

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CLASS _____

CALL No. 901.093946 Van

D.G.A. 79.

THE MOABITES

PRETORIA ORIENTAL SERIES

EDITED BY

A. VAN SELMS

VOL. III

A. H. VAN ZYL, THE MOABITES



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1960

THE MOABITES

BY

A. H. VAN ZYL, M.A. D.D.

Senior lecturer of semitic languages University of Pretoria
(South Africa)

3 186



Ref. 939.46
Van



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1960

Copyright 1960 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or
translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other
means without written permission from the publisher.

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.**

Acc. No. 38083
Date 27.7.61
Call No. 901.093946 / Van

CONTENTS

PREFACE	VII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	IX
I INTRODUCTION	I
II THE SOURCES	4
The Old Testament.	4
The Moabite Sources	29
Cuneiform Texts	36
Egyptian Sources.	39
Flavius Josephus.	41
The Apocrypha	41
III THE TOPOGRAPHY	43
The Name of the Country	44
The Boundaries	46
The Nature of the Country	49
Water in Moab	53
The Routes	60
The Cities	61
IV THE HISTORY	102
The pre-Moabite Settlement	102
The Emites	106
Descent and Settlement	108
The Clash with Sihon	113
Moab, Midian and Moses	118
Eglon in the West-Jordan Territory	125
Moab repulsed to the Arnon	130
Moab and the New Monarchy.	133
Moab and the Kingdom of Israel	136
Mesha' the Liberator of Moab	139
The Decline of the Kingdom of Mesha'	144

Moab, Vassal of Assyria	148
Moab, Vassal of Babylon	154
The Final Chords	158
The Moabite Culture	159
V THE LANGUAGE	161
The Verb	161
The Pronoun	168
The Noun	171
The Numerals	176
The Article	177
The Proper Name	177
The Orthography of M.I.	185
Moabitic and the Other Semitic Languages	188
Translation of M.I.	189
VI THE RELIGION	193
ADDENDUM I Text of M.I.	opposite to 202
ADDENDUM II Identifications of Cities, Rivers and Mountains.	203
Indexes	205
a. Biblical Passages and Apocrypha	205
b. Inscription of King Mesha ^c of Moab	212
c. Moabitic Words	214
d. Hebrew Words	215
e. General Index	218
Bibliography	228
Map of Moab with Key	at the end of the book

PREFACE

A few years ago Prof. A. van Selms, professor of Semitic Languages, University of Pretoria, drew my attention to the fact that a monograph about the Moabites or the Ammonites has not yet been published in spite of the fact that an abundance of new material on these peoples has come to light during recent years. He urged me to write a thesis about one of these peoples. Fortunately I have decided to write a monograph on the Moabites, because Landes has recently completed a restudy of Ammonite history. When I had completed the investigation concerning the Moabites at the end of 1955 it was submitted as a thesis titled "Die Moabiete" in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor Divinitatis in the Faculty of Divinity, University of Pretoria. As the ambit of this thesis, written in Afrikaans, was too extensive I had to abridge it considerably before translating it. This abridgement mainly concerns Chapters II and III.

I owe thanks to all who have assisted me in preparing this monograph. Their invaluable assistance is highly appreciated. I especially wish to express my profound gratitude to Prof. J. H. Kritzinger, my promoter under whose guidance I have written the original thesis; Prof. van Selms, whose interest in my work never faded, and Mr. N. Sabbagha, M. A. (S.A.), M.A. (Oxon.), Senior Lecturer of English, University of Pretoria, who read the final manuscript and corrected my English. Finally I want to express special thanks to my wife who has been a loyal help-meet during the past five years.

Publication of this volume has been made possible by generous grants from the Publication Committee of the University of Pretoria and the National Council for Social Research, Dept. of Education Arts and Science, whom I wish to thank.

University of Pretoria

13th November 1959

A. H. VAN ZYL

ABBREVIATIONS

Abb.	Abbildung
acc.	accusative.
A.D.A.J.	Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan.
Afb.	Afbeelding.
AfO	Archiv für Orient-forschung.
AJSL	Americal Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
Am.	Amos.
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the O.T.
Annual	The Annual of the America Schools of Oriental Research.
Ant. Iud.	Antiquitatum Judaicarum.
A.O.T.A.T.	Altorientalische Texte zum A.T.
AOTUB	cf. A.O.T.A.T.
AP	The Archaeology of Palestine.
A.P.B.	The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible.
A.P. I	Arabia Petraea, vol. I.
ARAB	Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia.
A.R.E.	Ancient Records of Egypt.
ARI	Archaeology and the Religion of Israel.
A.T.	Altes Testament.
Basor	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
BBLA	Beiträge zur Biblischen Landes und Altertumskunde.
B.H.	Biblia Hebraica.
Bi.Or.	Bibliotheca Orientalis.
BuA	Babylonien und Assyrien.
BZAW	Beiheft zur ZAW.
CAD	Assyrian Dictionary.
cf.	compare (confer).
ch.	chapter.
Chron.	Chronicles.
Cor.	Corinthians.
C.T.	Cuneiform Texts.
Cyl.	Cylinder.
D.B.	Dictionary of the Bible.
DCD	Development of the Canaanite Dialects.
DISO	Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest.
D.S.la.	The St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript, published in The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery.
Dt.	Deuteronomy.
e.	east, eastern.
E.B.	Encyclopaedia Biblica.
e.g.	for example (exempli gratia).
Einl.	Einleitung.
ETL	Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists relating to Western Asia.
Ex.	Exodus.

fig.	figure.
Gen.	Genesis.
G.I.	Geschichte Israels.
G.I.J.V.	Geschichte des Israelitisch-Jüdischen Volkes.
G. Isr.	Geschichte Israels.
GTT	Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift.
Hes.	Hezekiel.
Hos.	Hosea.
HTS	Hervormde Theologiese Studies.
i.e.	that is (id est).
imper.	imperative.
impf.	imperfect.
Intr.	Introduction.
Is.	Isaiah.
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.
JEOL	Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux.
Jer.	Jeremiah.
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
Josh.	Joshua.
JPOS	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review.
Judg.	Judges.
KAT	Die Keilinschriften und das A.T.
K.B.	Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.
Kh.	Khirbet.
Ki.	Kings.
km.	kilometre.
l.	line.
Lev.	Leviticus.
ll.	lines.
LVTL	Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.
Lxx.	Septuaginta.
m.	metre.
Macc.	Maccabees.
M.I.	Inscription of king Mesha ^c of Moab.
Mi.	Micah.
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orient-forschung.
n.	north, northern.
n.	note.
n.e.	north-east, north-eastern.
Neh.	Nehemiah.
no.	number (numero).
NSI	A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions.
Numb.	Numbers.
perf.	perfect.
PJB	Palästina-jahrbuch.
pl.	plate.
pp.	pages.

Prov.	Proverbs.
Ps.	Psalms.
Q.	Qaṣr.
R.	Rujm.
R.A.	Revue d'Assyriologie.
R.B.	Revue Biblique.
Rev.	Reverse.
Revel.	Revelation.
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.
s.	south, southern.
Sach.	Zechariah.
Sam.	Samuel.
s.e.	south-east, south-eastern.
Sp.	Spaltung.
s.w.	south-west, south-western.
T.P.	Tiglath-Pileser.
VAB	Vorderasiatische Bibliothek.
viz.	namely (videlicet).
vol.	volume.
V.T.	Vetus Testamentum.
V.T. Suppl.	Supplement to V.T.
W.	Wādī.
w.	west, western.
WDB	The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible.
WHAB	The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible.
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Zeph.	Zephaniah.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In spite of the fact that a monograph by Buhl about the Edomites appeared in 1893 ¹⁾, a similar work about the Moabites or the Ammonites ²⁾ has not yet been published. It may be that this has happened only accidentally, but in all probability it was assumed that the available information had been discussed elsewhere, even though fragmentarily and sporadically, for example, in Biblical expositions. All these discussions merely reflected the Israelite point of view. Significance was only attached to the occupation of the former Moabite territory by the Israelites ³⁾. For this reason no general survey of the Moabites has as yet appeared. The absence of a monograph about the Moabites can perhaps be considered a blessing in disguise, seeing that in recent years an abundance of new material on the Moabites, which materially transformed the conception of the Kingdom of Moab, has come to light. This new data is chiefly concerned with the geography of the country, the density of the population, and the nature of the civilization of the Moabites. The Kingdom of Moab need no longer be regarded as an inferior and insignificant petty kingdom, or the country as being merely barren. This could already have been assumed on account of the fact that the Moabite kings are mentioned in the Assyrian royal inscriptions together with other kings of Syria and Palestine. The thorough surface-survey carried out by Glueck, however, brought to light the fact that the Kingdom of Moab was as well organized as any of its neighbouring states and that the

¹⁾ Buhl: *Geschichte der Edomiter*, Leipzig, 1893.

²⁾ According to Basor 144, p. 31, George M. Landes has recently completed "a comprehensive restudy of Ammonite history", which, to the present writer's knowledge, has not yet been published.

³⁾ Noth: ZAW 1944, pp. 11-57; BBLA 1949, pp. 44-50.

country must have harboured a vast population. Also as regards the Moabites' sense of art and their skilful craftsmanship, past decades have brought new insight. Since Albright identified the first examples of typical Moabite pottery ¹⁾, many more of these silent witnesses have been found in the land of Moab. In the meantime several excavations have been carried out at ancient Moabite sites and though the results have been somewhat disappointing as far as the Moabite period is concerned, they have served to rectify several earlier misconceptions.

The aim of this monograph is principally to mould all available material about the Moabites into a co-ordinate survey of the land and the life of the Moabite people. Continually attention will be drawn to the part played by the Moabites; while only cursory reference will be made to other nations. An endeavour will be made to describe the history of the Moabites as that of one of the nations in and around Palestine and not as that of an isolated group. The people of a specific country do not necessarily determine the history and the fate of their country, but the surrounding peoples frequently supply major contributions. This sometimes facilitates the task of the historian, because changes and events which cannot be explained by interior circumstances are clarified by contemporary external events. On the other hand, we must admit that some occurrences become more intricate in the light of external evidence. Though this may be the position, our aim will still be to scrutinize the history and civilization of the Moabites within the framework of their geographical and historical relationships.

This monograph is devoted to the historical Moab only. It is needless to describe the history of the predecessors of the Moabites in detail, for their civilization ended at least six centuries before the Moabites settled in the country. Similarly there was a definite break in the history of the occupation of the land of Moab after the downfall of the Moabite Kingdom.

¹⁾ Albright: *Basor* 14, p. 11; cf. pp. 34, 75, 159 below.

After the destruction of their country by the Babylonians, the Moabites as a people finally passed from the scene. Since then only Moabite individuals are mentioned, and frequently Moabites are alluded to at a stage when the Moabites no longer existed. Actually the people who occupied the land of Moab after the Moabites are referred to ¹⁾. The scope of this monograph is determined by two distinctly marked events in the land of Moab, viz. the commencement of the settled occupation in the beginning of the Iron Age and the destruction of this civilization at the end of Iron Age II.

¹⁾ cf. inter alia *Iscrizioni e monumenti protocristiani del paes di Moab*, della Dott. Reginetta Canova, which, a few geographical details excluded, does not treat the historical Moab.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SOURCES

In this monograph about the Moabites we have to rely mainly on sources, which are not of Moabite origin. Thus we have to use information handed down and recorded by their neighbours, whose relations with them were frequently strained. This does not imply that we have to discard this information. More original Moabite sources could, however, have supplemented the existing sources, as the well-known inscription of king Mesha¹⁾ did¹⁾. As a rule the events are described atomistically in the different sources and therefore it is inevitable that some problems will remain unsolved and that there will be a hiatus now and then.

A. THE OLD TESTAMENT

Though the Old Testament must be considered to be of secondary importance in respect of our knowledge of Canaanite culture²⁾, it still remains a primary source for our knowledge of the Moabites. The O.T. frequently refers to or tells of the weal and woe of the Moabites or other peoples. In spite of the fact that the O.T. historians surpassed all their colleagues among other ancient peoples, we should always bear in mind that their idea about writing history was different from what ours is.³⁾ They frequently only mentioned an event that would have fascinated us, simply because that specific event was of no importance to their purpose, even

¹⁾ cf. pp. 138-140 below.

²⁾ cf. Van Selms : OTS XII, pp. 182-184.

³⁾ cf. Palache : *Het Karakter van het Oud-Testamentische Verhaal*, pp. 10-11; Noordtjiz : *Het Probleem van Het Oude Testament*, pp. 56-58; Aalders : *De Geschiedbeschrijving van Het Oude Testament*, p. 16; Vriezen : *Bi. Or. VIII*, p. 151; Böhl : *Opera Minora*, pp. 1-10; Ridderbos : *GTT* 57, pp. 112-120; 58, pp. 1-9.

though Israel or Judah was deeply concerned in it ¹⁾. But in spite of this inclination, the authors of the O.T. maintained a vivid objectivity ²⁾. Therefore the trustworthiness of the O.T. information about the Moabites need not be defended here.

It must be emphasized that not all the "*literar-kritische*" and "*formgeschichtliche*" problems of the specific sources will be discussed, but that the sole purpose is to trace their origin and historical context. Alterations of a textual-critical kind in the Masoretic Text will be discussed only if they concern this treatise directly.

I. Gen. 19 : 30-38.

Gunkel ³⁾, who is followed by Procksch ⁴⁾ and Jacob ⁵⁾, maintains that this is a legend of Ammonite-Moabite origin in honour of the two mothers who immortalized their reprehensible deed through the names given to their first-born sons ⁶⁾. But as sexual intercourse between relatives of the first degree was forbidden and regarded as abhorrent among all nations of the Ancient Near East ⁷⁾, these women were also bound by this moral code ⁸⁾. Moreover, if the motive of this chapter happened to be the adoration of the two mothers, their names would have been handed down to us. Even in narratives in which the first mother did not figure as prominent, like the role that Gunkel is apt to assign to the two daughters of Lot, their names have been preserved ⁹⁾. By omitting their names,

¹⁾ cf. I Sam. 14 : 47; II Sam. 8 : 2; Keil and Delitzsch: Samuel, p. 148. The subjugation of Moab by Omri is not mentioned, because "Omri wrought evil in the eyes of the LORD", cf. I Ki. 16 : 25.

²⁾ cf. Gunkel: R.G.G.² II, p. 1114.

³⁾ Gunkel: Genesis, p. 191.

⁴⁾ Procksch: Genesis, p. 135.

⁵⁾ Jacob: Genesis, p. 464.

⁶⁾ cf. Gen. 19 : 37-38 and the additions of the Lxx.

⁷⁾ cf. Gen. 35 : 22; 49 : 4; I Chron. 5 : 1; Lev. 18; Dt. 22 : 30; Epstein: Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud, pp. 223-224; Harper: The Code of Hammurabi King of Babylon, p. 54, §§ 154, 157-158; Neufeld: The Hittite Laws, p. 54, §§ 189-190.

⁸⁾ cf. Neufeld: The Hittite Laws, p. 128.

⁹⁾ cf. Gen. 4 : 19; 16 : 15; 36 : 2-3.

the author did not honour them¹⁾. Being unknown, they could not be called to account, and thus the author neither honoured nor blamed them. As a matter of fact he did not intend to honour or blame anybody, for Lot was unconscious of the act, and the daughters remain incognito. This narrative is directed rather against the offspring of the daughters. It is a reflection of the Israelite feeling of disdain towards the Moabites²⁾. Simultaneously we find the popular etymological explanation of the name מואב in it³⁾. As it was customary that each name had a distinct meaning, it is obvious that many people would deduce the etymology of the name from this narrative.

2. Numb. 21 : 11-20.

This itinerary furnishes the names of several sites at which the Israelites camped, while on their way to the w. Jordan region. These were not the only sites in the region concerned. While Israel trekked along this route, several other events, which are mentioned at the end of the itinerary, occurred. Thus Israel fought against Sihon (Numb. 21 : 21-31) before they reached the plains of Moab. Chronologically this battle is subsequent to the citation from "the book of the wars of the Lord" (Numb. 21 : 14-15)⁴⁾. It is only mentioned at the end of this pericope because the author did not want to split this source, which in days of yore included both poetical parts, viz. 21 : 14-15 and 21 : 17-18⁵⁾. The quotation from "the book of the wars of the Lord" is cited by the author of this pericope to demarcate the boundaries of Moab more clearly⁶⁾. He cited this ancient "*Landschaftsbeschreibung*"⁷⁾ to indicate that

¹⁾ cf. Stade: ZAW 1881, p. 347 n.l.

²⁾ cf. Holzinger: Genesis, p. 158; Böhl: Genesis I, p. 151.

³⁾ cf. Gunkel: Genesis, p. 192.

⁴⁾ cf. Noordtjiz: Numeri, p. 229.

⁵⁾ Contra Noth: ZAW 1940/1, p. 178.

⁶⁾ cf. also Noordtjiz: Numeri, p. 228; Noth: ZAW 1940/1, p. 175.

⁷⁾ Weiser: Einl.², p. 92; Bentzen: Intr. I, p. 145. Contra Holzinger: Numeri, p. 97.

the specific territory did not belong to the Amorites but to the Moabites ¹⁾.

The "Song of the Well" ²⁾ was sung after Sihon was defeated. This ancient song was not handed down merely to save a fraction of ancient oriental culture for posterity ³⁾, but by singing this song at this specific site, Israel denoted its legal claim to the right of ownership of the territory concerned ⁴⁾. In this song we can therefore ascertain a primary cause for the king of Moab's summoning Balaam ⁵⁾.

Numb. 33, which is another itinerary of the same journey, shows a few variations in comparison with Numb. 21 ⁶⁾. Correspondingly it is of topographical as well as political and historical importance. This list was compiled from ancient sources ⁷⁾. It mentions the names of several sites which are not mentioned elsewhere in the Pentateuch ⁸⁾. The two lists are complementary, especially as far as the region to the n. of the river Arnon is concerned. As in Numb. 21 : 11-20, Judg. 11 : 18 and II Chron. 20 : 10, this itinerary indicates that Israel as a whole passed the land of Moab to the east.

In Dt. 2 : 8-29 we have another account of the route taken by the Israelites when they approached the land of Moab. In addition to the topographical information, this chapter informs us of the relations between Israel and Moab, as well

¹⁾ Böhl: Kanaanäer und Hebräer, p. 54.

²⁾ Numb. 21 : 17-18.

³⁾ cf. the commentaries ad loci; but cf. Eissfeldt: Einl. p. 101.

⁴⁾ cf. Gen. 26 : 15-22.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 121-122 below.

⁶⁾ The variations cannot be ascribed to the fact that the Israelites trekked in two divisions along two different routes from Ijje-haabarim to the n., as is alleged by Heinisch: Numeri, p. 83 and Noordtzij: Numeri, p. 227. The variations only concern the sites mentioned to the n. of the Arnon, cf. Keil and Delitzsch: Pentateuch III, p. 149. After the defeat of Sihon, the Israelites could have spread.

⁷⁾ cf. Edelkoort: Numeri, p. 201; Noth: ZAW 1940/1, p. 171. This list originated shortly after Dibon was captured by the tribe of Gad, therefore it is called Dibon-Gad in it.

⁸⁾ Only two names of Numb. 33 : 44-49 correspond with those in Numb. 21 : 11-20. In both lists the starting-point and the terminus correspond, viz. Ijje-haabarim (Ijjim) and the plains of Moab.

as the pre-Moabite inhabitants of the land of Moab. According to Dt. 2 : 18, 29 it seems as though Israel trekked through the land of Moab. Consequently it was assumed that the Moabites allowed them to cross through the north-eastern corner of their country¹). But this assumption is contrary to the tradition in Numbers, Judges, and even Dt. 2 : 8, according to which the Israelites passed the land of Edom to the e. and thence they went due n. without entering the country of the Moabites²). The problem is solved if we regard Dt. 2 : 18, like Dt. 2 : 4, as a command which Israel could not carry into effect, because Moab did not allow them to enter the country, while Dt. 2 : 29 only refers to the fact that the Edomites and the Moabites sold provisions to the Israelites.

3. *Numb. 21 : 21-31.*

This pericope describes the defeat of the Amorites by the Israelites, after Sihon, king of the Amorites, had denied them permission to pass through his country. In the subsequent history attention was frequently given to this incident³). The author described this clash in prose, but within this framework of prose (21-26 and 31), a song by the מְשִׁלִּים is incorporated. Who were these מְשִׁלִּים and to which occasion does their song refer? Divergent answers have been given to these questions, e.g.:

i. It is a satire by Israelite מְשִׁלִּים, taunting the defeated Amorites with bitter scorn⁴). They casually refer to the Amorite triumph over the Moabites to boost their own achieve-

¹) Keil and Delitzsch: Pentateuch III, p. 296; Buhl: Edomiter, p. 21; Driver: Deuteronomy, p. 36; Ridderbos: Deuteronomium I, pp. 75-76; Kritzinger: Q'hal Jahwe, p. 94.

²) cf. Noordtzi: Numeri, pp. 221, 227-228; Goslinga: Richteren I, p. 179.

³) cf. Dt. 2 : 24-36; 3 : 6, 8, 12; Josh. 12 : 1-3; Judg. 11 : 19-22.

⁴) Ewald: History II, pp. 205-206; Keil and Delitzsch: Pentateuch III, p. 152 and p. 154 n.l.; cf. also Heinisch: Numeri, p. 84; Rudolph: ZAW 1934, p. 114; Noth: ZAW 1940/1, p. 167; ZAW 1944, pp. 39-40, all of whom regard this song as Israel's song of victory against the supremacy of Sihon.

ment¹⁾. But if we endorse this interpretation, we are compelled to alter the text too much²⁾. Furthermore, the area in which the battle, described in the song, took place is not the same as that of the clash described in the prose narrative. Jahas, the actual battleground on which the fight between the Israelites and the Amorites took place³⁾, is nowhere mentioned in this song⁴⁾. The obvious conclusion is, therefore, that two different clashes are referred to.

ii. According to Ed. Meyer⁵⁾ this song alludes to the defeat of Mesha⁶⁾, king of Moab, by Omri, king of Israel⁶⁾. He deletes the last few words of verse 29, viz. "the king of the Amorites"⁷⁾ and visualizes Sihon as king of Moab, because there were no Amorites in this area during this period. There is, however, no reason for the alteration of the text, if the historical context of this song is retained. It is further contended by Meyer that the sequence, in which the cities are mentioned, viz. from Heshbon to Dibon, indicates that the attacking army moved from north to south. He is correct in this respect, but it was not the army of Israel which came from the n., but that of the Amorites when they attacked Moab. To transfer this incident to the period of king Mesha⁶⁾ conflicts with the historical context of this poem and there is no reason to doubt the historicity of this context⁸⁾. Binns⁹⁾ also saw in this song a probable indication of an Israelite triumph over Moab. He did not try to link it to a definite incident, but demarcates

¹⁾ cf. De Vaux: *Vivre et Penser* I, p. 23.

²⁾ cf. also Noordtzij: *Numeri*, p. 231.

³⁾ *Numb.* 21: 23.

⁴⁾ *Numb.* 21: 28, 30.

⁵⁾ Meyer: *ZAW* 1881, pp. 128, 131; *ZAW* 1885, pp. 36-52; cf. also Stade: *ZAW* 1881, p. 146; Baentsch: *Exodus, Leviticus und Numeri*, p. 584.

⁶⁾ M.I. 4-6.

⁷⁾ Stade and Baentsch also delete the name "Sihon"; but cf. Edelkoort: *Numeri*, p. 169.

⁸⁾ cf. Kittel: *G. Isr. I*, p. 333 n. 4. The statement by Meyer: *ZAW* 1881, pp. 117-146; *ZAW* 1885, pp. 36-52, that there were no Amorites in this area at the time of the Exodus, is disproved by Böhl: *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, pp. 56-62 and Kittel: *G. Isr. I*, p. 377.

⁹⁾ Binns: *Numbers*, pp. 146-147.

it by means of a citation from Gray¹⁾ that "the poem celebrates a victory over Moab. Everything else is more or less uncertain".

iii. According to Holzinger²⁾, Edelkoort³⁾ and Noordtzij⁴⁾ this song celebrates the victory of Sihon, king of the Amorites, over Moab. The author of this pericope cited it to magnify the Israelite victory over Sihon. Thus this song was transformed by the Israelites to a mocking song, by which they demonstrated their own superiority over the Moabites⁵⁾.

Perhaps we may assume that this song was originally intended to be an Amorite mocking song, sung by their מְשִׁלִּים after they had defeated the Moabites⁶⁾. This is indicated by the sarcastic invitation to Moab to return to the recently destroyed city of Heshbon and to rebuild it. In ancient times the mocking song played a prominent part in warfare⁷⁾. This interpretation of the song conforms to its context, and it does not require inherent alterations of the text⁸⁾. By re-using this Amorite mocking song directed against the Moabites, the Israelites by implication uttered a threat against Moab. Thus they urged the king of Moab to acquire the help of Balaam⁹⁾.

4. *Numb. 22-24.*

In addition to the historically descriptive parts in prose, these chapters contain four songs, viz. 23 : 7-10; 23 : 18-24; 24 : 3-9; 24 : 15-19, which are supplemented by the proverbs of 24 : 21-24. In this treatise an endeavour will be made to indicate only the historical context of the proceedings of Balaam and Balak and the relation of those proceedings to the

¹⁾ Gray according to Binns : Numbers, p. 146.

²⁾ Holzinger: Numeri, pp. 98-99.

³⁾ Edelkoort: Numeri, p. 169.

⁴⁾ Noordtzij: Numeri, p. 231.

⁵⁾ Baarslag: De Bijbelse Geschiedenis II, p. 7.

⁶⁾ cf. Weiser: Einl.², p. 28.

⁷⁾ cf. Bentzen: Intr. I, p. 127.

⁸⁾ Perhaps מְשִׁלִּים should not be regarded as the name of an unknown site, but as a verbal form cf. also Böhl: Kanaanäer und Hebräer, p. 60; Noth: ZAW 1940/1, pp. 167-169.

⁹⁾ cf. p. 120 below.

so-called songs of Balaam, especially the last song (24 : 15-19), for it is the only song which directly concerns the Moabites.

Scepticism has been aroused about the trustworthiness of the historical information of the descriptive parts in prose, because of the so-called fictitious elements interspersed in them ¹⁾, while the name Balak was only created afterwards, as can be seen from the fact that the area concerned now has the same name. The historical setting would therefore have been fabricated at a later date, e.g. that of Omri, with the object of trying to explain the origin of the songs ²⁾. Priority should, however, be given to the proper name Balak, for the name el-Belqa originated at a much later date than the Biblical text. Both Balaam and Balak were historical figures ³⁾.

As regards the origin and historical context of the so-called songs of Balaam, opinions differ. On account of the eschatological ideas inherent in the songs and their grammatical peculiarities, they are dated by von Gall ⁴⁾ in the post-exilic period. This conception elicited strong opposition and the antiquity of these songs is generally acknowledged ⁵⁾. The use of archaic forms like *שָׁרִי* and *עֲלִיָּן*, the nearly complete absence of the article, the use of *ן* to indicate the suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. sing., and the retention of ancient case-endings accentuate the antiquity of these songs ⁶⁾. They could have been written down during the 10th or 9th century. At

¹⁾ cf. Baentsch: Exodus, Leviticus und Numeri, p. 592.

²⁾ Mowinckel: ZAW 1930, pp. 238, 259.

³⁾ cf. also Albright: JBL 63, p. 232 and n. 142; Annual VI, p. 23.

⁴⁾ Von Gall: Zusammensetzung und Herkunft der Bileamperikope in Num. 22-24, p. 150; cf. Holzinger: Numeri, pp. 116-117, 119.

⁵⁾ Though the following authors differ substantially in their interpretation of the songs, all of them regard them as dating at least from before the Disruption of the Monarchy; cf. Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 257; Sellin: Einl.⁴, pp. 22-23; Theologie des A.T., p. 129; Heinisch: Numeri, p. 88; Edelkoort: Christusverwachting, p. 72; Numeri, pp. 19, 181-184; Noordtzijs: Numeri, p. 276; Rudolph: BZAW 68, p. 120 n. 5; Bentzen: Intr. I, p. 142; Pfeiffer: Intr. p. 278; Weiser: Einl.², p. 40; Albright: ARI, p. 209 n. 94.

⁶⁾ cf. Albright: JBL 63, pp. 207-233.

that stage they could have existed as an oral tradition for a considerable period. It is improbable that the present text contains the original words of Balaam, because the first nucleus of the songs, which is ascribed to him, was altered before it was written down. The present text might rather refer to another historical event. The original words of Balaam which predicted disaster for the Moabites would not have been recorded in the land of Moab, nor would the Moabites have made known the contents of Balaam's predictions to the Israelites, because Israel could have applied them as a weapon against the Moabites themselves. Rumours about the favourable words which Balaam uttered for Israel could have penetrated to Israel and this could have given rise to the creation of the so-called oracle of Balaam at a stage when it could have been successfully applied by Israel in their struggle against the Moabites. Consequently it is quite possible that these songs could have a relation to the war of liberation under the command of Ehud ¹⁾. Perhaps Numb. 24 : 15-19 may even be either the song which aroused the animosity against Moab after the oppression of 18 years or the song which celebrated the victory over Moab.

5 *Numb. 25 : 1-5.*

This is a narration referring to the period when Israel was still camping in Trans-Jordan. The communication which directly follows, viz, 25 : 6-18, is not a mere doublet of the pericope mentioned above ²⁾, but an independent account of a simultaneous event.

6. *Dt. 23 : 1-8.*

According to the regulations mentioned in this pericope, the מַמְזֵר, Ammonite and Moabite are excluded from the קהל יְהוָה. On account of the fact that David, a progeny of the Moabitess Ruth, was not excluded from the קהל יְהוָה, the

¹⁾ Judg. 3 : 12-30; cf. p. 130 below.

²⁾ cf. Aalders: Introduction to the Pentateuch, p. 53.

authenticity of these regulations is questioned. ¹⁾ They would have been promulgated in post-exilic times to sanction the steps which Ezra and Nehemiah took against the foreign wives. But Ezra summoned the people to separate from alien women in general and not only from the Ammonite and Moabite women, ²⁾ and though Nehemiah could have had these regulations in mind, the steps he took were not limited to Moabite and Ammonite women ³⁾.

On the contrary it was considered that the regulations only concerned children born of marriages between Ammonite or Moabite men and Israelite women ⁴⁾. But this interpretation contradicts the evidence from the Book of Nehemiah ⁵⁾, according to which Nehemiah summoned the people to separate from foreign wives. Therefore we must accept that David and his family, and probably also other people, were exempted from these regulations. Even the most apodictic regulations in the O.T. seem to have had their exceptions ⁶⁾.

R e m a r k.

The historical sequence of the six preceding sources is:

Numb. 21 : 10-15 : Numb. 33 : 44-45a : Dt. 2 : 8, 18, 24.

Numb. 21 : 21-31 : Dt. 2 : 26-33.

Numb. 21 : 16-18a : Dt. 2 : 34-3 : 4.

Numb. 21 : 32-35.

Numb. 22 : 2-24 : 25 (excluding the : Dt. 23 : 2-6.
poetical parts)

Numb. 21 : 18b-20 : Numb. 22 : 1 : Numb. 33 : 45b-49 :
Dt. 3 : 29.

Numb. 21 : 1-5 and 25 : 6-18, which must be linked with
Numb. 31 : 1 ff.

¹⁾ cf. Bertholet: Deuteronomium, p. 71.

²⁾ Ezra 10 : 2 ff.

³⁾ Neh. 13 : 23.

⁴⁾ Kritzingen: Qahal Jahwe, p. 87, assumes that these regulations do not stand in connection with the so-called "mixed" marriages.

⁵⁾ cf. Neh. 13 : 1-2.

⁶⁾ cf. Van Selms: HTS 9, 11, pp. 34-47.

Numb. 24 : 15-19 refers to the period of the Judges, cf. Judg. 3 : 12-30.

7. *Judg. 3 : 12-30.*

Though this narrative is introduced ¹⁾ and concluded ²⁾ by the usual deuteronomistic formula of the Book of Judges ³⁾, it is very old. No reasonable grounds exist to denounce its trustworthiness ⁴⁾. The murder of Eglon took place in the beginning of the period of the Judges ⁵⁾.

8. *Judg. 10 : 17-12 : 7.*

With reference to Judg. 11 : 12-28 it is surmized that Moab was involved in the event described in these chapters. According to Ewald ⁶⁾, Keil-Delitzsch ⁷⁾ and Goslinga ⁸⁾, the Moabites are only mentioned because Jephthah referred to them in order to indicate that Israel had seized the disputed area neither from the Ammonites nor from the Moabites. To Glueck ⁹⁾ and Baarslag ¹⁰⁾ the reference to the area of the Moabites is an indication that the Ammonites had incorporated the former Moabite territory. In contrast to this conception it may be adduced that in later years Moab played such a prominent role on its own accord, that it could not have been annexed by the Ammonites at this stage.

Because the Moabites are mentioned as an independent participator in the warfare against the Israelites, it is frequently assumed that we have to distinguish two different strata,

¹⁾ Judg. 3 : 12-15a.

²⁾ Judg. 3 : 28-30.

³⁾ cf. Moore: Judges, pp. 89-90; Goslinga: Richteren I, pp. 15-17; Bentzen: Intr. II, p. 87.

⁴⁾ Moore: Judges, p. 91; Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 27 n. 2.

⁵⁾ cf. I Sam. 12 : 9.

⁶⁾ Ewald: History II, pp. 392-394.

⁷⁾ Keil and Delitzsch: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, p. 380.

⁸⁾ Goslinga: Richteren I, p. 178.

⁹⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 246-249.

¹⁰⁾ Baarslag: De Bijbelse Geschiedenis II, p. 355.

each of which is based on an independent event ¹⁾. Noth ²⁾ even regards Judg. 11 : 12-28 as literally dependent on Numb. 21. But if we are concerned with two separate events here, it is improbable that the sources would have been blended. The composition of these chapters rather indicates that both Ammon and Moab took part in the war. We have to assume that we are here confronted with an Ammonite-Moabite coalition against those infiltrating Israelites who wanted to conquer the heritage promised them by Moses, ³⁾ but which they had not yet occupied ⁴⁾.

9. *Numb. 32 : 2-3, 33-38 and Josh. 13 : 15-28.*

The description of the different regions which the East-Jordan tribes occupied is essentially of topographical importance. Josh. 13 : 15-28 links up with the narration that this area was assigned by Moses to the tribes concerned (Josh. 13 : 8-10; cf. also Numb. 32), but we may assume that the detailed enumeration of the sites occupied by the different tribes originated in the period when the Israelites finally infiltrated into this area ⁵⁾. The situation described by Josh. 13 : 15-28 is older than that of Numb. 32 : 33-38, in which the tribe of Gad seems already to have moved to the south ⁶⁾.

10. *Ruth.*

Even if the recording of the events described in the Book of Ruth took place at a considerably late period ⁷⁾, the narra-

¹⁾ Budde: *Das Buch der Richter*, pp. 80-81; Cornill: *ZAW* 1917-18, p. 251; Moore: *Judges*, p. 283; Kittel: *G. lsr.* II, p. 41; Sellin: *Einl.*⁴, p. 66; Weiser: *Einl.*², p. 117; Albright: *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 220; Bentzen: *Intr.* II, p. 90.

²⁾ Noth: *ZAW* 1940/1, p. 165 n. 2.

³⁾ cf. Numb. 32.

⁴⁾ cf. Josh. 4 : 12.

⁵⁾ cf. Van Zyl: *HTS* 14, II en III, pp. 117-123.

⁶⁾ According to Josh. 13 Reuben occupied the sites Aroer and Dibon, but according to Numb. 32 these sites belong to Gad.

⁷⁾ A comprehensive discussion of this problem can be found in Smit: *Ruth, Ester, Klaagliederen*, pp. 7-9 and Goslinga: *Richteren-Ruth*, p. 117.

ion in its present form fits well "into the days when the Judges ruled" ¹⁾, which was not a mere period of animosity, but also a period of tranquillity and peace. Not only the marriage of the two sons of Elimelech with the Moabite daughters is related ²⁾, but also the important fact that the ancestor of David was born of the marriage of Boaz and Ruth, the Moabitess ³⁾. The relationship of David to the Moabites is further emphasized by the later addition of a more complete genealogical list at the end of the book ⁴⁾. This list is trustworthy ⁵⁾, because the genealogy of David would not have been carried back fictitiously to Ruth, the Moabitess ⁶⁾.

II. I and II Samuel.

Many events recorded in the Books of Samuel are described copiously, while other events, e.g. the wars of Saul and David against the Moabites, are only mentioned in summarized lists ⁷⁾. Nevertheless Ed. Meyer expressed himself as follows concerning the character of these books: "*Es ist etwas Erstaunliches, dass eine derartige Geschichtsliteratur damals in Israel möglich gewesen ist. Sie steht weit über allem, was wir sonst von altorientalischer Geschichtschreibung wissen*" ⁸⁾. In consideration of this general observation, the following pericopes are discussed in more detail:

A. I Sam. 14 : 47.

In the synoptic review regarding the dynasty of Saul, the author gives a summary of the enemies against whom Saul waged war ⁹⁾. This short list does not reveal the historical

¹⁾ Contra Haller: Die Fünf Megilloth, p. 5.

²⁾ Ruth 1 : 4.

³⁾ Ruth 4 : 17.

⁴⁾ Ruth 4 : 18-22; cf. I Chron. 2 : 10 ff. and Van Selms: I Kronieken, p. 86.

⁵⁾ Bentzen: Intr. II, pp. 185-186.

⁶⁾ cf. Dt. 23 : 3.

⁷⁾ cf. Keil and Delitzsch: Samuel, p. 4.

⁸⁾ According to Sellin: Einl.⁴, p. 76. Cf. also Gordon: Intr. to O.T. Times, pp. 153, 168-169.

⁹⁾ I Sam. 14 : 47-52; cf. Weiser: Einl.², p. 125.

sequence of his wars. The same scheme can be found in the summary of the nations against whom David fought. The cause and the course of the war against the Moabites are omitted. It is only stated that the Moabites were defeated by Saul.

B. I Sam. 22 : 3-4.

While he was pursued by Saul, David brought his parents in safe custody to the king of Moab, who treated him most cordially. Stade ¹⁾ alludes that David's parents were no longer alive at that period and therefore he repudiates the trustworthiness of this narrative. There is, however, no sufficient reason why David's parents should be regarded as having been dead ²⁾. David had to save them from the hatred of Saul, but as they were too old to wander with him, he brought them to the land of Moab, whence his great grandmother had come. And as the king of Moab himself was harassed by Saul, he was quite willing to assist one of the enemies of Saul, whom he believed to be an ally.

C. II Sam. 8 : 2, 11-12.

This brief account of a defeat which the Moabites suffered at the hands of David relates the punitive measures taken by David, as well as the tribute the Moabites had to pay. In the corresponding narration of I Chron. 18 : 2, 11 the punitive measures are omitted because the Chronicler no longer understood them ³⁾. It is most probable that Benaiah slew the two mighty men of Moab during this campaign ⁴⁾.

12. I and II Kings.

As in the Books of Samuel, some events are recorded only with summary brevity in the Books of Kings ⁵⁾. The

¹⁾ According to Kamphausen: ZAW 1886, p. 67 n.l.

²⁾ cf. also Nowack: Die Bücher Samuelis, p. 113; De Groot: I Samuel, p. 151.

³⁾ Contra Nowack: Die Bücher Samuelis, p. 181.

⁴⁾ II Sam 23 : 20; I Chron. 11 : 22; cf. Keil and Delitzsch: Samuel, p. 357.

⁵⁾ cf. Weiser: Einl.², p. 133.

information concerning the Moabites is generally brief and sometimes even concealed. In these circumstances conclusions must be drawn from the context ¹⁾).

A. I Ki. 11 : 1, 7.

Among the many foreign women loved by king Solomon, there was a Moabitess. Even if 11 : 1b is to be regarded a later insertion ²⁾, we may gather from 11 : 7 and 23 : 15 that Solomon permitted his Moabite wife to build a high place for Chemosh, the god of the Moabites.

B. II Ki. 3 : 4-27.

Moab's desertion of Israel, which is already announced in II Ki. 1 : 1 ³⁾, took a more serious turn during the reign of Jehoram, the son of Ahab. The detailed description of this event must be attributed to the fact that Elisha, the prophet, played a prominent role in it. The author or editor of this chapter could have derived his information from the presumptive history of the prophets and especially that which accumulated around the person of Elisha. According to Weiser ⁴⁾ we have both legend and history in this chapter, while Benzinger ⁵⁾ assumes that it is a mere fantastic narrative, having as its nucleus a miracle performed by a prophet. In spite of this, there is a concensus of opinion about the historicity of the campaign undertaken by Jehoram and his allies against the Moabites. This chapter not only presents political history but also religious-historical data ⁶⁾.

¹⁾ Šanda: Die Bücher der Könige I, pp. 399, 406, 410.

²⁾ cf. Benzinger: Die Bücher der Könige I, p. 77; Šanda: Die Bücher der Könige I, p. 301.

³⁾ The brief remarks in II Ki. 1 : 1 and 3 : 5 describe the same events as the inscription of Mesha⁴, which indicates that there is a certain onesidedness to be observed in the Biblical historical writings if we look at them from a Moabite point of view.

⁴⁾ Weiser: Einl.², p. 136.

⁵⁾ Benzinger: Die Bücher der Könige II, p. 132.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 201 below.

C. *II Ki. 10 : 32-33.*

This brief account relates that Hazael, king of Aram, seized from Jehu, king of Israel, the territory to the n. of the Arnon, which still belonged to Moab at the time of Jehoram. Although Stade ¹⁾ refutes the whole account and Šanda ²⁾ queries the fact that Hazael won the territory concerned from Jehu, this information is generally regarded as trustworthy.

D. *II Ki. 14 : 25.*

According to this brief summary of his acts, Jeroboam II expanded the Israelite territory to the e. of the Jordan. Because he did that which was evil in the eyes of the LORD ³⁾, the author only mentions that the LORD saved Israel by Jeroboam's hand ⁴⁾. One of the deeds by which he liberated Israel must have been the reconquering of the territory from Moab.

13. *II Chronicles 20.*

In the Books of Chronicles we often find accounts not mentioned in other Biblical sources. For several decades there was a tendency to reject all such extra information ⁵⁾, and though this is still sometimes noticeable, ⁶⁾ the situation has changed ⁷⁾. Kittel ⁸⁾ and Curtis ⁹⁾ assert that II Chron. 20 is a mere revision of II Ki. 3 : 4-27. But the historical situation in II Chron. 20 differs completely from that in II Ki. 3 ¹⁰⁾. Because all the acts of Jehoshaphat are not recorded in the Books of the Kings ¹¹⁾, this war against the coalition of the e. enemies

¹⁾ According to Benzinger: *Die Bücher der Könige II*, p. 155.

²⁾ Šanda: *Die Bücher der Könige II*, p. 155.

³⁾ II Ki. 14 : 24.

⁴⁾ II Ki. 14 : 27.

⁵⁾ cf. Van Selms: *I Kronieken*, pp. 22-23.

⁶⁾ E.g. Pfeiffer: *Intr.*, p. 806.

⁷⁾ Van Selms: *I Kronieken*, p. 23; Albright: *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, pp. 61-82.

⁸⁾ Kittel und Siegfried: *Kronik*, p. 140; but cf. Kittel: *G. Isr. II*, p. 263.

⁹⁾ Curtis and Madsen: *Chronicles*, p. 404.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Rudolph: *Chronikbücher*, p. 258.

¹¹⁾ I Ki. 22 : 46.

may be regarded as one of those deeds not mentioned in the Books of the Kings. This campaign by the Moabites and their allies against Jehoshaphat took place after the campaign described in II Ki. 3¹⁾. After Jehoram and his allies had retreated (II Ki. 3 : 27), the Moabites, probably in coalition with the Ammonites and other neighbouring tribes, marched against the Edomites and subjugated them (Amos 2 : 1-3). Then the Edomites were compelled to march with them against Judah at a time when Israel could not assist them, because they were entangled in a war against the Aramaeans²⁾.

14. Amos 2 : 1-3.

This prophecy was fulfilled by the campaign of Jeroboam II against the Moabites³⁾. It had been pronounced by Amos because Moab had burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime. This outrage could have been the result of the campaign by Israel, Judah and Edom against Moab⁴⁾ and at the same time was the prelude to the coalition against Judah⁵⁾.

15. Is. 15-16.

Procksch⁶⁾ once characterized these chapters as "*das Schmerzenskind der Exegese*". Though the present author does not agree in every detail with Gray⁷⁾ in his analysis of these chapters, he does concur in ascribing 15 : 1-9a and 16 : 6-11, which re-appears with many textual variations and much difference in respect of order in Jer. 48, to an independent source. This source was, however, no elegy on Moab⁸⁾,

¹⁾ Šanda: Die Bücher der Könige I, p. 503; Van Gelderen: Koningen II, p. 376; Noordtzijs: Kronieken II, p. 240; Van Selms: II Kronieken, p. 134.

²⁾ cf. II Ki. 6-7.

³⁾ II Ki. 14 : 25; Amos 6 : 14.

⁴⁾ II Ki. 3 : 4-27; cf. Keil: The Twelve Minor Prophets I, p. 250; Cooke: The Book of Amos, p. 16; Van Gelderen: Het Boek Amos, p. 26; Bentzen: OTS VIII, pp. 85-99.

⁵⁾ cf. II Chron. 20.

⁶⁾ Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 208.

⁷⁾ cf. Gray: Isaiah I, pp. 271-278.

⁸⁾ Contra Wade: Isaiah, p. 107; Gray: Isaiah I, p. 271; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 223.

for the typical אֵי is replaced by בִּי , and we can observe a certain triumphant note throughout the poem. Therefore it seems more probable that this older source was originally a mocking song, sung by the enemies of the Moabites. The signs of sympathy with the Moabites ¹⁾ are mere expressions of sarcasm. This is also indicated by the rhythm, which is not קָיָה ²⁾. The mocking song could have originated in Israel or Judah ³⁾, but the linguistic peculiarities, e.g. לִי for לִי , נָא for נָא , the use of ה to indicate the suffix of the 3rd. pers. masc. sing ⁴⁾, and the retention of waw compaginis ⁵⁾, denote a non-Hebrew origin ⁶⁾. These discrepancies may best be accounted for by accepting the idea that the mocking song originated among Bedouins, who had at some time or other invaded and partly conquered the land of Moab.

This mocking song, which originated in the pre-exilic period ⁷⁾, became familiar in the West-Jordan country, where it was used by a prophet from Judah ⁸⁾, when he pronounced an oracle against Moab. This prophet added to this song

¹⁾ According to Verhoef: Voorsegginge, p. 183, it is a vivid allegorical demonstration of the effects of the catastrophe on the inhabitants of the land of Moab.

²⁾ cf. Gray: Isaiah I, p. 271. Contra Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 208; Oesterley and Robinson: Intr., pp. 249-250. In some instances the rhythm corresponds with that of Judg. 5, which is partly a mocking song, cf. Judg. 5 : 15b-17, 28-30.

³⁾ cf. Wade: Isaiah, p. 107; Gray: Isaiah I, p. 276 and all the authors who assume that these chapters contain the prophecy of an ancient prophet (e.g. Hitzig, Ewald, Sellin) or of Isaiah (e.g. Delitzsch, Ridderbos, Verhoef, Aalders).

⁴⁾ cf. 15 : 3.

⁵⁾ cf. 15 : 2.

⁶⁾ Pfeiffer: Intr., pp. 444-445, assumes a Moabite author. Then the sympathy would be genuine, but what about the triumphant tone?

⁷⁾ I disagree with those authors (e.g. Duhm: Jesaja, p. 102; Gray: Isaiah I, p. 276; Bentzen: Intr., II, p. 107; Pfeiffer: Intr. p. 445), who date these chapters in post-exilic times, because the Kingdom of Moab had disintegrated already in that period. The letters from Kalhu may throw light on the raid to which the original mocking song refers, cf. pp. 36-37 below.

⁸⁾ Therefore Moab is invited to the Mount of Sion.

certain prophetic words ¹⁾. Because these prophetic additions (15 : 9b-16 : 5 and 16 : 12) were from Isaiah ²⁾, this נִשְׁמָה was incorporated in the collection of oracles against alien nations ³⁾. Isaiah wanted to stress the point that Judah should not rely on Moab for help against the Assyrians. Therefore he re-used this ancient mocking song, which indicated that the Moabites could not withstand the Bedouin tribes. And to this mocking song he added a prophecy. The objection raised by Procksch ⁴⁾ that Isaiah did not make use of "*Weissagungen*" by others, must be rejected ⁵⁾. According to the addition by Isaiah, the land of Moab would be overwhelmed at a later stage (15 : 9b, 16 : 2) and then the Moabites would have to come to Sion, where the LORD would shelter them as He had sheltered Judah in the past ⁶⁾. But they would have to be willing to come to Sion and ask for help (16 : 3-4a). At the same time Judah was encouraged to assist them ⁷⁾. If the Moabites would come to Sion and ask for help, it would mean that they would have to sacrifice their haughtiness, self-confidence and fortified cities. When Isaiah had mentioned this, he could continue the old mocking song ⁸⁾, for in the past it had been the selfrighteousness and pride of Moab which characterized

¹⁾ According to Verhoef: Voorsegginge, pp. 180-182, Is. 15 : 1-16 : 12 is prophecy; cf. also Delitzsch: Isaiah, p. 339; Ridderbos: Jesaja I, p. 101; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 215.

²⁾ Isaiah could have known this mocking song, for the raid referred to by the letters from Kalhu, must have taken place in the days of Isaiah, cf. n. 3 on p. 37 below.

³⁾ cf. Weiser: Einl.², p. 145. Originally the oracles against the alien nations formed a separate volume, cf. Ridderbos: Jesaja I, p. XVIII.

⁴⁾ Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 223; cf. also Aalders: Kanoniek, p. 212.

⁵⁾ cf. Is. 2 : 2-4 and Ridderbos: Jesaja I, p. 14.

⁶⁾ cf. Ridderbos: Jesaja I, pp. 106-107; Mulder: Apokalipse, p. 85. Contra Verhoef: Voorsegginge, pp. 182-183.

⁷⁾ Beek: Hrozný-Festschrift, pp. 36, 40. The catastrophe, described in Is. 15-16 and Is. 25 : 10-12, are the result of warfare and not of an earthquake. Is it sound exegesis to explain these chapters with the help of 24 : 18b-20 ?

⁸⁾ Originally 16 : 6 was part of the ancient mocking song (cf. Jer. 48 : 29), but was changed by Isaiah himself to 1st person to contrast the attitude of Moab and Sion.

its people and which was satirized in this ancient song (16 : 6-11). At the end Isaiah once again emphasized the futility of the Moabite cult (16 : 12).

The Moabites did not accept this invitation to Sion and their haughtiness even increased ¹⁾. Therefore the invitation was afterwards withdrawn by the addition of the epilogue (16 : 14), which announced the actual downfall of the Moabite Kingdom. We may assume that the words ~~וְנָפְלָה~~ and ~~וְנָפְלָה~~ indicate that there was a substantial lapse of time between the prophecy of Isaiah and the epilogue ²⁾. In this instance it is quite possible that the epilogue originated in the period when the people's attention was once again drawn to this prophecy of Isaiah on account of the fact that the ancient mocking song was re-used by the editor of Jer. 48. The allusion to the downfall of Moab within three years, as the years of a hireling, finds its fulfilment in the campaign of Nebuchadrezzar in 582 B.C. ³⁾. In this case the epilogue could have been added in 585 B.C., shortly after the Moabites had mocked the fugitives from Judah in 586 B.C., the year in which Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadrezzar.

16. Hosea 10 : 14.

In this text the devastation of Beth-Arbel by a certain Shalman is mentioned ⁴⁾. The name Shalman may be an abbreviation of Shalmaneser ⁵⁾, but it seems plausible to identify this Shalman with the Moabite king Shalamanu ⁶⁾, who was a contemporary of Hosea. The "*entsetzliche Grau-*

¹⁾ cf. Jer. 48 : 2, 28, 30; Hes. 25 : 8-11.

²⁾ Contra Procksch : Jesaja I, p. 223; cf. Ps. 93 : 2; Is. 45 : 21; 48 : 3-8.

³⁾ cf. Josephus: Ant. Jud. X, 9, 7.

⁴⁾ The textual alterations according to the text of the Lxx must be rejected, cf. Robinson und Horst: Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, p. 42; Marti: Das Dodekapropheten, p. 85.

⁵⁾ cf. Keil: The Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 135; Marti: Das Dodekapropheten, p. 85.

⁶⁾ Schrader: KAT, p. 441. In KAT², p. 152, this identification is rejected, however.

samkeiten"¹⁾ to which this text refers occurred during a Moabite raid on Beth-Arbel²⁾).

17. *Ze. 2 : 8-II.*

According to Marti³⁾ this pericope, which is an interpolation, refers to the period of the fall of Jerusalem, when Judah was scorned by the Moabites and the Ammonites. But there were numerous other occasions on which they had the opportunity to disdain the people of the LORD⁴⁾. The resemblance between *Ze. 2 : 8* and *Is. 16 : 6* also indicates that this incident took place long before the fall of Jerusalem. In consideration of the fact that Zephaniah did pronounce oracles against other nations, we may assume that those two nations, who had frequently shown themselves hostile towards Israel and Judah, would not have been excluded⁵⁾.

18. *Jer. 48 : 1-47.*

Like *Is. 15-16*, this chapter contains both historical and topographical information, even if the locality of a number of the sites mentioned can no longer be determined. According to Volz⁶⁾, who denies the authorship of Jeremiah, the prophecies concerning the alien nations⁷⁾ originally formed a separate volume, with *Jer. 25 : 15-38* as its introduction⁸⁾. However, when Jeremiah was called as prophet, the LORD set him over

¹⁾ Robinson und Horst: *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, p. 43.

²⁾ cf. *II Ki. 13 : 20*, where a similar raid is mentioned.

³⁾ Marti: *Das Dodekapropheten*, p. 369; cf. also Nowack: *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 312; Smith: *Micah, Zephaniah and Nahum*, p. 225; Rost: *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, p. 191.

⁴⁾ cf. *Judg. 3 : 12-30*; *II : 4-36*; *12 : 1-3*; *I Sam. 11*; *14 : 47*; *II Sam. 8 : 1, 2, 12*; *II Ki. 3 : 1 ff.*; *13 : 20*; *24 : 2*; *II Chron. 20 : 1 ff.*; *26 : 8*; *27 : 5*.

⁵⁾ cf. Keil: *The Twelve Minor Prophets II*, pp. 142-143; Ridderbos: *De kleine Propheten II*, p. 192; Edelkoort: *Nahum, Habbakuk, Zephaniah*, p. 84; Sellin: *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch II*, p. 431.

⁶⁾ Volz: *Der Prophet Jeremia*, pp. 378-381; cf. Schwally: *ZAW 1888*, pp. 177-217; Pfeiffer: *Intr.*, p. 506; Bentzen: *Intr. II*, p. 117.

⁷⁾ *Jer. 46-51*.

⁸⁾ cf. also Aalders: *Jeremia II*, pp. 14-17.

the nations and the kingdoms¹⁾, and he caused Moab to drink the wine cup of fury²⁾. The original oracle against the Moabites would presumably have consisted of those parts which are not an elaboration of the ancient mocking song. It may be assumed that this oracle at least consisted of Jer. 48 : 1-13³⁾. The text of Jer. 48 : 1-47 now extant, is the result of an editorial process, either by Jeremiah himself⁴⁾ or somebody else⁵⁾. The date of this cannot be exactly determined, but we may assume a date shortly after the downfall of Jerusalem, when the Moabites scorned the fugitives from Judah⁶⁾.

19. *Hes. 28 : 8-11.*

Because the Moabites mocked and scorned the fugitives from Judah, this oracle of doom is directed against them by the prophet Hezekiel⁷⁾. The invasion of their country, to which this oracle refers, was either fulfilled by the conquering of the land of Moab by Nebuchadrezzar or by the appearance of the Nabataeans, to which Is. 11 : 14 refers.

20. *Is. 25 : 10b-12.*

The doom of Moab is announced much more severely in this pericope, than in the epilogue of Is. 15-16 or in Jer. 48. Neither the historical context nor the date of origin of this oracle can be determined exactly. It concerns the expression of an apathy towards, an animosity against, and an abhorrence of Moab. The feeling of disdain and contempt for the Moabites took a stronger hold on the author of this so-called apocalypse than on the editor of Is. 15-16, who added the

¹⁾ Jer. 1 : 10.

²⁾ Jer. 25 : 15; cf. Rudolph: *Jeremia*, pp. 139-141.

³⁾ cf. Bardtke: *ZAW* 1936, pp. 240-242.

⁴⁾ cf. Aalders: *Jeremia II*, pp. 224-225.

⁵⁾ cf. Giesebrecht: *Jeremia* p. 332; Sellin: *Einl.*⁴, p. 98; Rudolph: *Jeremia*, p. 239; Vriezen: *Oud-Israelitische Geschriften*, p. 173; Weiser: *Einl.*², p. 163.

⁶⁾ cf. pp. 156-157 below.

⁷⁾ cf. Bertholet: *Hezekiel*, p. 90.

epilogue to it. The gap between this pericope and Is. 15-16 becomes even greater if the apathy is compared with the sympathetic invitation in 16 : 3. Against the background of the blessings promised to Moab in Is. 15-16 ¹⁾, the satisfaction which the author derives from the idea that Moab will be annihilated completely, is strongly delineated. Therefore Is. 15-16 cannot have any connection with Is. 25 : 10b-12 (Is. 24-27) ²⁾.

This pericope forms part of the so-called apocalypse of Isaiah, viz. Is. 24-27. For our purpose the most important question is whether Is. 25 : 10b-12, as an integral part of the apocalypse ³⁾, should be the key to its interpretation ⁴⁾ or whether it is but a mere fragmentary element ⁵⁾ - a citation used to illustrate the main idea of the apocalypse.

Taken as a whole, the apocalypse bears a double character. Certain parts, e.g. 24 : 1-6, 24 : 13-23, 25 : 6-10a, 27 : 1, 27 : 7-13, are prophetic, as is apparent from their contents and the imperfect tense of the verbal forms. These parts deal with eschatological events, are universal and describe the difference between the destiny of Sion, the city of the LORD, and that of the hostile city. A number of older songs ⁶⁾ are interspersed with the sole object of illustrating the eschatological unknown with the historical common knowledge. As a rule these songs were nationally bound ⁷⁾. In order to retain the continuous idea, the author of the apocalypse sometimes had to revise them, and therefore their historical context, though originally known, can no longer be fixed.

¹⁾ cf. p. 22 above.

²⁾ Contra Eissfeldt: Einl., pp. 367-368; Beek: Hrozny-Festschrift, pp. 36-40; Theologia VI, pp. 11-17.

³⁾ cf. Delitzsch: Isaiah, p. 441; Ridderbos: Jesaja II, p. 159.

⁴⁾ e.g. Smend: ZAW 1884, pp. 161-224; Eissfeldt: Einl., pp. 367-368; Beek: Hrozny-Festschrift, p. 35; Theologia IV, p. 14; Mulder: Apokalipse, pp. 34-35, 80-81.

⁵⁾ cf. Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 321; Gray: Isaiah I, pp. 402, 431.

⁶⁾ Generally the songs are regarded the younger part, but the chronology should rather be reversed, cf. Eissfeldt: Einl., p. 367.

⁷⁾ In these songs the word ארץ denotes Palestine, while in the other parts it has the meaning "earth".

Is. 25 : 10b-12 is presumably such an illustrating song. Is. 25 : 10a is part of the preceding pericope (25 : 6-10a). This verse warrants the eschatological meal which is announced in 25 : 6¹⁾ and to which all nations are invited. Thereupon the author wanted to illustrate that some people will be excluded from the meal, which Jahweh, the only King (24 : 23), will prepare on Sion. Having a sound knowledge of the Scriptures, the author of the apocalypse knew quite well that the Moabites were prohibited from entering the *קֹהֶל יְהוָה* ²⁾. Therefore he cited this song, which describes the downfall of the Moabites, to indicate that some people will be exterminated before the eschatological festivity on Sion and that they will therefore be excluded from it. The extant text of Is. 25 : 10b-12 reflects to a certain extent the style of the author of the apocalypse, e.g. in the verbosity and assonance³⁾. It even has a prophetic and an eschatological character. But while the imperfect is used in 25 : 11, the perfect is applied in 25 : 12. The present verbal form in 25 : 10b could originally have been a perfect. The isolated song was thus partly elaborated, and to join it to the preceding verses, the waw consecutive was used. Thus the verbal form became imperfect in meaning in its new context. In order to effect agreement with this consecutive verbal form, the imperfect was used in 25 : 11, while the original perfect forms were retained in 25 : 12. The text could be translated:

10b. And Moab shall be trodden down in his place⁴⁾ even as straw is trodden down in⁵⁾ a dunghill

¹⁾ Because the hand of the LORD shall rest on *this mountain* (25 : 10a), He shall prepare a feast on *this mountain* (25 : 6).

²⁾ cf. Dt. 23 : 3. In the O.T. there is only one promise of salvation for Moab, Is. 16 : 5, but this is cancelled by Is. 16 : 14.

³⁾ cf. the resemblance with Is. 26 : 5. These verses were elaborated as can be seen from the fact that Moab is addressed in the 3rd person, while the original 2nd person is retained in v. 12.

⁴⁾ cf. Is. 46 : 7; I Sam. 14 : 9; II Sam. 2 : 23 and Gray: Isaiah I, p. 433.

⁵⁾ Read *בָּ* instead of *בְּ*. The *ב* was added as mater lectionis after *מ* was copied erroneously through dittography.

11. And he ¹⁾ shall spread forth his hands in the midst of it as a swimmer spreads (them) forth to swim

And he shall humiliate his pride together with the abundance of his strength ²⁾

12. And the fortification of your towering wall he laid low, brought down, caused to reach the ground, even the dust.

The date and historical context of the original song, which could have been an Israelite song of victory over the Moabites, can no longer be determined. At any rate, it assumed a more expansive meaning in its new environment ³⁾, but simultaneously it became less clear. It was separated from its original context to enter the realms of the undeterminable eschatology. Still, it seems improbable that Moab had already become the personification of the enemies of Judah. This eventually happened during the time of Sirach ⁴⁾. In Is. 25 : 10b-12 Moab is merely an example and no image or type ⁵⁾. The Moabite fortress is not identical with the hostile city described in the apocalypse. This hostile city can be identified with any of the numerous cities which were hostile towards Sion ⁶⁾. The fortification of Moab is but one example. As an expression of the feeling of animosity and hatred which Israel and Judah cherished against the Moabites, this pericope is more closely related to Jer. 48 than to Is. 15-16 ⁷⁾. Like Is. 11 : 14 it mentions Moab as one of the nations which will be exterminated in or before the Messianic era, and at the same time it describes the aversion for the Moabites more fervently than

¹⁾ The subject is Moab, which tries to save itself, contra Mulder: Apokalipse, pp. 34-35.

²⁾ We have to vocalize אַרְבּוֹת instead of the inexplicable אָרְבוֹת. The noun אַרְבּוֹת is formed from a root רַבַּב with the help of aleph-prostheticum. The word אַרְבּוֹת can mean "strength", cf. Dt. 32 : 36; Josh. 8 : 20; II Sam. 8 : 3; Prov. 3 : 27.

³⁾ cf. Beek: Theologia VI, pp. 3, 10.

⁴⁾ cf. pp. 41-42 below.

⁵⁾ Delitzsch: Isaiah I, p. 441; Ridderbos: Jesaja I, p. 159; cf. Gray: Isaiah I, p. 404.

⁶⁾ Mulder: Apokalipse, pp. 79-80.

⁷⁾ cf. Mulder: Apokalipse, pp. 85-86.

does any of the other oracles of doom against Moab. Therefore it is possible that its present context originated in a period when the hatred for Moab reached its zenith. This happened when Jerusalem was besieged by Nebuchadrezzar twice within 11 years, whereas the land of Moab was not entered by the enemy. A date much later than this period seems improbable, because the Moabite nation did not exist after 582 B.C. ¹⁾.

