

**Bibliography.** M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen* (1928), p. 227.  
B. T. DAHLBERG

**ISIS** i'sīs. An Egyptian goddess; the wife of Osiris and the mother of Horus.

Isis was worshiped in ancient Egypt from the earliest historical period as the supreme mother-goddess and as a personification of the creative power of the soil. Although she may have been originally a local predynastic deity of the Lower Egyptian nome of Sebennytus, her principle attributes were well defined by the time of the Pyramid Texts, and evidence points to her having attained her universal character at a very early date. By a constant syncretic process



16. Isis, seated on her throne, holds King Seti I (1318-1301 B.C.) on her lap; from Abydos

whereby she was identified with numerous Semitic, Greek, and Roman deities, her cult eventually spread over nearly all the ancient world. Her cults survived in the Roman world until the sixth century A.D.

Figs. ISI 16; EGY 18.

**Bibliography.** S. A. B. Mercer, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt* (1949), pp. 198-202; J. Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (1952), *passim*.  
T. O. LAMBDIN

**ISLAND, ISLE** [אִי אִים; νῆσος, νησόν]. The islands of the Mediterranean are referred to in the biblical references in which these words are found.

The hope is expressed in Ps. 72:10 that the kings of the isles will render tribute to the Hebrew king. According to Isa. 40:15, the Lord's power extends over islands. The same idea may be implied in Ezek. 26:18, although it is possible that אִי אִים, may refer to the Phoenician coastland (cf. vs. 15) rather than to the islands of the Mediterranean Sea. The eschatological imagery of Isa. 42:15 in the phrase: "I will turn the rivers into islands," is a unique use of אִים (some scholars have suggested that the text should be emended to read צִי אִים, "dry land").

In the NT, specific islands of the Mediterranean Sea are referred to by name. Among them are the islands of CYPRUS (Acts 13:4, 6); CAUDA (27:16); MALTA (28:1). Although they are not designated as islands, the islands of CRETE; RHODES; and COS are also mentioned in connection with the travels of Paul.

The Hebrew אִים, as can be judged by the context of the passages where it occurs, frequently does not mean "island" but "coast" or "coastland" (see COAST). It is so rendered correctly by the RSV in certain passages where the KJV has "island" or "isle" (Gen. 10:5; Esth. 10:1; Ps. 97:1; Isa. 11:11; Jer. 2:10; etc.). The same word in Isa. 13:22, 34:14; Jer. 50:39 is rendered "island" by the KJV (RSV correctly HYENA; JACKAL).  
W. L. REED

**ISMACHIAH** יִזְמַחִיָּהוּ, Yahu sustains] (II Chr. 31:13). A temple officer of third rank.

**ISMAEL** יִשְׁמָאֵל. Douay Version and KJV Apoc. form of ISHMAEL.

**ISMAIAH**. KJV form of ISHMAIAH 1.

**ISPAH**. KJV form of ISHPAH.

**ISRAEL, HISTORY OF (ISRAELITES).** The history of Israel can scarcely begin before the time of Jacob, who is represented in the Bible as the ancestor of the twelve tribes. The Bible opens, however, with cosmogonic traditions, and bridges the gap between Creation and the patriarchs by a series of genealogies, into which ancient stories have been woven. While some of these stories embody profound spiritual teaching and are of high value for the study of biblical thought, they cannot be treated by the historian as materials for any scientific account of the course of events. Their similarity to Babylonian traditions has long been recognized, even though the vast difference in spirit and in religious outlook between the Babylonian and the biblical stories demands equal recognition (see GENESIS; CREATION; FLOOD). Our knowledge of Canaanite mythology has now been greatly increased, chiefly through the discovery of the Ras Shamra Texts (see UGARIT). Nothing comparable with the biblical stories is known from Canaanite sources, and we may have reasonable confidence that there is historical substance in the biblical tradition that Israel's ancestors derived from Babylonia. Abram, the grandfather of Jacob, or Israel, is said to have left Ur and migrated with his family to Haran, and thence to have gone to Palestine. Since Ur was the principal seat of the worship of Sin, and the same god was the chief deity of Haran, some ancient connection between these cities

is probable, and migration from the one to the other is not unlikely. Nevertheless, Israel's links with N Mesopotamia seem to have been closer than with Babylonia, and in Deut. 26:5 Jacob is represented as a "wandering Aramean."

1. The patriarchal age
  2. Moses and the Exodus
  3. Joshua and the judges
  4. The rise of the monarchy
  5. The reign of David
  6. The reign of Solomon
  7. The Divided Kingdom
  8. The fall of Samaria
  9. The kingdom of Judah
  10. The fall of Jerusalem
  11. The Exile and restoration
  12. The Persian period
  13. The Greek period
  14. The Maccabean age
  15. The Roman period
- Bibliography

**1. The patriarchal age.** Some scholars have found no historical value in the traditions about the patriarchs, who were formerly thought to be mere personifications of tribes—though this view was always questioned by some scholars. In Gen. 10 we find many tribal names treated as the names of individuals and fitted into a genealogy, and it is characteristic of Hebrew thinking to personify a group, and to speak of Amalek or Moab with a singular verb when a whole people is meant. There is nothing antecedently impossible, therefore, in the supposition that in the patriarchal traditions group experiences were represented as those of individuals. In Gen. 34, indeed, the cities of Hamor and Shechem are represented as father and son. It is impossible to carry such a theory through all the patriarchal traditions, however, and especially so in the case of Abraham, whose singularly exalted character bears the stamp of individuality. Even if these stories were originally told about tribes, they might still have some historical substance, and they could not be lightly dismissed as without value for the historian.

It is true that of none of these stories do we have independent confirmation from other ancient or contemporary sources. Nevertheless, our recent knowledge of the ancient Near East from archaeological discoveries has made it clear that contemporary customs of the period in which the patriarchs are located are accurately reflected in the biblical stories. Wellhausen affirmed that "we attain to no historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but only of the times when the stories about them arose in the Israelite people; this later age is here unconsciously projected, in its inner and outer features, into hoar antiquity, and is reflected there like a glorified mirage" (*Prolegomena to the History of Israel*). But this is precisely what we do not find. Customs which are not attested for the period to which the creation of the stories is attributed are reflected in these traditions. Yet texts which have been found at NUZI and MARI show that similar customs prevailed in Mesopotamia in the first half of the second millennium B.C. (see *bibliography*). A modern writer, using all the resources of great libraries, may write a historical novel that

accurately reflects the conditions of the age in which he sets his story. But the biblical narratives cannot be supposed to have had such an origin, and when we find here striking examples of the true reflection of ancient customs, we can only conclude that they have been handed down in tradition. There is thus some reason to believe that the stories in which they are embodied were also handed down, and that the substance of the stories was faithfully transmitted. Hence there is a much greater disposition today to allow that there is some reliable historical substance in the stories.

We must, however, beware of going to the other extreme, and treating all these stories uncritically as scientific history. They are sagas, rather than history, and the recovery of history from them can only be in broad and general terms, and is only to be achieved with patience and by the careful study of the stories themselves and of known contemporary history. That Israel's ancestors came from Babylonia to N Mesopotamia and thence into Palestine, and that later some of them went into Egypt and subsequently were reduced to taskwork and then brought out of Egypt, there seems no reason to doubt—the more so as no obvious motive for the creation of such stories, if they were not true, lies to hand. Many of the individual stories preserve reliable traditions, though in evaluating these traditions one finds it impossible to consider the patriarchal age without relation to the Mosaic age.

The chronological problems attaching to this period are complex in the extreme, and it may be said at once that there is no general agreement about them. The biblical statements contained in Gen. 12:4; 21:5; 25:26; 47:9; Exod. 12:40; I Kings 6:1 would bring the migration of Abram from Ur into the twenty-first century B.C., and the Exodus into the middle of the fifteenth century. There is only one passage which sets Abram in relation to world history, and this is Gen. 14, a passage which has by many been held to be very late, but which many today believe to be quite ancient. Its use for historical purposes, however, is beset with difficulties. It makes Abram the contemporary of AMRAPHEL, king of Shinar. This king is often held to be HAMMURABI of Babylon, though the equation of the names is far from sure and has long been challenged. Hammurabi was formerly believed to belong to the twenty-first century B.C., and this perhaps contributed to the acceptance of the equation. But in the light of recent knowledge, and especially that gained from texts recovered from Mari, it is now certain that Hammurabi belonged to a much later period, and he is today placed either wholly within the eighteenth century or in the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries. If the equation of Amraphel with Hammurabi is retained, therefore, there are serious difficulties about the biblical chronology, while if it is abandoned, we have no passage which sets Abram in the framework of known history. For any reconstruction we must therefore start from the Exodus.

**2. Moses and the Exodus.** At the beginning of the century the Exodus was dated by most scholars of all schools, including the most conservative, in the thirteenth century B.C. More recently many scholars have moved back to the fifteenth century, and when

Garstang dated the fall of Jericho, on the basis of his excavations there, at the end of that century, this date became widely adopted. There were, however, many difficulties. For the biblical traditions represent the Israelites as engaged on taskwork in cities of the Nile Delta region for a Pharaoh who had his court in the neighborhood. Our knowledge of Egyptian history of the fifteenth century B.C. provides no suitable background for these traditions. Moreover, Exod. 1:11 gives the names of the cities on which the Israelites were set to work as Pithom and Raamses (*see* RAMESES [CITY]). These names have to be rejected as a later addition if the fifteenth-century date is retained. Furthermore, Palestinian archaeology has established that the main wave of destruction of Canaanite cities fell toward the end of the thirteenth century, and all probability would suggest that this destruction was at the hands of the Israelites. In favor of the fifteenth-century date for the Exodus, it is argued that the Amarna Letters (*see* TELL EL-AMARNA), written by Palestinian princes to the Egyptian court in the first half of the fourteenth century and appealing for help against enemies who are called by the ideogram SA-GAZ or by the name HABIRU, reflect from the Canaanite side the incursion of the Israelites who had come from Egypt. Since these letters ask for small reinforcements of fifty, or in one case as few as ten, soldiers, it is hard to reconcile them with the biblical tradition.

The recent excavations at JERICHO have brought Garstang's conclusions into question, and it is increasingly recognized that we have here a special problem and that the date of the fall of this city cannot be made the sole determining factor in considering the date of the Exodus.

