therefore be older forms.
Some scholars have looked to the verb יַהֲקָם meaning 'to blow', referring to Yahweh's (alleged) function as a storm-god, or to the homonym יִהְקָם meaning 'to fall'. Bowman looked to the Ugaritic word ḫt, of which he suggested the verbal radical is *ḥwv (> in Hebrew *ḥawḥ). Köhler suggested that we have in the tetragrammaton a substantive based on the √ הוה with preformative, meaning 'being, existence'. All these are possibilities, but have not gained wide acceptance. The ultimate argument against them is that which applies to יהוה in principle; that it is not the oldest form of the name.

2) The name deriving from יהוה (< *hwh/y) 'to be'.

Probably the most widely accepted solution to the problem of the tetragrammaton is to take it as a part of the verb 'to be'. Obermann drew attention to the Phoenician participial form (causative) with preformative י, occurring in the Karatepe inscription, and suggested that this is the form here, as preserved also in the name of the temple pillar 'Yachin'. He took it as a nomen agentis, which he rendered 'sustainer'. More commonly, it is taken to be a finite form of the verb, usually 3rd person masculine singular hiphil. This last interpretation, not originated by Albright, but vigorously argued by him over half a century, has probably been the most influential.

According to the hiphil interpretation, the name means 'he causes to be/come into existence/exist'. This view has been attacked on the grounds that it represents too sophisticated and philosophical a belief among pastoralist peoples. I am not sure that such an objection can be sustained completely, because much religious thought at all levels is, even if unconsciously, grappling with such problems in myths and other forms of religious
utterance. However, the theory presupposes that the verb חָּק כֻּנָּן (שַׁחַק כֻּנָּן) has an absolute, ontological use. This has been argued by Conard, whose view we shall consider below, but his arguments have been rejected. Besides, there are perfectly normal verbs with the sense of creation which we might expect to be used if this were the idea to be communicated. Hurtonen, Abba and Kosmala argue that the hiphil of חָּק כֻּנָּן does not exist, although this could be on the basis of its (prior?) use in this one context.

Lowinckel argued that a finite verbal form, as alleged here, is unparalleled in divine names; its only use is as a hypocoristic personal name, and implies a longer form, of the sort other scholars have noted in particular in Amorite names. Hyatt presented a rather bizarre form of the argument, arguing that the divine name is indeed a hypocoristic of a personal name of the form יַהַוֶּ-ב-ה where ב is itself a personal name, in fact, he suggests, as ancestor of Moses. But this is nonsense, since the element ב could in a name of this form be only a divine name (as in the Amorite names יַהַוֹל-דָגָן, יַהַוֹל-א-ן (-א), etc.), and not a personal name. Besides, for a deity to be named after a person (as distinct from being called 'B's god', as in the traditional view of the 'god of the fathers') is quite unprecedented, unless one argues that the person is in fact deified.

The evidence of the Amorite names has been claimed in support of the hiphil hypothesis by Cross. He lists the following forms: יָשָׁב-וָי-דִינִּי, לָשָׁב-וָי-בָּ-לו, לָשָׁב-וָי-דִינִּי, לָשׁ-וָי-בָּ-לִי-לִי-קֻי, יָשָׁב-וָי-דִינִּי, and יָשָׁב-וָי-דִינִּי. From Hutton's list we may add the following: יָשָׁב-וָי, יָשָׁב-וָי-נָה-שֵׁ, יָשָׁב-וָי-א-ן, לָשׁ-וָי-בָּ-לִי-לִי-קֻי, יָשָׁב-וָי-א-ן, יָשָׁב-וָי-דִּינִּי, לָשׁ-וָי-דִּינִּי, etc. The initial ל may represent an assonervative. The inflexibility of the syllabic script, which
cannot represent any guttural other than h, and with apparently no consistency in its solutions to the problem means that Yahu-ah-wa and Yahu-wa may either be variants of the same verbal form (either hw/y y/h 'to live' or hw/y y/h 'to be') or representations of the two verbs, though which is which it is difficult to say with certainty. It seems to me that both forms probably represent the verb hw/y y/h 'to live', and are also to be taken as causatives. If this be so (and again, there is no certainty) then the names would mean 'May N. (a deity) give life', 'N. gives life', or something similar. Two problems arise out of this kind of interpretation for the etymology of Yahweh. Firstly, other divine names are involved besides AN, DINGIR, and El (which may represent the same deity). Certainly Na-li-ku 'the king' can be a title of El, but is also found for other deities. Likewise, Na-lu/ Ba-ab-ku ('lord') could possibly indicate El, but we cannot be sure. Na-al ('prince') almost certainly does not do so, and Dagan is patently out of the question. Secondly, this interpretation seems to gloss over the problem of h > h. If the two are to be taken as cognate, then at least the name 'Yahweh as 'he who gives life' is better than Yahweh as 'he who causes to be'; it gives the creative role without the abstraction. Finet's argument, that the names represent a statement of the identity of Yahweh with El, Dagan etc., is quite unconvincing. Personal names may reflect religious devotional statements but hardly theological statements of this kind. The resort to such forms as Ya'agob-El and Yishaq-El proves nothing either.

There are also more general objections to this whole approach. The Amorite evidence consists of personal names. Yet the (hypothetical) form Yahweh-il of which Yahweh is supposed to be
a shortened version would need to be a divine name, not a personal name. The fact that a personal name of this form exists proves nothing. Cross pointed to a divine name from Mari of the form \((\text{DINGIR}) \text{Yakrub-il} \) 'the god(om El) blesses'. 65 'Fortunately', he remarks, 'there can be no doubt that Yakrub-Il is a divine name in view of its context in Mari texts and from the use of the DINGIR sign as determinative'. This may appear to establish in principle this kind of structure for a divine name, but it seems to me that it hardly proves that such a structure lies behind the tetragrammaton, because it is in any case a different verb; the hiphil in the case of Ya(h)wi-il is not in fact the same verb as that read in Yahweh, and the only analogues of Yahweh in the Mari names (Ya-wi, Ya-ab-wi, etc.) are theophoric and not divine. And again, any link at all between the two fields of evidence (Mari and the Bible) requires to be established, not taken for granted.

The argument also presupposes that the divine name Yahweh (as distinct from Yah, Yahn, etc.) goes back into the second millennium. Cross confidently asserted that it is 'primitive', 66 but this is simply a guess. He referred to the Meshal stele (but this is 9th century) and to an Egyptian reference to \(\text{y-h-x} \) (but this is a place name and not necessarily connected in any way). Another question that has not to my knowledge been asked is: how does this 'Amorite hypothesis' square with the 'Midianite/Kenite hypothesis'? Is it intended to be an alternative, or are the latter to be lumped together in that gloriously vague movement of 'nomads' in the second millennium which so many scholars are so certain about?

Thompson has shown how flimsy are the reconstructions of ethnic movements at this time, at least with regard to details, and the ethnic as distinct from the linguistic content of such movements. It seems to me that we know the ethnic movements insufficiently to
make any definite claims in this area.

The form Yahweh has also been interpreted as a verbal form (G-form). Von Soden's argument for this view is briefly as follows. Having accepted that Yahweh is the oldest form and rejected the hiphil and other interpretations, he suggests that the biblical view (which understood by Ex. 31:14) is the only tenable one. It is not however to be understood in an ontological sense. Rather must the meaning 'He is' (ex ist) be understood in keeping with ancient Oriental (ancient Semitic) conceptions. These can be discerned in the Akkadian name-form Ibaāni-ilu and its Old Canaanite (Amorite) equivalent Jahši-ilu, which Von Soden takes to be 'thanksgiving names' (Danknamen) to be understood as meaning that the god N. has demonstrated his power, and presumably therefore his being, in the birth of the child. The name giver affirms his gratitude for the power and goodness of his god, often manifested in his life and reckons, on the basis of this, that it will also be further manifested.

This sense can be transferred from the context of theophoric names to that of the divine name, so that Yahweh is the one who is, who 'proves himself', by his work in creation and in history. Von Soden asks why a non-Hebrew root should be used for the name of Israel's god, and argues that it is manifestly older than its use in Israel, being adopted from the Kenite-Midianite cult. The only ancient incidence of Yhwh in the Old Testament is Isaac's blessing of Esau (Gen. 27.29) which may come from an Edomite source, indicating the presence of the form in precisely the geographical location indicated by the Kenite-Midianite hypothesis. He then goes on to discuss the theological content of the name; the imperfect form preserved in the name alone could express the 'prefiguring stative' sense in which the god's activity was always premissory.
The Hebrew forms of the verbs were not so clear as the *yahweh* form. It is also a divine name which does not limit the qualities of its bearer (as other names must by virtue of delineating the character of the deity in question). *Ad* and other *Ad*-names were localised by tradition,* Alochond was used of other gods; *Yahweh* alone did not limit and was able to express the universality of the conception of God developed in Israel. It is not in fact a name at all but a substitute form of the type later exemplified in Israelite religion and Judaism, (ם"ת, ניחוח etc.).

At first sight this is an attractive view, but it seems to me that at every turn it begins the question. We have already argued that the Ad names, as theophoric personal names, cannot be taken as evidence for the interpretation of a divine name. We have also taken the alternative view to Von Soden's, that the verb 'to be' is not at issue here. And even if it were, the argument just mentioned applies — we cannot simply jump from theophoric names to divine ones. The theological exegesis of the name, implicitly peculiar to Israel, seems to me to be vitiated by his admission that we do not know the name of the *Adiantite* deity to whom the element *yahweh*-was attached. This suggests either that he did not exist anyway (because he becomes at the critical moment very elusive!) or that perhaps he was already known simply as Yahweh, in which case the Israelite contribution becomes after all unoriginal. Even the element *yahweh* in a hypothetical *Adiantite* divine name whether or not a further element — N was once present, already suggests that the kernel of the Israelite conception was already present.

The supposed *Adiantite* basis of Gen.27.29 seems in any case rather unlikely, since it records Jacob's appropriation of Isaac's blessing. At any rate, it is scarcely a sufficient step in the argument. On the theological argument, there is no evidence that Yahweh in the
early period was understood in either a universalist or implicitly monothestic fashion, and plenty of evidence to the contrary, so that it seems a dubious procedure to use the supposed (or at any rate probably later) theological understanding of the name as the basis for its fundamental (i.e. earliest) meaning. Certainly Ex.3.12-15 plays on the theme of the 'Cne who is', whatever exactly is meant, but this can hardly be taken as going back to the origins of Yahwism.

The greatest weakness in Von Soden's approach, as in that of all those so far discussed is the assumption that Yahweh is the oldest form of the name. This seems most unlikely. We have referred to the extra-biblical incidences to the name. The earliest that is beyond dispute is the 9th century Mesha inscription. The earliest incontrovertible biblical evidence comes from the 10th century, and we have seen that in the earlier passages where it appears, it is not beyond suspicion. Whatever position is taken on the antiquity of the name's first appearance, the vocalisation of it as Yahweh is a matter of considerable doubt. Ex.3.12-15 can scarcely be cited as evidence, since there are already two consonantal alterations from סינ to יְהֹוָ֖י and to that the similarity must therefore consist in the similar vocalisation would lead to Yahweh or Yihweh. The only other serious evidence is the spptuqntial forms but these can only reflect the contemporary evidence of the 3rd century if they even do that.

Most important as evidence for this problem, is the use of the divine name in Israelite theophoric names. In these, Yahweh never appears. To allege that the forms Яה, יהוה, -yah and -yahu which do appear, are abbreviations of the longer form, is to beg the question. No evidence of abbreviated forms of other divine names in this context is ever brought forward as a parallel.
ii) The short forms.

1) The Ugaritic form Yw.

In the AB cycle there is a passage which mentions a divine figure called Yw. The name occurs only once, and we have no means of determining its vocable value. As all too often in Ugaritic studies there have been those who have been only too glad to find links (real or imagined) between the Ugarit texts and the Old Testament, and Dussaud identified the deity Yw as the prototype of Yahweh on the basis of the form - which occurs in Israelite names (Jochebed, Joab, Joram, etc.). It is worth quoting the relevant passage, to see just what can be made of it:

And the Merciful, god of compassion replies the name of my son is Yw il...

and he pronounces the name 'Sea'...

they answer... (?) you shall be proclaimed 'Lord'...

I am the Merciful, god [of compassion]

over my hands(?) I have pronounced your name: 'the beloved of E[...]

Admittedly the tablet has suffered considerable mutilation, but at this point the gist is sufficiently clear for it to be beyond doubt that Yam is addressed throughout. He is to be called Yw,
whatever that means, aden ('lord'), and adad il ('beloved of El'). These are titles of Yam, and so Yw can be explained in two ways. Either it may be regarded as a language cundi for Ym or more probably, we should see in it some kind of divine title of the same kind as the others mentioned. Quite apart from the context requiring the identification of Yw and Yam, mythological considerations preclude any kind of direct association of Yw with an early form of Yahweh. Yw (as Yam) is the son of El; but Yahweh, in Judah, is identified with El, not as his son. This fact also rules out the suggestion of MacLaurin that Yahweh and Yam should be equated.

2) **The Babylonian 'Yau'.**

Hurtomen takes seriously the LXX practice of representing the tetragrammaton of LT by אדאכ and suggests that it may be linked to the problematic Yau/Yau(tu) which occurs in some Akkadian names. Earlier commentators had suggested that it was a term meaning 'Lord' or in the feminine form 'Lady'. But upon close examination it appears to be nothing more than a possessive (איה) meaning 'mine', so that its use in theophoric names such as yaau-ilu refers only to the close relationship claimed between the named person and a deity. Any implied link between Ugaritic Yw and Akkadian איה is obviously ruled out. Even if one accepts Hurtomen's explanation of the lexicographical list on tablet BM 93035, a link would still have to be demonstrated, as with the argument based on Mari names mentioned above, between the Amorite and Midianite/Kenite milieux.

3) **The pronoun איה as the basis.**

This has been suggested by Nowickel and Konmala and is discussed by MacLaurin. I am not at all convinced that it is the primary source of the name, but there is of course no reason why the
various passages cited in this context should not involve
cassonances on the forms Yahu, Yahweh (rather than puns, as
J. MacLaurin suggests). If this is the case, then it may be significant
for the strong value of the first י, which in the form יי is
always pointed with אָמַר ק, as though to emphasise its consonantal
value, as distinct from any value as a mere mater lectionis.

4) Other short forms.

The element יִי has also been construed as a participle of
יִי יי. H. Nowinckel thinks of the יִי element in the name as an
expletive(!), 'Oh!... ', and so does Driver. Both writers
consider that the name originated as a cultic cry ('Oh, he!') and
cite the Greek titles Dionysus, θαυτος and Δυστος as parallels.
Astour however has argued convincingly that however opaque these
epithets had become, they originally had a very definite meaning.
So the analogy is baseless. Neither of these approaches carries
conviction.

5) The divine name as a foreign loan-word.

From time to time scholars have suggested a non-Semitic origin
for the divine name. R. Noelle suggested that the
name of Ea, the Sumerian deity, is the source. J. Levy suggested a
Hurrian origin, the source being ia, iau-tu 'le dieu - divin',
but he has found no support. If anything the word looks suspiciously
like the (Amorite?) Iau mentioned above.

Littmann suggested the Indo-European Dyaus,
while Krozy gave a Dravidian origin, on the basis of his views on
the Indus Valley script.

A more plausible suggestion, based on Bohairic Ιό = moon,
was made in the mid-nineteenth century by Routh, and developed with
reference to the Egyptian 30 by Walker. Leaving aside the lateral developments he traces, we have this theoretical evolution:

\[
\text{I} \rightarrow \text{II} (U.K.) > \text{IV (H.K.)} > \text{Yh (Kenite, Heb.)} \rightarrow \text{Yh (Amorite)}.
\]

This view has been attacked on linguistic grounds by Vergote, who notes that much of Walker's theory depends on unsupported assumptions and even inaccuracies. Apart from Vergote's arguments, there are three weaknesses in Walker's theory. Firstly it requires that the Amorite Yh be later than any of the texts in which it in fact appears; secondly it disallows the existence of Kenite (for which read Midianite?) Yah before the New Kingdom (which would need to be proved), and thirdly, the further development of his theory (e.g. Yaww = 'I am') depends upon Ex. 3.14 being Mosaic in origin. This, we shall see below, is most unlikely.

It looks therefore as though every serious explanation of the divine name is untenable, and therefore we are left in an unsatisfactory position as with El. However, we have made a case for the so-called shorter forms being older than the tetragrammaton, so that explanations based on this, however theologically profound, in no way determine its etymological significance.


The view which we have discussed above, that the hiphil form of the verb ח"י lies behind the name Yahweh, is closely bound up with another problem, that of the treatment of Ex. 3.13-15. There has, to my mind, been a certain confusion here, due to a failure by some scholars to distinguish between two matters which should really be dealt with separately: firstly, the source-critical question, and secondly the exegetical one. To deal with the second, while ignoring the first simply vitiates arguments.

1). The source-critical problem.

The passage is generally agreed to belong to the E source.
However, it does not appear to be homogenous, and various attempts have been made to give an account of subsequent glosses and expansions of the text. It reads in full as follows:

v. 13 Then Moses said to God, 'I am to go, then, to the sons of Israel and say to them, 'The God of your fathers has sent me to you'. But if they ask me what his name is, what am I to tell them?'

v. 14 And God said to Moses, 'I am who I am (יהוה יְהוָה). This', he added 'is what you must say to the sons of Israel: 'I am(יהוה) has sent me to you'.

v. 15 And God also said to Moses, 'You are to say to the sons of Israel: 'Yahweh, the god of your fathers, the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac, and the god of Jacob, has sent me to you'. This is my name for all times; by this name I shall be invoked for all generations to come'. (JB)

Stalker takes vv. 13, 14 to be part of the original E tradition, with v. 15 the later addition of the redactor of J and E (Rje). 108

According to this interpretation, the problematic vv. 14 is Mosaic, or at least a very early tradition regarding the revelation and meaning of the divine name. This is not of course impossible, and accords with the widespread view which takes Moses to be the 'founder' in some sense at least, of the distinctive element in Israelite religion. Thus for Albright and his school, accepting the hiphil explanation of the divine name, this passage in the key to that explanation, and would perhaps even be regarded as being as old as the first revelation of the name. But of course even taking the verse as original, it can be argued that it is already dependent upon generations if not centuries of reflection upon both the role
of Moses and the revelation and significance of the name.

The majority of scholars take a different line. Noting that the account as it stands gives three distinct answers to the question of v.13, they argue that v.15 is the original, straightforward answer to the question. Even in v.15, the phrase, "the god of your fathers, the god of Abraham...Jacob" is generally regarded as an addition to the oldest form of the tradition. More importantly, v.14 is taken to be secondary, perhaps being incorporated in two stages, first 14a, and later 14b. Mögenstern thinks that while the verse is secondary, it is still due to the Elohist writer; Fohrer says that it is impossible to tell whether the addition (in two stages) goes back to E or to a later hand, while Hyatt dates v.14a to the seventh or sixth century, and v.14b a little later.

Hyatt's rather late dating could be defended on the grounds that the kind of theological idea underlying v.14a is unparalleled in any pre-exilic literature, and yet admirably fits the period of the exile, when the message of the statement would be both particularly relevant and also consonant with the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah. Certainly, if the passage is to be understood as having any kind of monotheistic sense, it would be hard to defend any earlier date. The point of this in the context of our broader discussion is that the verse cannot reasonably be used as evidence for the original meaning of the name or character of Yahweh, nor should it be regarded as of much use in a treatment of such new ideas as Moses may have introduced into the cult of Yahweh.

2) The exegetical problem.

My remarks above will already indicate that I do not consider the meaning of v.14a of any importance with regard to the solution of the problems attending either the original nature of Yahwism or
the role of Moses. I think that Hyatt's dating of the verse is likely to be correct, and that it reflects the maturity of the development of Yahwism from monolatry to monotheism. Of the various attempts to solve the problem, Schild's is at first sight the most attractive. He analysed the use of 'I am' in the introduction of relative clauses and showed that if certain conditions were fulfilled, which were, he suggested, in Ex. 3.14, then the verb in the predicate was always in the same person as the subject. In translation: it should be read not 'I am that/who I am' etc., with implications of evasiveness or vagueness, on Yahweh's part, but simply 'I am the one who is'. Schild's argument has been rejected however by Albrektson, who points out that the main clause in the sentence type under consideration must be a 'nominal clause' (i.e. a noun-clause), and that the expression in Ex. 3.14 does not fit this requirement. Albrektson says that we must return to the traditional rendering 'I am who I am', though he recognises that this still leaves us with the problem of how to interpret it, which Schild's argument had tried to solve.