21. *Post-exilic Accounts.*

In the post-exilic period we find a few references to Moabite individuals. In Ezra 9 : 1 they are mentioned for the first time in a hundred years after the oracle of Hezekiel ²⁾. Even in the days of Nehemiah there were Moabites among the Israelites ³⁾. This is the last occasion on which Moabite individuals as descendants of the nation Moab are mentioned in the O.T. All later references to Moabites, either as a nation or as individuals, should be regarded as archaisms, by which the successors of the Moabites are meant ⁴⁾.

B. THE MOABITE SOURCES.

We have gained possession of pure Moabite sources through archaeology ⁵⁾. The surface-survey carried out by Glueck has helped to reconstruct the picture of the land of Moab to a certain extent ⁶⁾. On a smaller scale several others have also carried out investigations in the land of Moab ⁷⁾. The most important excavations in the land of Moab were undertaken by "The Palestine Exploration Fund" and "The British School

¹⁾ This is the major objection against the date proposed by Mulder: *Apokalipse*, p. 93. But cf. Rowley: *Bi. Or.* XI, p. 213. If this date be correct, we must assume that Moab was mentioned as image of the enemies of the LORD.

²⁾ cf. Van Selms: *Esra en Nehemia*, p. 20.

³⁾ Neh. 13 : 1; cf. Rudolph: *Esra und Nehemia*, p. 20.

⁴⁾ cf. Dan. 11 : 41; Charles: *Daniel*, p. 320; Aalders: *Daniel*, p. 262.

⁵⁾ cf. Clark: *Basor* 122, pp. 7-9.

⁶⁾ For a valuation of his work, cf. Albright: *The O.T. and Modern Study*, edited by Rowley, p. 4.

⁷⁾ E.g. Musil, De Vaux, Albright.

of Archaeology in Jerusalem" at Kh. Bālū'ah ¹⁾, "The American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem" at Dhībān ²⁾ and the Franciscans at Kh. el-Mekhayyet ³⁾. In spite of the efforts following the discovery of the stele of king Mesha^c, no substantial written sources of Moabite origin have been found.

1. The Stele of King Mesha^c.

This distinguished document was discovered by the missionary Klein at Dhībān in 1868. From the moment he first saw it, he seems to have been interested in this well-preserved stele. In the meantime Clairmont-Ganneau also learned of this stone and gave attention to it. This interest by the Europeans aroused the suspicion of the Arabs, who thought that there might have been some unknown treasure inside it, and for that reason it was broken to pieces by them. Ganneau succeeded in collecting the majority of the fragments, and with the help of a squeeze taken of the stone, when it was still intact, he could piece them together and restore the text. Some parts of the text seem, however, to be lost for ever. Initially the authenticity of this inscription was strongly doubted, but at present it is generally assumed to be a first-class historical document ⁴⁾. For the study of Moabite history and the Moabite language this only source in the Moabite tongue is particularly valuable. This is a solitary, but distinctive, example of how Biblical information may be supplemented by other sources. The date of the inscription is about the middle of the ninth century B.C..

¹⁾ Crowfoot: PEFQ 1934, pp. 76-84.

²⁾ Winnet: Basor 125, pp. 7-20; Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 6-26.

³⁾ Saller and Bagatti: The Town of Nebo (Khirbet el-Mekhayyet) with a brief survey of other ancient Christian Monuments in Transjordan.

⁴⁾ cf. Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 206; Albright: JQR XXV, pp. 247-250. For the so-called "false Moabitica", cf. Clermont-Ganneau: Les Fraudes archéologiques en Palestine, Paris, 1885.

2. *Fragmentary Inscription from Dhibān.*

On the n.e. portion of the tell, Palmer found a small inscribed piece of basalt, which seems to be part of an originally much larger inscription stele ¹⁾. At first sight it was thought that it might have been one of the smaller fragments of the Mesha' Stele which are still lost, but an accurate investigation has brought to light that it must be assigned to the first part of the ninth century B.C. ²⁾. Although only one of the six letters of this small fragment is intact, the words אֱשָׁח ³⁾ and בַּת כֶּמֶשׁ are conjectured from it. It seems as though the original inscription, of which this is but a mere morsel, described the building activities of some king or other. On account of its fragmentary character, this inscription does not inform us about any specific occurrence in the history of the Moabites. It does reveal, however, that the inscription of Mesha' was no exceptional phenomenon in those days. A more intensive exploration of sites on which the Moabites were settled could easily supply more such finds, in spite of the fact that to the present the crop has been rather poor.

3. *Moabite Seals.*

In the Bulletin of the Jewish Exploration Society, vol. XII, 1945-1946, Reifenberg published the photos of two Moabite seals. Both seals are regarded by Albright as forged ⁴⁾, but Reifenberg is still of the opinion that they are authentic ⁵⁾. It is indisputable that seals were used in Moab as elsewhere, but whether these examples from the private collection of Reifenberg are genuine remains to be seen. For that reason they are not considered in this treatise.

4. *The Bālū'ah Stele.*

The first photo of this stele was published by Horsfeld and Vincent in R.B. vol. 41, plates XI and XII. The shape of

¹⁾ cf. Murphy: Basor 125, pp. 20-23.

²⁾ Murphy: Basor 125, p. 23; Albright: Basor 125 p. 23 n. 12.

³⁾ cf. M.I. 9.

⁴⁾ Albright: Basor 105, p. 14; cf. Thomsen: Bi. Or. VIII, p. 150.

⁵⁾ Reifenberg: Ancient Hebrew Seals, p. 40, nu. 28 and p. 55.

this stele resembles that of the stele of Narâm-Sin, king of Accad¹⁾. On the upper part there is a badly weathered inscription consisting of four lines. Every endeavour to decipher it has failed till now. Just below the inscription three figures are depicted in relief. Because of the so-called archaic shape of the stele and the weathered state of the inscription, Albright ascribes the inscription to the Early Bronze Age. In the 12th (or possibly the 11th) century B.C. the stele was reused when the relief was carved on the lower and larger part of it²⁾. But the resemblance to the stele of Narâm-Sin is only casual. The sculptor of the Bālû'ah stele retained the natural shape of the stone which he used, while the shape of the stele of Narâm-Sin was dressed on purpose to resemble a mountain on which the god could descend to present the royal insignia to the king. According to Horsfeld and Vincent the relief on the lower part of the stele originated in the period between Thotmes III and Merneptah³⁾. Drioton⁴⁾ also investigated the head-dress⁵⁾ and clothing of the figures on the relief. On account of their specific Egyptian features, he ascribes the relief to the beginning of the 12th century B.C. Since the script of the inscription corresponds with the Linear B Script⁶⁾, Alt⁷⁾ decided that the stele with the inscription had been set up by the Emites, who migrated from w. Palestine. Not long after the erection of the stele, the Emites were conquered by those tribes, who afterwards were united as part of the Moabite nation. The act by which the government of Bālû'ah was handed over to the conquerors was portrayed

¹⁾ cf. Meissner: BuA I, Abb. 55; Schmökel: Grote Culturen der Oudheid (translated by Böhl), afb. 68.

²⁾ Albright: AP, pp. 79, 186-187.

³⁾ Horsfeld et Vincent: R.B. 41, pp. 417-444.

⁴⁾ Drioton: R.B. 42, pp. 353-365.

⁵⁾ Barnett: A.D.A.J. I, p. 34, drew attention to the resemblance between the headdress of the "goddess" on the Bālû'ah stele and that of one of the sculptures described by him (cf. also plate X). The resemblance is rather due to Egyptian influence on the sculptures and not to their supposed Moabite origin.

⁶⁾ cf. Gaster: PEFQ 1937, p. 50; Chadwick: JHS 73, 1953, pp. 84-103.

⁷⁾ Alt: PJB 36, pp. 40-41.

in relief on the stele, which was re-used at that time¹⁾. Crowfoot²⁾ carried out some excavations at Bālû'ah, but no further information as regards this stele could be obtained.

5. *Unwritten Documents from Moab.*

A. Figurines of a fertility goddess.

At Kh. 'Ayûn Mûsa³⁾ a figurine of a fertility goddess, holding a sacred object in front of her chest, was found by Mr. Head⁴⁾. Only the head and the upper part of the body are intact. A figurine that is about identical to this one was found near Kerak⁵⁾, and it seems to be clutching some ovoid-shaped sacred object to the left breast. The heads of these figurines correspond to the two heads of other figurines, found respectively at Kh. el-Medeiyineh on the W. eth-Themed and Bālû'ah⁶⁾. All these figurines are assigned to the Iron Age and they have much in common as far as "the large ears, the bulging eyes over which are long, semicircular, prominent eyebrows, the distended cheeks, narrow slit of a mouth, long lock of hair and pointed chin"⁷⁾ are concerned. All these figurines are characterized as feminine⁸⁾, and they seem to represent a goddess, clutching a symbol of fertility to the chest⁹⁾. This goddess, whose cult most probably spread over a considerable part of the country, may perhaps be described

¹⁾ Alt: PJB 36, p. 43.

²⁾ Crowfoot: PEFQ 1934, pp. 76-84.

³⁾ Formerly known as el-Meshhed, cf. p. 90 n. 5 below.

⁴⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 27 and p. 26 fig. 8; OSJ, p. 153.

⁵⁾ cf. Harding: PEFQ 1937, p. 255 and plate X fig. 8; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 35 and p. 34 fig. 18a.

⁶⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 24 and p. 25 fig. 7a and b; XVIII-XIX, p. 35; OSJ, p. 153 and fig. 84.

⁷⁾ Glueck: OSJ, p. 153.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 35; OSJ, p. 153; but cf. Annual XIV, pp. 24-27.

⁹⁾ The features of these figurines resemble those of other figurines of the same kind, found elsewhere in Palestine; cf. Bliss: PEFQ 1899, pp. 128-129 and the figures on the opposite pages (especially the one in the middle, opposite p. 128); Harding PEFQ 1937, pp. 253-255 and plates IX and X; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, fig. 18b, 19, 20; OSJ, fig. 82, 83.

as the Moabite equivalent of the well-known Canaanite mother-goddess Asherah¹⁾.

B. Male figurines.

At the above mentioned Kh. el-Medeyineh the head of a figurine, which is also assigned to the Early Iron Age, was found²⁾. It has the features of a male, and according to Glueck it represents a Semitic king or deity. Barnett compared two sculptures from Ammān with this figurine³⁾, but it is more likely that these sculptures represent an Ammonite king⁴⁾.

C. Animal figurines.

Two pottery figurines, discovered at Kh. el-Medeyineh, seem to represent an equestrian, or perhaps a god, on horse-back⁵⁾. On the same dump-heap a figurine of a bull's head was found. Round the horns, which are broken off, the traces of a rope can still be observed⁶⁾. At Saliyeh, a figurine of a ram's head was found⁷⁾. Glueck⁸⁾ also discovered the pottery fragments of some more animal figurines and suggests that they could have been used as pedestals for the images of gods and goddesses. It is more possible, however, that all these figurines are depictions of sacrificial animals.

D. Pottery.

To a certain extent the pottery found in the land of Moab resembles that of w. Palestine. At Kerak, Albright found a type of pottery with a specific character, which he designated as Moabite pottery⁹⁾. Subsequently Glueck discovered the

¹⁾ M.I. 17.

²⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 22 and p. 23 fig. 5a and b; OSJ, pp. 153, 155 and fig. 86.

³⁾ Barnett: A.D.A.J. I, p. 36 and plates XI and XII.

⁴⁾ Barnett: A. D. A. J. I, p. 34.

⁵⁾ Glueck: XIV, p. 27 and p. 26 fig. 9a and b; OSJ, p. 155 and p. 156 fig. 87 and p. 157 fig. 88.

⁶⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 27 and p. 29, fig. 13b; OSJ, p. 153 and p. 155 fig. 85b.

⁷⁾ Glueck: OSJ, p. 153 and p. 155 fig. 85a.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 27.

⁹⁾ Albright: Basor 14, pp. 10-11.

same type of pottery at numerous sites throughout the land of Moab¹⁾. The pottery from the Iron Age, found in Moab, dates from the beginning of Iron Age I (1200 B.C.) to the end of Iron Age II (the first quarter of the 6th century B.C.). From this phenomenon we may gather that the settled civilization did not start long before 1200 B.C. and that it ended during the first quarter of the 6th century B.C. The archaeological evidence, concerning the extermination of the settled Kingdom of the Moabites, substantiates the remark by Josephus that the Moabites were overwhelmed by Nebuchadrezzar in 582 B.C.²⁾.

When pottery from this period is found at a site, we may be sure that it was occupied by the Moabites or their contemporaries. Thus we can obtain an idea of the sites occupied by the Moabites. Before this pottery from ancient times, which has the value of an almanac, was discovered, the Biblical sites were identified mainly by virtue of their resemblance to the recent names³⁾. Now we may subject these conclusions to the test of the pottery. If no pottery from the specific period can be found at the site, the identification may be wrong⁴⁾. Frequently the correct site is then found in the immediate vicinity. This is not the only service rendered by the pottery. It also reveals the external influences which affected the people of the land. These influences can be traced either from the pottery made elsewhere and brought to the land by merchants, or from pottery made in the homeland under foreign influence. Moreover, the pottery indicates to what extent the people were in a position to put their own stamp on it.

The Moabite pottery bears witness of a highly developed civilization, which had skilled artisans⁵⁾, whose products were

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, XV, XVIII-XIX, XXV-XXVIII, *passim*.

²⁾ cf. pp. 157-158 below.

³⁾ cf. p. 43 n. 1 below.

⁴⁾ On account of an intensive occupation in later times all remains could have been exterminated and therefore we must take all evidence into consideration.

⁵⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 14.

not inferior to those of their colleagues from elsewhere ¹⁾. This is not only evident from the workmanship and burnishing, but also from the decoration ²⁾.

C. CUNEIFORM TEXTS.

During their expeditions to the land of "*Amurru*" some of the Assyrian kings came into contact with the Moabites. These encounters are mentioned in the Assyrian royal inscriptions, which therefore can be regarded as an invaluable complement to our sources concerning the Moabites. We have, in comparison with the numerous references to the Moabites in the O.T., only a few lines in the Assyrian inscriptions, but they supply more names of Moabite kings than the whole of the O.T. does. Furthermore, during the period to which these cuneiform texts refer, O.T. references are not numerous. The following inscriptions and texts are of direct importance, though it must be borne in mind that some of the other inscriptions are as valuable as these, for they describe the background against which these events should be considered.

1. The Nimrud tablet of Tiglath Pileser III, Rev. 7-13 ³⁾.

2. Letters from Kalhu.

During the excavations at Nimrūd (Kalhu) by prof. Mallowan and others, a group of letters concerning Syria and Palestine were found. In one of these letters ⁴⁾ Qurdi-Aššur ⁵⁾, probably a high Assyrian official in the land of Amurru, wrote to the Assyrian king about Ezazu, a messenger of Aya-nūri ⁶⁾, who

¹⁾ Contra Crowfoot: PEFQ 1934, p. 79.

²⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 14-22 and plate 20 : 22-24; XVIII-XIX, pp. 251-267 and plate 60 : 3; OSJ, pp. 143, 145-147; Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 23-25.

³⁾ cf. K.B. II, pp. 8-25; Luckenbill: ARAB I, pp. 282-289.

⁴⁾ cf. Saggs: Iraq XVII, pp. 131-133 and plate XXXII; Albright: Basor 140, p. 34; Donner: MIO V, pp. 156-159. For problems concerning this type of letter, cf. Böhl: Het Tijdschrift der Sargoniden volgens Brieven uit het koninklijk Archief te Nineve, p. 3.

⁵⁾ He also figures in two letters about affairs of Tyre and Sidon, cf. Saggs: Iraq XVII, pp. 127 ff., 130 ff. .

⁶⁾ Aya-nūri could have been an Assyrian vassal. In line 5 we have to read *kur.da.ab.i.la.a.a.* which can scarcely be a distortion of an

carried a sealed document (*kaniku*) to the palace. He sent one of his own messengers to escort Ezazu to the Assyrian capital. Fortunately Qurdi-Aššur knew the contents of the *kaniku*, or else we would still have been ignorant ¹⁾ of the fact that the Gidirāya had entered the land of Moab to slaughter the people of at least one Moabite city ²⁾. The letter was written during the last third of the eighth century B.C. ³⁾. Presumably the Gidirāya was a Bedouin tribe, who forced its way into the land of Moab from the east ⁴⁾. Was the Bedouin mocking song, re-used by Isaiah a few years later, and still much later also by the editor of Jer. 48 ⁵⁾, composed during this raid?

In a second letter, which is somewhat fragmentary and obscure ⁶⁾, it is related that the LU.MAH. ^{MES} ⁷⁾ of a few Kingdoms, e.g. Mušur, Gazah, Judah, Moab, and Ammon, are

original *hur.da.ab.an.a.a.* (contra Saggs: Iraq XVII, p. 132; Donner: MIO V, p. 171). We have to read *māt Dābilāya* or *māt Ṭābilāya*. Perhaps we must prefer the reading Ṭābilāya, even though we do not identify this name with the Biblical טַבְיָאֵל (contra Albright: Basor 140, pp. 34-35; Vogt: Biblica 37, p. 264). Should Ṭābilāya perhaps be identified with the טַבְיָאֵל (Tu-by in Egyptian, cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 350). Geographically this identification would fit in well.

¹⁾ The *kaniku* has not been found yet. If Aya-nūri was an official or king of an Aramaean state, we may assume that he wrote in alphabet script on papyrus, parchment, or even a wax-tablet, cf. Böhl: Het Tijdvak der Sargonieden, p. 4. Because Ezazu, the messenger of Aya-nūri, was no Assyrian and he carried a document written in a non-Assyrian script and language, Qurdi-Aššur, the Assyrian official, sent his own messenger with a covering note in Assyrian to assure that Ezazu would safely reach the Assyrian palace.

²⁾ Perhaps *uru* in line 10 is no determinative but part of the text, cf. Albright: Basor 140, p. 34.

³⁾ Not before the fall of Damascus in 732 B.C. or after the transfer of the Assyrian capital from Kalḫu to Dūr-Šarrukēn in the early years of the reign of Sargon, cf. Saggs: Iraq XVII, pp. 126, 144 ff; Albright: Basor 140, p. 34; Vogt: Biblica 37, p. 264; Donner: MIO V, p. 156.

⁴⁾ cf. the copious discussion by Donner: MIO V, pp. 173-178.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 20-23 and 24-25 above.

⁶⁾ cf. Saggs: Iraq XVII, pp. 134 ff. and plate XXXIII; Donner: MIO V, p. 160.

⁷⁾ cf. Donner: MIO V, p. 179.

on their way to Kalḫu with a gift or tribute (?), which consisted of horses ¹⁾. This letter dates from the same period as the previous one.

3. The Prism A of Sargon II ²⁾.

4. The Taylor Prism of Sennacherib ³⁾, which is identical to the "Oriental Institute Prism" ⁴⁾.

5. The Prism B of Esarhaddon ⁵⁾.

6. Cylinder C of Assurbânipal ⁶⁾, col. I, 23-50, which is to be considered as an amplification of his Rassam Cylinder ⁷⁾, col. II, 68-71. His cylinder B ⁸⁾ describes the same events.

7. K. 1295. ⁹⁾

This fragmentary tablet presumably describes a tribute paid to an Assyrian king. Waterman ascribes it to any period in the time from Sargon II to Esarhaddon ¹⁰⁾, but the reign of Assurbânipal may also be considered.

8. In C.T. 24, 36, 52-66, Nergal is mentioned together with a group of gods. One of these gods bears the name *kammuš* ¹¹⁾, which must be identified with the Moabite god כמוש. Though this list in its final form is merely the result of speculation, we may assume that the character and cult of *kammuš* agreed to some extent with those of the gods with whom he was grouped, for the priests or scribes who composed this important series of explanatory lists tried to group together those

¹⁾ cf. also Weidner: AFO XIV, pp. 40-46; Albright: Basor 141, pp. 23-25; Donner: MIO V, pp. 178-184.

²⁾ Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 104-106.

³⁾ cf. K.B. II, pp. 80-113.

⁴⁾ cf. Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 115-128.

⁵⁾ cf. K.B. II, pp. 140-151; Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 265-267.

⁶⁾ cf. K.B. II, pp. 238-241; VAB VII, II, pp. 138-153; Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 340-344.

⁷⁾ cf. K.B. II, pp. 152-237; VAB VII, II, pp. 2-91; Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 291-323.

⁸⁾ cf. VAB VII, II, pp. 92-137; Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 323-340.

⁹⁾ cf. Waterman: Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire I, pp. 440-441; Oppenheim: ANET, p. 301.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Waterman: Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire III, p. 208.

¹¹⁾ cf. also Deimel: Pantheon Babylonicum, p. 153.

gods whose character or cult had something in common ¹⁾.

9. On a business document from the 6th year of Cambyses a certain *kamušū-šar-ušur* is mentioned ²⁾. The bearer of this name need not be of Moabite descent, since the name *kammuš* was known in Babylon.

D. EGYPTIAN SOURCES.

To look for references to Moab in Egyptian literature is almost fruitless. With one possible exception, there is absolute silence in the Egyptian sources as far as Moab is concerned. One must bear in mind, however, that there was no sedentary occupation of Moab during the ages when the Egyptian expansion of power reached its zenith in Palestine. And when the agricultural civilization with its permanent settlements was established in the land of Moab, there was no display of power by Egypt in Palestine.

1. *Copies a and b of the List of Thotmes III in the Temple of Amon at Karnak* ³⁾.

This list mentions the name *t-p-n* ⁴⁾, which is identified with the Biblical Dibon ⁵⁾. On linguistic grounds this identification seems to be correct ⁶⁾, as we have *d-b-n* as a variant of *t-p-n* ⁷⁾. Simons does not state whether he identifies *t-p-n* with the Dibon in Trans-Jordan ⁸⁾, or with the one in Judah ⁹⁾. Unfortunately it is impossible to find a fixed order in the classification of the names in this list. Therefore we have no criterion for deciding where we can fit in this name geogra-

¹⁾ cf. King: C. T. 24, pp. 5-10.

²⁾ cf. Schrader: KAT³, p. 472.

³⁾ cf. Simons: ETL, pp. 109-122.

⁴⁾ no. 98. Copy c is damaged on this spot.

⁵⁾ Simons: ETL, p. 219; Wilson: ANET, p. 242.

⁶⁾ Albright: Basor 125, p. 9 n. 7, rejects this identification on etymological grounds.

⁷⁾ cf. Jirku: Listen, p. 15 n. 5.

⁸⁾ cf. Winnet: Basor 125, p. 9 n. 7.

⁹⁾ Neh. 11: 25. דִּימוֹנָה in Josh. 15: 22 must be regarded as a variant of דִּיבֹן; cf. Jirku: Listen, p. 15 n. 5.

phically, but it seems improbable that the list of Thotmes III refers to the Dibon in Moab or Judah. We are informed by the list itself that the sites were located in the area of Upper Retenu ¹⁾. *T-p-n* is therefore to be identified with tell Dibbin, n. of merj 'Ajjun ²⁾, at which there was a settlement in the days of Thotmes III. In his time there was no city in Moab ³⁾, which could be mentioned on the lists, commemorating his victories in Palestine ⁴⁾.

2. Lists of Ramses II in the Temple of Luxor ⁵⁾.

Following in the footsteps of Legrain, Simons reads one of the names in this list ⁶⁾ as *m-i-b* and identifies it with Moab ⁷⁾. Both the depictions and the names ⁸⁾ on this colossus show Semitic features. Therefore it is possible that the list refers to Moab ⁹⁾.

3. Lists of Names.

In 1926 a number of ostraca, graffiti, and fragments of papyrus were discovered at Sakkara ¹⁰⁾. This find provides us with information concerning an arsenal at Memphis ¹¹⁾, and also with a few names of persons who might have been of Moabitic descent, as their names are composed with the help of the name *כמש* e.g. *כמשחי*, *כמשצדק* and *כמשפלט* ¹²⁾.

¹⁾ Simons: ETL, p. 37.

²⁾ Albright: Annual VI, p. 19 n. 15.

³⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 268-269.

⁴⁾ Therefore the identification by Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 37-41, is to be rejected; cf. also De Vaux: ZAW 1938, pp. 225-238; Alt: PJB 36, p. 33.

⁵⁾ Simons: ETL, pp. 155-156, List XXII, serie d.

⁶⁾ no. 10.

⁷⁾ Simons: ETL, p. 205.

⁸⁾ Only 6 out of the 12 names are legible.

⁹⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 501. Wilson: ANET, p. 242 regards the information of this list as unreliable.

¹⁰⁾ Published by Aimé-Giron: Textes araméens d'Égypte, Kairo 1931.

¹¹⁾ cf. Rosenthal: Die Aramaistische Forschung, p. 36.

¹²⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 441.

E. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS.

Opinions differ on the historical value of the writings of Fl. Josephus. No general maxim can be applied in judging his work. Quite often he mentions some facts which cannot be traced in the O.T. or elsewhere. As regards the Moabites there is one such instance ¹⁾. We have no means of controlling this information concerning the destruction of Ammon and Moab by Nebuchadrezzar ²⁾, but there is no sound reason why it should be regarded untrustworthy ³⁾. The only way to subdue those nations in Syria and Palestine who rebelled against the authority of Nebuchadrezzar ⁴⁾ was to make them participators in the fate of Judah ⁵⁾.

F. THE APOCRYPHA.

1. *The Proverbs of Sirach.*

In the Hebrew text of this book, Ch. 36 : 10, we read **השבת ראש פאתי מואב** : Crush the heads of Moab's princes. These words resemble the proverb of Balaam in Numb. 24 : 17, which is echoed in Jer. 48 : 45. Since these words were uttered against the Moabites, their meaning and aim were expanded ⁶⁾, and gradually the Israelite desire to take vengeance on the Moabites, grew stronger. In Numb. 24 : 17, Is. 11 : 14 and Jer. 48 : 45 the historical Moab is reprimanded. In Is. 25 : 10b-12 Moab is mentioned as an example of an impious people. In Sirach

¹⁾ Josephus: Ant. Iud. X, 9, 7.

²⁾ According to Josephus this expedition followed directly on one against Coele-Syria. Noth: G.I.², p. 265, supposes that it coincided with the campaign of Nebuchadrezzar to the Lebanon, which is mentioned in the W. Brisa inscription (cf. Oppenheim: ANET, p. 307). From his campaign against Egypt in 567 B.C. (cf. Meissner: Könige Babyloniens und Assyriens, p. 263; K.B. III, 2, p. 140), we may gather that Nebuchadrezzar still paid attention to the western countries after the subjection of Judah in 586 B.C..

³⁾ Contra Verhoef: Voorsegginge, p. 186.

⁴⁾ Shortly before 587/6 B.C. the Moabites were concerned in a rebellion against him, cf. p. 156 below.

⁵⁾ cf. Hes. 29 : 18 and Albright: JBL 51, p. 59.

⁶⁾ cf. Mulder: Apokalipse, p. 89.

36 : 10, about four hundred years later when Moab no longer existed as a nation, Moab became the impious power *par excellence*. Therefore מואב is inserted in the margin as a synonym of מואב¹⁾ and the Lxx translated the phrase *suntripson kephalas archontoon echthroon*²⁾.

2. Judith.

In the book of Judith the name of Moab is mentioned five times³⁾. As all these references to Moab are from a post-Moabitic time and the Book of Judith is of no value as a historical source⁴⁾, this data is left out of account⁵⁾.

¹⁾ cf. Charles: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. I, p. 441 n. 2-2.

²⁾ Rahlfs: Septuaginta II, p. 438, Ch. 33 : 12.

³⁾ Judith 1 : 12; 5 : 2; 5 : 22; 6 : 1; 7 : 8.

⁴⁾ Bentzen: Intr. II, p. 226.

⁵⁾ The same applies to references of the same kind elsewhere, e.g. 1 Macc. 4 : 61; 5 : 3-8.

CHAPTER THREE

THE TOPOGRAPHY.

In the previous century several travellers to the land on the eastern side of the Dead Sea committed their experiences to writing. Interesting information concerning the topography of Ancient Moab can be obtained by studying these writings ¹⁾. It is, however, no easy task to visualize at present the geographical and topographical conditions of the land of Moab as they were before the downfall of the Moabite civilization in approximately 580 B.C.. Therefore, in this treatise an endeavour will be made first to describe the geographical nature of this country only as far as it will be of use in identifying the mountains, rivers, and cities mentioned in the written sources. Secondly, based on the surface-surveys and excavations ²⁾ carried out in the land of Moab, a sketch of

¹⁾ False identifications by some of the authors, who easily identify ancient names with homonymic names from recent times, are misleading, e.g. Tristram: Moab, p. 132, identifies the ruin Hameitât with Ham (Gen. 14 : 5); cf. Steuernagel: ZDPV 1925, p. 79; Jirku: ZDPV 1930, p. 151, for the position of Ham. Even if an identification seems evident on linguistic grounds, one must still be cautious before coming to conclusions, cf. Van Deursen: Palestina, p. 47. The name **בֵּית נִמְרִיָּה** is preserved in the name of Tell Nimrin and the 2 sites were identified quite often, cf. Merrill: East of the Jordan, pp. 384-386; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 402, 404; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 278. Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 367-371, proved this identification to be wrong, however. It is obvious that Tristram: Moab, pp. 5-6, overestimated the importance of his conclusions when he wrote the following: "There is scarcely a passage in Holy Writ in which Moab is mentioned which was not in some degree illustrated during the journey".

²⁾ cf. Musil: A.P.I; Abel: R.B. 40, pp. 214-226, 375-440; 41, pp. 77-88, 237-257; Glueck: Annual XIV, XV, XVIII-XIX, XXV-XXVIII.

The objections raised by Alt: ZDPV 59, p. 163, against the surveys carried out by Glueck, have been nullified by the results of consequent surface-surveys, cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. xxiii; XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366-404 and the excavations at Dhibân, cf. Morton:

the different sites, at which indications of a Moabite settlement were found will be given.

A. THE NAME OF THE COUNTRY.

It is generally acknowledged that the name מואב¹⁾ could be used as *nomen masculini*, *nomen territorii*, and *nomen populi*²⁾. In Gen. 19:30-38³⁾ the name מואב is used as a proper name. It is remarkable that it does not occur anywhere else as the name of a person. Even the expression בני מואב is not used⁴⁾. Even if an author does apply the expression בני צמון, he does not use a similar terminology concerning the Moabites⁵⁾. Although it must be borne in mind that a name following בני in a similar expression does not necessarily designate a person, one may deduce from the fact that the Moabites were occasionally named בני לויס instead of בני מואב that the name מואב was not primarily used as a proper name.

Whenever the name מואב as such occurs in the O.T., it usually refers to the people. The same application can be traced in the inscription of king Mesha⁶⁾, in which the name occurs six times⁷⁾. In a few texts of the O.T., however, it is not absolutely clear whether the author applied the name מואב to the people or to their country. In Numb. 21:11, for

Basor 140, p. 6. But recently Harding: PEFQ Jan.-June 1958, pp. 111-12, has shown a certain scepticism concerning Glueck's chronology.

¹⁾ For the etymology of the name, cf. pp. 178-180 below.

²⁾ Brown, Driver and Briggs: Hebrew and English Lexicon, p. 555; Koehler: LVTL, p. 501; Bennet, Hastings: D.B. III, p. 403; Davis and Gehman: W.D.B., p. 402.

³⁾ cf. p. 5 above and Vollers: Z.A. 21, p. 237.

⁴⁾ I Chron. 20:1 must be regarded as late and exceptional. In Numb. 25:1 the term בנות מואב is used, but in this instance the name מואב refers to the people and not to an ancestor, cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 501.

⁵⁾ Gen. 19:38; I Sam. 14:47; Jer. 9:26. In the cuneiform inscriptions the same distinction is maintained, cf. Donner: MIO V, p. 161.

⁶⁾ M.I. 1,2,5,6,12,20.

instance, מואב is mentioned in relation to a number of geographical stipulations¹⁾. In the corresponding list of Numb. 33 : 44 the name מואב is preceded by the geographical term נבול, and this fact implies that in Numb. 21 : 11 the name is used as a designation of the land. In Judg. 3 : 28-29 the name מואב is found three times. In the first and the last instance it is a synonym of אֲבוֹתָם and thus refers to the people. In the second case it may also allude to the people, but it may just as well indicate the country²⁾. In I Sam. 22 : 3 the term מִצְפֵּה מואב is applied, and it must be assumed that it refers to the country³⁾, just as in Jer. 48 : 28. Only in these few instances is the name מואב as such used as a designation of the country. If a writer wanted to make it clear that he was not referring to the people, he used a geographical term⁴⁾ such as אֶרֶץ⁵⁾, נבול⁶⁾, עַרְבוֹת⁷⁾, מְדְבָר⁸⁾ or שְׂדֵה⁹⁾, in connection with the name מואב.

Therefore it seems as though the name מואב was used predominantly as the name of the people, and this must have been the original application of the word¹⁰⁾. Only afterwards was it used sporadically to designate the country. Initially

¹⁾ In Numb. 21 : 11 it is not used as a parallel of "the Amorites", as Smith regards it, cf. Cheyne and Black : E.B., p. 3166.

²⁾ In Judg. 3 : 28-29 the Lxx translates with *he moab*, which designates the country and the corresponding description by Josephus (Ant. Iud.V, 196, 319) is in accordance with the terminology of the Lxx.

³⁾ cf. מִצְפֵּה נִלְעָד, Judg. 11 : 29 and the translation of the Lxx.

⁴⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 278-279.

⁵⁾ Dt. 1 : 5; 28 : 69; 32 : 49; 34 : 5; Judg. 11 : 15, 18; Jer. 48 : 33.

⁶⁾ Numb. 21 : 13, 15; 33 : 44; Dt. 2 : 8; Judg. 11 : 18; Is. 15 : 8.

⁷⁾ Numb. 22 : 1; 26 : 3, 63; 31 : 12; 33 : 48-50; 34 : 1, 8; 35 : 1; 36 : 13; Josh. 13 : 32.

⁸⁾ Dt. 2 : 8.

⁹⁾ Gen. 36 : 35; Numb. 21 : 20 (cf. Dt. 34 : 6); Ruth 1 : 16, 22; 2 : 6; 4 : 3; I Chron. 1 : 46; 8 : 8.

¹⁰⁾ From this application the name was eventually transferred to the forbear of the people.

the Assyrian royal inscriptions refer to the land of Moab as "the land of the Moabites", ¹⁾ and only in the inscriptions of Asshurbânipal do we come across the terms *mātu mā'aba* ²⁾, *mātu mā'ab* ³⁾ and *ālu mā'aba* ⁴⁾. Furthermore, the sign DIŠ is sometimes applied before the name Ammon, whereas it is omitted before Moab ⁵⁾.

B. THE BOUNDARIES.

Musil ⁶⁾ once described the land of Moab as "*das zum Wasergebiet des Arnon-el-Môjib gehörige Hochland am Ostufer des Toten Meeres*". Indeed, it is true that the catchment area of the W. el-Môjib and its tributaries cover nearly the whole territory of the land of Moab, but both in the n.w. and in the s.w. of the country there is a large area which is not included in the above-mentioned demarcation. In this paragraph only the ideal boundaries of the land of Moab are outlined. The changes of frontiers which took place in the course of the history of Moab are sketched in the historical section.

1. The Western Boundary.

The *יַם הַמֶּלַח* ⁷⁾, elsewhere named "the sea of the plain" (*יַם הָעֶרְבָה*) under the springs of the Pisgah ⁸⁾, must have been the western boundary of the land of Moab ⁹⁾. Sometimes the two names were combined, e.g. *יַם הָעֶרְבָה יַם הַמֶּלַח* ¹⁰⁾. As the

¹⁾ cf. the Letters from Kalhu XIV, 10, *āli Ma'-a-ba-āja*; 12, *māt Ma'-a-ba-[āja]* (the tablet is somewhat fragmentary on this spot) and XVI, 36, *māt Ma'-a-ba-āja*; T.P. III: Nimrud tablet, 60, *māt mā-abāja*; Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 53, *māt mā'abāja*.

²⁾ Asshurbânipal: Cyl. C, I, 27.

³⁾ Asshurbânipal: Cyl. B, VIII, 37.

⁴⁾ Asshurbânipal: Rassam Cylinder VII, 112.

⁵⁾ cf. Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 52-53; Asshurbânipal: Rassam Cylinder VII, 110.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I., p. 1.

⁷⁾ Gen. 14 : 3; Numb. 34 : 3, 12; Josh. 15 : 2; 18 : 19.

⁸⁾ Dt. 4 : 49; II Ki. 14 : 25.

⁹⁾ Numb. 34 : 12; Dt. 4 : 47-49.

¹⁰⁾ Dt. 3 : 17; Jos. 3 : 16; 12 : 3.

sea was situated on the eastern boundary of Judah, it was called הַיָּם הַקָּדְמוֹנִי ¹⁾. Once or twice it is merely called הַיָּם ²⁾. Among the Arabs it is known as *baḥr lūt*, but elsewhere the name by which Jerome indicated it, viz. the Dead Sea ³⁾, has preference. Whenever the northern boundary of the country moved to the n. of the Dead Sea, the lower course of the river Jordan was a part of the western boundary.

2. The Southern Boundary.

No written record concerning the southern boundary of the land of Moab is known, but that boundary could have been the W. el-Ḥesā. After rising to the s.e. of the south-eastern corner of the Dead Sea, this Wādī winds in a north-western direction towards the Dead Sea. In its upper course the shallow bed of the river can be passed without difficulty. Nearer to the Dead Sea, where it is also known as the seil el-Ḳurāḥi ⁴⁾, the Wādī cuts its way through the hilly landscape, and the steep river banks form a natural boundary ⁵⁾. At the few spots on the lower course, where the river could be crossed without effort, frontier fortresses could easily be erected. Furthermore, it is the only Wādī to the s. of Kerak that passes broadwise through the country. Thus the Wādī is a natural boundary. In later times it was the boundary between Kerak and Petra ⁶⁾. On both the northern and the southern banks of the river, Glueck discovered a system of fortifications from the Iron Age, which indicates that it was the boundary between Moab and Edom ⁷⁾. On the Edomite border er-Ruweiḥeh, Kh. Bākher, R. Abū el-‘Azām, R. Jā‘ez and Kh. Baḥlūl ⁸⁾ may be mentioned.

¹⁾ Hes. 47 : 18; Joel 2 : 20; Sag. 14 : 8.

²⁾ II Chron. 20 : 2; Jer. 48 : 32.

³⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 167-169; Van Deursen: Palestina, pp. 241-246.

⁴⁾ Albright: Annual VI, p. 56; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 7.

⁵⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 83; Glueck: The River Jordan, p. 92.

⁶⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 64.

⁷⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 19, 24, 60, 61, 64, 69, 73, 79, 88, 89, 243.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XV, p. 102; Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 24, 49, 51, 53, 59, 69.

On the northern side of the river, in the Moabite territory, there were el-Medeiyineh, Maḥaij, Kh. el-‘Akūzeh, Kh. en-Njājir, Kh. Dhubāb, Kh. Khāneq en-Nasāra, and Medinet er-Rās ¹⁾.

The W. el-Ḥesā is frequently identified with the נַחַל וְרָד ²⁾, which was the border between the desert and the cultivated land ³⁾. But according to Numb. 21 : 11 the Israelites camped at עֵי הָעֲבָרִים in the desert to the e. of Moab and thence went to the נַחַל וְרָד, which was the last camping place before they crossed the river Arnon ⁴⁾. Therefore the identification of the נַחַל וְרָד with this Wādī cannot be recommended ⁵⁾.

3. The Eastern Boundary

Avoiding the territory of Moab, the Israelites trekked through the wilderness e. of Moab towards the river Arnon ⁶⁾. From this we may gather that the Moabite domain did not exceed the eastern end of the fertile plateau. In fact, to the e. of this highland Glueck did not discover any fortress from the Iron Age ⁷⁾. Although the Moabites could have pastured their numerous flocks in the surrounding area, which provided good pasture in the rainy season ⁸⁾, the actual Moabite territory did not stretch further to the e. than the chain of frontier fortresses Maḥaij, Medeibi‘, R. Khushm eṣ-Šireh, eṣ-Šireh, el-Māhri, Q. Nāṣer, Kh. el-Medeiyineh, Q. Abū el-Kharaq, Q. el-‘Āl, Sāliyah, Jemeil, ‘Aleiyān, R. el-‘Aliyā, Er-Remeil, Kh. el-Medeiyineh on the W. eth-Themed, Q. ez-Za‘ferān II, Zein-

¹⁾ cf. pp. 000 below.

²⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 64; Ewald: History II, p. 200 n. 2; Wilson PEFQ 1899, p. 308; Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 279, 310, 489; II, p. 216; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 60, 68-69, 244; Filson and Wright: WHAB, p. 112, cf. plates I, IV, V, VI, X; Koehler: LVTL, p. 265; Grollenberg-Van Deursen: Atlas van de Bijbel, p. 161, cf. map 9.

³⁾ cf. Dt. 2 : 14.

⁴⁾ Numb. 21 : 12-13.

⁵⁾ cf. Buhl: Edomiter, pp. 21, 117.

⁶⁾ Numb. 21 : 11, 23; Dt. 2 : 8, 26.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 20, 79.

⁸⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 182-184.

âb, Kh. el-Herî, Zobâyer el-Qaştal, Umm el-‘Amad, Kh.er-Rufaiseh, Jadudeh, and Jâwah ¹⁾. Eastward the pasture becomes scantier and gradually the scenery changes to that of a real desert ²⁾.

4. *The Northern Boundary.*

From time to time the Moabites forced their way to the n. of the river Arnon unto the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב ³⁾, where either the W. Nimrin ⁴⁾ or the W. el-Hesbân and the W. el-Kefrein ⁵⁾ formed the northern boundary. They were, however, frequently driven back to the s. of the Arnon ⁶⁾. In spite of the fact that the northern boundary fluctuated between these extremes, it was guarded equally well by frontier fortresses ⁷⁾.

C. THE NATURE OF THE COUNTRY.

As this treatise does not intend to offer a detailed description of the nature of the country ⁸⁾, no endeavour will be made to describe the numerous geological factors which helped to form the specific structure and nature of this country. These forces had already become inactive in pre-Moabitic times ⁹⁾ and after the Moabites had entered the country, no material changes took place in the geographical form of the land of Moab. It is possible that earthquakes caused minor changes

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 73, 121-122.

²⁾ cf. Wilson: PEFQ 1899, p. 307; Glueck: OSJ, pp. 33-34.

³⁾ Judg. 3 : 13; cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 243; Noth: G.I², p. 143.

⁴⁾ Abel: R.B. 40, p. 225; Geogr. I, p. 275; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366-404.

⁵⁾ Cheyne and Black: E. B., p. 2291; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 244.

⁶⁾ Numb. 21 : 13-15, 26; 22 : 36; Dt. 2 : 24, 36; Josh. 12 : 2; Judg. 11 : 13, 18, 22, 26.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 89, 269.

⁸⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab; Merrill: East of the Jordan; Conder: Heth and Moab; Musil: A. P. I; Glueck: Annual XIV, XV, XVIII-XIX, XXV-XXVIII.

⁹⁾ cf. Van Deursen: Palestina, pp. 89-104.

during the Moabitic era ¹⁾, as has happened recently ²⁾. Substantially the land of Moab may be assumed to have had the same pattern as it has in modern times.

1. *The Coastal Region.*

In the south-western corner of the country, where the ground gradually rises above the deep swamp which bars all access to the shore of the Dead Sea, the soil is arable ³⁾. Eventually the landscape changes to steep and gravelly slopes below the hills, into which the plateau diverges in a south-western direction ⁴⁾. In the s. the arable strip between the sea and the highland is about four miles wide, but it soon narrows to a width of approximately two miles ⁵⁾. No trace of a settlement in the Iron Age has as yet been found in this area ⁶⁾. This cannot be due to the inhospitable climate of the region during summer, because it was inhabited and cultivated in other periods ⁷⁾. It rather seems as though the Moabites preferred to build their south-western frontier fortresses directly below the edge of the highland, where they could easily be defended ⁸⁾. To the n. of the Lisan peninsula ⁹⁾, the lowland between the sea and the precipitous mountain slopes almost disappears ¹⁰⁾, and it seems as if the plateau rises directly from the sea. To the n. of the Arnon there are a few more strips of lowland on the seashore, e.g. at ez-Zāra ¹¹⁾ and around

¹⁾ Amos 1 : 1; Sach. 14 : 5; cf. Beek: Hrozny-Festschrift, pp. 31-40 and Apokalyptiek, pp. 11-17.

²⁾ Albright: Annual VI, p. 66; Blanckenhorn: ZDPV 1927, pp. 288-296.

³⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, p. 67; Hill: PEFQ 1900, pp. 273-275; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 161-162; Albright: Annual VI, pp. 54-56.

⁴⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 66.

⁵⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 70-71; Albright: Annual VI, p. 56.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 66 below.

⁷⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 66, 75-76; Albright: Annual VI, pp. 56-62.

⁸⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 88-89.

⁹⁾ cf. Ze. 2 : 9; Albright: Basor 14, p. 5; Palmer: PEFQ 1871, pp. 63-64; Tristram: Moab, p. 74; Albright: Annual VI, pp. 53-54 for the name and description of this area.

¹⁰⁾ Palmer: PEFQ 1871, p. 66; Tristram: Moab pp. 138-139, 281-282, 367; Hill: PEFQ 1900, pp. 275-276, 278-280.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 90 below.

the W. Zerqa-ma'in ¹⁾. Then the plateau once again takes the place of the valley, before it finally turns aside to the e. to frame the broad Ghôr es-Seisabân ²⁾, the previous עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב, with the W. Nimrin as its northern boundary ³⁾. The most prominent Wudyân in this region are the W. el-Kefrein, the W. er-Rameh and the W. el-'Aẓimeh ⁴⁾, which is the southern boundary of the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב.

2. The Highland.

To the e. of the coastal region the landscape rises sharply to form the real Moabite Highland ⁵⁾. Actually the highland is the southern continuation of the anti-Lebanon. From Mount Hermon this mountain range slopes to the s. to form the highland e. of the Jordan, of which the highland of Moab is the southern part. In the s.w. of the country, where access was more easy, the Moabites erected a system of fortifications ⁶⁾, but further to the n., the highland towered directly above the Dead Sea ⁷⁾ and from Jerusalem it looks like a dark-blue mountain range ⁸⁾. For this reason the northern part of the highland is called הָרֵי הָעֵבְרִים ⁹⁾ or הַר הָעֵבְרִים ¹⁰⁾. Initially the name עֵבְרִים was used as an appellative ¹¹⁾, but in Jer. 22 : 20 it is applied as a proper name, designating the entire highland of Moab ¹²⁾. To the s. of the river Arnon

¹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 293, 295.

²⁾ cf. Warren: PEFQ 1869, p. 285; Tristram: Moab, pp. 294-300, 349-350, 362-367; Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 137; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366-404.

³⁾ cf. p. 59 below.

⁴⁾ cf. pp. 59 below.

⁵⁾ Musil: A. P. I. pp. 1-4; cf. also Hill: PEFQ 1899, p. 307.

⁶⁾ cf. pp. 63-64, 68 below.

⁷⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 74, 93, 295; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 88.

⁸⁾ Smith: The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, pp. 48, 53; Musil: A. P. I. pp. 1-7; Dalman: Arbeit und Sitte I, 2, p. 606; Glueck: The River Jordan, p. 250; Kenyon: Digging Up Jericho, p. 26.

⁹⁾ Numb. 33 : 47

¹⁰⁾ Numb. 27 : 12; Dt. 32 : 49.

¹¹⁾ cf. also the Lxx Numb. 27 : 12 *to oros to en tooi peran*.

¹²⁾ It is also mentioned with the Lebanon and Bashan; cf. the situation

the chain of hills around the W. el-Kerak, on which Kerak is situated, is the most important. On the Jebel Shihān ¹⁾ the Shihān-stele from the Bronze Age has been found ²⁾. To the n. of the river Arnon is the Jebel 'Aṭārus ³⁾, which is frequently identified with the **בְּמֹת בַּעַל** ⁴⁾. According to Numb. 21: 19-20 it was situated between Nahaliēl and Pisgah and, according to Josh. 13: 17, between Dibon ⁵⁾ and Beth-baal-meon ⁶⁾. Therefore it must have been situated to the n. of the Jebel 'Aṭārus – even to the n. of the W. Zerqa-ma'īn ⁷⁾. The definite locality of **בְּמֹת בַּעַל**, which may be identified with **בְּמֹת** ⁸⁾, can no longer be fixed with absolute certainty, but perhaps it was situated at el-Qwēzije, to the s. of en-Neba ⁹⁾.

As regards the exact identification of **הַפְּסִגָּה** opinions differ ¹⁰⁾. The distance between Nebo and Pisgah was insignificant ¹¹⁾. Perhaps Pisgah is to be identified with the reef some 15 km. to the e. of the estuary of the Jordan ¹²⁾. If this reef in its entirety was not known as Pisgah, its highest summit, en-Neba, is to be identified with Pisgah ¹³⁾. West-

of **עֵי הַקְּבָרִים** in the s.e. of Moab (p. 62 below) and Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 378-379; Noth: ZAW 1944, p. 19.

¹⁾ Palmer: PEFQ 1871, p. 67; Tristram: Moab, pp. 135-138.

²⁾ Albright: Basor 14, p. 9; AP, p. 79; cf. Tufnell: Iraq XV, pp. 161-166.

³⁾ cf. pp. 83-84 below.

⁴⁾ Numb. 22: 41; cf. Tristram: Moab, p. 318; Keil and Delitzsch: Pentateuch III, pp. 147-148; Edelkoort: Numeri, p. 168.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 77 below.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 87 below.

⁷⁾ cf. p. 85 below.

⁸⁾ M.I. 27

⁹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 267-268, 274 n.l., 347 n. 3; Kalt according to Thomsen: ZDPV 1914, p. 191; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 261; Koehler: LVTL, p. 132.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab. pp. 287, 318, 339; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 129-131; Birch: PEFQ 1899, pp. 67-69; Wilson: PEFQ 1899, pp. 310-311; Koehler: LVTL, p. 768; Grollenberg-Van Deursen Atlas van de Bijbel, p. 157.

¹¹⁾ Dt. 34: 1.

¹²⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 587.

¹³⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 335-337; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 380 fig. 16 and

northwest of this summit there is a lower platform, the Jebel Šiyāghah, which is identified with the Biblical נְבוֹ ¹⁾. The W. 'Ayūn Mūsa in the valley to the n. of this reef ²⁾ is to be identified with the אֵשֶׁת הַפְּקֻזָּה ³⁾. Once again the highland rises northward to form a reef, on the slope of which Kh. eš-Šech-Dschajil is situated. The peak of this reef may be identified with the summit פְּעוֹר ⁴⁾. Alongside these reefs and crests there are still more heights, but they must be regarded as ridges or crests rather than mountain-tops. In fact, they are scarcely higher than the surrounding highland. They merely appear as ridges because of the surrounding valleys and Wudyān. On these elevations one can regularly find some traces of ancient settlements. On this fertile table-land to the n. of the Arnon, known as הַמִּישֹׁר ⁵⁾, viticulture and agriculture thrive and the pasture is excellent ⁶⁾. The same applies to the greater part of the highland to the s. of the Arnon ⁷⁾.

D. WATER IN MOAB.

Like western Palestine, the land of Moab has a "Mediterranean" climate with a hot, dry summer and rain in winter.

pp. 381-384; Glueck: *Annual XV*, p. 109. The proposal by Duncan: *PEFQ 1927*, pp. 197-210 is unacceptable.

¹⁾ Tristram: *Moab*, pp. 337-339; Smith: *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 563. The identification of Pisgah with the whole range to the e. of the Dead Sea, known as eš-Sefa (cf. Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 768), must be discarded (cf. Noth: *ZAW 1944*, pp. 19-23).

²⁾ Tristram: *Moab*, p. 339; Conder: *Heth and Moab*, p. 128; Smith: *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 564; Noth: *ZAW 1944*, p. 22.

³⁾ Dt. 3 : 17; 4 : 49; Josh. 12 : 3; 13 : 20; cf. Noth: *Josua*², p. 60 for the meaning of אֵשֶׁת.

⁴⁾ Musil: *A. P. I*, p. 348; Noth: *ZAW 1944*, pp. 19-23; *Numb.* 23 : 28.

⁵⁾ Dt. 3 : 10; 4 : 43; Josh. 13 : 9, 16-17, 21; 20 : 8; Jer. 48 : 21; cf. also Smith: *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 53; Noth: *Josua*², p. 79.

⁶⁾ cf. Musil: *A. P. I*, pp. 128-130.

⁷⁾ cf. Josephus: *Ant. Iud.* IV, 5, 1; Musil: *A. P. I*, pp. 19-20, 78, 155-157, 160-161, 330-331, 360-361; Glueck: *Annual XV*, p. 109; *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 93, 138-140; *The River Jordan*, p. 85; Filson and Wright: *WHAB*, p. 65.

The western slopes of the highland and the highland itself do not suffer from a scarcity of rain during winter, but eastward the rainfall average declines rapidly with the result that there is a sudden change from cultivated land to barren desert. During the rainy season all the Wudyân are in flood, but during the dry summer most of them change to waterless gullies or ravines. Then the land is dependent on the water from the few perennial rivers and springs, and the water which is stored in reservoirs and cisterns ¹⁾.

Generally a settlement is found on the hill nearest to a permanent spring. Against the western slopes of the highland springs are numerous ²⁾. The rainwater, which falls on the highland, filters through the porous limestone to the water-tight layers, whence it flows westward along subterranean watercourses only to reach the ground surface in the dales or to gush forth through the western slopes as springs ³⁾. The Wudyân, which have their sources on the highland, corrode deep ravines in the highland on their way towards the Dead Sea or the Jordan Valley ⁴⁾. Because of these ravines it is impossible to use the water of these Wudyân for irrigation. Only the water of the W. el-Wâla ⁵⁾, which flows through a valley, and of those Wudyân, that pass from the highland into the עֲרֻבוֹת מוֹאָב can be used for irrigation. Most of the sources in the hot coastal plain near the Dead Sea are useless, because they have hot water, containing sulphur. Perhaps the Moabites shunned these regions for this reason. To a certain extent the land of Moab appears to be suffering from a lack of water ⁶⁾, in spite of the numerous sources, springs and Wudyân ⁷⁾.

The most southerly river ⁸⁾ in the land of Moab is the

¹⁾ cf. M.I. 23-25.

²⁾ Palmer: PEFQ 1871, p. 64; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 17-18.

³⁾ Musil: A. P. I., pp. 29-30.

⁴⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 339; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 123-132.

⁵⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 132.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 17, 144.

⁷⁾ Kittel: G. Isr. I, p. 22.

⁸⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 9-17, 65, 256-258; Abel: Geogr. I, pp.

W. el-Ḥesā, which forms the boundary between Edom and Moab ¹⁾. As the southern Moabitic highland gradually slopes towards the river Arnon, the W. el-Ḥesā has its tributaries only from the Edomite territory. From the slopes of the hills in the south-western corner of the country, a few springs emerge, from which the W. eṭ-Ṭaiyibēh takes its rise. It flows into the W. el-Jedeirah, which is known as the seil en-Numeirah in its lower course ²⁾. The seil en-Numeirah is identified with the homonymic מִי נְמָרִים, mentioned in Is. 15 : 6 and Jer. 48 : 34 ³⁾. In both instances Heshbon, Elealeh and Jahas, which are situated in the n., are mentioned. Then Soar-Eglathshelishia, Luhit and Horonaim are mentioned in Isaiah, and Soar and Horonaim-Eglathshelishia in Jeremiah, with מִי נְמָרִים following in both texts. The situation of Luhit and Horonaim is not known ⁴⁾. To the best of our knowledge Soar was situated in the s.w. of the country ⁵⁾, and therefore the waters of Nimrim might also have been in the south. But because they regard the seil en-Numeirāh as insignificant, Merrill ⁶⁾, Volz ⁷⁾ and Glueck ⁸⁾ prefer to identify the מִי נְמָרִים with the W. Nimrīn in the עֲרֻבוֹת מוֹאָב. On account of the fact that the מִי נְמָרִים is mentioned in relation with Soar, Horonaim, and Luhit, which most probably were situated in the s., we must assume that the waters of Nimrim must be looked for

155-157, 176-178, 487-489 for a description of the different Wudyân in the land of Moab.

¹⁾ cf. pp. 47-48 above.

²⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 68; Albright: Annual VI, p. 56; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 8; XVIII-XIX, p. 86; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 178; II, p. 399.

³⁾ Palmer: PEFQ 1871, p. 62; Tristram: Moab, pp. 71-72; Delitzsch: Isaiah I, p. 327; Keil: Jeremiah I, p. 229; Musil: A. P. I, p. 74; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 213; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 399; Albright: Basor 91, p. 11 n. 7; Davis and Gehman: W. D. B., p. 428; Rudolph: Jeremiah, p. 247.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 65 below.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 66 below.

⁶⁾ Merrill: East of the Jordan, pp. 384-385.

⁷⁾ Volz: Jeremiah, p. 408.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 367 and note 1048.

in the s. of Moab. Furthermore, the order **נַחַל מִי נְמָרִים** ¹⁾ **הַעֲרָבִים** ²⁾ **בְּאֵר אֵילִים** ³⁾ **מִי דִימֹן** in Is. 15:6-9, likewise indicates that the **מִי נְמָרִים** was situated in the south. If the identification with the seil en-Numeirāh proves to be correct, the author of Is. 15:6 could have mentioned it, though it may be insignificant, to indicate that the country as a whole was, or would be, ruined. But an identification with the homonymic seil en-Numeirāh is not necessarily final. It could just as well be identified with one of the southern tributaries of the Arnon.

Originating s. of the city of Kerak, the W. el-Kerak flows to the n., before bending westward towards the Dead Sea ⁴⁾. The W. el-Kerak is sometimes identified ⁵⁾ with the **נַחַל זָרְד** ⁶⁾, but the Israelites did not penetrate so far into the territory of the Moabites ⁷⁾. The most important river which flows into the Dead Sea from the e. is the W. el-Môjib ⁸⁾. Coming from the s.e. and n.e. of the country, a number of brooks, rivulets, and streams merge in the centre of the country to form the large and impressive W. el-Môjib. The W. es-Sultāni, one of the tributaries from the s.e., can very likely be identified with the above mentioned **נַחַל זָרְד** ⁹⁾. As the W. el Môjib and its tributaries extend over a large area, Musil ¹⁰⁾ described the

¹⁾ To be identified with one of the s. tributaries of the Arnon and not with the W. el-Hesā (Buhl: Edomiter, p. 21; Gray: Isaiah I, p. 284). Musil: A.P.I, p. 170 n. 2 identifies it with the seil el-'arābi.

²⁾ cf. p. 86 below.

³⁾ **דִימֹן** is written instead of **דִיבֹן** on behalf of the alliteration with **דָם**.

⁴⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 82, 86; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 65-66; Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 88, 177; Albright: Annual VI, p. 56.

⁵⁾ e.g. Delitzsch: Pentateuch III, p. 143; Driver: Deuteronomy, pp. 38-39.

⁶⁾ Numb. 21:11.

⁷⁾ cf. p. 8 above.

⁸⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 140-144; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 9-14, 93-95, 127-133; Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 156, 177, 487-489; Glueck Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 113, 118, 127.

⁹⁾ Numb. 21:12; Dt. 2:3-4; Musil: A. P. I, p. 170; cf. also Abel: Geogr. I, Carte I.

¹⁰⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 1, 9

land of Moab as the catchment area of this Wādī ¹⁾. Before debouching into the Dead Sea, it flows from e. to w. through the greater part of the centre of the country ²⁾ and its tributaries come from both the south-eastern and the northern boundaries. In its lower course the river bed lies far beneath the highland ³⁾. According to Vollers ⁴⁾, the name el-Môjib, which means "the sunset", was given to this Wādī by the Bedouin tribes of the desert to the e. of the country. But it seems more probable to connect the name with the Arabic root *wajaba* ⁵⁾: to cause to fall with a noise ⁶⁾. If this derivation is correct, the name was given to the river by the inhabitants of the country, who were acquainted with the speed with which the water was pressed through the narrow river bed between the precipitous banks of limestone. The position and nature of the W. el-Môjib correspond exactly to that of the Biblical אֶרְנוֹן ⁷⁾ or נַחַל אֶרְנוֹן ⁸⁾. Since the 9th century A.D. the Arabic versions of the Pentateuch translate the name אֶרְנוֹן with *môjib* ⁹⁾. Schmidt ¹⁰⁾ derives the name אֶרְנוֹן from the root רָנַ: to jubilate, to give a cry of joy ¹¹⁾. This etymology is descriptive of the nature of the river, but nouns from double 'ayin roots are not formed with the help of 'aleph prostheticum ¹²⁾. The name must rather be derived from the root אָרַן, indicating the river fringed with אָרַן: the river bordered by

¹⁾ cf. p. 46 above.

²⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, p. 487.

³⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 140-143; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 12, 95.

⁴⁾ Vollers: Z. A. 21, pp. 239-240.

⁵⁾ Schmidt: J. B. L. 1903, p. 219.

⁶⁾ cf. Belot: Vocabulaire Arabe-Français sub *wajaba*.

⁷⁾ Numb. 21: 13-28; 22: 36; Judg. 11: 13, 18, 22, 26; Is. 16: 2; Jer. 48: 20.

⁸⁾ Dt. 2: 24, 36; 3: 8, 12, 16; 4: 48; Josh. 12: 1; 13: 9, 16; II Ki. 10: 33.

⁹⁾ Abel: Geogr. I, p. 487.

¹⁰⁾ Schmidt: J. B. L. 1903, p. 219.

¹¹⁾ Koehler: LVTL, pp. 859-860.

¹²⁾ But cf. אֶרְנוֹן according to Borée: Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas, p. 69. Koehler: LVTL, p. 91, derives this name from another root.

l aurelbushes ¹⁾. The Moabite pronunciation of the name could have been 'arnān ²⁾. As the name Arnon did not designate the river as a whole, the "brooks of the Arnon" are mentioned separately ³⁾. This name may refer to the group of rivulets known as W. el-Meḥeires, which unite with the W. eṣ-Şefei. Having crossed the Arnon, which is in the wilderness ⁴⁾, i.e. the upper course of the W. eṣ-Şefei, the Israelites went to זַרְקָא ⁵⁾, where they dug wells for water. During the dry season water can easily be obtained at this site by digging a hole in the sandy bed of the W. eth-Themed ⁶⁾.

To the n. of the river Arnon a number of Wudyān ⁷⁾, with the W. Zerqa-ma'in as the most prominent ⁸⁾, flow into the Dead Sea. In its upper course, drinking water is abundant and here the W. Zerqa-ma'in is known as the W. el-Ḥabis. Further to the w. several hot springs flow into it ⁹⁾, making its water hot and even undrinkable ¹⁰⁾. Whether the Moabites utilized the hot springs at Callirhoe ¹¹⁾ is unknown to us. Because this area abounds in water, it is frequently accepted that זַרְקָא was situated somewhere near the lower course of the W. Zerqa-ma'in ¹²⁾. Though the water at Callirhoe itself is potable ¹³⁾, some of the other hot streams contain sulphur and therefore the water is undrinkable. Perhaps זַרְקָא was

¹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 140-141; Musil: A. P. I, p. 95; Koehler: LVTL, p. 89.

²⁾ cf. p. 164 below.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 14-15.

⁴⁾ Numb. 21 : 13.

⁵⁾ Numb. 21 : 16 and cf. p. 86 below.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 109, 298, 318 n. 10; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 13.

⁷⁾ For their names, cf. Abel: Geogr. I, p. 177.

⁸⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 98-99; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 176.

⁹⁾ Musil: A. P. I. 18.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Olmstead: Syria and Palestine, p. 214; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 156.

¹¹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 249-266; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 141-144; Wilson: PEFQ 1899, p. 311; Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 86-87.

¹²⁾ Numb. 21 : 19; cf. Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 141; Smith: The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, pp. 561-562. Musil: A. P. I, p. 253 n. 1, locates it at the W. el-Wālā.

¹³⁾ Josephus: Ant. Iud. XVII, 6.

further to the n.e., near the W. el-Ḥabis¹⁾. Like the W. el-Môjib, the W. Zerqa-ma'in flows into the Dead Sea through a deep gorge, which lays bare the different strata of rock²⁾.