On the other hand, any simple acceptance of the thirteenth-century date involves us in other difficulties. The shortening of the period of the judges is got over by the view that the judges were local heroes, rather than a succession of national leaders. The "Israel stele" of MER-NE-PTAH brings us incontestable evidence of the presence of Israel in Palestine when they would be barely out of Egypt on this late-date view. This difficulty is countered by the observation that Israel does not appear to be a settled people, like the others mentioned in the stele. More difficult to explain is the fact that the wave of destruction of S Palestinian cities, such as LACHISH, fell almost immediately after the Israelites would have left Egypt on this view, whereas the biblical tradition is of an initial, unsuccessful attempt on the S. Here scholars have fallen back on the view that not all the tribes went into Egypt, and that some were in Palestine while the others were in Egypt. This view is supported by the fact that there is some evidence from contemporary sources that some of the tribes were in Palestine at a time when on any view the Israelites are represented as being in Egypt. The crucial difficulty here concerns the tribe of Levi. For there is much evidence in the OT that links the tribe of Levi with the S and with Judah, whereas Moses is represented as a Levite and as the bringer out of Egypt of the tribes which were there. Some have argued that the word "Levi" simply means "priest," but against this we have the evidence of

Gen. 34; 49:5-7, which associates Levi with Simeon, and predicts a common fate for both. That they did not share a common fate is certain, and it is therefore probable that Gen. 49:5-7 is an ancient oracle, coming from a time when it seemed likely that they would share a common fate, and when, therefore, Levi was a secular tribe.

Combining as much biblical evidence as possible with the extrabiblical evidence, one may put forward the view that the migration of Jacob and his sons from Mesopotamia fell early in the Amarna age, at the beginning of the fifteenth century B.C., and that this group formed part of the Habiru tribes, which were, however, far more widespread in the ancient Near East, and are not to be simply equated with the children of Israel. For detailed treatment of this view, *see bibliography*.

In that age there seem to have been two main attacks, one from the N and the other from the S. The treachery of Simeon and Levi at Shechem would fall in this age, and would perhaps indicate a group that advanced into the center of the country, but failed to maintain itself. The other associated groups moved much more slowly northward, and the archaeological evidence that points to destruction of S cities more than a century later is to be connected with their exploits. The story of Joseph's being taken into Egypt is placed shortly after the Shechem incident in the Bible, and if this is to be relied on, we should still be in the Amarna age for Joseph's rise to power. In that period the heretic Pharaoh AKH-EN-ATON broke with the Theban priesthood of Amen, that had hitherto provided the chief ministers of state, and proscribed the worship of Amen, making the worship of the sun-god, whose symbol was the sun-disk Aton, the sole permitted worship. Such a Pharaoh would have to look round for talent elsewhere for the service of the state, and this period would offer a suitable background for the story of Joseph. Moreover, we are told that Joseph was given as wife the daughter of the priest of On (Gen. 41:50). In no age would it have been a greater honor to be given the daughter of the priest of the sun-god as wife. The descent of a small group of Joseph's kindred into Egypt after his being taken there could rest on a subsequent migration, perhaps especially of some of the Levites and Simeonites who had failed to establish themselves in Shechem, while others of these tribes may have fallen back on Judah—the Simeonites to achieve some territorial settlement in the S for a time, prior to their early disappearance from history, while Levi gradually took on a functional character and became priests.

The period between the death of Joseph and the rise of the oppressing Pharaoh is passed over in a single verse in the Bible, and was probably quite short. The time of the sojourn in Egypt is given as 430 years in Exod. 12:40 (though this is halved in the LXX), but the biblical genealogies are uniformly inconsistent with this. The period is commonly put at four generations, with a maximum of seven in the case of Zelophehad's daughters and a minimum of three in the case of Moses. It would therefore seem likely that the sojourn in Egypt lasted about 130 years. The Pharaoh of the Oppression would then be Ramses II (*see* RAMESES 2), who is known to have

Simeon, they did s there; t oracle, nat they erefore,

possible put for- and his rna age, .c., and a tribes, d in the equated tment of

main at- e S. The n would a group try, but d groups and the uction of onnected ng taken ng in- d on, we l's rise to AKH-EN- nen, that tate, and : worship isk Aton, oh would the serv- i suitable r, we are aghter of would it daughter escent of t after his at migra- vites and selves in ave fallen some ter- r to their evi grad- l became

r and the over in a bly quite given as halved in uniformly only put zen in the imum of fore seem bout 130 d then be r to have

undertaken building operations in the Nile Delta region in the reign of his father, Seti I, and to have continued them in his own reign. This fact would provide an appropriate setting for the taskwork of the Israelites and for the Moses story, as well as for the names of the store cities preserved in the Bible. The Israelites who were led out by Moses would be mainly the Joseph tribes, but with Levite elements, to which Moses certainly belonged, and Levites would be connected both with the groups which had not gone into Egypt and with those which had. The tribes led out of Egypt would not, on this view, have spent a long period in the wilderness before attacking the center of Palestine across the Jordan under Joshua. It has to be remembered that in the biblical account thirty-eight of the forty years between the Exodus and the Conquest are said to have been spent at Kadesh, and the wandering proper was limited to two years. It may be that the long sojourn at Kadesh preceded the earlier entry in the time of Jacob, and it is the combining of the two movements into a single story which has resulted in the linking of the long sojourn at Kadesh and the short period of later wandering into a single period of forty years.

This view finds substantial historicity in the traditions of the Bible, though it disentangles them into two separate strands. It should be noted that no view accepts all the statements of the Bible as they stand, but that every view either openly or silently dismisses what it cannot use. The view indicated here represents a greater integration of biblical and extra-biblical evidence than can be found in any other, and while it cannot be presented as in any sense certain, it offers a reasonable working hypothesis. The only major pieces of archaeological evidence which provide difficulties are provided by Jericho and Ai, the latter of which seems to have been destroyed long before the time of Joshua, on any possible view of the Exodus. Both these difficulties lie, not alone against the present view, but against every other. Apart from these all the evidence of archaeology falls into place.

It will be seen that substantial historicity is here allowed to the Joseph story. It is also allowed to the story of Moses. Neither of these stories can be regarded as strict history in all its details, and certainly the numbers of those led out by Moses must have been greatly multiplied. But this does not mean that there is no core of reliably ascertainable fact. Some writers have dismissed the whole story of Moses as worthless from a historical point of view and as created by faith. This does not seem likely. Granted that none of the actual events of the Exodus can be shown to be referred to in contemporary non-biblical records, it has yet to be remembered that the known history of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries provides a background which suits the biblical stories. Moreover, it is antecedently unlikely that any people would invent the story that it had been reduced to taskwork in a foreign country, if there were no substance in the story. It is similarly unlikely that any people would have invented the story that in its deliverance it took no active part itself, if it had fought its way out. Nor would any people have invented the story that it had been delivered by a God it had not hitherto acknowledged as its

own God, if it had not substantial reasons for believing it.

The religious significance of the work of Moses is not in question here. Politically he was the creator of the nation, or at least of those elements which he led. From an oppression which lasted down to *ca.* the middle of the thirteenth century, he led these tribes into the desert and filled them with a national consciousness, as well as with the sense that they had been chosen by the Yahweh in whose name he had led them out, to whom they had committed themselves by the Covenant, and with the confidence that this God would give them a settled home in Canaan.

**3. Joshua and the judges.** Joshua is represented as the leader of the united tribes of Israel, and as achieving the conquest and division of the entire land. At the same time, in Judg. 1 the conquest is attributed to separate tribes, or small groups of tribes. This is probably the more accurate account. To Joshua, the Ephraimite, the leader of the Joseph tribes and their associates who had come from Egypt, should be attributed the securing for Israel of a foothold in the central part of the country. That he won a great victory at Aijalon is not to be doubted, since an ancient poem, which commemorated this victory, links it with his memory (Josh. 10:12-13). This poem may well be contemporary with the events of which it sings. In the S the kindred tribes who had not gone into Egypt were in the same age extending their influence and pressing steadily northward, and it may well be that Joshua in some way gave them support. It is improbable, however, that he succeeded in linking up with Judah, since we find that in a later age a Canaanite belt still separated Judah from the N tribes. The feeling that all the Israelite tribes were of a common stock, even though their settlement came in different waves, would seem to be well grounded in fact. The sense of kinship among the tribes and also the tensions that existed among them are alike to be understood, if we recognize a common origin, but a long period of separate history before they came together for a short time in the United Monarchy.

On the view presented above, it is not necessary to shorten the period of the judges to *ca.* a century and a half between Joshua and the rise of Saul. The judges were tribal heroes, rather than national heroes, and the chronological framework in which they are set in the book of Judges comes from the Deuteronomistic school of a later age, and is to be differentiated from the content of the traditions themselves. If some of the tribes had been continuously in the land from the time of Jacob, some of the stories may well come from the period before the time of Moses and Joshua. The earliest of the major judges, of whom alone we have traditions preserved, was OTHNIEL, who belonged to the S group, and whose exploits were probably stated to be against the neighboring Edomites in the earliest form of the tradition. The confusion of Edom and Aram is a common one in the Bible, and the expansion of Aram to Aram-naharaim, or Mesopotamia (Judg. 3:8), may postdate the confusion here.

It has been suggested that the Israelite tribes formed an amphictyony, pledged by a religious oath to help one another, with an amphictyonic shrine as

the center of their confederation. One may doubt whether there was any twelve-tribe amphictyony at this date, for one finds little evidence of it in the period of the judges. At the same time, the prominence of shrines in the narrative must be recognized, and it seems more likely that at various times there were alliances of groups of tribes, these alliances being sealed at sanctuaries. The variety of shrines mentioned seems to tell against an amphictyony of all the tribes with a central amphictyonic shrine.

The exploit of Ehud was against the Moabites, who were extending their power W of the Jordan; that of Gideon was against the Midianites, who were similarly extending their power; that of Jephthah was against the Ammonites on the E of Jordan; those of Samson against the Philistines. It will be observed that all of these were non-Canaanite foes, and the Israelite leaders were fighting the battles of the Canaanites, no less than their own. It is not surprising, therefore, that while in times of crisis the Israelites were conscious of their racial and religious distinction from the Canaanites, there was not a little fusion and intermarriage during this postsettlement period. That the fusion brought a measure of religious syncretism, involving the worship of Israelites at Canaanite shrines and the following of Canaanite religious customs, is clearly recognized in the Bible, and is understandable.