We shall return to Ex. 3 below, and offer another solution to the source-critical problem of the E material.

4) Was Yahweh a moon-god?

I believe that in the foregoing pages I have been able to demonstrate the original lunar character of the West Semitic god El, from the evidence of Ugaritic texts CTa 12 and 23, and from Ps. 19. It seems to be an obvious inference too from certain elements in the patriarchal traditions, early Israelite cultic practice - where El was undoubtedly the chief deity among the precursors of the twelve, and there was a strong linking function, get
historical Israel — and from theophany traditions, where those in
Genesis do not deal with Yahweh in the original tradition. In
these cases it is of course possible that it is the Yahwistic
background on which the tradition draws, but we shall see later
that this is highly unlikely. Now it is generally held that in the
time of David, El (Elyon) of Jerusalem was identified with Yahweh,
and the theology of the two deities coalesced in the cult of the
kingdom of Judah. We shall look at this development in the next
chapter. On the basis of the identification, one might argue that
Yahweh was possibly also a moon-god. However, such a view has not
been widespread, receives little if any attention in general
treatments of Israelite religion, and is only one among many
suggested roles for Yahweh.

Several different roles have been claimed. We have seen in
discussing the etymological problem that he has been seen as a
storm-god. This appears to be the view of Gray, 119 Erdmann, 120
and Meek. 121 Meek in particular refers to the theophany traditions
we have discussed above, and to the title מִקְבָּחַלְבִּセンター in Ps. 68.5
'EVV 4) in support of this view. But I have given reasons above
why the usual interpretation ('Rider of the clouds') should be
rejected: It is quite misleading to allege functional and other
parallels between Yahweh and Ba'al Hadad. The identification of
the rival deity involved in the contest on Mt. Carmel (1 K. 18) as
Hadad may be argued to support the storm-god view. Yahweh is the
ture author of the rains — the true storm-god. But we have seen 122
that this identification is by no means certain. However, in
rejecting the view that Yahweh was 'originally a storm-god' we do
not need to be too extre...
his many other wide-ranging functions, as god of plague and drought, as god of war (see below) and so on, are explicable as expressions of the universal conception of Yahweh which undoubtedly grew up in pre-exilic Israel, which saw him as the author of all Israel's weal and woe. In passages such as 1 K.18.45 (the rain), 1 K.17.1 (the drought preceding it) 2 S.24.13 (a choice of famine, military disaster or pestilence), it is wrong to seize upon these divine activities as the characteristic roles of Yahweh (as pestilence is of Resheph, or war of Anat), for they are the natural means by which the divine blessing or curse operates in Israel; they point beyond themselves to a much more broadly-based conception of the deity. Furthermore, since these images arise from within Israel's historical experience, they can scarcely be taken as evidence for the prehistoric conception we are trying to reconstruct. It is also worth remarking here that even such characterisations of Da'el Hadad, Resheph or Anat as we have mentioned do not do full justice to the natures of these deities, but illustrate only one (albeit dominant) facet of their character.

Yahweh has also been called (originally) a war-god. Meek takes this to be an early function as well as the storm, as do Smend, Miller, and Seale. There is obviously a considerable amount of evidence from the early period to support this view—the entire conquest tradition, the holy war ideology of Deuteronomy, and the martial flavour seen by many scholars in the title Ṣḥ’ḥ ‘ṣḥḥ, and undoubtedly present in the historical period, though perhaps not originally. There is no reason why such a conception should not be primitive, but elsewhere in the Semitic world, the function of war-deity is not assigned to a specialist who has no other roles; it is usually Anat, or Istar/Attart, or their masculine prototype Attar who fulfils the role. The origins
of Anat we have shown to be obscure, but possibly a goddess of the oasis, while the others are all derivatives of the divinized Venus. War, too, is not their exclusive function, but particularly in the case of the goddesses— is the opposite to their function as goddess of love and fertility. We can see the same polarity, as goddess of generation and destruction, in Athena, Aphrodite, Artemis, Kybele, Hathor, Kali, Durga, and so on. Likewise Deuteronomy can speak at one moment of the destruction to be noted out to Yahweh's enemies, and at the next of his love for Israel. This is not a grotesque parody of the divine nature, but rather an expression of its poles as a merismus indicating the totality of divine activities. So the idea of Yahweh as a war-god is, in no way inconsistent with his possible lunar nature.

He has also been called a creator god. This is implicit in the hiphil etymology, and there is a substantial evidence to support the view. We have noted the appropriation of El's title in Gen. 14:22, and there is the whole doctrine of creativity as set out in Gen. 1:1-2:40(P) and Gen. 2:4ff(J). This last passage and Gen. 14 are widely attributed to David's time, and might be considered to reflect the appropriation of the role of El Elyon, but except in the rather clumsy example of Gen. 14:22, it would be difficult to prove this to be a development no earlier than the tenth century and we shall see below that an early date for Gen. 2:4ff is by no means certain. The evidence of the personal names seems to indicate that Yahweh had essentially the same character as El. The very fusion of deities in Judah could only happen on the basis of considerable similarities of function, nature, and cult, and so we ought to presuppose a creative role for Yahweh at least as a probability. Finally, if such a role is admitted, it is not an abstraction from other roles, but is an
appropriate one for the head of a pantheon, the father of gods and men. If it were established that Yah(weh) was a moon-god, it may be taken as read that he was *ipso facto* a creator-god.

All of these roles so far discussed are, in a sense supplementary, and may or may not be attributes of a moon-god. One theory of Yahweh's nature however may be seen as an obstacle to the argument of this thesis. And that is the view that Yahweh was originally a sun-god. This has been argued by May. Morgenstern does not actually say this, but recognises solar symbolism in the Jerusalem temple cult, as does Hollis. Widengren pointed to the evidence of Ps. 19, but we have seen that this is evidence against rather than for a sun-god, and in any case it describes El. The Psalm is clearly evidence for the syncretism of El and Yahweh, who appears here to have appropriated El's role in the hierogamy and thus perhaps his lunar nature. The evidence of sun worship adduced by all these scholars can be adequately accounted for on the basis that Aserah was the consort of Yahweh in the pre-exilic temple, and apart from this, we have no evidence of any Near Eastern sun-god, but only of a sun-goddess.

How strong a case, then, have we for the lunar nature of Yahweh? In previous chapters we have dealt with the following elements:

1) He clearly has as consort Aserah in the Jerusalem temple. He may have acquired her by fusion with El, of course, but that can hardly be proved. Again the argument from silence in the north scarcely disproves the antiquity of the association, since we have a far stronger puritanical tradition in the north than in the south. However, we cannot claim beyond dispute that from the beginning Yahweh had the sun-goddess as consort.
2) The sacred marriage myth we traced in several recensions appears quite clearly in the story of the birth of Ishmael. Unfortunately this says more about Abraham than about Yahweh, and in any case the people of whom Abraham is the eponym were almost certainly not Yahweh-worshippers, but El-worshippers.

3) It is in the atonement theology as preserved (in somewhat disguised form) in the Passover and new year rites, and more overtly in the scapegoat rites, that we have the first unequivocal evidence. Of course one could argue that all this is a cultic tradition imposed on Yahwism from El-worship, but the onus of proof would need to be on the proponent of such a view. To my mind, it probably belongs to the pro-mosaic antiquity of Yahwism, though in view of our discussion in ch. 3, it is shared with the El-cult, also of lunar character, though independent. In terms of evidence for the lunar nature of Yahweh it is not however conclusive.

4) In our study of the theophany tradition, we have shown, a clear lunar character for the deity involved. Unfortunately in at least three instances the identification of the god with Yahweh is probably secondary - in Ex. 24.1-2, 9-11, Ps. 68.9 (EVV 8), Jg. 5.5. In the first case the deity is called 'the god of Israel', and in the second and third, 'the lord of Sinai'. These may be taken to cast some doubt on the other passages discussed, on the ground that here we have non-Yahwist imagery appropriated in Israelite poetry. However, to whatever degree these accounts and the wilderness narratives in general are overlaid with stereotyped and cultic symbolism, I see no reason to doubt the antiquity of the link between lunar motifs and early Yahwism.

5) In the discussion of El, we have been able to note no more
than the close similarity of character between various El-forms and Yahweh. In itself this feature proves little; taken with other arguments, it may be seen as confirmatory.

6) We have seen that the Midianite/Kenite god may well have been lunar, especially of our argument that he had the sun-goddess as a consort (see 1) be taken to be valid. However the evidence in this area is remarkably tenuous, and really the conclusion needs to be based on all our other arguments, rather than taken as an argument itself.

7) We shall see below the identification of Yahweh and El in Judah, and shall argue that the great rival to Yahweh in Israel was not Ba'al (Hadad) - though he may have been present - but rather the name El. The bitterness of this rivalry is almost too much for a simple antipathy to a god of another type; rather is it the bitterness one finds in sectarian hatreds, where the same god is worshipped, but different elements in his cult and constitution are emphasised by the rival groups. On this basis, it could be argued that Yahweh was essentially the same as El, but in certain respects was understood to be radically different. The argument of chapter eight however is not a part of the basis for my conclusion here, but is dependent upon this conclusion. This is, that although some of the evidence I have examined has proved to be quite inconclusive, other parts of it are most reasonably understood if the construction I have placed upon them is accepted. Yahweh, in his earliest form, was probably a moon-god. He may have retained a lunar character into the period of the monarchy, but in view of the conservative nature of literary and cultic forms it would be wrong to insist on it, since the older form would be in a continual state of reinterpretation.
Notes to Chapter Six


2. The so-called 'Kenite Hypothesis', though supported by evidence in J, is based upon that of E. (See below for discussion). P refers to Moses' mother as being called Jochebed, Ex. 6.20, Num. 26.59. On the problem of this name see Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, (1928), 111. He says that its uniqueness argues against it being a later invention, but does not explain why. He also says that there is room for doubt that it was originally a theophoric name; cf. too Weeke, Hebrew Origins, (1950), 97. Rowley notes the embarrassment which this name has (needlessly) caused the supporters of the Kenite hypothesis. He suggests that Jochebed was herself of Kenite stock, 'Early Levite history and the question of the Exodus', JNES 3 (1944), 77; ibid., The Biblical Doctrine of Election, (1959), 36, n. 4; ibid., From Joseph to Joshua, (1950), 159ff. Ex. 2.1 says otherwise: 'there was a man of the tribe of Levi who had taken a woman of Levi as his wife'. If we are not prepared to say that this is a later theological statement, then we must consider as likely the possibility that the name Jochebed was given later. 'E,' our primary source for information about Moses, does not use the name. In Ex. 2.1 we would expect the names of the parents if they were known.

3. We may contrast Ps. 106, 135 and 136, which all begin their survey of Yahweh's mighty acts with the Exodus. The reference to Jacob in Ps. 135, 4 must be construed with parallel Israel an referring to the nation, and not the patriarch.

4. The classic treatment on the absence of references to Sinai in the 'Creeks' of Dt. 26. 5ff., etc. is von Rad's essay, 'The
form-critical problem of the Hexateuch', in The problem of
the Hexateuch and other Essays, (LT 1966), 1-78. His approach
has been severely criticised by L. Rost (Das kleine Credo und
andere Studien zum Alten Testament, (1965), 11-25, and J. P. Hyatt,
'An ancient historical credo and an independent Sinai tradition?' pp. 152-170 in H. T. Frank and T. L. Reed (eds.) Translating and
understanding the Old Testament, (1970). However the
demonstration of late elements in the creeds does nothing to
explain away the curious omission of Sinai allusions from them,
and the suspicion this raises is considerably strengthened by
the fact that demonstrably ancient references to Sinai (e.g.
in Dt. 33.2f., and similar passages discussed in ch. 4) betray no
knowledge of the exodus and conquest traditions. I am not
aware that this point has been made with any force. (These
early Sinaitic passages also significantly omit any allusion to
the covenant).

For a good recent discussion see Weippert, The settlement of
the Israelite tribes in Palestine. On the argument for it being
the Joseph or 'Rachel' tribes, see R. E. L. Sour, 'L'alliance de
Sichem', RB 69 (1962), 264; R. de Vaux, 'La Thèse de l"Amphictyonie
israélite", HTR 64 (1971), 423ff; R. Smend, Jahweh was and
tribal confederation, (LT 1970), 112. Both held this view, but
modified it - see Das System der zwolf Stämme Israels, 65ff.,
and History of Pentateuchal traditions, 50ff., both cited.
A. D. H. Mayes, Israel in the period of the Judges, 118, n. 64. He
himself rejects the view but offers no alternative. He rejects
the idea that Jos. 24.18 a historical record. No doubt it is
not to be seen as one, but the fact that the tradition regards
an Ephraimite, Joshua, as the leader of the conquest and also
of the (no doubt fictitious) 'covenant' at Shechem, and that Shechem itself was an Ephraimite sanctuary, is an argument in its favour. So also is the development of the Joseph tradition. S. Herrmann concluded that the Joseph story (a 'Bildungsroman') dates from the early monarchy, and does not presuppose any closer knowledge of Egypt than would be expected of an intelligent observer from outside. See, Israel in Egypt, (ET 1973), 32ff. He points out however that Ephraim and Manasseh were born in Egypt (Gen. 41.50ff., 45.20) and this element clearly independent of the fictitious construction of the Joseph story and incorporated into it, may be regarded as preserving an ethnic memory. Similarly, Benjamin is born — later than all Jacob's other sons — in Palestine in the post-settlement period, op. cit., 82ff. In fact in Meyes' argument, op. cit., 29, 79-83, only the tribal unit of Ephraim (or its antecedents if the 'tribe' only came into existence as a political entity in Palestine) would have been involved, since not only was Benjamin a post-settlement offshoot of Ephraim, but Manasseh also only came into existence when Ephraim displaced the bulk of the 'tribe' of Machir eastwards into Gilead, and those remaining behind became Manasseh. The name Joseph was given to Ephraim and Manasseh collectively after the stabilisation of the situation.

This approach would of course invalidate any historical link between the Israelite Benjamin and the North Syrian Banu-lamina. For the theory, see e.g., M. Astour, 'Bene-lamina et Jericho', Memo. 1959, 5-20; and for its rejection, Thompson, EPH, 58-66. Meek took Levi to be the Israelite tribe in Egypt on the basis of names, and the tradition of Gen. 2.27f.,
Rebrew Orijrine, 31ff. But while he regarded it as the only group involved, Rowley endeavoured to harmonize this evidence with that of the Rachel tribes by having some Levites join them in Egypt, 'Early Levite history and the question of the Exodus', JNES 3 (1944), 76.

6 Ex.2:15(J). In Ex.3:1(E) Moses is suddenly in the land of Midian for no particular reason (unless it has been suppressed in favour of J).

Cf. Morgenstern, 'The Elohist narrative in Exodus 3:1-15', AJSL 37 (1920-21), 249. Jethro's praise of Yahweh (Ex.18:11 E) is 'not the exclamation of a recent and enthusiastic convert... but the proud and gratified utterance of an old and loyal devotee...'. The 'Kenite hypothesis' was first suggested by Chillany in 1862, (Week, op.cit., 93); accepted by, among others: Burney, The book of Judges, (1918), 251f.; Morgenstern, loc.cit.; H.H. Rowley, The rediscovery of the Old Testament; (1946), 82ff.; From Joseph to Joshua, 149f.; The biblical doctrine of election, 36f.; N.Walker, 'Yahwism and the divine name Yahweh', ZAW 70 (1958), 262; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology 1, 9;


patriarchs, an attempt at a synthesis, ASTL 4 (1963), 37.

In ch. 8 we shall discuss further the issues involved in the exegesis of Ex. 18.

8 In Jg. 1:16, patently a southern tradition, the name of the man is missing from MT. LXX tries to remedy the situation: recension A has a girl, and B has a boy. Burney would have us read כבּה for כּבּה of MT; op. cit., 14. Jg. 4:11 is in the context of a northern story, but in view of its independence of the E tradition (Jethro) - cf. p. 194 - it is apparently dependent for this information upon the southern tradition. (Albright classifies Jg. 5 upon which the prose narrative of Jg. 4 is probably dependent, as J: Jethro, Hobab and Reuel, CHQ 25 (1963), 10). Since it also differs on the matter of the tribe involved, Kenite and not Kadianite, it sounds independent even of Num. 10:29. Incidentally NEB reads כּבּה (translated, 'brother-in-law') for כּבּה 'father-in-law', which is a way of avoiding the problem, but not solving it. Cf. Burney's comment on RV, (op. cit., 15, 90), and Albright, op. cit., 7, n. 22. It is a matter of differing traditions.

Since Moses is to be linked preferably to the northern one, we should prefer Jethro the Kadianite as his 'historical' father-in-law, i.e. as the one furnished by the oldest tradition.

9 R. Abba, 'The divine name Yahweh', JBL 60 (1961), 320, speaks of 'the Kenites, a Kadianite clan'. Cr. was Kadian, perhaps simply a geographical term, so that anyone living there might be called a Kadianite? De Vaux places it in the Sinai Peninsula. MAT 1, 31ff. W. J. Dumbrell considers Kadian to have been a league of N.W. Arabian and Transjordanian tribes, whose eclipse at the time of Gideon led to the rise of Ishmael;
'Midian'—a land or a league? VT 25 (1975), 323-337.

10 'The name of the god of Moses', HUCA 32 (1961), 125. I cannot agree with Mowinckel's rather cavalier treatment of the source-critical problem, p. 122, and attribution of Ex. 3.13-15 to J. He simply gives no adequate reason for rejecting the general view. Cf. however, ch. 8 n. 143 on a 'late' authorship.

11 'The beginnings of the worship of Yahweh, conflicting biblical views', VT 6 (1956), 431.


14 Op. cit., 431. He also alters the curious הָיְתָה (then it was begun) to הָיְתָה (then he began), op. cit., 430.

15 Enoch might be a different matter altogether. But the name can hardly be equated with Enosh.

16 Loc. cit.


18 CTA 4 i 23, etc.


20 CTA 6 iii 5 etc.

21 CTA 14 i 37, iii 151.

22 CTA 4 ii 15f., etc. Also found as ymmu limmu, 3 iii 9.

23 Skinner, op. cit., 65ff., cf. I. I. Kikawallah, 'Two notes on Eve', JBL 91 (1972), 33-35; he does not mention the serpentine connection, but considers Eve to be a demythologised equivalent of the mother-goddess Mani of the Atrahasis epic.

24 Loc. cit. Cf. BDAG, 65f. This lists the normal rendering 'with the help of' (p. 86). But I see no reason why it could not be this with a sexual connotation. Cf. Kikawallah, op. cit., 35-37. He draws attention to the phrase itti enki(ma) in Atrahasis i.
he is quite right in stressing the fact that in her incorporation into the final product of J, Eve is no longer a mother goddess, but has become the first woman, a created being, although retaining some of the creative mystery of her divine prototype.

E.g., Ex. 34.17 (J), Lev. 19.4, (P) — both reflecting the southern Kenite tradition. Note that Ex. 20.4 (E: northern) speaks instead of a carved image (cf. Dt. 5.8). The two idioms are later used indiscriminately; Dt. 27.15. Abhistras however, takes the ban to date from after the settlement; ASIR, 17.

26 I do not think that we need give up in despair over these two passages, as does Noth (Exodus, 275, Numera, 117). MacNeile considers Ex. 35.3 late; Exodus, (1908), 227.

27 Burney calls them 'amulets', op. cit., 235. They are linked with moon-worship, as are those mentioned in Is. 3.18, by A. Jirku, 'Der Kult des Mondgottes im altorientalischen Palästina-Syrien', ZBI 100 (1950), 204.

28 B. Rothenberg, Timna, valley of the biblical copper mines, (1972), 183f.; but cf. H. H. Rowley, 'Zadok and Mehuashtan', JBL 58(1939), 111-141; Jbid., Worship in ancient Israel, (1967), 87, for the view that the serpent was Jebusite and the narrative in Num. an etiology.

29 See n. 23, and EBZ, 235. Is there a possible link between the idea of "תאנת " as a serpent and the Ugaritic verb ḫwy (UT §847, p. 395), usually found as 𐤉𐤃 Annunci (Heb. הָנָה) 'to prostrate oneself'? Is the radical sense to 'be serpentine'?