The most northerly Wâdî disemboguing into the Dead Sea, is the W. el-ʿAzeimeh. In its upper course, where it winds through the highland, it is known as the W. el-Ḥeri³⁾. To the n. of this Wâdî there are a few dry Wudyân. Of these the W. eṭ-Ṭerfeh must be mentioned because its upper course is known as the W. ʿAyûn Mûsa, which is to be identified with the אֵינֵי מוֹסָא⁴⁾. The W. Ḥeshbân originates to the w. of Ḥeshbân⁵⁾, and as it flows through the highland, a number of pools are formed in the river⁶⁾. From the spot where it enters the valley, it is known as the W. er-Rameh⁷⁾. About 5 km. from the Jordan it flows into the W. el-Kefrein⁸⁾, known in the highland as the W. el-Meqta'a⁹⁾. The W. el-Kefrein is correctly identified with אֵבֶל הַקֶּפְרִין¹⁰⁾. Frequently the W. el-Ḥeshbân-er-Rameh was the northern boundary of the land of Moab, but at certain times the Moabite territory stretched as far n. as the W. Nimrîn¹¹⁾, the northern boundary of the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב. In spite of the fact that the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב

¹⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, p. 217. Perhaps it was in the vicinity of the site, where Tristram pitched his camp, cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 248-249.

²⁾ For the formation and colour of the rocks, cf. Warren: PEFQ 1869, pp. 287-288; Palmer: PEFQ 1871, pp. 66, 69; Tristram: Moab, pp. 59, 65, 80, 250-252; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 122, 124-125, 145; Hill: PEFQ 1899, p. 307.

³⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, p. 86; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 110; XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366-398.

⁴⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, p. 76; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366, 395 and p. 53 n. 3 above.

⁵⁾ Warren: PEFQ 1869, pp. 286-287; Merrill: East of the Jordan, p. 240; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 366.

⁶⁾ cf. Ct. 7:4; Tristram: Moab, p. 353.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 389, 394.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 366.

⁹⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 378, 382.

¹⁰⁾ Numb. 33:49; cf. Albright: Basor 89, p. 15 n. 44; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 221, 378.

¹¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 366-367, 370 and cf. Merrill: East of the Jordan, pp. 224-225.

appears to be a dry land and is even described as a מִדְבָּר¹⁾, it could be irrigated and thus cultivated with the help of the water from these Wudyân.

E. THE ROUTES.

The modern highway through central Transjordan practically follows the line of the ancient Roman road and of the older King's Highway from the Iron Age, which was preceded by the route from the Bronze Age²⁾. This fact is partly due to the skill of those ancient engineers. But it must be admitted that the line of this route is determined by the geographical nature and position of the country. The route not only served as the line of communication between the northern and the southern parts of the country, but it was also used as a trade route from Damascus to Ezion Geber and vice versa. If the Israelites could have obtained permission from the king of Edom to pass through his country by the King's Highway³⁾, they would have trekked along it to the W. el-Ḥesā, where it entered the territory of Moab at Kh. el-Medeiyineh⁴⁾. From here it followed the track of the older Bronze Age route unto el-ʿAineh⁵⁾, to pass near the hill on which Kh. el-ʿAkûzeh is situated⁶⁾ before crawling up the hilly country to the central highland⁷⁾. Once the plateau was reached, it went straight, beyond el-Kerak⁸⁾, Mişna, and Kh. Bālûʿah, towards the W. el-Môjib. The descent from the plateau to the bed of the Wādī, as well as the ascent on the other side, was steep⁹⁾. The maintenance of this road must have been one of the

¹⁾ Numb. 24 : 1; cf. p. 51 n. 2 above.

²⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 20-22; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 3-4, 82; XV, pp. 3, 18; XVIII-XIX, pp. 12, 113, 142-143; OSJ, pp. 15-16.

³⁾ Numb. 20 : 17, 19; cf. Numb. 21 : 22; Dt. 2 : 27.

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 60.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 52. During the Iron Age there was no settlement at el-ʿAineh.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 20-22; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 61-62.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 60.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 66.

⁹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 140-144.

main tasks of the governor and inhabitants of this area. King Mesha¹ of Moab proudly claimed that he made the highway through the Arnon²), which means that he reconstructed the existing road. From the Arnon the highway passed 'Arâ'ir and then turned to the n.w. before passing on the eastern side of Dhibân³), towards the W. el-Wâla, where R. Abû Sighân and R. Mleḥleb guarded the fords of the King's Highway⁴). From there it continued northward beyond Mâdeba⁵) and Ḥeshbân, where it turned n.e. to pass el-'Al and Kh. Nefa'a⁶), before leaving the territory of Moab towards 'Ammân.

Besides this highway which passed through the central plateau, we may mention other roads, crossing the country from e. to w., e. g. the road which led from el-Lisân to the highland⁷) and the route to the n. of Ḥeshbân towards the Jordan. At present we do not have any further information about these ancient routes.

F. THE CITIES.

1. *Kh. el-Medeiyineh.*

On a solitary hill in the bend of the W. el-Ḥesâ, where the ancient King's Highway entered the land of Moab from Edom in the s., is the site of Kh. el-Medeiyineh⁷). Commanding a clear view over the greater part of the W. el-Ḥesâ and over the fertile valley⁸) towards the springs at el-'Aineh, the ancient fortress at Kh. el-Medeiyineh not only guarded the fords of the King's Highway but it also helped to defend the southern

¹) M.I. 27.

²) Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 63.

³) cf. p. 82 below and Musil: A. P. I, pp. 20-22; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 125.

⁴) Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 63, 142.

⁵) cf. p. 94 below.

⁶) cf. Alt: ZDPV 60, pp. 241-244; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 89.

⁷) Glueck: Annual XV, pp. 104-106, p. 105 fig. 38, p. 181 plate 19; Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 60. The Bronze Age fortress was situated somewhat further to the n. at el-'Aineh, cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 104.

⁸) cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 320.

border of the land of Moab. Glueck¹⁾ believes that the עֵי הַעֲבָרִים, referred to in Numbers, must be identified with the ford and the ascent marked by Kh. el-Medeiyneh. The account in Numbers cannot, however, be regarded as idealized as is surmized by Glueck²⁾. If עֵי הַעֲבָרִים was situated on the northern bank of the W. el-Ḥesā, it must have been further to the e., where the Wādī could be crossed without any difficulty. But it seems more probable that it was situated to the n. of the Wādī in the desert to the e. of Moab³⁾, somewhere to the s. of the W. es-Sulṭāni, which is to be identified with the נַחַל זָרַד⁴⁾.

2. Maḥaiy.

On the eastern end of the fertile highland, to the n.e. of Kh. el-Medeiyneh, is the great fortress of Maḥaiy⁵⁾. From the flat top of the hill on which it is situated, one has a view over the desert to the e. and n.e.. Furthermore it overlooks the W. el-Ḥesā, which flows approximately 4 km. s. of it⁶⁾, and the fertile valleys to the s.⁷⁾ and the n.⁸⁾ of it. These valleys were cultivated, but agriculture never was the main interest of the inhabitants of this fortress. As Maḥaiy was the most southerly⁹⁾ of the series of frontier fortresses on the eastern border of Moab, which commanded the access from the desert to the highland, its main task was to defend this approach. As I have indicated above¹⁰⁾, Maḥaiy cannot be identified with עֵי הַעֲבָרִים¹¹⁾.

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 68-69 n. 224.

²⁾ cf. p. 6 above.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 11-12; 33 : 44.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 48 above.

⁵⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 6, 19, 22, 81-82, 320, 324, 367; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 67-69.

⁶⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, p. 216.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 322.

⁸⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 324.

⁹⁾ But cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 69.

¹⁰⁾ cf. p. 62 above.

¹¹⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. I, pp. 216-217, 351.

3. *Kh. el-'Akūzeh.*

From Kh. el-Medeiyineh the King's Highway passed the strong springs of el-'Aineh and then turned w.n.w. towards a steep hill before zigzagging obliquely to the top of the Moabite plateau. On the top of this steep and hardly accessible hill ¹⁾ is Kh. el-'Akūzeh ²⁾. Together with Kh. el-Medeiyineh this fortress dominated the adjacent fords of the W. el-Ḥesā. Westward of Kh. el-'Akūzeh the banks of this Wādī were steep and impassable, and consequently the Moabites had no need to build fortresses further down the lower course of the river ³⁾.

4. *Kh. en-Njājir.*

To the w.n.w. of Kh. el-'Akūzeh the plateau unfolds into a series of flat shelves. On one of these shelves which is called 'Arḍ en-Njājir, is a small eminence on the top of which is the site of Kh. en-Njājir ⁴⁾. Judging from the scarcity of traces of a large fortress, the settlement on this site can be described as an advanced guard post from which the area in which the W. el-'Afra ⁵⁾ flows into the W. el-Ḥesā could be observed.

Between the natural strength of the s. border caused by the steep banks of the W. el-Ḥesā, and these frontier fortresses the southern approach to the Moabite highland was safeguarded against any hostile campaign ⁶⁾.

5. *Kh. edh-Dhubāb.*

To the n. of Kh. en-Njājir, about half a kilometre below the top of the s.w. corner of the Moabite plateau, is Kh. edh-

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 359; Savignac: R. B. 46, pp. 402-404.

²⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 2, 359; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 60-62.

³⁾ Soar is located in the s.w. corner of the country, near the lower course of the W. el-Ḥesā by Albright: Annual VI, pp. 57-58; Dhorme: R. B. 40, p. 505, but it may perhaps be identified with Kh. Khāneq en-Našārā, cf. p. 66 below.

⁴⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 360; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 81-82.

⁵⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 20, 360.

⁶⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 242-251.

Dhubāb¹⁾. On the northern slopes of the hills there are a few springs from which the W. eṭ-Ṭaiyibeh²⁾ originates. The sides of the hills were terraced to prevent erosion and to preserve the scanty rainwater. Kh. edh-Dhubāb commands a view of the descent to the W. el-Ḥesā and to the Lisān.

6. Kh. Khāneq en-Naṣārā.

A short distance to the w.n.w. of Kh. edh-Dhubāb, on an isolated hill, is the site of Kh. Khāneq en-Naṣārā³⁾. The surrounding area was cultivated to supply the garrison of this frontier fortress in the s.w. corner of the Moabite plateau, with provisions.

7. Kh. Medīnet er-Rās.

Approximately 3.5 km. to the w.n.w. of Kh. edh-Dhubāb, on the top of the ridge of a completely isolated hill, is Kh. Medīnet er-Rās⁴⁾. Being the highest ridge in the south-western corner of the country, it has a clear view of the descent towards the Dead Sea.

These ancient fortresses at Kh. edh-Dhubāb, Kh. Khāneq en-Naṣārā, and Kh. Medīnet er-Rās protected the approach from the s.w. towards the plateau⁵⁾. Traces of additional sites from the Moabite era could have been washed away. It is clear that the Moabites erected a series of frontier fortresses on their southern and south-western boundaries. It is possible that some of the sites, mentioned in the O.T. and in the inscription of king Mesha⁶⁾, which cannot be located with certainty might have been in this part of the country. Musil⁶⁾ believes that חורנים⁷⁾ must be identified with el-'Araq near

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 260; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 86.

²⁾ cf. p. 55 above.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 84, 86.

⁴⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 72, 260; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 86-88.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 84.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 73, 75; cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 332.

⁷⁾ Is. 15 : 5; Jer. 48 : 3, 5, 34; cf. also Cooke: NSI, p. 14; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 213; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 350; Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 246;

the source of the W. eṭ-Taiyibeh and the seil en-Numeirah ¹⁾. In Is. 15 : 5-6 the "way of Horonaim" is mentioned before the "waters of Nimrim", which probably must be located in the neighbourhood of the seil en-Numeirah ²⁾. In Jer. 48 : 34 the names are mentioned in the same order, with the exception that the obscure apposition עֲגֵלַת שְׁלִשָּׁה is attached to חֹרֶנִּים. Whether עֲגֵלַת שְׁלִשָּׁה is the name of an independent town or whether it must be regarded as an apposition to either חֹרֶנִּים or צֶעַר ³⁾, referring to the cattle breeding in this area ⁴⁾, has still to be ascertained. It is, however, of no help in the fixing of the locality of the two sites. As in M.I. 32, the verb ירד is used in Jer. 48 : 5 in connection with חֹרֶנִּים. This is an indication that one has to "go down" from the highland to חֹרֶנִּים, which therefore could have been in the s.w. corner of the country, where the highland descends towards the Dead Sea, or on the slopes towards the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב. But all the cities to the n. of the Arnon, which Mesha^c recaptured and rebuilt were formerly inhabited by the Israelites, whereas אִשׁ בֶּת־וָק. dwelt in חֹרֶנִּים ⁵⁾. This may be an indication that it was not situated to the n. of the Arnon. We may therefore assume that חֹרֶנִּים was situated in the s. of the country. If this be true, it may be identified either with Kh. edh-Dhubâb or with Kh. Khâneq en-Naṣārā or with Kh. Medinet er-Râs. Perhaps we may identify it with Kh. edh-Dhubâb and לוֹחִית with Kh. Medinet er-Râs ⁶⁾. The road which passes Kh. edh-Dhubâb

Galling: Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels, p. 49 n. y; Volz: Jeremia, p. 412; Gray: Isaiah, p. 283.

¹⁾ cf. p. 55 above.

²⁾ cf. p. 56 above.

³⁾ In Is. 15 : 5 it is an apposition to צֶעַר.

⁴⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 74.

⁵⁾ M. I. 32; cf. Galling: Textbuch, p. 49; Cooke: NSI, pp. 6, 14; Vriezen-Hospers: Palestine Inscriptions, p. 18.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 72, 75; Contra Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 140 and Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 370-371. For the meaning of the name לוֹחִית, cf. Krausz: ZAW 1908, p. 247.

might once have been known as "the way of Horonaim", and from where it ascends the height towards Kh. Medînet er-Râs, it could have been called "the going up of Luhith"¹⁾. In spite of many efforts to localize צֶעֶר elsewhere in the country²⁾, it must be assumed that it was situated in the southwestern valley, near the Dead Sea³⁾. The only objection which can be raised against this localization is the absolute absence of any traces of a settlement in this vicinity during the Iron Age. Or should we identify it with Kh. Khâneq en-Naşârâ, which seems to have been צֶעֶרָה in the Iron Age?

8. R. Umm Suwâna.

There is a small Early Iron site, called R. Umm Suwâna⁴⁾, to the e. of Kh. Khâneq en-Naşârâ on the top of a hill on the northern side of the W. Umm 'Arâ'is. Perhaps this was the Moabite equivalent of the Bronze Age settlement at el-Muddowwerah to the w. of it⁵⁾.

9. R. 'Alendâ.

E.s.c. of R. Umm Suwâna, on the top of a rise, is the small ruined site of R. 'Alendâ⁶⁾. Of the ancient buildings on this site only a few traces are left.

Merely two or three of the five last-mentioned settlements bear definite traces of having been thoroughly fortified. Each of the other three had its own fortress, but as they were situated in a fertile, cultivated area, agriculture could have been their main interest. Round the fortresses there were clustered a number of agricultural settlements, which mainly relied on the fortified cities for their safety. In times of war

¹⁾ cf. Is. 15:5; Jer. 48:5; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 89.

²⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 343; Merrill: East of the Jordan, pp. 232-239; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 149-150.

³⁾ cf. Albright: Annual VI, pp. 57-58; Dhorme: R. B. 40, p. 505; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 466; Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 247.

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 92.

⁵⁾ cf. Glueck: OSJ, p. 116; Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 89, 92, 94.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 361, 366; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 90-91, 97.

these settlers, who had to fill the granaries of the country, used to flee from the rural districts in the fertile areas to the fortified cities.

10. *Medeibî'.*

About 6 km. n.n.w. of Maḥaiy¹⁾ lies Medeibî', an ancient walled fortress²⁾. Situated on the top of a high hill, about 1,000 m. above sea-level, it commands a view of Maḥaiy to the s.s.e. and of el-Mâhri to the n.n.e. The Moabites utilized the strategic position of Medeibî' by building on this site one of the most prominent of their chain of fortresses on their eastern border. Furthermore, they could cultivate the fertile valleys in the vicinity under the cover of this fortress³⁾.

11. *R. eṣ-Şireh.*

Several km. to the n.w. of Medeibî', on the top of a rise at the boundary of the cultivated land, is a small Rujm, known as R. eṣ-Şireh or Şiret el-Heirân⁴⁾. Commanding a wide field of vision, it was an ideal site for a fortification to guard the eastern boundary as well as the tracks leading from the Fejj el-'Aseiker towards the Moabite plateau⁵⁾.

12. *Q. Nâşer.*

To the n.n.e. of R. eṣ-Şireh is Q. Nâşer, situated on a rise overlooking a small Wādī on the eastern side⁶⁾. A short distance to the n.w. of it, at R. Nâşer, there are traces of a settlement from the same period, indicating how well the eastern frontier of the Moabite Kingdom was guarded. As the 2 sites were only 1 km. apart, they could have belonged to the same settlement, with Q. Nâşer as the main centre.

¹⁾ cf. p. 62 above.

²⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 6, 79-81, 367; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 66-68; XVIII-XIX, pp. 69-70.

³⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p; 80.

⁴⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 81; Savignac: R. B. 45, pp. 252, 255; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 71.

⁵⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 6, 367; Savignac: R. B. 45, p. 252; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 72.

⁶⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 72.

13. *R. el-Mâhri.*

A little more than 3 km. n.n.w. of Medeibi' on the top of a high ridge is the site of R. el-Mâhri overlooking the Wâdi on the eastern side of Q. Nâser¹⁾. It commands a view towards Medeibi' and Maḥaiy, about 9 km. from there. In the neighbourhood of R. el-Mâhri there were a large number of military posts²⁾, indicating once again that the access to the rich Moabite highland was well guarded against invaders from the eastern desert.

14. *R. Khushm eṣ-Şireh.*

A short distance to the e.e.n.e. of Medeibi' on the top of a hill, commanding a clear view over a large area, is R. Khushm eṣ-Şireh, also named R. Meḥbes³⁾. In the rainy season water could be obtained from the Wudyân, but in summer the inhabitants had to rely on water from cisterns. From here R. el-Mâhri, Medeibi' and Maḥaiy are visible. One of the main features of the chain of fortresses on the Moabite borders was that several of them could be observed at the same time, making it impossible for the enemy to penetrate unobserved to the highland.

15. *Kh. el-Meidân.*

About 9 km. n.n.e. of Kh. Medinet er-Râs⁴⁾ on a high hill below the western edge of the highland is the double site of Kh. el-Meidân⁵⁾. Both sites have the same name, one of them being on the south-eastern end of the top of the hill and the other on the north-western end. Commanding a clear view over the southern half of the Dead Sea and of the Lisân,

1) Musil: A. P. I, pp. 6, 81, 216, 367; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 70-71 and p. 70 fig. 33.

2) cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 367; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 71-72. In an area of approximately 3 km. square Glueck discovered the traces of at least 5 settlements from the Iron Age.

3) Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 72-73.

4) cf. p. 64 above.

5) Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 94-95.

it was one of the fortresses of the line of western defences of the Moabites. The garrison at Meidân built terraces on the lower slopes of the hill to cultivate it.

16. *Kh. et-Telisah.*

On several sites to the s. and s.e. of Kerak there are traces of ancient settlements ¹⁾, some of which may date back as far as the Iron Age or even the Bronze Age, eg. Kh. en-Neqqâz ²⁾, which is generally regarded as an Iron Age settlement. But Glueck did not find any Moabite shards on this site. Nearby, to the s. of Kerak, at Kh. et-Telisah, he found a few clear Moabite shards. Actual rests of Moabite fortified cities could not be traced in this vicinity, but judging from the few Iron Age shards we may assume that the Moabites did cultivate this area. All signs of these Moabite settlements could have been erased by subsequent inhabitants. There are indications that this was the fate of some fortresses elsewhere. Here in the centre of the country, where there was no need to build such strong fortresses as on the border, such erasure could have happened much more easily. These settlements may be regarded as "villages" ³⁾ of Kerak, to which the inhabitants who cultivated this fertile area ⁴⁾ would have fled in times of danger. It may be that the Biblical site *אֶלְיָס* must be localized somewhere in this vicinity ⁵⁾.

17. *el-Kerak.*

Several km. e.n.e. of el-Meidân is a ridge, named Umm et-Telaje ⁶⁾. On a platform, about 950 metres above sea-level ⁷⁾,

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 98-99.

²⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 45, 362; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 99.

³⁾ cf. Numb. 21:25; Taylor Prism III, 13.

⁴⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 115-116; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 44, 87, 360-361; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 98, 100.

⁵⁾ Is. 15:8; cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 365, 381; Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 310-311; Koehler: LVTL, p. 9; Borée: Die Alten Ortsnamen Palästinas, p. 54.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 45.

⁷⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 86; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 90.

on the n. side of this ridge, the invincible Kerak is situated ¹⁾. Being by nature almost inaccessible, the approach to Kerak was further obstructed by the digging of a dry ditch on the s.s.e., where the platform was connected with the ridge by means of a small neck. The Moabites even tried to bring water into the fortress by cutting a tunnel through the hill ²⁾. As the building area on the platform is restricted, the settlers from subsequent settlements were forced to build on the foundations of the previous buildings. In this process they cleared away the residues left behind by their predecessors or their conquerors. As a result of this repeated process of demolition, only a few traces of the Moabite civilization have been found in Kerak. And yet, Albright gathered the first collection of typical Moabite pottery at Kerak ³⁾.

el-Kerak is generally pointed out as the site of the Moabite city קִיר מוֹאָב ⁴⁾, which, according to the Biblical tradition, may be described as a city of many names. Perhaps we may assume that the Israelites at first indicated it as קִיר מוֹאָב ⁵⁾: the wall of Moab, i.e. the fortress of Moab ⁶⁾. Another name, by which it could be designated is קִיר הַדָּשׁ ⁷⁾: the new wall, i.e. the new fortress or city ⁸⁾. Afterwards the pronunciation and the meaning of this name was slightly altered to coin

¹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 81-129; Bliss: PEFQ 1895, pp. 217-220; Dowling: PEFQ 1896, pp. 327-332; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 26, 45-49, 53-54; Albright: Basor 14, pp. 10-12; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 419; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 4; XVIII-XIX, p. 98.

²⁾ cf. Albright: Basor 14, p. 10.

³⁾ Albright: Basor 14, p. 11; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 4, XVIII-XIX, pp. 98, 100; The River Jordan, p. 85.

⁴⁾ This identification is based on the text of the Targum which reads כִּירְכָא; cf. also Musil: A. P. I, p. 58; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 418.

⁵⁾ Is. 15 : 1.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 175 below.

⁷⁾ The Lxx version of Jer. 48 : 31, 36 (Lxx 31 : 31, 36) has *kiradas*, which may go back to the Hebrew קִיר הַדָּשׁ; cf. also Abel: Geogr. II, p. 418; Koehler: LVTL, p. 838; Davis and Gehman: W. D. B., pp. 345-346.

⁸⁾ The translation of קִיר הַדָּשׁ into Greek would be *neapolis*.

the sobriquet קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת ¹⁾, קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת ²⁾ or קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת ³⁾ or קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת ⁴⁾. According to Borrée ⁵⁾ and Weiss ⁶⁾ the name קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת is related to the word הָרֶשֶׁת : sun, referring to an ancient sun-worship in this city and perhaps also in Moab. But the meaning of this name can more easily be explained by means of the word הָרֶשֶׁת : potshard ⁷⁾. The strongly fortified קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת of Moab was but a mere קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת , a city of potshards, according to the prophets of Judah. This contemptuous change took place at the time of strained relations between Judah and Moab, when Judah's desire for vengeance on Moab was rampant ⁸⁾. If we are to judge from the text of the Lxx, the pronunciation קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת was still used by Isaiah. The alteration in the spelling of the M.T. of Is. 15-16 came either as a result of the influence of Jer. 48 : 31, 36 or perhaps was carried through in consequence of the spelling of the name in the epilogue of Is. 16 : 14. The identification of קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת ⁹⁾, mentioned in M.I. 24, with קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת must be rejected ¹⁰⁾.

18. *el-Miṣna.*

Three km. e. n. e. of er-Rabbah ¹¹⁾, to the e. of the King's Highway on a low hill, is the site of el-Miṣna ¹²⁾. It is one of

¹⁾ Jer. 48 : 31, 36.

²⁾ Is. 16 : 11.

³⁾ Is. 16 : 7.

⁴⁾ II Ki. 3 : 25.

⁵⁾ Borrée: *Die Alten Ortsnamen Palästinas*, pp. 90, 105.

⁶⁾ Weiss: *Die Teofore Geografiese name van die O.T.*, pp. 39-40, 128. In this respect one could also refer to הָרֶשֶׁת הָרֶשֶׁת (Judg. 1 : 35). If this derivation is correct קִיר הָרֶשֶׁת would be the equivalent of עִיר שָׁמֶשׁ (Josh. 19 : 41) or בֵּית שָׁמֶשׁ (Judg. 1 : 33; I Sam. 6 : 9, 12, 19.).

⁷⁾ cf. Abel: *Geogr.* II, p. 418; Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 838.

⁸⁾ Is. 25 : 10-12; Jer. 48.

⁹⁾ cf. Abel: *Geogr.* II, p. 418; Rudolph: *Jeremia*, p. 247; Tristram: *Moab*, pp. 71, 149; Cook: *NSI*, p. 7.

¹⁰⁾ cf. pp. 78-80 below.

¹¹⁾ cf. Glueck: *Annual XIV*, p. 62 and p. 102, pl. 16.

¹²⁾ Glueck: *Annual XIV*, pp. 62-63 and p. 37 fig. 15a.

the few sites in Transjordan that were inhabited in both the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. The Iron Age settlement stretched from the 13th century to the 9th or 8th century B.C. If עַר¹⁾ was not situated on the bank of the Arnon, it could have been located on the site of el-Mišna. Although there are no definite traces of a settlement which might have been the residential city of the Moabite king, some indications of an Iron Age settlement have been found on this site. עַר is frequently identified with er-Rabbah²⁾, but to judge from the lack of Iron Age shards, there was no settlement at er-Rabbah during this period³⁾. This ancient identification of er-Rabbah, alternatively known as Rabbath-Moab or Areopolis, with the Biblical עַר, originated from the false identification of Ares with the homonymic עַר. There is, however, no affinity between the two names. The data from the O.T. does not clarify the problem concerning the locality of עַר. Being one of the prominent cities of Moab, it is mentioned with קִיר in Is. 15 : 1. According to Numb. 21 : 15, 28 and 22 : 36⁴⁾ it was situated near the river Arnon or the brooks of the Arnon. In Dt. 2 : 9, 18 it is stated that Ar, the possession of the children of Lot, was situated to the s. of the Arnon.

19. *el-Medeiyineh.*

Where the W. el-Lejjun flows into the W. el-Môjib, there are the remains of an ancient fortress, named el-Medeiyineh⁵⁾.

¹⁾ cf. Numb. 21 : 28; Is. 15 : 1.

²⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 124; Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 402; Ewald: History V, p. 236; Delitzsch: Isaiah I, p. 323; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 209; Davis and Gehman: W: D. B., p. 36. For a description of the site of er-Rabbah, cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 370-373; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 62 and p. 102 pl. 16. Binns: Numbers, p. 142, rejects this identification.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 62; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 248.

⁴⁾ Read עַר instead of עִיר, cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 702.

⁵⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 229-230; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 36, 52-53 and p. 53 fig. 22.

Musil ¹⁾ and Abel ²⁾ identified this site with עַר. Although it is impossible to fix the locality of עַר with absolute certainty on account of the description in the O.T., its position does correspond to a certain extent with that of el-Medeiyneh, where the site, which is by nature inaccessible, was transformed artificially into an invincible fortress ³⁾. Indeed, if עַר is to be localized directly on the s. bank of the Arnon, it may be identified with el-Medeiyneh. But if it was some distance from the river, el-Miṣna seems to be the most likely site.

20. *Kh. Bālû'ah.*

To the n. of Kh. el-Medeiyneh, in the fork, where the W. el-Ḳurri flows into the W. el-Bālû'ah ⁴⁾, is the site of Kh. Bālû'ah ⁵⁾. In building a fortress on this site, the Moabites safeguarded the crossing of the King's Highway over the river Arnon ⁶⁾.

21. *Kh. Miṣ'ar.*

Kh. Miṣ'ar lies to the n. of Kh. Bālû'ah, on the right bank of the W. Jedeirah, where it flows into the W. Freiwân ⁷⁾. On the other side of the W. Jedeirah, opposite Kh. Miṣ'ar, there are traces of another Iron Age settlement, named Freiwân ⁸⁾. These residues may be regarded as belonging to the same settlement, which was a "double city" ⁹⁾. Traces of

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 332 n. 1 and cf. pp. 369, 381 n. 4.

²⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, p. 351.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 52-53.

⁴⁾ After the confluence it is known as seil es-Sqefat, cf. R. B. 41, p. 417.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 31 above; Tristram: Moab, p. 139; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 138, 146, 376; Horsfeld et Vincent: R.B. 41, pp. 417-421; Crowfoot: PEFQ 1934, pp. 76, 78, 80-82; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 16-18, 55-56 and plates 20: 20, 22.

⁶⁾ Horsfeld et Vincent: R. B. 41, p. 421.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 53; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 58.

⁸⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 58.

⁹⁾ It could also have been two separate settlements, one on each side of the Wâdī, cf. p. 82 below.

a few so-called "double cities" have been found in Transjordan. If names like *קָרְיָתִים* and *אֵילִים*, are to be regarded as dual forms, which the present author is prepared to doubt, they could have referred to such "double cities".

22. *Q. Abū el-Kharaq.*

On the eastern boundary of Moab, to the n.e. of Kh. el-Medeyineh, there are the remains of a strongly built frontier fortress named *Q. Abū el-Kharaq*¹⁾. Situated on a hill in an unarable region, it was above all a military post, guarding the eastern boundary. Provisions were supplied by other settlements, while cisterns were cut into the rock for water supplies.

23. *Q. el-ʿĀl.*

Approximately 5 km. n. n.e. of *Q. Abū el-Kharaq*, on a flat ridge of the north-western slope of the eastern frontier-mountain *Sbejbân*²⁾, is *Q. el-ʿĀl*³⁾. Situated to the s. of the *Seil eš-Šefei*, a major tributary of the *W. el-Môjib*, the Moabite fortress on this site guarded the access to the fertile areas to the n. and the s. of the *W. el-Môjib*. It was one of the most important fortresses of the eastern border defence system. The majority of the police and military posts in this vicinity were visible from here, and all of them could have been controlled from *Q. el-ʿĀl*.

24. *es-Sâliyah.*

North of *Q. Abū el-Kharaq*, on the northern side of the *W. Sâliyah*, is the site of *es-Sâliyah*⁴⁾. Situated in a fertile

¹⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 33, 248, 328; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 103-105 and p. 104 fig. 38; Wright and Filson: WHAB, p. 65 fig. 45.

²⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 248; Abel: Geogr. I, Carte X under the name *Subeibân*.

³⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 145-146, 248-250, 388, 394 n. 3; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 34-36; XVIII-XIX, pp. 101-103, 105 and fig. 36, 37.

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 34-35 and p. 35 fig. 14, p. 92 pl. 6; cf. XVIII-XIX, pp. 103, 117.

district with the plain of el-Kûra to the n. of it ¹⁾, es-Sâliyah was dependent upon the cultivation of the arable soil. Whenever a fortress was situated in a fertile area, the Moabites devoted themselves to the cultivation of the soil, because the cultivated districts had to meet the needs of the garrisons in barren and inhospitable regions. A decorated Moabitic vase, resembling the Phoenician type, has been found at es-Sâliyah ²⁾. The polished pottery with their criss-cross lines show the characteristics of the Early Iron Age ceramic ³⁾. es-Sâliyah was the continuation of the line of eastern frontier fortresses to the north.

When the children of Israel pitched their camp on the other side of the Arnon, they were in the *קְדִמֹת מִדְבָּר* ⁴⁾. This phrase can be translated "the eastern desert", but as a Moabite city *קְדִמֹת* is also mentioned ⁵⁾, it seems more likely that the name *קְדִמֹת מִדְבָּר* designated the dry region to the e. of the city *קְדִמֹת*, which was located to the n. of the Arnon on the eastern boundary of the country. The children of Israel did not enter the territory of Moab, i.e. the city of *קְדִמֹת*, but pitched their camp to the e. of it in the *קְדִמֹת מִדְבָּר*. The city of *קְדִמֹת* could have been situated on the site of es-Sâliyah. Not only in this vicinity, but also in the entire Moabite territory to the n. of the Arnon, es-Sâliyah is the most eastern site, at which traces of an Iron Age settlement have been found, and therefore it could have been named *קְדִמֹת*.

25. Kh. el-Jemeil.

Kh. el-Jemeil lies 5 km. n.w. of es-Sâliyah near the watershed of the seil eş-Şefei and the W. el-Wālā ⁶⁾. This area is a fertile

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 110-330; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 122.

²⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 14 and fig. 5.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 18 and pl. 20: 16. The same type of ceramic has been found at Kh. Bālû'ah, cf. p. 73 n. 5 and Albright: Annual IV, p. 11; XII, p. 67.

⁴⁾ Numb. 21: 13; Dt. 2: 26.

⁵⁾ cf. Josh. 13: 18; 21: 37; I Chron. 6: 64; Noth: Josua², p. 129.

⁶⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 246, 253; Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 144;

agricultural district and even to the e. in the direction of Umm er-Rasas the soil was cultivated. Being one of the chain of fortresses on the eastern boundary, el-Jemeil helped to guard the crops. With sound reason it is identified with **בֵּית זְמַיִל**, mentioned in Jer. 48 : 23.

26. 'Arâ'ir.

To the n. of the W. el-Môjib is the site of the present Arabic village 'Arâ'ir ¹⁾. To the w. of it, on a small hill, there are ancient ruins, among which the rests of an Iron Age settlement were found. The hill, which is about 750 m. high, suddenly slopes towards the W. el-Môjib with the result that the ruins of 'Arâ'ir look down into the gorge of the river ²⁾. For their water the inhabitants of this site were dependent on the W. el-Môjib, although some of the numerous cisterns could have been cut out by the Moabites or their contemporaries ³⁾. After crossing the Wâdî, the King's Highway passed near 'Arâ'ir towards the north. It was of the utmost importance to station a strong garrison at 'Arâ'ir to safeguard this crossing as well as the other roads in the vicinity. Furthermore, from time to time marauding bands tried to raid the crops of the fertile valley of 'Arâ'ir, which had to be protected. The Biblical name **עֲרוֹעֵר** is preserved in the recent name. The modern pronunciation resembles that of the Moabites more closely than that of the Masoretic Text ⁴⁾. The situation of the ruins at 'Arâ'ir corresponds to the Biblical description of **עֲרוֹעֵר**. According to Dt. 2 : 36; 4 : 48; Josh. 12 : 2; 13 : 9, 16 it was situated on the **שְׂפַת-נַחַל אַרְנוֹן**, i.e. on the slope of the hill that looks down into the gorge of the Arnon (Dt. 3 : 12).

Cheyne: E. B., pp. 555-556; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 272; Volz: Jeremia, p. 245; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 36-37 and fig. 15; XVIII-XIX, pp. 101, 118, 121-122; Koehler: LVTL, p. 124.

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 329-332; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 49-51 and p. 91 pl. 11.

²⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 144-147; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 130-131.

³⁾ cf. M.I. 23.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 164 below.

In the Onomasticon of Eusebius it is stated that Aroer was situated on the brow of the Arnon ¹⁾.

27. *Dhībān*.

Approximately 5 km. n.w. of 'Arâ'ir ²⁾ and nearly 20 km. to the e. of the Dead Sea ³⁾, situated on two hills, are the ruins of Dhībān ⁴⁾. The two hills do not rise much above the surrounding highland of el-Ḳura. To the s.w. and the w. the hills are cut off from the highland by the W. Dhībān ⁵⁾, while the narrow tel'et el-Bakar ⁶⁾ separates it on the northern and north-eastern sides. Only the south-eastern flank of the northern hill and the eastern flank of the southern hill are connected with the highland ⁷⁾. By the digging of a ditch 15 m. deep through the narrow neck which combined the two hills, the northern hill was isolated entirely from the highland. From a strategic point of view it had a more favourable situation than the southern hill, which was vulnerable on the eastern side. It commands a clear view to all directions, except to the s., as the southern hill is about 30 m. higher than the northern, which rises about 720 m. above sea-level. To judge from the ruins, the two hills must have been intensively inhabited during various periods ⁸⁾. It is, however, impossible to indicate the extent of a settlement in a specific period, because the

¹⁾ cf. Cheyne: E. B., p. 317; Musil A. P. I, p. 333 n. 2.

²⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 51; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 305.

³⁾ Galling: Biblisches Reallexicon, p. 128;

⁴⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 146-152; Schick: ZDPV 1879, pp. 8-9; Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, pp. 57-79; Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, pp. 63-67; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 332, 376-380; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 51; Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 304-305; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 115; Winnet: Basor 125, pp. 7-8.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 115; Musil: A. P. I, p. 376; Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, p. 63; Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, p. 64.

⁶⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 376.

⁷⁾ cf. the sketch plan in ZDPV 1879, opposite p. 2 and in PEFQ 1913, p. 57 and cf. also Musil: A. P. I, p. 377 and Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, pp. 59-60.

⁸⁾ Pottery rests from the Iron Age have been found by Albright (Basor 49, p. 28; 51, p. 12), Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 115, cf. XIV, p. 51) and Tushingham (Basor 133, pp. 21-25, cf. fig. 10.).

inhabitants of subsequent settlements frequently re-used the building material or cleared away the ruins to lay their foundations on the maiden soil ¹⁾. We may assume that the majority of the remains which can be observed on the two hills originated in post-Moabitic times ²⁾. Though the southern hill is somewhat higher than the northern one, it was more difficult to defend, and we may therefore assume that the first Moabite settlers occupied the northern hill ³⁾, perhaps incorporating the north-western summit of the southern hill in the defence system of their settlement ⁴⁾. From here a hostile army, especially one coming from the s., could be spotted from afar, and when this outpost ran the risk of being overwhelmed, the watchmen could easily have been transferred to the fortified city on the northern hill ⁵⁾. We cannot trace the line of the walls of the Moabite city, as the excavations at Dhībān until now have not revealed any rests of the Moabite city wall ⁶⁾. It is impossible even to indicate which part of the n. hill was inhabited first ⁷⁾, or where king Mesha^c erected the buildings referred to in his inscription ⁸⁾.

Following his victories over Israel, Mesha^c built קרחה ⁹⁾, in which he made the temple of Chemosh ¹⁰⁾. Schick ¹¹⁾ is of opinion

¹⁾ cf. Tristram Moab, p. 149; Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, pp. 59, 61, 75-76; Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, p. 63.

²⁾ cf. Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, p. 64; Gallig: Biblisches Reallexicon, p. 128; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 115; Winnet: Basor 125, pp. 14-20; Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 7-25. Contra Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, pp. 64-65.

³⁾ Contra Schick: ZDPV 1879, p. 8, Guthe according to Thiersch ZDPV 1914, p. 64 and Musil: A. P. I, p. 377.

⁴⁾ cf. Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, pp. 60-61; Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, pp. 63-64.

⁵⁾ cf. Winnet: Basor 125, pp. 7-8; Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 25-26.

⁶⁾ Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 17-18; cf. also Winnet: Basor 125, p. 12 fig. 2 and p. 13 fig. 3.

⁷⁾ cf. Mackenzie: PEFQ 1913, p. 70; Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, p. 64.

⁸⁾ cf. M.I. 3, 21-25. Perhaps it was in the n.e. area, cf. Morton: Basor 140, p. 6.

⁹⁾ M.I. 21.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 3.

¹¹⁾ Schick: ZDPV 1879, p. 8; cf. Gallig: Biblisches Reallexicon, p. 48 n.g.

that Mesha^c expanded the boundaries of Dibon northward, so as to enclose the northern hill, which was not inhabited until then and קרחָה was the name of this new settlement. But the first Moabite settlement on this site started on the northern hill and the southern hill seems only to have been incorporated in the defence system of the city. It is uncertain whether the name קרחָה indicates that there was no settlement on this site before the time of Mesha^c ¹⁾. The verb בנה could be used by Mesha^c in the meaning "to rebuild" ²⁾ and it does not necessarily denote that Mesha^c erected the buildings. His building operations could have been mere restorations or renovations and extensions of existing buildings that were dilapidated. For the first time in the history of the city he commanded the cutting out of cisterns ³⁾.

Another problem concerning קרחָה is whether it was a section of Dibon, closed in by the walls of Dibon, as for instance Sion was a part of Jerusalem. According to Gressmann ⁴⁾ Cook ⁵⁾, Vriezen and Hospers ⁶⁾ קרחָה is a proper name, and perhaps it could have been the name of the residential city of king Mesha^c in the district of Dibon. In this new city he built a temple for Chemosh, and in it he erected the inscribed stone as a votive stele. But this would imply that the stele was afterwards moved from here to Dibon, where it was discovered. Both Abel ⁷⁾ and Rudolph ⁸⁾ identify קרחָה with el-Kerak ⁹⁾, the residential city of Mesha^c. But should we then regard it as mere chance that the stone, which was erected in קרחָה, where the temple was built, was brought back to Dibon, the city of Mesha^c, the Dibonite? As the stone was discovered in Dibon, we may assume that it was erected

¹⁾ cf. Is. 15 : 2 ?.

²⁾ cf. also Numb. 32 : 34; Josh. 6 : 26; Am. 9 : 14.

³⁾ M.I. 23-25.

⁴⁾ Gressmann: A.O.T.A.T., p. 440 n. h.

⁵⁾ Cook: NSI, p. 7.

⁶⁾ Vriezen and Hospers: Pal. Inscr., p. 19.

⁷⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, p. 418.

⁸⁾ Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 247.

⁹⁾ cf. pp. 69-71 above.

in this city¹). Mesha^c built the temple in which the votive stele was erected on a bald and at that moment uninhabited site, known as קרחה. Even if the temple was built in a part of the city that was previously occupied²), it is still possible that the site could have been known as קרחה, because the buildings, e.g. the temple, could have been ruined during the long Israelite occupation which preceded the revolt of Mesha^c. Whether Is. 15 : 2 is a direct reference to this original name קרחה is uncertain. The pronunciation of the name could have been קְרַחָה as in Is. 15 : 2, but it could also have been קְרַחָה or קְרַחָה³).

In Is. 15 : 9 the name דִּיבֹן is changed to דִּימֹן on account of the alliteration with דָּם⁴). In later times, when Judah despised the Moabites, this alternative name was deliberately transformed to מְדִיָּן⁵).

28. 'Aleiyân.

To the n.e. of Dhībân, on the top of a high hill, lies the extensive ruin of 'Aleiyân⁶), which was another link in the chain of Moabite fortresses on the eastern boundary. The identification of 'Aleiyân with חִלּוֹן⁷) cannot be approved. An identification with יַחֲזֵק⁸) seems more probable. When Israel asked Sihon, king of the Amorites, for permission to pass through his land, he did not trust the word of Moses and summoned his

¹) Winnet: Basor 125, p. 9, assumes that Mesha^c changed the name of Dibon to קרחה. But would Mesha^c, the Dibonite, have done it?

²) cf. Thiersch: ZDPV 1914, p. 64. But cf. also p. 79 n. 2.

³) cf. יַחֲזֵק or יַחֲזֵק, cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 7.

⁴) Musil: A. P. I. pp. 157, 170 n. 1 identifies Dimon with Kh. Dimne, s.w. of el-Kerak.

⁵) Jer. 48 : 2; cf. also Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 238 n. c; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 372. From this transformation it was but one step towards the pun in Is. 25 : 10b.

⁶) Musil: A. P. I, p. 245; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 116-117.

⁷) Jer. 48 : 21 cf. Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 144.

⁸) Numb. 21 : 23; Dt. 2 : 32; Josh. 13 : 18; 21 : 36; Judg. 11 : 20; I Chron. 6 : 63; Is. 15 : 4; Jer. 48 : 21, 34; M.I. 19-21; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 107, 122 n. 1, identifies it with Umm el-Walid, but it was

people to fight Israel ¹). Sihon trekked from Heshbon southward along the King's Highway towards Kh. Libb, where he turned in a south-easterly direction towards the camp of the Israelites ²) in the *מִדְבָּר קְדֵמוֹת*, to the n. of the Arnon ³). Hence the Israelites went to meet the advancing army of Sihon, and at *יִי* the 2 armies clashed and Sihon was defeated. This could easily have taken place in the vicinity of the modern 'Aleiyân. The identification of *יִי* with 'Aleiyân is in accordance with the other information concerning *יִי*. Situated some distance from Heshbon and Elealeh ⁴) it is in the *מִישֹׁר* ⁵) and like Kedemot a Levitical city in the southern part of the territory of Reuben ⁶). Yet it is not too far from Dibon to be incorporated in the district of Dibon ⁷). Furthermore, during the Iron Age there was a settlement at this site.

29. *er-Remeil*.

On a high cone, overlooking the W. er-Remeil from the s., is the site of er-Remeil in the middle of a fertile agricultural district ⁸). Having a perennial supply of water at its disposal and commanding a clear view of the vicinity, it was an ideal site for a strong fortress. It is one of the most perfectly preserved examples, if not the most perfect, of an Iron Age

not occupied during the Iron Age, cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 10-12. Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 247 locates *יִי* at Kh. Iskander, but on this site there was a settlement only during the Bronze Age, but not during the Iron Age, cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 127-129. If *יִי* was situated close to the King's Highway, it is more probable that it must be identified with R. Mleḥleb, cf. p. 82 below. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 354 identifies it with Jalûl, cf. p. 88 below.

¹) Numb. 21 : 23; Dt. 2 : 32; Judg. 11 : 20.

²) cf. p. 85 below.

³) Dt. 2 : 26; Numb. 21 : 13; cf. also p. 75 above.

⁴) Is. 15 : 4; Jer. 48 : 34.

⁵) Jer. 48 : 21.

⁶) Josh. 21 : 36; I Chron. 6 : 63. The 2 other cities of the Levites, viz. Bezer and Sibma, were situated in the n. of the country, cf. pp. 91, 92 below.

⁷) M.I. 20-21.

⁸) Musil: A. P. I, pp. 13, 251.

fortress in Moab ¹⁾. It has been identified with Kedemot, but quite correctly Abel has disproved this ²⁾.

30. *‘Aliyā*.

The 2 ruins of *‘Aliyā* are situated s. w.w. of er-Remeil ³⁾. Large numbers of Iron Age shards were found on the n. of the two hills. Situated not far from the well-fortified er-Remeil, the settlement of *‘Aliyā* could have been controlled by it.

31. *el-Kôm*.

About 3 km. s.w. of er-Remeil is el-Kôm ⁴⁾. The remains of the ancient buildings on this site have practically disappeared, because the inhabitants of the present village nearby used the stones of the ancient walls for building material ⁵⁾.

32. *R. Abū Sighân*.

On the s. side of the W. el-Wālā, almost due n. of Dhībân, is R. Abū Sighân ⁶⁾. Situated on a high hill it guarded the precipitous descent of the King's Highway to the river ⁷⁾.

33. *R. Mleḥleb*.

R. Mleḥleb is situated on a high hill on the n. side of the W. el-Wālā, to the w. of el-Kôm ⁸⁾. It occupied a strategic position, guarding the ford, where the King's Highway crossed the W. el-Wālā. Like R. Abū Sighân it originally was but a mere post guarding the crossing of the river, but unlike its neighbouring town it afterwards became a large settlement.

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 118-121 and p. 122 fig. 46.

²⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 217 n. 2.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 117-118.

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 123.

⁵⁾ cf. also Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 126, 135.

⁶⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 124.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 125-126.

⁸⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 244; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 125-126.

34. *Kh. el-Ḳurējāt.*

The extensive ruins of Kh. el-Ḳurējāt are to be found n. of seil Heidān and to the s. of Kh. 'Aṭārūs¹⁾. Frequently this settlement is identified with קְרִיָּתִים²⁾, but this city must be located nearer to Mādebā³⁾. It seems better to identify Kh. el-Ḳurējāt with קְרִיָּת⁴⁾. It is uncertain whether קְרִיָּת⁵⁾, the city of streets⁶⁾, must be identified with קְרִיָּת⁷⁾.

35. *Kh. 'Aṭārūs.*

On the western side of the jebel 'Aṭārūs lie the shapeless ruins of Kh. 'Aṭārūs⁸⁾. Judging from the numerous Iron Age shards found here, there must have been an extensive settlement on this site in the Moabitic era. Less than 3 km. n.e. of Kh. 'Aṭārūs situated on the top of a high hill, is R. 'Aṭārūs⁹⁾ where a number of Iron Age shards have been found. It probably was a military post of Kh. 'Aṭārūs, which frequently had to repulse the Israelite tribes from the north. It could have originated in the period when inhabitants of Kh. 'Aṭārūs started to cultivate the surrounding area¹⁰⁾. Situated in the area where the Moabites and the Israelite tribes continually struggled for supremacy, it was of the utmost importance for the inhabitants of this site to observe the aggressor from afar. From this post that could easily be done.

¹⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 289; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 133, 362.

²⁾ Josh. 13 : 19; Numb. 32 : 37; Jer. 48 : 1; Hes. 25 : 9; M. I. 10; cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 147 n. 3; Dhorme: R. B. 40, p. 511.

³⁾ cf. p. 88 below.

⁴⁾ Jer. 48 : 24; M. I. 13; Noth: Josua², p. 79. Am. 2 : 2 does not refer to this city (contra Robinson: Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten, p. 79).

⁵⁾ Numb. 22 : 39; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 421 identifies it with el-Ḳeryē, 12 km. n.e. of Dhībān.

⁶⁾ cf. Krausz: ZAW 1908, pp. 268-269.

⁷⁾ cf. p. 85 below.

⁸⁾ Tristram Moab, pp. 118, 283, 285-287; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 134, 236-237; 395-396 and fig. 189; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 255; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 135.

⁹⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 135-136.

¹⁰⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 134.

The name עֲטָרֹת ¹⁾ is preserved in the recent name 'Aṭārūs and Kh. 'Aṭārūs is generally identified with it ²⁾). עֲטָרֹת שׁוֹפָן is mentioned in Numb. 32 : 35 as one of the cities of the tribe of Gad. The site of this place has not yet been located ³⁾. Instead of שׁוֹפָן the Samaritan Pentateuch reads שָׁפִים, while the Syrian translation has שׁוֹפָם. Both of these variant renderings may perhaps be connected with the שָׁפִם, mentioned in I Chron. 7 : 12, 15 and I Chron. 26 : 6. Van Selms ⁴⁾ regards these שָׁפִם as a group of subordinated strangers, who had no legal rights and were dependent on the Benjaminites, together with whom they are mentioned. It seems as though a similar group of שָׁפִם were connected with the tribe of Gad and they might have inhabited שָׁפִם עֲטָרֹת ⁵⁾, which can be identified with R. 'Aṭārūs.

36. Kh. Umm Laḥwad.

The insignificant and completely destroyed site of Kh. Umm Laḥwad is situated to the e. n.e. of R. 'Aṭārūs on the eastern side of the W. Abū Ḥesheib ⁶⁾. Perhaps this was a mere guarding post in Moabitic times.

37. Kh. el-Hûmeh.

To the n. n.e. of Kh. Umm Laḥwad is the featureless site of Kh. el-Hûmeh ⁷⁾. Situated on the w. slope of the highland at about 725 m. above sea-level, it can be regarded as a military post on the western boundary.

¹⁾ Numb. 32 : 3, 34; M. I. 10-11.

²⁾ Tristram: Moab, p. 285; Musil: A. P. I, 399 n. 1; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 255; Koehler: LVTL, p. 698.

³⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, p. 256; Koehler: LVTL, p. 698.

⁴⁾ Van Selms: I Kronieken, pp. 118, 120, 125, 163.

⁵⁾ Perhaps the reading with final ך must be preferred, though the ך of the Lxx *sofar* can easier be declared as a misreading of ך.

⁶⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 136.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 236; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 136.

38. *Kh. Libb.*

Kh. Libb lies almost due e. of Kh. el-Hûmeh on a large, flat hill in the middle of a fertile agricultural district ¹⁾. The King's Highway, which traversed Moab, passed to the w. of Kh. Libb, while the road to Kh. el-Medeiyineh on the W. eth-Themed ²⁾ branched off nearby ³⁾. The identification of Kh. Libb with לִבְיָה ⁴⁾ cannot be approved, because לִבְיָה was situated further away to the s.e. of the country ⁵⁾. Perhaps we may identify Kh. Libb with קְרַיִת הַצֹּדֵת, which must have been near the road, for Balak and Balaam would have gone n. along the King's Highway towards Pisgah ⁶⁾.

39. *Q. ez-Za'ferân.*

Approximately 10 to 12 km. to the e. of Kh. Libb is a group of low hills with the ruins of ancient settlements. Two of these hills, almost 1 km. apart, are both called Q. ez-Za'ferân ⁷⁾. The main settlement in this area was situated on the northern hill. The settlements on the other hills seem to have been unfortified. During times of war the inhabitants of these sites, who were mainly interested in agriculture, could have taken refuge in the metropolis on the northern hill. This site is identified by Abel ⁸⁾ with קְרַמֹּת ⁹⁾, which is rather to be located in the s.e. of the country ¹⁰⁾.

40. *Kh. el-Medeiyineh.*

On an isolated hill on the northern side of the W. eth-Themed is a large and clearly marked ruin, called Kh. el-

¹⁾ Palmer: PEFQ 1871, p. 71; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 112, 126; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 32.

²⁾ cf. p. 85 below.

³⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 112.

⁴⁾ De Vaux: Vivrer et Penser I, p. 20.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 81 above.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 52 above.

⁷⁾ Musil A. P. I, p. 106; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 15, 30-31.

⁸⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 217, 415.

⁹⁾ Josh. 13: 18; 21: 37; I Chron. 6: 64 (79).

¹⁰⁾ Dt. 2: 26; cf. p. 75 above.

Medeiyineh ¹⁾. This settlement may be regarded as the continuation of the line of frontier fortresses along the e. border of Moab. It is identified with מִתְנָה ²⁾. It may be possible that בְּאֵר ³⁾ was not far from here, if, indeed, it was not located on the same site as מִתְנָה ⁴⁾.

41. *Kh. el-Herī.*

To the n. of Kh. el-Medeiyineh, on the top of a steep hill, is Kh. el-Herī, overlooking the W. el-Herī from the south ⁵⁾. Though it is situated somewhat to the w. of the eastern frontier defence-system, it must be regarded as a frontier fortress, guarding the crops of the fertile area to the s. of it.

42. *Kh. ed-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh.*

North-west of Kh. el-Herī, is Kh. ed-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh, which was inhabited during the Iron Age ⁶⁾. Musil ⁷⁾ identified עֵלְמֶן דְּבִלְתִּים ⁸⁾, also named בֵּית דְּבִלְתִּים ⁹⁾, with Deleilat el-Gharbiye. But at this site there was no settlement during the Iron Age ¹⁰⁾, and therefore it seems more probable that it must be identified with Kh. ed-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh ¹¹⁾, which was not far from Deleilat el-Gharbiye.

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 289-299; Glueck: Basor 51, pp. 10-12; Annual XIV, pp. 13-14; cf. also pp. 61, 72 above and Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 13-22.

²⁾ Numb. 21 : 18-19; cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 381.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 16. In Is. 15 : 8 it is called בְּאֵר אֵילִים.

⁴⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 318 n. 11; Abel: Geogr. I, p. 461; II, p. 217; Koehler: LVTL, p. 105 and Glueck: Basor 51, p. 10.

⁵⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 106; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 12.

⁶⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 32.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 253 n. 5; cf. also p. 251 and Koehler: LVTL, p. 124.

⁸⁾ Numb. 33 : 46.

⁹⁾ Jer. 48 : 22; M. I. 30 (בֵּית דְּבִלְתִּין).

¹⁰⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 137.

¹¹⁾ Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 242, 269; but cf. Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 245.

43. *Ma'in.*

About 8 km. s.w. of Mādebā¹⁾ on the e. slope of the ridge known as Sefa²⁾, lie the extensive ruins of Ma'in³⁾. On account of the intensive cultivation and re-settlement of this site in post-Moabitic times⁴⁾, the only traces of the Moabite settlement which have been preserved on this site, are a number of shards and the name of this site. The Moabite name of this site was **בֵּית בַּעַל מְעוֹן**⁵⁾, which was abbreviated to **בַּעַל מְעוֹן**⁶⁾ or even **בֵּית מְעוֹן**⁷⁾. **בעלמעני**⁸⁾, who was a distinguished personage in the palace of Jeroboam II, king of Israel, might have been a native of **בֵּית בַּעַל מְעוֹן**⁹⁾.

44. *Kh. et-Teim.*

Kh. et-Teim lies to the e. n.e. of Ma'in, in the middle of a fertile agricultural district¹⁰⁾. Judging from the ruins and shards from the Iron Age, this must have been a settlement of vast extent. Burckhardt¹¹⁾ identifies it with **קְרִיתִים**¹²⁾, while Noth¹³⁾ thinks this must have been the site of **בֵּית דִּבְלָתִים**. Both these identifications must however be rejected¹⁴⁾.

¹⁾ cf. Noth: Josua², p. 79; Koehler: LVTI, p. 124.

²⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 316-318; Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 139; Musil: A. P. I, p. 397; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 33. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 259.

³⁾ De Vaux: R. B. 47, pp. 227-258 and plates 11-16.

⁴⁾ Josh. 13 : 17; M. I. 30.

⁵⁾ Numb. 32 : 38; I Chron. 5 : 8; Hes. 25 : 9; M.I. 9.

⁶⁾ Jer. 48 : 23.

⁷⁾ Numb. 32 : 3; cf. also Abel: Geogr. II, p. 259; Koehler: LVTI, p. 124.

⁸⁾ Ostrakon from Samaria n. 27, 3.

⁹⁾ cf. p. 147 below.

¹⁰⁾ Tristram: Moab, pp. 318, 330; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 125-126; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 33; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 394.

¹¹⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, p. 318.

¹²⁾ cf. p. 83 above.

¹³⁾ Noth: PJB 36, pp. 12-13; cf. also Noth: ZAW 1944, p. 46 n. 3; Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 245.

¹⁴⁾ cf. p. 86 above.

45. *R. el-Meshrefe.*

The ruin of R. el-Meshrefe ¹⁾, which is identified by Musil ²⁾ with מִשְׁרֵפָה מוֹאָב ³⁾, is situated n.w. of Kh. et-Teim. The position of מִשְׁרֵפָה מוֹאָב is, however, still unknown ⁴⁾. It could just as well have been to the s. of the Arnon.

46. *Mādebā.*

To the n.e. of Kh. et-Teim, on the northern side of the W. el-Mādebā, are the vast ruins of Mādebā, occupying a large hill, which gradually slopes down in the n.w. towards the highland ⁵⁾. The city מִדְבָּא ⁶⁾ was situated on this site, but the traces of this ancient settlement were wiped out by subsequent inhabitants. According to Harding a Late Bronze—Early Iron Age tomb was found on this site ⁷⁾.

47. *Jalūl.*

Jalūl lies 5 km. to the e. of Mādebā ⁸⁾. Visible from afar, the Moabite fortress on this high hill commanded the surrounding valleys, which were intensively cultivated.

48. *Zobāyer el-Qaşṭal.*

About 11 km. to the n.e. of Jalūl and 12 km. from er-Rufaiseh is Zobāyer el-Qaşṭal ⁹⁾. Judging from the pottery finds, some of which resemble the pottery of Tell el-Fūl ¹⁰⁾, this site was inhabited during the Iron Age.

¹⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 270.

²⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 274 n. 2; cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 391; Davis and Gehman: W. D. B., p. 403.

³⁾ cf. I Sam. 22 : 3.

⁴⁾ cf. De Groot: I Samuel, p. 151; Koehler: LVTL, p. 557.

⁵⁾ cf. Tristram: Moab, pp. 319-328; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 113-123; Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 381-382, for a description of the post-Biblical era.

⁶⁾ Numb. 21 : 30; Josh. 13 : 9, 16; Is. 15 : 2; I Chron. 19 : 7; M. I. 7-9, 30.

⁷⁾ Harding: PEFQ 1958, p. 12.

⁸⁾ Albright: Basor 49, pp. 28-29; Glueck Annual XIV, p. 5.

⁹⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 7.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Albright: Annual IV, p. 15 pl. XXXI.

49. *Kh. el-Mekhayyet.*

Almost 3 km. to the s.e. of the Jebel Şiyāghah is the ruined city of Kh. el-Mekhayyet ¹). The majority of these ruins date from the post-Moabitic ages. But many shards from the Iron Age were found on this site, which must have been inhabited at that time ²). It is generally identified with the Moabite city נְבוֹ ³) or נְבֵה ⁴).

50. *R. el-Herī.*

Approximately 5 km. below Mount Nebo, on a hillock in the plain descending westward towards the Dead Sea, is the small and ruined site of R. el-Herī ⁵). The W. el-Herī, known as the W. el-‘Azeimeh in its lower course ⁶), flows to the w. of this hillock. The settlement, which must have existed here during the Iron Age, helped to guard the approach from the w. to the highland and from the e. to the מַצְבֵּה מוֹאָב below.

51. *Tell el-‘Azeimeh.*

Tell el-‘Azeimeh is situated on the edge of a high, flattish, isolated bench on the southern side of the W. el-‘Azeimeh ⁷). Towards the w. the land falls away sharply, with the result that Tell el-‘Azeimeh commands a splendid view of the plain towards the Dead Sea. To a greater extent than R. el-Herī, this fortress controlled the flow of the water of the Wādī westward and at the same time guarded the track leading up to the highlands of the Mādebā region. Tell el-‘Azeimeh is identified with בֵּית הַשְּׁמוּת ⁸).

¹) Musil: A. P. I, pp. 335-340, 347 n. 3; Glueck: Annual XV, pp. 110-111; Abel: R.B. 40, pp. 377, 379 fig. 1; Geogr. II, p. 397.

²) Glueck: Annual XV, p. 111. The only remains from the Iron Age, found by Saller and Bagatti (The Town of Nebo) are shards. For post-Biblical rests, cf. also Lemaire: R. B. 43, pp. 385-401.

³) Numb. 32 : 3, 38; Is. 15 : 2; Jer. 48 : 1, 22; I Chron. 5 : 8.

⁴) M.I. 14.

⁵) Glueck: Annual XV, p. 110 and p. 183 pl. 21.

⁶) cf. p. 59 above.

⁷) Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 400-404; cf. also Abel: R. B. 41, p. 78 fig. 1 and Geogr. II, Carte 1.

⁸) Numb. 33 : 49; Josh. 12 : 3; 13 : 20; Hes. 25 : 9; cf. Glueck: The River Jordan, pp. 239-240; Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 402; Koehler:

52. *Teleilat Umweis.*

Teleilat Umweis, which was probably a *בית* of *הַשְּׁמוּת*, lies about 2 km. n. n.w. of Tell el-‘Azeimeh, on the southern side of the W. el-‘Azeimeh ¹⁾. Perhaps there were more of these small settlements, which were inferior to this important city on the banks of this Wādī.

53. *Kh. Ayûn Mûsa.*

The W. ‘Ayûn Mûsa, which is to be identified with the *נַחַל אֵינֻן* ²⁾, flows due n. of Pisgah ³⁾. It originates to the n. n.e. of the jebel Šiyâghah and flows through the valley ‘Ayûn Mûsa in a north-westerly direction ⁴⁾. Though somewhat stony, the soil of the valley is fertile. Through the centuries the whole area was cultivated intensively. The remains of a Moabite fortress, at present called Kh. ‘Ayûn Mûsa ⁵⁾, are to be found on the steep slope which fringes the valley on the n.w. side. The situation of this ruin reminds one of the description of the site of *צִרְתַּת הַשְּׁחָר*, namely “in the mount of the valley” ⁶⁾. Judging from the grouping of the Israelite cities in Transjordan, it could have been situated rather here than at ez-Zāra ⁷⁾.

LVTL, p. 124. The identification with Kh. Sweimeh (Musil: A. P. I, p. 247; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 275) must be rejected, because there was no settlement during the Iron Age (Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 398-400).

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 400; Abel: R. B. 41, pl. IV, 1.