In the case of only one of the judges was the enemy Canaanite. This is in many ways the most important of the stories of the judges. Sisera of Harosheth was extending his power from the Vale of Esdraelon over the Israelite tribes N and S of the vale, until Deborah, a prophetess, urged Barak to summon the tribes on both sides to combine against the foe. The subsequent victory, in which the Israelites routed the far better equipped enemy, was due in no small part to a storm which immobilized the chariots of Sisera, and in which the Israelites found the hand of their God. The victory was celebrated in a magnificent poem (Judg. 5), which is doubtless contemporary, and which is therefore a historical document of the utmost importance (*see* DEBORAH 1). In the prose account, which precedes the poem, the victory over Sisera has been combined with the account of a victory over Jabin of Hazor, won by two N tribes, originally quite separate from it. In the book of Joshua the victory over Jabin and the destruction of his city is attributed to Joshua (Josh. 11). Sisera was defeated by a larger combination of Israelite tribes than had hitherto come together in any single operation. Various tribes are praised or blamed in the poem for giving or withholding aid, but the measure of the blame varies, and this does not suggest that all the tribes were under a common amphictyonic oath to give aid. Judah is not mentioned for praise or blame, and this is probably because Judah was still separated from the N tribes by a Canaanite belt, and it would have been unrealistic to expect any help from that quarter.

Samson, the last of the major judges, performed feats of personal heroism against the PHILISTINES, who here come prominently before us for the first time. The Philistines were a people who effected a foothold on the Mediterranean coast early in the

twelfth century B.C., probably as a part of the movement of peoples and wide disturbances in the E Mediterranean following the fall of the Minoan Empire, though there is no evidence that the Philistines had come from Crete itself. Gradually they extended their sway up the coast and into the hinterland, until they became the most dangerous menace to both Israelites and Canaanites. The migration of the tribe of Dan to its N home, recorded in the appendix to the book of Judges, was doubtless due directly or indirectly to the pressure of the Philistines.

The book of Judges is of the utmost importance for the study of the social and political conditions in the postsettlement period, as well as for the study of the religious conditions. There was little lasting cohesion among the Israelite tribes, and more than once intertribal jealousies led to internal war among the tribes. At one time the son of Gideon by a Canaanite wife attempted to establish a monarchy (*see* ABIMELECH), with an authority based on force instead of the moral authority of a leadership based on charismatic gifts freely recognized by the tribes; but this attempt came to a speedy end.

The most serious internal strife among the Hebrew tribes is recorded in the appendix to the book of Judges, when other tribes combined against Benjamin after the incident concerning the Levite's concubine (Judg. 19-21). The story itself is full of interest for the light it sheds on the times, but also because it prepares the way for things that follow.

**4. The rise of the monarchy.** The rise of Saul and the establishment of the monarchy was mainly due to the extension of Philistine power to the heart of the land. In the time of Eli, who was the priest of SHILOH, where the ancient symbol of the ark, which had come down from the time of Moses, was kept, the Philistine pressure was strong, and a battle was fought at Aphek. Here the ark was carried onto the battlefield as the guarantee of the presence of the national God, Yahweh. Instead of the hoped-for succor, however, disaster ensued. The ark itself was captured and taken as a trophy, and Shiloh was destroyed. Eli collapsed and died on hearing the news of the defeat, and the whole of the central highlands came into the power of the enemy. Israel lay defenseless and leaderless. The Philistines soon returned the ark, but its sanctuary had been destroyed, and it lay neglected in Kiriath-jearim for many years, while Philistine influence continued dominant.

The rise of the monarchy to meet this situation was due to prophetic inspiration. Prophecy is a phenomenon by no means limited to Israel, and it is now known that it was found in Mesopotamia as well as in Syria quite anciently (*see* PROPHET). The rising against Sisera had been due to the activity of a prophetess, and from now on, we find frequent evidences of the political as well as religious activities of the prophets of Israel. The man who had most to do with the establishment of the monarchy was Samuel, though it is clear that there were prophetic bands who fostered patriotic and religious feelings. Samuel is depicted as a judge, though he does not fit into the pattern of the judges of the book of Judges, and in one story is represented as a man of local fame before the emergence of SAUL.

That two accounts of the rise of the monarchy are combined in the Bible is well known. The earlier represents Saul as first privately anointed by the prophet Samuel (see SAMUEL 1) in the name of Yahweh, with the commission to deliver the Israelites from Philistine power. At the same time the Jephthah story and the story of the war with Benjamin also seem to lead up to the same climax. Saul's first exploit was against the Ammonites, who were renewing the pressure on the E of Jordan from which Jephthah had given relief. After the war with the Benjaminites, the people of Jabesh-gilead had intermarried with the Benjaminites, as they had stood aside from the war. Hence, when they were now pressed by the Ammonites, they appealed to the tribe of Benjamin for help, and Saul took the lead against the enemy with conspicuous success. The Philistines would be unconcerned with this incident, which seemed likely only to weaken the Israelites and not to menace themselves. But Saul turned against the Philistines the strength and popular support he had gained by this exploit, and the Philistines were driven out of the center of the land and Saul was acclaimed as king. The Philistines still controlled the coastal region and the vale of Esdraclon, and in the subsequent encounters with Saul they tried first to force their way inland, and then later to attack from the N. As the result of the latter thrust Saul was killed on the fatal field of Gilboa, and Philistine power was re-established W of the Jordan.

Some idea of the real achievement of Saul may be gained by noting the scenes of his battles with the Philistines. At the beginning of his reign they were in the heart of the country, until the victory at Michmash drove them out. Later, they sought to go up the defiles that led directly from their own chief cities into the hill country, but the battle of Ephesdammim, with which the story of David's victory over Goliath is associated, checked their attempt. At the end of Saul's reign it was by the wide detour and approach from the N that they were able to re-enter. The moodiness of Saul, which is given prominence in the Bible, should not lessen the historian's recognition of the service he rendered his people during the years he led them.

**5. The reign of David.** Already, before the death of Saul, the attention of the reader of the Bible is directed to David, of whose life we are given a more detailed account than we have of any other OT character (see DAVID). At first he was a supporter of Saul, until the king's jealousy of his popularity turned him into an outlaw, who fled for refuge to the Philistines and then became the dependent of one of the Philistine leaders. On the death of Saul, Ish-bosheth succeeded his father as king, but had his headquarters E of the Jordan. He can have had little real authority W of the Jordan, where Philistine influence was again paramount, and even E of the Jordan he counted for but little, all real power being in the hands of his general, Abner. Meanwhile, David extended his influence in Judah, where he was recognized as king. At once war ensued between him and Ish-bosheth. This war the Philistines were content to watch unmoved. At first there would be a certain benevolent neutrality toward David, since he owed some allegiance to the king of Gath, but they would

welcome the struggle with Ish-bosheth as calculated to weaken both groups of Israelites, and to prevent David from becoming too powerful. Again they miscalculated, as they had done at the time of Saul's rise. Ish-bosheth's cause languished, and when Abner made overtures to David, he was killed by David's general, Joab, as the result of a blood feud which the war had created. Ish-bosheth was thereafter murdered, and David was recognized as the king of all Israel. This brought Judah into a closer union with the N tribes than had hitherto been known.

David quickly turned his arms against Jerusalem, which till now had remained a Jebusite town. It is probable that in the war with the Philistines, Jerusalem had recognized that her interests and those of the Israelite tribes were common, and no embarrassment had been caused to Saul while he was defending the land against them. But in the encounter between David and Ish-bosheth the situation was different. David's relations with the Philistines would not commend him to the Jebusites, and this stronghold in his path must have hampered him in dealing with Saul's son. Hence, no sooner was David acclaimed as king of all Israel than he turned to attack Jerusalem. The natural strength of the city gave its people a sense of security against such means of attack as were available to David. By a bold and skilful ruse, however, the city was entered and captured, though David was too wise to treat its people harshly, or to destroy its defenses.

It was at once clear to the Philistines that David was no longer a dependent, but a menace to their power, and they quickly tried to suppress him. It was now too late, however. Just as Saul had turned against them the strength he had developed in the encounter with the Ammonites, so David faced them with a strength they had watched him acquire. Instead of yielding to their attack, therefore, David turned the tables on them, and was able to reduce them to dependence on him. His position was now much stronger than Saul's had ever been, and he was not long in exploiting the situation and reducing the surrounding states one by one to a similar recognition of his overlordship. In consequence he soon established himself as the head of a kingdom greater than that ruled by any other Israelite king during all the history of the people. That this was in part due to his own and Joab's military gifts is beyond question. But it should be remembered that it was also in part due to the international situation of his time. In an earlier age Egyptian power had been dominant in the whole region, just as in later ages Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian power was dominant. During the brief period of the United Monarchy none of the greater neighboring powers was in a position to interfere in Palestine, and the union of the Israelite tribes under skilful leadership made them the strongest unit within that little world, and gave to David an opportunity that did not recur.

This is not to attribute the success of David simply to good fortune. The situation offered the opportunity, but David's skill enabled him to seize it. His genius is seen in his transfer of his capital to Jerusalem after its capture. This would seem to have alienated some Israelite sentiment, but David was anxious to enlist the natural strength of the city, and

the prestige it had long enjoyed, on his own side. The wisdom of his choice was matched by the measures he took to attach Israelite sentiment to the city. He brought the long-neglected ark into the city. As a sacred object linked with the name of Moses, it made Jerusalem an Israelite center no less than a Jebusite; and since the ark was no longer kept in a famous shrine, no sentiment could be offended by its elevation to prominence again. Hitherto the ark had been associated with the N tribe of Ephraim, while David's personal links with the tribe of Judah ensured its support at this stage. More important was the clear declaration implicit in this act that the national religion lay at the base of David's kingdom, and that the worship of Yahweh was to be its unifying force. For despite the tribal independence and often separate history, all the Israelite tribes had come to recognize Yahweh as their God, by whatever diverse ways they had come to this recognition.