Cf. UT §856, ḫwy 'to live' (p. 396) to which Gordon gives a parallel 𐤉𐤃 Usually found in ḫw 'mayest thou live!', CPA 10 11 20.

30 Published by Virollleaud, 'Nouveaux textes mythologiques at liturgiques', Ugarita V, 564-574. Cf. too the title dt bt a
32. See ch. 4, nn. 46, 74.
33. P. 209.
34. Wherever it was! See ch. 3, n. 166 for discussion.
35. See Keck, Hebrew Origins, 97, 111ff.
37. S. D. Goitein, 'Yhwh the passionate - the monotheistic meaning and origin of the name Yhwh', VT 6 (1956), 1-9.
40. On the question of monotheism see E. J. Christen and H. E. Hazelton, Monotheism and Moses, (1969); for the conflicting views see also Barr, 'The problem of Israelite monotheism', TUCCH 17 (1957-8), 52-62. On the matter of jealousy see M. Smith, Palestinian parties and policies that shaped the Old Testament, (1971), 44f. See also below, ch. 8.
44. Bowman, op. cit., 4. I take it he understands the divine name to be the qal. impf. 3rd. p. sg., he does not in fact parse it.
45. KB, 368f.
46. J. Obermann, 'The divine name Yhwh in the light of recent
discoveries', *JBL* 68(1949), 301-323; *ibid.*, 'Survival of an old Canaanite participle and its impact on biblical exegesis', *JBL* 70(1951), 199-209. For criticism, see 'Driver,' 'The interpretation of Yahweh as a participial form from a causative theme of the verb', *JBL* 73(1954), 125-131; and Kurtonen, *op.cit.*, 61.

It is mentioned already by *EBB*, 218. For Albright's views, see 'Contributions to biblical archaeology and philology', *JBL* (1924), 363-393; 'The names of Israel and Judah', *JBL* 46(1927), 151-185; *FSAC* (1957), 15-17; etc. See also D.N. Freedman, 'The name of the god of Moses', *JBL* 79 (1960), 151-156; Cross, 'Yahweh and the God of the patriarchs', *HTR* 55(1962), 225-259(esp. 250f.), also *Guthrie*, 60-65, and 65; n. 78. Dhorme accepted the view in *RIM*, 358; and Ringgren appears to in 'Israelite religion' (*LT* 1966), 47.

Albright, *FSAC*, 16. He points to יְהוָה נֵסֵי, יָדִּישׁ נֵסֵי, and יְהוָה נֵסֵי reading יְהוָה not יְהוָה) and says 'these are obviously quotations from ancient litaniens of the supreme patriarchal deity, and the new name is thus derived from an abbreviation of a liturgical formula... thy 'obviously?' Cross translates יְהוָה נֵסֵי as 'he creates the divine'... hosts' *Guthrie*, 65. But how would he then construe יְהוָה נֵסֵי? The solution offered by him on p. 70 seems a puerulus.


E.g. נָא, וַיֵּשָׁב, וַיֵּשָׁב.

Kurtonen, *op.cit.*, 66; Abba, *op.cit.*, (n. 9), 325; Kosmala, *op.cit.*, 105.

The piel has the causative function (Abba, Kosmala – but *BDB* gives no example of this).


Nowinckel, *op.cit.*, 128f.

Hyatt, 'Yahweh as the god of my father', *VT* 5 (1955), 136, *ibid.*, 'Was Yahweh originally a creator deity?', *JBL* 86 (1967), 376.
I.e. the Euhemerist approach. This has been alleged for some Egyptian deities—particularly Osiris and Ptah, and for the Indian god Krishna. But there is no evidence of such developments in the Semitic world (except perhaps some sacral kings, but they are incarnations of the deity, rather than apotheosised men).

HTR 55, p. 252. This view also endorsed by Freedman, op. cit., 156, n. 20.

H. B. Huffmon, APWAT, 29f., 164, 161.

Cf. de Vaux, HAI 324, Huffmon, APWAT, 72f.

See Huffmon, APWAT, 66–73, for the problem.

On this, see Cross, HTR 55, p. 253, n. 122; and Huffmon, loc. cit.

Roberts suggested that the ideogram DINIR may in some instances indicate the presence of Ilu in Babylonian personal names (The earliest Semitic pantheon, 33); while Huffmon argued that the ideogram AN served the same purpose in Amorite names (APWAT, 162f).

See ch. 3, nns. 34–35.


See de Vaux’s comments, HAI, 324.

See Thompson, IPN, 36–40.

CHRE 61.67. HTR 55, p. 251. Cf. Freedman, loc. cit., 'once it is recognised that the term Yahweh goes back to patriarchal times... It seems to me that this proves nothing but the circular nature of Freedman’s argument.

See also Albright, review of Vanhacq’s L’épithète Yahwe Seba’ot, JBL 67 (1948), 380; H. S. Fairman, 'Preliminary report on the excavations at ‘Amārah West', JEA 25 (1939), 138–144; J. Leclant,
'Fouilles et travaux en Egypte et au Soudan, 1961-1962', Orient. 32 (1963), 203, n. 3; and references there.

68 Thompson, HIN, 58ff., 70ff.

69 Apparently the view already endorsed by ABD, 218. So also, among others, Kosala, 'The name of God (YHWH and HU)', ASTI 2 (1963), 103-106; de Vaux, HAI 1, 329; von Soden, 'Jahwe, "Er ist, Er erweist sich"', KO 3 (1966), 177-187.

70 Op. cit., 182ff. (The earliest part of his argument on the nature of the H.W. Sem. verbal forms is briefly criticised by Cross, CATW, 63ff.).

71 By which spelling (used on p. 183), von Soden means both spellings, is-wi- and is-ah-wi in so far as they represent hawā 'to be' and not hawā 'to live', though he admits that this is his intuition and not something proven, op. cit., 181. I have taken the other line (above p. 285).


74 Loc. cit. The incidences of the word in BH are Gen. 27.29 (J), Is. 16.4, Neh. 6.6, and Eccles. 2.22 and 11.3 (the latter example dubious). See BDB, 217, KB, 226 (v/II). BDB suggests that the use in Is. is perhaps in imitation of Kosbiya.


77 Cf. e.g. Abba, op. cit., 320; Ehrdann, 'The name Jahu', OTS 5 (1948), 22; Thierry, 'The pronunciation of the tetragrammaton', OTS 5 (1948), 31.

78 Dussaud speaks of Hadad as appearing in names in full and abbreviated forms, 'Jahwe', CRAEL (1940), 369, but he gives no examples. The name cited by Huffman, APHT, 156f., do not bear this.
Many scholars consider evidence of the "ya-wi" and "ya-ab-wi" names in the context of the Yahweh problem, and come to the same negative conclusion: J. Gray, "The god YW in the religion of Canaan", JNES 12 (1953), 278; Fohrer, HTR, 76; de Vaux, loc. cit.; Oldenburg, The conflict between Baal and El in Canaanite religion, 171.

79 Published by Virolleaud, La déesse Anat, (1938), see pp. 97ff.


81 Herdner reads this as 'ilt'; Gordon (UT) reads II [ ]; Virolleaud reads ilt; Driver reads alq; Murtonen thinks that 'ilm is best (op. cit., 49, n.4). I agree with this. In the plate column of CTA the line is broken thus; the final letter could be (b→) or (m→). There is no warrant for Albright's suggestion of yr (r→) for m→, FSAC, 259. It may avoid one difficulty, but provides no solution.

82 The 'ya is read by all commentators. But as in the previous line, the letter is broken though m (→) is a reasonable probability.

83 I take this to be a formal declaration made over a gesture with the hands—perhaps laying them on the head of Yam. (Cf. Ps 24?)

84 CTA 1 iv. 13-20.

85 R. de Langhe estimated that the lines originally had about twenty signs, so that half of each line is probably missing.

86 Accepted by Murtonen, op. cit., 49ff., de Vaux, HAI, 323ff.

87 I would therefore reject the interpretation of Dussaud, "Yahwé fils de El", Syria 34 (1957), 232-242. See Gray's comments in "The legacy of Canaan", 182. Gray also points
but that Yahweh's connections are always with the south, not with northern Syria (op. cit., 279). On Yam as the eldest son of Il, and a conglomerate of an Aegean sea-god and Attar, see MacLauren, op. cit., (n. 7), 449ff. Wyatt, Tawos 25, p. 28.

Murtonen, op. cit., 70ff.

E.g. Burney, in "A theory of the development of Israelite religion in early times", JTS 9 (1908), 342ff. For an up to date translation of the passages in Gilgamesh Burney adduced in his argument, see Epeiser, ANET, 88, 92.

See CAD, vol. 7, (I/J), 33a., sub jā'u, and von Soden, AHw 4 143a, sub jā'u(m).

See G.H. Parke-Taylor, Yahweh, the divine name in the Bible (1975), 43, and references cited.

Murtonen, op. cit., 44-53, esp. 48, n. 6. Certainly some of the evidence Murtonen lists - e.g. some names seem, scarcely plausibly on the basis of the jā'u element being no more than a possessive, and his explanation, on p. 48 of the presence of jā'u in BM 93035 (CT XII, pl. 4, 1.1, AH = ia-‘u (sic)) - does not seem unreasonable. Again, if the name L-bi-‘di is really a variant of a form dîa-U2 bi-‘di (sic, note determinative), a king of Hamath in the eighth century (p. 44) there appear to be many issues in need of further examination.

See also n. 103.

Nowinckel, op. cit., (n. 10).

Kozmala, op. cit., (n. 69), 105f.

MacLaurin, op. cit., 454ff. Cf. also Irwin, "The tetragrammaton: an overlooked interpretation", JNES 3 (1944), 257-259; he cites Feigin and Morgenstern.

E.g. Ex. 34.14; Jer. 10.10, 25.31, 33; Dt. 32.6.

GK § 14 a-d, p. 56f. This incidently disproves Driver's idea,

102. Belton, "Israel," 1938. See also Williams in 'Yahw'e'; JTS 28 (1927), 276-283, argued for an original form Yahu-h; without suggesting any meaning. Burkitt, in the same journal ('Yahweh or Yahu-

103. J. Levy, 'Influences hurrites sur Israel,' RAS (1938) 55ff. See Keel, op. cit., 37, on Yahu-(Ya) and EA. On the possible importance of the Hurrians in the ethnic constitution of Israel, see Keel, op. cit., 37, ff. Levy's suggestion deserves further examination in the light of kurtzen's discussion referred to in n. 93. If the divine name 'Yah and variations is Kenite/Midianite in origin, the chief problem seems to be not linguistic (in view of undoubted Hurrian influence in Palestine) but historical. Can we find any evidence of Hurrian influence among the Sinaitic and N.W. Arabian tribes? None has been found so far as I am aware. The theory must therefore be regarded as attractive,
but unproven. (On the interesting though probably untenable
view of Mendenhall concerning the Anatolian origins of the
Midianites—which would bring together the elements in question—
see Dumbrell, op. cit., (n.9), 324.

104 E. Littmann, Review of D. Diringer, Le iscrizioni antico-Ebraiche
palestinesi, AFO 11 (1936-7), 162; E. Brozny, 'Inschriften und
kultur der Proto-Inden von Koheno-Daro und Jerappa', 11, Ar Cr
11 (1942), 52ff. — both cited and dismissed by de Vaux, HAI 1,
325, n. 102, 104.

105 N. Walker, 'Yahwism and the divine name "Yahweh"', ZAW 70 (1958),
262-265; for reference to Roth, see p. 264, n. 14.

106 J. Vergote, 'Une théorie sur l'origine égyptienne du nom de Yahweh',
EJI 39 (1963), 447-452. His rejection endorsed by de Vaux,
HAI 1, 325, and Fohrer, HIR, 79, n. 28.

107 Walker, op. cit., 265.

108 'Exodus', in Peake's Commentary, 178a, p. 211.

109 For this approach see W. R. Arnold, 'The divine names in Exodus
III: 14', JBL 24 (1905), 133ff., 162; J. Morgenthal, op. cit.,
(n. 7), 256; R. A. Bowman, op. cit., 3; Roth, Exodus, 43; de Vaux,
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Israelite religion never could, as the prophets and the Rechabites fondly hoped, be a perpetuation of the desert honeymoon period. With settlement and urbanisation, the change to agriculture and the development of trade and foreign relations, contact and compromise with the ideologies of surrounding peoples became inevitable. The entire history of religions is of course precisely the nature of such contact and compromise, reacting with the development of society to produce ever new and ever-renewed riches out of the ancient heritage. There were always some however in Israelite society, as we shall see below, who tried to fight a constant rearguard action against such things happening to their ancestral faith. Yahweh was a jealous god, who would brook no rivals, and punished his people whenever they committed 'adultery' with foreign cults. The Rechabites constantly hankered after the golden age of life in the steppe, and the prophets too occasionally alluded to it almost wistfully. The particular history of Israelite religion was largely the rather sour and uneasy relationship that existed between these purists and the population at large who could not really have cared less about theological niceties, but cheerfully adopted the Canaanite sanctuaries as their own, and with them the attendant cultus.  

We have alluded to the basic division in Israel between the northern tribes, who came to form the kingdom of Israel, and the southern tribes who formed the kingdom of Judah (cf. ch. 6, n. 4).
While the brief unification under David and Solomon set a precedent for an ideal situation, in which the promised land was to stretch not merely from Dan to Beersheba, but 'from the Wadi of Egypt to the Great River', this was always an essentially southern dream, and the two parts of this greater Israel were sharply divided by prehistory, local situations, problems of domestic and foreign affairs, and matters of cult. Superficially, both came together in the common cult of Yahweh, but there were undoubtedly quite considerable differences in spite of the appearance of unity. In the north, for example, the cult of Yahweh probably succumbed to quite a considerable extent to local syncretistic pressures, but with something of a jolt from the time of Elijah saw itself more and more in self-conscious opposition to everything that savoured of 'Canaanite' practice. In the south, due largely, it appears, to the choice of Jerusalem as capital by David and his adoption of Jebusite beliefs and practices, the entire cult of Yahweh (already with a different prehistory from that of the northern tribes) became closely assimilated to local traditions. One interesting aspect of this general distinction is to be seen in the attitudes of Yahwism, north and south, to local forms of cult worship. We shall examine this matter in the present and following chapters.

a) The positive inter-action.

We have little evidence to go on to reconstruct the situation in Judah before the time of David. The most important event in the early period was undoubtedly the capture of Jerusalem by him about 1000 B.C. (2 S.5.6.10). The capture of a fortified city was generally the signal for an orgy of murder, rape, looting and arson. It is very strange that nothing like this appears to have happened on this occasion. Even more remarkable is the deference
David showed the inhabitants by buying, for example, the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. His concern for observing a proper legal procedure in a reflection rather upon the cultic circumstances involved than upon David's character - it is a clear indication of some kind of cultic continuity beyond the common one of preserving an ancient sanctuary. We also read in 2 S.8.17 that Zadok and Abiathar were David's priests in Jerusalem. Abiathar was a priest from the sanctuary at Nob, who had escaped the massacre (1 S.22.20f.) and fled to David. In 1 Ch.5.29-34 and 6.35-38 Zadok is given an Aaronite genealogy, which is already established in part in 2 S.8.17 (cf. 1 Ch.18.16) where Zadok is said to be the son of Ahitub. But Ahimelech, father of Abiathar, is said to be the son of Ahitub in 1 S.22.9. Other passages simply refer to Zadok by name, or by the formula 'Zadok the priest'. Abiathar was deposed and banished by Solomon, and Zadok, his erstwhile colleague, became (chief) priest in his stead (1 K.2.26f., 35). The name Zadok (ZADOK) is curious. It is probably a hypocoristic form, and the incidence of the element of in the names Jebusite rulers of the city, Melchizedek (Gen.14.18) and Adonizedek (Jos.10.1, Jg.1.5f.6), suggests that far from being of Aaronite descent, Zadok was the original religious or religio-political leader in Jerusalem. Sedaq was probably a Jebusite deity who is paired with Salem, the patron deity of the city. ('foundation of Salem') in Ps.85, though in the context they may have been to some extent 'demythologised'.

These somewhat fragmentary pieces of evidence are really all we have to go on, apart from the incidence of various features in the religion of Judah, which we may infer are to be derived from the Jebusite cultus, but which hardly count as primary evidence. The most important of these are the theory of sacral kingship, wholeheartedly espoused by the Davidic dynasty, the ideology of Zion,
and more significantly for our present purpose, the cult of El Elyon. Here were elements completely foreign to Judah before the monarchy, which must have been adopted from somewhere, and Jerusalem is the most likely source. The position of El Elyon may have been analogous to that of El at Ugarit, or of Baal Canaan (= El) at Tyre. His son was in fact the ruler of the city; in divine terms the local form of OAttar - Salem in Jerusalem, Melqart in Tyre, and Yam - OAttar-Mot in Ugarit, deposed before the fixing of the AB cycle tradition by Baal Hadad. But this in no way amounted to an overthrow of El. He remained, as it were, the power behind the throne, and still played an essential role in the community's cult. The importance of El Elyon at Jerusalem can be measured by the fact that the god of the conquerors of the city, Yahweh, was identified with him and not with Salem the city-god. The reasons for affirming this are as follows:

1) Yahweh and El are identified in Dt. 32.8 and Gen. 14 (and see further back).

2) Salem is clearly a subordinate deity (so far as the formal structure of the pantheon is concerned) in that he follows in the train of Yahweh in Ps. 85, and can therefore hardly be identifiable with him.

3) We have seen reason to identify OAttar and Salem in Ugarit, and while this does not amount to proof of the latter's identity in the Jerusalem cultus, it is reasonable inference, strongly supported by the first two points.

It might be objected that Solomon's other name, Jedidiah (2 Sm 12.25) implies an identity between the two deities occurring in the theophoric names. This seems however an unnecessary and indeed improbable inference.
the passage is not entirely clear in that in the broader context of Solomon's life the alternative name is not used.

It appears to be a cognomen rather than a proper personal name, in that it indicates a theological assessment of the situation (viz. the rehabilitation of the adulterous union of David and Bathsheba) which should perhaps be attributed in any case to the Deuteronomist. Eissfeldt mentions this example in a brief study on renaming, in which he notes that the renaming of Hosea as Joshua may indicate a phenomenon which took place at the adoption of the Yahweh-cult, though he discounts this in the case of Solomon/Jedidiah, on the ground that it does not give evidence of a significant moment in Israelite religion.

Eissfeldt appears to make this assessment on the basis of accepting that Yahwism was at least as old as the settlement in Israel. This is the whole problem. It may be that Yahwism, so far as 'Israel' is concerned, dates from no earlier than the time of David, in which case the 'renaming' of Solomon would be an important piece of evidence. It would in this case indicate that Salem and Yahweh are quite distinct.

We shall examine below the general use of in the Old Testament, where it appears to refer to , but is without any additional epithet. Here we may briefly note that on a number of occasions he is given the title Golyon, or the title appears by itself, in contexts where it is quite clear that the national god of Judah is concerned. The only narrative material where the form is found is in Gen.14. This passage, not clearly fitting into any of the accepted sources for Genesis, has always been a puzzle. All that we need say there is that it is undoubtedly to be linked to the Davidic appropriation of Jerusalem, and thus its theological statements (discussed in ch.5) relate to the fact of identification
of the two gods. All other references to בְּלִיִּון (with or without צֶלַּב) are in poetry. They are as follows:

1) **Yahweh/** בְּלִיִּון;
   Ps. 7:16 (EVV 17), 9:2-3 (EVV 1-2), 18:14 (+ 22:22-14), 21:8 (EVV 7), 83:19 (EVV 18), 91:9, 92:2 (EVV 1).

2) **בְּלִיִּון/** Yahweh;
   Ps. 87:5-6. (Cf. 77:11-12 (EVV 10,11) בְּלִיִּון, Yah).

3) **Yahweh** בְּלִיִּון;
   Ps. 47:3 (EVV 2).

4) **Elohim/** בְּלִיִּון;
   Ps. 46:5 (EVV 4), 50:14, 78:35 (Elohim/** בְּלִיִּון), 58 (cf. 17-19).

5) **Elohim** בְּלִיִּון;
   Ps. 57:3 (EVV 2).