²⁾ Glueck: Annual XV, p. 110; Abel: R. B. 40, pl. XI,

³⁾ cf. p. 52 above.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 59 above and Tristram: Moab, p. 339; Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 131-132; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 341-346; Abel: R. B. 40, pp. 375-376.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XV, p. 110 and pl. 22. Formerly it was known as el-Meshjed (Musil: A. P. I, pp. 341-346; Abel: R. B. 40, p. 375; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 26-27).

⁶⁾ Josh. 13: 19. In Numb. 21: 20 it is not described as *עֵמֶק*, but as *גֵּי*.

⁷⁾ But cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 457; and Noth: Josua², p. 80.

54. *Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch.*

Almost 5 km. e. n.e.e of the jebel Şiyâghah on the bank of the W. Salma is Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch ¹⁾. Traces of a strong settlement during the Bronze Age and, to a lesser degree, of one during the Iron Age were found among the extensive ruins. Perhaps it may be identified with שְׁבִמָּה ²⁾. The type of soil perfectly suits the cultivation of vineyards and it must be remembered that שְׁבִמָּה was renowned for its vines ³⁾.

55. *Kh. esh-Shēch Dschāyil.*

The ruins of Kh. esh-Shēch Dschāyil ⁴⁾ lie about 10 km. to the w. of Ḥeshbân, ⁵⁾ on the slope of the summit, which is identified with Mount Peor ⁶⁾. It commands a clear view of the neighbourhood. Musil ⁷⁾ identified this site with בֵּית פְּעוֹר ⁸⁾, also named פְּעֵל פְּעוֹר ⁹⁾, which may be abbreviations for בֵּית פְּעֵל פְּעוֹר. Perhaps the name שְׁדָּה צָפִים ¹⁰⁾ is preserved in the recent name of this vicinity, which is called eş-Şafa' ¹¹⁾.

56. *Umm el-'Amad.*

On a large hill to the n.w. of Zobāyer el-Qaşal ¹²⁾ are the vast ruins of Umm el-'Amad ¹³⁾. No traces of Iron Age settle-

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XV, pp. 111, 123; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 458.

²⁾ Numb. 32 : 3, 38; Josh. 13 : 19; cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 458; Noth: Josua², pp. 79-80; Davis and Gehman: W. D. B., p. 563. Contra Musil: A. P. I, pp. 355, 356 n. 3.

³⁾ cf. Is. 16 : 8; Jer. 48 : 32.

⁴⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 344, 348.

⁵⁾ cf. Noth: Josua², p. 52; Koehler: LVTL, p. 125.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 53 above.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, p. 348 n. 5; cf. also Abel: Geogr. II, p. 278; Noth: Josua², p. 80; Koehler: LVTL, pp. 125, 770.

⁸⁾ Dt. 3 : 29; 4 : 46; 34 : 6; Josh. 13 : 20.

⁹⁾ Hos. 9 : 10. It could have been the name of a god, but cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 770.

¹⁰⁾ Numb. 23 : 14.

¹¹⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 334, 346.

¹²⁾ cf. p. 88 above.

¹³⁾ Warren: PEFQ 1869, pp. 289, 293; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 349-351; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 33.

ments have been discovered to the e. of Umm el-‘Amad. It seems, therefore, as though the chain of fortresses on the eastern boundary was bent inward to the w. towards Umm el-‘Amad, which certainly was a boundary fortress. The city בְּצֶרֶת ¹⁾ or בְּצֶרָה ²⁾ might have been situated on this site ³⁾.

57. *Ḥesbân.*

The ruins of Ḥesbân ⁴⁾ extend over the high hill ⁵⁾ which forms a part of the watershed between the W. el-Ḥabis and the W. Ḥesbân ⁶⁾. From here the distance to Jericho is approximately 30 km ⁷⁾. The King's Highway passed nearby. In post-Moabitic times this site was of great importance ⁸⁾ and all the traces of the Iron Age settlement were either erased or are buried under the debris of subsequent settlements. Only one shard from the Iron Age was found here ⁹⁾. In spite of the complete lack of remains from the Iron Age it can be assumed that this is the site of חֶשְׁבֹן ¹⁰⁾.

58. *Tell Iktanû.*

About a half km. s. of the W. er-Râmeḥ as the lower course of the W. Ḥesbân is known ¹¹⁾, and due n. of R. el-Ḥerî ¹²⁾, is the site of Iktanû ¹³⁾. It is situated on a large iso-

¹⁾ Dt. 4:43; Josh. 20:8; 21:36; I Chron. 6:63; M.I. 27.

²⁾ Jer. 48:24; cf. Rudolph: *Jeremia*, p. 245.

³⁾ Abel: *Geogr.* II, p. 264; Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 142.

⁴⁾ cf. Warren: *PEFQ* 1869, p. 286; Tristram: *Moab*, p. 351; Conder: *Heth and Moab*, p. 138; Musil: *A. P. I*, pp. 383-388, 393 n. 1; Glueck: *Annual XIV*, pp. 6, 75; Olmstead: *History of Syria and Palestine*, p. 214.

⁵⁾ Smith, Cheyne: *E. B.*, p. 2044; Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 340.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 59 above.

⁷⁾ Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 340.

⁸⁾ cf. Abel: *Geogr.* II, p. 349.

⁹⁾ Glueck: *Annual XIV*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁾ Numb. 21:25-28; 32:3, 37; Dt. 1:4; 2:24, 26, 30; 3:2, 6; 4:46; 29:6; Josh. 9:10; 12:2, 5; 13:10, 21, 26-27; 21:39; Judg. 11:19, 26; Is. 15:4; 16:8; Jer. 48:2, 34, 45; 49:2; Neh. 9:22.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 59 above.

¹²⁾ cf. p. 89 above.

¹³⁾ Merrill: *East of the Jordan*, pp. 230, 235-236; Albright: *Annual XXV-XXVIII*, pp. 394-395.

lated hill, which commands the plain to the w. and the access to the plateau. The identification with **בֵּית הָרָם** ¹⁾ is supported by the traces of an Iron Age settlement on this site ²⁾.

59. *el-ʿĀl.*

The ruinous site of el-ʿĀl ³⁾ is found 3 km. n. n.e. of Ḥesbān. Judging from the shards found on this site, it was inhabited in both the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. It is generally identified with **אֶלְעָלָה** ⁴⁾.

60. *Kh. er-Rufaiseh.*

Due n. of Zobāyer el-Qaşṭal and almost e. n.e. of el-ʿĀl is Kh. er-Rufaiseh ⁵⁾. There are two other ruins within a few hundred square metres from here. It is likely that here might have been a cluster of settlements in Moabitic times.

61. *Kh. el-Jadudeh.*

Seven km. n.e. of Ḥesbān and 2 km. s.w. of Jāwah is Kh. el-Jadudeh ⁶⁾. Situated in a fertile plain, it could have been inhabited in Moabitic times, but no traces of an Iron Age settlement have been found. It is identified with **יַעֲזָר** ⁷⁾, which was situated on the fringe of the cultivated land. But this

¹⁾ Josh. 13 : 27. Probably it is the same site as **בֵּית הָרָם**, mentioned in Numb. 32 : 36. **בֵּית הָרָם** is generally identified with Tell er-Rameh, cf. Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 402; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 344, 347 n. 4; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 273, but there was no settlement during the Iron Age at Tell er-Rameh, cf. Albright: Annual VI, p. 49; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 389-391.

²⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 490-491 and pl. 82-83.

³⁾ Warren: PEFQ 1869, p. 289; Tristram: Moab, p. 352; Merrill: East of the Jordan, p. 240; Conder: Heth and Moab, p. 138; Musil: A. P. I, pp. 248, 390; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 6; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 312.

⁴⁾ Numb. 32 : 3, 37; Is. 15 : 4; 16 : 9; Jer. 48 : 34.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 5.

⁶⁾ Warren: PEFQ 1869, p. 292; Musil: A. P. I, p. 218; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 4.

⁷⁾ Schultze: PJB 28, p. 68; De Groot: II Samuel, p. 149; Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 247.

identification has been questioned ¹⁾. The site of יְעוֹר was either near Nā'ūr ²⁾ or at Kh. eṣ-Šīreh ³⁾. In this vicinity we must also look for אֶבְלָל כְּרָמִים ⁴⁾.

62. Jāwah.

Jāwah lies on the top of a high hill, exactly n. of Kh. er-Rufaiseh and about 10 km. to the s. of 'Ammān ⁵⁾. It seems to have been the most north-eastern frontier fortress of the Iron Age. This may be the site of מַעֲצֵת ⁶⁾, which is frequently identified with Kh. Nefa'a, somewhat further to the east ⁷⁾.

63. Tell el-Hammām.

Approximately 2.5 km. from Tell Iktanû ⁸⁾ is the site of Tell el-Hammām ⁹⁾, overlooking the W. el-Meqta'a ¹⁰⁾ from the south. It dominates the outlet of the water of this Wādī as it emerges from the hills. Contrary to the consensus of scholarly opinion ¹¹⁾, Glueck ¹²⁾ quite correctly identified it with הַשְּׁטִים ¹³⁾.

64. Tell el-Kefrein.

About 2.3 km. n.w. of Tell el-Hammām and nearly 1 km.

¹⁾ cf. Abel: Geogr. II, p. 356; Noth: ZAW 1944, pp. 30-35.

²⁾ cf. Noth: Josua², p. 81.

³⁾ cf. Landes: Basor 144, pp. 30-37.

⁴⁾ Judg. 11:33; cf. Abel: Geogr. II, pp. 233-234; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 249.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 4.

⁶⁾ Josh. 13:18; 21:37; I Chron. 6:64; Jer. 48:21; cf. also Abel: Geogr. II, p. 385.

⁷⁾ Musil: A. P. I, pp. 352, 356; Rudolph: Jeremia, p. 247; Koehler: LVTL, p. 519; Noth: Josua², p. 129.

⁸⁾ cf. p. 92 above.

⁹⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 378-381 and fig. 115-116; cf. also Abel: R. B. 41, p. 78 fig. 1.

¹⁰⁾ cf. p. 59 above.

¹¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 374.

¹²⁾ Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 378, 382; Koehler: LVTL, p. 964.

¹³⁾ Numb. 25:1; 33:49; Josh. 2:1; 3:1; Mi. 6:5.

to the n. of the W. el-Kefrein ¹⁾ is Tell el-Kefrein ²⁾. Situated on a completely isolated hill, it commands a splendid view of the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב. It is generally identified with הַשְּׁשִׁים ³⁾, but Glueck rejected this identification.

65. *The Building of Fortifications.*

Indications and traces of settlements during the Moabitic era have been found on more than sixty sites. The majority of these sites were well fortified cities and were linked together in a system of defence, not only on the boundaries of the country but also at strategic positions in the inland. Many more of these fortified cities could have existed, but as subsequent settlers frequently re-used the building-material of preceding buildings, or often cleared away the debris before they started erecting their dwellings and fortifications, the vestiges of the previous settlements sometimes disappeared completely. The archaeological excavations at Dhībān or Kh. el-Mekhayyet for instance, clearly indicated that, apart from the numerous Iron Age pottery-ware, no other traces of the corresponding Iron Age settlement could be indicated with absolute certainty, though it is admitted that some of the buildings could have been erected during the Iron Age ⁴⁾. Be that as it may, enough indications of these fortified cities have been discovered to expose the falsity of the statement that קִיר הַרְרָשֶׁת was "the only stronghold in the whole country which was difficult to conquer" ⁵⁾. In view of the solid line of defences, it is evident that the Biblical writer, who mentioned the fenced and choice cities of Moab ⁶⁾ in which the nation lived in haughtiness and self-content ⁷⁾, was not exaggerating.

¹⁾ cf. p. 59 above and Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, p. 378.

²⁾ Abel: R. B. 40, pp. 216-223 and pl. VIII, 1; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 371-376.

³⁾ cf. Albright: Annual VI, p. 49; Abel: Geogr. II, p. 234.

⁴⁾ cf. Winnet: Basor 125, pp. 12-13; Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁾ Ewald: History IV, p. 89.

⁶⁾ cf. II Ki. 3: 19, 25.

⁷⁾ cf. Jer. 48; Is. 25: 10b-12.

Isolated from the west by the Dead Sea and almost inaccessible from the south, and to a lesser extent from the north ¹⁾, the land of Moab was almost a natural fortress. On the east it was most vulnerable, and therefore the Moabites planned a chain of fortifications on the eastern fringe of the fertile highland. But even in the south, where the deep-flowing W. el-Ḥesā formed a natural boundary, in the west and in the north, they erected a system of defences.

We must draw attention to the fact that the majority of the Iron Age cities were not built on sites, at which Bronze Age settlements had been ²⁾. Only at el-Kerak, Mišna', Bālū'ah, Kh. Mis'ar, 'Arā'ir, Kh.et-Teim, Mādebā, Jalūl, Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch, Kh. el-Mekhayyet, Umm el-'Amad, el-'Āl, and Kh. er-Rufaiseh traces of a Bronze Age settlement have been found. In these instances the Moabite settlers either sank their foundations through the debris to the maiden soil, as at 'Arā'ir, or cleared away all the debris of the preceding settlement which ended about six centuries earlier ³⁾. Frequently the ancient Bronze Age settlement can be traced not far from that of the Iron Age, eg. Kh. el-Medeyineh on the W. el-Ḥesā, and el-'Aineh ⁴⁾, Kh. en-Njājir, and Kh. Umm eṣ-Ṣedeirah as well as Kh. Serāreh ⁵⁾, R. Abū Sighān and its neighbouring town R. Mleḥleb, and the Bronze Age site Kh. Iskander ⁶⁾. In a few instances there was no Iron Age settle-

¹⁾ Whenever the Arnon was the n. boundary, the land of Moab was almost completely isolated from the n. as well. As for as we know a hostile army never crossed the Arnon from the n. The Babylonians, who finally conquered the Moabites, might have been the only exception.

²⁾ In w. Palestine the position seems to have been the reversed. Tell el-Fūl and Samaria are exceptional, cf. Albright: *Annual VI*, p. 7; Böhl: *Palestina in het Licht der Opgravingen*, pp. 27-75.

³⁾ Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 179-181.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 61 above.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 63 above and Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 82-84, 94.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 82 above and Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 127-129. Nearby there was another Bronze Age settlement, viz. Kh. Abū Khirqeh, cf. Musil: *A. P. I*, p. 111; Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 129-131.

ment in the vicinity of Bronze Age sites, e.g. at Ader¹⁾, Lejjun²⁾, Bâb edh-Dhrâ³⁾ and Kh. 'Aqrabah⁴⁾. It seems as though the Iron Age settlers did not deliberately shun the Bronze Age sites. For their purpose it did not seem necessary to build fortified cities on these sites. As the Bronze Age cities were not united under a central government, every city, whether it was situated on the outskirts or in the inland, had to be a stronghold. For the Moabite kingdom however, it was of primary concern only to fortify the border cities, which had to guard the interior. For this reason the traces of only a few fortified cities in the interior to the s. of the river Arnon have been discovered. Around these fortified strongholds in the interior, a number of smaller unfortified villages were clustered. Therefore, once the Israelite army had overwhelmed the boundary fortresses in the s.e. of the country, they could hasten towards קִיר תְּרַשֶׁת without meeting any significant resistance⁵⁾.

Before building a fortress, the Moabites looked for a solitary hill which overlooked the vicinity⁶⁾. Thus invaders could be observed from afar and the other fortresses could be warned in time. Messages were sent from one fortress to another by means of fire signals, trumpets or runners⁷⁾. As a rule the slopes of the high hills are steep and difficult to ascend and therefore easy to defend. The hills, skirted on one or more flanks by a Wādī or Wudyân were a popular choice, as they were inaccessible from those sides, especially during the rainy season when the Wudyân were in flood. Furthermore, perennial Wudyân guaranteed enough drinking water in times of

¹⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 27-28; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 45-47; Albright: Basor 53, pp. 13-18. Perhaps there could have been a settlement on this site during the Iron Age, cf. Albright: Basor 53, p. 17.

²⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 40, 44-45.

³⁾ cf. Albright: Annual VI, pp. 58-62; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 5.

⁴⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 113-114.

⁵⁾ II Ki. 3 : 24-27.

⁶⁾ cf. pp. 61, 62, 64, 67, 76, 77, 81, above.

⁷⁾ cf. Jer. 6 : 1; Lachish Ostrakon IV, 10; cf. also Dossin: R. A. 35, pp. 174 ff.; Torczyner: The Lachish Letters I, pp. 83-84.

siege ¹⁾. In times of peace the water could be used to irrigate the lands, as the inhabitants of a number of these sites were interested in agriculture ²⁾. When a permanent Wādī or source was not at hand, the inhabitants had to cut cisterns into the rocks to preserve the rainwater. If the rock, e.g. the limestone, was porous, the cisterns were cemented to make them water-proof. Frequently when a hill or ridge on which a fortress was situated was connected with the highland only on one side, whence the access was easy, the settlement was completely isolated from the plateau by the cutting of a ditch through the solid rock ³⁾. With the water from the other Wudyān, this ditch could easily be transformed into a rivulet, and thus the settlement was situated on an island, out of the enemy's reach.

In addition to this natural and artificial inaccessibility of the site, the strongly built fortresses were surrounded by high walls ⁴⁾. They appeared to invaders as fortified up to heaven ⁵⁾. As a rule the area enclosed by the Moabites was not very large. Generally the entire top of the hill on which the settlement was located was surrounded ⁶⁾. At Kh. el-'Akūzeh the south wall of the fortified top of the hill measures about 225 m., while the north wall measures approximately 250 m. The western and eastern walls were much shorter ⁷⁾. At Kh. Medīnet er-Rās the fortified area had the form of an irregular rectangle of 164.30 × 16.90 × 155.60 × 26 m. ⁸⁾. At er-Remeil, which was not only a fortress but a strongly fortified city with a surrounding outer wall, the extreme

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 52; XV, p. 110; XVIII-XIX, pp. 72-73, 126; XXV-XXVIII, p. 401.

²⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, pp. 350-351; Glueck: Annual XXV-XXVIII, pp. 371, 394, 401.

³⁾ cf. Musil: A. P. I, p. 383; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 52-53; XV, pp. 110-111; XVIII-XIX, pp. 61-62; 118.

⁴⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 105; XVIII-XIX, pp. 62, 94-95, 118-121, 123, 126.

⁵⁾ Glueck: The River Jordan, p. 85.

⁶⁾ cf. also Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 90-91.

⁷⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 62.

⁸⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 87.

measurements of the enclosed area are about 115×70 m. ¹⁾. Houses were built inside the enclosure against the sides of the surrounding walls, leaving an open space in the middle, where flocks could have been sheltered in times of danger. Sometimes there are remnants of houses outside the outer wall. The fortress either stood in the middle of the enclosure, or, more generally, against the wall opposite the gateway. Towers flanked the gateway. At times both the enclosing wall and the fortress were re-inforced with towers. The wall was built with roughly hewn flint, basalt or limestone blocks. On a few occasions unhewn stones were used ²⁾. Frequently the large building blocks were laid in dry courses, but in spite of the lack of mortar, the walls were strongly built, as can be seen from the walls which are still standing ³⁾. The corners were laid in headers and stretchers ⁴⁾. A strong glacis ⁵⁾, built against the outside of the wall, helped to strengthen it ⁶⁾. The Moabite system of fortification with its enclosing wall, strengthened by a glacis, and a rectangular or square fortress, reinforced by ramparts and towers, resembled that of w. Palestine. Even in the use of proto-Ionian pilaster capitals, it was in keeping with the Cis-Jordanian fortresses ⁷⁾.

Quite a number of the fortified cities had agricultural interests. Their inhabitants cultivated the soil in the fertile plains in the vicinity, or even terraced the slopes of the hills outside the walls. In the Bronze Age the settlers enclosed as much land as they needed for agriculture, and they cultivated the soil behind the security of their exceedingly strong walls. Only when the population increased or in times of

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 120.

²⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 52-53, 62-63, 66; XV, pp. 66-67; XVIII-XIX, pp. 70, 72, 87, 102, 136.

³⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 70, 102.

⁴⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 31, 54, 55, 66-67; XVIII-XIX, pp. 97, 104.

⁵⁾ cf. Albright: AP., pp. 120-127; Annual IV, pp. 19-20; Crowfoot: PEFQ, 1937, p. 79.

⁶⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 61; XVIII-XIX, pp. 123, 126, 136; XXV-XXVIII, p. 378.

⁷⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 67-68.

peace, agriculture was carried on outside the walls of Early Bronze sites. But in the Iron Age, there was certainly not enough land inside the enclosure for the growing of a respectable crop ¹⁾. Because there was no central government in the Bronze Age, the hand of every city was against that of its brother, and therefore it had to guard its crops inside the wall. In contrast to this system the subsequent Moabite settlements were united under a monarch at an early stage of their existence. Once the boundaries were duly fortified, there was no need to enclose the cultivable lands in the interior. Before marauding bands from the desert could plunder the crops, they had to pass the solid line of frontier-fortresses. For this reason we do not find as many traces of settlements in the inland to the s. of the Arnon. The prophet Jeremiah had this part of the land of Moab in mind when he said "Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity: therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed" ²⁾. The cities were no longer inimical to each other as frequently happened under the system of independent city states of the Bronze Age. The vast fertile plains behind the security of the frontier fortresses but outside the fortification walls of the inland cities, in the field or שָׂדֶה, could be cultivated to produce a large crop. In this respect the Moabites not only surpassed their predecessors, but also some of the Canaanite cities, and even the Israelites.

66. *Conclusions.*

1. Judging from the sites at which traces of an Iron Age settlement have been found, the land of the Moabites must have been densely populated. The majority of the sites were located to the n. of the river Arnon. But it would be incorrect to state that the southern part of the country was sparsely

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 44, 61-62, 88, 90-91.

²⁾ Jer. 48: 11.

populated. As has been stated above, there was no need to fortify this area strongly, and therefore the traces of these Moabite settlements were much more easily erased than those in the north, which continually were a bone of contention between Israel/Judah and the Moabites and, therefore, had to be duly fortified.

2. Merely a few of the Bronze Age sites were repopulated during the Iron Age. Frequently the Bronze Age site can be traced in the vicinity of the Iron Age settlement. In the subsequent Nabataean period all of them were re-occupied.

3. The plans of the Moabite cities and their chain of frontier-fortresses resembled those of the Edomites and the Ammonites. To a certain extent the structures displayed a close affinity to those of western Palestine.

4. The cities to the n. do not disclose any external signs of the continual strife between Israel/Judah and Moab. The regular change of power between these nations in this vicinity does not seem to have been drastic at all.

5. The cities occupied by the different Israelite tribes according to the lists in Numbers 32 and Joshua 13 were concentrated to the n. of Mā'in. To the s. of Ma'in we could only locate עֲטָרוֹת שָׁשִׁם, עֲטָרוֹת דִּיבֵן, עֲרוּעָר, יַחֲזֵק, קְדֵמוֹת and "the city that is by the river"¹⁾.

¹⁾ cf. Dt. 2 : 36; Josh. 13 : 9.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HISTORY.

1. The pre-Moabite Settlement of the Country.

The history of the territory of which the geographical boundaries are described in the preceding chapter ¹⁾, reveals an almost rhythmical pattern of rise and fall of civilizations, which has repeated itself throughout the centuries down to the present ²⁾. Frequently a nomadic group of people was displaced by a sedentary community, which in its turn was ousted after a longer or shorter period by wandering groups. The excavations at Teleilat el-Ghassûl by Mallon and others have revealed that during the Middle Chalcolithic Age ³⁾ a highly developed cultural standard had already been achieved ⁴⁾ in the territory afterwards known as the *עַרְבֵי מוֹאָב* ⁵⁾. After the settlement was devastated, a new established community did not develop in the immediate vicinity e. of the Dead Sea, until several centuries had elapsed. Glueck came to the conclusion that only between Early Bronze IV and the Middle Bronze I had a sedentary civilization again existed in these regions ⁶⁾. This civilization was at its zenith from the 23rd to the 20th century B.C., when it was extinguished. After that it took at least six centuries before the nomadic shepherds,

¹⁾ cf. pp. 46-49 above.

²⁾ In this respect the history of this region corresponds with that of the area to the n. and the s. of it, cf. Glueck: *Annual* XV, pp. 35, 111; XVIII-XIX, pp. 268-269; XXV-XXVIII, p. 423; *Basor* 122, pp. 14-18.

³⁾ cf. Albright: *AP*, p. 66; Jirku: *Biblica* 29, p. 270. The archaeological periods referred to are clarified by Glueck: *Annual* XXV-XXVIII, p. xix.

⁴⁾ cf. Simons: *Opgravingen in Palestina*, pp. 118-124 and Plates 13-16; Albright: *AP*, pp. 66-68.

⁵⁾ cf. *Numb.* 22 : 1.

⁶⁾ cf. Glueck: *Annual* XIV, XV, XVIII-XIX, XXV-XXVIII.

who in the meantime grazed their flocks in the uninhabited regions, were supplanted by sedentary occupants.

The Early Bronze IV - Middle Bronze I settlers secured themselves against their enemies by building fortified cities ¹⁾. Most of these cities were situated in the neighbourhood of the caravan route which traversed Transjordan from n. to s. Apparently the initial purpose of these first settlements was to defend the caravans with their valuable wares ²⁾. Therefore the settlement was generally situated on a site, which for strategical purposes was excellently chosen ³⁾, whereas from a purely agricultural point of view a settlement would probably never have been made there. Kh. Umm eṣ-Ṣedeirah, on the n. bank of the W. el-Ḥesā ⁴⁾, is for instance situated on a barren inhospitable piece of rock, which protrudes perpendicularly and was therefore actually isolated from its environment. This site was only made and kept habitable by a sense of duty and systematic erection of terraces, which could check the flow of water and thus save the sparsely available soil from erosion so that it could be exploited for agricultural purposes. This must have been a most strenuous task. Glueck ⁵⁾ interprets this phenomenon principally as an indication of the intensive occupation of this region during the period concerned ⁶⁾. It seems beyond doubt that the community established

¹⁾ e.g. el-Lejjūn, cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 44-45, 95 pl. 9; cf. also Annual XVIII-XIX, maps IIa and IIb.

²⁾ At regular intervals on the present route from Damascus to Medinah a *Qal'ah* can be found, which might be something analogous to the phenomenon described above. This does not imply that there were no settlements situated far from the route which bisected the land from n. to s., cf. Albright: Annual VI, pp. 58-62; Musil: A. P. I, p. 344; Glueck: Annual XV, p. 111.

³⁾ e.g. el-Leḥūn on the n. bank of the W. el-Môjīb (Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 48) and R. el-Qleib on the opposite side of the river (Musil: A. P. I, p. 376; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 57-58 and p. 99 pl. 13).

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 82.

⁵⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 82, 84.

⁶⁾ It cannot be alleged that the country was more densely populated than in the time of the Moabites, because Moabite settlements have been found on different sites at which no traces of a Bronze Age settlement could be indicated. Furthermore, the corresponding Moabite

in this era comprised a substantial magnitude ¹⁾ and it is readily accepted that it comprised a rigid agricultural inclination ²⁾, but the primary purpose of these sedentary occupations did not extend beyond the idea of serving as watchposts or small garrisons, whose major task was to guard the caravan route from strategical positions. If a site could be defended easily, it was regarded as suitable for occupation. Originally no heed was taken of acquiring sites which were favourable for agriculture; hence their unfavourable situation as for agricultural activities. Eventually these watchposts were developed, and more attention was directed to agriculture, which in due time might even have become the most prominent character of this civilization. The more fertile plateau-region was consequently also cultivated and the meagre rainfall was supplemented by means of irrigation.

When once the inhabitants became interested in tilling the soil and reaping their crops and once they were joined by some of the original nomads of these regions, they lost sight of the original purpose. Another reason why this civilization was no longer interested in its original common purpose may probably be sought in the disintegration of the foster-country. At this stage the different cities were apparently not united under a central government and therefore there could have been rivalry and wars among them. The primary object of each city was merely its own progress and expansion of power. That may be a reason—if not the main reason—why this civilization could not withstand the invasions from elsewhere and accordingly the established culture dwindled away at the

settlement can frequently be observed next to the Bronze Age site, cf. Glueck: Annual XV, pp. 104-106.

¹⁾ During the Bronze Age the enclosed area was larger than that of the Iron Age, cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 44, 85 pl. 9. As a rule agriculture was confined to the area inside the walls, cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 90, although they also cultivated land outside the stronghold, cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 46-47.

²⁾ Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch was situated on a hill, which is cultivated at present, cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 111. For a description of the Early Bronze - Middle Bronze I settlements, cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 90-94.

end of the 19th century B.C. It seems improbable that the final blow was delivered by the Hyksos¹⁾, because this Bronze Age civilization had dwindled even before they made their appearance²⁾. Therefore it seems more probable that the final disappearance of these cities was caused by the migration of the Amorites round about 1900 B.C.. One offshoot of this migration moved to Babylon³⁾ and the other to the west, namely to Palestine and Syria⁴⁾. The absence of a powerful central government and a series of frontier fortresses⁵⁾ facilitated the task of the invaders.

We are absolutely at a loss as to who the builders of this Bronze Age civilization could have been. This is mainly due to the absence of written records referring to this region in the period concerned. The account of Sinuhe (1970 B.C.), telling of his sojourn in *qdmj* after he had left Byblos⁶⁾, does not refer to this civilization⁷⁾, for *qdmj* should be located further north, in the vicinity of Damascus⁸⁾. Even the account in Gen. 14, concerning the four kings from the east who marched through Transjordan to make war against the five kings of the Valley of Siddim⁹⁾, is connected neither with the rise nor with the downfall of this civilization. This campaign did not result in the destruction of the five cities in the

¹⁾ cf. Albright: Annual VI, p. 31; Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 81-82; Annual XV, p. 138.

²⁾ Though the precursors of the Hyksos invasion came before the end of the 18th century B.C. (Albright: AP., p. 85), the actual Hyksos irruption was not launched before the 17th century B.C. (Albright: AP., p. 86; cf. Böhl: Opera Minora, p. 347).

³⁾ Eventually they gained the supremacy in this country and founded the First Dynasty of Babylon.

⁴⁾ cf. also Noth: G.I.², p. 30. The decline of the Egyptian power in Palestine and Syria caused by the rebellions at which the "Aechtungs-texte" hint (Albright: JPOS VIII, pp. 223-256), cleared the way for these invaders.

⁵⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 82-83.

⁶⁾ cf. The Story of Si-nuhe, 28-30.

⁷⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 138.

⁸⁾ cf. Gressmann: AOTUB, p. 56 n. j; Galling: Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels, p. 3 n.c.

⁹⁾ cf. Albright: A. P. B., p. 142; Glueck: Annual XIV, p. 82; XV, pp. 104, 138; XVIII-XIX, p. 265.

valley ¹⁾. A few of the other sites mentioned in Gen. 14, e.g. עִשְׁתָּרוֹת קָרְנִים and הָם, also still existed long after the supposed date of this expedition ²⁾. It is even highly improbable that this chapter refers to the civilization concerned, because the campaign seems to have taken place a considerable time after its downfall ³⁾. Therefore we must accept that this Bronze Age civilization dwindled away for reasons until now unknown to us. Written indications of this decline and the factors which contributed to it are still missing, just as is any written evidence of the existence of the civilization itself.

The conclusion of Glueck ⁴⁾ that there existed a gap in the sedentary history of this region is substantiated by the literary sources from the corresponding period, e.g. the Egyptian topographical lists and the Letters from Amarna ⁵⁾. After the downfall of this civilization there were no permanent settlements in this country for at least six centuries. Only from the end of the 13th century B.C. do we again find indications of another permanent habitation of this territory. It may therefore be assumed that the purposive occupation of this region could have started somewhat more than a century earlier.

2. *The Emites.*

According to Biblical sources the Moabites called their

¹⁾ cf. Gen. 19 : 1.

²⁾ cf. Steuernagel: ZDPV 48, p. 79; Jirku: ZDPV 53, p. 151; Albright: A. P. B., p. 142; Glueck Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 265; XXV-XXVIII, pp. 249-251.

³⁾ cf. Böhl: Opera Minora, p. 47; Albright: Basor 88, p. 35. Van Gelderen: Bijbelsch Handboek I, pp. 112-114, regards any chronology that fixes a date later than 1865 B.C. for Abraham as inconsistent with Ex. 12 : 40 and I Ki. 6 : 1. On account of the same chronological grounds as those of Van Gelderen, Kroeze: Genesis Veertien, pp. 7, 154 fixed the call of Abraham at 2090 B.C.. Biblical numbers are frequently interpreted in different ways and it seems best not to regard these numbers literally but to regard them as round numbers; cf. also p. 108 n. 3.

⁴⁾ Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 81-82; XV, p. 138; XVIII-XIX, pp. 92, 179.

⁵⁾ Contra Abel: Geogr. II, p. 39; cf. also Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 1, 82; XV, pp. 1, 138; De Vaux: ZAW 1938, p. 228.

immediate predecessors אֵמִיטִים¹⁾. It is important to recognize the relation between the Emites and the above-mentioned nomadic groups, who grazed their flocks in this country since the downfall of the Bronze Age civilization. According to the expressions used in relation to their habitation of and expulsion from the land²⁾, it is clear that the Emites were no nomadic group³⁾. They seem to have established themselves in the country before the arrival of the Moabite tribes. That the Emites acquired the grazing rights in these regions immediately after the downfall of the Bronze Age civilization seems doubtful. It seems more probable that they, and simultaneously with them other groups from elsewhere, arrived in this region after a longer period and gradually settled down among the shepherds, who succeeded the Bronze Age people. Kirjataim might probably have been the first settlement of the Emites. These new inhabitants, who arrived from west-Jordan⁴⁾, were not sympathetically inclined towards the trading interests of the kings from the east, or were even a potential danger to them, and accordingly the kings wanted to safeguard the route⁵⁾. The campaign against the newly settled groups, who were not yet securely established, was successful. Then the kings from the east continued their campaign towards the s. and the w. of the Dead Sea. This is an indication that the new immigrants to the e. of the Jordan and the Dead Sea originally came from West-Palestine.

¹⁾ Dt. 2 : 10-11; cf. also Numb. 13 : 28-33; Dt. 2 : 20-23. The Emites were a historical people in spite of the fact that they are described as tall and were accounted to be giants as the Anakims, cf. Kittel: G. Isr. I, p. 21. Contra Schwally: ZAW 1898, pp. 135-137; Karge: Rephaim, p. 626.

²⁾ יָשַׁב and יָרַשׁ, cf. Kochler: LVTL, pp. 409-410 and 406-407 respectively.

³⁾ cf. Alt: PJB 36, p. 34.

⁴⁾ On account of the type of script used on the Bālû'ah stele (cf. p. 32 above), Alt: PJB 36, pp. 29-43, indicated that the original authors of the stele came from west-Palestine. He attributes the inscription to those people, whom the O.T. designated as the Emites.

⁵⁾ Gen. 14; cf. Böhl: Opera Minora, p. 44.

After the retreat and their eventual defeat at the hands of Abraham and his allies from West-Palestine, the Emities continued their occupation of the country, until in their turn they were supplanted by the Moabite tribes ¹⁾. In accordance with their interest in agriculture the Emities occupied the plains and valleys surrounding the rivers ²⁾.

The exact date of the first arrival of the Emities is not known, but in view of the fact that the above-mentioned campaign could have taken place in the course of the 17th century B.C., the date should have been more or less within that period ³⁾. The expedition of the kings from the east temporarily retarded the attempt of the Emities to settle in the uninhabited region, where the shepherds only casually grazed their flocks. But eventually they brought their efforts to a satisfactory conclusion. This eastern migration took a considerable time and the Bālû'ah stele probably dates from the last phase of this movement. The first incentive for the renewed occupation of the country thus actually originated from the Emities. The prolonged and gradual process of changing from a nomadic way of life to an established civilization may have been effected for the major part by the Emities. As may be expected they did not immediately claim all the arable land. Alongside them there still existed a nomadic element, who claimed their rights to graze their flocks. But in due time some of these nomads would have followed the example set by the Emities and would have adopted a permanent or at least a semi-permanent life.

3. Descent and Settlement.

The story of the descent and the settlement of the Moabites

¹⁾ Dt. 2 : 8-10; cf. Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 212.

²⁾ cf. Gen. 14 : 5.

³⁾ If Abraham was born in the latter part of the 15th century B.C., cf. Gordon: Introduction to O.T. Times, p. 103; Van Selms: OTS XII, p. 185 n. 10, the period attributed to the Emities and their activities is reduced by at least two centuries and their history would be less complicated. It is tempting to accept this chronology, but cf. p. 106 n. 3.

is lost to us. In the O.T. we only have some vague allusions to their descent. The O.T. simply describes the final settlement of the Transjordan nations as an event which was accomplished when the Israelites came into contact with them ¹⁾ in the 13th century B.C. ²⁾ As regards the descent of the Moabites, nothing can be deduced from the etymology of their name ³⁾. Furthermore, Gen. 19 is, as was indicated above, no proof of the purity of race of the Moabites, but it served as an expression of the contempt which Israel felt for them ⁴⁾. But in spite of this disdain, Moab and Israel were still regarded as related nations, belonging to the group of people, who spoke a Semitic language. The fact that the Moabites and the Ammonites were genealogically connected in Gen. 19 and that elsewhere they are mentioned together ⁵⁾ may be an indication of a common descent.

Perhaps they originally came from a circle of nomadic tribes who inhabited the Syrian-Arabian desert ⁶⁾. Thence they could have moved south-west towards the land of Moab. Initially they could only have come to graze their flocks, but subsequently they occupied the country during the 14th or early in the 13th century B.C. It was no difficult task to enter the country from the e., for at that time no series of frontier fortresses barred the way. It seems probable that some relationship could have existed between these new immigrants and the Bedouins, the Shâsu, whom the Egyptians

¹⁾ cf. Noth: BBLA 1949, p. 45.

²⁾ The intricate problem concerning the date of the Exodus cannot be discussed here, cf. Rowley: *From Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 1-108. We may only mention that a king ruled the Moabites when Israel met them first. If the Exodus took place at the end of the 15th century B.C., as is frequently maintained on account of Judg. 11:26 and 1 Ki. 6:4, the Biblical account about the Kingdoms of Edom, Moab and Ammon, whom Israel encountered before entering Palestine, must be regarded either as untrue or as anachronistic because these Kingdoms existed only after the 13th century B.C. (cf. Rowley, p. 21).

³⁾ cf. pp. 178-180 below.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 6 above.

⁵⁾ e.g. Dt. 23:3.

⁶⁾ Alt: PJB 36, p. 29. But cf. Kittel: *G. Isr. I*, pp. 49-50; Bennet: *D.B.*, p. 408b; Sellin: *G. I. J. V.*, p. 18.

encountered frequently¹⁾. The strong Egyptian influence, which is so conspicuously apparent in the second phase of the Bālû'ah stele, may be explained along these lines²⁾. It is highly improbable, on the other hand, that the *בְּנֵי-שֵׁט*³⁾ in Numb. 24 : 17 should be brought into relation with the other Bedouins, the Shutu, mentioned in Egyptian Execration Texts from the 12th Dynasty⁴⁾. Between these two records there is a gap of at least seven centuries.

These new settlers, who assimilated with the nomadic tribes that had formerly grazed their flocks on the land left uncultivated by the Emites⁵⁾, eventually constituted the majority of the population. The conduct of the Emites, who gradually tried to acquire more land for cultivation, could have served as an incentive to the Moabite and other tribes to secure their pastoral rights and to safeguard their pasturage for themselves⁶⁾. Their only means of accomplishing this was to occupy the country not only partially and temporarily, as they had done till then, but thoroughly and permanently. At this stage of the settlement clashes between them and the Emites would certainly have occurred and, as so frequently happened in the history of Palestine, the rugged tribes from the desert got the better of the sedentary community. By mutual collaboration the Moabite tribes were able to subjugate the Emites. The government of the cities of the Emites was transferred one after another to the Moabites, and eventually the Moabites controlled the whole country. The relief on the Bālû'ah stele relates the story of an Emite city which was captured by a Moabite sheik. Most probably this relief depicts the act by which the government of Bālû'ah was handed over

¹⁾ cf. Breasted: A. R. E. II, pp. 124, 170, 171, 517; III, pp. 86, 88, 101, 108, 319, 457, 638; IV, pp. 129, 403-404.

²⁾ cf. p. 32 above; Horsfeld et Vincent R. B. 41, pp. 417-444; Drioton: R. B. 42, pp. 353-365.

³⁾ cf. the variant *בְּנֵי שֵׁט* in Jer. 48 : 45.

⁴⁾ Contra Wilson: ANET, p. 329 n. 4.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 108 above.

⁶⁾ Alt: PJB 36, p. 42; cf. also Alt: Kleine Schriften I, pp. 89-175.

to the conquerors by the deity and his spouse ¹⁾. By re-using the stele, the new governor wanted to notify the conquered people that his government would not break drastically with the past ²⁾ but would be a mere continuation of the preceding reign. In future they would accept the culture of their predecessors ³⁾, and in this way the change to an established population was expedited.

Against this conception of the Emitees having been an established group it may be alleged that, excepting the Bālū'ah stele in its older form, no finds indicating an Emitee occupation have been made ⁴⁾. This lack of archaeological evidence may, however, not seem strange. The Emitee occupation was neither intensive nor extensive. Furthermore, a separate cultural layer for this population should not be contemplated, for the Moabites, being nomads of lower cultural development than the Emitees, merely built on the foundations laid by the Emitees ⁵⁾. It may also be noticed that as a rule there is quite a long lapse between the settlement of a people and the first signs of their cultural activities. Israel invaded Palestine at the end of the 13th century B.C. and only after the lapse of two centuries did they leave traces of their sojourn ⁶⁾. Seeing that the Moabites did not encounter such rigid opposition as did the Israelites and that the acquisition of the culture of their predecessors could be effected without prejudice, the process of settling down was realized during a shorter period than was the case with Israel and could be finalized after approximately a century. At the end of the 13th century B.C. the Moabite Kingdom had

¹⁾ Alt: PJB 36, pp. 42-43.

²⁾ Contra Alt: PJB 36, p. 43.

³⁾ In the history of the Ancient Near East we have a few analogies of the same kind.

⁴⁾ cf. amongst others the objections raised by Glueck: Annual XV, p. 138, against the idea of accepting the Horites as the immediate predecessors of the Edomites.

⁵⁾ cf. Gen. 36: 2, 20, 25, where it is indicated that the Edomites assimilated with their predecessors. The Moabites could have done the same, cf. Alt: PJB 36, pp. 34, 41.

⁶⁾ Albright: AP., p. 120 and pp. 86, 110.

already been established. The process of settling down by the Moabite tribes could have started early in the 14th century.

The name of Moab does not occur in Gen. 10. Thus the Moabites were regarded as one of the younger nations. In the Genesis-tradition they are related to the clan of Abraham, but they settled down to a sedentary mode of life before the descendants of Abraham did ¹⁾. Furthermore, the names of Moab, Ammon, and Esau are mentioned in the Biblical records before the name of Jacob, the actual progenitor of the Israelites, and these nations are regarded as having settled down earlier than Israel did ²⁾. When these nations were encountered by the Israelites during the Exodus, they were already governed by a king ³⁾. The process of national and political consolidation had just been concluded. The surface-survey carried out by Glueck, revealed that the Kingdoms of Edom, Moab and Ammon were established during the last quarter of the 13th century B.C. During the preceding and especially the following years the political situation was extremely favourable for the inception of new states in and around Palestine. The Egyptian domination in Palestine terminated provisionally at the end of the 13th century B.C. ⁴⁾. During the latter part of the same century the Empire of the Hittites began to wane ⁵⁾. The two great powers which dominated Syria-Palestine for several centuries had thus disappeared, and therefore an opportunity manifested itself to found new states. Assyria, which had appeared on the horizon as a great power a short while before this, still had to direct its attention elsewhere ⁶⁾.

¹⁾ Gen. 19.

²⁾ Luther: ZAW 1901, p. 43; Bennet: D.B., p. 408b.

³⁾ cf. Numb. 21: 11; Dt. 2: 8. Contra Winckler: G.I. I, p. 197; Cheyne: E. B., p. 3178.

⁴⁾ The last Pharaoh who penetrated to the n. of Palestine was Ramses II. His successor, Merneptah, suppressed a riot in s. Palestine, but then he had to give his attention to the rebellious Lybians.

⁵⁾ Gurney: The Hittites, p. 38.

⁶⁾ Tukulti Ninurta I (1235-1198 B.C.) had to undertake expeditions to the n., s. and e., either to safeguard or to expand his Empire, cf. Meissner: Könige, pp. 105-106; Schmökel: Ur, Assur en Babylon, p.

4. *The Clash with Sihon.*

By the assimilation with the Emites and the shepherds who were in the country earlier than themselves ¹⁾, the Moabitic tribes eventually developed into a powerful front. They were not confined to the area between the W. el-Ḥesā in the s. and the W. el-Môjib in the n., but also occupied the territory to the n. of it. This region was controlled by the Kingdom of the Amorites ²⁾, and afterwards the Moabitic tribes also began to settle there. The most northern site reached by the Moabites during this period should be fixed in the vicinity of Heshbon ³⁾. To the n.w., adjacent to the Jordan, they could have proceeded as far as the W. Nimrin, because this region was called the עֲרֻזִּים מִרְיָה. Four cities, that were governed by the Moabites at this time are mentioned, viz. Heshbon, Dibon, Nophah ⁴⁾, and Medeba ⁵⁾. Jaazer had apparently not yet been occupied by Moab and therefore it is not mentioned in the ancient song of mockery. But as the author actually dealt with the defeat of Sihon by Israel, he mentioned the capture of Jaazer separately. For this reason Numb. 21 : 34b should not be regarded as a later comment added to the text in consideration of Dt. 3 : 16 ⁶⁾. If the previously mentioned supposition concerning the building of Kirjataim by the Emites is correct, it may also be added to the list of Moabite

116. Tiglath Pileser I (1116-1078 B.C.) was the first Assyrian king who penetrated to Arvad on the Phoenician coast, cf. Luckenbill: ARAB II, p. 98, and then the Moabite Kingdom was already well established.

¹⁾ cf. Jeremias: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East* II, p. 46; Alt: PJB 36, p. 31; Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, p. 265.

²⁾ cf. Böhl: *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, pp. 43, 57.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 21-30; Dt. 2 : 27-37; Judg. 11 : 19-22. Contra Olmstead: *History of Palestine and Syria*, p. 212 and Noordtzij: *Numeri*, p. 230, who move the n. boundary towards the Jabbok on account of an erroneous interpretation of Numb. 21 : 24, 26 and Judg. 11 : 23.

⁴⁾ Perhaps Nophah is rather to be regarded as a verbal form, cf. p. 10 n. 8 above.

⁵⁾ Numb. 21 : 30.

⁶⁾ Contra Noth: ZAW 1940/1, pp. 164-165.

cities to the n. of the W. el-Môjib. Whether Baal-peor (Beth-peor) had already been founded at this stage is uncertain. A generation or two afterwards it was a well-known religious centre of the Moabites, and therefore it probably dates from this era ¹⁾. The same holds good for Jahaz ²⁾ and Bamoth ³⁾. The Moabite influence and control had thus expanded over a considerable area to the n. of the W. el-Môjib before they clashed with the Amorites. When this happened, the still unconsolidated Moabite tribes were unable to defend their advanced posts in the n. against the Amorite "Gegenstosz" ⁴⁾ under the command of Sihon ⁵⁾. The initiative in recapturing this area emanated from those Amorites who were settled further north. Therefore the direction of this campaign was from north to south. This is correctly noted by Meyer and others ⁶⁾, but they interpret this fact incorrectly as an indication that it concerns a later campaign of Israel against Moab. The song of mockery refers to this campaign of the Amorites against the Moabites. First of all Sihon reconquered Heshbon. Being the most northerly of the Moabite settlements it probably was not too strenuous a task. From Heshbon, the city of Sihon, a fire went out, consuming the Moabite cities to the n. of the Arnon ⁷⁾. According to the tradition of his time, Sihon enslaved quite a number of the inhabitants of these

¹⁾ Numb. 25 : 1.

²⁾ Numb. 21 : 23.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 19.

⁴⁾ Böhl: Kanaanäer und Hebräer, p. 62.

⁵⁾ The name of the Moabite king is omitted. He is indicated as מֶלֶךְ מוֹאָב הָרִאשׁוֹן. This may be translated as "the previous king" of Moab, cf. Baentsch: Exodus, Leviticus und Numeri, p. 584; Noordtzij: Numeri, p. 226, or "the first king of Moab", cf. De Vaux: Vivre et Penser I, p. 23.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 9 above.

⁷⁾ Numb. 21 : 27-28. Though the Amorites laid claim to the destruction of "Ar of Moab", they never controlled the land to the s. of the Arnon. On account of the Shihân stele Kittel: G. Isr. I, p. 377 n. 1 assumes that an Amorite Dynasty ruled to the s. of the Arnon during the 14th or 13th century B.C. But the stele from Shihân is much older, cf. p. 52 n. 2 above.

cities¹⁾. Still he did not altogether depopulate that region. Though the conflict with Sihon resulted in a temporary setback for the Moabite settlement of the regions to the n. of the Arnon, it did not wipe out that settlement.

Although the Arnon is emphatically mentioned as the official boundary between the Moabites and the Amorites²⁾, that fact does not imply that there were no Moabites to the n. of it. In those ages the boundary lines were not marked so clearly. Among the cities under the control of the Amorites, there were several unoccupied areas, in which the Moabite tribes continued to settle³⁾. The sources, that allude to this reflect the circumstances and relations of a couple of decades later, but there are some indications that the process by which these relations were created, must have been older.

a. *The Name עַרְבּוֹת מוֹאָב.*

When the Israelites descended from the highland towards the Jordan, they immediately designated the valley between the n. of the Dead Sea and the W. Nimrîn as the *עַרְבּוֹת מוֹאָב*⁴⁾. In reference to this period, the use of this name may be anachronistic. Then it may have originated during the Moabite occupation of this region in the time of the Judges⁵⁾. But it is doubtful whether the Israelites would have designated this much disputed area in this way during a period in which the Moabites laid such a strong claim to the right of ownership of the territory concerned. By doing so they would merely have strengthened the Moabite claim. The name rather originated at a stage when there was no dispute between Israel and Moab about the occupation of this territory. The only period during which this occurred was when the Israelites

¹⁾ Numb. 21 : 29; cf. the translation of Numb. 29 : 30 by Noordtzij: Numeri, p. 226.

²⁾ Numb. 21 : 13.

³⁾ A similar state of affairs manifested itself in west-Palestine, where the Israelites lived next to the former inhabitants of the country without actually controlling them or being controlled by them.

⁴⁾ Numb. 22 : 1 and passim.

⁵⁾ cf. Judg. 3 : 12-30.

first arrived here ¹⁾. As they had met some Moabite tribesmen in this valley, they called it the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב.

b. The Locality of the Activities of Balaam.

Balaam conducted his activities within the territory of the Moabites ²⁾. The infiltration of the Moabites into the area n. of the Arnon could not have occurred within the short stretch of time from the defeat of Sihon by Israel to the arrival of Balaam. There must have been an uninterrupted Moabite settlement in this area.

c. The Apostasy at Baal-peor.

While Israel dwelt in Shittim, the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab and they even joined in the Moabite sacrifices to their gods. Unless it is assumed that the Moabites rushed to their sanctuary at Baal-peor immediately after the defeat of the Amorites by Israel, their presence at this site is only understood on the supposition that they inhabited this area even though the Amorites controlled it. To the author of Numb. 25 : 1-5 the presence of the Moabites at Baal-peor seems to be no anomaly. They are regarded as the permanent inhabitants of this area.

d. The Death of Moses.

The author of Dt. 34 : 5-6 explicitly states that Moses died in the land of Moab and was buried by the LORD opposite to Beth-peor in the land of Moab.

On account of these occurrences we may assume that the Moabite domicile in the territory n. of the Arnon was not interrupted by the Amorites. These tribes to the n. of the Arnon were not completely isolated from their fellow tribesmen to the s. of the river. Therefore Balak, who was not simply a local king of one Moabite tribe ³⁾, came from the s. to their

¹⁾ If the name is older it probably originated during the settlement in the n. before they were defeated by Sihon. But it seems as though the name was coined by the Israelites, cf. Noth: ZAW 1944, p. 18.

²⁾ cf. p. 123 below.

³⁾ Contra Noth: ZAW 1944, p. 30 n. 3.

aid. As the Moabites took a strong stand against the Israelites ¹⁾, we may assume that the different tribes were already consolidated into a united Kingdom, when the Israelites first met them. During the period immediately preceding their first contact with Israel, two incidents, which very much expedited the consolidation of Moab, occurred. The first was the expansion of power by the city-state of Heshbon under the command of Sihon. At a stage, when the Moabite tribes still existed as incoherent states and groups ²⁾, the Amorites succeeded in retarding the Moabite expansion to the n. of the Arnon and thus their official boundary was the Arnon. They found that they would not be able to hold their ground against a more powerful enemy unless they were united and ruled by one king ³⁾. The second event that could have influenced the unification of the different Moabite and other tribes in the land of Moab was the rumour of the victory of Israel over the Egyptians ⁴⁾, who had been known from ancient times in Palestine as a mighty power. The report of the advance of Israel filled the Moabites with fear ⁵⁾ and could have been a stimulus to unification especially as the Moabites had found shortly before that the incoherent tribes could not resist the enemy. It is of significance that Ex. 15 : 15 refers neither to a king of Edom nor to a king of Moab, whereas both Edom and Moab were ruled by kings when Israel first met them ⁶⁾. Is this difference just accidental and due to the poetical character of Ex. 15 ? Or does it actually indicate that the transition to the monarchy had taken place in the meantime ? Furthermore it may be noted that the settlers were continually confronted

¹⁾ cf. Judg. 11 : 17.

²⁾ In Numb. 21 : 26 מֶלֶךְ does not refer to a king of the Monarchy. It refers to a local king; cf. the usage in the Amarna Letters and in Joshua; cf. also p. 114 n. 5 above. The correct rendering of מֶלֶךְ is "the previous".

³⁾ cf. I Sam. 8 : 20 for the conception that a monarchy is the best form of government.

⁴⁾ Ex. 14 : 26.

⁵⁾ cf. Ex. 15 : 15.

⁶⁾ cf. Numb. 20 : 14; 22 : 4.

with raids from eastern nomads. This circumstantial pressure accelerated the process of unification ¹⁾. The period from the defeat by Sihon to the arrival of Israel was utilized for the consolidation of the tribes and the building of fortified cities ²⁾.

5. *Moab, Midian and Moses.*

When the consolidated Moabite Kingdom learned that the Israelite invasion into Palestine had failed ³⁾ and that the Edomite army had forced the Israelites to by-pass the Edomite borders ⁴⁾, the Moabites regarded themselves superior or at least equal to the Israelites. According to the address delivered by Jephthah, they even refused to allow Israel to proceed through their territory ⁵⁾. The Israelites, being to the e. of the country of Edom, advanced due n. and thus marched past the territory of Moab. From the time that the Israelites came near the south-eastern border of Moab at Ijje-abarim ⁶⁾ until they left the fields of Moab to enter the land of promise, the mutual relation between them and the Moabites fluctuated. In the beginning something like the modern "cold war" existed between them. Though it never came to a display of military power, the relationship was

¹⁾ According to Albright: *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 221, the Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites all had kings, who were much more than tribal *emirs*, in the 11th century B.C.. In Gen. 36 and I Chron. 1 the names of 8 kings, who reigned in the land of Edom before any king reigned over the children of Israel, are mentioned. They are named in contrast to the **אֱלֹהִים**, cf. Gen. 36: 29-30, 40-43.

The date of the kingship of Saul may be fixed in the last quarter of the 11th century B.C.. The origin of the Monarchy in Edom (and Moab) may be dated 2 centuries earlier. On the assumption that Gen. 36 and I Chron. 1 provide the names of the kings who reigned over Edom before an Israelite king ruled over Edom, cf. Van Selms: *Kronieken I*, p. 83, we may date the origin of the Edomite Monarchy one generation later.

²⁾ Numb. 21: 13.

³⁾ cf. Numb. 14: 40-45; Dt. 1: 43-44.

⁴⁾ Numb. 20: 14-21.

⁵⁾ cf. Judg. 11: 17. As Jephthah did not quote Numb. 21 literally, this reference might have been a lapse of memory. Perhaps he called only Numb. 20: 14-21 or Numb. 21: 22 to mind.

⁶⁾ cf. Numb. 21: 11 and p. 62 above.

definitely strained. According to the Deuteronomist the Israelites were summoned by the LORD not to trouble the land of Moab or to contend with the Moabites in battle, for they would not inherit the land of Moab ¹⁾. This instruction may be regarded as an indication of the unsympathetic relationship. Because the Moabites did not allow them in their territory, the Israelites had to remain aloof.

According to Edelkoort the Moabites are not mentioned in the Letters from Amarna because they had been driven out of their country and the Moabite Kingdom did not exist at that moment. When the Israelites marched forward from the desert the Moabites joined them, and only by cooperating with them, were the Moabites able to reinstate their Kingdom ²⁾. But the Moabites are not mentioned in the Letters from Amarna because their Kingdom did not yet exist at the time. Furthermore, the sources concerning the march of Israel indicate just the opposite in respect of relationship between Israel and Moab. When the Israelites came near the border of Moab for the first time, the Moabites assumed an unfriendly attitude towards them. Only after the Israelites had marched past their country without any indication of hostility whatsoever did the Moabite suspicions and animosity begin to dwindle. The Israelites by-passed the country of the Moabites and camped for quite a period near the boundary alongside the Arnon ³⁾, without trying to enter the country. Thus they convinced the Moabites that they were only aiming for the West-Jordan territory. Whereas the Moabites formerly had considered Israel a potential menace, they now looked upon the Israelites as allies in their struggle against the Amorites. From this time they started to trade with the Israelites ⁴⁾. Although the sources do not disclose whether Israel and Moab

¹⁾ Dt. 2 : 9.

²⁾ Edelkoort: *Numeri*, pp. 166-167.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 13; Judg. 11 : 18; cf. also Gemser: *V. T.* II, p. 353. Israel respected the official boundaries of Moab, cf. Numb. 21 : 15-16 and p. 6 above.

⁴⁾ Dt. 2 : 28-29. At this time they camped at Kedemot, cf. Dt. 2 : 21 and p. 75 above.

concluded an agreement, we may assume that Moses would not have undertaken the expedition against Sihon before having been assured by the Moabites that the Israelites would not be attacked by them. The contention of Wellhausen¹⁾ that the Israelites could have undertaken their campaign against the Amorites only in collaboration with Edom, Moab and Ammon may not be correct in all aspects²⁾, but his suggestion that the Israelites collaborated with the Moabites during their campaigns against Sihon and Og, contains a high degree of historical probability³⁾. This tie of friendship between Israel and Moab could benefit both peoples. Israel did not risk an attack in the rear, while engaged in a war with Sihon⁴⁾, and Moab cherished the hope that they would regain the lost territory once the Amorites had been defeated by the Israelites, whom they believed were heading for the west-Jordan territory.

After the Israelites had conquered Sihon at Jahaz, things developed in a different way from that which the Moabites had expected. The victorious Israelite army chanted the same song of mockery that the Amorites had sung formerly after they had triumphed over the Moabites⁵⁾. By singing this song, the Israelites not only celebrated their own victory over the Amorites, but also made known that they were capable of subjecting the Moabites who had once been defeated by the Amorites. The re-use of this song cut the tie of friendship between Israel and Moab, for the Moabites realized that the song of mocking was a mighty implement of war⁶⁾. In the mouth of Israel this ancient Amorite song of mocking against

¹⁾ Wellhausen: *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 346; cf. Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis* I, p. 531; II, pp. 5-8; Wildeboer: *Het Oude Testament*, p. 77.

²⁾ Initially the relation was somewhat strained, contra Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis* II, p. 7.

³⁾ cf. Böhl: *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, p. 61.

⁴⁾ cf. Ewald: *History* II, p. 205.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 8-10 above.

⁶⁾ cf. Bentzen: *Intr.* I, p. 140; Aalders: *Intr. to the Pentateuch*, p. 157.

the Moabites became an Israelite song of mocking against the Moabites, which the Moabites could not fail to perceive.

Having gained the victory at Jahaz, the Israelites moved their camp closer to the cultivated land. To the n. of the Arnon they moved westward towards Beer ¹⁾, where they remained for a considerable period. Perhaps the campaign to the n. territory of Sihon in the vicinity of Jaezer and the campaign to the Kingdom of Og were launched from here. This display of power by which Israel conquered a territory, the possession of which was not essential for anybody who only required a thoroughfare to the fords of the Jordan opposite Jerichof still further increased the suspicion, created in the minds of the Moabites by the re-use of the old song of mockery. They began to doubt the intention formerly stipulated by the Israelites that their sole objective was the west-Jordan territory.

At Beer a further incident which drove the steadily increasing tension between Moab and Israel to a culminating point occurred. During the campaign against the Amorites a few of the Israelite tribes had noticed that the conquered territory was an excellent cattle-raising region, and it became their desire to settle there. Although the intention possibly did not materialize immediately in an act of occupation ²⁾, they actually were given the opportunity at Beer to make known their intention and to seal their claim to the right of ownership by an ancient custom. This custom is preserved for us in the tradition of the song of the well ³⁾. If the suspicion of the Moabites against Israel had already been aroused by the re-use of the ancient Amorite mocking song and the apparently unnecessary conquering of the two Amorite Kingdoms in their entirety, they were now assured that Israel wanted to occupy the conquered territory themselves in spite of their formerly outlined intention of only wanting a thoroughfare to the west-Jordan territory.

¹⁾ Numb. 21 : 16-18a; cf. p. 86 for the locality of Beer.

²⁾ They first had to help to conquer the land of Canaan.

³⁾ Numb. 21 : 16-18a and p. 7 above and cf. also Gen. 21 : 25-31; 26 : 15-22.

The Moabites had to counteract these three designs if they wished to regain control of the area n. of the Arnon. Therefore Balak, king of Moab, invited Balaam to curse the Israelites¹⁾. Those Moabites who still inhabited the region that was now claimed by the Israelites could have begged Balak to drive out the Israelites. But though the Moabite Kingdom was already consolidated at this moment, Balak was afraid of becoming entangled in open warfare with Israel. The apparent ease with which Israel settled matters with the Amorites, together with the fact that Moab had formerly been defeated by the same nation, obliged him to act cautiously. Israel indicated its claim to the disputed area in a distinct and effective way. The only counter-measure the Moabites could rely on was to try to undo the power of the words of the ancient song of mocking and the song of the well, by means of a soothsayer of no mean fame. For this reason Balaam was requested to curse Israel.

It is significant that Balak, first of all, turned to the elders²⁾ of the Midianites for further discussions. Therefore we may assume that cordial contacts then existed between the Moabites and the Midianites. Because the Midianites were a nomadic group par excellence, their domicile cannot be fixed exactly³⁾. Frequently only one tribe appeared at a specific spot, while the main group could have been many miles from there. During the period under consideration such a group of Midianites was located directly to the e. or n.e. of Moab. They were moving in a westernly direction with the sanction of the Moabites, as is apparent from their presence at Baal-peor⁴⁾.

¹⁾ Contra Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis* II, p. 14, who finds the cause for the request by Balak in the fact that Israel broke their alliance with the Moabites.

²⁾ The מְזִימִים were the chiefs of the Midianite tribes from the desert, while the Moabites were united under the leadership of a מֶלֶךְ cf. Numb. 21: 1 ff.

³⁾ cf. Noth: *G.I.*², p. 149.

⁴⁾ On account of the friendly relation between Israel and the Midianites previously, cf. Ex. 2: 18; Numb. 10: 29-31, Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis*, II p. 8, concludes that the Midianites had been

Balak would have found them a willing ally against Israel. Furthermore, the Midianites being merchantmen¹⁾ had at their disposal better facilities to expedite the journey of Balaam from Mesopotamia²⁾. When the negotiations to secure the assistance of Balaam were completed and he appeared on the scene, Balak went to meet him at Ar of Moab³⁾. By the expression "Ar of Moab" is meant the whole region around the city of Ar, which could have been the seat of the king of Moab. He seemed to have met Balaam on the banks of the Arnon and, from there, accompanied him to Kirjath-huzoth⁴⁾, the two of them proceeding thence to Baal-peor⁵⁾. From the Moabite point of view the appearance of Balaam was a failure. According to the tradition of the Israelites Balaam blessed the Israelites instead of uttering a curse against them, thus nullifying the power of the dreaded song of mocking and the song of the well. Therefore the Moabites contrived new means of bringing the wrath of their God upon Israel. While the Israelites camped at Shittim, the daughters of the Moabites who resided to the n. of the Arnon cunningly persuaded the Israelites to take part in the religious festival at Baal-peor. Their participation in this festival resulted in the Israelites eating of the sacrificial meat and bowing down before the Moabite gods⁶⁾. This was a flagrant transgression, for Israel

the "trait d'union" at the inception of the alliance between Israel and Moab. But a definite alliance never existed. In this instance it concerns quite different Midianite tribes, who were not closely related to Moses. Otherwise their linking up with Moab in preference to Moses cannot be easily discerned.