David's rule did not continue to be popular among all his subjects, however. The disappearance of the menace of foreign foes removed one of the major unifying forces, and the newly found unity of the Israelite tribes began to disintegrate. Even David's own tribe of Judah became disaffected, as is clear from the fact that when Absalom raised the standard of revolt, he did so in Hebron. At this time David was able to find refuge E of the Jordan, in the place where Ish-bosheth had maintained himself after the death of Saul. The hostility of Saul's own tribe of Benjamin is to be understood, and is clear from the fact that at the time of the king's flight before Absalom, Shimei could openly curse him with impunity. Later Sheba, from the same tribe, led a revolt against David, which seemed at first likely to be dangerous, until the seasoned and ruthless Joab took charge of the campaign. It must be remembered, also, that despite the glory of David's reign, to which later generations looked back with some wistfulness, his subjects in his own day were conscious of the burdens of war, arising, not alone from the hazards of battle which they were compelled to face, but also from the frequent neglect of their own occupations. For David imposed forced labor on his subjects, and established the system which aroused deep resentment in the time of Solomon.

**6. The reign of Solomon.** When David's end seemed near, his eldest surviving son, Adonijah, assumed that the succession would be his, and made his plans to meet the expected situation. He was foiled by the prophet Nathan and the queen Bathsheba. When David had committed adultery with Bathsheba and had had her husband, Uriah the Hittite, virtually murdered, Nathan had rebuked the king in the name of Yahweh (II Sam. 12). Afterward, however, Nathan was on the side of Bathsheba, and it was because of his resource that her son secured the throne. Various rivalries played their part in the situation. During the time of his outlawry in the reign of Saul, David had been accompanied by Abiathar, the sole survivor of the family of Eli who had escaped the massacre which Saul had ordered. In Jerusalem, however, we find Abiathar beside Zadok, who was perhaps the Jebusite priest in the city before David captured it. That there was rivalry between them is certain, and

we find Abiathar supporting Adonijah and Zadok supporting Solomon. Similarly we find David's field commander, Joab, on the side of Adonijah, but Benaiah, the captain of the king's bodyguard, on the side of Solomon. By a swift stroke, planned by Nathan, Solomon was proclaimed king on David's orders, before the death of his father, and the succession thereby secured.

Later generations accorded Solomon a reputation for wisdom which his subjects might have disputed, and we find the works known as the wisdom literature freely ascribed to him. That there was a certain splendor about his reign may be recognized, but it was largely a hollow splendor. Solomon's reign was predominantly one of peace, in contrast to the constant wars whereby David had established and maintained his kingdom. It might therefore have been expected that the country would enjoy prosperity, in which people and king would share. Instead, the people faced ever harder conditions, while the court grew in size and splendor.

The sources of Solomon's wealth were many. He levied heavy taxes on his own people, requiring both goods and services from them. His country was divided into twelve districts, charged with the maintenance of the court for a month in turn, and since approximately equal districts would be needed, the tribal divisions were ignored. This would inevitably add to the dissatisfaction the levies must in any case have aroused. Moreover, Judah seems to have been given a privileged position, and so the feeling was increased. For the king's many building enterprises forced labor was used, doubtless in a far more burdensome form than the reign of David had seen. The subject peoples were also forced to contribute, probably under harsher conditions than the Israelites. Again, the tolls that were levied on the transit trade that passed through the land went to swell the king's exchequer. During many of the periods of peace the land knew, such tolls went to the exchequer of some foreign sovereign, in Egypt or Assyria or Babylonia. During other periods several of the small states must have levied their toll on the trade that passed from Asia Minor and Mesopotamia to Egypt. The reign of Solomon was the one period of peace when the Israelite king controlled this area, and drew the profit from this trade. Again, Solomon engaged in state trading enterprises. He fitted out a fleet of ships which sailed down the Red Sea and as far as India, engaging in commerce which brought various exotic products into the land and no small profit to the coffers of the king. In the neighborhood of the port of EZION-GEGER, from which his ships sailed, he had copper mines, which are unmentioned in the Bible, but which archaeology has uncovered. These were doubtless worked by slave labor. From all these sources, it is not surprising that the king acquired a wealth which seemed to his contemporaries to be vast, perhaps the more so since his subjects were given so little opportunity to share it.

Great building enterprises were undertaken. The most famous building was the temple, which Solomon built to house the ark, and which later became the sole sanctuary where sacrifice to Yahweh was recognized as legitimate by the Jews. It was not built



by the king to be the sole sanctuary, however, and there is ample evidence that he visited other shrines. The temple was intended to be the royal shrine, and it was attached to the king's palace, which exceeded it in size, and probably in splendor. In various parts of the land the king established depots, of which some were to provide for the large number of chariots which he maintained. At MEGIDDO stables have been discovered by archaeologists, and there can be little doubt that these were built for Solomon. So costly was his court and so many his enterprises, that despite his wealth he was not able to meet all his obligations, and he was forced to cede some cities to the king of Tyre in payment for the services of the skilled craftsmen placed at his disposal and materials imported from abroad.

Solomon entered into numerous foreign alliances, including one with the Pharaoh of Egypt, as well as his alliance with the great maritime power of Tyre. These alliances were sealed by marriages with foreign princesses, which brought religious and cultural influences into the land which were unwelcome to the devotees of the national religion of Israel. For now, as so frequently, religion became the focus for all the discontent with which the land seethed, and when the time was ripe, it was the prophets who directed the discontent.

**7. The Divided Kingdom.** Already, during the reign of Solomon, the discontent was smoldering, and the prophet Ahijah encouraged Jeroboam, who was one of the king's officers in charge of the *corvée*, to lead a revolt. News reached Solomon, however, and he took swift action against Jeroboam, who escaped to Egypt and remained there until the king's death, placing himself under the protection of the reigning Pharaoh—who was not, needless to say, the Pharaoh with whom Solomon had allied himself by marriage, but of another dynasty, which had by now gained control of the country. Throughout his reign Solomon does not seem to have had to face any outbreak of rebellion within the country, as David had done, and may not have realized the strength of feeling his oppressive reign had aroused. Before the end of his life, however, he had seen clear signs that the little empire he had inherited was cracking. Some of the neighboring states had broken away and secured their independence, and the revolt of Damascus brought into being a kingdom which was later to become a serious threat to Israel.

On the death of Solomon, Jeroboam returned from Egypt, and soon became the leader of the dissident elements in the N. The tribes gathered at Shechem to demand reform before they pledged their loyalty to Rehoboam, the son of Solomon. The story of Rehoboam's disdainful answer is familiar. It showed that he and some of the court circle were still quite unaware of the state of feeling in the land, and Rehoboam was completely unprepared for the open revolt which at once broke out, under the leadership of Jeroboam.

It would be unfair to attribute the rebellion solely to the foolish answer the new king had given. A more adroit handling of the situation might have surmounted the peril, but the real causes were deep-seated, and it may well be that the Disruption would have come in any case. It has been said above that

under Solomon, Judah seems to have enjoyed a favored position; and jealousy of this position played its part in the situation. In the period of the judges intertribal jealousy among the tribes of the N had more than once led to friction, and it is not surprising that there was feeling against the privileged position of Judah, which had so recently come into the stream of Israelite life. On the view presented above, Judah had entered the land quite separately from the Joseph tribes, and in a different age, and though they recognized a common origin and shared a common religion, they had for long had a separate history, because of the Canaanite belt across the land. To conciliate this feeling would have meant that Rehoboam would forfeit the support of his own tribe, and he could have little certainty that the dissidents would at once rally to his side. To respect the tribal divisions would have meant an immediate reorganization of the land, and to lighten taxation and abandon the *corvée* would have struck at once at the life of the swollen and luxurious court Rehoboam had inherited, and would have turned its members into enemies. To cut expenditure when circumstances compelled was one thing; to do so in response to a demand whose seriousness neither the king nor the court could recognize would have been another, and would have been interpreted by friend and foe as weakness. While recognizing the folly of the answer that touched off the rebellion, it is fair to recognize that the new king was in a real difficulty, which was not of his making.

Still more important, we should not forget the part the prophets played at this time. AHIJAH, a N prophet, had instigated the rebellion; and after it had broken out, a S prophet, Shemaiah, paralyzed Rehoboam's arm when he planned to suppress the rebellion. Prophets of N and S therefore favored the Disruption. That they were moved in part by the sufferings of the people is doubtless true, and we should not suppose that the prophets of the eighth century were the first to feel indignation at social injustice and oppression. On the other hand, we should not forget that Ahijah and his fellow prophets were also interested in the national religion and were concerned to fight all that imperiled it. At the time of the establishment of the monarchy, the prophets realized that the Philistine domination was a menace to the religion of Yahwism, since a God who was powerless to defend his people, as Yahweh had seemed in the battle of Aphek, would be likely to lose their confidence. Now, however, the menace was more insidious. The foreign alliances of Solomon had brought Israel into the stream of international life in a way she had not hitherto known in her history; and this in turn brought religious and cultural influences into the land that the prophets could not but view with alarm. The Disruption was the final blow at the little empire which David had established, to which later generations looked back with wistfulness. But the prophets preferred religious purity to political power.

The relatively brief period during which all the Israelite tribes had been united in a single kingdom had left a permanent deposit of the greatest importance. For during this period the traditions of N and S had been brought together and amalgamated into



a single corpus. It is generally believed that among the sources of the Pentateuch there are two early documents, one coming from the N and the other from the S, and these probably took their separate shape after the Disruption. Both, however, were collections of traditions of N and S, and the United Monarchy had left an enduring mark on these traditions, which in part determined the form in which they have come down to us.

When Jeroboam led the N tribes in revolt, the S tribe of Judah continued to be loyal to Rehoboam. From now on until the destruction of Samaria the two kingdoms continued to be separate, sometimes warring with each other, the smaller kingdom sometimes accepting a position of dependence on the other. The S kingdom remained true to the dynasty of David, save that for a few years Athaliah ruled the land. The N kingdom had frequent changes of dynasty, however, and throughout its checkered history had less stability than the S. Not infrequently these changes of dynasty were due to prophetic incitement, and we sometimes find that the prophet who had instigated an insurrection quickly turned against the man of his choice, just as Samuel had turned against Saul. Jeroboam himself did not long retain prophetic support. In the books of Kings he is constantly condemned from the Deuteronomic standpoint of the compiler because he elevated the sanctuaries of Bethel and Dan into national shrines. The priesthood of Dan claimed descent from Moses, while Bethel is associated in the traditions with the patriarchs. Neither shrine was first created by Jeroboam, and both had continued through the period of the United Monarchy to function as shrines, just as other sanctuaries in the land had. Solomon's temple later became the only sanctuary to be recognized as legitimate, but, as has been observed above, it was not built to be the sole sanctuary, but to be the royal shrine. It was therefore natural that Jeroboam should desire a royal shrine, though in actual fact he had two. Both were recognized as Yahweh shrines, and it is probable that the bull images which stood in them were not thought of as images of Yahweh, but as the pedestals of an imageless God. Their condemnation by the Deuteronomist is to be understood. We should not suppose, however, that the N was religiously inferior to the S. For long the religious leaders belonged to the N. Elijah and Elisha were both N prophets, and in the eighth century Amos, though a southerner, prophesied in the N, and Hosea was a northerner.