6) **Elohim** בְּלִיִּון;
   Ps. 73:11, 107:11, Num. 24:16 (J).

7) **בְּלִיִּון/** Elohim;
   Ps. 78:17-18 (v.19: Elohim), Dt. 32:8 (see BMJ appr).

8) **בְּלִיִּון/** שַׁחֲדַד;
   Ps. 91:1 (v.2; Yahweh).

9) **בְּלִיִּון**;
   Ps. 77:11 (EVV 10 -see 2), 82:6, Is. 14:14, Lam. 3:35,38.

The very presence of the name in biblical poetry probably indicates the adoption of (Elohim מֶלֶל_לַיִּיִּון by Judah, and in 1) - 3) we perhaps have the explicit identification of the two in the binomial form Yahweh בְּלִיִּון. We can with good reason treat the parallel usage here, and also in 4) (cf. 5)), as the poetic separation of the two halves of the name. 16 Though we have seen that the title בְּלִיִּון appears outside Judah, it is reasonable to take all of the above passages as reflecting the southern ideology. The reasons for this will emerge below, when we consider the northern experience. Certainly—
none of the passages listed outside the Psalms can be attributed to northern authorship; Dt. 32.8 is at least post-721 if not exilic in its stratum in Deuteronomy, and is of southern origin, and the passages in Isaiah and Lamentations are self-evidently southern, and exilic. 17

Two passages cited are of particular interest in that they afford us a glimpse into the ancient role of Elohim as head of the Jebusite pantheon. His position has been transferred to Yahweh (Elohim in Ps. 82), and in both cases the frankly polytheistic background is probably not to be taken as surviving fully in the mind of the writer. Ps. 82 envisages a courtroom scene, in which Elohim judges the gods of the nations, and declaring them unfit to rule, announces their deposition. They are referred to collectively as the נָאָשִׁים. Dt. 32 is a part of a secondary or even tertiary stratum of Deuteronomy, after the bringing of the Un-Deuteronomy (12-26) from the north. 18 In v. 8,9, we have this passage:

when Elohim gave the nations their inheritance,
when he divided the sons of men,
his fixed their boundaries according to the number of sons of Elohim; 19 but Yahweh's portion was his people, Jacob his share of inheritance.

Dunsaud took the passage to mean that Elohim and Yahweh were not identified, but that Yahweh was one of the sons of Elohim to whom Israel was apportioned. 20 But a common-sense reading does not require this sense, and it is exegetically impossible that Yahweh should be subordinated to Elohim. Rather are Elohim and El to be taken as a reversed parallel (7, above), and Yahweh is to be identified with El Elohim. In parcelling out the nations, he preserved Israel for himself. 21 This is a mythological way of describing the doctrine
of election.

All this is rather tenuous evidence for the adoption by Judah of the cult of El Elyon, as distinct from the name. But as we have remarked above, there are whole areas of the Judahite cult from the time of David onwards which can only be adequately explained on the basis of a thorough-going fusion of cults. While this kind of argument is necessarily rather unsatisfactory, nevertheless this is one of the problems of ancient history, where sources are scant, and the burden of proof must lie with those who would insist on no such syncretism. This was the tragedy of the prophets alluded to above; they were simply fighting against the tide of history if they hoped for a return to the honeymoon period.

b) The negative reaction.

On the basis of the syncretism described above, Eisufeldt was able to claim that there was never any conflict between El and Yahweh. He has been followed in this judgment by a number of scholars. I shall try to show below that with regard to Israel this is simply not supported by the evidence. I believe that there is a limited amount of evidence to show that in Judah too there was in some circles at least a sense of unease at some of the implications of the syncretism which shaped the cult from the inception of the Davidic dynasty.

Our evidence comes from the J source, normally dated to the time of David or at least during the brief period of the united kingdom. In the J account of the creation of man and the fall, Gen.2.4b-3.24, the fact of a rich mythological background is generally acknowledged, and yet it contains an apparent contradiction in the presence of two trees in the centre of the garden, 2.9. Far from representing a rather awkward fusion of two different
myths, this curious feature should point to a significant element in the story. I believe that it shows that the story is being used for a particular polemic purpose. Avidberg has argued that Gen.1-3 is to be understood against the background of the Canaanite cultus. I think that he is wrong with regard to Gen.1-2.4a, which is to be set rather against the Babylonian milieu of the Exile, and only partly correct as regards the J material. The garden of Eden is of course the centre of the world. Every cult-centre is to be seen as the centre of the world, so that paradise and the cult-centre are essentially one. Thus the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim is the 'navel of the earth', the Omphalos, in Jgs.9.37, as is Jerusalem in Ezek.38.12. Paradise is the archetypal sanctuary, and man tending the garden (Gen.2.15) in a paradigm of the cult, itself paradigmatic for all human activity. This is why the mythical background, to Ezek.28.12-19 has been widely understood by scholars to be paradisaic, for there the locale is the home of the gods, and this of course is also to be identified with the sanctuary.

The Eden in Genesis also has in the background the idea of an oasis in the desert. It is the place of sanctuary, the source of life, to which the pastoralist repairs to tend his flocks, replenish his supplies, and celebrate his festivals. So the tradition lying behind the J account of Eden probably dates back into the remote background of the pastoralist ancestors of Judah, reflecting in its nostalgia for the place with trees and living waters and its attitude of resignation to life cut on the steppes, the hardship of life for the semi-nomad and his coveting of lands flowing with milk and honey which bordered his own territory. But that is very much in the background, and I believe that the author of the story in the form in which we have it has given it an entirely new slant.
the key to this is the matter of the two trees. There were two principles represented in Canaanite sanctuaries: the male and the female. We saw in chapter 1 the presence of a massëbah and an ašerah-pole in the Canaanite sanctuaries taken over by the Israelite tribes. The massëbah, I suggested, was probably taken to be the emblem of Yahweh, and the pole that of Ašerah his consort. Now while the massëbah may have always been associated with Yahweh after the settlement, it is perhaps more likely that here we have a feature of the indigenous El worship. It may be asked why it should be an emblem of El rather than of waIQI, as is commonly supposed.

We saw in chapter 1 that there are passages, such as Jgs. 6.25, 2 K. 23.6, where an ašerah-pole is destroyed, but there is no mention of an accompanying massëbah. We inferred that this was regarded (at least in some circles) as a legitimate adjunct to the Yahweh cult. Thus we find Moses setting one up to Yahweh in Ex. 24.4(E), while Is. 19.19 envisages one put up near the Egyptian frontier, again to Yahweh. It may be that in both cases it is to be seen as no more than a commemorative stela, such as David set up as a memorial to Absalom in 1 S.18.18. But in many cases the massëbah is clearly a cultic emblem, and an analysis of its occurrence in the Old Testament leads to some surprising results. In Genesis it occurs nine times. In three cases it refers to a memorial to Rachel (35.20, J) or to the treaty between Jacob and Laban (31.51, 52, E). In all the others it refers to a monument dedicated to El by Jacob, at Bethel (28.18, 22, 31.13, 45 - E; 25.14 – J) or at Shechem (33.20 E; cf. Jos. 24.26, Jgs. 9.6 below). In the rest of the Pentateuch, it occurs several times, in demands that it should be destroyed, or prohibitions on its erection: Ex. 23.24 (E), 34.13 (J), Lev. 26.1 (P),
and Dt. 7.5, 12.3 and 16.22 (D). Now in all three instances in Deuteronomy it is paired with the šəerah-pole. In almost all the references to the one term in the deuteronomistic history, the other is also present: at 1 K. 14.23, 2 K. 17.10, 18.4 (= 2 Ch. 31.1), 23.14, cf. also 2 Ch. 14.2 ( = 1 K. 15.11f.) and 210.5.12. This evidence may be taken as implying that the mazzebah represents the consort of Ašerah, who we know to be, not Baʿal, but Yahweh or El.

And in so far as the mazzebah is considered idolatrous, we may reasonably consider that the biblical authors are condemning the cult of El rather than that of Yahweh or at any rate a Yahweh-cult affected by elements of the cult of El. 27 There are more problematic passages too however. In 2 K. 10.26f., WT is apparently corrupt, and it seems that we should read:

\[
\text{they removed the } \text{(מְנָהִגָּה)} \text{ from the } \text{(בֵּית הָבָטֹא) and burned it } \text{(and they demolished the )} \text{ and } \text{(also) demolished the } \text{(כַּנְיָה 해ל).}
\]

The temple is self-evidently not that of Baʿal (for there would then be no article) but of 'the Baʿal', i.e. the local god. I suggest that this was probably El or Melqart (ʿAttar). The text is concerned with Samaria, and need not concern us further here. Yet the principle is true, that in almost all incidences of the term בּעָי used to designate a god, the article is used, and therefore it need not refer to Baʿal, but refers to some specific but unnamed deity. 29 This is a matter we shall develop later. The point here is that the evidence for any form of the cult of Baʿal Hadad is tenuous, and that where the term occurs, it may well refer to El. 30

... Now in Gen. 3, Evidborg takes the serpent to represent Baʿal, on the grounds of his connection with serpents. 31 We simply have no...
evidence of Ba'al being linked with serpents. But we do have evidence of El being so linked, and Yahweh is linked with serpents, possibly, in the Kenite(? ) prototype of the myth of the birth of Cain and in the Nehumatan episode in Num. 21,8f. (E) — which Rowley however has attributed to the Jebusite cult in Jerusalem and in the seraphs of Isaiah's vision (Is. 6,2ff.), which again may have been cultic impediments taken from Jebusite tradition. The serpent is described as 'cunning ( כִּיּוֹן) in the J accounts. This is in accordance with its overt form in the story. But behind this may be the conception of El as 'wise' (חָכָם), I suggest — a characteristic of El rather than of Ba'al, as Nivieberg claims. The phallic association of the serpent would be appropriate to Ba'al as a fertility deity, but are equally applicable to El.

The serpent is not actually described as being in the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but this is a reasonable inference from the universal iconographical treatment of the theme. Symbolically at any rate, the two represent the same thing, the masculine power. I take this first tree to be a 'phytomorphic' equivalent to the mansebah to be seen as paired with the 'tree of life', a transparent reference to the aṣerah-pole of Canaanite and Israelite sanctuaries, which was a surrogate for the tree. Here then, in the garden, the sanctuary, the archetypal place 'flowing with milk and honey' and thus signifying all the promise of the land of Canaan to Israel, are to be found the two emblems of the great deities of the land, El and Ašerah, inviting (Israelite) man to partake of them. However Yahweh forbids this, and when his edict is flouted, he removes the man and his wife from the garden, not so much as a punishment (though that in not excluded) but as a safeguard, for, as Nivieberg remarks, 'the serpent was not a giver of life.' On the contrary, he brought death instead of life; he
was a deceiver. The idea that the garden is a sanctuary is confirmed by the guardian cherubs, who are undoubtedly the tutelary deities of the sanctuary. In the light of this interpretation, we may suggest that the broad approach of the J author (on the basis of a tenth century date) is to call man out from this place of temptation, out into the wilderness. So while the story speaks of the yearning for settlement and security by the pastoralist, it also echoes the Israelite nostalgia for the desert, which in spite of the generally paleful symbolism of the desert, was undoubtedly present in some circles. The language of discipleship and of apostasy in Israelite religion is always in terms of the verbs of movement of pastoralist life and while this was in most respects just a historical accident, and a semantic specialisation of the terms undoubtedly developed, the fact that the pastoral imagery was considered appropriate and powerful even in exilic and post-exilic times suggests that an appreciative response could be relied on. Discipleship for Judah was a call out from the fleshpots of Canaan, a demand for constant repentance, constant vigilance, and in sharp contrast to the Canaanite version of the same ancient moon-guilt, which by its adaptation to the ideology of Bronze Age agricultural society was reduced to a debauched level in the eyes of influential groups within Yahwism. If my view is tenable, then we have in Judah a critique of El-worship just as severe as that which we shall see was expressed in the northern kingdom.

This interpretation can be sustained even without an appeal to the 'desert ideal', which is perhaps rather conjectural, if we accept the position of some recent writers. Van Seters argued that J in its final form dates only from the exile, although he only treats the patriarchal traditions in detail.
to universalist and monotheistic elements in Gen.1-11 which can only plausibly be dated in the exile. Thompson suggested that this ancient story 'was being re-edited and adapted in the light of Israel's mature faith gained during the experience of the exile.43 Mendenhall44 was concerned only with the present narrative, but on the basis of its vocabulary and wisdom-elements he also dated it an exilic. If we accept this revised background, then the expulsion from Eden may be understood as a parable of the deportations from Jerusalem in 597, 586 and 582. The placing of the passage in its present context, presumably in the late exile, or possibly early post-exilic period, would then indicate that even in the expulsion/exile is to be discerned, for those who have eyes to see, an element of hope, a call to a more genuine relationship with Yahweh. If the passage is to be regarded as exilic, then the attack is of course on the broad syncretism of El and Yahweh, with its 'Canaanite' forms of worship which, as the exiles now saw only too clearly, had rendered it all but indistinguishable from other levantine cults. It had failed to maintain its inherent opposition to them. Some, at least would digest this message in the post-exilic world.
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25 Heb. יִמַּעֹל. Is the mountain name כָּבֹל perhaps related?

D.W. Thomas links Tabor to the Ar. ḫābārā, 'raised; elevated' (perhaps related to Lth. hēmbert, Am. ṣebert – 'navel'). He mentions Cooke's link between it and debir (both place names and term for the holy of holies in a sanctuary) and suggests that the link with tabbūr must remain an open question, but is possible; 'Mt. Tabor – meaning of the name', VT 1 (1951), 229f.


26 Above, p. 23. Perhaps for לַשָּׁהֶבֶת in ḫg. 6.25, we should understand an original לַשָּׁהֶבֶת?

27 The māsēbah as a religious emblem is obviously of very great antiquity as well as of widespread use (cf. the large numbers in certain areas of Britain, notably Cornwall, Wiltshire, Anglesey, Argyll, etc.). Its original significance can only be guessed, though something of its fairly general importance may be seen from Eliade, Patterns in comparative religion, (ET 1958), ch. 6. Graham and May suggest that in Palestine many of these stones were from at least the EB (i.e. ca. 3200-2900 B.C.; de Vaux, CAH 1, 11 234) or even the Chalcolithic, Culture and conscience, (1936), 44f., and were originally connected with a mortuary cult, but later adapted to changing theological patterns. We see this adaptation at work in their association with El by the incoming Amorite patriarchs, and with Yahweh at the settlement. There is no need to see phallic symbolism.
They may even have had an astronomical function, in keeping with a lunar and astral cult. Cf. the theories of A. Thom, Megalithic lunar observations, (1971), and G. Hawkins, Stonehenge decoded, (1966). Though we cannot with confidence transfer their findings concerning Britain and Brittany to the Levant, they certainly merit a further look at levantine megalithic sites.

28 Perhaps there is an overloading of the text here; on the whole passage see III appar. Cf. Montgomery, Kings, (1951),411, who rejects the reading I support. On the reading יִזֹּכַה, the burning seems to demand this — a massebah would be smashed.

29 See ch.1, n.67. The following usages are found: with article 57 times; plural form with article (emphatic? NDB) 16 times; without article once (Num.22.41, where Banot-Ba'al may be a place name); in the compound Ba'al Peor 4 times (where it is probably construct), and replaced by הַשָּׁבָּה twice (see NDB,127). See also 2 K.32 where Jehoram of Israel destroys the massebah of the Ba'al. The 'great stone' in the sanctuary of Yahweh at Shechem (Jos.24.26) is a massebah (Jg.9.6, cf. Gen.33.20). On the use of the article, see R.Bussaud, 'Le vrai nom de Ba'al', RHR 113 (1935),6; 'Sous le nom de Ba'al (hab-ba'al) c'est bien Hadad que l'Ancien Testament met en scène'. This is an assertion not a demonstration. On the other hand, in almost all cases where הַשָּׁבָּה is used in prose, the article is lacking.

30 In the case of the deity on Mt. Carmel, we have seen that it is probably Melqart — ch.3, n.127. The temple at Samaria (1 K.10) may also have been dedicated to Melqart, or to his father El.

31 Op.cit.,287. Followed by Ringgren, op.cit.,(n.7),110. The iconography of the devil as a serpent is to be traced not back to Ba'al, as both assert.
to Ba'al, as both assert, but rather to 'Attar. See Wyatt, TCUOS 25, p. 93. On the background of Gen:3 as 'Baalist', see also G. Ostborn, 'Yahweh and Baal', LUÁ 51.6 (1955), 24, 31.

32 Above, pp. 299ff.

33 JBL 58 (1939), 132ff. He speaks of Num. 21, cf., as 'obviously etiological', p. 132.


35 Both in Christian and other art forms. A few examples must suffice: 'The fall' - Michelangelo's panel 6 on the Sistine chapel ceiling (1508-12); Cranach's, 'Adam and Eve', (Florence, Dresden) (1568/31); Dürer's 'Eve', (Franko, cat. no. 2178) 1507. Cf. the serpents on the staff of the Asclepios emblem (the Caduce of Hermes), the serpent guardians of the golden apples of the hesperides and the golden fleece.

36 On the knowledge of good and evil as sexual, see R. Gordin, 'The significance of the paradise myth', AJSL 52 (1935-6), 66-94. He takes 'good' to be heterosexual, and 'evil' to be homosexual activity. H. S. Stern argues that this approach is fallacious, in so far as the very making of male and female (Gen. 2.23-25) implies sexuality. 'The knowledge of good and evil', VT 8 (1958) 407. However he gets into hot water when he tries to suggest an alternative meaning. Of course a sexual interpretation of the tree need not be regarded as exhausting its ramifications. Ideas of divine knowledge and no on are also undoubtedly present.

37 Op. cit. (he is of course speaking of Ba'al).

38 Wyatt, TCUOS 25, pp. 90ff.

39 In southern (Judaite) thought, see Dt. 8.2, 3, and the tradition of the desert theophany, Dt. 33.2 etc.; in northern (Israelite) thought, cf. the Rechabites (Jer. 35) Am. 5.25 (though the prophet was a southerner) and Hos. 12.10. For discussion and
references see A. Altdorfer, 'The notion of the desert in Sumero-
Akkadian and West-Semitic religions', WZKM 1950, 3; and S. Talmon,
'The "desert motif" in the Bible and in the Quaran literature',

Ezek. 34:1; Joel 1:18; Zech. 10:3, 13:7; Ps. 15:4; frequently (with
problem of dating), and, clearly late, 119:176.


42 F. V. E. Minnett, 'Re-examining the foundations', JBL 84 (1965), 1-5.

43 P. E. S. Thompson, 'The Yahwist creation story', VT 21 (1971), 205.

Thompson like Hvidberg speaks of 'El, the deity whom the
story attacks - p. 206. My point throughout is that it was El.

44 C. E. Mendenhall, 'The shady side of wisdom: the date and purpose
I have argued above, while discussing the patriarchal formula 'the god of my(your, etc.) father', that it conceals an attempt to disguise or disparage original references in the E material of Genesis to El. I suggested that there was considerable evidence of a violent antipathy in the northern kingdom to El. In the present chapter I shall examine this evidence, which I believe gives abundant support to my view.

a) Hosea's allusions to non-Yahwist cults.