¹⁾ cf. Gen. 37 : 28; Numb. 22 : 7. Contra Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis I*, p. 353, who regards the Moabites as being subject to the Midianites.

²⁾ cf. Albright: *JBL* 63, pp. 211-212.

³⁾ In Numb. 22 : 36 עֵר must be read instead of עֵיר.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 85 above.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 91 above.

⁶⁾ The regulation laid down in Ex. 34 : 15-16 so literally refers to this incident that it could have been issued immediately after the festival at Baal-peor. In Dt. 4 : 3 the cult of Baal-peor is contrasted to that of Jahwe. Prof. Van Selms drew my attention to the fact that Israel, adopted by Jahwe as His people (Ex. 19 : 5), devoted them-

had been warned not to worship any other gods or to serve them. The festival at Baal-peor resulted in the Israelite disdain of Moab and their open hostility against Midian ¹⁾. The echoes of this act resounded through the centuries in the history of Israel ²⁾, and the hatred for Moab, which originated from it, may best be conceived in the stipulation that the descendants of Moab should never be assimilated into the community of the LORD ³⁾.

The Deuteronomist gives two historical reasons for this rigid isolation of the Moabites and the Ammonites: their failure to meet Israel with bread and water when the Israelites came forth out of Egypt, and their hiring of Balaam to curse Israel. The first reproach could also have been cast into Edom's teeth, for the Edomites even proceeded to meet Israel with an army. And still, in the third generation their descendants were able to enter into the community of the LORD. Their close relationship with Israel could not have gained them this prerogative, for Egypt and Edom are treated alike in spite of the fact that the Moabites and Ammonites were, according to Biblical tradition, more closely related to Israel than the Egyptians were ⁴⁾. The second reproach could have led to far reaching consequences if the LORD had not turned the curse into a blessing unto Israel ⁵⁾. In spite of

selves to Baal-peor as his property (cf. Numb. 25 : 3, 5; Ps. 106 : 28). The verb **צָמַד** is used in the same sense as *šamādu* in Nougayrol: Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit III, Text 16.207,9 which means that, on account of the acts described in the previous lines, the house concerned became the property of Šaittenu and this is described by bitu šamid. He also indicated that the guilty in Israel (cf. Numb. 25 : 5 : **הַנִּצְמָדִים** **לְכַעַל פְּעֹר**) were hanged **נָגַד הַשָּׁמֶשׁ**, which is the same as *ina* " *šamši* *āmi* in Text 16.207, 10.

¹⁾ cf. Numb. 31.

²⁾ Numb. 31 : 16 ff.; Dt. 4 : 3; Josh. 22 : 7; Hos. 9 : 10; Ps. 106 : 28; I Cor. 10 : 8; Rev. 2 : 14.

³⁾ Dt. 23 : 1-8, cf. p. 12 above.

⁴⁾ Though Israel were strangers in Egypt, they were severely suppressed there, and Egypt did Israel more harm than the Ammonites did for instance.

⁵⁾ But this incident alone could not have tipped the scale, as the

the fact that the Israelite contempt for the Moabites was born at Baal-peor, the seduction did not result in a clash between the armies of Israel and Moab. Moab still did not wish to be entangled in a struggle with Israel, for the power of the songs they feared had not been counteracted by Balaam. Therefore they left the Israelites, who camped to the e. of the Jordan, unhindered, while they themselves continued to occupy or even re-occupy the same territory. Even when some of the Israelite tribes preferred to remain in Transjordan¹⁾ they were left undisturbed by the Moabites, because there was enough unoccupied area which they could appropriate.

6. *Eglon in the West-Jordan Territory.*

Less than half a century after Joshua had relieved the warriors of Reuben and Gad from their plight²⁾, the Moabites succeeded in re-occupying the **עַרְבֹת מוֹאָב**. At that stage the tribes of Gad and Reuben were not yet properly settled³⁾. If these tribes did clash with the Moabites during this period, the tribes from the w. of the Jordan were either unable⁴⁾ or unwilling to help them. Though the eastern tribes assisted those from the west in conquering the land of Canaan, the western tribes were never highly pleased with the fact that these eastern tribes had settled outside the boundaries of the actual land of promise⁵⁾. These strained relationships among the ranks of the Israelite tribes facilitated the task of Eglon. Led by Eglon, their king, the Moabites gained control of the territory n. of the Arnon to the east-Jordan plains opposite

Ammonites did not take part either in the invitation to Balaam or in the festival at Baal-peor. The only common ground on which both Ammon and Moab could be excluded is the fact that the Israelite tradition grouped them with the **בְּנֵי קְנִזִּי** on account of their origin, cf.

Van Selms: HTS Mei 1953, pp. 41-43.

¹⁾ The first Israelite settlements seem to have been somewhere on the banks of the W. Sha'ib, cf. Van Zyl: HTS 14, p. 119.

²⁾ Josh. 22 : 8; cf. Numb. 32 : 17; Dt. 3 : 12; Josh. 4 : 12.

³⁾ cf. Van Zyl: HTS 14, p. 122; Noth: ZAW 1940/1, p. 170 n. 1.

⁴⁾ cf. Filson and Wright: WHAB, p. 44.

⁵⁾ Numb. 32 : 14-15; Josh. 22 : 9; cf. Judg. 12 : 12.

Jericho. Eglon concluded an alliance with the Amalekites and the Ammonites. The alliance with the Amalekites, who usually dwelt to the s. of Judah and the Dead Sea ¹⁾, indicates once again how the fortunes of different nations fluctuated during this time. A group of Amalekites seem to have been somewhere to the n.e. of Moab at this moment ²⁾ and as they wished to enter the land of Canaan, they eagerly undertook to assist Eglon. The Ammonites, formerly penned by the Amorites into an inadequate area, were always on the lookout to expand their territory, and they too would have been a willing ally of Moab against Israel. Garstang ³⁾ identifies this expedition with an onslaught of the Shâsu on the southern part of Palestine, suppressed by Seti I ⁴⁾. The Shâsu are frequently mentioned in the Egyptian records. They were Bedouins, who could have had some relations with the original Bedouin-groups, that settled in the land of Moab ⁵⁾. But they stood in no relation whatsoever to this coalition, for the invasion to which Garstang refers, was undertaken a considerable time before the invasion of these allies ⁶⁾. Baarslag ⁷⁾, on the other hand, is of the opinion that the invasion took place with the sanction of Egypt. According to him, Israel was subjected by Egypt during the period of the Judges and the Egyptian Pharaoh handed over the execution of his authority to Moab or Ammon or Philistea. Baarslag's theory is purely hypothetical because the power of Egypt was an insignificant factor in Palestine during the time of the Judges.

Of their own accord the Moabites, the Amalekites, and the

¹⁾ cf. Gen. 36 : 12; Ex. 17 : 8-16; Numb. 13 : 29; 14 : 25, 43-45; Dt. 25 : 17-19.

²⁾ cf. Numb. 24 : 20; Dt. 34 : 1-3. Still later they moved further towards the cultured land of w. Palestine, cf. Judg. 5 : 14; 6 : 33; 12 : 15. Both Saul and David fought against them in the Negeb, cf. I Sam. 15 : 6-7; 27 : 8; 30 : 1 ff.

³⁾ Garstang: Joshua Judges, p. 270.

⁴⁾ cf. Breasted: A. R. E. III, p. 101; Pritchard: ANET, p. 254.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 109 above.

⁶⁾ The campaign of Seti I took place in 1314 B.C., while this invasion occurred shortly before 1200 B.C..

⁷⁾ Baarslag: De Bijbelse Geschiedenis I, p. 345.

Ammonites tried in a joint effort to expand their territories. When their occupation of the land, which had formerly been given to the tribes of Gad and Reuben though the land was not yet fully occupied by them, was carried out without interference from the West-Jordan tribes, the Moabites ventured to shift their outposts to the western side of the Jordan also. Exactly how the subjugation of the West-Jordan tribes concerned took place, we do not know. It may, however, be assumed that the Moabites did not control all the Israelite tribes. Only the tribe of Benjamin ¹⁾ and the n.e. corner of Judah ²⁾, in which also some of the Reubenites were settled ³⁾, would have been subjected. That Benjamin suffered a good deal in consequence of this submission may perhaps be deduced from the fact that the liberation was planned and carried out by a Benjaminite, Ehud, the son of Gera ⁴⁾. Auerbach ⁵⁾ alleges that the Moabites invaded Palestine round the southern end of the Dead Sea, where they joined forces with the Amalekites ⁶⁾, before conquering the city Tamar. He therefore reads תָּמָר instead of הַתְּמָרִים ⁷⁾. But the text of the M.T. seems to be the correct one, and the purpose of the author has been to indicate that the vicinity of Jericho had been subjugated ⁸⁾. It is possible, but not necessarily final that this campaign directly followed the punishing-expedition of

¹⁾ cf. Josh. 18 : 2.

²⁾ cf. Josh. 15 : 7.

³⁾ cf. Van Zyl: HTS 14, pp. 119-120.

⁴⁾ cf. Gen. 46 : 21; I Chron. 8 : 3, 5, 7. With reference to I Chron. 8 : 7 Richter: ZAW 1914, p. 138, assumes that Gera, the father of Ehud, was imprisoned in Moab. This would have been a sound reason why Ehud rebelled. But the text emendations by Richter seem somewhat far-fetched.

⁵⁾ Auerbach: ZAW 1933, p. 49; Wüste und Gelobtes Land I, p. 101, cf. also Baarslag: De Bijbelse Beschiedenis II, pp. 143, 248-249. If Edom had any sympathy with Israel, why did they allow Moab to pass through their country?

⁶⁾ Auerbach: ZAW 1933, p. 48, does not mention the Ammonites.

⁷⁾ Auerbach: ZAW 1930, p. 4; 1933, p. 49; Kochler: LVTL, pp. 701-702.

⁸⁾ In Dt. 34 : 3 and I Chron. 28 : 15 Jericho is called הַתְּמָרִים; cf. Van Selms: II Kronieken, p. 163 and Noth: G. I.², p. 144.

the other tribes against Benjamin ¹⁾, when the tribe of Benjamin was weakened so much that the allies could subjugate them and compel them to pay tribute ²⁾. This they had to pay to the king of Moab. He seems to have initiated the campaign.

After the subjected tribes had regularly paid the tribute for 18 years, they availed themselves of the opportunity of bringing their tribute to throw off the Moabite yoke. We are not informed where Eglon, king of Moab, was when the tribute was handed over to him. To the author of Judg. 3 it seemed evident that he was at Jericho. But as Ehud accompanied the people who brought the tribute to Gilgal ³⁾ before returning to Eglon, this assumption has been queried ⁴⁾. It is suggested that the tribute was brought to Medeba, where Eglon had his residence ⁵⁾. In addition to the objections raised by Auerbach ⁶⁾ against this idea, it may be mentioned that it seems improbable that Ehud would have executed his risky deed in the Moabite capital, where revenge could have been taken on him much more easily. All the occurrences took place in Jericho. Though Jericho had just previously been ruined by the Israelites ⁷⁾, the Moabites could have restored a few bastions and established themselves there temporarily ⁸⁾. The period of occupation by the Moabites was too short to leave any definite traces and whatever remains there could perhaps have been eventually washed down the slopes by torrents. The objection that Ehud and his companions, who brought the tribute, proceeded homeward in the wrong direction is not convincing either. The intrigue had been prearranged. In order to hamper the pursuit by the Moabite

¹⁾ Judg. 20 : 1 ff.; cf. Baarslag: *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis* II, p. 244. But this incident could also have taken place much later.

²⁾ Judg. 3 : 14.

³⁾ Judg. 3 : 19.

⁴⁾ cf. Noth: *G.I.*², p. 145 n. 1.

⁵⁾ cf. Auerbach: *ZAW* 1933, p. 48; Kittel: *G. Isr.* II, p. 27 n. 4.

⁶⁾ Auerbach: *ZAW* 1933, p. 48.

⁷⁾ Josh. 6 : 1 ff.

⁸⁾ cf. Kittel: *G. Isr.* II, p. 27.

soldiers, Ehud and his companions returned to Benjamin by a detour. After the murder Ehud followed the same road for the same reason.

Eglon was on a tour through his Kingdom when the subordinates handed over their tribute to him. In Jericho Ehud, the Benjaminite, appeared with a great number of followers to acknowledge his superiority. A great embassy was an indication of extraordinary homage to the king, and thus Eglon would not have any suspicion if the behaviour of Ehud were afterwards to be somewhat extraordinary. After receiving the signs of their complete subordination, Eglon and his guards were convinced of the loyalty of the Benjaminites. It may even be that Ehud promised to furnish Eglon with information, which could aid him in his further wars of expansion. Therefore nobody was suspicious when he returned and asked to see the king in private. Ehud pretended that he had, apparently at the **פְּסִילִים** of Gilgal ¹⁾, received an oracle which he wanted to disclose to the king in private. The king ordered the guards to leave, and in honour of the oracle, which he expected to receive, he rose from the exalted chair upon which he sat ²⁾. Consequently Ehud could kill him with a single stab. Ehud, being left-handed, could hide his sword on the righthand-side where it would not be looked for. Without arousing the suspicion of the body-guard, Ehud passed them after he had locked the door of the room in which he had murdered Eglon ³⁾. Only when the king, after a long lapse of time, failed to appear, was their suspicion aroused, and by then the murderer had already escaped. The confusion that resulted after the murder of the king furnished Ehud with the opportunity to escape to the mountains of Ephraim, where he immediately summoned his people to fight

¹⁾ The **פְּסִילִים** probably were statues erected by the Moabites. Contra Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 62.

²⁾ Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 296; cf. Neh. 8 : 5.

³⁾ From the outside they could open the door only by means of a key, Judg. 3 : 25; cf. Gen. 19 : 10. Perhaps they first had to go and look for the key.

the Moabites ¹⁾. As they were attacked unawares, the Moabites were defeated without much opposition and driven back to the other side of the Jordan. Many of them were killed at the fords of the Jordan, which had previously been taken by Ehud and his men. The number of the killed, estimated at ten thousand men ²⁾, is exceedingly high, for with such a great army at their disposal, the Moabites would have rendered fiercer opposition, however surprising the attack or however intense the chaos after the death of their king might have been. Only if the war progressed to the e. side of the Jordan, could we expect a considerable slaughter of the enemy. But the author does not mention that the Israelites persecuted the Moabites across the Jordan. Once they had driven the intruders out of their own territory, the Benjaminites were satisfied. They did not trouble themselves about the struggle that the other tribes across the Jordan might have with the Moabites. This behaviour of theirs might have been caused either by a lack of sympathy with their brethren or by fear of the Moabite army, which could come from the s. to avenge the death of their king.

7. Moab Repulsed to the Arnon.

After the Moabites had been driven back from the West-Jordan territory, there apparently ensued a period of peace between the Moabites and the Israelite tribes on the e. side of the Jordan. For at least two generations there were no clashes between the Moabites and their Israelite neighbours. One gathers that each group was engaged in consolidating itself during this period. When new residential areas had to be found, the groups preferred regions not yet occupied or utilized as pasture land by the other group. This peaceful relationship was due partly to the successful venture of Ehud and partly to the threatenings by other nations and groups. Perhaps the isolated remark that the Edomite, Hadad, son

¹⁾ The tribes concerned could have been incited to taking part in the war by the so-called Oracles of Balaam, cf. p. 12 above.

²⁾ Judg. 3 : 29.

of Bedad, smote Midian in the field of Moab ¹⁾, has bearing on the situations during this time ²⁾. Exactly why the Edomites and Midianites clashed on Moabite soil we do not know. Most probably Moab had again concluded an alliance with the Midianites in an attempt to invade Palestine. After the expulsion of the Moabites by Ehud, they joined forces with the Midianites to invade Palestine by way of the route to the s. of the Dead Sea. For that purpose it was necessary, first of all, to obtain permission from the king of Edom to pass through his territory. When the king of Edom failed to grant their request, they could have tried to force their way through his territory. But they were driven back by the Edomite garrison which was stationed at the strongly fortified n. boundary of Edom ³⁾. The Edomites pursued the retreating enemy and in the fields of Moab they were smitten once again.

Thus the Moabites had experienced a set-back both in the n. and in the s. and for the time being they were compelled to live in peace with their neighbours. Gradually the tribes of Reuben and Gad moved s. towards the Arnon. It even seems probable that Israelite families from the w. of the Dead Sea and the Jordan moved to the land of Moab during this period. On account of a famine the family of Elimelech, for instance, sojourned in the more fertile land of Moab ⁴⁾. In

¹⁾ cf. Gen. 36 : 35; I Chron. 1 : 46.

²⁾ Hadad the son of Bedad was the 4th of the 8 kings, who ruled in Edom before an Israelite king ruled in Edom, cf. Procksch: Genesis, p. 222; Heinisch: Genesis, pp. 341-342; Van Selms: I Kronieken, p. 83 (but cf. also Delitzsch: Pentateuch I, p. 325; Skinner: Genesis, p. 434). David was the first Israelite king who subjugated the Edomites under his suzerainty, cf. II Sam. 8 : 14. According to this chronology, the clash between the Edomites and the Midianites in the fields of Moab could have occurred shortly before or after 1100 B.C. (David ruled about 1000 B.C. Approximately 20 to 25 years are allowed for each of the preceding 4 generations, cf. Skinner: Genesis, p. 434.) Albright: JBL 63 p. 231, dates it in 1080 B.C.; cf. also Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, pp. 283, 325.

³⁾ cf. Glueck: Annual XV, p. 104; XVIII-XIX, pp. 53, 60, 69.

⁴⁾ Ruth 1 : 1; cf. also Reed: Basor 146, pp. 6-10. Chronologically it fits in well to date the migration of Elimelech before the liberation by Jephthah, because his migration must be dated about one century

spite of the rigid prohibitive regulation of Dt. 23 : 3 inter-marriages between Israelites and Moabites took place as a result of this migration ¹). The fragmentary account concerning the family of Ehud ²) may be yet another example of the blending of Israel and Moab during this period.

The friendly relations between the Israelites and the Moabites did not, however, last long. The southward infiltration of the tribe of Reuben and other Israelites took a turn too dangerous for Moab. The Ammonites also began to suffer from the activities of the tribe of Gad. Therefore the Moabites and Ammonites concluded an alliance to check the Israelite intrusion ³). Initially the allies were successful. They penetrated to the Jabbok and even subjected the people to the n. of it. They also troubled the Israelites to the w. of the Jordan ⁴). The position of the Israelites to the e. of the Jordan was most precarious. They persuaded Jephthah to take the lead in their liberation. He tried to settle the differences by entering into negotiations with the enemy. But he regarded their claims as unreasonable, because Israel had not taken the disputed area from the Moabites and Ammonites, but had conquered it from the Amorites. The river Arnon was then the n. boundary of the land of Moab ⁵). Consequently the negotiations were broken off and in the battle which followed, the two allies were defeated and their boundaries pushed back to where Sihon had fixed them long ago. The southernmost city reconquered by Jephthah, was Aroer ⁶) and this prac-

before David's accession to the throne; cf. Haller: *Die Fünf Megilloth*, p. 5.

¹) cf. Van Selms: HTS Mei 1953, pp. 37, 43. This seems to be proof of the authenticity of the genealogical list, even though it might have been attached to the Book of Ruth at a later stage.

²) I Chron. 8 : 6-9. It is not known when Shaharaim went to the land of Moab. Unless some names are omitted or unless this list originated at a later stage, reflecting conditions during the time of its origin, it may have bearing on the time of the Judges.

³) cf. Judg. 10 : 17 - 12 : 7 and p. 14 above.

⁴) Judg. 10 : 7-10.

⁵) Judg. 11 : 18, 22; cf. Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, pp. 245-249.

⁶) Judg. 11 : 26, 33; cf. Tristram: *Moab*, p. 155; Burney: *Judges*.

tically meant that he repulsed the Moabites to the s. of the Arnon. Though the tribe of Reuben was liberated, it actually never recovered from this blow. This firstborn tribe of Jacob declined more and more as a result of the continuous plundering of the Moabites, until it later assimilated apparently altogether with the tribe of Gad.

8. Moab and the New Monarchy.

After their defeat by Jephthah the Moabites did not soon again venture to restore their authority to the n. of the Arnon. In the meantime, more Israelites, especially the tribe of Gad, moved southward towards the Arnon. Only after the creation of the monarchy in Israel and the dissatisfaction which it aroused in some circles ¹⁾, did there follow another attempt by the Moabites to expand their territory. During the struggle in Israel to ensure the existence of the new monarchy, there again evolved a general turmoil among the other nations in Cis- and Transjordan ²⁾. Seeing that the East-Jordan tribes had been weakened by the expedition of Nahash the Ammonite, the Moabites seized the opportunity to try to recapture the territory to the n. of the Arnon. They might even have attempted this with the collaboration of the Ammonites. While Saul's attention was engrossed elsewhere, they succeeded in establishing their authority to the n. of the Arnon and thus became another menace to the Israelite control of Transjordan. Therefore Saul had to wage war against them. This war, which is only incidentally mentioned in the O.T. ³⁾, must be regarded as a defensive rather than an offensive war. It was initiated to secure the Israelite territory against the Moabite efforts to expand their own boundaries at the cost of the Israelite tribes ⁴⁾. Once again the Moabites were repulsed to the s. of

p. 320; Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, p. 246 n. 666. Contra Moore: *Judges*, p. 300; Abel: *Geogr.* II, p. 250; Goslinga: *Richteren I*, p. 187.

¹⁾ cf. I Sam. 10: 27; 11: 12.

²⁾ I Sam. 11: 1 ff.; 13: 1 ff.; 14: 1 ff.

³⁾ I Sam. 14: 47; cf. Delitzsch: *Samuel*, p. 148; De Groot: *I Samuel*, p. 130; Goslinga: *De Bocken van Samuel I*, p. 182.

⁴⁾ cf. also Ewald: *History III*, p. 43.

the Arnon. Saul did not subject the Moabites to himself. The Moabites to the s. of the Arnon were still independent without being compelled to pay tribute to the new Israelite monarchy. But by liberating the e. Jordan tribes from the Ammonite and Moabite oppression, he turned them into his most loyal supporters.

While David was fleeing before Saul, the Moabites were on good terms with him. David was not only related to them ¹⁾, but he was also regarded as an ally. Therefore, when David's parents were compelled to go into exile with him, the king of Moab allowed them to sojourn in his country ²⁾. David and his band of followers temporarily resided in the land of Moab. At this stage Ithmah, the Moabite, could have joined the band of David ³⁾. When David had to depart from the land of Moab, his parents remained there ⁴⁾. They were too old to endure the hardships thrust upon them by the mode of life David was compelled to adopt ⁵⁾. They remained in the land of Moab until David went to live in Hebron as king of Judah ⁶⁾. When the power of Saul crumbled on account of the revolt of the Philistines ⁷⁾, the Moabites could again move to the n. of the Arnon. Because of the struggle for the throne which followed the death of Saul, the opportunity to revolt extended over a considerable period. As soon as David was crowned king of Judah, the Moabites changed their attitude towards him. He immediately became a professed enemy of the nations to the e. of the Jordan, and because a considerable period elapsed before his throne was well-established and the power

¹⁾ Ruth 4 : 18-22; I Chron. 2 : 11-15.

²⁾ I Sam. 22 : 3. The position of Mispheh is still unknown, cf. p. 88 above.

³⁾ I Chron. 11 : 46; cf. Rudolph: *Chronikbücher*, pp. 101-103.

⁴⁾ I Sam. 22 : 4. Olmstead: *History of Palestine and Syria*, p. 308 assumes that they stayed with the king. But cf. the text of the Vulgate and the Syrian translation of I Sam. 22 : 3.

⁵⁾ cf. Kamphausen: *ZAW* 1886, p. 67 n. 1.

⁶⁾ I Sam. 22 : 4; II Sam. 2 : 1 ff. The later tradition that his parents were treacherously murdered by the king of Moab, cf. *Bemidbar Rabba* XIV, 1, has no historical value.

⁷⁾ cf. I Sam. 31.

of the Philistines crushed, the Moabites continued to encroach upon Israelite territory. At the same time the Moabites took revenge for the blood shed by the Israelites during the war waged by Saul. This northward expansion was sufficient cause for David to wage war against them, as he did against the Ammonites and the Aramaeans, once he had established his throne over all Israel ¹⁾. David defeated them and subjected them. The heroic deeds which Benaiah, the son of Jehoiadah, had accomplished on Moabite soil ²⁾ may perhaps date back to this war. A great number of Moabites were captured. David caused them to lie down on the ground, and then measured two measures to put to death and one full measure he kept alive ³⁾. This procedure of David's seems extraordinary. As the Chronist no longer understood the purpose of it, he does not mention it ⁴⁾. The measuring did not serve to divide the prisoners into big and small, after which those who exceeded a certain length were killed ⁵⁾. It only was an arbitrary method of indicating those destined for death. Furthermore, the procedure has a symbolical meaning. By being forced to lie down before his feet, they at once recognized David's superiority. Further significance was given to this token of subjugation by the laying of hands on the heads of the conquered ⁶⁾. During David's life-time it was still the practice to kill all prisoners of war. When a third part was spared by David, this was a gesture of mercy bestowed on the nation to whom

¹⁾ The precise historical sequence in which David marched against these nations is unknown. Moab is mentioned first, II Sam. 8 : 2 (but cf. I Sam. 14 : 47). Perhaps the historical sequence of his campaign has been transmitted, cf. also Noth: BBLA 1949, p. 48 n. 1. If the Moabites succeeded in penetrating to the **עַרְבֹת מוֹאָב**, it is only natural that David should have assaulted them after he had conquered the Philistines.

²⁾ II Sam. 23 : 30; I Chron. 11 : 22; Albright: ARI, p. 218 n. 86.

³⁾ II Sam. 8 : 2. The act of measuring concerned the prisoners and not the country; cf. the application of the suffix of the masc. plural.

⁴⁾ I Chron. 18 : 2; cf. p. 17 above.

⁵⁾ cf. Pedersen: Israel II, p. 24; Baarslag: De Bijbelse Geschiedenis III, p. 16.

⁶⁾ Koehler: LVTI, p. 271.

he was related and among whom his parents resided, while he was fleeing before Saul. But even these considerations did not deter David from subjugating them altogether. The region up to the Arnon was considered Israelite territory ¹⁾, while the people to the s. of it were subjugated and had to pay a yearly tribute ²⁾. The nature of this tribute is not mentioned, but we may assume that it consisted of agricultural products and live-stock ³⁾. This condition of subjugation to the Israelite monarchy continued during the reign of Solomon. He ensured this authority by marrying the daughter of the king of Moab and by dedicating a site to the s.e. of Jerusalem to the cult of Chemosh, the god of the Moabites ⁴⁾.

During these years of its subordination to Israel, there were Judaic governors in the country of Moab, who had to see to the regular payment of the tribute by the Moabites. The mention of Joash and Saraph, who had the dominion in Moab ⁵⁾, refers to this period, while the proper name מִשְׁפַּח מוֹאָב ⁶⁾ could have originated then too.

9. *Moab and the Kingdom of Israel.*

As long as the grand state which David had built up and which had been sustained by Solomon still existed in all its splendour, the subordinate nations did not try to regain

¹⁾ According to II Sam. 24 : 5 Aroer was the most southerly city to the e. of the Jordan that was governed by David; cf. also Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 246.

²⁾ II Sam. 8 : 2; I Chron. 18 : 2; cf. Noth: G.I.², p. 181. But the Kingdom of Moab was not incorporated into that of David as Edom or Ammon was for instance.

³⁾ cf. Wright and Filson: WHAB, p. 47.

⁴⁾ I Ki. 11 : 7, 33; II Ki. 23 : 13; cf. Sanda: Die Bücher der Könige I, pp. 303-304; II, pp. 347-348.

⁵⁾ I Chron. 4 : 22; cf. Keil: The Books of Chronicles, p. 93; Smend, according to Cheyne: E.B. III, p. 3524; Macalister: PEFQ 1905, p. 340; Rudolph: Chronikbücher, pp. 35, 37. The alteration of the text by Richter: ZAW 1914, p. 122 and Rothstein-Hänel: Das erste Buch der Chronik, pp. 65-66 is unnecessary. This list does refer to conditions much earlier than the 5th century B.C., cf. Van Selms: I Kronieken p. 103.

⁶⁾ Ezrah: 2 : 6; 8 : 4; 10 : 30; Neh. 3 : 11; 7 : 11; 10 : 14; cf. Van Selms: Ezra en Nehemia, p. 65; Rudolph: Ezra und Nehemia, p. 8.

their independence. Towards the end of Solomon's reign, however, the Edomites ¹⁾ and the Aramaeans ²⁾ began to defy the authority of Solomon, and even Egypt granted asylum to Jeroboam, when Solomon tried to capture him ³⁾. The confusion that followed the death of Solomon created a favourable opportunity for all nations who wanted to throw off the yoke of the Israelites to regain their independence. When the divided kingdoms, who were involved in mutual frictions, were attacked by Pharaoh Shishak ⁴⁾, the nations to the e. of the Jordan could openly revolt.

Seeing that the history of these nations is closely linked with that of the kingdom of Israel, it is generally assumed that the Moabites were tributary to the kingdom of Israel, after the schism ⁵⁾. But the fact that the Moabite Kingdom was subjugated to Israel at a later stage does not imply that they did not regain their independence or even expand their boundaries directly after the death of Solomon ⁶⁾. This happened to the detriment of the tribe of Reuben, which actually faded away as a tribe towards the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 9th century B.C. ⁷⁾. During the first half-century of the existence of the Kingdom of Israel, its kings were frequently involved in clashes with other nations, e.g. Judah, Egypt, or Philistea, and consequently they could not subject the Moabites. The result was that the Moabites gradually moved to the n. until they reached Medeba. Not before

¹⁾ I Ki. 11 : 14 ff.

²⁾ I Ki. 11 : 23-25.

³⁾ I Ki. 11 : 40; cf. I Ki. 3 : 1 ff.

⁴⁾ I Ki. 14 : 25-28; cf. Noth : G.I.², pp. 218-219; Mazar: V.T. Suppl. IV, pp. 57-66.

⁵⁾ cf. I Ki. 15 : 18 ff.; Ewald: History IV, pp. 3-4; Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 220; Noth: G.I.², pp. 208, 223. But as all the other nations liberated themselves, we may assume that the Moabites did the same, cf. Noth: ZAW 1944, pp. 42-43. Contra Noth: BBLA 1949, p. 49 n. 1 and G.I.², p. 208.

⁶⁾ cf. Jeremias: The O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East II, p. 237; Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 353; Cooke: NSI, p. 4.

⁷⁾ M.I. 10.

the reign of Omri could Israel re-establish its control of the territory to the s. of the עֲרֵבוֹת מוֹאָב. Because Chemosh, the national god of the Moabites, "was angry at his land" ¹⁾, Omri succeeded in driving the Moabites back towards the Arnon. He conquered the cities קִרְיָתוֹן, בְּעַל פֶּעֶר, מַהְדָּבָה ²⁾ and עֲטָרָה ³⁾. For many years Moab was again subordinated to Israel and compelled to pay a heavy tribute to the king of Israel. Even after the death of Omri, Mesha⁴⁾, the son of the Moabite king who had been subjugated by Omri ⁵⁾, still "used to render to the king of Israel a hundred thousand lambs and the wool of a hundred thousand rams" ⁶⁾. The Moabites were able to pay this substantial tribute because their country "was a place for cattle" ⁷⁾.

According to king Mesha⁸⁾ this subordination, which continued till the middle of the reign of Omri's son ⁹⁾, lasted forty years. These forty years should not be considered literally ¹⁰⁾, for Omri reigned only 12 years and his son Ahab 22 years. Moreover, the subjugation of the Moabites by Omri could not have been achieved at the beginning of his reign, seeing that he first had to ensure his claim to the throne of

¹⁾ M.I. 5.

²⁾ M.I. 5-11. Contra Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 328. It is not certain whether Omri, before his accession to the throne, achieved some of the victories with which he is credited, cf. Sānda: Die Bücher der Könige II, p. 421 and cf. p. 139 n. 1.

³⁾ The subjugation occurred during the reign of Mesha's father.

⁴⁾ II Ki. 3 : 4; Montgomery and Gehman: Kings, pp. 359-360; cf. also Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 132; Dalman: Arbeit und Sitte V, p. 9.

⁵⁾ Numb. 32 : 1.

⁶⁾ M.I. 8.

⁷⁾ בְּנֵה is regarded a sing. form; cf. Sānda: Die Bücher der Könige II, pp. 420-423; Van Gelderen: Koningen II, pp. 120-121; Koopmans: Bi. Or. 3/4, 1952, p. 125. According to Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 39 בְּנֵה has the meaning "his grandson". But בְּנֵה does not refer to Jehoram.

⁸⁾ Even if בְּנֵה is translated "his sons" the number forty is not regarded literally, cf. Driver: E.B. III, p. 3047; Cooke: NSI, p. 9; Kittel: G. Isr. II, p. 239; Auerbach: Wüste und Gelobtes Land II, pp. 36-37, 45; Vriezen and Hoppers: Palestine Inscriptions, pp. 14-15.

Israel ¹). By using the number forty, king Mesha^c only wanted to indicate that the subjugation lasted for approximately one generation, i.e. from the middle of the reign of king Omri to the middle of that of his son. Though Omri compelled the Moabites to pay tribute, he did not conquer the whole of the country as far as the Arnon. The territory around the cities Dibon and Aroer was still in the hands of the Moabites ²). Mesha^c did not need to reconquer these cities, only because Omri had not conquered them. His father, being a vassal of Omri, still had his residence in Dibon. And we may assume that Mesha^c also resided there, even before he threw off the Israelite yoke.

10. Mesha^c, the Liberator of Moab.

According to the inscription of king Mesha^c he revolted against the Israelite domination in the middle of the reign of Omri's son ³). The Biblical tradition dates this revolt immediately after the death of Ahab ⁴). It may, however, be possible that the revolt had already been initiated during the life of Ahab. Thus Mesha^c could have revolted in the middle of the reign of Ahab. Though Ahab tried to suppress this revolt ⁵), he could not subjugate Moab, because he became entangled in a war with the Aramaeans and then had to join the Aramaeans in a coalition against Shalmaneser III. Shortly afterwards he was killed while fighting the Aramaeans once again ⁶). At the time of his death the Moabite revolt had

¹) I Ki. 16 : 8-23; but cf. Šanda: *Die Bücher der Könige I*, p. 405; II, p. 42; Van Gelderen: *Koningen II*, p. 120.

²) Contra Noth: *BBLA* 1949, p. 49 n. 3.

³) M.I. 8, cf. p. 138 n. 7 above.

⁴) II Ki. 1 : 1; 3 : 5.

⁵) cf. M.I. 6. The attempt to rebuild the city of Jericho (I Ki. 16 : 34) may perhaps be connected with this struggle against the Moabites, cf. Šanda: *Die Bücher der Könige I*, p. 411; Kittel: *G. Isr. II*, pp. 239-240. Could this have taken place during part of the 3 years referred to in I Ki. 22 : 1 ?

⁶) cf. II Ki. 20 : 1 ff.; Shalmaneser III: *Monolith II*, 90-92; II Ki. 22 : 1 ff.; Cooke: *NSI*, p. 4; Wildeboer: *Het Oude Testament*, p. 123; Noth: *G.I.*², pp. 219-223. The Moabites did not take part in

become so extensive ¹⁾ that the Moabites did not come to pay tribute to the new king and therefore the revolt was mentioned in the Israelite annals at that stage. Thus the revolt supplies the motive for the expedition of Jehoram and his allies against Moab ²⁾. The Biblical data, in so far as it concerns the chronology, should not be interpreted too literally, seeing that it informs us that Jehoram undertook the expedition against the Moabites immediately after the revolt at the end of Ahab's reign ³⁾, while the reign of Ahaziah, even only for two years, has to be fixed between the death of Ahab and Jehoram's accession to the throne ⁴⁾. During these years Mesha' could have completed the liberation of Moab. He thus expanded the Moabite territory to a line parallel to the n. point of the Dead Sea ⁵⁾. In his inscription he mentions the names of various cities which he conquered and rebuilt subsequently. These building operations seem to have taken place only after he had liberated his people. The reconquering of the cities must be regarded as one phase and their rebuilding as another. If this differentiation is correct, we may trace the route which Mesha' followed from south to north ⁶⁾. He first conquered עטרת ⁷⁾, then מהדבה, which was the headquarters of the king of Israel ⁸⁾, and subsequently נבה ⁹⁾, where there was an ancient Moabite sanctuary ¹⁰⁾. Only when he had secured the route from the north, whence the Israelite re-inforcements would come, he turned to יהץ, another Israel-

this coalition (contra Noth: BBLA 1949, p. 49 n. 1), because they were involved in a rebellion against Israel.

¹⁾ cf. M.I. 7. These words do not refer to the extermination of the house of Omri by Jehu; contra Jeremias: *The O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East II*, pp. 239-240.

²⁾ II Ki. 3.

³⁾ II Ki. 3 : 5-6; cf. Montgomery and Gehman: *Kings* p. 360.

⁴⁾ I Ki. 22 : 52.

⁵⁾ They even captured Nebo, M.I. 14.

⁶⁾ Contra Noth: ZAW 1944, p. 43 n. 3.

⁷⁾ M.I. 10-14.

⁸⁾ It is not mentioned again, as the conquest is mentioned in lines 8-9.

⁹⁾ M.I. 14-18.

¹⁰⁾ Num. 25 : 1 ff.

ite stronghold ¹⁾, which he conquered easily. Whether Mesha^c accomplished the re-conquering of the former Moabite soil during a somewhat extended expedition or in the course of a few successive campaigns is not known. He took stern precautionary measures in order to prevent the authority from slipping again from Moabite hands. The children of Gad, who in the meantime had replaced the children of Reuben in Ataroth ²⁾, were all killed by him, and he shed their blood as a sacrifice to Chemosh. Ataroth itself was newly populated by prisoners of war from Sharon and Maharith ³⁾. He fought against Nebo from break of day until noon, before overwhelming it. He slew all the inhabitants of Nebo, even children and maid-servants, and thus dedicated them to 'Ashtar -Chemosh ⁴⁾. Like Israel, the Moabites regarded every war as a holy war of their god ⁵⁾. Chemosh delivered them into the hands of their enemies whenever he was angry with them; he commanded them to wage war; he defeated the enemy, and the booty was dedicated to him as a sacrifice.

Having achieved his desires, Mesha^c annexed the conquered territory and started re-inforcing the n. frontier and rebuilding the ruined cities. But before he completed this task, he once again had to wage war against the combined forces of the kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom. Jehoram, king of Israel, intended to regain the territory his father had lost to Mesha^c. But as Mesha^c had re-inforced the cities on the n. boundary ⁶⁾ to such an extent that Jehoram could not enter from there, he had to conclude an alliance with the kings of Judah and Edom ⁷⁾. The allies marched through the Kingdoms of Judah and Edom, towards the s.e. course of the W. el-Hesā, where the banks of the Wādī were less steep. Perhaps

¹⁾ M.I. 18-21.

²⁾ cf. pp. 133 above.

³⁾ M.I. 13-14.

⁴⁾ M.I. 16-18.

⁵⁾ cf. Von Rad: *Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, pp. 6-14.

⁶⁾ II Ki. 3 : 8; cf. also Sanda: *Die Bücher der Könige II*, p. 19; Olmstead: *Assyria*, p. 140; Glueck: *Annual XVIII-XIX*, p. 89.

⁷⁾ II Ki. 3 : 9.

they crossed the Wādī opposite the Edomite stronghold of er-Ruweihah¹⁾, thus trying to by-pass the series of frontier fortresses on the s.e. boundary of the land of Moab, in order to find a gap in the series a little further northward. It is quite possible that the first Moabite soldiers who clashed with them had come from Maḥaiy²⁾. These soldiers seem to have attacked the enemy before the main force, led by the king, reached the battlefield, because they held the idea that the enemy, attacking in the dry summer, would be exhausted. Furthermore, the small garrison from Maḥaiy was tempted to this rash attack by a delusion. Through an unexpected thunderstorm³⁾ the W. el-Ḥesā was in flood, and the water had a red shade on account of the red sand-stone in the vicinity⁴⁾. But the Moabites, looking at it in the light of the rising sun, which made the reddish water look like blood, thought the kings had smitten one another⁵⁾. The garrison intended gathering an unexpected spoil, but were slain instead. Thus the enemy were able to enter the land of Moab at Maḥaiy. Pursuing the retreating Moabites, the allies even defeated the main Moabite force, which had come to the help of those in retreat. The king and his forces had to retreat to the rather inaccessible Kir-hareseth⁶⁾. The allies wrought havoc in the land of Moab. They besieged king Mesha' in Kir-hareseth. When he realized that this stronghold was in danger of being captured by the enemy, he ventured to break through the lines of the enemy⁷⁾, but failed to do so. In de-

¹⁾ cf. Glueck: *Annual* XIV, pp. 69, 77; XV, p. 106; XVIII-XIX, pp. 24, 53, 69; II Ki. 3 : 9, 16, 21c.

²⁾ cf. Glueck: *Annual* XVIII-XIX, pp. 61, 68.

³⁾ Being further to the s.e. in the upper-course of the Wādī, it was not noticed by the allies, cf. II Ki. 3 : 17.

⁴⁾ cf. Musil: *A. P.* I, pp. 83, 381; Šanda: *Die Bücher der Könige* II, p. 22; Dalman: *Arbeit und Sitte* I, 1, pp. 201-203; Montgomery and Gehman: *Kings*, pp. 361-362.

⁵⁾ II Ki. 3 : 21-23.

⁶⁾ II Ki. 3 : 25; cf. pp. 69-71 above.

⁷⁾ Exactly what happened cannot be determined because the text of II Ki. 3 : 25-26 is problematic, cf. Van Gelderen: *Koningen* II, p. 394. The intention of Mesha' could not have been to break through

speration he sacrificed his first-born son on the wall of the city, where the enemy could witness the sacrifice. Consequently they had to depart from the city ¹⁾. The Moabites believed that Chemosh was pacified by the sacrifice of the crown prince and therefore had intervened to save the city and the country.

As a result of this campaign Mesha^c had to secure the s. boundary. Perhaps the command to proceed and fight against חורן must be interpreted in this way ²⁾. But the text is too fragmentary and the location of חורן too uncertain for us to draw a definite conclusion. There is, however, another event which indicates that Moab paid attention to the southern boundary and the route to the s. of the Dead Sea during that period ³⁾. The previous campaign by Israel and its allies had shown that, though the W. el-Ḥesā is a natural boundary in its lower course and the southern boundary was fortified by fortresses, the enemies of the Moabites could penetrate from that quarter if only the Edomites were inimical to the Moabites. Therefore Mesha^c intended to subjugate the Edomites. The Moabites and their allies followed the route to the s. of the Dead Sea when they wanted to wage war with Judah, because they first wanted to subjugate the Edomites. This effort was apparently successful. But in their hatred for Edom they seemed to have rendered themselves guilty of desecration of the dead ⁴⁾. The Edomites, being subjugated, were compelled to proceed with them against Judah. But the allies became entangled in mutual strife and consequently the army destroyed itself ⁵⁾. Whether Mesha^c himself took part in this campaign, we do not know. The defeat, however, did not

to obtain help from Edom because Edom was the ally of Israel, but simply because the Edomite contingent was smallest; cf. Kittel: *Die Bücher der Könige*, pp. 195-196.

¹⁾ cf. also Sanda: *Die Bücher der Könige* II, p. 24; Montgomery and Gehman: *Kings*, pp. 363-364; Mulder: *Apokalipse*, Stelling IV. Contra Van Gelderen: *Koningen* II, p. 396.

²⁾ M.I. 32-34.

³⁾ II Chron. 20 : 1 v.v. and p. 20 above.

⁴⁾ Amos 2 : 1-3 and p. 20 above.

⁵⁾ II Chron. 20 : 22-23.

affect the Moabite authority elsewhere. Mesha^c was still in a position to continue his building operations. Besides reinforcing the cities in the n., e.g. Baal-meon, Kirjatan, Beth-bemoth, Bezer, Madebah, and Beth-diblatan ¹⁾, he expanded his residential city and annexed to Dibon the new "suburb" קרחה ²⁾, which he walled in. He also re-inforced Aroer on the banks of the Arnon. But the most important of his building activities was the erection of the sanctuary of Chemosh at קרח, where he also deposited his inscribed stele.

The reign of Mesha^c was long and successful. Precisely when he succeeded his father we do not know, but it might have been during the first half of the reign of king Ahab of Israel. Because Mesha^c mentioned that the whole of Israel had been killed ³⁾, it is sometimes assumed that he was referring to the extermination of the house of Omri by Jehu ⁴⁾. If that were so his stele could only have been erected after 842 B.C. But the words of Mesha^c should rather be regarded as the Moabite interpretation of the victory over Israel. In that case the rule of Mesha^c could have ended before the death of Joram of Israel. If, however, we take into account that Mesha^c was engaged in several wars and that he completed an extensive building programme a long reign should be assigned to him. In round figures we may assign the period 870-840 B.C. to him.

11. *The Decline of the Kingdom of Mesha^c.*

When Jehu was anointed king of Israel at Ramoth-Gilead in 842 B.C., the Israelite forces were entangled in a struggle with Hazael, the king of Aram ⁵⁾. After the victories attained by Mesha^c, the Israelites could not reconquer the southern part of the East-Jordan territory, because they had to count-

¹⁾ M.I. 9, 10, 25, 27, 30.

²⁾ M.I. 21-26; cf. pp. 78-80 above.

³⁾ M.I. 26.

⁴⁾ Jeremias: *The O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East II*, pp. 239-240; Sarda: *Die Bücher der Könige II*, pp. 119-120, 423.

⁵⁾ 11 Ki. 8 : 28.

eract the Aramaic infiltration. Immediately after the murder of Joram, the new king, Jehu, had to withdraw his forces from e. of the Jordan. He first had to establish his throne in Samaria ¹⁾. The Biblical records do not mention that Jehu waged any wars. They only state that Hazael of Aram was successful against Israel at the end of Jehu's rule and that he conquered the whole territory to the e. of the Jordan southward as far as Aroer on the bank of the Arnon ²⁾. The fact that Hazael now seized from Israel the territory directly to the n. of the Arnon indicates that Jehu had been able to reconquer it from the Moabites ³⁾. Jehu not only established his throne in Israel but acquired the favour of the Assyrians by paying tribute to Shalmaneser III ⁴⁾. Having established his throne, Jehu could exploit the confusion in Moab following the death of Mesha^c. This confusion could have been caused by the fact that Mesha^c had formerly sacrificed his eldest son ⁵⁾. The heir-apparent to the throne being dead, there would have been many that would have tried to seize the throne. The result would have been mutual strife and disorder in the land of Moab. Furthermore, the people to the s. of the Arnon could have been discontented on account of the fact that both Mesha^c and his father held residence in Dibon, a city, which until then, had frequently been in the hands of non-Moabites. This could easily have led to a clash between a pretender to the throne from the s. and another from the n. of the Arnon. This struggle as well as the temporary debilitation of the Aramaeans by Shalmaneser III, gave Jehu the opportunity

¹⁾ cf. II Ki. 10 : 1 ff.

²⁾ II Ki. 10 : 32-33.

³⁾ Shortly after Jehu was anointed king of Israel, the Aramaeans were weakened by the Assyrians, cf. also Noth: G.I², pp. 226-227, while they regained power during the latter part of his reign; cf. also the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III, 97-99 and 102-104, according to which he was more successful against the Aramaeans during his expedition in 842 B.C. than in 839 B.C..

⁴⁾ Jehu of the house of Omri, i.e. Israel, is portrayed on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III in the act of paying homage to the Assyrian king.

⁵⁾ II Ki. 3 : 27.

to reconquer the Moabite territory as far as the Arnon. Perhaps it was conquered only partly, while the whole territory, which formerly belonged to Israel, was accepted as Israelite dominion once again. This nominal Israelite territory was then conquered by Hazael, king of Aram, and though his struggle in this specific area was directed more against the Moabites than the Israelites, mention of the struggle in the Israelite annals creates the impression that he fought against Israel. In any case, this casual information about the victory of Hazael indicates that the strong Moabite Kingdom, built up by Mesha¹, shrank to an insignificant little kingdom to the s. of the Arnon within one generation after his death ¹).

As long as the Aramaeans controlled the southern part of Transjordan, the Moabites could not expand their territory to the n. of the Arnon. But isolated groups could have moved northward, especially if they showed themselves hostile towards the Israelites. Moabite hordes, sanctioned by the Aramaeans, could even have moved to the w. of the Jordan to raid the Israelite crops ²). Though the Aramaeans did not control the Moabite territory to the s. of the Arnon, the Moabite power diminished to a great extent during this period. When Adadnirâri III, the Assyrian king, marched against Damascus at the beginning of the 8th century B.C., neither the Moabites nor Ammon and Judah paid tribute to him, whereas Edom, Philistea and Israel did ³). This may either be due to the fact that these nations who did not pay tribute were isolated geographically or to the fact that they played an insignificant role during the specific period. But as Edom, which was geographically even more isolated, did pay tribute, we must

¹) Therefore Moab is not mentioned by Shalmaneser III, whereas both Edom and Ammon are mentioned, cf. Monolith II, 95.

²) cf. II Ki. 13 : 20b-21; Keil : *The Books of the Kings*, p. 378; Kittel: *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 259; Sânda: *Die Bücher der Könige* II, pp. 156-157.

³) cf. the inscription of Adadnirâri III on the stone slab from Nimrud, 4-21; Abel: *K.B. I*, pp. 190-192 and Donner: *MIO V*, p. 162 n. 12.

prefer the latter alternative. This would indicate that neither the Moabites nor the Ammonites could act independently as a result of the display of power by the Aramaeans during the previous years.

The Aramaeans, being subjected by Adadnirâri III, could not maintain their control of the Ammonite and Moabite territory. Jeroboam II, king of Israel, grasped this opportunity ¹⁾ and with the help of Uzziah, king of Judah ²⁾, he once again conquered Transjordan. During his reign a certain בעלמעני is mentioned ³⁾. Perhaps he was one of the court officials. His name is probably related to the city בעל מעון, which was from time to time controlled by the Moabites ⁴⁾. Perhaps Jeroboam II brought a prominent figure from this city to hold a distinctive office at the court in Samaria to win the goodwill of the inhabitants of this territory. In the s. the official boundary of the territory of Jeroboam II stretched to the ים הערבה or the sea of the plain ⁵⁾, which is another name for the Dead Sea ⁶⁾. The נחל הערבה is mentioned once as the southern boundary ⁷⁾. This נחל must be located in the vicinity of the northern end of the Dead Sea ⁸⁾ and not at the southern end

¹⁾ The subjugation of the Aramaeans was so soundly executed that the Assyrians did not have to appear in this region before the lapse of at least half a century, viz. the time of Tiglath Pileser III, cf; also Noth: G. I.², p. 228.

²⁾ Amaziah, predecessor of Uzziah, started this rehabilitation of the Kingdom of Judah, cf. II Ki. 14:7. In the Annals of Tiglath Pileser III, 130-132, Uzziah is designated as leader of the revolt in which the Aramaeans from Hamat and its surrounding cities took part. He was also known by the name of Azariah, cf. Van Selms: HTS 1951, pp. 152-154.

³⁾ cf. Ostrakon no. 27,3. For the chronology of these ostraca, cf. Albright: AP., p. 129.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 87 above.

⁵⁾ II Ki. 14:25; cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 733 and Šanda: Die Bücher der Könige II, p. 171 for the term ערבה.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 46 above.

⁷⁾ Amos 6:14; cf. 2:1-3.

⁸⁾ cf. Landersdorfer: Die Bücher der Könige, p. 191; Ridderbos: De Kleine Profeten I, pp. 233-234; Noth: G. I.², p. 228.

of it ¹⁾. Perhaps it may be identified with the W. el-Kefrein ²⁾. The territory to the s. of this Wādī was given to Uzziah as compensation for the help rendered by him ³⁾. He made ample use of the pasture lands of the מִישֹׁר by grazing his flocks there ⁴⁾. Though he thoroughly controlled this part of the former Moabite territory, he did not subject the Moabites to the s. of the Arnon, for they did not pay tribute to him ⁵⁾. The claim of Judah to this territory continued during the reign of Jotham, who at first was regent and then the successor of Uzziah ⁶⁾.

Although the territory to the n. of the Arnon frequently fell under the authority of another nation, this rapid change of control did not cause a break in the occupation and culture of the cities concerned. The surface-survey carried out by Glueck did not establish any definite break in the history of these cities. Perhaps future excavations may alter this conception. But we may assume that this will not be the case, because the claims of the different nations were often simply nominal.

12. Moab, Vassal of Assyria.

During the middle of the 8th century B.C. the circumstances favoured the Moabites and Ammonites to regain their freedom. Jeroboam II, who partly revived the glory of the Kingdom of David, was succeeded by kings who could not hold their ground. Though the revolt of the Ammonites was suppressed by Jotham, the successor of Uzziah ⁷⁾, circumstances took a turn for the better after his death. In 738 B.C.

¹⁾ cf. Keil: The Twelve Minor Prophets I, p. 304; Weiser: Amos, p. 234; Van Gelderen: Amos, pp. 191-192; Robinson: Die Zwölf Kleine Propheten, p. 159.

²⁾ cf. p. 59 above.

³⁾ cf. Ewald: History IV, p. 144; Keil: The Books of Chronicles, p. 428; Ridderbos: Het Godswoord der Propheten II, p. 11; Van Selms: II Kronieken, pp. 156-157.

⁴⁾ II Chron. 26 : 10. The name מִישֹׁר frequently indicates the Moabite plateau to the n. of the Arnon., cf. p. 53 above.

⁵⁾ cf. II Chron. 26 : 6-8; 27 : 5.

⁶⁾ cf. I Chron. 5 : 17; Van Selms: I Kronieken, p. 107.

⁷⁾ II Chron. 27 : 5; cf. 26 : 8.

Menahem, king of Israel, had to pay a heavy tribute to Tiglath Pileser III ¹⁾, and in 734 B.C., during the eponym of Bêl-dân ²⁾, this Assyrian king, partly because of the Syro-Ephraimitic war ³⁾, but partly also because he wished to extend his authority, undertook a campaign to Aram and Palestine. Having clashed with Israel ⁴⁾, he penetrated to the *naḥal mušur*, the present W. el-'Arisch. As a result of these events, the Moabites could once again hold their own. During this period Salamanu was in command of the Moabites ⁵⁾. He seized the opportunity, created by the intrigues and wars to the w. of the Jordan, to extend the authority of Moab to the n. of the Arnon. He even penetrated into Gilead ⁶⁾ and he conquered and annihilated Beth-arbel ⁷⁾, amongst other cities. This may have been the fate of many other Israelite cities. When Tiglath-Pileser III again appeared in Syro-Palestine in 733 B.C. ⁸⁾, Salamanu, by the timely paying of tribute to Tiglath Pileser III ⁹⁾, prevented the Assyrian army from entering his territory.

¹⁾ II Ki. 15 : 19; Tiglath Pileser III: Annals, 150.

²⁾ cf. Luckenbill: ARAB II, p. 436.

³⁾ Is. 7 : 1 ff.; II Ki. 16 : 5-9; cf. Alt: Kleine Schriften II, pp. 163-187; Van Gelderen: Hosea, pp. 168-187.

⁴⁾ cf. Alt: Kleine Schriften II, pp. 150-162.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 23-24 above.

⁶⁾ This could have happened in alliance with the Ammonites. There is no indication that the Moabites were under Ammonite control during this period; contra Albright: ARI, pp. 207-208 n. 72.

⁷⁾ Hos. 10 : 14.

⁸⁾ The tribute could also have been paid in 732 B.C., when Tiglath Pileser III conquered Damascus; cf. Annals 195 ll. In Is. 17 : 2 the ruin of the cities of Aroer is connected with the fall of Damsacus. This could have been an Aroer further to the n.; but cf. Kittel: B.H.³ and D.S.Ia.

⁹⁾ The names of the countries that paid tribute are listed on the Nimrud tablet, 7-13. After the destruction of Damascus, Tiglath Pileser III did not undertake any expedition to the land of Amurru. Until his death the conditions seem to have remained unaltered. Only to the end of his reign Shalmaneser V (727-722 B.C.) undertook an expedition to Samaria, which was captured in 721 B.C. by his successor, Sargon II (722-705); cf. also Donner: MIO V, pp. 165-169. In one of the letters from Kalḫu (cf. p. 38 above) it is stated that the Moabites, together with a few other nations, sent horses to one or other

This policy of subjugation to the Assyrian king was continued for a long period. Thus the Moabites were assured of Assyrian help if they were attacked by another nation, and at the same time the Assyrian army would not invade their country. But they were still exposed to raids by the Bedouin tribes from the eastern desert. In spite of the fact that the Gidirāya plundered part of their country in this period ¹⁾, the Moabites were able to regain part of their former glory. Their territory was expanded to the n. of the Arnon, but this area was not occupied as intensively as previously ²⁾. This subordination to the Assyrians continued during the time of Salamanu, which partly coincided with the reign of Shalmaneser V ³⁾. When the Kingdom of Israel came to a fall in 721 B.C., the Moabites rejoiced. Now they could expand and strengthen their Kingdom without having to fear the Israelites. Such was the increase of their power that their king could join an anti-Assyrian coalition ⁴⁾, when Sargon II had to pay attention to revolts in other parts of his extended territory ⁵⁾. In 711 B.C., however, Sargon suppressed this revolt ⁶⁾. Once again the king of Moab hastened to pay homage to the Assyrian king and as Sargon regained control of the main route by subjecting Asdod, he did not try to capture the more remote territories of Judah, Ammon and Moab. He

of the above mentioned Assyrian kings, cf. also p. 38 n. 1 above.

¹⁾ cf. p. 37 above.

²⁾ cf. Glueck: *Annual XIV*, p. 83; *XVIII-XIX*, p. 269.

³⁾ Though the East-Jordan territory was incorporated in the Assyrian provinces, cf. Alt: *Kleine Schriften II*, pp. 201-202, it is improbable that it extended so far south; cf. also Jirku: *ZDPV 51*, pp. 249-253.

⁴⁾ Judah also took part in this coalition, but Isaiah was opposed to it, cf. p. 22 above.

⁵⁾ cf. Sargon's *Annals* of the 6th to the 10th years and Olmstead: *Assyria*, pp. 207-211.

⁶⁾ The revolt was suppressed in 711 B.C. (cf. Sargon: *Annals* 224 ll.), but though it is first mentioned in the year of its suppression (*Annals* 215 ll.), it must have begun earlier. In the *Clay Prism* the revolt is mentioned in his 9th year. Therefore it must have lasted at least 3 years (713-711 B.C.); cf. Is. 20 : 3; Olmstead: *Assyria*, p. 218; Weiser: *Einl.*², p. 141; Noth: *G.I.*², pp. 214-242.

was appeased by their tribute and did not curtail their power¹⁾. Ten years later, when Hezekiah tried to throw off the Assyrian yoke²⁾, Ammon, Moab and Edom, as well as the Philistine cities Gazah and Asdod remained loyal to Assyria. They realized the futility of rebelling against the stronger Assyrians³⁾. Therefore Mitinti of Asdod, Budu-ilu of Beth-Ammon, Kammusunadbi of Moab and Malikrammu of Edom paid tribute to Sennacherib and kissed his feet. This pro-Assyrian attitude of Moab and the other nations certainly met with the aversion of the rebels. A substantial part of the hatred of Judah for Moab was caused by this so-called treacherous behaviour. But Moab and the others did not regard it as treachery. It had been their experience that they were left alone if only they paid tribute to the mighty Assyrians. Thus the Moabites had a free hand to expand their power in the s. Transjordan, because the state of Judah no longer controlled it. The pro-Assyrian Moabites flourished, whereas Judah suffered severely at the hands of Sennacherib⁴⁾, and this had the result of increasing Judah's jealousy of Moab.

The vassalage of Moab continued during the reign of Esarhaddon. Whether Moab rendered any assistance to him during his Egyptian campaign, we do not know⁵⁾. But all the nations who had acknowledged his supremacy, as well as those who had recently been subjected, were summoned by

¹⁾ Until now no Assyrian army had entered the Moabite borders. In 715 Sargon II merely undertook an expedition against the Arabs on the border of his land. This campaign was not tied to a marauding expedition undertaken by the Assyrians through the land of Moab; contra Procksch: *Jesaja I*, p. 225; Verhoef: *Voorsegginge*, pp. 67, 185. As a rule the Assyrian king did not appoint an Assyrian governor in Moab. The local kings were left on their thrones and they were called *šarru* in the Assyrian inscriptions.

²⁾ cf. *Is.* 30: 1-5; 31: 1-3; *II Ki.* 19: 9; 20: 12-19; Kittel: *G. Isr. II*, pp. 380-390.

³⁾ Contra Kittel: *G. Isr. II*, p. 388. Cf. also Donner: *MIO V*, p. 169.

⁴⁾ cf. Sennacherib: *Taylor Prism II*, 51-57; *III*, 11-41; Haag: *R.B.* 1951, pp. 348-359.

⁵⁾ Luckenbill: *ARAB II*, pp. 224-227; Meissner: *Könige Babylo-niens und Assyriens*, pp. 222-224.

him to do compulsory labour ¹⁾. It is obvious that these kings, among whom the king of Moab is mentioned ²⁾, had to complete his building program ³⁾. Perhaps Esarhaddon was compelled to this measure because he did not have enough prisoners of war at his disposal to do the work. At the same time the population of his homeland decreased, with the result that he could not enrol local labourers ⁴⁾. Instead of only paying tribute to the king of Assyria, the Moabites now had to render actual service to him. When Asshurbânipal succeeded Esarhaddon, the Moabites remained loyal to him. During his expedition to Egypt in 667-666 B.C. ⁵⁾, his army was strengthened by soldiers from Moab and other states from the Westland ⁶⁾, while all the nations, who had rendered compulsory service to his father ⁷⁾, came to kiss the feet of Asshurbânipal ⁸⁾. The policy of subordination to Assyria had brought progress and security to the Moabites during the past decades and therefore they adhered to it. During the so-called fraternal war, which lasted from 652 until 648 B.C. ⁹⁾, the Arabs not only tried to help the rebellious Shamash-shum-ukîn in Babylon ¹⁰⁾, but also endeavoured to conquer the vassal states of Assyria in the land of Amurru ¹¹⁾. Though

¹⁾ Prisms A and C, 28-31; Abel: K.B. II, pp. 134-135; Prism B col. V, 7-8; Winckler: K. B. II, pp. 148-149.

²⁾ Prism B col. V, 15; Winckler: K.B. II, pp. 148-149; Luckenbill: ARAB II, p. 265.

³⁾ Prisms A and C 28-31; Abel: K.B. II, pp. 136-137; Luckenbill: ARAB II, pp. 205, 211.

⁴⁾ Free citizens could be enlisted only by force, and this mode of enlistment could have resulted in a rebellion.

⁵⁾ cf. Streck: VAB VII, pp. CCXXXVII, CDLXVI.

⁶⁾ Rassam Cylinder I, 69-74.

⁷⁾ Only 2 new kings are mentioned .viz. Jakinlû of Aruada instead of Matan-ba'al and Amminadbi of Bit-Ammanâ instead of Badu-il; cf. Prism B col. V, 13-24 of Esarhaddon and Cylinder C, 23-50 of Asshurbânipal. The list of Asshurbânipal is not a mere copy of that of Esarhaddon.

⁸⁾ cf. Cylinder C, 23-50.

⁹⁾ Streck: VAB VII, pp. CCLXXVIII-CDLXVII.

¹⁰⁾ Rassam Cylinder VII, 83-101.