Not long after the Disruption the Pharaoh of Egypt, SHISHAK, led an expedition against the land. His own inscription shows that this was not to support Jeroboam against Rehoboam's attempts to reduce the revolted tribes to obedience, as the reader of the biblical account might suppose, but was against both the little kingdoms. One of the first effects of the Disruption, therefore, was to expose both kingdoms anew to perils from without. In the subsequent times of friction between the two states, the S kingdom, with a shortsightedness it was often to show, appealed on occasion to the kingdom of Damascus to come to its aid by an attack from the N. Gradually the Arameans of Damascus increased their power, until they became a serious menace to the Israelites.

Early in the ninth century the N Israelite kingdom went through a period of revolution when there were three aspirants to the throne. One was quickly eliminated, but for a time the other two continued their rivalry, until Omri emerged as the sole king (*see* OMRI, KING). He was an abler leader than the few verses devoted to him in the Bible would suggest. To him was due the choice of Samaria for the capital. Hitherto the N capital had been moved about, but for some time had been at TIRZAH. The choice of Samaria showed something of the strategic insight David had shown in moving to Jerusalem, though Samaria was not already a famous city, but had to be created by Omri. In order to strengthen himself against Damascus, Omri made an alliance with the maritime power of Tyre, and his son Ahab married a Tyrian princess. Under Omri's leadership the N kingdom showed a new strength, and he was able to reconquer Moab, as we learn from the MOABITE STONE. This monument was prepared for Mesha, the king of Moab of whom we read in II Kings 3, and it tells us that for forty years the Moabites had been subject to Israel.

In the reign of Omri's son Ahab, the evil effects of the Tyrian alliance became apparent. For the queen, JEZEBEL, was a forceful personality, whose ideas of the position of a king were other than those of the Israelites, as the story of Naboth's vineyard eloquently testifies. Tyrian cultural and religious influence was widely felt in the land, and it inevitably roused prophetic opposition. Such opposition the queen would not brook, and the sanctity of the person of the prophets was not recognized.

The S kingdom was at this time friendly to the N, and both flourished. The S king, Jehoshaphat, was able to re-establish control over the S route to Ezion-geber, and even attempted to renew the maritime trade that Solomon had maintained. An alliance between the two kingdoms was sealed by the marriage of Ahab and Jezebel's daughter Athaliah to the son of Jehoshaphat. Subsequent events showed that the S kingdom was not regarded as an equal partner in the alliance.

It is of interest to note that though the prophet Elijah (*see* ELIJAH THE PROPHET) was bitterly opposed to Jezebel and all the Tyrian influence, and though in this reign his great conflict with the prophets of the Tyrian god took place on Mount Carmel, whenever it came to a conflict with Damascus, the prophet was on the side of his people. Later we find the same thing with ELISHA. Though he was opposed to the court, and ultimately instigated the revolution which brought Jehu to the throne, he was regarded by the Arameans as their most powerful enemy, because of the support he always gave to the Israelite king. In Ahab's reign Damascus made a determined attempt to conquer Israel. This ended in a defeat which brought the king of Damascus into the hands of Ahab as a prisoner. To the consternation of the prophets, Ahab treated his prisoner with generosity and made a treaty with him. Our external sources show that this was less quixotic than might appear. At this time Assyrian power was waxing, and her influence and arms were already known in the W. In 853 B.C., which must have fallen shortly after Ahab's treaty with Ben-hadad, Assyria was met by a con-

federation of W states at the battle of Qarqar. Here a large Israelite contingent was found, including a considerable force of chariots, which probably consisted of those ceded to Ahab by Ben-hadad. The Assyrians claimed the victory, but at least their advance was halted, and they do not boast of any large fruits of the victory. In effect, therefore, this concerted action was a triumph for the W states.

Statesmanship did not long outlive the triumph, however. Ahab called on Ben-hadad to implement the provisions of the treaty he had made and restore Israelite districts E of the Jordan which had earlier been annexed; and when Ben-hadad refused, war broke out anew between Israel and Damascus. Here it is to be noted that one prophet opposed Ahab's adventure, though all the other prophets—prophets of Yahweh and not of Baal—supported him, just as Elijah and Elisha consistently supported their country against foreign foes. Only the prophet Micaiah (*see* MICAH 3) proved to be a true prophet, and in the battle which ensued Ahab met his end, despite the fact that Jehoshaphat had reluctantly been drawn into the adventure and had been compelled to wear the royal robes.

Within a few years the prophets judged that the time was ripe for another revolution in the N. This time they sought to promote revolution in the Damascus kingdom as well as in Israel, doubtless to prevent Aramean exploitation of the situation in Israel. In fact, the Damascus revolution took place first, and advantage was taken of Israel's weakness. This time Jehu was the chosen vessel of the prophets for the revolution against the dynasty of Omri, and the revolution swept away the kings of both Israel and Judah; the queen mother, Jezebel; and large numbers of the royal house. Despite the zeal for Yahwism which Jehu showed, the prophets were not long in turning against his house, though before it came to an end, it attained a splendor the N kingdom had not hitherto known.

Jehu sought to make up for his weakness against Damascus, now that the alliance with Tyre was completely broken, by sending tribute to the Assyrian king. This shortsighted policy of buying security against a nearer menace by welcoming a farther one, we find repeatedly in both kingdoms; and it is a tragic fact that the nearest approach to statesmanship, shown by Omri and Ahab, was ruined by the baneful influence of Jezebel and the religious opposition she aroused. Jehu found temporary relief against Damascus, but soon Assyria was occupied with her own troubles, and for some years Israel had to face continual pressure from Damascus with little relief through Assyrian activity in the W. It was not until toward the end of the ninth century that the Aramean pressure was relaxed.

In the meantime Jehu's revolution had affected the S kingdom as well as the N. The king of Judah had been among his victims, and Athaliah, the queen mother and daughter of Ahab, at once seized the power and put to death all the surviving members of the royal house, with the exception of the boy Joash, whose life was preserved by the high priest, Jehoiada. After six years he was presented in the temple by Jehoiada and acclaimed king, while Athaliah was swept away. For a time the kingdom was adminis-

tered by the high priest, but later, when the king assumed the power, there was friction between Joash and his former guardian. This took the form of a dispute as to whether the maintenance of the temple fabric should be a charge on the king's revenues or on those of the priests. In the end a compromise was reached, and a system which continued to the days of Josiah, two centuries later, was established.

With the advent of the eighth century there was an improvement in the fortunes of both kingdoms. Renewed Assyrian activity in the W had weakened the Aramean kingdom, but had then given place to further Assyrian inactivity in this area, and as there was now peace between Israel and Judah, each kingdom had been able to protect itself, and even to expand its power against its neighbors. In the N kingdom the long reign of Jeroboam II saw a revival which brought a greater measure of prosperity than had been seen since the Disruption. Unhappily the prosperity was not shared by all classes, and it but served to breed social evils which proved a menace to the stability of the state. Wealth was concentrated in the hands of a small class, and many of the small peasant farmers found themselves dispossessed of their lands and reduced to the position of serfs. The courts were venial, and the poor were denied the protection of the law. In such a situation the prophets championed the rights of the oppressed, as their predecessors had done, and championed them in the name of religion and not merely in the name of humanity. Amos and Hosea belonged to the time of Jeroboam and the period immediately following, and their prophecies give a vivid insight into the social ills of the time. They show that the forms of religion were still maintained—indeed, splendidly maintained. Nevertheless, in the prophetic view Israel's religion consisted, not simply in the observance of ritual, but in the maintenance of a covenant which bound the people to God and to one another. "You shall love the Lord your God . . . , and your neighbor as yourself," is a fitting summary of the prophetic demand no less than of Christ's.

In the S kingdom Uzziah's long reign fell largely at the same time as Jeroboam's in the N, and it saw a similar prosperity and some expansion against Judah's neighbors in the S. That it brought similar ills in its train is clear from the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah, though the work of both prophets fell somewhat later.

**8. The fall of Samaria.** To the prophet the collapse of the N kingdom was due to its weakness and disloyalty; to the historian it was due to the irresistible power of a revived Assyria. The prophet was aware of this power, and regarded it as the divine means of disciplining Israel; the historian is aware of the part the seething discontent within the land and the bitter divisions among the little W states played in exposing them to the new peril. In 745 B.C., Tiglath-pileser seized the Assyrian throne, and soon showed himself a vigorous and ruthless ruler. The system of deportation of conquered peoples which he began was continued by his successors, and this inevitably checked the recovery of the states once reduced to dependence. Before Assyrian arms brought menace to Israel, however, the inner weakness of the state was manifest. For after the death of Jero-

boam II there were frequent revolutions, and no king continued long on the throne. One party pinned its faith to Egypt and another favored submission to Assyria, with a resulting inner strife that ensured that no policy should be successful. In 734 B.C. there was an attempt to revive an anti-Assyrian alliance in the W, and Israel joined with Damascus to bring pressure on Judah to join it. Instead of joining the alliance, Ahaz, the king of Judah, appealed to Assyria for help, in continuance of the already noted policy of embracing a more distant menace to avoid a nearer. The prophet Isaiah had only contempt for the W allies, though he did not favor the appeal for Assyrian aid. This aid brought relief; it also brought the end of the Damascus kingdom, and so brought the dreaded foe to the borders of Israel. Within a few years the Assyrians were on Israelite soil, and after a stubborn resistance Samaria was captured, many of its citizens deported, and the N kingdom had come to an end.

**9. The kingdom of Judah.** One of the most vexed questions of OT chronology concerns the date of Hezekiah's accession to the throne, since the biblical data do not seem to be self-consistent (*see* CHRONOLOGY OF THE OT). There is therefore disagreement among scholars as to whether he was already on the throne at the time of the fall of Samaria. In any case, Judah was not involved in the disaster of her neighbor, and this little kingdom survived for a further century and a half. She was now the buffer state between Assyria and Egypt, and therefore the scene of constant intrigue. It was not only Egypt that intrigued here. Babylon was restless under Assyrian rule, and Merodach-baladan, a Chaldean, twice sought to head a revolt in the E and to free Babylon from Assyria under his own rule. His embassy to Hezekiah (II Kings 20) was concerned with more than the king's health, and was doubtless directed toward the fomentation of rebellion in the W to synchronize with the rebellion in the E. Both of Merodach-baladan's bids for power in Babylon were crushed, the second by Sennacherib before the W plans were ripe.