Of all the prophets, Hosea is the most specific in his attack on the popular religion of his day, to which some worshippers of Yahweh took exception. Apart from one or two allusions elsewhere, evidence from the other prophetic books is very difficult to characterise, but in Hosea I believe we have evidence which is quite clear in its import. In accordance with much of the discussion that has been devoted to the problem of syncretism and 'pagan' cults in Israel, it is generally assumed that the fertility cult to which Hosea refers is that of the storm deity Baal Hadad. Mays, for example, claims that 'from the opening verses of ch.1 to the concluding oracle of ch.14, the cult and mythology of the god Baal in the full of most of Hosea's sayings'. It seems to me that insufficient attention has been paid to details in the biblical text, and that a pan-Baalism has tended to cloud scholarly judgment. While I would not wish to deny altogether that Baal Hadad was worshipped in Israel,
the sacred marriage of Ba'al is not the only one in the Ugaritic texts, and there is no reason why it should not be that of El which is present in Israel. We have already argued that a version of this survives in the Abraham tradition. However tenuous the connection may have become between cult and tradition in this instance, it is surely significant that it is the El- and not the Baal - cult that lies behind the patriarchal tradition. This cannot be argued away as a natural attempt to treat the patriarchal god(s) with respect, since Jos.24.15 clearly regards even these as 'foreign'. The sacred marriage of El continues to feature in the cult of Judah (though of course El has become fused with Yahweh) according to Ahlström. This undoubtedly derived from the Jebusite period, though it is possible that a form of the rite had also belonged to primitive Yahweh. I hope to show that the same tradition was present in (northern) Israel too; and at any rate that it is El and his cult that honed attacks. The cult of Hadad seems to be referred to in Ezech,12.11, where mourning rites are mentioned, but this describes the post-exilic situation in Megiddo, and can hardly be used as evidence for the national cult of preexilic times. It may even refer to a non-Israelite community. The evidence of theophoric names points the same way. There is only one example of a Hadad name referring to an Israelite, and this is the post-exilic Levite Henadad (Ezra 3.9., Neh.3.18 etc.). All other examples in the Old Testament are of names borne by foreigners: the form Hadad (hypocoristicon) is Edomite, Gen.36.35ff.//1 Ch.146ff.; 1 K.11.14ff., or Ishmaelite, 1 Ch.1.30; the form Hadadezer is Aramaean, 2 S.8.3ff., as is Ben-Hadad, 1 K.19.18,20, 1 K.20.1ff., etc. Ba'al names scarcely constitute clear evidence, since we have seen that the divine title does not necessarily indicate the identity of the deity referred to, and we even have the form Baaliah in.
1 Ch. 12.5, a contemporary of David.

We must first recognise that the term does appear in Hosea, and offer an explanation for it. So in 2.18 (יV 16) we have this passage:

לְקָה יָּאָשְׁי בוֹלוֹת נַחֲלָה לְזוֹרִי בֵּבֵלוּל

She shall call me, 'my husband', and no longer 'my lord'.

Here the quite common word for husband is to be eschewed, because it is also a divine title and refers to a god who is clearly Yahweh's rival, and has powerful overtones of the fertility image of Israel as the consort of the deity (though of course Hosea himself uses the image to great effect). But it is begging the question to assume that the deity called Ba'al is the storm-god Ba'al Hadad. The title itself is used widely, and even of Yahweh, as this verse implies. We have seen that the Ba'al referred to in 1 K.18 is probably Molqart (*C. Attar), and the Shechemite deity El-Berit (Jg.9.46) could be called Ba'al Berit (Jg.8.33, 9.4) — where the deliberate change is probably intended to indicate that the deuteronomist (a southerner) regards this northern cult as idolatrous. So the case for Ba'al (Hadad) here is not proven.

In 2.10 (יV 8) and 13.1, the term is used again, but here it has the article, and as we have observed above, this clearly cannot be a divine name; it refers to a specific god, like 2.18, but in no way indicates his identity. That must be established independently.

In 2.15,19 (יV.13,17) and 11.2 the plural form appears, and refers to a number of deities. It may be that one or more of these was Ba'al Hadad or hypostases of him, but the word by itself does not constitute evidence of this. As we have seen, it simply means the Canaanite gods in general, set over against Yahweh. One cannot discount the possibility that the god Ba'al is referred to here.
but the evidence of the term constitues no proof. The phrase in 14.9a was amended by Wellhausen to read: 

\[ \text{I am her } \text{Anat and her Aserah.} \]

and this might be considered as evidence for Ba'al worship, by reference to his consort. It is also evidence for the worship of El (or Yahweh) on the basis of the reference to Aserah, but is a purely speculative amendment. It would also be the first evidence of the cult of Anat in Israel after the settlement; the lack of other evidence suggests that Anat had either become defunct, or more probably had fused with Astart and lost her independent name.

Suggestions have been made from time to time that the text of Hosea alludes in various places to the cult of El. There has not been to my knowledge any attempt to discuss them all together. I shall consider them here, add some suggestions of further instances, and also deal with the associated problems of the significance of the term in Hosea.

In order to deal with the apparently meaningless MT in Hos.6.6, Tur-Sinai proposed a re-grouping of the consonants to read:

\[ \text{יִרְכָּהשֶׁנָּה} \]

For who in Bell L1?

The suggestion is based on the Ugaritic title of El as tr 11, and fits in well with the allusion to the calf in 6.5. We shall look at this whole context later. El has also been found in 12.1 (LXX 11.12), where Cassuto proposed the translation:

\[ \text{But Judah still roams with El,} \]

and is faithful to the Holy Ones.

Here the allusion is undoubtedly to El and the pantheon of gods. I think it most improbable that 'El' is to be taken here 'in a good
sense!, as suggested by Ackroyd. 10

There are several other passages which may also allude to El. In a passage which is probably somewhat overloaded, 3:4f, the NRS translation reads:

For the Israelites shall live many a long day
without king or prince,
without sacrifice or sacred pillar,
without image or household gods;
but after that they will again seek
the LORD ("Yahweh") their god and David their king,
and turn anxiously to the LORD for his bounty in
days to come.

We have here the contrast of present polytheistic impiety with future faithfulness to Yahweh alone, and the house of David. 11

But the list of malpractices which Israel is to forego is entirely cultic, with the exception of the first items (v.4a.). This reference to a political misdemeanor 12 seems to me to be a misconception of the passage. The phrase in MT is יָבָא יָמִים יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְלְקַל יִשְׂרָאֵל יָתָן יִבְלְקַל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְלְקַל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְלְקַל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְלְקַל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְלְקַל יִבְלְk

Cazelles thinks that in this verse it probably has the same sense. 14 Now if יָבָא here is a divine name or title, as I think it most probably is, then the term יָבָא is best explained as another one. We have seen from Tur-Sinai's reading of 8:5 that יָבָא, 'bull' is written without the vocalic י. I suggest that here too we have this term. In this case 3:4a reads 'there will be no נָעֵל, and there will be no בֵּאל'. I take the 'Bull' to be a reference to El. 15 It could be argued of course that it refers to the storm-god Hadad. But we have seen that there is no clear evidence for the cult of Hadad in Israel,
and he is not apparently alluded to by Hosea, while El is. We shall see below that the bull-cult in Israel can be explained without reference to Baal Badad. Elek is a divine title given to several gods, and here may be plausibly construed as referring to El (i.e. הַלָּו, הַלַּו, or more probably to Atar). Gelston discusses all the references to הַלָּו in Hosea, and in every instance rejects its interpretation as a divine title. I am not convinced by his argument, which offers little real substance for his purely political view. On the other hand, there may possibly have been a deliberate double entendre in the mind of the prophet, in view of the ideological link existing between the king and Atar as the (firstborn) son of El. The instances of the term are as follows:

1), 2): 1:1 it occurs twice here and simply refers to the kings listed during whose reigns Hosea prophesied.

3): 3:4 we have just dealt with.

4): 3:5 probably a gloss, referring to a king of Judah, as the context implies.

5): 5:1 referring to the king in Israel. It should be noted that here the article is used, while in 3:4, for which we suggested a reference to a deity, there is none. The other examples so far cited are either constructs or have a suffix.

6): 5:13 here הַלָּו, for which some read הַלָּו, is // to הַלָּו, and is therefore best understood as a reference to Israelite and Judahite dealings with Assyria.

7): 7:3 here הַלָּו is // to הַלָּו; see below.

8): 7:5 הַלָּו is // to הַלָּו; see below.

9): 7:7 הַלָּו is // to הַלָּו, and appears at first sight to have a political reference. However, the poetic structure of the verse appears to be damaged, since the two
coli do not match. Without having a complete solution to the problem, I suggest that דכתobble has replaced an earlier ירוב. The whole complex 7.3-7 is exceedingly difficult both with regard to a damaged text and (consequently) with regard to a consistent meaning. In proposing my own version here, I do so with no great confidence that I have all the answers, but out of a sense of frustration at the inability of other modern versions to agree among themselves, and above all because I think that the purport of the passage as a whole is reasonably clear (as distinct from enormous problems in detail), and other versions simply do not transmit, or even recognise this, with due diffidence, therefore, I propose the following:

3 In their wickedness they make Delsk rejoice, and the Bulls in their deceptions. 21
4 All of them are adulterers, 22 like an oven that burns without a baker; 23

be rests from stirring (no: the fire)
from kneading the dough until it is leavened.

5 By day their Nelek they profane; the Bulls become inflamed with wine...

(6,7a all a gloss, following on from 4a).

7bc But they shall devour their Bulls, (yes) all their Neleks shall fall,

and yet there is none among them who seeks me.

10: 8.10 is apparently construct to '••; perhaps a is required.

11: 10.3 here appears twice, the second time with an article. In view of the context of vv.1-2, I understand the first instance to refer to the god Nelek, though with a pun, because with their icons and symbols destroyed (v.2) the Israelites are spiritually leaderless. The phrase 'because we have not feared Yahweh' fits with difficulty, and I suggest that both this and the following 'what can the king do for us?' are a gloss. Colston refers both instances to Hoshea, last king of Israel.

12: 10.6 here the term probably refers to the Assyrian king. Cf.5.13.

13: 10.7 'Samaria and her king are swept away'; the term here is undoubtedly a pun; both the king and the god perish with Samaria.

14: 10.15 a pun, as in 10.7.

15: 11.15 refers to the Assyrian king.

16: 13.10 two references. The second is // to '••, and the first to '••(cf.7.7). It seems that the allusion is cultic rather than political, though as we have seen above there may be a pun.

18: 13.11 again, perhaps a pun, alluding both to the deity and the political leader.
In this survey, we have seen that though there is often a double entendre, the cultic reference of the term ייִּתְנָדֵי is primary. More importantly for our purposes here, it is in parallel to or paired with יַעֲשֶׂה מִזְבַּח in five certain cases, and in two further possible cases. It seems to me that it is difficult to give an adequate explanation of this distinctive usage on a purely political level. The term ייִּתְנָדֵי, referring to a deity, is in the singular because the god is manifested particularly in the king, and is therefore always thought of in unitary terms. ייִּתְנָדֵי, reads as ייִּתְנָדֵנָי, in however in the plural or even perhaps dual ייִּתְנָדֵנָי, I suggest, for two reasons: firstly because the bull icons were set up in two sanctuaries at least, Dan and Bethel, and perhaps at others too; and secondly to emphasize the pluralist conception of El this tended to encourage (cf. ‘Ba'alim’) as opposed to the strongly unitary nature of Yahweh (cf. contemporary with if not earlier than Hosea, Dt.12, and rather later, and perhaps reflecting Hosea’s theology, Dt.6.4). 33

If this parallel use of names is established, then it provides a key to 8.4a, where both appear, to be used by way of a paronomasia, in verbal forms:

 luego הַמַּלֵּךְ לְאַלְמֵנָלָא
שִׂימֵר לְאַל עַלְמֵנָלָא

Again, I would not wish to rule out political overtones, but suggest that they are overtones, and not the primary meaning. The whole passage 8.4-6 is then an extended attack on the cult:

They make Moheke, but not by my authority,
they set up bulls, 34 but I know nothing of it.
With their silver and their gold they have made themselves idols... 35

I reject your calf, O Samaria. 36
My rage is kindled against it 37
For who is E'l?  
He is silent and is no god.  
Indeed, the calf of Samaria will become mere fragments.

The names of Hosea's children, chosen with great irony, may also be taken as evidence for the nature of the cult under attack. In Lo-Ruhamah Jacob suggests that the allusion is to the divine name rhy which occurs in Ugarit. Referring to CTA 23, he observes that 'il-pourait s'agir de la déesse Anat'. As we have seen; CTA 23 deals with the marriage of El and his consort Atirat (Aserah) and the most reasonable interpretation in the context of the expression atrt wibly is as a binomial: 'the walker and the gracious one' or 'the maid who walks' (lit. 'the walker and the maid') on the analogy of ktr wney. So the name Lo-Ruhamah may be an allusion to Aserah.

The god El appears transparently in the name given to Hosea's first child, Jezreel, and may be present too in the name Lo-Amsi. Amsi is the name of the moon-god in Qataban, and as Amon (Heb. Ammon) appears in Transjordan (Ammon) as well, though not necessarily as a moon-god. Jacob detects this divine name here, where it is probably a pun on the divine name ('guardian', 'kinsman') and its homonym 'people'. Perhaps the restored form (Amsi -2.3, LV 2.1) is to be understood as a hypocoristic for El-Amsi, of which Lo-Amsi is a deliberate perversion.

Yet a further reference to El may be intended in the element לֶז, perhaps to be read לֶז. Hyberg has drawn attention to its use as a divine title, probably a form of אָל. In 10.5 there is some doubt, but I offer the following tentative interpretation:
the inhabitants of Samaria worship the calf of Beth-Avon/Beth-On.

yea, they mourn. And the priests of the Most High will reveal its glory for it will be taken from us.

In 11.7bc, we have in LT the calf. There is no need to amend to as do Kell and Wolff. NIB takes the to be their High God, while NH3 appears following in repoints the particle to In fact a combination of these measures seems best. does not require a preposition, so that reading we may translate:

and they invoke El Most High.

Lastly, in 7.16 we have a damaged text. Again NIB follows Nyberg in referring to their High God but I think that the text demands more attention. I suggest the following:

They have returned to El Most High:

they are a slackened bow.

Their bulls shall fall by the sword;

their rulers by my indignation,

for this has been their calf since they were in Egypt.

A reference to the (golden) calf motif here makes very good sense, and also ties up very interestingly both with the episodes of Ex.32 and 1-K.12, and also with evidence that El was a rival to Yahweh from the earliest times. We shall turn to these questions below.
In this section I believe that I have established fairly securely, though perhaps with some doubt in individual passages, that Hosea had in mind the cult of El, especially in the form of the bull or calf image, and with strong overtones of the sacred marriage rite, in which Melek (Attar) the son of El was probably the partner of the goddess (the king performing his role in the cult). It is the sacred marriage motif which lies behind the whole imagery of adultery and prostitution in the Old Testament, as a means of referring to apostasy or syncretism, which amounted to the same thing in the opinion of strict Yahwists, of whom Hosea was perhaps the most outspoken. Behind the particular choice of metaphor there probably lies the idea that Israel embodies the consort of Yahweh (and/or of El) and that a strictly monogamous relationship is the only proper one. So the cultic situation which envisages an act of incest (or 'adultery') between the consort and another deity becomes the image for any dealings with rival cults. Apart from the natural antipathy of Yahwism to the use of images, which goes a long way to explaining the condemnation of the iconic cult of El, there may also be present the view that a god who positively abets his wife in her adultery is not fit to be worshipped.

There are however two instances in Hosea where the term מָנָה is used in a favourable sense. We must explain these in view of our argument so far. They are 2.1 (בְּבֵית לֵית 1.10);

for they shall be called the sons of the living El

(or god), and

for I am El (or 'god') and not a man.

In failing to see the consistent attack maintained against Bull-El in the book of Hosea, commentators have naturally missed the significance of these two passages. We have seen above the
probable origin of the expression "ז (נ-ף)• in lunar mythology. The idiom may have referred originally to El rather than Yahweh.

Whatever Hosea's contemporaries thought, there is no hint that he had any conception of Yahweh that was not totally transcendent, and more or less completely emancipated from ancient lunar vestiges even if traditional language prevails, as at 6:2. Here the term distinguishes the living El (i.e., Yahweh) from the insubstantial block of gilded wool or stone that was paraded around the sanctuaries of Israel. If the use of a despised divine name is bold here, it is nothing short of shocking - and perhaps deliberately so - in the second example in 11:2. Here we have simply the absolute statement, and this may unconsciously parody the title 'Bull El' given to the rival deity. It may also be a deliberate forcing of the term from its specific use (El) to its appellative use ('god', or more rather 'God'). In view of the strongly Inanian flavour of the (the Holy One!) the line could perhaps be construed as a post-721 gloss, but we cannot be certain. The startling way in which Hosea reverses the whole idea of the sanctity of Israel's relationship with its god into that of adultery - and he was perhaps the first to use the metaphor - while appropriating its positive content as a symbol of Israel's relationship with Yahweh, indicates that he was quite capable of using for his own purpose the very divine name he attacks in other contexts. Whether or not 11:9 goes back to Hosea, I think it probable that the whole of 2:1-3 (נ 1.10-2.1) is a later addition (likewise the reference to 'David their king', in 3:5?), resupplying the book of Hosea to the situation of Judah. The reunification of the kingdom envisaged may be an allusion to Josiah's activity, or may even be exilic. In this case, the reference to El is simply irrelevant to the broader question of Hosea's attitude to El, since it refers rather to the Jerusalem deity El (E'lyon).
b) The golden calf.

In Ex. 32 we have the account of Aaron's provision of a golden calf for the Israelites to worship, after Moses has been absent up on the mountain for some time. In 1 K.12.26ff. we have an account of the religious schism which accompanied the secession of the northern tribes from the united kingdom. There is clearly some link between the two passages, and the close literary and thematic parallels have been analysed by Aberbach and Smolar. The interdependence of the passages may be explained in one of two ways. Either i) the account of Jeroboam's activity is primary, and he initiated a new cult in the north to rival the claims of Jerusalem as the chief sanctuary. The account of his 'building' of Shechem (גֵּבֵּר) in 1 K.12.25 may be evidence that the deuteronomist understood this. Certainly there is no warrant for explaining away the verb by interpretations such as 'rebuilt' or 'fortified' on the grounds that Shechem was ancient. While this statement is of course independent of the religious actions, the indication that there is a 'new' and rival capital in a sense conveys the idea of innovation into his other activities in the religious sphere. The primacy of the king's account appears to be understood by Meek, Noth, and Gray, the account in Exodus is then understood to be an attempt further to discredit Jeroboam by showing how Moses himself had condemned the 'earlier' occasion. Noth places Ex.32 in J, but this involves him in two problems; either the dating of J must be brought down to after 921 and the secession of the north, or ch.32 must be regarded as a later addition to it. The first creates wide-ranging problems, and the second seems rather unlikely, though there may be an expansion (see below).

The alternative, ii) is to take the passage in Ex.32 to be primary (or at any rate the tradition behind it an historical and
therefore primary); with Jeroboam consciously modelling his procedures on it. In this case of course the present form of the Exodus narrative in which it is a record of an act of apostasy would not have been reached. Both in fact suggests that the implication of Aaron in the tradition is probably secondary, and according to Aberbach and Smolar it reflects later rivalries between Aaronite and Zadokite priesthoods. However, this possibility raises in an even more acute form the problem of the source. Is it conceivable that Jeroboam would model himself on a southern tradition when deliberately trying to justify an alternative policy? On account of this difficulty, it seems to me more reasonable to take the story to be E, with Eissfeldt’s query concerning the threat of punishment in Ex. 32.34 and its implications for the dating of the whole passage is, to my mind unnecessary, because there is every reason to take the verse as a later addition (post-721), since the punishment is carried out by the Levites in vv. 26ff. This reference to the Levites set against the Aaronites seems to me to be a better explanation than that of Aberbach and Smolar just referred to, because if it is an E passage, then it must refer to an internal struggle in Israel rather than to one between northern and southern priesthoods.

This conclusion, and my general approach as outlined, is borne out by a consideration of another important issue in the two narratives and the background to them both. This is the question of the significance of the calf-image used. A variety of answers have been given to the problem. We shall list them briefly before suggesting an alternative.

1) The throne (or ‘vehicle’) of Yahweh.

This view was suggested by Albright and has been widely accepted. According to it Jeroboam did no more than try to provide
an alternative cult-object to the ark in Jerusalem, and intended neither idolatry nor apostasy. Yahweh was still understood to be invisible and merely enthroned upon the calf, as in Jerusalem he was 'enthroned on the cherubs'. Albright also insists (and has been followed in this by many) that the animal is not an image of the god, but only his throne or vehicle. Frankly I think the subtnery of this view, quite apart from the dubious evidence of iconography, is far removed from the practical concerns and reactions of the ancient world. The Exodus narrative clearly states that the god is to be 'made', and sacrifice is offered to it. This is not just the deliberate identification of image and god in an attempt to ridicule both which sometimes appears to motivate the biblical treatment (cf. Is. 44:9-20; 46:1f., etc.), but the fact that icon and deity are identified in the ancient world. This is not to say that the deity is not more than his idol, as the biblical propagandists would have it; rather is the image a focus for the hierophany of the deity who can appear simultaneously in many images. Thus the two calves, at Dan and Bethel, were manifestations of the deity in two places at once. But we have suggested that the ban on images is very ancient in Yahwism, and it is inconceivable that the northern tribes would turn so deliberately against an ancient tradition, which must have led immediately to further schism between Yahwists in the northern kingdom. If the images are those of another cult entirely, this question would not arise.