¹¹⁾ Rassam Cylinder VII, 102-106; Cylinder B, col. VII, 93-VIII, 22.

Asshurbânipal claimed that he had defeated the Arabs in the land of Moab ¹⁾, it is elsewhere stated that Ammuladi, king of Qidri, was defeated by Kamoshalta, king of Moab and vassal of Asshurbânipal ²⁾. Kamoshalta captured Ammuladi with his own hands, bound him with iron fetters and sent him to the Assyrian king in Nineveh. This campaign of the Arabs against the land of Moab is another example of the many attempts by the Arabs to conquer the cultivated land, but, thanks to the well-devised system of frontier fortresses on the eastern boundary of these Kingdoms their wings could be clipped. The honour of the victory is attributed by the Assyrian inscription to the Moabite king. This indicates that, in spite of minor setbacks from elsewhere, the Moabite Kingdom, while under Assyrian vassalage, flourished and expanded its power. The fact that Moab paid just one mina of gold as tribute to Asshurbânipal ³⁾ should not be regarded as an indication of the poverty and inferiority of Moab during this period. In comparison with the tribute of Ammon, that which Moab paid was rather small ⁴⁾, but poverty or wealth were not the only considerations in the assessment of tribute. What was of much greater importance was whether the nation concerned behaved as a loyal subject or not. After Moab became tributary to Assyria in 733/2 B.C., it withheld its tribute only once ⁵⁾. During the years of crisis which Asshurbânipal had to face, Moab protected the territory of Assyria ⁶⁾. Therefore Moab had to pay only a nominal tribute. In the middle of the 7th century B.C. the Kingdom of Moab still was playing a significant rôle ⁷⁾.

Noth has alleged that Moab and Ammon did not expand

¹⁾ Rassam Cylinder VII, 112; Streck: VAB VII, pp. CCLXXXIII, CCXIV; Olmstead: History of Palestine and Syria, p. 489.

²⁾ Cylinder B col. VIII, 31-44; Olmstead: History of Assyria, p. 427; cf. also p. 38 above.

³⁾ Waterman: Royal Correspondence I, p. 440; cf. p. 38 above.

⁴⁾ Ammon had to pay 2 mina of gold.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 150 above.

⁶⁾ Did Moab only protect its own territory?

⁷⁾ Contra Albright: J. B. L., 61 p. 119.

their territory in the s. of the East-Jordan area after the fall of Samaria ¹⁾, but this conception is contradicted by the evidence of the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions as well as the Biblical tradition. The divine oracles against Moab, which were pronounced round about the time of king Josiah of Judah, indicate that the region to the n. of the Arnon belonged to Moab during this period ²⁾. The allegation that king Josiah conquered this area from the Moabites ³⁾, is not substantiated by the contemporary sources, which indicate that Moab was in a position to take a strong stand against Judah.

What attitude Moab adopted towards Assyria during the years of confusion and decrease of power which followed the death of Asshurbânipal, we do not know. We may suppose, however, that the pro-Assyrian behaviour of the past century continued until the final fall of the Assyrian Empire. Whether the Moabites paid homage to each of the successors of Asshurbânipal, we do not know. They did not openly take part in the struggle to restore the Assyrian power ⁴⁾. Their sympathy could have been with Egypt and Assyria and therefore Moab did not become a subject of Egypt as Judah did after Josiah had been killed by Pharaoh Necho.

13. Moab, Vassal of Babylon.

When the properties of the former Assyrian Kingdom were distributed by its heirs, the Medes and the Babylonians, the land of Moab fell within the boundary of that part which was assigned to Nabopolassar, the Babylonian ⁵⁾. Babylonia did not, however, establish its power in the land of Amurru

¹⁾ Noth: G.I.², p. 248.

²⁾ cf. Zeph. 2: 8; Jer. 48.

³⁾ E.g. Ewald: History IV, pp. 214, 241; Ginsberg: Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume, p. 362; Noth: G.I.², p. 248; Rudolph: Chronikbücher, p. 77. Josh. 13 does not refer to this period, cf. Van Zyl: HTS 14, p. 122.

⁴⁾ cf. II Ki. 23: 12, 29; II Chron. 34: 3, 35: 20; Josephus: Ant. Iud. X, 5, 1; Van Selms: II Kronieken, pp. 192-193; Noth: G. I.², pp. 246-247, 251-252.

⁵⁾ cf. Noth: G. I.², p. 253.

until after the battle of Carcemish in 605 B.C.¹⁾ From Carcemish the victorious army of Nebuchadrezzar went to Palestine. Moab hastened to meet the new ruler to pay homage to him. The king of Judah, Jehoiakim, also recognized his authority²⁾. After 3 years Jehoiakim revolted, however. Nebuchadrezzar could not operate against him immediately and therefore he had to rely on the help of his loyal vassal states to suppress this revolt³⁾. Consequently Moab opposed Judah. When Nebuchadrezzar himself besieged Jerusalem in 598 B.C., the Moabites would again have been willing to help him⁴⁾. Because Moab repeatedly collaborated with the enemy of Judah, the flame of hatred between these two nations, which had been kindled long ago, blazed up higher during this period⁵⁾.

For more than a century the Moabites had proved themselves the loyal subjects of the suzerain states of the Tigris and the Euphrates⁶⁾. Therefore we are somewhat surprised by the fact that, shortly after 597 B.C., they propagated an alliance with Egypt against the Babylonians⁷⁾, while Zedekiah, the Babylonian vassal-king in Judah, was reluctant to take part in a revolt. The reason for this sudden change of policy should perhaps be sought in the fact that the ambitious Nebuchadrezzar tried to restore the former grandeur of Babylonia. He could have summoned all the vassal nations to

¹⁾ II Ki. 24 : 7; II Chron. 36 : 5; Jer. 46 : 2. Judah, being subjugated to Egypt, had to fight against Babylonia.

²⁾ II Ki. 24 : 1a, b.

³⁾ II Ki. 24 : 1c-2; cf. Ewald: *History IV*, p. 267; Kittel: *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 306; Sanda: *Die Bücher der Könige II*, pp. 365-367; Noth: *G.I.*², p. 255.

⁴⁾ II Ki. 24 : 10 ff. The revolt was initiated by Jehoiakim, but he died suddenly and his son Jehoiachin had to face Nebuchadrezzar. Lam. 1 : 2 refers to the behaviour of the Moabites and the other nations, cf. Haller: *Die Fünf Megilloth*, p. 94.

⁵⁾ cf. Hes. 25 : 8-11; Zeph. 2 : 8-11; Jer. 48 : 1-47; Is. 25 : 10b-12; Ps. 60 : 10; 83 : 6-7; 108 : 9.

⁶⁾ There is only one exception, cf. p. 150 above.

⁷⁾ Jer. 27 : 3; Kittel: *G. Isr. II*, p. 424; Rudolph: *Jeremia*, p. 149; Noth: *G.I.*², pp. 257-265.

Babylonia to complete his extensive building program ¹⁾. As they had formerly helped Nebuchadrezzar against some of his enemies, the Moabites were discontented. Being loyal and helpful subjects, they thought that they might have been exempted. Therefore they joined Edom, Ammon, Tyre and Sidon in sending a delegation to Zedekiah to exhort him to revolt against Nebuchadrezzar. Initially Zedekiah, who owed his kingship to Nebuchadrezzar ²⁾, was not inclined to revolt ³⁾, but when help was promised from Egypt ⁴⁾, he also joined the alliance ⁵⁾. In 589 B.C. Nebuchadrezzar mustered his army to proceed against the rebels ⁶⁾. Like the Assyrian kings before him, he first occupied the route to Egypt to prevent them from helping the enemy ⁷⁾, and only then did he advance against Judah. In 586 B.C. he conquered Jerusalem ⁸⁾, which had been left in the lurch by those nations who had instigated the revolt ⁹⁾. Thus the fate that befell Judah was much more severe than that of Moab. Judah was laid waste and most of its inhabitants were carried off into exile whereas Moab was not even entered by the Babylonians. Perhaps the king of Moab warded off the danger by paying tribute to Nebuchadrezzar ¹⁰⁾. The fugitives from Judah thought they would be welcomed by their allies in Transjordan and therefore sought refuge in Ammon and Moab, but instead of being hosts to the fugitives, the Moabites scorned them. They rejoiced in the fate that had befallen Judah and proclaimed their own

¹⁾ cf. Dan. 4 : 29-30; Meissner: *Könige Babyloniens und Assyriens*, pp. 265-272; Beek: *Aan Babylons Stromen*, pp. 165-183.

²⁾ II Ki. 24 : 17.

³⁾ This attitude was mainly due to the influence of Jeremiah, cf. Jer. 27 : 4-22; 51 : 59.

⁴⁾ Jer. 37 : 5; Van Selms: *II Kronieken*, p. 195; Olmstead: *History of Palestine and Syria*, p. 523; Auerbach: *Wüste und Gelobtes Land II*, p. 194; Noth: *G.I.*², p. 257.

⁵⁾ II Chron. 36 : 13; Hes. 17 : 15.

⁶⁾ II Ki. 25 : 1.

⁷⁾ Noth: *G.I.*², pp. 257-258.

⁸⁾ II Ki. 25 : 2; Noth: *G.I.*², pp. 258-261.

⁹⁾ cf. Ginsberg: *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, p. 365. But the Moabite territory was not as diminished as he alludes; cf. p. 153.

¹⁰⁾ Then Jer. 48 : 14 is sarcasm.

country the impregnable fortress which could not be trodden upon by the enemy ¹⁾. In spite of all the turmoil they were at ease. This haughtiness of Moab caused a flood of condemnations to be released against them by prophets of Judah. By re-using old mocking songs against Moab, the prophets reminded the Moabites that even Bedouins from the desert had penetrated into their country ²⁾, and the message of salvation that Isaiah had once proclaimed ³⁾ was repealed. Within 3 years the honour of Moab would also become despicable and what remained of it would be few, trifling, feeble ⁴⁾. In fact, the days of the Kingdom of Moab were numbered. According to an account by Josephus ⁵⁾, Nebuchadrezzar marched against the Ammonites and the Moabites and defeated them in his 23rd year, i.e. in 582 B.C.. Some of them were carried off to Babylonia into exile ⁶⁾, while others fled to Egypt, where they earned a living as hirelings ⁷⁾. The voice of the Moabite nation was thus silenced; the impregnable fortress was conquered, and its walls were thrown down into the dust ⁸⁾. The fate of Moab was severe ⁹⁾. When the power of the state had once been broken by the Babylonians, the children of the east ¹⁰⁾ could encroach upon the cultivated land, for the former inhabitants of the line of fortresses, who had so boldly defended their country during the past centuries, had been abducted. The only service that these fortresses and the pottery remains in their vicinity still render is to tell the story of the downfall of the Moabite Kingdom and civilization

¹⁾ Jer. 48 : 26, 29, 30.

²⁾ cf. pp. 21, 37 above.

³⁾ Is. 16 : 1, 3; cf. p. 22 above.

⁴⁾ Is. 16 : 14.

⁵⁾ Josephus: Ant. Iud. X, 9, 7; cf. p. 41 above.

⁶⁾ Jer. 48 : 7b. In the 6th year of Cambyses a certain *kamušu-šar-ušur* is mentioned. This may be an indication of the fact that some Moabites were taken to Babylonia into exile.

⁷⁾ cf. the proper names from Egypt, bearing the theophoric element כמ, cf. p. 40 above.

⁸⁾ Is. 25 : 12.

⁹⁾ cf. Jer. 48 and Is. 25 : 10b-12.

¹⁰⁾ Is. 11 : 14; Hes. 25 : 9.

in the first quarter of the 6th century B.C. ¹⁾. After this depopulation of the country, we still have some references to individuals of Moabite origin ²⁾, but there can be no reference to the Moabite nation or state after the first 2 decades of the 6th century B.C.

14. *The Final Chords.*

Once the land of Moab had been flung open to the east, the Bedouins freely entered the land. Thus the cycle that had started about 8 centuries before, when the tribes, which later formed the Moabite Kingdom, had entered the land from the same direction, was completed ³⁾ and a new one begun. Many of the Moabites who had remained in the country after the exile migrated to the depopulated land of Judah, where they would be more safe. In the days of Ezra and Nehemiah there were already a considerable number of aliens, among whom were Moabites, in the former territory of Judah ⁴⁾. Officially, a hostile attitude was assumed towards them. The old law which prohibited inter-marriage of Israelites and foreigners might have prompted this attitude. Furthermore, Nehemiah promulgated anew the prohibition according to which no Moabite might enter into the congregation of the LORD ⁵⁾. This stipulation and its strict application in this period, contributed to the fact that the name "Moabite" became proverbial for the words "impious" and "sinner". This connotation in the meaning of the name "Moabite" was further prompted by those passages from which it is apparent that Israel and Judah had held Moab in contempt in the past ⁶⁾.

¹⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 269.

²⁾ cf. Ezra 9 : 1, 12; Neh. 13 : 1; Dan. 11 : 41.

³⁾ Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, p. 74; cf. also p. 112 above.

⁴⁾ Sanballat, the Horonite, Neh. 2 : 10, 19; 13 : 28, was no native of the Moabite city Horonaim, Is. 15 : 3; Jer. 48 : 3, but he was the Persian satrap in Samaria, cf. Cowley: The Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., no. 30, 29.

⁵⁾ Ezra 9 : 1, 12; Neh. 13 : 1 ff.; Dt. 23 : 3.

⁶⁾ cf. Numb. 24 : 17; Amos 2 : 1-3; Zeph. 2 : 8-11; Ps. 60 : 10; 83 : 7; 108 : 9; Jer. 48 : 1 ff.; Is. 16 : 14.

Therefore the author of the so-called apocalypse of Isaiah saw the fate that had befallen the Moabites as an example of the fate that would overcome the impious in the last days ¹⁾. Just as Moab was excluded from the *קהל יהוה*, so all the impious would be excluded from the festivity on Mount Sion. Finally in the book of Sirach, about 400 years after the state of Moab had perished, Moab was personified as the impious power itself ²⁾.

15. *The Moabite Culture.*

The cultural remains discovered in the land of Moab reveal that the Moabites were culturally a highly developed people. From the first years the stele from Bālū'ah bears witness that, though the stele itself betrays a strong Egyptian influence, its sculptors were skilful craftsmen. Both the writing on the fragment stone from Dhibān and that on the stele of king Mesha' resemble the old-Hebrew script. The authors of these inscriptions possessed a skilful pen and an exercised hand. These impressions of the Moabite culture were substantiated by the Moabite earthenware. This earthenware shows some similarity to the Cypro-Phoenician and the Aramaic earthenware. This similarity is most evident in the great number of figurines of the goddess Ashtarte, which resemble the figurines of the same deity that have been found elsewhere in Palestine. These specific types of earthenware could partly have been imported from these regions but they could also have been of local manufacture. The Moabites continually came into contact with people from the west of the Jordan. Thus there was ample opportunity for the Cypro-Phoenician influence to penetrate into the land of Moab. The Aramaic influence could have infiltrated into Moab much more easily, for the main route from Damascus to Elath bisected the land of Moab. Furthermore, there were enough opportunities in the

¹⁾ cf. Is. 25 : 10b-12 and pp. 25-29 above.

²⁾ cf. also Mulder: *Apokalypse*, p. 88.

history of Moab for the Moabites to be influenced by the Aramaeans.

But apart from these products, which either came from elsewhere or were manufactured under alien influence, a typical kind of Moabite earthenware has been discovered. This Moabite earthenware is not only limited to the s. of the Arnon, but is found in the whole land of Moab. Even in those parts of the land in which the Moabites were frequently subjugated, they maintained a substantial degree of cultural independence. We have seen that the Moabite cities in this contested area were never completely destroyed. In the same way the cultural influence of the Moabites was never eradicated in those areas in which they lived next to the Reubenites and Gadites or other foreigners. At Kh. el-Medeiyineh on the W. eth-Themed, where some Israelite cities are to be located, the best examples of the typical Moabite earthenware have been found.

This Moabite earthenware bears evidence of a well-developed sense of art, which could only have been given material form by skilled artisans. This is apparent not only from the shaping and burnishing of the earthenware but also from its typical decoration. As far as the physical-material remains of the Moabite civilization are concerned, we may conclude that there was a well-developed civilization in the land of Moab, which in most instances was not inferior to that of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE LANGUAGE.

The only document from which the Moabitic language can be studied at present, is the inscription of king Mesha¹). The proper names mentioned in sources written in other languages were frequently changed according to the laws of those languages and therefore do not disclose the peculiarities of Moabitic any longer. But these names do tell us something about conceptions current in Moab at the time of their origin. Thus they supply interesting information concerning the Moabitic religion for instance. The inscription of king Mesha¹ originally consisted of at least 34 lines, but when the Arabs broke up the stone in their search for gold, a number of words were lost or became illegible. Approximately 300 words remained intact. If we take into consideration the fact that a number of words are repeated, only about 130 different words are used in the inscription. It would be entirely wrong, however, to deduce from this fact that the Moabites did not have an extensive vocabulary. At the same time we must draw attention to the fact that it is not only the vocabulary of a language that determines or reveals its character²). Linguistic affinity is much more clearly revealed by the formation of words or syntax than by the mere application of words.

1. *The Verb.*

The 3rd pers. sing. masc. perf. of the Qal or simple form of the verb is the same as the root of the verb without any

¹) cf. p. 30 above.

²) Contra Jean: DISO, p. 8.

inflectional connections, e.g. אבד¹⁾, אחז²⁾, אמר³⁾, בנה⁴⁾, הרס⁵⁾, ישב⁶⁾, while the affirmative תי⁷⁾ was affixed to the root to indicate the 1st pers. sing. e.g. בנתי⁸⁾, יספתי⁹⁾, כרתי¹⁰⁾, מלכתי¹¹⁾, עשתי¹²⁾. In Moabitic the initial Waw of the original Pe-Waw verbs¹³⁾, had already become Jodh¹⁴⁾, e.g. ישב¹⁵⁾. In the verb בנה¹⁶⁾ the He is merely a vowel sign, indicating that the vowel following the 2nd consonant was lengthened to compensate for the loss of the original Waw or Jodh. The loss of the final Waw or Jodh indicates that the perfect had the form יִשֵּׁב. Whether the vowel between the 2nd radical of the verba tertiae Waw Jodh and the consonantal affirmative, e.g. עשתי was an accentuated long vowel¹⁷⁾, can no longer be indicated, as the text lacks vowel signs and even the matres lectionis, or vocalic consonants, were not written in the middle of the word¹⁸⁾.

The impf. of the 3rd pers. sing. is indicated by a prefixed Jodh as preformative consonant, e.g. יאמר¹⁹⁾, יגרש²⁰⁾, יחלף²¹⁾,

¹⁾ M.I. 7.

²⁾ M.I. 14.

³⁾ M.I. 6, 32.

⁴⁾ M.I. 8, 18.

⁵⁾ M.I. 27.

⁶⁾ M.I. 10, 31 (8-9, 33?).

⁷⁾ Because the Jodh is a mater lectionis, it should be supplied with a hireq as vowel, cf. Harris: DCD, pp. 59-60.

⁸⁾ M.I. 21-23, 26-27, 29-30.

⁹⁾ M.I. 29.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 25.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 2-3 (28-29?).

¹²⁾ M.I. 23, 26 (33?).

¹³⁾ Though some of the so-called "weak verbs" originally might have been biconsonantal (cf. p. 163), they are not regarded as such in this treatise, because they had already been trilateralized in the time of Mesha'. In Moabitic we do not have the means of tracing back the biliteral forms of these roots.

¹⁴⁾ Hammershaimb: Verb, p. 196.

¹⁵⁾ M.I. 10, 31; cf. Harris: DCD, p. 8.

¹⁶⁾ M.I. 8, 18.

¹⁷⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, pp. 619, 627; Harris: DCD, pp. 56-57; Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 214-217.

¹⁸⁾ cf. p. 186 below.

¹⁹⁾ M.I. 6, 14.

²⁰⁾ M.I. 19.

²¹⁾ M.I. 6.

while the Aleph indicates the 1st pers. sing., e.g. **אהלך** ¹⁾, **אהרנ** ²⁾, **אסחב** ³⁾. In the imper. the verb **הלך** is inflected on the analogy of the Pe-Waw verbs, e.g. **לך** ⁴⁾ and **רר** ⁵⁾ respectively. But in the impf. the initial He is retained, resembling the Pe guttural verbs, e.g. **אהלך**. Rarely is this inflection of **הלך** also found in Hebrew ⁶⁾ and it is regarded as "almost exclusively late or in poetry" ⁷⁾. But as this inflection occurs in the inscription of king Mesha⁸, it cannot be regarded as late or poetical only. Judging from the fact that the variant inflection occurred at an early stage, e.g. in Ugaritic ⁹⁾, both inflections could have been in use. The explanation of the origin of this variant inflexion, advised by Prätorius ⁹⁾, must be rejected on account of the fact that the change of accented *ā* to *ō* did not occur in Ugaritic ¹⁰⁾. Perhaps it may be explained by accepting the existence either of 2 roots **הלך** and **ולך** having the same meaning, or of an original two radical root **לך** ¹¹⁾ which became trilateral.

In the impf. of the Pe-Waw verbs the original Waw is dropped, e.g. **ישב** ¹²⁾, **ארר** ¹³⁾, with the lengthening of the preformative vowel, thus **יִשַׁב** and **אִרַר**. The 3rd pers. sing. impf. of the Pe-Jodh verb **ירש** is written in the same way as that of the Pe-Waw verbs, e.g. **ירש** ¹⁴⁾. The pronunciation could have

¹⁾ M.I. 14-15.

²⁾ M.I. 11, 16.

³⁾ M.I. 18 (12-13).

⁴⁾ M.I. 14.

⁵⁾ M.I. 32.

⁶⁾ Ex. 9: 23; Ps. 58: 9; 73: 9; Job 16: 22; 23: 8; 41: 11.

⁷⁾ Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 192; cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 232.

⁸⁾ cf. Harris: DCD, p. 33; Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 103-104.

⁹⁾ ZAW 1882, pp. 310-312.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Harris: DCD, pp. 43-44; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 22; Meyer: ZAW 1951, p. 224 n. 4; but cf. also Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 150-152.

¹¹⁾ cf. Driver: Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, pp. 3-8.

¹²⁾ M.I. 8, 19 (8-9, 33?).

¹³⁾ M.I. 32.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 7.

been יִרְשׁ¹⁾, indicating that the defective manner of writing was used in the middle of the word. In the impf. of the Pe-Nun verbs the initial Nun is assimilated to the next consonant, e.g. אִשָּׁא²⁾. As in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew and old-Aramaic the Lamedh of the root לִקַּח is assimilated to the next radical in the impf.³⁾, e.g. אִקַּח⁴⁾. In both instances the duplication of the 2nd radical is not indicated. The 1st pers. sing. impf. of the verba primae Aleph quiesced the initial Aleph and therefore it was dropped in the orthography, e.g. אָחוּ⁵⁾ and אָמַר⁶⁾. The pronunciation could have been אָחוּ and אָמַר or אָחוּ and אָמַר respectively. If the accented *ā* was already changed to *ō* in Moabitic, the pronunciation could have followed the Hebrew pattern⁷⁾. But it seems as though this change did not occur in all Canaanite dialects. In Ugaritic, for instance, we have 'ār becoming אֹר in Hebrew⁸⁾, the west-Semitic deity, known in Hebrew as דְּגֹן, was known elsewhere as *dāgān*⁹⁾ and כַּפְתָּר was known as *kaptāra*¹⁰⁾. Therefore the pronunciation could have been אָחוּ and אָמַר respectively.

With preceding Waw consecutive the impf. of the Lamedh-He verbs was formed by the dropping of the final vocalic syllable, e.g. וַיִּבֶן¹¹⁾, וַאֲבֵן¹²⁾, וַאֲרֵא¹³⁾, וַאֲעֵשׂ¹⁴⁾. Between the 1st and

¹⁾ cf. Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 188; Gemser: Hebräische Sprachkunde, p. 138; Hammershaimb: Verb, p. 198.

²⁾ M.I. 20, 30.

³⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 176; Harris: DCD, p. 9; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 74; Hammershaimb: Verb, p. 195.

⁴⁾ M.I. 17, 19-20.

⁵⁾ M.I. 11, 15-16, 20; cf. Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 150-152.

⁶⁾ M.I. 24.

⁷⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 591; Gemser: Hebräische Sprachkunde, pp. 128-129; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 40.

⁸⁾ cf. also p. 163 n. 10.

⁹⁾ cf. Schmökel: Der Gott Dagon, Ursprung, Verbreitung und Wesen seines Kultes.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Wainwright: V.T. VI, 2, pp. 199-202.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 10.

¹²⁾ M.I. 9.

¹³⁾ M.I. 7.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 3, 9.

the 2nd radical of the root a helping vowel might have moved in ¹). Before the vocalic affirmative of the 2nd pers. masc. plural imper. the weak 3rd consonant disappeared, e.g. עשו ²), showing that the weak 3rd consonant was dropped between 2 vowels. From the orthography ויעו ³) and אעו ⁴) we may assume that the verb עו retained the original final Waw in the impf. ⁵). But as the so-called Lamedh-He verbs as a rule take the apocopated form after the Waw consecutive, we may assume either that the verb עו formed the intensive by doubling the last radical or that it was conjugated as a strong verb to distinguish it from the verb עני, which, though it is not included in the vocabulary of the M.I., certainly did exist in the Moabitic tongue.

The reflexive is formed with the help of an infigated *t* ⁶). This form is also used to indicate reciprocal actions. The impf. is formed regularly, e.g. אלתהם ⁷), while the imper. and the infinitive construct is formed with the help of "He-prostheticum", which indicates the absence of any vowel between

¹) cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 628.

²) M.I. 24.

³) M.I. 5.

⁴) M.I. 6.

⁵) Contra Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 627. cf. also Hammershaimb: Verb, p. 219; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 40. As far as we know the verb *ʿnw* does not occur in the Ugaritic literature, known to us.

⁶) cf. Landsberger: Islamica II, p. 356; Von Soden: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, p. 120; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 70; Brockelmann: Arabische Grammatik, p. 39. Contra Brockelmann: Grundriss I, pp. 528-530 and Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 42-43. In this form Moabitic preserved an older verbal form, which is only found back in Hebrew when the initial root of the verb is a sibilant and in names of places, e.g. אלתקן (Josh. 15:59) אלתקה (Josh. 19:44), אלתקא (Josh. 21:23, cf. also Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 76, 82), אשתמע (Josh. 21:14), אשתאול (Josh. 15:33; 19:41; Judg. 13:25; 16:31; 18:2, 8, 11; cf. also II Chron. 2:53). תהתסף and תהתסף (Ahiram, 2, cf. Vriezen and Hospers: Palestine Inscriptions, p. 7) must also be regarded as reflexive forms with infigated *t*. Perhaps the Hebrew Hitpa'el must be ascribed to an Aramaic influence.

⁷) M.I. 11,15; Harris: DCD, p. 62.

the 1st radical and the *t.e.g.* הלהחם¹⁾ and בהלהחם²⁾, respectively.

The perfect of the causative conjugation is formed by prefixing the radical ה to the root of the verb, *e.g.* הראני³⁾, החרמתה⁴⁾ and השעני⁵⁾. In the causative the initial radical of the Pe-Waw verb ושע, which became ישע in the simple form, is dropped in the orthography, indicating that it was not pronounced. By the prefixing of the preformative *ha-* to ושע the diphthong *aw*, which contracted to *ō*, was formed⁶⁾. Even in this instance the vowel consonant ו is not written. The same applies to the 1st pers. impf. of the causative of ישב, *e.g.* אשב⁷⁾. In the 1st pers. impf. of the causative of the mediae Waw verb שוב, the Aleph is prefixed and the mediae Waw is dropped, *e.g.* אשב⁸⁾.

In the inscription of Mesha⁹ the majority of verbs belong to the so-called irregular or weak verb classes¹⁰⁾. Twenty six different verbal roots, from which 16 are irregular, 9 doubly weak and only 1 regular, are used in the part of the inscription which is legible.

The perf. indicates the actions, events, or states, conceived by the author as completed or beyond doubt. It is applied to both active and stative verbs. In this respect Moabitic corresponds with Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic¹⁰⁾. The impf. expresses what is still continuing or

¹⁾ M.I. 32; cf. also the formation of the imperative of the Ugaritic Gt (Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook I, p. 70), the Hebrew Nif'al (Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 137) and of Arabic conjugations VII and VIII (Thatcher: Arabic Grammar, pp. 112-113; Brockelmann: Arabische Grammatik II, p. 12).

²⁾ M.I. 19.

³⁾ M.I. 4.

⁴⁾ M.I. 17.

⁵⁾ M.I. 4.

⁶⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 600.

⁷⁾ M.I. 13.

⁸⁾ M.I. 12.

⁹⁾ For the terminology, cf. Gemser: Hebreuse Spraakkuns, p. 114.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 53-64, 75-79, for a discussion of the use of "tenses" in the Semitic languages. Contra Harris: DCD, pp. 45-46.

what is to be accomplished; what is still doubtful. In Ugaritic the form *jkl* is also used in narrative style and it may even be preceded by a perfect ¹⁾. In a few instances the narrative function of *jkl* is preserved in Hebrew ²⁾. Even in Moabitic there is a similar use, viz. *יאנף* ³⁾. The transition from this narrative form to the Waw consecutive imperf., which is frequently used in this inscription ⁴⁾, is self-evident ⁵⁾.

The infinitive construct resembles the imperative ⁶⁾. In connection with the preposition *ב* it is used to describe an event simultaneous to that of the main clause, e.g. *ישב בה* *בהלתחמה בי*: and he dwelt therein while he was fighting against me ⁷⁾. The agent of the action is indicated by the attaching of a pronominal suffix, which refers to the subject mentioned in the 1st part of the sentence ⁸⁾, to the infinitive construct. The infinitive absolute is placed before the finite verb to emphasize the idea of the verb, e.g. *ישראל אבד אבד עלם*: while Israel perished utterly for ever ⁹⁾. The direct object of the transitive verb is generally preceded by the sign of the accusative *את* ¹⁰⁾. The pronominal object is expressed by a pronominal suffix, which is attached to the verb ¹¹⁾. The effect of this suffix on the pronunciation of the word cannot be ascertained in a purely consonantal text. The acc. suffix cannot be attached to the reflexive form of the verb and this conjugation is followed by the preposition *ב* to which the suffix is attached ¹²⁾.

¹⁾ cf. Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 57; Hammershaimb: Verb, pp. 93-97.

²⁾ cf. Driver: Problems, pp. 14-15.

³⁾ M.I. 5. If *תאנף* is to be read, cf. Driver: Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p.1, it could have been a form similar to the Arabic conjugation V, but it is sure that *יאנף* is written.

⁴⁾ It is used about 30 times.

⁵⁾ cf. Driver: Problems, pp. 85-97; Hammershaimb: Verb, p. 93.

⁶⁾ M.I. 19, 32.

⁷⁾ M.I. 19.

⁸⁾ Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 354.

⁹⁾ M.I. 7; cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 7.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 5, 6, 7, 9, 10-14, 17, 18, 30, 31.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 170 below.

¹²⁾ M.I. 11, 15, 19, 32; cf. Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook.

2. The Pronoun.

The independent personal pronoun is used in Moabitic to express the nominative as well as the accusative. In the M.I. only the 1st pers. sing. and the 3rd pers. masc. and fem. are used as the subject of the sentence. The form אֲנִי¹⁾ denotes the 1st pers. sing. According to the context it refers to masculines only, but as the pronoun of the 1st pers. sing. is generally of the common gender²⁾, the same pronoun would have been used for the feminine. Orthographically אֲנִי resembles the Ugaritic, Phoenician and Aramaic forms, respectively *anḥ*³⁾, אֲנִי⁴⁾ and אֲנִי⁵⁾. The lack of the vowel consonant Jodh is an indication that the word did not end in the vowel *i*⁶⁾. On the analogy of other Semitic languages we may assume that the 1st vowel was *ā*, while the 2nd was an accented *ā*⁷⁾. The deictic or demonstrative element *h* was attached with the help of this vowel to the basic form *'an*⁸⁾. The pronunciation could have been אֲנִי⁹⁾.

The demonstrative אֵה¹⁰⁾ is used in Moabitic to indicate the 3rd pers. sing. masc.¹¹⁾. The orthography in Ugaritic, viz. *hw*¹²⁾, points out that the *h* was no substantial element of this pronoun¹³⁾. In the Canaanite dialects the deictic *h*¹⁴⁾ devel-

¹⁾ M.I. 1, 2, 21-23; 25-29.

²⁾ cf. Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 106.

³⁾ cf. Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 25.

⁴⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 69; Jean: DISO, pp. 33-34.

⁵⁾ cf. Cook: NSI, pp. 159, 180.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 186 below and Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 298; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 36.

⁷⁾ cf. also Harris: DCD, pp. 43-44.

⁸⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 298; Koehler: LVTL, p. 69; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 25.

⁹⁾ Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 36 vocalize אֲנִי, but cf. p. 164.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 302.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 6.

¹²⁾ cf. Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, pp. 25-26. Contra Harris: DCD, pp. 53-54.

¹³⁾ cf. the Accadian pronouns *šū* and *šī* and the original forms in Mehrī, *he*, *hi*, *se*, *si* (Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 303).

¹⁴⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 316; Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 404.

oped either to *hw*, i.e. *huwa* as in Ugaritic ¹⁾ or to *h* ²⁾, i.e. *hu'a* ³⁾ as in the other Canaanite dialects. Later the final short vowel was dropped ⁴⁾ and the pronunciation could have been *hu'*, with the Aleph as final consonant ⁵⁾. In the consonantal text the pronoun of the 3rd pers. sing. fem. **ה** resembles that of the masc. ⁶⁾. The development of this form was the same as that of the masc. with the exception of the 1st vowel, which is to be regarded as *i*, viz. *hi'*. In the M.I. the pronoun does not occur in the 3rd pers. masc. plural as a nominative. **הם** is used as an accusative, however ⁷⁾. **הם** might have been formed by attaching the plural-ending *m* ⁸⁾ to the deictic or demonstrative *h*, the pronunciation being *him* ⁹⁾ or *hēm* ¹⁰⁾. The use of the independent personal pronoun as an accusative does occur in Ugaritic, but in a conjugated form, which differs from the nominative, e.g. *hmt* ¹¹⁾. In Aramaic the pronoun is used in the same construction as in Moabitic ¹²⁾. More frequently the accusative and the genitive are expressed by pronominal suffixes. The 1st pers. sing. suffix attached to the noun is **י**, e.g. **אבִי**: my father ¹³⁾. Orthographically the suffix of the plural noun does not differ from that of the sing. noun, but in the former instance the **י** is a consonant, e.g. **בָּנִי**: in

¹⁾ Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 26; cf. the old-Arabic forms, Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 303. In the inscriptions from Zenjirli (Aramaic) the form **ל** is applied once, cf. Brown, Driver and Briggs: Dictionary, p. 214.

²⁾ cf. Jean: DISO, pp. 74-75; Koehler: LVTL, p. 226.

³⁾ Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 303; Harris: DCD, p. 53.

⁴⁾ Brockelmann: Grundriss I, pp. 100, 304.

⁵⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 226. At a still later stage the Aleph could be quiesced as in Hebrew.

⁶⁾ M.I. 27.

⁷⁾ M.I. 18.

⁸⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, pp. 301, 304-305. Though the regular termination of the plural is **ים** in Moabitic, the plural of the pronoun could have ended in **ם**; cf. the archaic form *humu* in Arabic in spite of the fact that the plural ending regularly is *n*.

⁹⁾ cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 41.

¹⁰⁾ The vowel *ē* would have been more in accordance with Hebrew.

¹¹⁾ Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, pp. 25-26.

¹²⁾ cf. Ezrah 4 : 10, 23; 5 : 5, 12, 14; 7 : 17; Dan. 2 : 34; 3 : 22; 6 : 25.

¹³⁾ M.I. 2, 3.

my days ¹⁾, שָׁנָי: my enemies ²⁾. Originally nouns, the prepositions have the same suffix as the noun, בִּי ³⁾, לוֹ ⁴⁾, מִפָּנָי ⁵⁾. The verbal suffix is י- , e.g. הִשְׁעֵנִי: he saved me ⁶⁾, הִרְאֵנִי: he caused me to see ⁷⁾. Though the suffix of the 3rd person masc. sing. which is attached to the sing. and the plural of the noun, the preposition, and the verb, is indicated by הָ, e.g. בְּאַרְצָה: with his land ⁸⁾, יָמָה: his days ⁹⁾, בָּהּ: upon him ¹⁰⁾, לָהּ: for himself ¹¹⁾, וַיִּחְלֶפָהּ: and he succeeded him ¹²⁾, there would have been a difference in its pronunciation. The suffix attached to the sing. of the noun and the preposition was pronounced *ō*, while the suffix of the plural noun and the impf. of the verb, would have been pronounced *ē* ¹³⁾. Orthographically the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. fem., which is attached to all parts of speech, corresponds to that of the masc., e.g. מִגְדָּלֶיהָ: her towers ¹⁴⁾, שַׁעְרֶיהָ: her gateways ¹⁵⁾, בָּהּ: in it ¹⁶⁾, בָּהּ: against it ¹⁷⁾, וַאֲחֻזָּהּ: and he took it ¹⁸⁾. Contrary to the masc. suffix, the הָ, may have the value of *ā* ¹⁹⁾. The personal suffix of the

¹⁾ M.I. 6, 9.

²⁾ M.I. 4; cf. Brockelmann: *Grundriss I*, p. 308; Cross and Freedman: *Orthography*, p. 37.

³⁾ M.I. 19.

⁴⁾ M.I. 4, 32.

⁵⁾ M.I. 19, omitted by Jean: *DISO*, p. 107.

⁶⁾ M.I. 4.

⁷⁾ M.I. 4.

⁸⁾ M.I. 6.

⁹⁾ M.I. 8.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 7.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 10.

¹²⁾ M.I. 6.

¹³⁾ But cf. Cooke: *NSI*, p. 9; Brockelmann: *Grundriss I*, p. 311; Harris: *DCD*, p. 55; Cross and Freedman: *Orthography*, pp. 37-38. A similar form occurs in Hebrew, cf. Driver: *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 22.

¹⁵⁾ M.I. 22.

¹⁶⁾ M.I. 8, 9, 13, 19.

¹⁷⁾ M.I. 5.

¹⁸⁾ M.I. 11, 16, 20. In the five last mentioned notes the suffix refers to the city and is therefore feminine. Contra Cooke: *NSI*, p. 11.

¹⁹⁾ cf. Brockelmann: *Grundriss I*, p. 311; Cross and Freedman: *Orthography*, p. 41.

2nd pers. masc. plural is attached to the preposition ל, e.g. לַכֶּם: for you¹⁾. The vocalic changes resulting from the attaching of the pronominal suffix cannot be traced from the purely consonantal text. The verbal suffixes could be connected only with the active verbs or with the causative conjugations of stative verbs. The relation of a personal pronoun to a stative verb is expressed with the help of the prepositions ב²⁾ and ל³⁾. With the reflexive conjugation the preposition ב is used⁴⁾.

As demonstrative pronoun of the fem. sing. the form זאת⁵⁾ is used, following a noun written without the definite article⁶⁾. The relative clause is introduced by אשר⁷⁾, referring to the object by means of a retrospective suffix.

3. The Noun.

In Moabitic there are 2 genders, viz. masc. and fem. The masc. has no special indication, e.g. בן⁸⁾. The fem. has the ending ה, e.g. במת⁹⁾, מסלת¹⁰⁾, חמת¹¹⁾, שחרת¹²⁾, מכרתת¹³⁾, שת¹⁴⁾. Originally the fem. ending was -atum, which became -atu after the loss of the mimation¹⁵⁾, from which -at was formed by dropping the final short vowel. The fem. nouns קר¹⁶⁾ and ארץ¹⁷⁾ are

¹⁾ M.I. 24-25.

²⁾ cf. M.I. 8, 9, 13, 19.

³⁾ M.I. 14, 32.

⁴⁾ M.I. 15, 19.

⁵⁾ M.I. 3.

⁶⁾ cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 5.

⁷⁾ M.I. 29.

⁸⁾ M.I. 1.

⁹⁾ M.I. 3.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 26.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 21.

¹²⁾ M.I. 15.

¹³⁾ M.I. 25.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 2, 8, 34. שת is contracted from שנת: Santu, cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, p. 334; Harris: DCD, p. 36.

¹⁵⁾ cf. Harris: DCD, pp. 67-68; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, pp. 40-41; Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, pp. 223-224.

¹⁶⁾ M.I. 11, 24 (12?); cf. Albrecht: ZAW 1896, pp. 56-60.

¹⁷⁾ M.I. 5, 10, 29, 31; cf. Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 392; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 41.

without any indication of gender. The ending of the dual is ן- , e.g. מאתן : two hundred ¹⁾. Names of places, having the termination ים- in Hebrew, e.g. בית דבֿלָתים ²⁾, חורנים ³⁾, קִירְיָתים ⁴⁾, or ן- in Moabitic ⁵⁾, e.g. בת דבלתן ⁶⁾, חורן ⁷⁾, קריתן ⁸⁾ are not to be regarded as forms of the dual. The plural of the masc. noun is indicated by adding ן- to the sing., e.g. ימן ⁹⁾, יערן ¹⁰⁾, עין ¹¹⁾, רבן ¹²⁾. The fem. nouns without indication of gender, merely add ן- to form the plural, e.g. קרן ¹³⁾. To form the construct state, the final ן- of the plural masc. is elided, the termination becomes \bar{e} , viz. ימי ¹⁴⁾, אסרי ¹⁵⁾ and the vowels are reduced as much as possible ¹⁶⁾. The ending of the construct state indicates that the vowel of the plural termination ן- was \bar{e} or even \bar{i} . In the plural of fem. nouns only a change of vowels seems to have taken place, e.g. גברת ¹⁷⁾, רחמת ¹⁸⁾. The plural ending could have been $-\hat{a}tun$, which became $-\hat{a}tu$ and thence $-\hat{a}t$. Therefore it is difficult to ascertain whether מנדלתה ¹⁹⁾ is sing. or plural. Orthographically there is no difference in the consonantal text between the fem. sing. and plural. When the pronominal suffix is attached to the plural

¹⁾ M.I. 20; Cooke: NSI, pp. 5, 10; Driver: Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p. xciii.

²⁾ Jer. 48 : 22.

³⁾ Is. 15 : 5; Jer. 48 : 3, 5, 34.

⁴⁾ Jer. 48 : 1, 23; Hes. 25 : 9.

⁵⁾ The vowel preceding the ן could have been a ; cf. also Cooke: N.S.I, p. 10.

⁶⁾ M.I. 30.

⁷⁾ M.I. 31-32.

⁸⁾ M.I. 10.

⁹⁾ M.I. 5.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 21.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 27.

¹²⁾ M.I. 5.

¹³⁾ M.I. 29.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 8; cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 38.

¹⁵⁾ M.I. 25-26.

¹⁶⁾ cf. also Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 247; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 42.

¹⁷⁾ M.I. 16.

¹⁸⁾ M.I. 17.

¹⁹⁾ M.I. 22.

of the masc. noun, the Jodh, indicating the \bar{e} in the masc. construct state, is written, e.g. שַׁעֲרִיה ¹⁾. As this vowel consonant is wanting in מַגְדִּלְתָּה, we may assume that it is singular. But on the other hand we must take into consideration the fact that a gateway was usually flanked by towers ²⁾ and as שַׁעֲרִיה is plural we may also regard מַגְדִּלְתָּה as a plural. In this instance בִּנְה ³⁾ could also be regarded as a plural ⁴⁾. As it is masc. in gender, it seems more feasible to treat it as a singular, however ⁵⁾.

The formation of nouns from the original word-stems is in accordance with the use in other Semitic languages, especially the Canaanite dialects. In the M.I. a few primitive nouns ⁶⁾, e.g. אֵב ⁷⁾, בֵּן ⁸⁾, are used, while the majority of the nouns stand in connection with verbal stems, e.g. אָסַר ⁹⁾, מָלַךְ ¹⁰⁾, בָּקַע ¹¹⁾. It is impossible to classify these nouns into different groups ¹²⁾, as the vowel signs are wanting. The substantives עָם ¹³⁾ כָּל ¹⁴⁾, רַב ¹⁵⁾, are derived from so-called double 'Ajin roots. From the orthography רָבָן we may assume that the duplication of the consonant is not denoted ¹⁶⁾. We may connect אֵשׁ ¹⁷⁾ and יָם ¹⁸⁾ with the 'Ajin-Waw roots. This class also includes the

¹⁾ M.I. 22.

²⁾ cf. p. 99 above.

³⁾ M.I., 6, 8.

⁴⁾ cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 2; cf. p. 138 above.

⁵⁾ It is clear from the context that בִּנְה is sing. in M.I. 6. If the plural was meant, the form would rather have been בִּנְיָה, cf. שַׁעֲרִיה, M.I. 22; cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 39.

⁶⁾ cf. Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 225.

⁷⁾ M.I. 2, 3.

⁸⁾ M.I. 1, 6, 8.

⁹⁾ M.I. 24-25.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 1, 2, 5, 10, 18, 23.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 15.

¹²⁾ cf. Brockelmann: Grundriss I, pp. 331-364.

¹³⁾ M.I. 11, 14.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 4, 5, 11, 20, 24, 28.

¹⁵⁾ M.I. 5.

¹⁶⁾ cf. p. 186 below; Harris: DCD, p. 76.

¹⁷⁾ M.I. 10, 13, 20, 25. But cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 40 and Gemser: Hebräische Sprachkuns, p. 67 n. 2.

¹⁸⁾ M.I. 8.

noun גר¹⁾, with גרת²⁾ as feminine, The Waw is dropped in the consonantal text because the nouns became monosyllabic and vowel consonants are not written in the middle of words. In the noun דור³⁾ it seems as though the middle Waw is a vowel consonant. Perhaps it was pronounced דור⁴⁾. In accordance with Kupper and Tadmor the connection with *dawidum* is ruled out⁵⁾. The middle Waw or Jodh is retained as a consonant if the final consonant, being Waw or Jodh, is dropped, e.g. עי⁶⁾. In the plural the Waw or Jodh was duplicated, without its being indicated in the orthography, e.g. עין⁷⁾. The nouns בנה/בית⁸⁾, לל⁹⁾, קר¹⁰⁾ are derived from the so-called 'Ajin-Jodh roots. The orthography בית as variant of בת is quite interesting¹¹⁾. The word is derived from the root בית, which means to spend the night¹²⁾. The final He in ללה must be regarded as an affirmative¹³⁾. Thus the noun לל corresponds with the Accadian *lêlu*¹⁴⁾, the Ugaritic *ll*¹⁵⁾ and the Hebrew

¹⁾ M.I. 16.

²⁾ M.I. 16.

³⁾ M.I. 12.

⁴⁾ The He must be regarded as the pronominal suffix. Before the short vowel ending was dropped, the pronunciation could have been *dawdu*, which became *dawd*, before contracting to דור; cf. p. 190 below.

⁵⁾ cf. Kupper: *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*, pp. 58-62; Tadmor: *JNES* 17, p. 130. Contra Dossin: *Syria* XIX, pp. 109-110; Dussaud: *Syria* XXVIII, p. 348; Albright: *Basor* 89, p. 16 n. 55, who reads *dawidoh*. But the suffix refers to the city and should be feminine, thence *dawdah* or *dōdah*. Cross and Freedman: *Orthography*, p. 40, vocalize *dawideh*, but it is uncertain whether the vowel of the feminine suffix would have been *e*.

⁶⁾ M.I. 27. The noun is derived from a root עו or עוי cf., Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 699.

⁷⁾ cf. also ריית, M.I. 12.

⁸⁾ M.I. 7, 23. The word בת frequently occurs in names of places.

⁹⁾ M.I. 15.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 11, 12, 24.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 186 below.

¹²⁾ cf. Hommel: *OLZ* 1907, Sp. 482; Koehler: *LVTL*, p. 122.

¹³⁾ It may be an old accusative termination, denoting duration of time, cf. also Stevenson: *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, p. 25.

¹⁴⁾ Bezold: *Babylonisch-Assyrisches Grammatik*, p. 156.

¹⁵⁾ Gordon: *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 243.

לִיל or לִילָה, with a near resemblance to לִיל in Is. 15 : 1. The substantive קר is derived from the root קיר and is related to the Hebrew קיר. Originally the noun קיר meant "wall", but it can also designate a city, as the settlement was changed to a city by the surrounding wall¹⁾.

In the nouns בר²⁾, רש³⁾ the middle Aleph, being silent, fell out in the written text⁴⁾. The fundamental Jodh appears in the construct state of nouns derived from the so-called Lamedh-He roots, e.g. חצי⁵⁾. This final Jodh is a vowel consonant. Thus there is no difference between the sing. and the plural of the construct state of these nouns, e.g. חצי and חצִי⁶⁾ respectively. Perhaps there was a difference in pronunciation, viz. חָצִי and חֲצִי⁷⁾ respectively. The termination of the feminine nouns is attached to feminine nouns derived from these roots, without indicating the long vowel, which preceded this termination, e.g. חמת⁸⁾. The noun רית⁹⁾ is derived by Albright¹⁰⁾ from the root ריה, which originally was *rawj*¹¹⁾. The vowel of the 1st syllable, which was closed, was *a* and being feminine, the form would have been *rawjat*¹²⁾. But in the closed and unaccentuated syllable *a* became *i* and thereupon the Waw assimilated to the next consonant; hence we have the form *rijjat*¹³⁾. In the plural form עין the

¹⁾ Van Selms: HTS 1952, p. 82; cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 838.

²⁾ M.I. 24-25.

³⁾ M.I. 20.

⁴⁾ cf. Harris: DCD, pp. 42, 73; Koehler: LVTL, p. 114; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 41.

⁵⁾ M.I. 8; cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 38; Koehler: LVTL, p. 324.

⁶⁾ M.I. 17-18.

⁷⁾ Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 41.

⁸⁾ M.I. 21.

⁹⁾ M.I. 12.

¹⁰⁾ Albright: Basor 89, p. 16 n. 55; cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 40.

¹¹⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 876.

¹²⁾ cf. שִׁלָּה in Hebrew (Koehler: LVTL, p. 973), which would have been שִׁלָּת in Moabitic.

¹³⁾ cf. p. 190 n. 6 below.

middle consonant would also have been duplicated¹⁾.

In Moabitic nouns were formed with preformatives, e.g. ארבען²⁾. The Aleph-prostheticum also occurs in the word אשוח³⁾. Torczyner⁴⁾ regards the Waw as a vowel consonant and connects the word with the Sumerian-Accadian word *ešmahhu-ešwahhu* and translates "a holy building". But the noun may be derived from the root שוח⁵⁾, to which Aleph-prostheticum was prefixed, e.g. אשוח, pronounced אַשְׁוּחַ⁶⁾. The nouns מגדלתת⁷⁾, מכרתת⁸⁾, מסלת⁹⁾, מעין¹⁰⁾ and משמעת¹¹⁾ are formed by prefixing a Mem as preformative.

4. The Numerals.

The formation of the numerals does not differ substantially from that in Ugaritic and Hebrew. Like the feminine noun, the ending of the feminine is ת-¹²⁾, while the masc. plural ending is ך-. The tens are expressed by the plural forms of the units, e.g. שלשן¹³⁾, ארבען¹⁴⁾, חמשן¹⁵⁾. Generally the numerals stand in their absolute state before the word which they enumerate¹⁶⁾. In שבעת אלפן גברן¹⁷⁾ we have an example of the principle of polarity.

¹⁾ cf. p. 187 below.

²⁾ M.I. 8.

³⁾ M.I. 9, (23?).

⁴⁾ Torczyner: JPOS 1936, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁾ cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 10.

⁶⁾ cf. Sirach 50 : 3.

⁷⁾ M.I. 22.

⁸⁾ M.I. 25.

⁹⁾ M.I. 26. Derived from a double 'Ayin root סלל. The duplication of the root is not indicated.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 23; cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, pp. 41-42.

¹¹⁾ M.I. 28.

¹²⁾ cf. שבעת (M.I. 16) and מאת (M.I. 29).

¹³⁾ M.I. 2.

¹⁴⁾ M.I. 8.

¹⁵⁾ M.I. 28.

¹⁶⁾ If they had the construct state the ך- would have been dropped, cf. p. 172 above.

¹⁷⁾ M.I. 16.

5. *The Article.*

The definite article is prefixed to the word, which is defined by it, e.g. *הַקִּיר*: the city ¹⁾, but: *יָמֵן רַבִּין*: many days ²⁾. Whether it caused the duplication of the next consonant is unknown, because the duplication of a consonant is not indicated orthographically. Both the vowel of the definite article and the principles which were applied when it was prefixed to a noun having a guttural as initial consonant are obscure, e.g. *הַאֲשֹׁר* ³⁾, *הַעֵם* ⁴⁾. We may assume that it closely resembled the use in Hebrew ⁵⁾. Unlike the use in Hebrew the demonstrative pronoun, which is used adjectivally, did not take the article ⁶⁾, e.g. *הַבִּמְתָּ זֹאת* ⁷⁾.

When the prepositions *ב* and *ל* are prefixed to words with the definite article, the *He* is elided ⁸⁾ e.g. *בְּקִרְן* ⁹⁾, *לְמַעַן* ¹⁰⁾. In the construct state the definite article is dropped.

6. *The Proper Name.*

The analysis of proper names can be of help in different ways. As proper names frequently preserve ancient transition forms or obsolete words, they may help to explain other obscure forms or to supplement our vocabulary. Furthermore, names had a specific value and meaning ¹¹⁾, which reveal to us the background of the nomenclature. In analyzing the proper

¹⁾ M.I. 24 (12?).

²⁾ M.I. 5.

³⁾ M.I. 9 (23?) and cf. p. 176 above.

⁴⁾ M.I. 11, 24.

⁵⁾ cf. Koehler: ZAW 1940/1, pp. 230-232.

⁶⁾ This archaic style also occurs in Hebrew, e.g. Gen. 19:33; 24:8; 30:16; 32:23; 38:21; Ex. 10:1; Josh. 2:20; Judg. 6:14; I Sam. 2:23; 19:10; I Ki. 10:8; 22:23; II Ki. 1:2; 8:8; Jer. 10:19; 31:21; Ps. 12:8. A few of these examples may be the result of haplography, e.g. Gen. 19:33; 30:16; 32:23; 38:21; I Sam. 19:10.

⁷⁾ M.I. 3.

⁸⁾ cf. Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 112.

⁹⁾ M.I. 29.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 23 and cf. p. 191 n. 10.

¹¹⁾ cf. Gemser: *De Beteekenis der Persoonsnamen voor onze kennis van het leven en denken der oude Babyloniërs en Assyriërs*, p. 1.

names mentioned in M.I., we must take into consideration the fact that some of the names did not originate among the Moabites, e.g. **יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל**, **עַמְּרִי**. Moreover, many of the cities could have been named by Israelite or other non-Moabite settlers, for the children of Reuben "gave other names unto the cities which they built" ¹⁾. Because we cannot determine the exact extent of the Moabitic naming of places or of the changes made by them or others, any conclusions, based purely on geographical names in respect of the Moabitic language or the mode of life and conceptions of the Moabites will not be sound. Therefore it seems better to omit them from this treatise.

i. **מֹאָב** ²⁾).

This name occurs in the O.T. as **מֹאָב** ³⁾, in M.I. as **מֹאָב** ⁴⁾, in the Assyrian royal inscriptions as *mā'aba* ⁵⁾, *mā'ab* ⁶⁾ or *mū'aba* ⁷⁾, in an Egyptian source as *m-i-b* ⁸⁾ in the Lxx as *moaab*, in the writings of Fl. Josephus as *moabos*, in the literary heritage of the Nabataeans as **מוֹבִיא** ⁹⁾.

According to the text of the Lxx the firstborn daughter of Lot called her son *moaab*, saying "*ek tou patros mou*" ¹⁰⁾. As I have already indicated ¹¹⁾, Gen. 19 does not describe the special and, at the same time inartificial, occasion according to which the name was given to the child, but it rather

¹⁾ Numb. 32 : 38.

²⁾ cf. p. 45 above.

³⁾ In I Sam. 8 : 12 **מֹאָב**, elsewhere in scriptio plena, **מֹאָב**, cf. Mandelkern: *Condordantiae Hebraicae*, p. 1468.

⁴⁾ M.I. 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 20.

⁵⁾ Tiglath Pileser III: Nimrud Tablet, reserve, 10; Letters from Kalhu XIV, 10, 12; XVI, 36; Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 53; Esarhaddon: Prism B, V, 15; Asshurbānīpal: Cyl. C, I, 27.

⁶⁾ Asshurbānīpal: Cyl. B, VIII, 37.

⁷⁾ Asshurbānīpal: Rassam Cyl. VII, 112.

⁸⁾ cf. p. 40 above; Simons: ETL, p. 205; Buhl: Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A.T., p. 403 reads *mu'b*.

⁹⁾ cf. Kochler: LVTL, p. 501.

¹⁰⁾ Gen. 19 : 37. In Hebrew it would have been **מֹאָבִי**.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 5 above.

suggests a popular etymology of the name, punning on אָב as motive word ¹⁾. In spite of this, the occurrence referred to in Gen. 19 and especially the additions of the Lxx, has frequently been the starting point for explaining the name מוֹאָב ²⁾. On the other hand, the form מוֹאָב has been regarded as a variant of מֵאָב, meaning "semen of the father" ³⁾. This explanation is discarded, however ⁴⁾. According to Hommel ⁵⁾, the original form of the name was *emmô-ab*: his mother is father, i.e. the father is unknown or is desired to be unknown. But in Gen. 19 we have the name of the father, whereas that of the mother is wanting. Wellhausen ⁶⁾ explained the name by means of the Arabic root *wa'aba*: to be ashamed. The elder daughter of Lot was ashamed of the way in which her son was begotten and therefore she called him מוֹאָב: he who puts to shame. Vollers assumes that the name *ma'âb* originated among the Bedouin tribes to the e. of Moab. It was coined with reference to the land, indicating it as "the land of the sunset", i.e. the west. As the Arabic *ma'âb* would become *ma'ôb* in Hebrew, the form מוֹאָב is regarded by him as an unintentional distortion ⁷⁾. Related to the view of Vollers that the country must be regarded as the object of the nomenclature, is the derivation of the name from the root יָאָב: to long for ⁸⁾. It seems, however, that the name מוֹאָב originally referred to the people. Further-

¹⁾ cf. p. 6 above; Böhl: *Opera Minora*, pp. 12-15; Noth: *Personennamen*, pp. 4-5, 9-11 Gunkel: *Genesis* p. 192.

²⁾ e.g. Bereshith Rabba LI, 11; Nestle: ZAW 1896, pp. 322-323.

³⁾ e.g. Schroeder: *Das erste Buch Mose*, p. 381; Krenkel: ZAW 1888, p. 283; Davidson: *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. CCCCLXXXIII; Davis and Gehman: WDB, p. 402.

⁴⁾ Leupold: *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 577.

⁵⁾ Hommel: *Ethnologie und Geographie des Alten Orients*, p. 164 n. 2.

⁶⁾ Wellhausen: EB II, p. 3166.

⁷⁾ Vollers: Z.A. 1908, pp. 237-240.

⁸⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 357 for the meaning of this root. The idea seems to be expressed in Gen. 13: 10, but the same root is not used.

more, if the original form of the name was מֹאָב as it would have been if it had been a derivation from יָאֵב, the origin of the Accadian form *mā'ab/a* would be problematic. Therefore it seems more reasonable to derive the name from a root מֹאֵב, yet unknown to us. The original pronunciation would have been *mā'abu*¹⁾. In course of time a pronunciation *mu'abu/mu'ab* developed²⁾ alongside the original *mā'abu*. The traditional vocalization of the M.T., as well as the translators of the Lxx, followed the pronunciation *mu'ab*.

ii. מִשֶּׁע.

In the O.T. the name occurs as מִשֶּׁע³⁾, in M.I. as מִשֶּׁע⁴⁾ and in the Lxx as *moosa*⁵⁾. In view of the existence of a word יִשַּׁע in Moabitic⁶⁾, it seems as though the king's name was pronounced מִשֶּׁע⁷⁾. The meaning of the name is "help" or perhaps "salvation"⁸⁾, and it must be regarded as the pious wish of his parents that the newborn son would be the means in the hand of Chemosh, their national god, to bring salvation from the oppressing Israelite yoke.

iii. כִּמֹּשׁ.

In the O.T. the name of this god is written כִּמֹּשׁ⁹⁾, in M.I.

¹⁾ But cf. Jenni: Das Wort עוֹלָם im A.T., p. 6. Alternatively we may derive it from the root וָהֵב: to love, with יָהֵב or וָהֵב (cf. Numb. 21:14): to give voluntary, as an interchangeable form. The He could have been altered to Aleph and the noun was formed by prefixing *ma-*, i.e. *maw'ab*, which changed to מֹאָב. But what about the Accadian *mā'abu*? Yet another possibility remains. The name could have been formed in the same way as מוֹאֵל, cf. Albright: JPOS VIII, p. 249, the element אֵל referring to a deity.

²⁾ cf. Asshurbānīpal: Rassam Cyl. VII, 112.

³⁾ II Ki. 3:4.

⁴⁾ M.I. 1.

⁵⁾ Lxx Basileioon D, 3:4.

⁶⁾ M.I. 3-4. יִשַּׁע is generally regarded as being the correct reading.

⁷⁾ cf. also I Chron. 2:42. Unfortunately the name מִשֶּׁע is omitted in Lxx, cf. Paralipomenoon A, 2:42.

⁸⁾ cf. Noth: Personennamen, pp. 154-155.

⁹⁾ Numb. 21:29; Judg. 11:24; I Ki. 11:7, 33; II Ki. 23:13; Jer. 48:7, 46.

כמש¹⁾ and in the Lxx *Xamoos*. Hommel²⁾ is of the opinion that the name developed from the combination *Aku-Mašu* and therefore designates the Moongod as twin. This derivation has been discarded, however³⁾. Perhaps the name is to be connected with a root כמש. In Ugaritic a root *kms*, meaning "to prostrate oneself" is attested⁴⁾. The same root, having the variants *kaṁāšu*, *kaṁāsu*, *kaṁāšū* also occurs in Accadian. The intensive form of the root means "to throw down"⁵⁾. If we examine the orthography of personal names, having the name of this god as one of its elements, e.g. *kammusunadbi*⁶⁾, we find that the middle consonant is duplicated. The original form of the name could have been *kammuš* or *kammus*⁷⁾. The name can therefore be regarded as a *nomen agentis*, i.e. "the subduer", the one who throws down his enemies⁸⁾. In M.I. the name is written כמש. If we consider the fact that the duplication of consonants is not indicated in the inscription, the name could have been pronounced *kammuš*. This pronunciation is in accordance with the vocalization of Lxx, viz. *Xamoos*. Only the duplicated middle consonant is wanting in the Lxx rendering. This may be ascribed to the fact that the Israelites dropped the duplication of the middle consonant and the vocalization on purpose. They regarded the god of their arch-enemy as כמש: the subdued one. Still later it was changed to כמש⁹⁾. As this pronunciation is the traditional one, it is used in this treatise.

¹⁾ M.I. 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 32, 33.

²⁾ Hommel: *Ethnologie und Geographie des Alten Orients*, pp. 89, 117 n. 1, 163.

³⁾ Horsfeld et Vincent: R.B. 41, p. 432. The derivation by Albright: JPOS XLI, p. 317, must also be rejected.

⁴⁾ Gordon: *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 239.

⁵⁾ cf. Bezold: *Babylonisch Assyrisches Glossar*, p. 42. The variant forms *kaḇāsu*, *kaḇāšū* and *kaṇāšū* have a similar meaning.

⁶⁾ cf. Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 53.

⁷⁾ cf. C.T. 24, 36, 66.

⁸⁾ cf. Brockelmann: *Grundriss I*, pp. 360-361.

⁹⁾ Prof Gemser suggested to me that the change could have taken place on account of the influence of words like כמש: stink and כמש: putrid, rotten berries (of grapes).