In 711 B.C., Hezekiah seems to have maintained the policy of submission to Assyria which he had inherited from Ahaz, at a time when Assyrian arms were moving toward Egypt along the coast road through Philistia. A few years later, however, he was drawn into the alliance in which doubtless Merodach-baladan's envoys had been interested. Revolt in the W, with Egyptian backing, was planned, and in preparation for it Hezekiah sought to bring the same pressure on his Philistine neighbors as Samaria and Damascus had sought to bring on Ahaz. Padi, the king of Ekron, was carried to Jerusalem, and the city was brought into the alliance. Hezekiah strengthened the defenses of Jerusalem, and constructed the SILOAM tunnel to ensure the water supply of the city. He also carried through a religious reform, which was doubtless closely linked with the revolt. For Assyria imposed the worship of her gods on conquered peoples, and the altar which Ahaz had built in Jerusalem following his submission to Assyria (II Kings 16:10 ff) was an expression of the recognition of Assyrian gods. Any revolt against Assyria would therefore involve the repudiation of her gods, and the

revival of the national religion. In this revival Hezekiah incorporated reform, and the most significant feature of this reform, abortive though it proved, was the centralization of Judah's religion in Jerusalem.

The prophet Isaiah did not favor the rebellion, and perceived that it could not succeed, though he consistently promised that Jerusalem itself should be spared. When Sennacherib moved against the W, the whole of Judah, with the exception of Jerusalem, was soon overrun. Hezekiah yielded without a struggle, and handed over Padi to be restored to his throne, and paid a heavy fine. Thereafter we read of the investment of Jerusalem by Assyrian troops, the closing of the gates with the support of Isaiah, and the deliverance of the city through a plague which broke out in the Assyrian camp, compelling the withdrawal of the enemy, who had moved to meet an advancing Egyptian army. While in the Bible this reads as the account of a single campaign, many scholars believe that two separate campaigns of Sennacherib are here telescoped.

In any case the reform of Hezekiah seems to have collapsed with the revolt associated with it. His successor, Manasseh, pursued the policy of submission to Assyria, and when Assyrian arms were carried into Egypt, which was conquered for a short time, Manasseh loyally supplied contingents. Manasseh's reign saw the greatest expansion of Assyrian power; before its end, however, that power was already crumbling. New foes were now appearing from the Caucasus, invading the Assyrian dominions from the N, and though for a time they were successfully met and diverted, the menace remained. Yet when Assyria fell, it fell from inner weakness as much as from external pressure. After the long reign of Ashurbanipal, the Assyrian throne knew little stability, and revolt was soon widespread. In Babylon, Nabopolassar appeared, to renew—this time successfully—the attempt of Merodach-baladan to establish a Chaldean dynasty there. In the W, Josiah revolted in alliance with other little states, which dreamed anew of freedom. That Josiah carried through a religious reform is in no way surprising, and that he should seek to give leadership to Israel as well as to Judah is not surprising. For Israel had no surviving royal house, and Israel's interest in liberation was the same as Judah's. The reform again centralized religion in Jerusalem, but this time on the basis of a book which was discovered in the temple, and which is identified by almost all scholars with the book of Deuteronomy, or at least with its core. Babylon secured her independence, and in alliance with the Medes she overthrew Assyria. In 612 B.C., Nineveh was destroyed, and though the capital was transferred to Harran, that also fell two years later.

Meanwhile Egypt, traditionally the foe of Assyria, had come to the help of the tottering empire. This may have been in part because she feared the upstart powers attacking Assyria, and in part in order that she might extend her own powers W of the Euphrates. Certainly when Assyria fell, she sought to occupy that W area, and whatever measure of freedom Josiah might have enjoyed now came to an end. The Pharaoh at once sought to consolidate his own power in the W in readiness for the inevitable struggle with Babylon, and Judah was quickly reduced to obedi-

ence, while Josiah perished for his resistance. In 605 B.C. the battle of Carchemish settled the fate of the W states. Here Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabopolassar, conquered Neco, who hastily withdrew to Egypt, and Egypt itself was spared invasion only through the death of Nabopolassar, which compelled Nebuchadrezzar to return to Babylon without delay to secure the kingdom for himself. It is now known that the battle of Carchemish did not finally decide the issue. A few years later Babylon was forced to meet another threat from Egypt, and another battle was fought in the S.

**10. The fall of Jerusalem.** Not even yet could the W believe that the new power would endure. On the death of Josiah, his younger son had been placed on the throne, but he was quickly removed by Neco in favor of Jehoiakim, who promised obedience. This obedience was in turn pledged to Babylon after the battle of Carchemish, but Jehoiakim looked for the opportunity to revolt, and later did so. Josiah's reform had collapsed with his revolt, and the suppressed shrines were soon functioning once more. Jehoiakim's revolt was short-lived when Nebuchadrezzar moved against him and his allies. Before the Chaldean armies appeared at the gates of Jerusalem, the king had died and his son Jehoiachin had succeeded him. The city surrendered, and Jehoiachin was carried off to Babylon to face a long captivity. We now know from surviving tablets that children were born to him there, and we have particulars of the allowances of food made to the king and his family (cf. E. F. Weidner [see bibliography]). Meanwhile his uncle, Zedekiah, had been placed on the throne in Jerusalem. Many of the leading people of the city had been carried away with Jehoiachin, and the weak Zedekiah, with no wise counselors to guide him, save the prophet Jeremiah, whose advice he had not the strength to take, became drawn into fresh Egyptian plots and rebelled against Babylon once more, bringing down on himself and his people the horrors of the long siege of Jerusalem, and ultimately the destruction of the city and the temple, and the end of the kingdom of David. In the surviving Lachish Letters we have contemporary records from a time shortly before the fall of Jerusalem, and while they add little to our knowledge of events, they reveal the tension and recrimination that marked the closing stages of the resistance to Nebuchadrezzar. See LACHISH.

**11. The Exile and restoration.** Large numbers of the people were carried away to Babylon when Jerusalem fell. Soon fresh troubles came upon the unhappy people left behind, for Gedaliah, who had been made governor by the conqueror, was murdered, and his companions fled to take refuge in Egypt, taking Jeremiah the prophet with them. In the years that followed, the Edomites pressed in on the people of Judah who survived, leaving bitter memories that long persisted; but otherwise we have little knowledge of the state of the land. The exiles seem to have cherished in an alien land the faith they had been frequently reproved by prophets for forsaking, and while there were doubtless some who were absorbed into the community among which they lived, there were others who maintained their separateness and cherished the hope of restoration to their land. In

this they were helped by the prophet Ezekiel, whose despair for Jerusalem before its fall was matched by his hope of a new temple and a reorganized cultus. Many of the exiles gradually settled down in Babylonia, and a century later we find a successful firm of Jewish bankers there.

Nebuchadrezzar was not only a great warrior, but also a wise and enlightened ruler, whose inscriptions tell of his works of peace more than of his victories (see NEBUCHADREZZAR). No comparable ruler of this line followed him. After his death there were a few years of disorder, during which three rulers followed him, and then NABONIDUS seized the throne. For most of his reign he lived in Tema, leaving the administration of the state in the hands of his son Belshazzar. From a surviving lampoon in verse we know of the contempt in which Nabonidus was held, and a fragment from Qumran describes him as mad. The land was seething with discontent, and was in no state to meet a new peril which had arisen. CYRUS, king of Anshan, had become king of Persia, and then revolted against his overlord, the Median king, and within a few years had conquered Croesus, king of Lydia. Here was a clear menace to the Babylonian kingdom, and before long the arms of Cyrus were directed against it.

Among the Jewish exiles was the prophet whom we call Deutero-Isaiah, who quickly perceived the significance of the new star on the horizon, and heartened his people with the promise of deliverance. Cyrus won a victory at Opis, and shortly afterward Babylon fell without a blow, and the Babylonian Empire was annexed to the Persian. Cyrus soon gave the Jews permission to return to their land and to rebuild their temple. A few seem to have returned, but the rebuilding of the temple was delayed. The enthusiasm of hopes was exchanged for the hard realities of rebuilding their homes and their life among the dispirited people they found in Judea.

**12. The Persian period.** Of the history of the Jews in the Persian period relatively little is known. On the death of Cyrus, Cambyses became king, and during his reign Egypt was added to the Persian Empire. We learn from the ELEPHANTINE PAPYRI, which were found in Egypt ca. the beginning of the twentieth century, that there was already a Jewish colony in the island of Elephantine, opposite Assuan, when Cambyses invaded Egypt, and that the Jews had a temple of their own God there, which Cambyses left undisturbed. How far back this colony went can only be conjectured. It continued to exist for more than a century after the Persian invasion, and it became a Persian military outpost.

Cambyses did not return from his Egyptian campaign. One Gaumata laid claim to the throne, giving himself out to be Smerdis, brother of Cambyses, who had been put to death by the king before setting out for Egypt. For a time it looked as though the Persian Empire would fall to pieces, the various provinces each taking advantage of the situation to resume their independence. At this time ZERUBBABEL, who was of the house of David, was the governor of Jerusalem. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Jews should have dreamed of the restoration of the kingdom of David, and before long we find the prophets Haggai and Zechariah calling for the rebuilding of

the temple, and seeking to revive the national life on the basis of the national religion.

Meanwhile Darius Hystaspis, who was a kinsman of Cyrus, though not in the direct line of succession, assumed the leadership, and quickly eliminated Gaumata, and then set to work to reduce the provinces one by one to obedience. In this he was completely successful, and before long the Persian Empire was restored, and then given a more solid organization than it had yet had. Before the Jews were reduced, the rebuilding of the temple had been begun, and Zechariah had visions of Zerubbabel and the high priest standing side by side as the crowned heads of the restored Jewish state. Suddenly Zerubbabel disappears from the picture, and we can only suppose that in some unrecorded way Judea came again under the Persian sway and Zerubbabel was eliminated for his rebellion. Nevertheless, the building of the temple continued. The Samaritan community appealed to the king to stop this, but the people of Jerusalem were able to produce the authority to rebuild the temple granted by Cyrus, and they were allowed to continue the work, and in 516 B.C. it was completed. From the beginning the Persian religious policy toward subject peoples was more enlightened than the Assyrian policy had been, and it was under the Persian rule that Judaism was established.