2) Hathor.

This suggestion has been made by Cesterley, in a discussion of Egyptian religious influences in Israel, that the calf in Ex. 32 is an image of Hathor. This can hardly be taken seriously if the narrative is associated with 1 K. 12, since there is no trace of
Nathor worship in Israel, except possibly in the cult of Aššur and Karmain.

3) Moses.

A highly unlikely theory has been developed by J. M. Casson, to the effect that Aaron made the calf as a representation of Moses, who was apotheosised on the mountain. He mentions the 'horns' appearing on Moses' temple (Ex. 34:29), and offers an etymology of the name Moses, equating it with the calf born to Bašal and Anat in CTA 5 v. 22. "Certainly Moses does have royal features, but the king is never himself represented directly by a theriomorphic image, or directly worshipped with sacrifices, outside Egypt."

4) Polytheism.

Montgomery understands a deliberate rejection of Yahwism for polytheism: 'with only one calf there was danger of confusion of the image with Yahweh; with the introduction of a second one the worship in the northern kingdom is presented as clearly polytheistic. This is supposedly the view of the southern editors of the tradition, who have altered an earlier form in which Jeroboam merely set up one calf, at Bethel. Unfortunately, Montgomery offers no identification for the (original singular) calf, nor does he explain how the same icon was deliberately understood by the editors to represent different gods.

5) Bašal.

Cutbom argues that Jeroboam's calves represented Bašal. His monograph exhibits all the characteristics I have criticised above lumping everything that is not Yahwism together as 'Bašalism', and assuming that Bašal (Hadad) is everywhere referred to by name. I have shown this not to be the case in Hosea, and no evidence is available which makes it likely in either passage under consideration here.
Two scholars have argued that the calf/calves represented the moon-god Sin. They draw attention to the many lunar associations there are in the early narratives, but both fall down on the same point: the failure to recognize that there were within historical times different forms of the moon-god worshipped in different areas. We have already suggested that behind the Sinai tradition there may well be the cult of Sin, preserved in the names 'the lord of Sinai' and 'il Shaddai'. There was originally however no connection between the Exodus and Sinai traditions, so that the Israelites coming from Egypt and the northern tribes as a whole in their earliest period of settlement, before the unification under David, would have no occasion to worship Sin. Certainly there is nothing in the Exodus tradition to suggest it. When during the united kingdom the northern tradition of a mountain (the mountain of God E/Horeb D/Sinai J) was developed, this was always associated with Yahweh. However, I believe both scholars are correct in linking the calf/calves with the cult of the moon-god, and it remains only to determine his particular form.

7) El.

This identification has already been made by Schaeffer, with regard to the episode in 1 K.12, but he does not link it with Ex.32, and offers no reason why it should represent El rather than Ba'al. Neither does he consider El's role as moon-god, although providing information which seems to me to provide evidence for this.

He illustrates and discussed a particular bull-image, found near Tyre. The bull is ithyphallic, and has a (solar?) disc and ankh symbol between its horns, indicating Egyptian influences and perhaps linking the bull with the cult of Hathor. We saw above that
Hathor was identified at Sinai with Atirat, the consort of El. The association with Hathor and the ankhe may however reflect purely artistic borrowing, not necessarily accompanied by ideological dependence. Cf. also the Samaria ivories, which borrow heavily from Egyptian iconographical motifs, though there is no biblical evidence at any rate for a wider influence. The bull is also covered with tiny incised stars. This seems to be an iconographical reference to the stars of El we meet in Is. 14.13 and CTA 23rev.54. The astral decoration also seems to rule out the possibility of this particular bull representing Heqal.

It is possible that the text of Ex. 32 actually contains a reference to El, which has now been (deliberately?) obscured. Verses 4 and 8 both contain this cultic declaration:

≤אכ choked 재ordan ṡואנ כהן נלטאי

And they said 'these are your gods, O Israel, which brought you from the land of Egypt'.

It is curious that we should have the plural demonstrative form if only one calf was made. Apart from that, the plural form of the verb could still be construed as singular, following נב as a plural of majesty. In support of a singular reading here, we may cite 1 K.12.28, where Jeroboam says exactly the same as in the Exodus narrative, except that for א we have נ, thus reading either 'Behold your gods...!' or 'Behold your god...!' Jeroboam is hardly likely to be speaking of two or more gods, but of one residing in two images. A third allusion to the Ex. tradition, in Neh. 9.18, clinches the argument:

This is your god, who brought you out of Egypt.

I suggest that the following process has taken place in Ex. 32.4.8.
The formula may originally have read "ר"מ ג, meaning 'El is your god, 0 Israel, who brought you out of the land of Egypt'. Aaron (or the Israelites themselves, if he was added later) then advocates the rejection of this new god Yahweh of whom Moses had spoken in favour of their ancestral god, now come to their rescue and celebrated as saviour in the cult. The change from ל to ה is explicable in terms of the reforming principles underlying various amendments of the biblical text during transmission. When the (southern) exilic or post-exilic editors of the Pentateuch came across Ex. 32.4,8, they would see no cause for alarm in Aaron's reference to El. For them, El in his old Jebusite form had long been identified with Yahweh. Knowing that some kind of apostasy was referred to they therefore took ל to be an older spelling of ה 'thence', and possibly amended the verbs to plurals. This explanation also helps with the reference to a feast of Yahweh in v. 7. This might be considered an embarrassment for the view I am advocating. But in the latest pentateuchal-recension, Aaron's sin was seen as promoting the cult of an image of Yahweh (א) rather than a rival cult, and so an older reference to a feast of El became standardised with no thought that a radical alteration of the sense was implied.

Which of the two narratives was in fact the primary one? In purely literary terms, we may suppose Ex. 32 to be earlier, if only on the grounds that א is to be dated about the middle of the eighth century, and therefore antedates the work of the deuteronomist, writing in the late seventh or (more probably) early sixth century. In terms of the primacy of the cultic situation, I believe that the same is true. We saw in Hos. 7.16 that the prophet was probably referring to the early cult of the calf:

for this has been their calf
since they were in Egypt.
His (contemptuous?) use of הַי as the means of reference may be the source of the term הַי in Neh 9:16. Of course the actual narrative of Ex 32 may be a literary construction of E, but this in no way invalidates the idea that it is based on a genuinely ancient cult of El going back into the past long before the settlement. Certainly the placing of the episode at the foot of the main narrative, designed to highlight the enormity of apostasy immediately after the sealing of the Covenant, but this has been done in the interests of polemic, and the identity of the opponents of the El cult is likewise plain from the narrative: it is Levites who support Moses, against a rival priestly cult which may well have served the sanctuaries at Dan and Bethel, or at least the latter, for any centuries. They would naturally be jealous of any rise in power of the levitical priests of Yahweh. So this element of the priestly rivalry may also belong to a secondary expansion of the tradition (though still in a northern context). It was originally, I suggest, a perfectly acceptable tradition that El, the god appearing to the patriarchs, had brought their descendants out of Egypt. It only becomes a matter for dispute when the rival cult, of Yahweh, makes the same claims. We argued above that E has deliberately suppressed or disguised references to El in Genesis, and instead has used the colourless אֱלֹהִים who is understood to be Yahweh. Egyptian history provides instances of the same kind of suppression of evidence, particularly in Dynasty 18, when Thutmose III had the cartouches of Hatshepsut erased from monuments, and later when Akhenaten had references to Amun removed, only to have the tables turned on him by the Theban priesthood after his death. Cf. too the reduction of Trotsky and others to the status of 'non-person' in modern Russia and satellite countries, so that they do not even appear in history books.
c) The Balsam cycle.

We have further evidence which supports my conclusions here, and also justifies my rendering of Hos. 7:16. This comes from the Balsam cycle of stories in Numbers. The parts which concern us here are chs. 23 and 24. Both analyses these as follows: 22.41–23.26 E, 23.28–24.19 J, with 23.27, 29, 30 secondary additions.

A remarkable bi-colon appears in 23.22 (E) and almost verbatim in 24.8 (J):

![Bi-colon image]

El brought him out of Egypt; he is like the horns of the wild ox to him. He brought him out of Egypt; he is like the horns of the wild ox to him.

The first colon parallels exactly the passages discussed above, and the simile of the second is remarkable, to say the least. There seems to me no doubt that it is a clear iconographic allusion to the horns of El as the bull-god. It could, of course, be argued that we have here just a poetical use of מָאָס, meaning a title of Yahweh.

But so far as the L material is concerned I believe we have established the unlikelihood of this. Besides, our present context appears to support the conclusions I have drawn. In Num. 23:15 we have the following usages referring to God: 'Yahweh', vv. 3, 8, 12, 16, 26. In all but v. 8 there is manuscriptal or versional support for the reading 'Elohim'. 'El' occurs in vv. 8, 19, 22, 23. In addition, in v. 21 we have the expression מָאָס רַם, where I believe the expression to be secondary in its present form. It seems that there is a strong tradition having a preference for מָאָס over מָאָס, which has been partially reversed only in the final MT, and even then with considerable support for the former. If we bear in mind the probable levelling effect the editing of the Pentateuch would have had, the usage is certainly worthy of note. As regards the use of מָאָס, it
is perhaps significant that it appears only in the poetic parts, which would probably be more resistant to change than prose, and both considers them as additions anyway. In the prose sections, it does not appear once. This may be seen as at least supporting my view of the use of \( \text{יִתְנָה} \) in Genesis to disguise references to El.

In the J material (ch. 24) on the other hand, the use is altogether freer, although perhaps in its present form it has been slightly affected by editorial treatment. The divine names here are as follows: 'Yahweh', vv. 1, 6, 11, 13 (twice, the second time with support for \( \text{יִתְנָה} \); 'Elohim', v. 2 and perhaps v. 13; in v. 4 we have 'El...Shaddai' divided between the cola, in v. 16 we have 'El...Elyon...Shaddai' similarly divided, and we have noted the use of 'El' in v. 8. Here we have the typical usage of southern poetry, where names from all stages of the tradition are freely interwoven, though only 'Yahweh' and 'Elohim' appear in the prose sections. Whether this last point reflects the reluctant attitude towards El which I suggested was present in Gen. 3 is not clear.

Which elements in the Balsam tradition are primary, and in particular, which of the two verses, 23.22 or 24.7 is primary? The answer to this problem will determine to a considerable extent whether my exegesis of the passage can be supported. The context of the story is the invading Israelites from Egypt massing on the borders of Moab and constituting at least a potential threat to Moabite sovereignty. If this has a historical basis, then it can refer only to those tribes involved in the exodus and invasion of Palestinian territory across the Jordan from the East. These we have seen to be northern, which sets the Balsam cycle clearly within northern tradition. In detail the J and E sections are broadly independent. Only 23.22 24.8 are in fact common to both,
and significantly refer to the very element in the cycle which is the core of northern rather than southern tradition. The development of the tradition into its present form is best explained as one of the classic instances where the two blocks of tradition have incorporated elements originally alien to them, a process which can have happened only in the reigns of David and Solomon, or after 721. The borrowing of the traditions of the other main grouping (northern against southern) took place before the fixing in written form of either J or L (on the conventional dating of these), and in the final period of relative fluidity of oral tradition, allowed the differences which are now manifest to develop. 114

d) Ps. 106.19-22.

A short section in this national confession of Yahweh's mighty works alludes to the two elements we have discussed in the previous sections. vv. 19ff. read:

They made a calf at Horeb,
and bowed down before a molten image;
they exchanged their Glory
for the likeness of a grass-eating bull.

They forgot El who had saved them,
him who had done great things in Egypt,
wondrous things in the land of Ham,
fearful things at the Sea of Reeds.

Here the technical difference we have suggested between בְּנֵי as the deity and הָאָדָם as his image (n.36) seems to be supported. The northern provenance of this particular passage, if not of the whole Psalm, is indicated by the reference to Horeb. Of particular interest is the fact that here we have a tradition of a legitimate, apparently aniconic cult of El the saviour god contrasted with the falsity of the calf-worship. In this it would appear that the psalm has been handled within the Yahwist community (already clear from the overall structure of the Psalm (Yahweh in vv.1,2,4,16,34, 40,47,48; El in vv.14,21), in which the 'true El' identifiable with Yahweh has been distinguished from the physical representations of him, which are unacceptable. Nevertheless, here is further evidence of a tradition that El was the god of the exodus.

e) Pentateuchal references to God.

There is a further matter in which a northern tradition that El was the god who brought Israel from Egypt may perhaps be present. We have noted the special use of דְּהֹוֹ in the E passages in Genesis. Now the term continues to be used in other parts of the Pentateuch, in certain parts of Exodus and Numbers. It seems to me highly significant that it occurs as a title, or proper name, only in E. Apparent exceptions turn out not to be such. Thus, its occurrence in Ex.6.2(P) precedes the revelation of the name Yahweh and is simply the final case of P's scheme throughout Genesis, while the odd instances in J are all in formulae which show it to be generic: 'the god of the Hebrews' (Ex.5.3), 'Our God' (Ex.5.8, 8.21) and so on.

The name Yahweh is of course used freely in E after Ex.3.15. There are isolated uses of דְּהֹוֹ or דְּהֹהֵשׁ: It is difficult to offer a satisfactory explanation of such isolated cases (e.g. Ex.4.20...
27; 17:9, Num.21:5) and it is tempting to put it down to stylistic variation and no more. However, there are several important passages where the term occurs (in both forms) sufficiently often to suggest that within E we have an alternative tradition interwoven with the Yahwist one. We shall look briefly at each of these in turn.

1) Ex.13.17-19. This small pericope (the neighbouring passages are 12.35f., and 14.3,5, and do not appear to be directly connected) contains two disparate elements: the explanation of the roundabout route taken by the Israelites (vv.17f.) and the statement that the bones of Joseph were taken from Egypt (v.19). They are connected only by the use of the term בַּגַּלָּנָה. V.19 is perhaps the key to the entire usage in Exodus and Numbers that we are discussing taken in isolation. It enables us to make a case for the view that בַּגַּלָּנָה disguises an allusion to 11 in this passage. On the ground that 13.17-19 and the blocks of material we shall discuss below can only be reasonably explained in terms of a distinct source (or oral tradition) underlying them, we may then infer that בַּגַּלָּנָה elsewhere in E probably reflects the same disguise. This inference of course falls short of proof, but it is then found to be overwhelmingly supported by the evidence of Genesis, and by the other material we have discussed above, especially Noah. V.19 quotes the words of Joseph, regarding the pledge he's descendents must make to take his remains with them when they leave Egypt: 'Elohim will surely visit you, he says 'and you will'(i.e. must) carry out my bones from here with you'. These are not of course actual words spoken by a historical Joseph; they are instead an essential element of the tradition linking the people of the exodus (the 'Joseph tribes') with their eponymous ancestor. But this makes the wording all the more significant. We might well have expected the author/traditor of E
to lapse into an anachronism and write 'Yahweh'. Instead he uses the term he has applied throughout Genesis. Consequently all that we have written in that context applies here. Furthermore, Joseph (or the tradition) would almost certainly have originally given the name of the god involved, and in view of all that we have said of 'patriarchal religion' the only serious possibility is that El was the god in question. The passage then not only provides an allusion to the religion of the patriarchal period, but also suggests (a suggestion that is strengthened by the volume of the other material to be discussed) that it is the same deity who is to be involved in the exodus. It is Joseph's god El, not any later arrival, who will rescue his people. This is precisely what we have seen to be suggested elsewhere. The fact that מַעְלָה (for מַעְלָה) also occurs three more times in 13.17–19 shows that we are dealing not with a single instance which cannot support the construction I have put upon it, but with a consistent usage.

2) Ex.18. This passage (all Ex) is taken to be a crux in the Midianite-Kenite hypothesis. I described this above as a useful working hypothesis, rather than proven fact, and in spite of the result of our discussion here, I still consider that it has its uses. However, it also has several limitations, or rather, it is clear from this passage that the issue is far more complex than generally recognized. There are two divine names used, Yahweh and Elohim, and their occurrence allows a division of the text into what appear to be two narratives. The detailed breakdown is tentative in so far as the allocation of verses not employing either name can only be guessed. Verse 4 in particular, with the formula 'the god of my father', is problematic. Allowing some room for manoeuvre, however, we may divide the chapter as follows: the 'Yahwist source'; 2–4, 8–11; the 'Elohist source'; 1.5–7,
12-27 (vv. 2-4, and 5-7 can quite readily be transposed). It appears that we have a tradition in both sources that Jethro and Moses meet. In the 'Yahwist source' Jethro rejoices and blesses Yahweh (vv. 9-11). There is no reason why Koggenstern's interpretation of this, which we endorsed above, should not be maintained. However, the supporting evidence that Jethro was a priest of Yahweh, on the ground that he sacrificed to him (v. 12) is no longer available, because this verse belongs to the 'Elohist source'; he sacrifices in fact to El, rather than Yahweh, a most awkward situation for the hypothesis! It survives as a hypothesis in my view on the strength of the Kenite/Cainite material in J (Eissfeldt's source L) which gives incontrovertible evidence of the cult of Yahweh among the Kenites.

3) Ex. 19 (E). We have already discussed the J material in Ex. 19 in ch. 3 above. We noted there that vv. 1, 2a were P and vv. 9a (b gloss), 10, 11a (b gloss), 12-16a*, 18, 20, and perhaps 21-24 were J. That leaves vv. 2b, 3b, 16aβ b, 17, 19 and 25. These are to be attributed either to E or of course to J.# It seems to me that within E, we can divide the verses as follows:

the 'Yahwist source' (or perhaps J#e?), vv. 3b-8;
the 'Elohist source' vv. 2b, 3a, 16aβ b, 17, 19, 25.

The second source reads as follows (J#B):

2b There facing the mountain Israel pitched camp.
3a Moses then went up to God.
16aβb There were peals of thunder on the mountain and lightning flashes, a dense cloud, and a loud trumpet blast and inside the camp all the people trembled.
17 Then Moses led the people out of the camp to
east God; and they stood at the bottom of the mountain.

19 Louder and louder grew the sound of the trumpet.

Moses spoke, and God answered him with peals of thunder.

25 then Moses went down to the people and spoke to them.

We have here a complete, self-contained account of the mountain theophany. The fact that such a passage can so easily be isolated seems to me to give strong support to my view. Its real identity as an account of the theophany of a deity other than Yahweh is confirmed by an examination of the sequel. V. 25 records that Moses began to speak to the people. In the final redaction of the Pentateuch, this verse prefaces the decalogue, 20.2-17, the link verses 20.18-21, and then the Book of the Covenant, 20.22-23.33. But there is evidence of a secondary handling of the materials.

4) Ex. 20-23. The awkwardness of the present position of the decalogue is manifest. Eissfeldt solved the problem by transposing vv. 18-21, so that the sequence ran vv. 18-21, 1-17, 22ff. Both and Hyatt preferred to see it as a secondary insertion. Since it is addressed to Israel in the singular (יהוה ), it seems that it should be closely associated with Dt. 5, in spite of the detail differences. If it is excised, together with v. 1 which is a link (note however that it speaks of Elohim, not Yahweh), then vv. 18-21 follow directly from 19.25; and are seen to be the appropriate sequel to it. And these verses speak only of Elohim. Then follows the Book of the Covenant itself. The divine names used here are as follows: Elohim: 21.6, 13 22.7, 8(x2); 27, (6 times). Yahweh: 20.22, 22.10, 19 (probably twice). The Lord: Yahweh: 23.17.
These last two expressions are both suspect. 'The Lord Yahweh' sounds Isaianic, but is perhaps rather to be read as 'the ark of Yahweh' (\textsuperscript{128} for \textsuperscript{1}(\textit{lý}ý)\textsuperscript{128} or 'Yahweh your god' (\textit{sg.}).\textsuperscript{129} In the latter event, it is to be taken with 23.19.' The expression 'Yahweh your God' is used distinctively. Its occurrence in the four pentateuchal sources is as follows:

J: (four times in the mouth of Pharaoh; pl.);\textsuperscript{130} three times in the singular. In 15.26 Yahweh is addressing Moses, so the singular use is not remarkable; and in 34.24,26, the phrase occurs in a decalogue (formulated in the \textit{sg.}) and again the singular use is not remarkable. In all three cases however, priestly or deuteronomistic influence is probably to be assumed.