The name **כֶּמֶשׁ** occurs frequently as one of the elements in proper names. The father of king Mesha¹ was — **כֶּמֶשׁ**¹). Perhaps the reading **כֶּמֶשֶׁן**²) is to be preferred. If this be correct, the name is formed by combining the name of the god with a verbal form and it would mean "may Chemosh confirm/establish"³). The name *kammusunadbi* stands in connection with the root **נָדַב**, which occurs in other proper names⁴). If the ending *-i* is a pronominal suffix, the element *nadb* is to be regarded as a noun of the *qatl-type*⁵). Dhorme translates it as "Chemosh is my prince"⁶), but it should rather be translated "Chemosh is my giver", i.e. the one who shows himself benignant towards me⁷). In **כֶּמֶשִׁיחִי**⁸) the impf. of the verb **חָיָה** is connected with the name of the god. It was meant as a pious wish or ejaculatory prayer, i.e. Chemosh live⁹), meaning show yourself alive, active, benevolent in the life of him, who bears this name¹⁰). The name **כֶּמֶשְׁצַדִּיק**¹¹) is a combination of Chemosh and **צַדִּיק**, which occurs in different proper names¹²) and it may be rendered "Chemosh is just, righteous". The combination with **מֶלֶךְ**, e.g. **כֶּמֶשְׁמֶלֶךְ**¹³), indicates that Chemosh

¹) M.I. 1.

²) There is not enough space for the reading **כֶּמֶשְׁמֶלֶךְ**. Galling: Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels, p. 48, reads **כֶּמֶשְׁנֹד**, in which instance the name consists of the names of two gods and it would have meant Chemosh is Gad, i.e. Chemosh is the god of fortune, cf. Noth: Personennamen, pp. 5, 126-127.

³) cf. Noth: Personennamen, pp. 179-202.

⁴) cf. Sennacherib: Taylor Prism II, 53 and Noth: Personennamen, pp. 22, 193 n.l. Ammi-nadbi was king of Ammon. The contemporary king of Edom was Kaušgabri, cf. Asshurbânipal: Cylinder C, 26; Koehler: LVTL, p. 714.

⁵) Cowley: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, p. 228.

⁶) So Dhorme according to Horsfield et Vincent: R.B. 41, p. 431 n. 4.

⁷) cf. Noth: Personennamen, p. 193.

⁸) cf. p. 40 above.

⁹) cf. the formula by which the king is addressed in Dan. 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7, 22.

¹⁰) cf. also Horsfield et Vincent: R.B. 41, p. 431 n. 4; Noth: Personennamen, p. 206.

¹¹) cf. p. 40 above.

¹²) cf. Noth: Personennamen, pp. 161-162.

¹³) cf. p. 40 above.

was regarded as the king of his worshippers. The name *kamu-šar-šar-ušur*¹⁾ reveals Babylonian influence and is only of importance in so far as it illustrates the dispersion of the name Chemosh. The name *kam(as)hālta*²⁾ is indistinct, both in its transmission and its meaning³⁾. All the personal names, having the name Chemosh as one of its elements, are so-called "Satznamen"⁴⁾ with Chemosh as the subject of the sentence.

iv. שלמן.

In the O.T. this name occurs as שלמן⁵⁾ and in the royal inscription of Tiglath Pileser III as *salamanu*⁶⁾. The Moabitic שלמן⁷⁾ is derived from the root שלם with ך- as affix⁸⁾. The pronunciation could have been שלמן. A west-Semitic god *š-l-m* is known⁹⁾ and in the Accadian inscriptions a god *šlmn* is mentioned¹⁰⁾. Etymologically all these names are akin, but the personal name must be regarded as a direct derivation from the root שלם¹¹⁾.

v. עגלון.

The name Eglon is derived from עגל with the help of the affix ך-¹²⁾. Perhaps it stands in connection with the Accadian *Ig/klānu*¹³⁾.

¹⁾ cf. p. 39 above.

²⁾ Asshurbānīpal: Cyl. B, VIII, 37.

³⁾ Perhaps it is related to the word *hālta*, cf. CAD vol. 6, p. 53. meaning Chemosh is (my) *hālta*-stone.

⁴⁾ cf. Noth: Personennamen, p. 15.

⁵⁾ Hos. 10:14.

⁶⁾ Tiglath Pileser III, Nimrud Tablet, Reverse 10.

⁷⁾ cf. Noth: Personennamen, pp. 165, 174; Koehler: LVTL, p. 980. Tallquist: Götterepitheta, p. 226 refers to Šulmān, the name of a city.

⁸⁾ cf. Noth: Personennamen, p. 38.

⁹⁾ cf. Schrader K.A.T.³, pp. 224, 474; Šanda: Das Buch der Könige II, pp. 12-13; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, p. 273; De Groot: Van der Leeuw, De Godsdiensten der Wereld I, pp. 311, 323.

¹⁰⁾ Deimel: Pantheon, 3165.

¹¹⁾ cf. Dhorme: R.B. 40, p. 373.

¹²⁾ Judg. 3:12-17.

¹³⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 679.

vi. צָפּוֹר.

This name is related to the Hebrew word for "bird" ¹⁾).

vii. בָּלָק.

As far as is known this name does not occur elsewhere ²⁾).

viii. Muşuri ³⁾).

Somehow this name reveals a kinship with Egypt (*muşru/ muşur*) or with that part of n. Arabia, which was known as *muşru* ⁴⁾). Perhaps the last mentioned alternative is to be preferred. The generation of Muşuri could have entered the land of Moab during the Bedouin invasion referred to in Is. 15-16 and the letters from Kalhu ⁵⁾).

ix. יַתְמָה.

Koehler refers to the Babylonian name Jatamā ⁶⁾).

x. שָׁמֶר ⁷⁾).

The feminine form of this name, viz. שָׁמְרִית ⁸⁾) must be preferred as the bearer of it was female. The name is a derivation of שָׁמֶר ⁹⁾).

xi. רִית.

Opinions differ about the meaning and origin of this name. Böhl ¹⁰⁾ is of the opinion that the name is derived from the

¹⁾ cf. Numb. 22 : 2, 4, 6, 10; 23 : 18; Josh. 24 : 9; Judg. 11 : 25; Koehler: LVTL, pp. 812-813.

²⁾ cf. Numb. 22 : 2-24; Josh. 24 : 9; Judg. 11 : 25; Mi. 6 : 5; Koehler: LVTL, p. 131.

³⁾ cf. Luckenbill: ARAB II, p. 265.

⁴⁾ Koehler: LVTL, p. 558.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 20-23, 36-38 above.

⁶⁾ I Chron. 11 : 46; cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 415.

⁷⁾ I Ki. 12 : 22.

⁸⁾ cf. II Chron. 24 : 26.

⁹⁾ Whether these two names were purely Moabitic is uncertain.

¹⁰⁾ Böhl: Bijbelsch-Kerkelijk Woordenboek I, p. 261. But cf. Noth: Personennamen, p. 10.

root רעה¹⁾. On the other hand Haller derives it from the root רית²⁾. Then the name would be akin to the noun רית³⁾.

xii. עֶרְפָּה⁴⁾.

Because Orpah turned her back and parted from her mother-in-law, her name is combined with the word עֶרֶךְ: neck⁵⁾. Orpah was not stubborn, however. She left at the request of her mother-in-law. Therefore it is better to connect the name with the Arabic *ʿurfatun*: mane, viz. the woman with the long hair⁶⁾, or with the Accadian *urpu*, *urpitu*: clouds⁷⁾, in which case the name also referred to the head-dress. Perhaps the last mentioned alternative must be preferred.

7. *The Orthography of M.I.*

The orthography of the M.I. has been investigated frequently⁸⁾, because for a long time it supplied the only comparable information about the orthography of the O.T. As regards the orthography of the M.I., the following may be indicated:

i. The author devised a practical method to indicate the end of words and clauses. Words are divided by points and clauses by vertical lines⁹⁾. The first mentioned device was also applied in the Siloam inscription and a few Aramaic inscriptions from the 8th century B.C.¹⁰⁾

¹⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 883.

²⁾ cf. Haller: Die Fünf Megilloth, p. 7.

³⁾ cf. p. 175 above.

⁴⁾ Ruth 1:4, 14.

⁵⁾ cf. Haller: Die Fünf Megilloth, p. 7.

⁶⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 738.

⁷⁾ cf. Bezold: Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar, p. 69. We do not know whether these two names were purely Moabitic.

⁸⁾ cf. Nöldeke: Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab, p. 31; Stade: Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik, p. 34; Driver: Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p. xxvii; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 35.

⁹⁾ cf. Cook: The O.T., a reinterpretation, pp. 23-24; Poebel: Das Appositionell Bestimmte Pronomen der I. Pers. Sing. in den Westsemitischen Inschriften und im A.T., p. 9; Würtwein: Der Text des alten Testaments, pp. 78, 90.

¹⁰⁾ cf. Cooke: NSI, pp. 14, 158, 171, 180.

ii. Principally the text is a consonantal text in which the so-called *matres lectionis* or vowel consonants are only used by way of exception.

iii. The duplication of consonants is not indicated ¹⁾, e.g. אקח as 1st person sing. impf. of לקח ²⁾, מסלת from a root סלל ³⁾ and ריית for rijjat ⁴⁾.

iv. The final vowel of a word is indicated by a vowel consonant. Only He, Waw and Jodh are used as such. The final Aleph is still consonantal ⁵⁾. The He represents *a, e, o, u* as final long vowels ⁶⁾. Though pronounced differently, both the 3rd person masc. sing. and the 3rd person fem. sing. suffixes are indicated by He ⁷⁾. The Waw represents the final *u*, while the Jodh represents the final *i* as well as the final *e*, which is the ending of the plural of the construct state ⁸⁾. Whenever an affix is attached to the plural of a masc. noun, this vowel consonant is retained in the middle of the word. A feminine noun, having a pronominal suffix attached, does not have any indication whether it is sing. or plural. Perhaps this may be regarded as the major defect of the orthography of the M.I. ⁹⁾.

v. Generally vowel consonants were not applied in the middle of words. The orthography of a few words seems to contradict this statement, however. So for instance בית occurs next to בת ¹⁰⁾. This seems to indicate that, in this instance,

¹⁾ For a similar orthography, cf. also Lakish Ostrakon III, 8-9. The same consonant is written once only, even if it belonged to two different words, e.g. וכי יאמר for וכי יאמר.

²⁾ cf. 164 above.

³⁾ cf. p. 176 n. 9 above.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 175 above.

⁵⁾ cf. also Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 43 and p. 169 above.

⁶⁾ Hommel: Das graphische *h* im Minäischen, p. 20 ff. assumes that the He indicates *ē* and *ō* and therefore he assumes that Moabitic has an affinity with the Minaean dialect of Arabic known from the inscriptions of el-Ūla; cf. also Hommel: Ancient Hebrew Traditions, p. 276. But the historical gap between these inscriptions is too wide, cf. also König: Hebräer und Semiter, p. 82; Cook: NSI, pp. 8-9.

⁷⁾ cf. p. 170 above.

⁸⁾ cf. p. 172 above; Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 38.

⁹⁾ cf. pp. 138, 172, 173 above.

¹⁰⁾ cf. also Cross and Freedman: Orthography, pp. 38, 42.

the Jodh is but a mere indication of a vowel. However, if the Jodh was used in the middle of a word as a vowel consonant, except in the plural noun having an affix, it certainly would have been applied to the verbal forms בנתי and ירש¹). Therefore we must assume that the Jodh was pronounced in בית. The same applies to the words עין and מעין, where the diphthong had not yet become an ē. This implies that at this specific period two different pronunciations of the same word existed among the Moabites, viz. one with contracted diphthong written בח and one without contraction, written בית. Being the older of the two forms, the uncontracted one existed mainly in the names of cities, e.g. דיבן (*dajbān*) and חורן (*hawrōnān*). Even the He in מהרבא is to be regarded as a consonant²). In דוד contraction could already have taken place.

vi. From the above mentioned examples we may gather that the uncontracted diphthong is indicated in the middle of the word. The Jodh and Waw respectively represent *aj* and *aw*. Whenever the diphthong is not indicated where it could have been expected on etymological grounds, it must be regarded as contracted, e.g. השעני, being the causative of a root ושע³).

vii. The conception of Cross and Freedman⁴) concerning the origin of the *matres lectionis* may be correct, but the argument that they were already applied in Aramaic inscriptions from the 10th century B.C., whereas they are known in Moabitic only since the middle of the 9th century B.C., does not hold water. Only if we had inscriptions in the Moabitic language from the 10th century B.C. and the *matres lectionis* were wanting in them, could this be asserted. In favour of their view that the *matres lectionis* originated in Aramaic, we may mention that the system used in Aramaic inscriptions is clearer⁵) than that of the other languages. This may also

¹) cf. pp. 162, 163-164, above.

²) cf. Cooke: NSI, p. 8.

³) cf. p. 166 above.

⁴) Cross and Freedman: Orthography, pp. 43-44.

⁵) cf. Cross and Freedman: Orthography, p. 31.

be due to a simplification of an existing system by the Aramaic writers.

8. *Moabitic and the Other Semitic Languages.*

Moabitic belongs to the so-called Canaanite language, which is one of the group of n.w. Semitic languages. Until now the view has been held that it is more closely related to Hebrew ¹⁾, but in opposition to this it was recently assumed by Jean ²⁾ that Moabitic is more closely related to Ugaritic than to Hebrew. Both these conceptions are somewhat misleading, however. In certain respects Moabitic has an affinity with Ugaritic, in others with Phoenician, and in still others with Hebrew, while all these languages are closely related in numerous other aspects. Therefore Moabitic is rather to be considered as a dialect of the Canaanite language, which is related to all other languages which belong to this group. In a few respects Moabitic reveals a more archaic character than Hebrew, e.g. the verbal forms with infixed *t*, the retention of the diphthong, the use of *jqtl* as perfect tense, and the application of the demonstrative without the article, following a noun with article. In some instances these discrepancies also occur in Hebrew. It may be that Moabitic was influenced more directly by the original Canaanite language than Hebrew was. Thus the Canaanite *stratum* in Moabitic can be more clearly designated in Moabitic than in Hebrew. Moabitic also has some relationship to Aramaic ³⁾. Even so-called Arabic forms have been supposed ⁴⁾. There were ample opportunities for these two languages to infiltrate into the land of Moab and to influence Moabitic.

This somewhat complicated character of Moabitic, a language in which we have but one important inscription,

¹⁾ cf. Lidzbarski: *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* I, p. 104; Cook: *NSI*, p. 5; Albright: *A. R. I.*, p. 41; Rowley: *The Rediscovery of the O.T.*, p. 34.

²⁾ Jean: *DISO*, p. 8.

³⁾ cf. Cooke: *NSI*, p. 185; Cross and Freedman: *Orthography*, p. 37.

⁴⁾ Bennet: *D.B. III*, p. 409.

indicates that both a geographical division of the Semitic languages ¹⁾ and the genealogical theory, which is reduced to a hypothetical Ur-Semitic, are insufficient. There still remain discrepancies which cannot be declared in this way. The affinities which occur in some of these languages, while the same languages differ in many other respects, must rather be declared by keeping a two or three dimensional development in mind.

9. *Translation of M.I.*

1. I am Mesha²⁾, son of Chemoshkan³⁾, king of Moab⁴⁾, the Dajbonite.
2. My father reigned over Moab thirty years and I became king
3. after my father. And I have made this high place for Chemosh⁵⁾ in Kericho -----⁶⁾
4. because he saved me from all the *kings*⁷⁾ and because he caused me to look with delight upon my adversaries. As for Omri,
5. king of Israel, he humiliated Moab for many days because Chemosh was angry with his

¹⁾ cf. for e.g. the "Coast Canaanite" and "Inland Canaanite" (Harris: DCD, p. 98).

²⁾ In spite of the objections raised by Poebel: *Das Appositionell Bestimmte Pronomen*, p. 8, against this translation it is upheld in this treatise, because, though the present author is inclined to agree with Poebel in many instances, it seems as though the pronoun is not used in apposition in the M.I. For a full discussion of the use of the so-called self presentation style in the Ancient Near East, cf. Poebel: *Das appositionell Bestimmte Pronomen*, pp. 1-86. [Perhaps the use of *andku* as the 1st word of the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions is even older.]

³⁾ cf. p. 182 above.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 178 above.

⁵⁾ cf. p. 180 above.

⁶⁾ Perhaps we may read **בִּנְס יִשַׁע** as a banner of victory, cf. Galling: *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels*, p. 48; Vriezen and Hospers: *Palestine Inscriptions*, p. 15 and Cooke: *NSI*, p. 7-8.

⁷⁾ The words written in italics are based on a somewhat uncertain reading. Another suggestion is **הַשְׁלִיכְן**, cf. Cooke: *NSI*, p. 8.

6. land. And his son succeeded him and he also said : "I will humiliate Moab". In my days he spoke *thus* ¹⁾)
7. but I saw my desire upon him and his house, while Israel has perished completely for ever. And Omri took possession of the *land*
8. of Mahdebah and he dwelt in it, his days and half of his son's days ²⁾), forty years, but Chemosh *dwelt*
9. in it in my days. And I built Baal-meon and I made the reservoir ³⁾) in it. And I built
10. Kirjatan ⁴⁾). And the men of Gad had dwelt in the land of Ataroth from of old ⁵⁾); and the king of
11. Israel had built Ataroth for himself. But I fought against the city and took it and I slew all the people
12. of the city as a sacrifice of atonement ⁶⁾) for Chemosh and Moab. And I brought back from there the altar-hearth ⁷⁾) of his god ⁸⁾) and I
13. *dragged* it before Chemosh in Kerijoth. And I settled there men of SRN ⁹⁾) and *men* of
14. MHRT ¹⁰⁾). And Chemosh said to me : "Go, take ¹¹⁾) Neboh from Israel". So I

¹⁾ cf. Gallig: Textbuch, p. 48 n.m.

²⁾ cf. pp. 138, 173 above.

³⁾ cf. p. 176 above.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 172 above.

⁵⁾ cf. Jenni: Das Wort עולם im A.T.

⁶⁾ cf. Ryckmans: JEOL 14, p. 81.

⁷⁾ cf. Hes. 43 : 15, 16; Cooke: NSI, p. 11; Gallig: Textbuch, p. 48 n. aa; Vriezen and Hospers: Palestine Inscriptions, p. 20. It is regarded as a proper name by many authors, cf. Morris: The Expository Times, 1928/9, p. 237; Procksch: Jesaja I, p. 371; Albright A.R.I., p. 218 n. 86; Basor 89, p. 16 n. 55. But since the translation of דוד as "commander-in-chief" is ruled out, cf. p. 174 above, we must prefer the meaning "altar-hearth". cf. also the incense stand which was found at Dhībān, p. 200 below.

⁸⁾ cf. p. 174 above; Cooke: NSI, p. 11; Gallig: Textbuch, p. 48. The primary meaning of the word is "beloved one", "father's brother" (Koehler: LVTI, p. 204), and thus the word could easily be used to indicate the god; cf. also the alternate reading in Amos 8 : 15.

⁹⁾ The situation of this site is unknown.

¹⁰⁾ The situation of this site is still unknown in spite of an identification by Tristram; Moab, pp. 82, 118.

¹¹⁾ The construction על אחו does not occur in Hebrew.

15. went by night ¹⁾ and fought against it from the break of dawn ²⁾ until noon ³⁾ and I
16. took it and slew *them all* ⁴⁾, seven thousand *men, boys, women, girls*
17. and maid-servants ⁵⁾, for I had devoted it to Ashtar-Chemosh. And I took thence the
18. *vessels* ⁶⁾ of Jahwe, dragging them before Chemosh. And the king of Israel had built
19. Jahaz and he dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. But Chemosh drove him out before *me*. And
20. I took from Moab two hundred men, his whole division ⁷⁾ and I led it against Jahaz and took it
21. in order to add it to Dajbon. I built Kericho, the wall of the orchard ⁸⁾ and the wall
22. of the hill; and I built its gates and I built its towers and
23. I built the king's house and I made the wall ⁹⁾ of the reservoir for the *fountain* ¹⁰⁾ inside

¹⁾ cf. p. 174 n. 13 above.

²⁾ cf. Koehler: ZAW 1926, pp. 56-57.

³⁾ צהרם is derived from צהר, to which the adverbial ending ם- is affixed. This adverb of time also occurs in Hebrew, but it is supplied with the vowels of a dual, cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 796. If it must be regarded as a dual, the termination would have been ם- in Moabitic.

⁴⁾ Cooke: NSI, p. 12 reads כלה, but cf. Galling: Textbuch, p. 49.

⁵⁾ Lidzbarski: Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik I, p. 368 translates "kriegsgefangene Sklavinnen". cf. also Cooke: NSI, pp. 3, 12; Van Selms: Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature, pp. 110-111; Judg. 5:30.

⁶⁾ Morris: The Expository Times, 1928/9, p. 237 reads אראל, but it seems better to read כלי; cf. Ex. 38:3; Numb. 3:8, 11; II Ki. 23:4.

⁷⁾ cf. Koehler: LVTL, p. 866. The suffix of רשה refers to Moab and that of אשבה to רש. For other translations, cf. also Lidzbarski: Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik II, p. 152; Galling: Textbuch, p. 49 n.h.; Albright: ANET, p. 320; Lidzbarski: Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik I, p. 366; Cooke: NSI, p. 13.

⁸⁾ cf. also Cooke: NSI, p. 13; Ricciotti: Geschiedenis van Israel I, p. 361; Lidzbarski: Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik I, p. 289; Galling: Textbuch, p. 49 n.l.

⁹⁾ כלאי has no affinity with Hebrew כלאים: both, but is related to

כלא: restrain, shut up, cf. Albright: ANET, p. 320.

¹⁰⁾ In accordance with Cross and Freedman: Orthography, pp. 41-42 למעיו is read.

24. the city. And there was no cistern inside the city, in
Kericho, so I said to all the people: "Let each of you
make
25. a cistern for himself in his house". And I cut beams ¹⁾
for Kericho with
26. Israelite prisoners. I built Aroer and I made the Highway
in the Arnon.
27. I built Beth-bamoth, for it was ruined. I built Bezer, for
it lay in ruins,
28. with fifty men of Dajbon, for all Dajbon was obedient.
And I reigned
29. over - - - - - ²⁾ hundred cities, which I added to the land.
And I built
30. *Mahdebah* and Beth-diblatan ³⁾ and Beth-baal-meon and
I set there the - - - - -
31. of the land. And as for Hawranan, there dwelt in it - - -
- - - - - ⁴⁾
32. And Chemosh said to me: "Go down, fight against
Hawranan". So I went down - - - - -
33. and Chemosh *dwelt* in it in my days - - - - -
- - - - -
34. - - - - -

¹⁾ Derived from רכת; cf. also Koehler: LVTL, p. 457; Albright: ANET, p. 320; I Ki. 6: 36; 7: 2, 12.

²⁾ The preposition על and a numeral are wanting.

³⁾ cf. p. 172 above.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 65 above.

CHAPTER SIX

THE RELIGION.

The relationship between the Moabites and the people of the rest of Palestine is reflected in their religion in the same way as in their history and language. Numerous traces of the Canaanite religion and the worship of some of the gods of Palestine-Syria are found among the Moabites. Unfortunately we have hardly any sources concerning the Moabite religion. Therefore questions concerning the nature of their cult, their conception of sin, or their ideas about death or a life hereafter ¹⁾ cannot be answered. It is noteworthy that we have a good deal of information about the religion of the Moabites from the beginning of their history, whereas there is a lack of sufficient data from the later period. It is mainly on the strength of the information from the early periods that the Moabite religion is regarded as more or less similar to that of the Canaanites.

When Balak, king of the Moabites, accompanied Balaam to Kirjath-huzoth, he offered oxen and sheep ²⁾. It is not mentioned to whom he sacrificed these animals, but because he subsequently brought Balaam to Bamoth-baal, which is to be identified with **במת** ³⁾, we may assume that he honoured the god Baal. Whether it was only a local Baal, we do not know. At another site, viz. at Beth-baal-peor, which Balak and Balaam also visited, Balak honoured a local god,

¹⁾ They buried their dead in tombs outside the city. The tombs consisted of roughly cut, approximately rectangular chambers, hewn out of the hillside and entered by a doorway. Some of the tombs had the three raised benches at the back and on either side, like other tombs of the Iron Age. Numerous shards were found in the tombs. Fragments of terra cotta coffins were found in several of the tombs, cf. Tushingham: Basor 133, pp. 23-25.

²⁾ Numb. 22 : 40.

³⁾ cf. p. 52 above.

namely Baal Peor¹⁾. Once again Balaam asked him to build seven altars, and he offered a bull and a ram on every altar²⁾. A little later the daughters of the Moabites called the Israelites, who camped at Shittim, to the sacrifices of their god Baal Peor³⁾. During this worship of Baal Peor the Israelites indulged in sexual excesses⁴⁾ and eating of the meat offered to the god⁵⁾. By calling him **בַּעַל**, the prophet Hosea identifies Baal Peor with the god Baal⁶⁾. The name Peor is related to the root **פער**, which means in Ugaritic "to give a name" or "to proclaim"⁷⁾, and in Hebrew and Syriac it means "to open wide"⁸⁾. People open (**פער**) their mouths in amazement⁹⁾, while Sheol opened her mouth to swallow the people, who were to go into exile¹⁰⁾. Thus the etymology of the name Peor does not reveal anything about the nature of the cult of Baal Peor.

In some of the names of sites in the land of Moab we find traces of the names of gods worshipped by the inhabitants of the country. At Beth-baal-meon¹¹⁾ the local god **בַּעַל מְעוֹן** was honoured. Perhaps the god was regarded as the "dwelling" or "hidingplace", i.e. the patron of his worshippers¹²⁾. The name Neboḥ is frequently connected with the cult of the Babylonian god Nabû. Even if the name Neboḥ indicates

¹⁾ Numb. 23 : 28-30.

²⁾ cf. Numb. 23 : 1-4, 14.

³⁾ Numb. 25 : 1-6; cf. also p. 123 above.

⁴⁾ cf. Numb. 25 : 3-6; 31 : 16; Böhl: *Bijbelsch-Kerkelijk Woordenboek* I, pp. 35-36; Pedersen: *Israel* II, p. 473.

⁵⁾ Numb. 22 : 40; cf. Revel. 2 : 14. They did not bring sacrifices to the dead, for in Ps. 106 : 28 the word **מַתִּים** refers to the idols, cf.

Delitzsch: *The Psalms* III, p. 156; Cheyne: *The Book of Psalms*, p. 292; Baethgen: *Die Psalmen*, p. 322; Gunkel: *Die Psalmen*, 467; Gemser: *De Psalmen* III, p. 123.

⁶⁾ Hos. 9 : 10; cf. Böhl: *Bijbelsch-Kerkelijk Woordenboek* I, p. 35.

⁷⁾ cf. Gordon: *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 263.

⁸⁾ cf. Koehler: *LVTL*, pp. 771-772.

⁹⁾ Ps. 119 : 131; Job 16 : 10; 29 : 23.

¹⁰⁾ Is. 5 : 14.

¹¹⁾ cf. p. 87 above.

¹²⁾ cf. Koehler: *LVTL*, pp. 545, 549; cf. Ps. 90 : 1.

that Nabû was worshipped in the land of Moab ¹⁾, we do not know whether the Moabites took part in his cult, because this site was also inhabited by other people. The name Hawranan (חורן) ²⁾ reminds one of the Canaanite god חרן ³⁾, but whether this god was worshipped at this site, we do not know ⁴⁾. Perhaps his cult was brought from Canaan to the land of Moab by the Emmites. According to Albright חרן was a god of the netherworld, whose cult had a chthonic character. Perhaps our information about this god is too scanty for us to arrive at a definite conclusion.

From the archaeological evidence it is also clear that the Moabite religion resembled that of their neighbours ⁵⁾. The pottery figurines of men on horseback ⁶⁾ are perhaps to be identified with gods on horseback. In this instance they would remind one of the god Azizu, who is depicted on horseback ⁷⁾. These figurines may perhaps be identified with the Moabite god of warfare, who proceeded on horseback towards the enemy ⁸⁾. The pottery figurines representing the mother-goddess Astarte resemble the same type of figurine from other parts of Palestine ⁹⁾. The mother-goddess controlled the fertility of people, animals, and plants. Therefore she is depicted on the figurines holding a symbol of fertility in her hands,

¹⁾ cf. Weiss: Die Teofore geografiese name van die O.T., p. 45.

²⁾ cf. pp. 65, 172 above.

³⁾ cf. Albright: AJSL LIII, pp. 1-12; Basor 84, pp. 7-11; ARI, pp. 80-81; Gray: JNES VIII, pp. 27-34.

⁴⁾ cf. also Weiss: Die Teofore geografiese name van die O.T., pp. 37-39.

⁵⁾ The dolmens do not date from the Iron Age (cf. Glueck: Annual XIV, pp. 33, 37; XVIII-XIX, p. 216; The River Jordan, p. 250) and cannot be identified with the altars mentioned in the history of Balaam (contra Conder: Heth and Moab, pp. 153, 270).

⁶⁾ cf. p. 34 above.

⁷⁾ cf. Rostovtzeff: Caravan Cities, pp. 138, 151.

⁸⁾ We may interpret these figurines in a few other ways too. They could have been depictions of human riders from daily life, used by children as toys or apotropaic figurines which symbolized the enemy.

⁹⁾ cf. Simons: Opgravingen in Palestina, pp. 369-371; Glueck: Annual XVIII-XIX, pp. 32-35; Albright: From the Stone Age to Christianity, pp. 160, 177; Bennet: A.D.A.J. I, pp. 34-36.

clutched over the breast. In the inscription of king Mesha^c she is named עשתר כמש¹). This name, which is composed of the names of a god and a goddess, reminds one of the names of ענתיהו and ענתבעל, mentioned in the Elephantini papyri²). According to the inscription of Mesha^c the mother-goddess was worshipped in Moab side by side with כמש. Perhaps the depiction on the stele from Bālū'ah indicates that these two gods were already worshipped when the Moabite tribes began to settle in the land of Moab³). The figure on the far left, which is turned to the right, represents a god. The one in the middle, which represents a human being, is turned to the left towards the god. The figure on the far right, which is turned to the left, represents a goddess⁴). Though it is assumed that this goddess is the patron-goddess of the Moabite king (?) who introduced him to the Moabite god (Chemosh?)⁵), it seems more probable that a divine couple is depicted on this relief⁶). Their names are not mentioned, but it is obvious that they are כמש and עשתר כמש or their predecessors, who had the same character.

With the exception of these two deities, all indications of gods worshipped in the land of Moab, date from the earliest history of the Moabites. In the later history they are neither mentioned nor referred to. This may be due to the nature of our sources or to the fact that when the inhabitants of the country were united into a Kingdom, they abandoned the worship of the local gods and devoted themselves to the most prominent of the gods and his spouse. His name is already mentioned in the Amorite mocking song, one of the

¹) M.I. 17. Contra Albright: ARI, p. 74, who identifies עשתר כמש with the south-Arabian god ʿŠtr; cf. also Cook: The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology, p. 144; Kraeling: The Brooklyn Museum Papyri, p. 88.

²) Cowley: Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., 44 : 3.

³) cf. pp. 110-111 above.

⁴) cf. Horsfeld et Vincent: R. B. 41, p. 423 fig. 4 and plates 11 and 12.

⁵) cf. Simons: Opgravingen in Palestina, pp. 290-291.

⁶) Horsfeld et Vincent R.B. 41, pp. 432, 434; Alt: PJB 36, p. 36.

most ancient sources concerning the Moabites ¹⁾. The conception that Chemosh was the Moabite god par excellence is found in all the written sources concerning the Moabites.

On account of the fact that he derives the name כִּמּוֹש from the words *Aku* and *Māšu*, Hommel assumes that the moon was worshipped as twin-god in the land of Moab. But this derivation of the god's name is rejected ²⁾. Baethgen ³⁾ assumes that Chemosh was both sun-god and god of warfare. The description of the two divine figures on the stele from Bālū'ah by Alt is partly in keeping with this view. According to him we can identify a sun and a moon above the figure in the middle of the relief ⁴⁾. It is quite clear that Chemosh must be characterized as god of warfare ⁵⁾. The domination of the Moabites by the Israelites was due to the wrath of Chemosh. The king was commanded by him to march against the suppressor of his people, and Chemosh granted a victory over the enemy. The booty was carried to his temple and captives were killed before him. The etymology of the name Chemosh also indicates that he was the god of warfare. He was the one who subjected the enemy, i.e. the enemy of those who worshipped him ⁶⁾. Therefore he is classified with Nergal and other gods, who were either associated with warfare or with the nether-world ⁷⁾. Because Chemosh is mentioned in Judg. 11:24, Jensen ⁸⁾ assumes that he was the god of both the Moabites and the Ammonites. But he is mentioned because the Moabites joined the Ammonites in a coalition against the Israelites ⁹⁾. Therefore the characteristics of the Ammonite god Milcom may not simply be transferred to Chemosh ¹⁰⁾. From the refer-

¹⁾ cf. pp. 8-10 above.

²⁾ cf. p. 181 above.

³⁾ Baethgen: *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, p. 13.

⁴⁾ Alt: *PJB* 36, p. 36.

⁵⁾ M.I. 3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 32, 33.

⁶⁾ cf. p. 181 above.

⁷⁾ cf. pp. 38-39 above.

⁸⁾ Jensen: *Z.A.* XLII, 1934, pp. 235-237.

⁹⁾ cf. p. 15 above.

¹⁰⁾ Contra Jensen: *Z.A.* XLII, 1934, p. 236. The list concerned was

ence in the Babylonian list, in which he is mentioned together with Nergal we cannot conclude that his cult was but a mere imitation of that of Nergal ¹⁾. The authors of the list concerned only wanted to group together those gods whose cult had some aspect or other in common. This list does not identify Chemosh with Nergal. It only indicates that his cult resembled that of Nergal in that both were known as gods of warfare ²⁾.

Originally Chemosh was the god of the main group of Bedouins who entered the country ³⁾, and because he blessed their weapons, he was worshipped as the Moabite god of warfare, who gave the land to them ⁴⁾. In due course he became the god who took care of all aspects of daily life, the Moabite god par excellence. We come to the same conclusion by examining the personal names, which have the name Chemosh as one of their elements. The friendly attitude of the god towards the namegiver is revealed by the names *kammusunadbi* and כמשיח. The name כמשמלך designated the loftiness of Chemosh. He, and nobody else, was the king, who did justice to everyone (כמשצדק) ⁵⁾. The relation between Chemosh and the Moabites did not come into effect on account of a covenant, but it is a natural relation ⁶⁾. While the Israelites regarded the Moabites as the children of Lot or assumed a progenitor Moab when they wanted to taunt them ⁷⁾, the Amorites (and this idea could have originated among the Moabites themselves) regarded them as the children of Chemosh ⁸⁾.

published in C.T. XXIV, 36, 66 and not C.T. XXV, 36, 66 as is mentioned by Jensen.

¹⁾ Contra Albright: Basor 90, pp. 33-34.

²⁾ cf. also Tallquist: Akkadische Götterepitheta, pp. 389-396.

³⁾ cf. also Cook: The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology, p. 143.

⁴⁾ Judg. 11: 24.

⁵⁾ cf. pp. 40, 182 above; Noth: Die Israelitischen Personennamen, pp. 161-162. We must bear in mind that the majority of these names are young.

⁶⁾ cf. Sellin: Israelitisch-Jüdische Religionsgeschichte, pp. 12, 17; Lods, Robinson: Record and Revelation, p. 206.

⁷⁾ cf. Dt. 2: 9; Ps. 83: 9 and pp. 5-6 above.

⁸⁾ Numb. 21: 29.

Practically one god only, Chemosh, and his spouse, the goddess עשתר כמש, of whom a vast number of figurines have been found, were worshipped by the Moabites. Perhaps figurines of Chemosh himself have been found, e.g. the figurines of the men on horseback. Even the figurine of the male person from Kh. el-Medeiyineh perhaps represented the god Chemosh¹⁾. This god Chemosh may be regarded as the Baal of Moab, i.e. Chemosh is the personal name of the Baal of Moab²⁾. The Moabites did not have the same fear for pronouncing the personal name of their god as the Israelites had³⁾. This does not imply that they did not hold their god in reverence. He was the prime cause of everything that happened in the land of Moab, and all were subject to him⁴⁾.

The first place at which Chemosh was worshipped was the altar. Though it is not stated that Balak brought sacrifices to Chemosh, we may remember that he first built altars before he sacrificed⁵⁾. The altar would have been built of unhewn stone⁶⁾. As a rule the altar was built on the top of a hill, where a kind of platform, known as the בִּמְה, was erected⁷⁾. Outside Jerusalem a בִּמְה was built by king Solomon for Chemosh, the god of his Moabite wife⁸⁾. Mesha^c himself built a בִּמְה at קִרְיָה in honour of Chemosh, because he had helped Mesha^c to defeat Israel⁹⁾. It is not stated that a temple was built for Chemosh, but we may assume that temples were built at various sites throughout the land of Moab. Perhaps a temple is meant by the בִּמְה, which Mesha^c built. In קִרְיָה there could also have been a temple¹⁰⁾. In spite

¹⁾ cf. p. 34 above.

²⁾ He is not to be identified with Baal Peor, who was a local god; contra Horsfeld et Vincent: R. B. 41, p. 431 n. 2.

³⁾ cf. Böhl: Bijbelsch-Kerkelijk Woordenboek I, pp. 34-35.

⁴⁾ cf. Euler: ZAW 1938, pp. 304-305.

⁵⁾ Numb. 23 : 1, 14, 29; cf. Pedersen: Israel II, p. 118.

⁶⁾ cf. Ex. 20 : 24.

⁷⁾ cf. Albright: ARI, p. 105; V.T. Supp., IV, pp. 242-258.

⁸⁾ I Ki. 11 : 7, 33; II Ki. 23 : 13.

⁹⁾ M.I. 3.

¹⁰⁾ M.I. 13.

of the fact that a temple from the Bronze Age was excavated ¹⁾, no temple from the Iron Age has yet been found in the land of Moab. Mackenzie ²⁾ thought that a temple would perhaps be discovered on the spot where the stele of Mesha^c was found, but excavations on the s.e. corner of the tell of Dhībān were disappointing in this respect ³⁾. On the summit of the mound the foundations of a building, which might have been a sanctuary, were found ⁴⁾. Among the recovered pieces in this building was an incense stand.

Perhaps we may gather from Jer. 27 : 9 that a group of ecstatic persons gathered around the Moabite temples to propagate the religion of Chemosh. Though numerous sacrifices were brought to Chemosh, we never hear that this was done by a priest. If there was a priestly caste, and there is no reason why we should not accept the existence of one, there was no hierarchy. The king was the leader in religious matters. Balak took the lead when sacrifices were brought, before Balaam tried to curse the Israelites. Presumably he was helped by priests. The position had not changed in the days of king Mesha^c. Being instructed by Chemosh, he advanced against the enemy. Whether this instruction was mediated by a priest or prophet, we do not know. When he sacrificed his first-born son, it is stated that the king conducted the sacrifice. As was the case with Balak, this can mean that Mesha^c only supplied the sacrifice and commanded the priests to fulfil the sacrificial act, but as the Canaanite kings generally possessed priestly authority and acted as priests ⁵⁾, we may assume that king Mesha^c himself took the lead in the sacrificial ceremonies. Thus the king of Moab was the representative of Chemosh among the people and, at the same time, represented his people in the presence of his god. Chemosh

¹⁾ Albright: *Basor* 53, pp. 13-18.

²⁾ Mackenzie: *PEFQ* 1913, pp. 73-74.

³⁾ Tushingham: *Basor* 133, pp. 6-25.

⁴⁾ cf. Morton: *Basor* 140, p. 6.

⁵⁾ cf. Gray: *V.T.* II, pp. 193-220. Initially even Aaron acted only by instruction of Moses. The first kings of Israel also had priestly authority, cf. II Sam. 6 : 14, 18; 8 : 18; I Ki. 8 : 55.

instructed him concerning all matters, and he made known the will of his god to the people.

From the early history of the Moabites we have the testimony that bulls and rams were offered ¹⁾, and in this respect it is noteworthy that figurines of the heads of a bull and a ram were found at Kh. el-Medeiyineh and Saliyeh respectively ²⁾. The head of the bull was depicted as though it had a piece of rope around its head. These figurines could have represented sacrificial animals. It is also mentioned that Mesha^c offered his son. This does not imply, however, that human sacrifices were common practice in the land of Moab. As a rule man brought his best as a sacrifice to his god. By sacrificing his first-born, Mesha^c gave his very best to Chemosh and thus the god was greatly obliged to him ³⁾. Being in a precarious position, the king did his utmost to regain his god's favour. When the army of the enemy departed, Mesha^c believed that the sacrifice of his heir to the throne had not been in vain. Even the army of Israel, which was constituted of soldiers from Israel, Judah, and Edom, feared the wrath of the local god and, therefore, left immediately ⁴⁾. Incense could also have been burned in the sanctuaries. The booty which was captured during a war was dedicated to the god as a *תָּרֶם* ⁵⁾. All the inhabitants of a captured city were killed as a sacrifice to the god, according to common practice in the Ancient Near East ⁶⁾. These sacrifices had to conciliate the god if by chance he was infuriated. Thus every war was a holy war of Chemosh.

If the figurine of the male person described above ⁷⁾ did

¹⁾ Numb. 23 : 1, 14, 29.

²⁾ cf. p. 34 above.

³⁾ cf. Volz: *Die Biblischen Altertümer*, p. 179; Pedersen: *Israel II*, pp. 326-347, 634; Albright: *ARI*, p. 164; Gray: *Sacrifice in the O.T.*, p. 86.

⁴⁾ cf. p. 143 above and Vriezen: *Hoofdlijnen*, p. 220 n. 1 and p. 226.

⁵⁾ M.I. 17.

⁶⁾ M.I. 12-13; Albright: *ARI*, p. 77; *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 213.

⁷⁾ cf. pp. 34, 199 above.

not represent a god, it may have been the depiction of somebody who went to the sanctuary. This would indicate that worshippers, especially when they were in great distress, made incisions on their faces. Another sign of distress or self-abasement was the cutting of the hair and the beard.

Incisions were also made in the hands ¹⁾. All these signs reveal that the religious feeling of the Moabites and their devotion to Chemosh was real. They sincerely believed that Chemosh, their god, could rescue them and therefore they fulfilled all religious rites and prayed to him. כמש and his spouse עשתר כמש were the only gods whom the Moabites regarded as worthy of worship ²⁾. According to the conception of the Israelite and Judaeen prophets, however, Chemosh was no god, but a mere abomination ³⁾. Therefore the Moabites ineffectually wearied themselves on the high places of Chemosh ⁴⁾. They asked for strength but they remained impotent and incapable of averting the onslaughts of the enemy ⁵⁾. Thus god and people, religion and culture, were exterminated.

¹⁾ cf. Is. 15 : 2; Jer. 48 : 47; I Ki. 18 : 28; Gordon: Ugaritic Handbook, text 68, VI, 19-22.

²⁾ Rowley: The Re-discovery of the O.T., p. 88.

³⁾ cf. I Ki. 11 : 7; II Ki. 23 : 13.

⁴⁾ Is. 16 : 2.

⁵⁾ cf. Pedersen: Israel II, p. 197.

ADDENDUM I

Text of M.I. ¹⁾

- (1) אנך. משע. מלך. בן. כמשכן. מלך. מאב. הד
- (2) יבני | אבי. מלך. על. מאב. שלשן. שת. ואנך. מלך
- (3) תי. אחר. אבי | ואעש. הבמת. זאת. לכמש. בקרחה | בנס. י
- (4) שע. כי. השעני. מכל. מלכן. וכי. הראני. בכל. שנאי | עמר
- (5) י. מלך. ישראל. ויעני. את. מאב. ימן. רבן. כי. יאנף. כמש. באר
- (6) צה | ויחלפה. בנה. ויאמר. גם. הא. אעני. את. מאב | בימי. אמר. כן
- (7) וארא. בה. ובביתה. וישראל. אבד. אבד. עלם. וירש. עמרי. את. כל. אר
- (8) ק. מהדבה | וישב. בה. ימה. וחצי. ימי. בנה. ארבען. שת. ויש
- (9) בה. בימי. ואכן. את. בעלמען. ואעש. בה. האשוח. ואבן
- (10) את. קריתן | ואש. גד. ישב. בארץ. עטרת. מעלם. ויבן. לה. מלך. י
- (11) ישראל. את. עטרת | ואלתחם. בקר. ואחזה | ואהרג. את. כל. העם. מ
- (12) הקר. רית. לכמש. ולמאב | ואשב. משם. את. אראל. דודה. ואס
- (13) חבה. לפני. כמש. בקרית | ואשב. בה. את. אש. שרן. ואת. אש
- (14) מחרת | ויאמר. לי. כמש. לך. אחז. נבה. על. ישראל | וא
- (15) הלך. בללה. ואלתחם. בה. מבקע. השחרת. עד. הצהרם | ואח
- (16) זה. ואהרג. כלם. שבעת. אלפן. גברן. וגרן. וגברת. וגר
- (17) ת. ורחמת | כי. לעשתר. כפש. החרמתה | ואקח. משם. את. כלי.
- (18) לי. יהוה. ואסחב. הם. לפני. כמש | ומלך. ישראל. בנה. את.
- (19) יהץ. וישב. בה. בהלתחמה. בי | ויגרשה. כמש. מפני | ו
- (20) אקח. ממאב. מאתן. אש. כל. רשה | ואשאה. ביהץ. ואחזה.
- (21) לספת. על. דיבן | אנך. בנתי. קרחה. חמת. היערן. וחמת
- (22) העפל | ואנך. בנתי. שעריה. ואנך. בנתי. מגדלתה | וא
- (23) נך. בנתי. בת. מלך. ואנך. עשתי. כלאי. האשוח. למעין. בקרב
- (24) הקר | ובר. אן. בקרב. הקר. בקרחה. ואמר. לכל. העם. עשו. ל
- (25) כם. אש. בר. בביתה | ואנך. כרתי. המכרתת. לקרחה. באסר
- (26) י. ישראל | אנך. בנתי. ערער. ואנך. עשתי. המסלת. בארץ.
- (27) אנך. בנתי. בת. במת. כי. הרס. הא | אנך. בנתי. בצר. כי. עין.
- (28) ... באש. חמשן. דיבן. כי. כל. דיבן. משמעת | ואנך. מלכ
- (29) ת. ... מאת. בקרן. אשר. יספתי. על. הארץ. ואנך. בנת
- (30) י. מהדבה. ובת. דבלתן | ובת. בעלמען. ואשא. שם. את.
- (31) צאן. הארץ | וחורקן. ישב. בה. בת. יוק. ... אש
- (32) אמר. לי. רד. הלתחם. בחורקן | וארד.
- (33) בה. כמש. בימי. ועל. דה. משם. עש. ...
- (34) שת. שדיק | ואנך.

¹⁾ For references and notes, cf. pp. 189-192 above.

ADDENDUM II

IDENTIFICATIONS OF CITIES, RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS

a. Cities

אַבְל הַשְּׁטִים :	tell el-Hammâm (63)	p. 94
אַוּלִים :	near Kh. et-Telisah (16)	p. 69
אַלְעֶלָא :	el-ʿÂl (59)	p. 93.
בְּאֵר אֵילִים :	near Kh. el-Medeyineh (40)	p. 86
בֵּית בְּמֹות בַּעַל :	el-Qwēzfe ?	p. 52
בֵּית בַּעַל מַעֲוֹן :	Maʿin (43)	p. 87
בֵּית בַּעַל פְּעֹור :	Kh. esh-Shech-Dschâyil (55)	p. 91
בֵּית גְּמֹול :	Kh. el-Jemeil (25)	p. 76
בֵּית דִּיבְלָתִים :	Kh. ed.-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh (42)	p. 86
בֵּית הַיְשָׁמֹות :	tell el-ʿAẓeimeh (51)	p. 89
בֵּית הָרָם :	tell Iktanû (58)	p. 93
בֶּצָר :	Umm el-ʿAmad (56)	p. 92
דְּבֹן :	Dhībân (27)	p. 77
חֶלֶן :	?	p. 80
חֶרְבִּים :	Kh. edh-Dhubâb (5)	p. 65
חֶשְׁבֹן :	Heshbân (57)	p. 92
יָחֵץ :	ʿAleiyân (28)	p. 80
יַעֲוִיר :	near Nāʿūr or at Kh. eş-Şireh	p. 94
לֹוחִית :	Kh. Medīnet er-Râs (7)	p. 65
מִדְבָּא :	Mādebâ (46)	p. 88
מִיפְעַת :	Jāwah (62)	p. 94
מִצְפֶּה מֹאָב :	?	p. 88
מִתְנֶה :	near el-Medeyineh (40)	p. 86
נָבֹר :	Kh. el-Mekhayyet (49)	p. 89
עֶטְרוֹת :	Kh. ʿAṭārûs (35)	p. 84
עֶטְרַת שׁוּפָן :	R. ʿAṭārûs (35a)	p. 84
עַיִי הַעֲבָרִים :	to the s. of the W. es-Sultāni	p. 62
עֶלְמֹן דְּבִלָתִים :	Kh. ed-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh (42)	p. 86

עַר :	either el-Miṣna (18) or el-Medeiyineh (19)	p. 72
עָרוֹעַר :	‘Arā‘ir (26)	p. 76
צֵעַר :	Kh. Khāneq en-Nāsārā? (6)	p. 66
צָרַת הַשְּׁחַר :	Kh. ‘Ayûn Mûsa? (53)	p. 90
קְדָמוֹת :	es-Sâliyeh (24)	p. 75
קִיר חֲרָשֶׁת :	el-Kerak (17)	p. 70
קָרְיֹת :	Kh. el-Kurējât (34)	p. 83
קָרְיַת חֲצוֹת :	Kh. Libb? (38)	p. 85
קָרְיָתִים :	near Mādebā (46a)	p. 83
שִׁבְכָּמָה :	Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch (54)	p. 91

b. Rivers

אֶבֶל הַשְּׁטִים :	W. el-Kefrein	p. 59
אֶבֶל קְרָמִים :	near Nā‘ūr	p. 94
אַרְנוֹן :	W. el-Môjib	p. 57
אַשְׁדּוֹת הַפְּסָגָה :	W. ‘Ayûn Mûsa	p. 59
אַרְנוֹן אֶשֶׁר		
בְּמִדְבָּר :	Seil eş-Şefei	p. 58
נַחַל הָעַרְבִים :	one of the s. tributaries of the W. el-Môjib.	p. 56
נַחַל זֶרַד :	W. es-Sultāni	p. 56
מִי דִיבָן :	W. Dhībān	p. 77
מִי נִמְרִין :	Seil en-Numeirah	p. 55
נַחַל־יָאֵל :	W. el-Habis	p. 58

c. Mountains

הַר הָעֲבָרִים :	the Highland of Moab	p. 51
הַר נֶבֹּו :	Jebel Şiyaghah	p. 53
הַפְּסָגָה :	en-Neba	p. 52
רֹאשׁ הַפַּעוֹר :	near Kh. esh-Shech-Dschâyil	p. 53

INDEXES

A. BIBLICAL PASSAGES AND APOCRYPHA

<i>Genesis</i>	Page	<i>Exodus</i>	Page
4 : 19	5 n. 9	17 : 8-16	126 n. 1
10	112	19 : 5	123 n. 6
13 : 10	179 n. 8	20 : 24	199 n. 6
14	105 f., 107 n. 5	34 : 15-16	123 n. 6
14 : 3	46 n. 7	38 : 3	191 n. 6
14 : 5	108 n. 2		
16 : 5	5 n. 9	<i>Leviticus</i>	
19	109, 112 n. 1, 178 f.	18	5 n. 7
19 : 1	106 n. 1		
19 : 10	129 n. 3	<i>Numbers</i>	
19 : 30-38	5 f., 44	3 : 8, 11	191 n. 6
19 : 33	177 n. 6	10 : 29-31	122 n. 4
19 : 37	178 n. 10	13 : 28-33	107 n. 1
19 : 38	44 n. 5	13 : 29	126 n. 1
21 : 25-31	121 n. 3	14 : 25, 43-45	126 n. 1
24 : 8	177 n. 6	14 : 40-45	118 n. 3
26 : 15-22	7 n. 4, 121 n. 3	20 : 14	117 n. 6
30 : 16	177 n. 6	20 : 14-21	128 n. 4 n. 5
32 : 23	177 n. 6	20 : 17	60 n. 3
35 : 22	5 n. 7	20 : 19	60 n. 3
36	118 n. 1	21	15, 118 n. 5
36 : 2-3	5 n. 9	21 : 1-5	13
36 : 2, 20, 25	111 n. 5	21 : 10-15	13
36 : 12	126 n. 1	21 : 11	44 f., 48, 56 n. 6, 112 n. 3, 118 n. 6
36 : 29-30, 40-43	118 n. 1		
36 : 35	45 n. 9, 131 n. 1	21 : 11-20	6 ff.
37 : 28	123 n. 1	21 : 12	56 n. 9
38 : 21	177 n. 6	21 : 13	45 n. 6, 58 n. 4, 75 n. 4, 81 n. 3, 115 n. 2, 118 n. 2, 119 n. 3
46 : 21	127 n. 4		
49 : 4	5 n. 7	21 : 13-15	49 n. 6
		21 : 13-28	57 n. 7
<i>Exodus</i>		21 : 14-15	58 n. 3
2 : 18	122 n. 4	21 : 15	45 n. 6
9 : 23	163 n. 6	21 : 15, 28	72
10 : 1	177 n. 6	21 : 15-16	119 n. 3
12 : 40	106 n. 3	21 : 16	58 n. 5, 86 n. 3
14 : 26	117 n. 4	21 : 16-18a	13, 121 n. 1, n. 3
15	117	21 : 18-19	86 n. 2
15 : 15	117, 117 n. 5		

<i>Numbers</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>Page</i>
21 : 18b-20	13	25 : 3, 5	123 n. 6
21 : 19	58 n. 12, 114 n. 3	25 : 3-6	194 n. 4
21 : 19-20	52	25 : 6-18	12, 13
21 : 20	45 n. 9, 90 n. 6	26 : 3	45 n. 7
21 : 21-30	113 n. 3	26 : 63	45 n. 7
21 : 21-31	6, 8 ff.	27 : 12	51 n. 10, n. 11
21 : 22	60 n. 3, 118 n. 5	31	124 n. 1
21 : 23	81 n. 1, 114 n. 2	31 : 1 ff.	13
21 : 24, 26	113 n. 3	31 : 12	45 n. 7
21 : 25	69 n. 3	31 : 16	194 n. 4
21 : 25-28	92 n. 10	31 : 16 ff.	124 n. 2
21 : 26	49 n. 6, 117 n. 2	32	101
21 : 27-28	114 n. 7	32 : 1	138 n. 5
21 : 29	115 n. 1, 180 n. 9, 198 n. 8	32 : 2-3	15
21 : 30	88 n. 6, 113 n. 5, 115 n. 1	32 : 3	87 n. 7, 91 n. 2, 92 n. 10
21 : 32-35	13	32 : 3, 34	84 n. 1
21 : 34b	113	32 : 3, 37	92 n. 10, 93 n. 4
22-24	10, 13	32 : 14-15	125 n. 5
22 : 1	13, 45 n. 6, 102 n. 5, 115 n. 4	32 : 17	125 n. 2
22 : 2, 4, 6, 10	184 n. 1	32 : 33-38	15
22 : 2-24	184 n. 2	32 : 34	79 n. 2
22 : 4	117 n. 6	32 : 36	93 n. 1
22 : 7	123 n. 1	32 : 37	83 n. 2
22 : 36	49 n. 6, 57 n. 7, 72, 123 n. 3	32 : 38	87 n. 5, 178 n. 1
22 : 40	193 n. 2, 194 n. 5	33	7
22 : 41	52 n. 4	33 : 44	45
23 : 1-4, 14	194 n. 2	33 : 44-45a	13
23 : 1, 14, 29 199 n. 5, 201 n. 1	10	33 : 44-49	7 n. 8
23 : 7-10	10	33 : 45b-49	13
23 : 14	91 n. 10	33 : 46	86 n. 8
23 : 18	184 n. 1	33 : 47	51 n. 9
23 : 18-24	10	33 : 48-50	45 n. 7
23 : 28-30	194 n. 1	33 : 49	89 n. 8, 94 n. 13
24 : 1	60 n. 1	34 : 1	45 n. 7
24 : 3-9	10	34 : 3	46 n. 7
24 : 15-19	10, 12, 14	34 : 8	45 n. 7
24 : 17	41, 110, 158 n. 6	34 : 12	46 n. 7, n. 10
24 : 20	126 n. 2	35 : 1	45 n. 7
24 : 21-24	10	36 : 13	45 n. 7
25 : 1	44 n. 4, 94 n. 13, 114 n. 1		
25 : 1 ff.	140 n. 10		
25 : 1-5	12, 13, 116		
25 : 1-6	194 n. 3		

Deuteronomy

1 : 4	92 n. 10
1 : 5	45 n. 5
1 : 43-44	118 n. 3
2 : 3-4	56 n. 9
2 : 4	8
2 : 8	8, 13, 45 n. 6, n. 8, 48 n. 6, 112 n. 3

<i>Deuteronomy</i>	Page	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	Page
2 : 8-10	108 n. 1	34 : 5	45 n. 5
2 : 8-29	7	34 : 5-6	116
2 : 9	119 n. 1, 198 n. 7	34 : 6	45 n. 9, 91 n. 8
2 : 9, 18	72		
2 : 10-11	107 n. 1	<i>Joshua</i>	
2 : 14	48 n. 3	2 : 1	94 n. 13
2 : 18	8, 13	2 : 20	177 n. 6
2 : 20-23	107 n. 1	3 : 1	94 n. 13
2 : 21	119 n. 4	3 : 16	46 n. 10
2 : 24	13, 49 n. 6, 57 n. 8, 92 n. 10	4 : 12	125 n. 2
2 : 24-36	8 n. 3	6 : 1 ff.	128 n. 7
2 : 26	48 n. 6, 75 n. 4, 81, n. 3, 85 n. 9, 92 n. 10	6 : 26	79 n. 2
2 : 26-33	13	8 : 20	28 n. 2
2 : 27	60 n. 3	9 : 10	92 n. 10
2 : 27-37	113 n. 3	12 : 1	57 n. 8
2 : 28-29	119 n. 4	12 : 1-3	8 n. 3
2 : 29	8	12 : 2	49 n. 6, 76, 92 n. 10
2 : 30	92 n. 10	12 : 3	46 n. 10, 53, n. 3, 89 n. 8
2 : 32	81 n. 1	12 : 5	92 : 10
2 : 34	13	13	101, 154 n. 3
2 : 36	49 n. 6, 57 n. 8, 76, 101	13 : 8-10	15
3 : 2, 6	92 n. 10	13 : 9	101
3 : 6, 8, 12	8 n. 3	13 : 9, 16	53 n. 5, 57 n. 8, 76, 88, n. 6
3 : 8, 12	57 n. 8	13 : 10, 12, 26-27	92 n. 10
3 : 12	125 n. 2	13 : 15-28	15
3 : 16	57 n. 8, 113	13 : 16	57 n. 8
3 : 17	46 n. 10, 53, n. 3	13 : 16-17	53 n. 5
3 : 29	13, 91 n. 8	13 : 17	52, 87 n. 4
4 : 3	123 n. 6, 124 n. 2	13 : 18	75 n. 5, 85 n. 9, 94 n. 6
4 : 43	92 n. 1	13 : 19	83 n. 2, 90 n. 6, 91 n. 2
4 : 46	91 n. 8, 92 n. 10	13 : 20	53 n. 3, 89 n. 8, 91 n. 8
4 : 47-49	46 n. 9	13 : 21	53 n. 5
4 : 48	57 n. 8, 76	13 : 27	93 n. 1
4 : 49	46 n. 8, 53 n. 3	13 : 32	45 n. 7
22 : 30	5 n. 7	15 : 2	46 n. 7
23 : 1-8	124 n. 3	15 : 7	127 n. 2
23 : 2-6	13	15 : 22	39 n. 9
23 : 3	16 n. 6, 27 n. 2, 109 n. 5, 132, 158 n. 5	15 : 33	156 n. 6
25 : 17-19	126 n. 1	15 : 59	156 n. 6
28 : 69	45 n. 5	18 : 2	127 n. 1
29 : 6	92 n. 10	18 : 19	46 n. 7
32 : 36	28 n. 2	19 : 41	71 n. 6, 165 n. 6
32 : 49	45 n. 5, 51 n. 10	19 : 44	165 n. 6
34 : 1-3	126 n. 2		
34 : 3	127 n. 8		

<i>Joshua</i>	Page	<i>Judges</i>	Page
20 : 8	43 n. 5, 92 n. 1	11 : 26	49 n. 6, 57 n. 7, 109 n. 2
21 : 14	165 n. 6		
21 : 23	165 n. 6	11 : 26, 33	132 n. 6
21 : 36	81 n. 6, 92 n. 1	11 : 29	45 n. 3
21 : 37	75 n. 5, 85 n. 9, 94 n. 6	12 : 1-3	24 n. 4
21 : 39	92 n. 10	12 : 12	125 n. 5
22 : 7	124 n. 2	12 : 15	126 n. 5
22 : 8	125 n. 2	13 : 25	165 n. 6
22 : 9	125 n. 5	16 : 31	165 n. 6
24 : 9	184 n. 1, n. 2	18 : 2, 8, 11	165 n. 6
		20 : 1 ff.	128 n. 1
<i>Judges</i>		<i>I Samuel</i>	
1 : 33	71 n. 6	2 : 23	177 n. 6
1 : 35	71 n. 6	6 : 9, 12, 19	71 n. 6
3	128	8 : 12	178 n. 3
3 : 12-17	183 n. 12	8 : 20	117 n. 3
3 : 12-15a	14 n. 1	10 : 27	133 n. 1
3 : 12-30	12 n. 1, 14, 24 n. 4, 115 n. 5	11	24 n. 4
3 : 13	49 n. 3	11 : 1 ff.	133 n. 2
3 : 14	128 n. 2	11 : 12	133 n. 1
3 : 19	128 n. 3	12 : 9	14 n. 5
3 : 25	129 n. 3	13 : 1 ff.	133 n. 2
3 : 28-29	45 n. 2	14 : 1 ff.	133 n. 2
3 : 28-30	14 n. 2	14 : 9	27 n. 4
3 : 29	130 n. 2	14 : 47	5 n. 1, 16 ff., 44 n. 5, 133 n. 3, 135 n. 1
5	21 n. 3	15 : 6-7	126 n. 2
5 : 14	126 n. 2	19 : 10	177 n. 6
5 : 30	191 n. 5	22 : 3	45, 88 n. 3, 134 n. 2, n. 4
6 : 14	177 n. 6	22 : 3-4	17
6 : 33	126 n. 2	22 : 4	134 n. 4, n. 6
10 : 7-10	132 n. 4	27 : 8	126 n. 2
10 : 17-12 : 7	14 f., 132 n. 3	30 : 1 ff.	126 n. 2
11 : 4-36	24 n. 4	31	134 n. 7
11 : 12-28	14 f.		
11 : 13	49 n. 6, 75, n. 7		
11 : 15	45 n. 5		
11 : 17	117 n. 1, 118 n. 5	<i>II Samuel</i>	
11 : 18	7, 45 n. 5, n. 6, 49 n. 6, 57 n. 7, 119 n. 3, 132 n. 5	2 : 1 ff.	134 n. 6
11 : 18, 22	132 n. 5	2 : 23	27 n. 4
11 : 19, 26	92 n. 10	6 : 14, 18	200 n. 5
11 : 19-22	8 n. 3, 113 n. 3	8 : 1, 2, 12	24 n. 4
11 : 20	81 n. 1	8 : 2	5 n. 1, 17, 135 n. 1, 136 n. 2
11 : 22	49 n. 6, 57 n. 7	8 : 3	28 n. 2
11 : 23	113 n. 3	8 : 11-12	17
11 : 24	180 : 9, 197, 198 n. 4	8 : 14	131 n. 2
11 : 25	184 n. 1, n. 2	8 : 18	200 n. 5