For the next half century we have no secure knowledge of Jewish history. We read of an abortive attempt to rebuild the walls of the city in the reign of Artaxerxes (Ezra 4:7-24), and this was almost certainly Artaxerxes I. Again, there was an appeal to the court against this rebuilding from Samaria, this time successful, and the king ordered the forcible interference with the work, pending his further pleasure. It is probably this blow to the Jerusalem community which lies behind the grief of Nehemiah on his receiving news from the city (Neh. 1:4), and it would explain his nervousness in asking the king for permission to renew the rebuilding.

That the mission of Nehemiah fell in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I admits now of little question. His adversary was SANBALLAT, who is known from the Elephantine Papyri to have been the governor of Samaria, and at the end of the fifth century Sanballat was still governor, though the actual administration was then in the hands of his sons. The extreme caution of Nehemiah in laying his plans and the extreme speed with which he carried through the work of rebuilding the walls would alike be explained by the recent abortive attempt. Nehemiah was anxious to complete the work before there could be any renewed appeal to the court.

The mission of Ezra is less easy to place. We are told that he was sent to Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and if this was also Artaxerxes I, it fell before Nehemiah's mission. The Chronicler clearly believed that Ezra was sent to put into effect the "law of the Lord" before Nehemiah came to restore the walls, but that Ezra delayed to carry out his mission for thirteen years and first read the law after Nehemiah had arrived. The abortive attempt to rebuild the walls would then appear to have fallen after Ezra's arrival, though it is nowhere associated with his name. Many scholars believe, however, that

the work of Ezra lay in the reign of Artaxerxes II, and this greatly eases the difficulties. Both men are represented as having exercised independent civil and religious authority, and if both were in the city together, this is hard to understand. Both dealt with the question of mixed marriages. When Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem after reporting to the court, he found that there had been intermarriage between the family of Sanballat and that of the Jerusalem high priest, and also another enemy, Tobiah the Ammonite, was installed in a room in the temple. It was therefore political conditions that angered him, and led him to attack mixed marriages. Ezra's action was religiously inspired, and was directed against the threat that such marriages brought to the religious purity of the Jews. While the chronological problems attaching to the work of these two men cannot be settled with certainty, it seems likely that the work of Ezra should be placed later than that of Nehemiah. Some scholars would place Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes I, but shortly after the second visit of Nehemiah. This would hardly allow time for the evil of mixed marriages to have become serious once more after Nehemiah had forcibly dissolved such marriages. To place Ezra's mission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II would allow an adequate period for this. *See bibliography.*

The work of Ezra was the enforcement of a religious law which he brought from Babylon. It is not necessary to suppose that this was a new and unheard-of law. It may well have been heard of in Palestine as well as in Babylonia, and the fact that it was accepted as the law of Moses would suggest that this was so. Whether it was the completed Pentateuch or the Priestly Code is not agreed, but in either case it became accepted by the Samaritans no less than by the Jews, and its origin was therefore clearly not attributed to Ezra. By putting this law into force Ezra gave to Judaism the character it continued to have down to NT times.

One of the vexed questions of Jewish history is that of the Samaritan Schism. Throughout the post-exilic period there were recurrent crises between the Jews and Samaria, though these seem to have been political rather than religious. Since the Samaritans accepted the Pentateuch, which must have included the law book of Ezra, the final breach cannot have taken place until after the mission of Ezra, but it appears to have been final before the work of the Chronicler, who left the N kingdom entirely out of his history so far as this could be done, and who seems to have regarded the N community as no true part of Israel. *See bibliography.*

**13. The Greek period.** For the remainder of the Persian period we have little secure knowledge of Jewish history. With the rise of Alexander the Jews soon passed into his power, and from extrabiblical sources we learn that when the conqueror passed through Palestine, he was received by the high priest. Alexander advanced into Egypt and there founded Alexandria, which seems from the start to have contained a Jewish colony. This colony inevitably soon became Greek-speaking, and it was for them that the Bible was translated into Greek. The translation of the Pentateuch is ascribed by tradition to the middle of the following century, and this is probably

reliable. It must be remembered, however, that there was a considerable Jewish Diaspora in other lands, and with the spread of Greek power the Greek language became widely current, so that for other Jewish communities Greek renderings would be valuable. How far the Alexandrian rendering spread elsewhere, or how far there were other local renderings which ultimately influenced what came to be known as the LXX, cannot be known with certainty.

When Alexander came to his early end, his generals fell to quarreling, and for some years the history of the period became rather like a kaleidoscope. Gradually there emerged three principal divisions, of which two concerned the Jews. These were the Ptolemaic kingdom of Egypt and the Seleucid kingdom, which included Asia Minor, Syria, Babylonia, and a rather nebulous claim to the more E conquests of Alexander, somewhat fitfully renewed from time to time. These two kingdoms are referred to in the book of Daniel as those of the S and the N respectively. Palestine soon fell within the sphere of the Ptolemies, and for more than a century continued to owe them allegiance. Nevertheless, the Seleucids claimed that it belonged to them of right. Seleucus I, who established the Seleucid kingdom, had once been a fugitive at the court of Ptolemy I, with whose help he set out to secure for himself the largest slice of the empire of Alexander. Before the battle of Ipsus it had been agreed among the victorious allies that in the event of victory Palestine should fall to Ptolemy, but the contingents of Ptolemy arrived too late to take part in the battle, and Seleucus held that the agreement was void. Since Ptolemy's troops had occupied Palestine, and since Seleucus was too conscious of his debt to Ptolemy to use force against him, he contented himself with a protest. The result was that Palestine was a bone of contention between the two houses for a century. Of the conflicts and alliances between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, briefly summarized in Dan. 11, it is unnecessary here to treat. It must suffice to say that following the battle of Paneion, in 198 B.C., Palestine passed to the rule of the Seleucids. Antiochus III had sought twenty years earlier to wrest this region from the Ptolemies, but had failed. When he now succeeded, there were Jews who welcomed the change. It was not long, however, before they took a different view.

At this time there were inner dissensions among the Jews. The Greek kingdoms, while separately governed, claimed to be parts of the undivided empire of Alexander, and both continued Alexander's policy of spreading Greek culture and marrying it to the culture of the E. There were Jews who favored the spread of Greek culture and welcomed its influence, while there were others who clung to the separatism which Ezra had stamped deeply upon Judaism, and held aloof from it. Political and religious considerations were soon woven together. The high-priestly house of Onias stood over against the house of the Tobiads, who, before the change-over to the Seleucid rule, had secured from the Ptolemies the tax-farming rights which had formerly belonged to the high priest. Hence the Oniads favored the change to Seleucid rule. They soon found that they had secured no advantage from the change, however. The Tobiads secured their position with their new

masters, and neither religiously nor politically had the Oniads strengthened theirs. It is only in the light of these internal and external factors that the conflict of the Maccabean age can be understood.

**14. The Maccabean age.** Antiochus III became involved in war with Rome a few years after his annexation of Palestine, and at the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C. he was defeated and compelled to forfeit his control of Asia Minor and to pay a large indemnity. His successor, Seleucus IV, inherited an exchequer depleted by wars, and a reduced kingdom to provide the indemnity. The high taxation this involved contributed to the unpopularity of Seleucid rule. When Seleucus turned to robbing temples to supply his needs, and sent his representative to rob the Jerusalem temple, this unpopularity among the Jews was increased, even though the attempt to rob the temple was foiled. Religious loyalty, nationalism, and resentment at oppressive taxation united one section of the people, while the pro-Seleucid elements reacted more strongly in favor of Greek culture.

When Seleucus was murdered by Heliodorus, who proclaimed the infant son of Seleucus as king, with the real power in his own hands, Antiochus, brother of Seleucus, soon landed in Syria to eliminate Heliodorus and to take his nephew under his own protection, and then to eliminate him and leave himself on the throne (*see* ANTIOCHUS 4). Antiochus had been a hostage in Rome, but had been replaced by Demetrius, the son and rightful successor of Seleucus. Antiochus was not, therefore, the heir to the throne, and it is not surprising that the elements in Palestine who were disaffected toward the Seleucids disputed his title to rule them. Antiochus, who became known as Antiochus Epiphanes, was not long in seeking to exploit dynastic troubles in Egypt in order to get possession of the Ptolemaic kingdom. His nephews, the two disputing Ptolemies, hastened to make up their quarrels, perhaps moved by the fate of the son of Seleucus. Before long, Antiochus made an open move against Egypt, but this time was foiled by the ambassador of Rome, to whose Senate Egypt had appealed for help.

Humiliated and angry, Antiochus fell back on Jerusalem. Here he found a complex situation. Already before this, Onias had been removed from office through inner Jewish intrigues, and the high priesthood had been bartered to the highest bidder. Deep personal feelings had been aroused, and all the religiously loyal had been driven to the side of Onias. This high priest had been himself put to death before the time we have now reached, but the bitter divisions continued. Now Antiochus determined to destroy the religion of Judaism, since he judged that though religious and political considerations were woven together in the opposition to himself, this opposition would collapse if its religious root were extirpated. It has been said that it was the policy of the Greek rulers to foster Greek culture. Antiochus therefore now pursued this policy in Palestine with greater vigor and violence than any of his predecessors. All the practices of the Jewish faith were forbidden, the temple was desecrated and turned into a shrine of Zeus, and the Jews were ordered to eat unclean foods and to sacrifice to idols.

It was this situation which brought about the

Jewish revolt under the Maccabees. Led at first by Judas Maccabeus, the rebels scored initial successes against the forces sent by Antiochus, until the temple was recovered, cleansed, and rededicated, though a Seleucid garrison continued to occupy the citadel in Jerusalem. The death of Antiochus in the E led to a period of confusion in the Seleucid kingdom, with upstarts and pretenders taking part in the internal wars that followed. Judas Maccabeus was himself killed in 161 B.C., but he was followed by his brothers Jonathan and Simon in turn, and these took advantage of the troubles in Syria to barter their support now to one and now to another, so as to secure their own position and to gain Jewish independence. The result was the Hasmonean rule, which continued down to the Roman annexation of Palestine. The Maccabean family was a priestly house, though not in the high-priestly line. The successors of Judas nevertheless assumed the high priesthood, and later took the title of king, thus combining in a single person these two offices, save for a period when the civil office was held by a woman.