E: four times (\textit{sg.}) in the decalogue.\textsuperscript{131} This we have seen to be a later addition, and in any case it represents deuteronomistic influence. The only other occasions in E are the two (or three) under consideration. We shall return to these.

P: the phrase occurs 29 times, always in the plural.

D: Deuteronomy uses variations of the expression with great frequency: Yahweh our god: 24 times; Yahweh my god: twice; Yahweh his gods: twice; Yahweh your god: (pl.): 45 times; Yahweh your god (\textit{sg.}): 229 times.

The final two figures are open to alteration, because in places LXX and MT are not in agreement, though I believe that KP-1 is to be preferred. The singular form represents the usage of 'Un-Deuteronomy' (most of 12-26) with its first expansion perhaps in Josiah's time. The plural form represents the usage of the deuteronomist, who gave the work its present form as a prologue to his history. Levelling both ways has clearly occurred in individual
passages. It is quite clear that the expression, especially in its singular form, is very typical of Deuteronomy. It probably has its origins in the cultic context envisaged in the work, where Israel stands as the child of Yahweh before him. So when we find the singular form in Ex. 23.19 (and perhaps 17) the possibility arises that we have a deuteronomistic amendment or insertion. This may be confirmed by the context of the verses— the thrice-yearly assembly at a (central?) sanctuary, and the bringing of the first fruits to the temple. Bearing in mind that Dt. 12-26 (the bulk) was probably expressly compiled as a corrective to certain features of the Book of the Covenant (see further below) it is not at all surprising to find traces of such a correcting tendency in the Book of the Covenant itself, especially since the deuteronomists had such a considerable literary and theological influence during the exile.

The other instance is Ex. 23.25, where the plural suffix is used. Here 'Yahweh your god' is mentioned in express contrast to the other deities of Canaan. In view of the continuum of El-worship throughout the southern Levant, as evidenced by the northern and southern traditions we have already examined and by frequency of place names with the element El- or -el, we could hardly expect any such statement, were the Book of the Covenant to be understood as a document of the El-worshippers of Israel, rather than the Yahweh-worshippers. Now this is precisely what I am suggesting in this discussion, and since we have been able progressively to demonstrate the secondary nature of reference to Yahweh within it, we may at least consider the possibility that this reference too is secondary, and has been added at some time to confirm the appropriation of the document by the Yahwists. Again, quite independently of the case I am making, the deuteronomistic flavour of 23.23-5 is self-evident (cf. Dt. 7.1f., 12.3).
If we are correct in our disposal so far of all references to Yahweh in the Book of the Covenant, then the only remaining instance in 20.22 ('Yahweh said to Moses, "Tell the sons of Israel this..."'), can not unreasonably be treated as the result of levelling in the final priestly redaction of the Pentateuch, and hence as not part of the original work.

Much of what I have said here is necessarily conjectural, and therefore I do not more than present my conclusion as a hypothesis, the validity of which seems to me to be generally borne out by the supporting evidence, though it is perhaps not susceptible of proof. My view is that the Book of the Covenant is in fact a document recording the legal, cultic and moral rules of an El-worshipping community in northern Israel, the very same community who believed that El had brought them from Egypt to their present territory. This cult was characterised, probably from its inception in Israel, and certainly from the time of Jeroboam I, by its plurality of sanctuaries. This perfectly normal practice was a godsend to the propagandists of the Yahwists in Israel, who ridiculed the idea of one god having many sanctuaries: he must inevitably degenerate into many gods, unlike Yahweh, who had only one legitimate sanctuary, probably Shechem. This viewpoint is enshrined in Dt.12,13-19, and 20-28 (a passage belonging to Ur-Deuteronomy) and 12.2-7, 8-12 (pl. passages, part of the final expansion of Deuteronomy, in the Exile). Cf. also Dt.6.4.

This fundamental cultic distinction between the Book of the Covenant and Dt.12-26 provides to my mind a much more substantial basis for the curious literary and legal relationship of the two documents than exists if they are both taken to be Yahwist. The Yahwists could not gainsay the bulk of what the El-document contained, and among less critical members of the Yahwist community
the two cults were probably well on the way to a syncretistic fusion; and so they write a new version of it, highlighting humanitarian policies, emphasizing the need for worship at one sanctuary only, and making the same claims for Yahweh which the other tradition had made for El. At a later stage they took over large sections of the El-tradition (the passages we are discussing) including the Book of the Covenant, and integrated them into their own Yahwist tradition, disguising allusions to El under the neutral 'Elohim'.

5) Ex.24.9.11. We have noted above that this passage is to be assigned to E, in spite of Nicholson's arguments. In its description of a theophany we would naturally expect a reference to the god who appears. In the light of the previous usage discussed, it seems that the name El is to be seen as lying behind the term Elohim. If this is granted, the passage becomes, along with Ps.19, evidence from Israelite tradition of the lunar character of El.

6) Num.22-23. We have already given reasons for regarding the Balaam cycle as belonging to the El-cult. This is borne out (if my argument so far is accepted) by the use of divine names in the narrative parts of the E tradition. "Yahweh" is used in 22.8,13,19, 23.3, 137 5,8, 138 12,16, 137 17,26, 137 'Elohim' is used in 22.9,10, 12,20,38, (23.17) 23.4, (16?), (26?), 27. These occurrences allow a tentative division of the text into two independent and self-contained parallel narratives. With the possibility of some flexibility, they are as follows: The Yahwist narrative (E): 22.8,13, 23.5,12,17. This is very brief, and has been added secondarily into the El/Elohist narrative, which originally consisted of: 22.2,3,9,10,12,14,15,16,19, 136 20,21aa,35,38,40,41, 23.1-4,6-11,13-16,18-30. Material not included here belongs to the J account. If, the Yahwist (E) material is excised, the flow of the El/Elohist narrative is improved.
7) Ex. 3 (E). With the conclusions we have now reached, we are in a position to take a fresh look at the E narrative in Ex. 3. Some parts of the narrative are to be regarded as secondary insertions into the tradition. In v. 6, the formula 'the god of Abraham, the god of Isaac and the god of Jacob' is clearly an expansion, linking the tradition of Moses with those of the patriarchs. The introductory אֲדֹנָי אַלְלֵי בָּרָא is on our earlier argument an expansion of אֲדֹנָי אַלְלֵי בָּרָא, in which the deity declared himself by name.

There is a slight awkwardness in v. 12, in that the coming to the mountain is hardly the authenticating sign of Moses' mission, but rather the conclusion to the whole enterprise. However the sign is mentioned in v. 20 (21–22 additional?), which must therefore at some stage have followed on directly from v. 12a (with v. 19 probably redactional). The reference in 12b to the mountain was probably the conclusion to the narrative. The suggested sequence vv. 12a, 20 is supported by Ex. 10.1f.

... Go to Pharaoh, for it is I who have made his heart and his courtiers stubborn, so that I could work these signs of mine among them; so that you can tell your sons and your grandsons how I made fools of the Egyptians and what signs I performed among them, to let you know that I am Yahweh. It is evident from this passage that the authenticating sign is Yahweh's (originally El's) mighty acts in Egypt.

It leaves out of account the whole of vv. 13–15, which I believe to be secondary. We have already seen the wide consensus on 14 and the patriarchal formula in 15 being secondary. I believe however that before the final addition of these passages, there was already an expansion in which the Exodus tradition was
appropriated by Yahwism with the incorporation of v.13 and the rest of v.15 into an older corpus. We have seen that there is a substantial portion of the wilderness narrative which does not know of the deity Yahweh (i.e., the passages discussed above), and have argued that behind the term נג⁹ lies the divine name El. We have also seen that there are clear indications in the Balaam oracles, Ps.106 and the golden calf tradition, that the god El was regarded as the saviour from Egypt.

Here is a reconstruction of the original form and sequences of the Elohist narrative, in which I have replaced 'Elohim' by 'El'. It is a consistent account, and provides the basis on which the Yahwist version has built its own account. In v.4b, we should probably read an original 'mountain' for 'bush',¹⁴ which has been altered to harmonise with J. Apart from this, it should be emphasised that I am simply applying conclusions already reached to the present context. The original E version would read as follows:

1. Moses was looking after the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, priest of Midian. He led his flock to the far side of the wilderness and came to (Horeb) the mountain of El.

4b. And El called to him from (the middle of) the mountain:

6. 'I am El your father' he said... At this Moses covered his face, afraid to look at El.

9. 'And now the cry of the sons of Israel has come to me, and I have witnessed the way in which the Egyptians oppress them.

10. So come, I send you to Pharaoh to bring the sons of Israel out of Egypt.

11. Moses said to El, 'Who am I to go to Pharaoh and bring the sons of Israel out of Egypt?'
12a 'I shall be with you' was the answer, 'and this is the sign by which you shall know that it is I who have sent you:

20 I will show my power and strike Egypt with all the wonders I am going to work there. After this he will let you go.

12b After you have led the people out of Egypt you are to offer worship to El on this mountain.'

Here we have an account of what was, I believe, the original 'kerygma' of Israelite religion. While its 'historic' essence survived later developments, it underwent a theological transformation, in that, the kerygma was appropriated by another deity, Yahweh, although we have seen that he was in many respects similar to El. 143

f) The evidence of Deuteronomy.

Since Deuteronomy represents a good example of a northern document subsequently reedited and expanded in the south, it provides a useful control to all my foregoing arguments. In the earliest stratum, chs. 12-26, the name El does not occur once. This block, referred to above as 'Ur-Deuteronomy,' is widely agreed to be the document discovered in the Jerusalem temple at the time of Josiah in 621, 144 and being originally from the north. If as I have suggested it was partly, if not primarily, a polemic against the El-cult, then we would naturally not expect any reference to El, unless they were negative, and certainly no equivalence of El and Yahweh.

When we look at the subsequent expansions of the work, however, which occurred after 721, and therefore represent the adaptation of the book to southern (and later exilic) purposes, then we find that the term El does appear, and interestingly reflects the ambivalent attitude to the god which we suggested was felt in Judah: at one level a straight-forward identification of El Elyon and Yahweh, but

at another, a deep suspicion of El as the bringer of all things Canaanite into the Israelite sphere. Eissfeldt recognises two
introductions to the books 4.44-9.7, 10.12-11.32, and 1.1-5, 9.8-10.11, 1.6-4.40. Broadly speaking, allowing for levelling and expansion of the first of these, together with a few typical phrases repeated verbatim in the second, they are couched in the form of a second person singular address and a second person plural address respectively.

I would date them broadly as follows: the singular introduction (4.44ff.) from the period 721-621, though it may be as late as the beginning of the exile; the plural one (1.1ff.), which is designed to transform Deuteronomy into the prologue to the deuteronomistic history; ca. 562 B.C.

Occurrences of the term я are as follows: in the earlier in introduction 5.9, 6.15, 7.9, 7.21, 10.17. In the later one, 3.24, 4.24, 31, and also (from southern poems) 32.4, 12, 18, 21, 33.26.

1) 5.9 יְהֵו יָדָה יְהֵו יָדָה יָדָה יָדָה יָדָה

This is normally rendered: 'For I, Yahweh your God, am a jealous God'. (so JB, RSV, NBL - 'the Lord'). But it is just as possible to translate as 'For it is I, Yahweh your god, who am jealous El'.

יְהֵו יָדָה is a set expression, and in view of its occurrence in prose passages only, cannot be dismissed as a poetic use of יָדָה for 'god' or 'God'. I believe we have here a formal title of El, which Yahweh appropriates as most fitting: 'I am the jealous El, not any spurious Canaanite El'.

2) 6.15 יְהֵו יָדָה, cf. 5.9.

3) 7.9 יְהֵו יָדָה יְהֵו יָדָה יְהֵו יָדָה יָd

It seems to me that the word יָדָה here is superfluous (rather than an affirmation of Yahweh's divinity, as JB, RSV, NBL), and is to be regarded as a gloss on יָדָה following. On the article in יָדָה, see 10.17 below. I suggest the following sense: 'Yahweh in your god, it is he who is the faithful El'. (contrast to the spurious one?).
4) 7.21

"Yahweh your god in your midst, El great and awesome".
(perhaps in contrast to the one who inspires no awe?) on the form of n.147.

5) 10.17

Yahweh your god,
he is the God of gods,
yea, the Lord of lords,
the great El,
the mighty and the awesome one.

The articles here contrast with the formula in 7.21. They do not necessarily make generic, but rather follow in the context of supremacy, emphasizing the uniqueness of El. Here of course Yahweh is the 'unique El'. In all these passages, the implied rivalry between Yahweh and El may or may not be present. If the singular introduction is to be dated shortly after 721, perhaps written by northern refugees come into Judah, then we should give greater weight to it. If the introduction is to be dated in Josiah's time or even later, then the likelihood of rivalry is reduced in the sense that the south shows evidence of an ambivalent attitude to El, as we have argued.

The other instances in which the name appears belong to the deuteronomist's work and the poems he has incorporated. They therefore date from within the exile, and in view of the very different
circumstances of the time (more especially if we assume that the deuteronomistic history was written in Babylon) we may assure that the old rivalry of the two gods was no longer a burning issue, if indeed of any importance at all. Consequently the two appear to be equated in these passages: 4.24,31, 32.4,12,18,22, and 33.26 (the last being southern in any case). In 3.24 a case could be made either for the generic use of the term, or possibly for a hint of the old rivalry, though this would be somewhat passe in the changed situation.

In the last two chapters we have seen that two cults which sprang originally from the same foundation in Semitic religion, the cult of the moon-god, nevertheless had developed in different ways within Israel and Judah until in the north they became bitter rivals, and in the south had a rather uneasy relationship.

The complex of traditions that are normally associated with the cult of Yahweh, the exodus and the conquest tradition, the Sinai covenant, and the pan-Israelite nature of Yahwism from the time of the Judges, are seen upon a close examination to spring from diverse sources, so that it appears that for the tribe or tribes (Ephraim, the 'house of Joseph') historically involved in the exodus and conquest, the god they worshipped was 'El, whom their forebears the 'Hebrews' in Egypt had worshipped before them. It was this cult of El which was always the national cult of Israel, except perhaps in the dynasty of Jehu; while Yahwism was the faith of the minority. The exodus kerygma was appropriated by Yahwism in the north by the writers of Deuteronomy (13.6b,11), and would appear to imply that the presence of the same kerygma in J must belong to the later stages of J posited by van Seters, rather than to a tenth century document.

Thus our findings have far-reaching implications for the whole study of the Old Testament.
Notes to Chapter Eight.


2 *AMR*, 69ff. It may be that we have in this royal hierarchy, and in the Tyrian form, a marriage between the king (mythically: 'Attar) and the queen mother (the 'Aṣerah; mythically: 'Āserah). Thus El's marriage (*CTA* 12, 23, 24) would be regarded as the archetype of all marriages, and 'Attar's (incestuous) marriage with his mother a 'reactivating' version of it in the cult.

'Baʿal of course copulates with 'Anat, and not with 'Āserah, and this may be evidence of his secondary super-imposition on the Ugaritic mythology. The incest motif is strong in Egypt (see in particular Herodotus' account of the festival at Paphros, II 63, where the verb σπευδάω has sexual overtones) and also in the Oedipus myth. I believe that Oedipus is a form of Dionysus, and therefore ultimately derived from 'Attar. 'Attar's marriage in Ugarit has perhaps been displaced by that of Baʿal.

I argued in ch. 3 that Baʿal had taken 'Attar's original place in the atonement rite.

3 Ch. 3, n. 127.

4 Cf. 9.10, where Baʿal–Peor (place-name) is mentioned.

Immediately after, the expression יָּ֫וָּ֖שׁ is present, and is probably a lampoon on the term בְּיָשׁוּ כָּל. It should be noted that even in its (scarcely) disguised form, the article is present.
5. J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, (1898), 134 - cited with approval by Jacob, op. cit., 254, n. 5. See also BH3appar.


8. LNB vol. 1, col. 31; see also Pope, El, 35; Cassuto, The goddess Anath, 57n, and NBD.


10. Loc. cit.

11. Many scholars take the reference to the Davidic dynasty as a gloss. See Gelston, op. cit., passim, for references and discussion. He himself expresses 'some doubt' as to the Hosean origin of the verse, pp. 79, 82.

12. So Gelston, op. cit., 76. See also his discussion of the mas reading יִתְם for יִתְמָה, p. 85.


15. Perhaps the vocalisation יְהִי and sense of 'king' could still refer to El; cf. the use of הָאָר (not tr) as a title of El (CFA 23, obv. 8). However, while this would make sense in view of the frequent pairing of יְהִי/יְהוָה, it would make nonsense of the probable pairing of יְהִי/יְהוָה.

16. See ch. 3, nn. 34-36; for Umbrian usage.

17. See for instance the ideology behind Tyrian kingship in Ezek. 28 and probably to be discerned in the Jerusalem monarchy too, the basis of which was undoubtedly Jebusite tradition.

18. Of course, after יְהוָה, we would not expect one, so there may be no significance in this.
On כז and מְשְׁרֵת as terms for apostasy see Jg. 2.11 and passim (טְמֵאִים), Hos. 10.1 (תַּărֹן), and Is. 59.13 (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה). What is deceit and wickedness to Hosea is fervent devotion to the god addressed; hence their rejoicing.

Hosea's standard imagery for disloyalty to Yahweh. This and the constant image of heat in the following verses makes the broad sense of the passages only too obvious. Contrast the approach to this verse (and the whole passage) by S. P. Paul, 'The image of the oven and the cake in Hosea VII 4-10', VT 18 (1968), 114-120. For מִשׁוֹחַ he reads מֵשׁוֹחַ (p. 115, n. 4).

I suggest that the bi-colon originally read:

All of them are adulterers,
like an oven that burns (spontaneously) from its heat (סַרְפּוֹ). This sense of the particle או is better than 'without' which is required since כְּבוֹד has become pronounced as כְּבֹד (baker)—though the emendation is reasonable in that an oven burning without help from the baker clearly burns spontaneously—and the rest of the verse has been added as a not very illuminating gloss.

Perhaps a haplography has occurred; read מִשׁוֹחַ.

MT reads 'our king'. If the original sense of כְּבֹד was lost in transmission, perhaps the knowledge of the Ammonite form of the god כְּבֹד led to a pious emendation. Cf. Wolff, op. cit., 107.

Cf. the verbs used in v. 3 (n. 21). There may be a malicious pun here on כְֹבֹד; 'they praise'.

Bijl apparen...
I.

27 Pointing  יֵּעַּה, following Caster, Zu Hosea 7.3–6, 8–9, VT 4, (1954), 78f., and Wolff, loc.cit. On El, becoming drunk, see GC.24.256, Votum 5, 545–551.

28 A clear sense is impossible here. Does רָשִׁית perhaps mean 'he takes out his phallus'? Cf. El in CTA 23. Since it is as, it would presumably refer to Melek. Does the end of the line mean 'the mockers' as a parody for 'the worshippers'? All very obscure.

29 A pun - on the eating of sacrifices? Or has מִלְכָּ֫י replaced מִלְכָּ֫י?

30 Reading מִלְכָּ֫י, as suggested above.

31 So MB3 appar.


33 See n.146 below.

34 Pointing מִיָּהוּ, to produce a carrollesque hybrid of מִיָּהוּ and מִיָּהוּ


36 Reading מִיָּהוּ, with MB3 appar. Cf. Maas, op.cit., 133f.

Wolff, loc.cit. Lundbom retains מִיָּהוּ, with מִיָּהוּ in the second colon doing double duty as subject to both verbs. 'Double-duty subject in Hosea VIII.5', VT 25 (1975), 228–230. The frequent use of מִיָּהוּ may be abusive, or a poetical alternative to מִיָּהוּ, or it may be that מִיָּהוּ refers to the god, and מִיָּהוּ to his images. Cf. 12.12 (EVVII) where we should read מִיָּהוּ. Cf. MEB, JE. Wolff takes the bulls as the sacrificial animals, not the recipients, op.cit., 142, 207. I believe מִיָּהוּ has dropped out through haplography. The plane form מִיָּהוּ may be explained as a scribal error, influenced by מִיָּהוּ just before.

37 Reading ag. in view of מִיָּהוּ in v. 6.

38 Omitting v. 5c as a gloss.
39 Omitting מַעְלָה and reading מַעְלָה מַעְלָה. Alternatively, we may omit מַעְלָה and read מַעְלָה מַעְלָ. MT represents a hybrid. In favour of the former sense, cf. 1 K.18.26, Is.41.21f., etc.