It was this period which saw the rise of the Jewish parties known as Pharisees and Sadducees. Other Jewish sects seem also to have been born in the second century B.C. According to Josephus the Essenes already existed in the middle of that century. By many writers the sect of the DEAD SEA SCROLLS is identified with the Essenes. Whether or not this identification is allowed, it is commonly believed that the sect of the Scrolls took its origin in some way from the troubles of the Maccabean age, though there is less agreement as to when the Teacher of Righteousness of that sect lived.

**15. The Roman period.** At the end of the second century there was much tension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and this continued into the first century, when, under Alexander Jannaeus, the Pharisees were ranged in opposition to the king, whose enemies at one point invoked the aid of Demetrius III against him. Arising from this, a large number of the Pharisees were crucified by Jannaeus. In the middle of the first century, however, Palestine became involved in the Roman civil wars, and the army of Pompey came to Jerusalem and brought the Jews under Roman control. Soon Herod, an Idumean, skilfully exploited the dissensions in the Hasmonean family, and secured from Rome the title of king, though he had yet to win his kingdom, which was, of course, still subject to Rome. He succeeded in winning his kingdom, and by his adroitness in dealing with the ever-changing situation arising from the civil wars among the Romans, he continued to hold the kingdom until his death in 4 B.C. In some ways he served the Jews well, though he was never loved by them and was always regarded as an alien. His ruthless cruelty was experienced by members of his own family, as well as by large numbers of his subjects, and despite the outer splendor of his reign and the building achievements which he could claim, including the undertaking of the rebuilding of the temple, he won no gratitude. See HEROD [FAMILY].

After his death his kingdom was divided among members of his family; Archelaus secured the rule of Judea for a few years, until he was displaced and Judea was brought under direct Roman rule. The

other parts of Herod's kingdom continued to be ruled by members of the Herodian house, though still with responsibility to Rome. Again deep divisions developed among the Jews. Some cherished bitter hostility to the Romans and to all who supported them, while others sought by co-operation with Rome to further Jewish interests—and their own at the same time. The Roman rulers rarely understood the Jewish character, and were themselves of varying ability and worth. The situation therefore went from bad to worse, until in A.D. 66 the Jewish Revolt broke out. The course of the war is recounted by Josephus in *The Jewish War*. It was marked by fanaticism and bitter excesses even among those who fought the Romans, and despite the heroism of the rebels and the religious loyalty that made them observe the sabbath and maintain the sacrifices of the temple even when in the direst straits, the issue was the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70. For a time the Roman armies were commanded by Vespasian, until he was called to wear the purple. The final capture of Jerusalem was made by his son Titus (see TITUS, EMPEROR). Among the treasures carried away by Titus, and displayed at his triumph, were the table of shewbread from the temple, the golden candlestick, and a roll of the Law. The temple itself was destroyed completely, and has never been rebuilt. It was not destroyed, however, until its work was complete. It symbolized the religion of Israel, with its high achievement, its pure monotheism, its noble prophetic teaching, and its deep personal piety. Its sacrifices might pass, as the author of the Letter to the Hebrews says, for they had been superseded by the sacrifice of enduring efficacy at Calvary. But the table, the candlestick, and the Law were fittingly carried to Rome, to symbolize the dissemination in the wider world of the faith that had sprung from Judaism—the faith whose supreme sacrament centers in a table, whose Lord is the light of the world, and whose roots are so firmly embedded in Israel's history that without the Old Covenant it cannot be fully understood.

**Bibliography.** J. W. Rothstein, *Juden und Samaritaner*, BWAT, vol. 3 (1908). E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols.; 4th ed., 1901-9). R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (6th ed., 1923); II (6th ed., 1925); III (1927-29). A. Schlauer, *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian* (3rd ed., 1925). W. Kolbe, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte*, BWANT, N.F. 10 (1926). H. H. Schaefer, *Esra der Schreiber* (1930). A. Jirku, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1931). E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, II (2 vols.; 2nd ed., 1928-31). A. T. Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest* (1931). W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (1932). A. Lods, *Israel from Its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century* (English trans. S. H. Hooke; 1932). W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *A History of Israel* (2 vols.; 1932). E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer. Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung* (1937). A. Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism* (English trans. S. H. Hooke; 1937). A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judea* (1938). E. F. Weidner, "Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten," *Mélanges syriens*, II (1939), 923 ff. W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (1949). T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (2nd ed., 1950). H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (1950); "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), pp. 217 ff; also "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," pp. 131 ff. F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à*



*l'invasion arabe* (2 vols.; 1952). W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (1952). A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (2 vols.; 1953). J. B. Pritchard, ed., *ANET* (2nd ed., 1955). G. Ricciotti, *The History of Israel* (trans. C. della Penta and R. T. A. Murphy; 2 vols.; 1955). H. H. Rowley, "Sabbat and the Samaritan Temple," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XXXVIII (1955-56), 166 ff. D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings* (1956). M. F. Unger, *Israel and the Aramaeans of Damascus* (1957). G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (1957). M. Noth, *Gesammelte Studien zum AT* (1957); *Die Welt des ATs* (3rd ed., 1957); *History of Israel* (1958). J. Bright, *History of Israel* (1959).

Bible atlases: P. Lemaire and D. Baldi, *Atlante Storico della Bibbia* (1955). L. H. Grollenberg, *Atlas of the Bible* (trans. and ed. J. M. H. Reid and H. H. Rowley; 1956). E. G. Kraeling, *Rand McNally Bible Atlas* (1956). G. E. Wright and F. V. Filson, *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* (2nd ed., 1956). H. H. ROWLEY

**ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.** See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, §§ 7-8.

### ISRAEL, NAMES AND ASSOCIATIONS OF.

1. The name of Jacob the patriarch
  2. A designation of the people of Israel as a whole
  3. A designation of the inhabitants of the N kingdom
  4. A designation of the inhabitants of the S kingdom
  5. A designation of a cult community
- Bibliography

1. **The name of Jacob the patriarch.** In Gen. 32:22 ff we are told about Elohim's wrestling with Jacob, and that because of this the latter's name was changed and he should be called Israel. This story contains an etymology of the name, what we may call a popular etymology, according to which the meaning of the name would be "El wrestles." It is commonly admitted that this interpretation cannot be said to give the real meaning of the name, and, of course, it is impossible to present decisive arguments for any etymology of a name like Israel. However, the most probable interpretation is that which connects the name Israel with the root *šr*/*šr*, "reliable," "successful," "happy." It may be mentioned that in cuneiform texts there are names almost identical: *İšrē-il*, *Ašri-ilišu*. It seems hard to assume that such names should be explained in another way than Israel. If Israel is etymologically connected with Ašer, we are faced with the possibility that Israel is originally connected with the ancient Canaanite gods of fertility, Ašer being the male counterpart of Ašera, which is one name of the Canaanite goddess of fertility. In that case, the name Israel refers to the Canaanite substratum of OT religion, and Jacob's change of name may then refer to a merging of the tribes entering from the E with a Canaanite religious community. The "Rock of Israel" (Gen. 49:24) has been referred to in this connection as being an allusion to the cult stone (*massebah*) and parallel to the "Mighty One of Jacob," the latter expression referring to the bull as the symbol of the god of fertility.

2. **A designation of the people of Israel as a whole.** According to the OT traditions of the growth of the Israelite nation, the patriarchs were the earliest ancestors of the people. In the scholarly discussion of these figures several theories have been advocated.

According to one theory, they were real historical persons; according to another they are to be regarded as cult heroes. Since the traditions of the patriarchs were created much later than the time they reflect, they have received many features from later periods, and they can by no means be considered real historical sources. In all probability they reflect early migrations of various ethnic groups, a number of which later merged with one another. As a matter of fact, they have been associated with cult centers, Abraham with Hebron, Isaac with Beer-sheba, and Jacob with Bethel.

In the traditions about the sojourn in Egypt and the Exodus from there, the wandering through the desert and entering into Canaan under Joshua, the name of "Israel," or more commonly the "children of Israel," is used about the Israelite people as a whole, and accordingly the twelve tribes of Israel all appear in these traditions. It is true, in several passages the term "Hebrews" is used. In the sections of the OT dealing with the people after the invasion of Canaan, "Israel" is used as a designation of the people as a whole (Deuteronomy-Samuel), consisting of twelve tribes. If we compare various lists of the twelve tribes, a few variations are found. In Gen. 49 we encounter the twelve sons of Jacob, whereas in Deut. 33 the tribe of Simeon is omitted and the tribe of Joseph is divided into two tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh. The system of the twelve tribes is now admitted to have originated in Palestine, and accordingly, this system as applied to earlier periods is not historical. The traditions about the early periods may be said to be a schematic outline of historical events during many centuries.

3. **A designation of the inhabitants of the N kingdom.** In passages like II Sam. 2:9, 17; 3:10; 19:41; 20:1; I Kings 12:16, the name Israel is used about the N tribes, whose center is Ephraim. The mountain of Israel is found in Josh. 11:16, 21. After the division of the United Kingdom into two, Israel is the name of the N kingdom (I Kings 14:19, etc.) Other expressions are, e.g., the "house of Israel" (I Kings 12:21; Hos. 5:1; Amos 5:1; Mic. 1:5; etc.).

4. **A designation of the inhabitants of the S kingdom.** In some passages Israel is used about the S kingdom (e.g., Isa. 5:7; Mic. 3:1). This is particularly the case after the fall of the N kingdom.

5. **A designation of a cult community.** The name Israel has come into use as a designation of the Israelite people, and from an early time particularly of the N tribes, in Canaan. In this development Canaanite elements played an important role, several of the Israelite tribes being Canaanite or other ethnic groups. But when the Israelite nation became conscious of its national characteristics, it was the belief in the national god Yahweh that was the basis of the Israelite nation. Because of this belief not only was the name Israel used as a designation of the cult unity bound up with the worship of Yahweh, but also the figure of Israel became a religious ideal (see, e.g., Isa. 1:3; 4:2; 49:3). This religious basis of the national consciousness is particularly to be observed in the idea of the people of Israel as the people chosen by Yahweh, and in the idea of the covenant. These ideas are the chief recurrent theme in the whole OT conception of the history of the Israel-