40 Taking מֵא as emphatic. See Dahood, Psalms iii, 402ff.

41 Jacob, op.cit., 252ff.

42 'Girl' according to Gordon MT 2321, p.483. rham is used of 0Anat in CTA 6 ii 27, and rh may appear to be used independently in a list of deities invoked in a damaged passage, CTA 15 ii 6.

43 See also ibid., 'Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament', AWT 35 (1938), 329f.


45 On the form מֵא, see Wolff, op.cit., 171.

46 On מֶא(bi in terror, treble) as a cultic term, cf. Pss.22.24 (LYV 23), 33.8 (Wolff, loc.cit.).

47 Cf. L.B. Bailey, 'The Golden Calf', HUCA 42 (1971), 114, who takes מֶא as a place-name, 'the town of מֶא known as מֶא.

48 Either a lampoon on Bethel, or a reference to Beth-Shemesh. (See May, 'some aspects of solar worship at Jerusalem', ZAW 55 (1937), 269,n.2: a double entendre, and perhaps referring to Solar worship at Bethel?)

49 Emphatic מַעְלָה.

50 Cultically, but with an irony, because of the sequel. See Wolff, loc.cit., The verb can take the preposition מַעְלָה, but need not.
52 In גֵּרָה an altered form, or should we read גִּרְנֶה (for גִּרְנָה) or גִּרְנֶה? On גִּרְנֶה see below. is perhaps a reference to גָּם, with a sarcastic suffix of ownership. Cf perhaps.

53 רַע הָעָשֹׁת, a difficult term, perhaps not clearly understood by a scribe, which may explain the... On גִּרְנֶה see n.52.

54 A reference to a cultic procession. See BDB, on piel form of verb with גִּרְנֶה. Here the unusual hiphil form indicates the irony of the verb, to be used, in a very different sense in the next line.

55 Lit. 'will depart!' for exile to Assyria.

56 May, op. cit.,150, Wolff, op. cit.,192. So also JB. Cf. JB on 7.16.

57 Following Nyberg, op. cit.,58ff., 89f.

58 Cf. Wolff, loc. cit.

59 Perhaps the... of גִּרְנֶה has been omitted through haplography.

60 MT גִּרְנֶה. See discussion on solutions in Wolff, op. cit.,108, BHS app., etc. It seems to me that גִּרְנֶה requires the proposition גִּרְנֶה. I therefore propose either גִּרְנֶה or, even better. Gal. On this basis, one has dropped out from MT. Cf. Nyberg, op. cit.,57. JB corrects גִּרְנֶה to גִּרְנֶה.

61 A gloss?

62 Reading יְבִּזְרֵי for יְבִּזְרֵי of MT.

63 Reading יְבִּזְרֵי with BHS app. I take it that יְבִּזְרֵי, 'rulers,' refers to gods (or did originally) and may have displaced earlier יְבִּזְרֵי (see n.25), thus losing the pun.

64 I take יְבִּזְרֵי to refer to El. Cf. יְבִּזְרֵי in Jg.5.5 and Ps.68.2 (HNV 8) discussed above. For the unsatisfactory יְבִּזְרֵי I have read יְבִּזְרֵי.
Lit. 'from the land of Egypt'. For - 'from', see Dahood, Psalms iii, 39ff.

The fact that Israel is also Yahweh's 'son' - 2.1, 11.1, cf. Dt.14.1 etc., may be an indication of the breakdown of the mythical conception of kinship for a more morally orientated one (though I see no reason why the two should be incompatible). Perhaps it is simply over-rationalising on our part to see an inconsistency where none existed in the Israelite mind, but each image served a particular purpose.

On the idea of El taking a positive role in encouraging the 'adultery', cf. the myth of 'El, Ashertu and the storm-god', ANET, 519. Here 'the storm-god' - anonymous but presumably Tešub/Baal Hadad - is the partner. This is the nearest we got to Baal being presented as Ašerah's consort, but he may have taken over in Ugarit a role in the sacred marriage originally played by OAttar, who continued it elsewhere where he remained dominant (Tyre, Israel, Judah, Ammon, Moab?)

There is however no internal evidence in the Ugaritic texts to support such a view, nor from the biblical tradition, to support the idea of such a development in Israel.

68 P.151.
69 See n.148 below.
70 G. Ostborn, Yahweh and Baal', LUA 51.6, 11.
74 Hebrew origins, 153ff.
75 Exodus, 246.

I am speaking in Neth's terms. On J as perhaps later, see ch. 7, nn. 41-43. I am inclined to agree with van Seters et al. that in its final form it is exilic.


Stalker, loc. cit., 'E(Eje?i).

The Levites being the priests of Yahweh. See Nielsen, Chechen (1955), 197ff. This also explains the concern of Dt. for the Levites.

FSAC, 299. See Aberbach and Smolar, op. cit., 135, nn. 32-34, and Bailey, op. cit., 97ff., n. 3, for further references. For the view that the deity promoted by Jeroboam was Yahweh, see also L. B. Paton, 'Did Amos approve the calf-worship at Bethel? JBL 13 (1894), 80f. He cites 1 K. 22.53 and 2 K. 3.7f., as supporting such an interpretation. However in the first case the following verse makes it untenable, and in the second the very passage cited should rather be construed the other way - a rival deity is set up.

There were two sanctuaries of Horus in the temple at Edfu, each with its falcon form of the god. At the same time, the stone falcons in the great courtyard and outside the pylons, together with the low-reliefs on the walls, were all...
manifestations of the god, who could equally well be seen in the sky each day. The Egyptian material alone demolishes Albright's views, as does the fact that the cherubs he refers to were themselves (originally at least) deities. On the principle of the identity of god and image of the remark cited in ch.1, n.51. This does not mean that the cult animal (Istar's lion, etc.) cannot at the same time be the 'vehicle'. The vehicle itself, as can be seen particularly well in the Hindu context, is a symbolic reference to certain chief characteristics of the deity and his protean manifestations in anthropo-, therio-, or phytomorphic forms are precisely what distinguish him or her from man, with his limitations. Of course this whole view of the natural world, with the immanence of divine powers in many physical structures, is characteristic of a polytheistic and/or monistic world-view (often referred to scathingly and without sympathy or understanding by scholars as 'nature-religion') but became wholly unacceptable to Israel as the doctrine of Yahweh's transcendence became paramount.

86 Above, pp.269f.
87 W.C.E. Cesterley, 'Egypt and Israel', in The Legacy of Egypt (ed. Glanville, 1942), 239.
90 The sacred falcon at Edfu is an image of the king.
92 Of course the bull or calf could represent more than one deity—e.g. El or Baal; but without express distinction, we would expect the plural form in the king's text to refer to two images of one god.
95 Ch.6.n.4.
97 Op.cit., fig.10, p.15 and pl.IV; for discussion, see pp.16ff.
98 V.4 requires Aaron as subject (cf.Lk.). Perhaps v.8 has attracted the verb into the plural.
99 Cf. Cross, 73ff.
100 Cf. CHS 145 i (p.463), where however this usage is denied for this passage. Cf. Bailey, op.cit., 99, and n.16.
101 According to Nielsen, Shechem, 196,207, there was originally only one calf, at Bethel, and in Ex.32. Cf. Montgomery, referred to above, p.348.
102 The remarkable similarity of these three formulae, with however significant differences, indicates that the relationship between them is not simply literary. The expression is best understood as an exclamation of recognition and acknowledgment at the epiphany of a god (i.e. of his image) during a cult procession. The reference to a feast of Yahweh is perhaps secondary, if early, development in the sense.
103 Cf.CH.34b, p.109.
104 It is tempting to relate the expression to the divine title. 'The Lord of Sinai' (נברון) discussed above, ch.4, n.62. But while the demonstrative in both cases refers to a divine being there is otherwise no immediate connection.
105 Husbarn.171
106 Although I believe that E is primary here, the J reading is preferable. The דיל E is primary here, the J reading is preferable. The דיל E is primary here, the J reading is preferable. The דיל
perhaps due to a ditography, preceding תמרת. Cf. יד (eg.) in both passages, which must refer to the same person.

107 The word חָתִים (י"הם BDB, 419) is obscure, but JS, NEB both accept (horns). On the reference of כ, see previous note. This can hardly be a simile for Israel’s strength (so BDB, adloc.) which makes nonsense of the poetic structure. This misconstruction may be due to the simile/metaphor of the lion (Israel) which follows the second occurrence. There is a distinct break from one image to the other here, with different subjects, and not an ‘imperceptible’ passage from one to the other, as claimed by Noth, op. cit., 191. Cf. also his remarks on p.187.

108 Cf. Noth, op.cit., 187: ‘the archaic word חָתִים...

109 The exact significance of חָתִים in every instance in the Old Testament is beyond the scope of our present enquiry, but I suspect that it may prove very fruitful in shedding light on the extent to which El and Yahweh were rivals, especially in the north. The evidence I have analysed at any rate places the onus of proof upon those who insist that חָתִים is no more than appellative, a poetic (‘archaic’) form for יהוה, or theologically the equivalent of Yahweh. If the use of different divine names was of significance for the understanding of Genesis—a supposition which is the foundation of all pentateuchal criticism, then why stop the analysis at Ex. 3 or 6?

110 See BDB, appx.

111 Secondary, according to Noth, loc.cit.

112 Either the double usage reflects the double ms. witness of the other passages (i.e. תמרת may be a gloss that has been incorporated into the text), or possibly for, תמרת we should read חָתִים. In any case, I suspect that חָתִים in the following colon has a divine reference, so that the bi-colon may have originally meant.
And his god was with him (or 'Ama?)

and the trumpet-blast of Weleq (sounds) on his account.

113 Both, loc. cit.

114 Other cross-fertilisation is seen in the northern use of the
mountain assembly and the southern version of the exodus
tradition. It does not appear to stretch so far as the borrowing
of distinctive regional divine names.

115 A first examination of the two forms appeared to indicate that
$\gamma\nu\gamma\omicron\tau\alpha\omicron\rho\nu$ always occurred as a nominative, and $\gamma\nu\gamma\omicron\tau\alpha\omicron\rho\nu\iota\tau\iota$ as an
accusative or genitive, but this is by no means consistently
so. I can discover no other reason why there should be a
constant changing from one to the other form. There is no
justification for suggesting two different sources.

116 In this section, I am of course speaking of 'Yahwist' and
'Elohist' sources with regard to the use of the names in $E$, and
not with regard to $J$ and $E$, the major penteteuchal sources.
On multiple sources in $E$, see Lissfeldt, Introduction, 169. I
prefer not to refer to $E^1$, $E^2$ etc., as this implies successive
expansions of a common tradition. My case is that we have
two traditions, broadly parallel, and with common elements,
which attribute the saving acts of the exodus and so forth to
two different gods - Yahweh and $\mathbb{E}$. They represent not
different recensions in the same religious (i.e. Yahwist)
tradition, but two distinct traditions.

117 Though against transposing them, we may note the reference to
'the mountain of god', in v.5. This is a usage quite distinct
from Horeb, used in $E$ at 3.1, 17.6, and it is possible that the
two terms belong to the different strands of $E$. The 'mountain
of Elohim', originally perhaps 'the mountain of El', fits
best into the 'Elohist' strand.
118 Ch. 6, n. 7.
119 P. 136, and notes.
120 J. F. Hyatt, Exodus, (1971), 49, attributes Jb-8 to 'Rd' - the deuteronomistic redactor.
121 JB: so. (Heb. 'l).
122 A reference to his ascent to speak to God is perhaps suppressed in favour of vv. 20f.
123 On. cit., 213.
124 On. cit., 160 - 'loosely joined to the narrative...'.
125 On. cit., 207.
126 Sam. exits; to be deleted, BH3 appr.
127 Sg. acc. to LXX; BH3 appr.
128 Sam.: BH3 appr.
129 LXX, Syr.: BH3 appr.
130 Ex. 8.24, 10.8, 16, 17.
131 Ex. 20.2, 5, 10, 12.
132 To the former, cf.: Ex. 34.24, and to the latter, Ex. 34.26 (both J).
133 It may be countered that this is the language of the Book of the covenant, which provides the inspiration for Deuteronomy. This is possible; 'However Deuteronomy frequently alters the legislation of E (e.g. with regard to the use of altars. Ex. 20.24-6, Dt. 12.13-19; see Hissfeldt, Introduction, 220f.). So far as the list of nations is concerned, it only occurs three times in northern documents, Ex. 23.23, 28; and Dt. 12.17. All other occurrences are southern (8 times in J. Gen. 10.16, 15.20f.; Ex. 3.8, 17; 13.5, 33.2, 34.11, Num. 13.29) or late (10 occasions in the deuteronomistic history or the chronicle's work: Josh. 3.10, 9.1, 12.8, 24.11, Jg. 35, 1 K. 9.20, 1 Chr. 14.5, 2 Chr. 8.17, Neh. 9.8, and also Dt. 7.1 from after 721). The reference to Job sites in Ex. 23.23 suggests that southern influence is at work.'
134 Dt. 27.11-13. On B as representing laws that are not specifically Yahwist, cf. Alt, 'The origins of Israelite law', in *Essays on C.T. history and religion*, (LT 1966), 96ff. He is concerned rather with casuistic laws in general, but the part he recognises as B (21.2-22.16, p. 68, n. 16, where the reference is given incorrectly) is precisely that part of it which is wholly casuistic in form.

135 Above, p. 179ff.

136 Perhaps Yahweh here (v. 19) should be read as Elohim, having been altered by levelling. See the narrative reconstruction below.

137 Some ms. רַבָּה; see BH3 appar.

138 Verse, with Ll//Yahweh. See my remarks above on the survival of the name Ll in verse sections.

139 Pp. 244, 248ff.

140 See JB, n. ad loc.

141 So Noth, Exodun, 28, 38 (see ch. 4, n. 105).

142 Later gloss? — see ch. 4, n. 105. The reference to Horeb is undoubtedly deuteronomistic rather than RJe.

143 If not originally a hypothesis of him, as suggested by Croda, *Cilt*, 71. In this case of course we must assume a divergence some time before the Israelite appropriation of Yahweh. K. T. Andersen, in *Der Gott meines Vaters*, St. Th. 16 (1962), 185, suggested that the people who left Egypt were not Yahwists, but see Dec. Note, *History of Israel*, 156ff. unfortunately did not elaborate. Van Seters suggested that vv. 13-15 were to be dated no earlier than the exile, on independent grounds. For him, the patriarchal formula in vv. 6, 15, betrayed the concerns of the exilic community, for when the 'Mosaic Covenant' was recognised as broken, and the patriarchal was substituted an one that still stood. See 'Confessional reformulation in the exilic period', VT 22 (1972), 456ff. This would make it what van Seters calls 'late J' — i.e., the exilic...
2 K.22.8. The tradition underlying Dt.27 (or at any rate vv.11-13) must also have originated in the north, though perhaps not in its present form. Cf. Dt.12-26 as northern, see n.146.

I envisage five stages in the development of the book, and it is to this schema that I have occasionally referred above:

1)† mid-8th. century; northern — most of 12-26.

2) ca. 621-580 or possibly after 721 — 4.44-9.7a, 10.12-11.32, 28.1-46 (refers to destruction of Samaria?), 30.11-20.

3) if we take an early date for 2), this is an adaptation to the events of 597-582 — 28.47-68, 30.1-10.

4) ca. 562** (writing of history) — 1.1-5, 9.7b-10.11, 1.6-4.40, 27.29.31-34, Jos. — 2 K.

5) still exilic; incorporation of Dt. into Pentateuch (priestly history) — 4.41-43 and various other minor glosses and alterations.

† Predominantly sg. in address.

‡ Predominantly pl. in address.

** The 'deuteronomist'.

complex than any such analysis can indicate. See for instance, Dt. 27, Nielsen, Shechem, 50ff.

147 Ex. 34.14 (J), Ex. 20.5 (E) - Dt. 5.9, Dt. 4.24, 6.15; Jcs. 24.19. On the form of the expression with the omission of the article, see Gil. § 126f., p. 409f., where it is noted that the article may be omitted from the attribute of a proper name. Among other examples cited are יִשָּׁמְעֵל הָאָנָּו and יִשָּׁמְעֵל יְהוָה (cf. יִשָּׁמְעֵל הָאָנָּו).

On this last, see n. 148.

148 The name is true in my view of the expression 'the living God' - rather 'the living El', referring to the cultic affirmation of his resurrection. There are three versions of it in Hebrew, which I suggest developed in this order:

תֵּא דתְּלָנָה Pss. 42.1 (LEV 2), 84.3 (LEV 2); Jcs. 3.10; Hos. 1.10;
תֵּא דתְּלָנָה 2 K 17.19; Is. 37.4, 17;
תֵּא דתְּלָנָה Dt. 5.26; 1 S. 17.26; Jer. 10.10, 23.36.

149 Read יֵתָנָה.

150 The verse could be rendered, 'for who is El, in heaven or hell (יָשָׁב עָלָּי), that he can do deeds like yours, or mighty acts like yours?'
Conclusion.

Our findings can be summarised briefly as follows:

i) The distinctive identity of the three major goddesses of the Levantine world is usually handled very loosely; an analysis of each shows that they are different. Their nature can be shown to be conditioned by their pastoralist milieux, and in particular Åseråh, who is found as the Consort of both El and Yahweh, is seen in her most primitive form as the sun-goddess of the Semitic pastoralists. Her presence in the Jerusalem temple raises various problems for the approach of most biblical scholars towards Israelite syncretism.

ii) There is little evidence for the 'Baal-worship' - by which scholars mean the worship of Ba'al Hadad - within the Old Testament. The usage of the title with the article is only plausibly explained as generic, so that while it obviously refers to specific gods, or even one specific god, it offers no identification. This must be sought elsewhere.

iii) There is an almost universal assumption that the fertility cult in Israel is to be explained in terms of that of Ba'al Hadad. But the Ugaritic evidence so frequently cited in support of this view itself describes another tradition - that of the marriage of El and Åseråh (Atirat), which has demonstrable links with patriarchal tradition and Israelite practice where Atar/Malik takes over the role of husband, and provides a far more likely point of contact with the Canaanite background.

iv) A study of the West Semitic forms of El leads to the conclusion that a specific god lies behind much of the usage, and that he is best characterized as an ancient moon-god, compassionate and
benevolent; the father of gods and men. The close relationship which Israelite El has with Yahweh, in terms of both fusion and opposition, is best explained on the ground that:

v) Yahweh also was a moon-god. While this can perhaps not be proven with certainty, it is not an unreasonable conclusion to draw from the theophany and atonement traditions discussed. If it is rejected, then it must be admitted that in both language and ritual observance Yahwism borrowed heavily from El-worship.

vi) A sectarian rivalry between two forms of the moon-god in the northern kingdom explains the evidence of religious conflict – as in the book of Hosea – with greater force than the alleged rivalry of two gods of completely different background, such as Yahweh and Baal Hadad. On the other hand, the obvious syncretism in Israelite religion, and especially in the southern kingdom, can better be explained on the basis that El was the national god of the Canaanites rather than Baal Hadad. If El was the national god (with Attar/Malik his son) there is immediately a sound basis for the syncretism. The complex literary problem of Deuteronomy and its relationship to the Book of the Covenant is to some extent clarified by the supposition that the latter represents the teaching not of a primitive and errant Yahwism but of the rival cult of El. Finally many problems in the Pentateuch can be solved on the basis of an ancient tradition that it was El who rescued Israel from Egypt, which was subsequently appropriated by Yahwism, and the whole question of 'the God of the fathers' is shown to be something of a chimaera, being in origin the rather clumsy result of the Elohist's concern to disguise the presence of El in his source material, because he is only too well aware of the fact that for many Israelites El was the saviour god.
In fact the widely acknowledges view that 'patriarchal religion' was essentially the cult of El is a useful control on my analysis of passages outside Genesis, for the arguments of Thompson, van Seters and others show that the Genesis traditions reflect not a memory of the pre-settlement era, but rather the concerns of post-settlement Israel and Judah. Their historical value lies not in the elucidation of the Bronze Age, but in the light they throw on the ideologies of the two kingdoms and even the period of the exile. They give no hint of any acquaintance with the cult of Baal Hadad, but demonstrate the ubiquity of the cult of El.
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