<i>II Samuel</i>		Page	<i>II Kings</i>		Page
23 : 20		17 n. 4	3 : 27	20, 145 n. 5	
23 : 30		135 n. 2	6-7	20 n. 2	
24 : 5		136 n. 1	8 : 8	177 n. 6	
			8 : 28	144 n. 5	
<i>I Kings</i>			10 : 1 ff.	145 n. 1	
3 : 1 ff.		137 n. 3	10 : 32-33	19, 145 n. 2	
6 : 1		106 n. 3	10 : 33	57 n. 8	
6 : 4		109 n. 2	13 : 20	24 n. 4	
6 : 36		192 n. 1	13 : 20b-21	146 n. 2	
7 : 2, 12		192 n. 1	14 : 24	19 n. 3	
8 : 55		200 n. 5	14 : 25	19, 46 n. 8, 20 n. 3,	
10 : 8		177 n. 6		147 n. 5	
11 : 1, 7		18	14 : 27	19 n. 4	
11 : 7		202 n. 3	15 : 19	149 n. 1	
11 : 7, 33	136 n. 4,	180 n. 9,	16 : 5-9	149 n. 3	
		199 n. 8	19 : 9	151 n. 2	
11 : 14 ff.		137 n. 1	20 : 1 ff.	139 n. 6	
11 : 23-25		137 n. 2	20 : 12-19	151 n. 2	
11 : 40		137 n. 3	23 : 4	191 n. 6	
12 : 22		184 n. 7	23 : 13	136 n. 4, 180 n. 9, 199	
14 : 25-28		137 n. 4		n. 8, 202 n. 3	
15 : 18 ff.		137 n. 5	24 : 1a, b	155 n. 2	
16 : 8-23		139 n. 1	24 : 1c-2	155 n. 3	
16 : 25		5 n. 1	24 : 2	24 n. 4	
16 : 34		139 n. 5	24 : 7	155 n. 1	
18 : 28		202 n. 1	24 : 10 ff.	155 n. 4	
22 : 1		139 n. 5	24 : 17	156 n. 2	
22 : 23		177 n. 6	25 : 1	156 n. 6	
22 : 46		19 n. 11	25 : 2	156 n. 8	
22 : 52		140 n. 4			
23 : 15		18	<i>Isaiah</i>		
<i>II Kings</i>			2 : 2-4	22 n. 5	
1 : 1	18, 139 n. 4		5 : 14	194 n. 10	
1 : 2	177 n. 6		7 : 1 ff.	149 n. 3	
3	19, 20, 24 n. 4, 140 n. 2		11 : 14	25, 28, 41, 157	
3 : 4	138 n. 4, 180 n. 3			n. 10	
3 : 4-27	18, 19		15-16	20 ff., 24, 25 ff., 28,	
3 : 5	18 n. 3, 139 n. 4			71, 184	
3 : 5-6	140 n. 3		15 : 1	72	
3 : 8	141 n. 6		15 : 2	80, 88 n. 6, 89	
3 : 9	141 n. 7			n. 3, 202 n. 1	
3 : 17	142 n. 3		15 : 3	158 n. 4	
3 : 19, 25	95 n. 6		15 : 4	81 n. 4, 92 n. 10, 93	
3 : 21-23	142 n. 5			n. 4	
3 : 24-27	97 n. 5		15 : 5	64 n. 7, 65 n. 3, 66	
3 : 25	71 n. 4, 142 n. 6			n. 1, 172 n. 3	
3 : 25-26	142 n. 7		15 : 5-6	65	
			15 : 6	55	
Pretoria Oriental Series, III				14	

<i>Isaiah</i>	Page	<i>Jeremiah</i>	Page
15 : 8	45 n. 6, 69 n. 5, 86 n. 3	48 : 2, 28, 30	23, n. 1
15 : 9	80	48 : 2, 34, 45	92 n. 10
16 : 1, 3	157 n. 3	48 : 3	158 n. 4
16 : 2	57 n. 7, 202 n. 4	48 : 3, 5, 34	64 n. 7, 172 n. 3
16 : 5	27 n. 2	48 : 5	65, 66 n. 1
16 : 6	24	48 : 7b	157 n. 6
16 : 7	71 n. 3	48 : 7, 46	180 n. 9
16 : 8	91 n. 3, 92 n. 10	48 : 11	100 n. 2
16 : 9	93 n. 4	48 : 14	156 n. 10
16 : 11	71 n. 2	48 : 20	57 n. 7
16 : 14	27 n. 2, 71, 157 n. 4, 158 n. 6	48 : 21	53 n. 5, 81 n. 5, 94 n. 6
17 : 2	149 n. 8	48 : 22	86 n. 9, 172 n. 2
20 : 3	150 n. 6	48 : 23	76, 87 n. 6
24-27	26	48 : 24	83 n. 4, 92 n. 2
25 : 10b-12	25 ff., 41, 71 n. 8, 95 n. 7, 155 n. 5, 157 n. 9, 195 n. 1	48 : 26, 29, 30	157 n. 1
25 : 12	157 n. 8	48 : 28	45
30 : 1-5	151 n. 2	48 : 31, 36	71
31 : 1-3	151 n. 2	48 : 32	47 n. 2, 91 n. 3
45 : 21	23 n. 2	48 : 33	45 n. 5
46 : 7	27 n. 4	48 : 34	55, 65, 81 n. 4, 93 n. 4
48 : 3-8	23 n. 2	48 : 45	41, 110 n. 3
		48 : 47	202 n. 1
		49 : 2	92 n. 10
		51 : 59	156 n. 3
<i>Jeremiah</i>		<i>Hezekiel</i>	
1 : 10	25 n. 1	17 : 15	156 n. 5
6 : 1	97 n. 7	25 : 8-11	23 n. 1, 25, 155 n. 5
9 : 26	44 n. 5	25 : 9	83 n. 2, 87 n. 5, 89 n. 8, 157 n. 10, 172 n. 4
10 : 19	177 n. 6	43 : 15, 16	190 n. 7
22 : 20	51	47 : 18	47 n. 1
25 : 15	25 n. 2		
25 : 15-38	24	<i>Hosea</i>	
27 : 3	155 n. 7	9 : 10	91 n. 9, 124 n. 2, 194 n. 6
27 : 4-22	156 n. 3	10 : 14	23 ff., 149 n. 7, 183 n. 5
27 : 9	200		
31 : 21	177 n. 6	<i>Joel</i>	
37 : 5	156 n. 4	2 : 20	47 n. 1
46-51	24 n. 7		
46 : 2	155 n. 1	<i>Amos</i>	
48	20, 23, 25, 28, 37, 41, 71 n. 8, 95 n. 7, 154 n. 2, 157 n. 9	1 : 1	50 n. 1
48 : 1	83 n. 2	2 : 1-3	20, 143 n. 4, 147 n. 7, 158 n. 6
48 : 1, 22	89, n. 3	6 : 14	20 n. 3, 147 n. 7
48 : 1, 23	172 n. 4	9 : 14	79 n. 2
48 : 1 ff.	158 n. 6		
48 : 1-47	24 ff., 155 n. 5		

<i>Micah</i>	Page	<i>Lamentations</i>	Page
6 : 5	94 n. 13, 184 n. 2	1 : 2	155 n. 4
<i>Zephaniah</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
2 : 8	24, 154 n. 2	2 : 4	182 n. 9
2 : 8-II	24, 155 n. 5, 158 n. 6	2 : 34	169 n. 12
2 : 9	50 n. 9	3 : 9	182 n. 9
<i>Zechariah</i>		3 : 22	169 n. 12
14 : 5	50 n. 1	4 : 29-30	156 n. 1
14 : 8	47 n. 1	5 : 10	182 n. 9
		6 : 7, 22	182 n. 9
		6 : 25	169 n. 12
		11 : 41	158 n. 2
<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Ezrah</i>	
12 : 8	177 n. 6	2 : 6	136 n. 6
58 : 9	163 n. 6	4 : 10, 23	169 n. 12
60 : 10	155 n. 5, 158 n. 6	5 : 5, 12, 14	169 n. 12
73 : 9	163 n. 6	7 : 17	169 n. 12
83 : 6-7	155 n. 5	8 : 4	136 n. 6
83 : 7	158 n. 6	9 : 1	29
83 : 9	198 n. 7	9 : 1, 12	158 n. 2
90 : 1	194 n. 12	10 : 2 ff.	13 n. 2
93 : 2	23 n. 2	10 : 30	136 n. 6
106 : 28	123 n. 6, 124 n. 2, 194 n. 5	<i>Nehemiah</i>	
108 : 9	155 n. 5, 158 n. 6	2 : 10, 19	158 n. 4
119 : 131	194 n. 9	3 : 11	136 n. 6
<i>Proverbs</i>		7 : 11	136 n. 6
3 : 27	28 n. 2	8 : 5	129 n. 2
<i>Job</i>		9 : 22	92 n. 10
16 : 10	194 n. 9	10 : 14	136 n. 6
16 : 22	163 n. 6	11 : 25	39 n. 9
23 : 8	163 n. 6	13 : 1	158 n. 2
29 : 23	194 n. 9	13 : 1 ff.	158 n. 5
41 : 11	163 n. 6	13 : 1-2	13 n. 5
		13 : 23	13 n. 3
		13 : 28	158 n. 4
<i>Ruth</i>		<i>I Chronicles</i>	
1 : 1	131 n. 4	1	118 n. 1
1 : 4	16 n. 2	1 : 46	45 n. 9, 131 n. 1
1 : 4, 14	185 n. 4	2 : 11-15	134 n. 1
1 : 16	45 n. 9	2 : 42	180 n. 7
1 : 22	45 n. 9	4 : 22	136 n. 5
2 : 6	45 n. 9	5 : 1	5 n. 7
4 : 3	45 n. 9	5 : 8	87 n. 5, 89 n. 3
4 : 17	16 n. 3	5 : 17	148 n. 6
4 : 18-22	16 n. 4, 134 n. 1	6 : 63	81 n. 6, 92 n. 1

<i>I Chronicles</i>	Page	<i>II Chronicles</i>	Page
6 : 64	75 n. 5, 85 n. 9, 94 n. 6	36 : 5	155 n. 1
8 : 3, 5,	127 n. 4	36 : 13	156 n. 5
8 : 6-9	132 n. 2		
8 : 7	127 n. 4	<i>I Corinthians</i>	
8 : 8	45 n. 9	10 : 8	124 n. 2
11 : 22	17 n. 4, 135 n. 2		
11 : 46	134 n. 3, 184 n. 6	<i>Revelation</i>	
18 : 2	17, 135 n. 4, 136 n. 2	2 : 14	124 n. 2, 194 n. 5
18 : 11	17		
19 : 7	88 n. 6	<i>I Maccabees</i>	
20 : 1	44 n. 4	4 : 61	42 b. 5
28 : 15	127 n. 8	5 : 3-8	42 n. 5
<i>II Chronicles</i>		<i>Judith</i>	
2 : 53	165 n. 6	1 : 12	42 n. 3
20	19, 20 n. 5	5 : 2	42 n. 3
20 : 1 ff.	24 n. 4, 143 n. 3	5 : 22	42 n. 3
20 : 2	47 n. 2	6 : 1	42 n. 3
20 : 10	7	7 : 8	42 n. 3
20 : 22-23	143 n. 5		
24 : 26	184 n. 8	<i>Sirach</i>	
26 : 6-8	148 n. 5	33 : 12	42 n. 2
26 : 8	24 n. 4, 148 n. 7	36 : 10	41 f.
26 : 10	148 n. 4	50 : 3	176 n. 6
27 : 5	24 n. 4, 148 n. 5, n. 7		

B. INSCRIPTION OF KING MESHA^c OF MOAB

1	171 n. 8, 180 n. 4	4, 32	170 n. 4
1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 20	44 n. 6, 178 n. 4	5	138 n. 1, 165 n. 3, 167 n. 3, 170 n. 17, 172 n. 9, n. 12, 173 n. 15, 177 n. 2
1, 2, 5, 10, 18, 23	173 n. 10	5, 6, 7, 9, 10-14, 17,	167, n. 10
1, 2, 21-23, 25-29	168 n. 1	18, 30, 31	171 n. 17
1, 6, 8	173 n. 8	5, 10, 29, 31	138 n. 2
2	176 n. 13	5-11	139 n. 5, 162 n. 21, 165 n. 4, 168 n. 11, 170 n. 8, n. 12, 173 n. 5
2-3	162 n. 11	6, 8	173 n. 3
2, 3	169 n. 13, 173 n. 7	6, 9	170 n. 1
2, 8, 34	171 n. 14	6, 14	162 n. 19
3	78 n. 10, 171 n. 5, n. 9, 177 n. 7, 199 n. 9	6, 32	162 n. 3
3-4	180 n. 6	7	140 n. 1, 162 n. 1, 163 n. 14, 164 n. 13, 167 n. 9, 170 n. 10
3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14,	181 n. 1, 197	7-9, 30	88 n. 6
18, 19, 32, 33	164 n. 14	7, 23	174 n. 8
3, 9	78 n. 8		
3, 21-25	166 n. 3, n. 5, 170 n. 2, n. 6, n. 7		
4	173 n. 14		
4, 5, 11, 20, 24, 28			

8	138 n. 6, 139 n. 3, 170 n. 9, 172 n. 14, 173 n. 18, 176 n. 2, n. 14	17	34 n. 1, 166 n. 4, 172 n. 18, 196 n. 1, 201 n. 5
8-9	140 n. 8, 163 n. 12	17-18	175 n. 6
8, 9, 13, 19	170 n. 16, 171 n. 2	17, 19-20	164 n. 4
8-9, 33	162 n. 6	18	163 n. 3, 169 n. 7
8, 18	162 n. 4, n. 16	18-21	141 n. 1
8, 19	163 n. 12	19	162 n. 20, 166 n. 2, 167 n. 7, 170 n. 3
9	31 n. 3, 87 n. 5, 164 n. 12, 176 n. 3	19, 32	167 n. 6
9, 10, 25, 27, 30	144 n. 1	20	172 n. 1, 175 n. 3
9, 23	177 n. 3	20-21	81 n. 7
10	83 n. 2, 137 n. 7, 164 n. 11, 170 n. 11, 172 n. 8	20, 30	164 n. 2
10-11	84 n. 1	21	78 n. 9, 171 n. 11, 172 n. 10, 175 n. 8
10, 13, 20, 25	173 n. 17	21-23	162 n. 8
10-14	140 n. 7	21-26	144 n. 2
10, 31	162 n. 6, n. 15	22	170 n. 14, n. 15, 172 n. 19, 173 n. 1, 176 n. 7
11, 12, 24	174 n. 10	23	76 n. 3, 176 n. 3, n. 10, 177 n. 3, n. 10
11, 14	173 n. 13	23-25	54 n. 1, 79 n. 3
11, 15	165 n. 6	23, 26, 33	162 n. 12
11, 15-16, 20	164 n. 5	24	71, 164 n. 6, 165 n. 2
11, 15, 19, 32	167 n. 12	24 (12?)	177 n. 1
11, 16	163 n. 2	24-25	171 n. 1, 172 n. 9, 175 n. 2
11, 16, 20	170 n. 18	25	162 n. 10, 171 n. 13
11, 24	171 n. 16, 177 n. 4	25-26	172 n. 5
12	166 n. 8, 171 n. 16, 174 n. 3, n. 7, 175 n. 9	26	144 n. 3, 171 n. 11
12-13	163 n. 3, 201 n. 6	26-27	162 n. 8
13	83 n. 4, 166 n. 7, 199 n. 10	27	52 n. 8, 61 n. 1, 92 n. 1, 162 n. 5, 169 n. 6, 172 n. 11, 174 n. 6
13-14	141 n. 3	28	176 n. 11, n. 15.
14	89, n. 4, 140 n. 5, 162 n. 2, 163 n. 4	28-29	162 n. 11
14-15	163 n. 1	29	162 n. 9, 171 n. 7, 172 n. 13, 177 n. 9.
14-18	140 n. 9	29-30	162 n. 8
14, 32	171 n. 3	30	86 n. 9, 87 n. 4, 172 n. 6
15	171 n. 12, 173 n. 11, 174 n. 9	31-32	172 n. 7
15, 19	171 n. 4	32	65, 163 n. 5, n. 13, 166 n. 1
16	172 n. 17, 174, n. 2, 176 n. 17	32-34	143 n. 2
16-18	141 n. 4	33	163 n. 12

C. MOABITIC WORDS (INCLUDING NON-MOABITIC WORDS MENTIONED IN M.L.)

	Page		Page
אב :	173, 180 n. 1	בת :	174, 186 f.
אבד :	162, 167	בת במת :	52
אבי :	169	בת כמש :	31
אהלך :	163	בת דבלתן :	86 n. 9, 172
אהרנ :	163	גברן :	176
אחז :	162, 164	גברת :	172
אחז על :	190 n. 11	גר :	174
אלפן :	176	גרת :	174
אלתחם :	165	דוד :	174, 187, 190 n. 7
אמר :	162, 164	דיבן :	187
אנך :	168	הא :	168
אסחב :	163	האשוח :	177
אסר :	173	החרמתה :	166
אסרי :	172	הלך :	163
אעני :	165	הלתחם :	166
אקח :	164, 186	הם :	169
אראל :	191 n. 6	העם :	177
ארבען :	176	הקר :	177
ארד :	163	הראני :	166
ארץ :	171	הרס :	162
אב :	173	השלכן :	189 n. 7
אשא :	164	השעני :	166, 187
אשב :	166	ואבן :	164
אשבה :	191 n. 7	ואחזה :	170
אשוח :	31, 176	ואעש :	164
אשר :	171	וארא :	164
את :	167	ויבן :	164
את במת :	193	ויחלפה :	170
ב :	167, 171	ויענו :	165
בארצה :	170	ולך :	163
בה :	167, 170	ושע :	166, 187
בהלתחם :	166	זאת :	171
בהלתחמה :	167	חורנן :	143, 172, 187, 195
בי :	167, 170	חיה :	182
בימי :	169	חמשן :	176
בית :	174, 186 f.	חמת :	171, 175
במת :	171, 199	חצי :	175
בן :	171, 173	יאמר :	162
בנה :	79, 138 n. 8, 162, 173	יאנף :	167
בניה :	173 n. 5	יגרש :	162
בנס ישע :	189 n. 6	יהוה :	178
בנתי :	162, 187	יהץ :	140
בעל פער :	138	יחלף :	162
בקע :	173	ים :	173
בקן :	177	ימי :	172
בר :	175	ימן :	172

Page		Page	
ימן רבן :	177	עטרת :	138, 140
יספתי :	162	עי :	174
יערן :	172	עין :	172, 174 f., 187
ירש :	163, 187	על :	192 n. 2
ישב :	162, 163, 166, 167	עלם :	167
ישע :	166, 180	עם :	173
ישראל :	178	עמרי :	178
כל :	173	ענו :	165
כלא :	191 n. 9	עני :	165
כלאי :	191 n. 9	עשו :	165
כלה :	191 n. 4	עשתי :	162
כלי :	175, 191 n. 6	עשתר כמש :	196, 199, 202
כמש :	38, 40, 157 n. 7, 180 f., 196 f., 202	צדק :	182
כמשגד :	182 n. 2	צהר :	191 n. 3
כמשיחי :	40, 182, 198	צהרם :	191 n. 3
כמשכן :	182	קיר :	175
כמשמלך :	182, 198	קר :	171, 175
כמשפלט :	40	קרחה :	71, 78 ff., 144
כמשצדק :	40, 182, 198	קריה :	199
כרתי :	162	קריתן :	138, 172
ל :	171	קרן :	172
לה :	170	רב :	173
לו :	170	רבן :	172, 173
לך :	163	רד :	163
לכם :	171	רחמת :	172
לל :	174	רית :	175, 186
למעין :	177, 191 n. 10	רכת :	192 n. 1
לקח :	164, 186	רש :	175, 191 n. 7
מאב :	178 ff.	רשה :	191 n. 7
מאתן :	172	שבעת :	176
מגדלתה :	170, 172 f., 176	שוב :	166
מהדהבה :	138, 140, 187	שוח :	176
מכרתת :	171, 176	שחרת :	171
מלך :	173	שלם :	183
מלכתי :	162	שלמן :	183
מסלת :	171, 176, 186	שלשן :	176
מעין :	176, 187	שנאי :	170
משמעת :	176	שנת :	171 n. 14
משע :	180	שעריה :	170, 173
נבה :	89, 140	שת :	171
סלל :	186	תאנף :	167 n. 3

D. HEBREW WORDS

אָב :	179	אָבֵל כְּרָמִים :	94
אָבֵל הַשָּׁטָן :	59	אָנָלִים :	69, 74

- אריב : 42
 אור : 164
 איביכם : 45
 איך : 21
 אלופים : 118 n. 1
 אלעלה : 93
 אלתקא : 165 n. 6
 אלתקה : 165 n. 6
 אלתקון : 165 n. 6
 אמים : 107
 ארבות : 28 n. 2
 ארבות : 28 n. 2
 ארן : 57
 ארנון : 57
 ארץ : 26 n. 7, 45
 ארץ טוב : 36 n. 6
 אשדוד : 57 n. 12
 אשדות הפסגה : 53, 59, 90
 באוש : 181 n. 9
 באוש : 181 n. 9
 באר : 58, 86
 באר אליים : 86 n. 3
 בית בצל מעון : 87
 בית בצל פעור : 91
 בית גמול : 76
 בית דבלתים : 87, 172
 בית הישמות : 89 f.
 בית הרם : 93
 בית הרן : 93
 בית מעון : 87
 בית נמרה : 43 n. 1
 בית פעור : 91
 בית שמש : 71 n. 6
 בלק : 184
 במה : 199
 במות בעל : 52
 בנות מואב : 44 n. 4
 בני : 44
 בני לוט : 44
 בני מואב : 44
 בני צמון : 44
 בני שאן : 110 n. 3
 בני שת : 110
 בעל מעון : 87, 147, 194
 בעלמעני : 147
 בעל פעור : 91
 בצר : 92
 בצרה : 92
 בשת : 194
 בת : 90
 גא : 21
 גאה : 21
 גבול : 45
 גי : 90 n. 6
 דגון : 164
 דיבון : 39 n. 9, 56
 דימון : 56 n. 3, 80
 דימונה : 39 n. 9
 דם : 56 n. 3, 80
 הים : 47
 הים הקדמוני : 47
 הם : 106
 המישור : 53
 הנצמדים : 123 n. 6
 הפסגה : 52
 הר העברים : 51
 הרי העברים : 51
 הר חרס : 71 n. 6

השבת ראש פאתי	41	מָאֵב	179
מוֹאֵב		מָאֵז	23
הַשָּׁטִיִּים	94 f.	מִדְּבָר	45, 60, 81
וְהָב	180 n. 1	מִדְּבַר קְדָמוֹת	75
וּכְרָאֵמֶר	186 n. 1	מִדְּמֶן	80
וְקָנִים	122 n. 2	מוֹאֵב	passim
חֹרֵיִם	64 f., 172	מוֹאֵל	180 n. 1
חִיָּהוּה	186 n. 1	מִי גְמָרִים	55 ff.
חֶלֶן	80	מִדְּבָא	88
חָרָם	201	מִישָׁע	180
חֶשְׁבֹּן	92	מִישָׁר	81, 148
טָבָאֵל	36 n. 6	מֶלֶךְ	117 n. 2, 122 n. 2
יֵאֵב	179	מֶלֶךְ מוֹאֵב הָרֵאשֶׁן	114 n. 5, cf. 117 n. 2
יָד	28 n. 2	מִמְזֹר	12, 124 n. 5
יֵהֵב	180 n. 1	מִפְעֵת	94
יֶחֶץ	80f., 85, 101	מִצְפֵּה מוֹאֵב	45, 88
יָם הַמֶּלַח	46	מִשָּׂא	22
יָם הָעֶרְבָה	46, 147	מִשְׁלִים	8, 10
יַעְזֹר	93 f.	מִתִּים	194 n. 5
יָרֵד	65	מִתְנָה	86
יָרַח	80 n. 3	נָבוֹ	53, 89
יָרֵשׁ	107 n. 2	נֶגֶד הַשָּׁמַשׁ	123 n. 6
יָשֵׁב	107 n. 2	נִדָּב	182
וְחָמָה	184	נִחַל אֲרֵנוֹן	57
כִּי	21	נִחַל הָעֶרְבָה	56
כֵּלָא	191 n. 9	נִחַל וְרֵד	48, 56, 62
כְּלָאִים	191 n. 9	נִחְלִיאֵל	58
כְּמוֹשׁ	181	נִפְח	10 n. 8
כְּמוֹשׁ	180 f.	עֶבְרִים	51
כְּפָהֶר	164	עֶגֶל	183
לֹחֲחִית	65	עֶגְלוֹן	183
לֵיל	21, 175	עֶגְלֵת שְׁלִישִׁיהָ	65
לֵיל	21, 175	עוֹלָם	180 n. 1, 190 n. 5
לֵילָה	175		

- עֲטָרוֹת : 84, 101, 138
 עֲטָרַת שׁוֹפָן : 84
 עֲטָרַת שָׁפָם : 84, 101
 עֵי הָעֲבָרִים : 48, 51 n. 12, 62
 עִיר : 72 n. 4, 123 n. 3
 עִיר הַתְּמָרִים : 127
 עֲלִיּוֹן : 11
 עֲמָק : 90 n. 6
 עַר : 72 f., 123 n. 3
 עֲרֵכָה : 147 n. 5
 עֲרֵבוֹת מִוָּאֵב : passim
 עֲרוּעַר : 76, 101
 עֶרֶךְ : 185
 עֶרְפָּה : 185
 עֲשָׂתָרוֹת קֶרֶנִּים : 106
 עֵתָא : 23
 פֶּתַח מִוָּאֵב : 136
 פֶּסְיִלִּים : 129
 פָּעוֹר : 53
 פֶּעַר : 194
 צָמַד : 123 n. 6
 צָעִירָה : 66
 צִיעַר : 65 f.
 צָפוֹר : 184
 צָרַת הַשֶּׁחֶר : 90
 קַמּוֹת : 75, 85, 101
 קָהֵל יְהוָה : 12, 27, 159
 קִינָה : 21
 קִיר : 72, 175
 קִיר חֲדָשׁ : 70 f.
 קִיר חֲרָשׁ : 71
 קִיר חֲרָשֶׁת : 71, 95, 97
 קִרְיָתִים : 172
 קִיר מִוָּאֵב : 70
 קָרְיֹת : 83
 קָרְיַת חֲצוֹת : 83, 85
 קָרְיָתִים : 74, 83, 87
 רוֹת : 184
 רִית : 185
 רֵעָה : 185
 שְׁבָמָה : 91
 שָׁדָה : 100
 שָׁדָה : 45
 שָׁדָה צָפִים : 91
 שְׁפֵת נֶחֱל אֲרָנוֹן : 76
 שְׁדִי : 11
 שׁוֹפָן : 84
 שְׁלֹקָה : 175 n. 12
 שְׁלֹנָת : 175 n. 12
 שְׁלֶמֶן : 183
 שֶׁמֶר : 184
 שְׁמָרִית : 184
 שָׁפִים : 84
 שָׁפִים : 84
 תְּמָר : 127

E. GENERAL INDEX

- Aaron 200 n. 5
 Abraham 106 n. 3, 108 n. 3, 112
 Accadian 174, 180 ff., 185.
 accusative, sign of the 167
 Adadnirāri III 146 f.
 Ader 97
 adverbial ending 191 n. 3
 „Achtungstexte” 105 n. 4

- affix 186
 affirmative 162, 165, 174
 agriculture 53, 66, 99 f., 104
 Ahab 18, 138 ff., 144
 'Ajin-Jodh roots 174
 'Ajin-Waw roots 173
 Aku-Mašu 181, 197
 'Aleiyân 48, 80 f.
 Aleph prostheticum 28, 57, 176
âli Ma-'a-ba-âja 46 n. 1
 'Aliyâ 82
 'Ajjun, Merj 40
 altar 199
 altar-hearth 190
 Amalekites 126
 Amarna, Letters from 106, 117
 n. 2, 119
 Amaziah 147 n. 2
 American School of Oriental
 Research 30
 'Ammân 34, 61, 94
 Ammi-nadbi 152 n. 7, 182 n. 4
 Ammon 15, 37, 109 n. 2, 112,
 120 ff., 126, 136 n. 2, 146, 150 ff.,
 156, 182 n. 4
 Ammonites 1, 12 ff., 34, 101, 109,
 118, 124, 126 f., 132 f., 147 f.,
 157, 197
 Ammonite-Moabite 5, 15
 Amorites 8 ff., 45 n. 1, 80, 105,
 113 ff., 119 ff., 126, 132.
 Ammuladi 153
 „Amurru” 36, 152, 154
 Anakims 107 n. 1
anâku 189 n. 2
 animal figurines 34, 201
 animal, sacrificial 34, 201
ank 168
 אִנְךָ 168
 anti-Assyrian 150
 anti-Lebanon 51
 'nw 165 n. 5
 apathy 26
 apocalypse 25, 26, 159
 apocoped form 165
 apotropaic figurines 195
 Ar 72, 114 n. 7, 123
 'âr 164
 Arabic 76, 166 f., 179, 185 f., 188
 Arabic Versions 57
 Arabs 30, 46, 152 f., 161
 'Arâ'ir 61, 76 f., 96
 Aram 19, 144 ff., 149
 Aramaean(s) 20, 37 n. 1, 135, 137,
 139 ff., 145 ff., 160
 Aramaic 145, 159, 165 f., 168 f.,
 185, 187 f.
 'Arđ en-Njājir 63
 Areopolis 72
 Ares 72
 Arnon 7, 19, 48 ff. passim, 192
 Arnon, Brooks of the 58, 72
 Aroer 132, 136 n. 1, 139, 145, 149
 n. 8, 192
 arsenal 40
 art 2
 article, definite 171, 177 f.
 Aruadu 152 n. 7
 Arvad 112 n. 6
 Asdod 150, 151
 Ashera 33
 'Ashtar-Chemosh 141, 191
 Ashtarte 159
 Asshûrbânipal 152 ff.
 Asshurbânipal, Cyl. B 38, 46 n. 3,
 153 n. 2, 178 n. 6, 183 n. 2
 Asshûrbânipal, Cyl. C 38, 46 n. 2,
 152 n. 7, n. 11, 178 n. 5, 182
 n. 4
 Asshurbânipal, Rassam Cyl. 38,
 46 n. 4, 152 n. 6, n. 10, n. 11,
 153 n. 1, 178 n. 7, 180 n. 2
 assonance 27
 Assyria 112, 151 ff.
 Assyrian(s) 1, 22, 36 f., 46, 112
 n. 6, 145 ff. passim, 178
 Astarte 195
 'štr 196 n. 1
 Ataroth 141, 190
 Aya-nûri 36
 Azariah 147 n. 2
 Azizu 195
 Baal 193, 199
 Baal-meon 144, 190
 Baal-peor 114, 116, 122 ff., 194 f.
 Bâb edh-Dhra' 97
 Babylon 39, 105

- Babylonia 154 ff.
 Babylonian(s) 3, 154 ff., 183 f., 194, 198
baḥr lū! 47
 Balaam 7, 10 ff., 85, 116, 122 f., 130 n. 1, 193 f., 200
 Balak 10 ff., 85, 116, 122 f., 193, 199
 Bālō'ah, cf. Kh. Bālō'ah
 Bālō'ah stele 31 ff., 107 n. 4, 108, 110 f., 159, 196, 200
 Bamoth 114
 Bamoth-baal 193
 Bedad 131
 Bedouins 21 f., 109, 110, 126, 150, 157 f., 198
 Bedouin tribe(s) 22, 37, 57, 150, 184, 179
 Beer 121
 Bēl-dān 149
 Benaiah 17, 135
 Benjamin 127 ff.
 Benjaminites 84
 Beth-Ammon 151
 Beth-Arbel 23 f., 149
 Beth-baal-meon 52, 192, 194
 Beth-baal-peor 193
 Beth-bamoth 144, 192
 Beth-diblattan 144, 192
 Beth-peor 114, 116
 Bezer 81 n. 6, 144, 192
 Biblical passim
 biconsonantal verbs 162 n. 13
 Bīt-Ammāna 152 n. 7
bītu šamid 123 n. 6
 Boaz 16
 Book of the wars 6
 of the Lord
 Boundary(ies) 6, 46 ff., 59, 64, 75, 84, 113 n. 3, 115, 117, 119 n. 3, 131, 132, 143, 147
 British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, The 29
 Budu-ilu 151, 152 n. 7
 Byblos 105
 Callirhoe 58
 Cambyses 39, 157
 Canaan 121 n. 2, 125 f., 195
 Canaanite(s) 34, 100, 188, 193, 195, 200
 Canaanite dialects 164, 168, 169, 173
 Carcemish 155
 causative conjugation 166
 ceramic 75, 75 n. 3
 Chemosh 18, 78 f., 136 ff. passim, 180 ff. passim.
 Chemoshkan 189
 Chronist 135
 C.H. 5 n. 7
 civilization 2, 3, 35, 43, 70, 102, 104 ff., 157, 160
 Coastal Region 50
 Coele-Syria 41 n. 2
 coffins 193 n. 1
 construct state 172 f., 175
 craftsmanship 2
 cult 23
 culture 4, 159, 202
 cuneiform 36, 38, 44 n. 5
 Cypro-Phoenician 159

dāgān 164
 Dajbon 191, 192
 Dajbonite 189
 Damascus 37 n. 3, 60, 103 n. 2, 105, 146, 149 n. 8, n. 9, 159
 David 12 ff., 126 n. 2, 131 n. 2, 134 ff., 148
 David's parents 17
dawd, dawdah, dawdu 174 n. 4, n. 5
dawideh, dawidoh 174 n. 5
dawidum 174
 Dead Sea 43, 47, 50 f., 53 ff., 64 ff., 89, 96, 102, 107, 115, 126 f., 131, 140, 143, 147
 death 193
 deity(ies) 34, 111, 164, 196
 Deleilat el-Gharbiye 86
 Deuteronomist 119, 124
 Dhibān 30 f., 43 n. 2, 61, 77 ff., 82 f., 95, 190 n. 7, 200
 Dhibān, Inscription from 31, 159
 Dibon 7 n. 7, 9, 39, 40, 52, 78 ff., 81, 113, 139, 145
 Dibon-Gad 7 n. 7, 9
 Dimon 80 n. 4

- diphthong 166, 187
diš, the sign 46
 ditch 69, 77, 98
dōdah 174 n. 5
 Dolmens 195 n. 5
 double 'Ayin roots 173
 „double city” 73 f.
d-p-n 39 f.
 dual 172, 191 n. 3
 duplication of 164, 175, 176 n. 9,
 consonants 186
 Dūr-Šarruken 37 n. 3

 Edom 8, 20, 47, 60, 109, n. 2, 112,
 117, 118, 120, 124, 127, 136
 n. 2, 141 ff., 145, 156, 151, 182
 n. 4, 201
 Edomite(s) 1, 8, 20, 47, 101, 111,
 118, 130 f., 141, 143
 Ephraim 129
 Eglon 14, 125 f., 128 f.
 Egypt 39, 41 n. 2, 124, 126, 137,
 154, 157, 184
 Egyptian(s) 32, 36 n. 6, 39, 105
 n. 4, 106, 109 f., 112, 124, 126,
 151 f., 159, 179
 Ehud 12, 127 ff.
 el-‘Aineh 60, 61, 96
 el-‘Āl 61, 93, 96
 el-‘Araq 64
 Elath 159
 el-Belqa 11
 Elealeh 55, 81
 elegy 20
 Elephantini 196
 Elimelech 16, 131
 Elisha 18
 el-Keryē 83 n. 5
 el-Kōm 82
 el-Kūra 75, 77
 el-Lehūn 103 n. 3
 el-Māhrī, cf. R. el Māhrī
 el-Medeiyineh, cf. Kh. el M.
 el-Ōla 186 n. 6
 el-Qwēzīje 52
emirs 118 n. 1
 Emite(s) 32, 106 ff., 110 ff., 195
emmō-ab 179
 en-Neba 52

 er-Rabbah 71 f.
 er-Remeil 48, 81 f., 98
 er-Ruweihah 47, 142
 Esarhaddon 38, 151 f.
 Esarhaddon, Prism A 152 n.
 n. 3
 Esarhaddon, Prism B 38, 152
 n. 2, n. 7
 Esarhaddon, Prism C 152 n. 1, n. 3
 Esau 112
 eschatological 11, 26, 27
eš-Šafa 91
eš-Šefa 53 n. 1
eš-Šireh 48
 etymology 6, 44 n. 1, 57, 109, 179,
 197
 Euphrates 155
 Europeans 30
 Eusebius 77
 excavations 2, 43, 95, 102
 Execration Texts 110
 Exodus, the 109 n. 2, 112
 Ezazu 36 f.
 Ezion Geber 60
 Ezrah 13, 158
 ez-Zāra 50, 90

 Fejj el-‘Aseiker 67
 figurines 33 ff., 159, 195 f., 199,
 201
 fire signals 97
 foreign wives 13
 foreign women 18
 fortifications 95 ff.
 Franciscans 30
 fraternal war 152
 Freiwān 73

 Gad 7 n. 7, 15, 84, 125, 127, 131,
 133, 141, 190
 Gadites 160
 Gateway 99
 Gazah 37, 151
 genealogical list 16, 132 n. 1
 Gera 127
 Ghōr es-Seisabān 51
 Gidirāya 37, 150
 Gilead 149
 Gilgal 128 f.

- god 18, 34, 38, 39, 91, 123, 136,
180, 183, 190 ff. passim
goddess 32 n. 5, 33 f., 159, 196
graffiti 40
- Hadad 130 f.
hallu, *hallu* 183 n. 3
Ham 43 n. 1
Hamat 147 n. 2
Hawronan 192, 194
Hazel 19, 144
he 168 n. 13
headdress 32
Hebrew 163 ff., 174 ff., 184,
188 ff.
Hebron 134
„He-prostheticum” 165
Hermon, Mount 51
Heshbān 59, 61, 92 f.
Heshbon 9 f., 55, 81, 113 f., 117
Hezekiah 151
Hezekiel 25, 29
hi 168 n. 13
Hitpa’el 165 n. 6
Hittites 112
hmt 169
homonymic 43 n. 1, 56, 72
Horites 111 n. 4
חֲרֹק 195
Horonaim 55, 158 n. 4
Horonaim-Eglathshelishia 55
Horonaim, the way of 65 f.
Horonite 158 n. 4
Hosea 23, 194
houses 99
humu 169 n. 8
hw 168
חַל 169 n. 1
Hyksos 105
- Ig/klanu 183
Ijje-haabarim 7 n. 6, n. 8, 118
Imperative 163, 165, 166 ff.
imperfect 26, 27, 162 ff., 166 f.
ina il šamsi ūmi 123 n. 6
incense 201
incense stand 190 n. 7, 200
incisions 202
- infigated *t* 165, 188
infinitive absolute 167
infinitive construct 165, 167
Isaiah 21 n. 3, 22 f., 37, 55, 150
n. 4, 157, 159
Israel passim
Israelite(s) passim
itinerary 6 f.
- Jaazer 113
Jabbok 113, 132
Jacob 112
Jadudeh, cf. Kh. el J.
Jahas 9, 55, 114, 120 f., 191
Jahwe 123 n. 6, 191
Jakinlū 152 n. 7
jakūl 167
Jalūl 88, 96
Jatamā 184
Jāwah 49, 93, 94
Jebel ‘Aṭārus 52, 83
Jebel Shihān 52
Jebel Šiyāghah 53, 90 f.
Jehoiachin 155 n. 4
Jehoiadah 135
Jehoiakim 155
Jehoram 18 ff., 140 f.
Jehoshaphat 19 f.
Jehu 19, 140 n. 1, 144 f.
Jemeil 48
Jephthah 14, 118, 131 n. 4, 132
Jeremiah 24 f., 55, 100
Jericho 92, 121, 127 ff., 139
Jeroboam 137
Jeroboam II 19 f., 87, 147 f.
Jerusalem 23 ff., 29, 51, 79, 155
jkl 167
Joash 136
Joram 144 f.
Jordan 51 f., 59 ff., 113, 115,
121, 125, 127, 131, 134, 137,
146, 149, 154
Jordan Valley 54
Josephus, Fl. 35, 41, 45 n. 2,
157, 178
Joshua 125
Josiah 154
Jotham 148

- iqāl* 167, 188
 Judah passim
 Judaic governors 136

kabāsu, *kabāšu* 181 n. 5
Kalḥu 21 n. 7, 22 n. 2, 36 ff., 46
 n. 1, 149 n. 9, 178 n. 5, 184
kam(as)halta 183
kamāšu, *kamāsu*, *hamāšu* 181
kammuš 38, 39, 181
Kammusunadbi 151, 181 f., 198
Kamoshalta 153
kamušu-šar-ušur 39, 157 n. 6, 183
kanašu 181 n. 5
kaniku 37
kaptāra 164
 Karnak 39
Kaušgabri 182 n. 4
Kedemot 81 f., 119 n. 4
Kerak 33 f., 47, 52, 56, 60, 69 ff.,
 79, 80 n. 4, 96
Kericho 189, 192
Kerijoth 190
 Kh. 'Aqrabah 97
 Kh. 'Aṭarūs 82 f.
 Kh. 'Ayūn Mūsa 33, 90
 Kh. Baḥlūl 47
 Kh. Bākher 47
 Kh. Bālū'ah 30, 33, 60, 73, 75
 n. 3, 96, 159
 Kh. Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh 86
 Kh. Dimne 80 n. 4
 Kh. edh-Dhubāb 63 f., 65
 Kh. el-'Akūzeh 48, 60, 63, 98
 Kh. el-Ḥerī 49, 86
 Kh. el-Hūmeh 84 f.
 Kh. el-Jadudeh 49, 93
 Kh. el-Jemeil 75 f.
 Kh. el-Ḳurējāt 83
 Kh. el-Medeiyineh (on the W.
 el-Ḥesā) 48, 60 ff., 63, 96
 Kh. el-Medeiyineh 48, 72 f., 74
 (on the W. el-Lejjūn)
 Kh. el-Medeiyineh (on the w.
 eth-Themed) 33 f., 48, 85 f.,
 160, 199, 201
 Kh. el-Meidān 68 f.
 Kh. el-Mekhayyet 30, 89, 95 f.
 Kh. en-Neqqāz 69

 Kh. en-Njājir 48, 63, 96
 Kh. er-Rufaisch 49, 88, 93, 94, 96
 Kh. eš-Šech-Dschajil 53, 91
 Kh. eš-Šireh 94
 Kh. et-Teim 87 f., 96
 Kh. et-Teliseh 69
 Kh. Iskander 80 n. 8, 96
 Kh. Khāneq en-Naṣāra 48, 64 ff.
 Kh. Libb 81, 85
 Kh. Miṣ'ar 73, 96
 Kh. Nefa'a 61, 94
 Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch 91, 96, 104
 n. 2
 Kh. Serāreh 96
 Kh. Umm eš-Šedeirah 96, 103
 Kh. Umm Laḥwad 84
 King's Highway 60 ff. 71, 73, 76,
 81 ff., 85, 92, 192
 Kir-hareseth 142
 Kirjataim 107, 113
 Kirjatan 144, 190, 191
 Kirjath-huzoth 123, 193
kms 181

 Lamedh-He roots 175
 Lamedh-He verbs 164 f.
 laurelbushes 58
 Lebanon 41 n. 2
 Lejjun 97
lēlu 174
 Levites 81 n. 6
 Levitical city 81
 life hereafter 193
 Linear B Script 32
 Lisān 50, 61, 64, 68
ll 174
 Lot 6
 Lot, children of 198
 Lot, daughters of 5 f., 178, 179
 Luhith 55
 Luhith, the going up of 66
 LU. MAḤMES 37
 Luxor 40
 Lybians 112 n. 4

mā'ab, *mā'abu*, *mū'ab* 178 ff., 180
 n. 1
 Mādebah 61, 83, 87, 88 f., 96, 144
 Maḥaiy 48, 62, 67, 68, 142

- Maharith 141
 Mahdebah 190, 192
 Ma'in 87, 101
 Malikrammu 151
 Masoretic Text 5, 76
 Matan-ba'al 152 n. 7
mât mât'abaja 46 n. 1
mātu mât'abâ/mât'ab 46
 mater lectionis 27 n. 5, 162 n. 7
 matres lectionis 162, 186, 187
 Medeba 113, 128, 137
 Medeibi^c 48, 67, 68
 Medes 154
 mediae Waw verb 166
 Medinah 103 n. 2
 Medinet er-Râs 48, 64 ff., 68, 98
 „Mediterranean" 53
 Memphis 40
 Menahem 149
 Merneftah 32, 112 n. 4
 Mesha^c 4, 9, 18 n. 3, 30 f., 44, 61,
 64, 78 f., 138 ff., 145 ff., 159,
 161 ff., 166, 182, 189, 196, 199 f.
 Mesopotamia 123
 Messianic era 28
 MHRT 190
m-l-b 40, 178
 Midian 131
 Midianites 122 ff., 131
 Milcom 197
 Mišna 60, 71 f., 73, 96
 Mispeh 134 n. 2
 Mitinti 151
 „mixed" marriages. 13 cf. 132
 Moab passim
 Moabite(s) passim
 Moabitica, false 30 n. 4
môjib 57
 Moongod 181
 Moses 15, 80, 200 n. 5
 mother-goddess 195, 196
 Mount Hermon 51
 Mount Nebo 89
 Mount Peor 91
mu'b 178 n. 8
mušru 184
 Nabataeans 25, 101, 178
 Nabopolassar 154
 Nabû 194 f.
 Nahaliël 52
naḥal mušur 149
 Nahash 133
 Narâm-Sin 32
 narrative form 167
 Nâ'ur 94
 Nebo 52, 190, 194
 Nebuchadressar 23, 25, 29, 35, 41
 n. 2, 155 ff.
 Necho 154
 Negeb 126 n. 2
 Nehemiah 13, 158
 Nergal 197 f.
 netherworld 195, 197
 Nimrûd 36
 nomadic group 102, 107, 122
 nomadic shepherds 102, 108, 113
 nomadic tribes 109, 110
 non-Hebrew 21
 Nophah 113
 n.w. Semitic 188
 Noun 171 ff.
 nouns, formation of 173
 Numerals 176
 object, direct 167
 object, pronominal 167
 Og 120 f.
 old-Aramaic 164
 O.T. passim
 Omri 5 n. 1, 9, 11, 138 f., 189 f.
 Onomasticon 77
 Orpah 185
 orthography 164 ff., 168, 174, 181,
 185 f.
 orthographically 169 f., 177
 ostraca 40, 147
 ostrakon 87 n. 8
 Palestine passim
 Palestine-Syria 193
 Palestine Exploration Fund 29
 papyri 196
 papyrus 37 n. 1, 40
 parchment 37 n. 1
 Pe guttural verbs 163
 Pe-Jodh verbs 163
 Pentateuch 57

- Pentateuch, Samaritan 84
 Pe-Nun verbs 164
 Peor 194
 perfect 26, 27, 161 f., 166, 188
 Persian satrap 158 n. 4
 personal pronoun 168
 Petra 47
 Pe-Waw verbs 162 f., 166
 Pharaoh 112 n. 4, 126, 137
 Philistea 126, 137, 146
 Philistine(s) 134 f., 151
 Phoenician 75, 112 n. 6, 164, 166, 168, 188
 Pisgah 46, 52, 53 n. 1, 85, 90
 plains of Moab 6, 7
 plural ending 176
 plural termination 169 n. 8, 172
 polarity 176
 post-Biblical 88 n. 5, 89
 post-Moabitic 78, 87, 89, 92
 potshards, city of 71
 pottery 2, 34 ff., 70, 75, 77 n. 8, 88, 95, 157, 160, 195
 preformative 162, 163, 166, 176
 pre-Moabite 8
 priests 38, 200
 Primae Aleph verbs 164
 pro-Assyrian 151, 154
 Pronoun 168 ff.
 proper name 161, 177, 182
 pun 80 n. 5
 Qal 161
 Qal'ah 103 n. 2
 Q. Abū el-Kharaq 48, 74
 Q. ez-Za'ferān II 48, 85
 Q. Nāṣer 48, 67, 68
 qaṭl-type 182
 qdmj 105
 Qidri 153
 Qurdi-Aššur 36 f.
 Rabbath-Moab 72
 rainfall 54, 104
 Ramoth-Gilead 144
 Ramses II 40, 112 n. 4
 reciprocal actions 165
 reflexive 165
 relationships 2, 16, 118 ff., 124 f., 130, 193
 religion 161
 Retenu, Upper 40
 Reuben 81, 125, 127, 131 f., 137, 141, 178
 Reubenites 127, 160
 rijjat 175, 186
 road, Roman 60
 route 159
 routes, ancient 60 f.
 route, caravan 103 f.
 R. Abū el-'Azām 47
 R. Abū Sighān 61, 82, 96
 R. 'Alendā 66
 R. 'Aṭārus 83 f.
 R. el-'Aliyā 48
 R. el-Herī 89, 92
 R. el-Māhrī 48, 67, 68
 R. el-Meshrefe 88
 R. el-Qleib 103 n. 3
 R. Umm Suwāna 66
 R. Jā'ez 47
 R. Khushm eṣ-Šireh 48, 68
 R. Meḥbes 68
 R. Mleḥleb 61, 80 n. 8, 82, 96
 R. eṣ-Šireh 67
 runners 97
 Ruth 12, 15, 16, 184
 ruḥj 175
 Šaittenu 123 n. 6
 Sakkara 40
 Salamanu 149 f.
 Šāliyah 34, 48, 74 ff., 201
 salvation 27 n. 2, 180
 Samaria 87 n. 8, 147, 149 n. 9, 154, 158 n. 4
 Samuel 16, 17
 Sanballat 158 n. 4
 Saraph 136
 sarcasm 21
 Sargon II 37 n. 3, 149 n. 9, 150 f.
 Sargon II, Prism A 38
 šarru 151 n. 1
 satire 8
 "Satznamen" 183
 Saul 16 f., 118 n. 1, 126 n. 2, 133 f.
 Sbejbân 74
 scriptio plena 178 n. 3
 Scriptures 27

- se* 168 n. 13
 sea of the plain 46
 Seals, Moabite 31
 Seil el-Kuraḥu 47
 Seil en-Numeirah 55 f., 65
 Seil eš-Šefei 74 f.
 Seil es-Sqeifat 73 n. 4
 Semitic 34, 40, 168, 173
 Semitic language(s) 109, 189
 Sennacherib 151
 Sennacherib, Taylor Prism 38,
 69 n. 3, 151 n. 4, 165 n. 6, 178
 n. 5, 182 n. 4
 Seti I 126
 sexual intercourse 5
 Shabaraim 132 n. 2
 Shalamanu 23
 Shalman 23
 Shalmaneser 23
 Shalmaneser III 139, 145 ff. 146,
 n. 1
 Shalmaneser V 149 n. 9, 150
 Shamash-shum-ukin 152
 Sharon 141
 Shāsu 109, 126
 Sheol 194
 Shihān 114 n. 7
 Shihān stele 52, 114 n. 7
 Shishak 137
 Shittim 116, 123, 194
 Shutu 110
š 168 n. 13
š 168 n. 13
 Sibma 81 n. 6
 sibilant 165 n. 6
 Sihon 6, 7, 8 n. 4, 9, 10, 80 f.,
 113 ff., 116, 120 ff., 132
 Siloam inscription 185
 simple form 161, 166
 Sinuhe 105
 Sion 21 n. 8, 22 f., 27 f., 79, 159
 Sirach 28, 41, 159
 Šret el-Heirān 67
šlm 183
šlmn 183
 Soar 55
 sobriquet 71
sofar 84 n. 5
 Solomon 18, 136 f.
 song, mocking 10, 21 ff., 37, 113 f.,
 120 f., 196
 songs of Balaam 11 ff.
 song of the well 7, 121
 song of victory 8 n. 4, 28
 south-Arabic 196
 SRN 190
 Stele, Bālū'āh 31 f., 107 n. 4, 108,
 110, 159, 196, 200
 Stele, Mesha^c cf. Mesha^c
 Stele, Shihān 52, 114 n. 7
*š*u 168 n. 13
 substratum 188
 suffix 11, 21, 135 n. 3, 167, 169 f.,
 174 n. 5, 182, 186, 191 n. 7
šulman 183 n. 7
 Sumerian-Accadian 176
 sungod 197
 sunworship 71
 surface-survey 1, 29, 43, 148
 sympathy 21
 Syria 1, 36, 41, 105
 Syriac 194
 Syrian-Arabian desert 84, 109
 Syrian-Palestine 112
 Syrian translation 134 n. 4
 Ṭabilaya 36 n. 6
 table-land 53
 Targum 70 n. 4
 tel'et el-Bakar 77
 Teleilat el-Ghassūl 102
 Teleilat Umweis 90
 tell Dibbīn 40
 tell el-'Azeimeh 89 f.
 tell el-Fūl 88
 tell-el-Kefrein 94 f.
 tell el-Ḥammām 94 f.
 tell er-Rameh 93
 tell Iktanū 92, 94
 Tell Nimrīn 43 n. 1
 temple 199 f.
 temple of Chemosh 78 f.
 tertiae Waw-Jodh verbs 162
 Tamar 127
 Thotmes III 32, 39 f.
 תהתפך 165 n. 6
 תהתפך 165 n. 6
 Tiglath Pileser I 112 n. 6

- Tiglath Pileser III 147 n. 1, n. 2,
 149, 149 n. 1, n. 8, n. 9, 183
 Tiglath Pileser III, Nimrud tablet
 36, 149 n. 9, 178 n. 5, 183 n. 6
 Tigris 155
 tomb 88, 193 n. 1
 towers 99, 191
 toys 195 n. 8
t-p-n 39 f.
 Transjordan passim
 trumpets 97
 Tukulti Ninurta I 112 n. 6
 twin-god 197
 Tyre 156

 Ugaritic 163 ff. passim, 174, 176,
 181, 188, 194
 Umm el-‘Amad 49, 91 f., 96
 Umm el-Walid 80 n. 8
 Umm er-Rasas 76
 Umm et-Telaje 69
 unification of Moab 118
‘urfatun 185
urpu, *urpitu* 185
 Ur-Semitic 189
uru 37 n. 2
 Uzziah 147, 147 n. 2, 148

 Valley of Siddim 105
 vase, Moabitic 75
 Verb 161 ff.
 vineyards 91
 viticulture 53
 vowel consonant 186 f.
 Vulgate 134 n. 4

wa‘aba 179
 W. Abū Ḥesheib 84
 W. ‘Ayūn Mūsa 53, 59, 90
 W. Brisa 41 n. 2
 W. Dhibān 77
 W. el-‘Afra 63
 W. el-‘Arisch 149
 W. el-‘Aẓimeh 51, 59, 89 f.
 W. el-Bālūt ‘āh 73
 W. el-Ḥabis 58 f., 92
 W. el-Ḥerī 58, 86, 89
 W. el-Ḥesā 47, 48, 55, 60 ff., 96,
 103, 141 f.
 W. el-Jedeirah 55
 W. el-Kefrein 49, 51, 59, 95, 148
 W. el-Kerak 52, 56
 W. el-Ḳurri 73
 W. el-Lejjun 72
 W. el-Meḥeires 58
 W. el-Meqta‘a 59, 94
 W. el-Môjib 56 f., 59 f., 74, 76,
 103 n. 3, 113 f.
 W. el-Wāla 54, 61, 75, 82
 W. er-Rameh 51, 59, 92
 W. er-Remeil 81
 W. eṣ-Ṣefei 58
 W. eṣ-Ṣultāni 56, 62
 W. eṭ-Ṭaiyibeh 55, 64 f.
 W. eṭ-Ṭerfeh 59
 W. eth-Themed 33, 48, 58, 85, 160
 W. Freiwān 73
 W. Ḥeshbān 49, 59, 92
 W. Jedeirah 73
 W. Nimrīn 49, 51, 55, 59, 113, 115
 W. Saliyeh 74
 W. Salma 91
 W. Umm ‘Arā‘is 66
 W. Zerqa-ma‘in 51 f., 58 f.
wajaba 57
 water 53 ff., 74, 76, 97 f.
 waters of Nimrim 55, 65
 waw compaginis 21
 waw consecutive 27, 165, 167
 wax-tablet 37 n. 1
 „weak verbs” 162 n. 13, 166
 West land 152
 West-Semitic 164, 183

 Xamoos 181
 Zeināb 48
 Zobāyer el-Qaṣṭal 49, 88, 91, 93
 Zedekiah 155 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalders, G. Ch.: *De Geschiedschrijving in het Oude Testament*, Kampen, 1928.
- : *Het Boek Jeremia II*, Kampen, 1925.
- : *Het Boek Daniel*, Kampen, 1928.
- : *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*, London, 1949.
- : *Oud-Testamentische Kanoniek*, Kampen, 1952.
- Abel, F. M.: *Exploration du Sud-est de la Vallée du Jourdain*, R.B. 40, Paris, 1931; 41, Paris, 1932.
- : *Géographie de la Palestine*, Tome I, Paris 1933; Tome II, Paris, 1938.
- Aime-Giron, N.: *Textes Araméens d'Egypte*, Kairo, 1931.
- Albrecht, K.: *Das Geschlecht der hebräischen Hauptwörter*, Z.A.W. 1896, Giessen, 1896.
- Albright, W. F.: *Gilgames and Enkidu, Mesopotamian Genii of Fecundity*, JAOS XLI, 1920.
- : *The Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age*. Annual, American Schools of Oriental Research, vol. VI, New Haven, 1926.
- : *The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-first Century B. C.*, JPOS VIII, Jerusalem 1928.
- : *Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, vol. 51, Philadelphia, 1932.
- : *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, New York, 1932-35.
- : *Basor* 14, Baltimore.
- : *Explorations in Transjordan*, *Basor* 49, Baltimore, 1933.
- : *Soundings at Ader a Bronze age City of Moab*, *Basor* 53, Baltimore 1933.
- : *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. XXV, 1935.
- : *The Egypto-Canaanite Deity Haurôn (Hôrôn)*, AJSL vol. LIII, Chicago, 1936/7.
- : *The Egypto-Canaanite Deity Haurôn*, *Basor* 84, Baltimore, 1941.
- : *Book Reviews*, JBL 61, Philadelphia, 1942.
- : *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, Baltimore, 1942.
- : *A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia*, *Basor* 88, Baltimore, 1942.
- : *Two little understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley*, *Basor* 89, Baltimore, 1943.
- : *Some Notes on the Stele of Ben-Hadad*, *Basor* 90, Baltimore, 1943.
- : *The Oracles of Balaam*, JBL 63, Philadelphia, 1944.
- : *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore, 1946.
- : *Comment on Recently Received Publications*, *Basor* 105, Baltimore, 1947.

- Albright, W. F. : *The Archaeology of Palestine*, London, 1949.
- : *The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat*, Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his seventieth Birthday, English Section, New York, 1950.
- : *The O.T. and the Archaeology of Palestine*, The O.T. and Modern Study, edited by H. H. Rowley, Oxford 1951.
- : *The Son of Tabeel* (Isaiah 7 : 6), *Basor* 140, Baltimore, 1955.
- : *Further Light on the Synchronisms between Egypt and Asia in the Period 935-685 B.C.*, *Basor* 141, Baltimore, 1956.
- : *The High Place in Ancient Palestine*, V.T. Suppl., Leiden, 1957.
- Alt, A. : *Israel und Aegypten*, Leipzig, 1909.
- : *Ein Reich von Lydda*, ZDPV 47, Leipzig, 1924.
- : *Bücherbesprechungen*, ZDPV 59, Leipzig, 1936.
- : *Zum Römischen Straszennetz in der Moabitis*, ZDPV 60, Leipzig, 1937.
- : *Emiter und Moabiter*, PJB 36, Berlin, 1940.
- : *Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina*, *Kleine Schriften I*, München, 1953.
- : *Erwägungen über die Landnahme der Israeliten*, *Kleine Schriften I*, München, 1953.
- : *Tiglath Pileasers III erster Feldzug nach Palästina*, *Kleine Schriften II*, München, 1953.
- : *Hosea 5 : 8-6 : 6*, *Kleine Schriften II*, München 1953.
- : *Das System der Assyrischen Provinzen*, *Kleine Schriften II*, München, 1953.
- Auerbach, E. : *Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch*, I, ZAW 1930, Giessen 1930; II, ZAW 1933, Giessen, 1933.
- : *Wüste und Gelobtes Land I*, Berlin 1936; II, Berlin 1936.
- Baarslag, D. J. : *De Bijbelse Geschiedenis*, I, II, III, Baarn.
- Baentsch, B. : *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*, Göttingen, 1903.
- Baethgen, F. : *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1888.
- : *Die Psalmen*, Göttingen, 1904.
- Bardtke, H. : *Jeremia der Fremdvölkerprophet*, ZAW 1936, Berlin, 1936.
- Barnett, R. D. : *Four Sculptures from Ammān*, A.D.A.J. vol. I, Ammān, 1951.
- Beek, M. A. : *Ein Erdbeben wird zum prophetischen Erleben*, Hrozny-Festschrift, Praag, 1949.
- : *Aan Babylons Stroom*, Amsterdam, 1950.
- : *Inleiding in de Joodse Apocalyptiek van het oud- en nieuw-Testamentisch Tijdvak*, Theologia VI, Haarlem 1950.
- Belot, J. P. : *Vocabulaire Arabe-Français*, Beyrouth, 1951.
- Bennet, W. H. : *Moab, Moabites*, Hastings J. : *A Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. III, Edinburgh, 1900.
- Bentzen, A. : *Introduction to the Old Testament I-II*, Copenhagen, MCMXLVIII.
- Benzinger, I. : *Die Bücher der Könige*, Tübingen, 1899.
- Bergman, A. : *The Israelite Tribe of Half Manasseh*, JPOS XVI, Jerusalem, 1936.

- Bertholet, A.: Das Buch Hesekiel, Freiburg, 1897.
 —: Das Buch Deuteronomium, Tübingen, 1899.
 Bezold, C.: Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar, Heidelberg, 1926.
 Binns, L. E.: The Book of Numbers, London, 1927.
 Birch, W. F.: Pisgah, PEFQ, 1899, London, 1899.
 Blanckenhorn, M.: Das Erdbeben im Juli 1927, ZDPV 50, Leipzig, 1927.
 Bliss, F. J.: Expedition to Moab and Gilead, PEFQ 1895, London, 1895.
 —: Second Report on the Excavations at Tell es-Sâfi, PEFQ, 1899, London, 1899.
 Böhl, F. M. Th.: Kanaanäer und Hebräer, Leipzig, 1911.
 —: Bijbelsch-Kerkelijk Woordenboek, Het Oude Testament, Groningen, den Haag, 1919.
 —: Genesis I, Groningen, 1930.
 —: Palestina in het Licht der jongste opgravingen en onderzoekingen, Amsterdam, 1931.
 —: Het tijdvak der Sargoniden volgens brieven uit het Koninklijk archief te Ninive; Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks, Deel 12, no. 8, Amsterdam, 1949.
 —: Wortspiele im Alten Testament, Opera Minora, Groningen, 1953.
 —: Das Zeitalter Abrahams, Opera Minora, Groningen, 1953.
 —: King Hammurabi of Babylon in the Setting of his Time, Opera Minora, 1953.
 Borée, W.: Die Alten Ortsnamen Palästinas, Leipzig, 1930.
 Breasted, J. H.: Ancient Records of Egypt, II, III, IV, Illinois, 1927.
 Briggs, E. G.: The Book of Psalms, vol. II, Edinburgh, 1907.
 Brockelmann, C.: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, Band I, Berlin 1908.
 —: Arabische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1948.
 Brown, F., Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A.: A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1907.
 Budde, C.: Das Hebräische Klagelied, ZAW 1882, Giessen, 1882.
 Budde, K.: Das Buch der Richter, Tübingen, 1897.
 Buhl, F.: Geschichte der Edomiter, Leipzig, 1893.
 —: Geographie des alten Palästina, 1896.
 —: Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A.T., Leipzig, 1921.
 Burney, C. F.: The Book of Judges, London, 1930.
 Burrows, M.: The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, vol. I. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habbakuk Commentary, New Haven, 1950.
 Canova, R.: Iscrizioni e monumenti proto-cristiani del paese di Moab, Roma, 1954.
 Charles, R. H.: A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Oxford, 1929.
 —: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T., vol. I, Oxford, 1930.

- Cheyne, T. K.: *Moab*, Cheyne, T. K. and Black, J. S.: *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. III, London, MCMII.
- : *The Book of Psalms*, London, 1888.
- Clark, K. W.: *Manuscripts belong to Archaeology*, Basor 122, Baltimore, 1951.
- Clermont-Ganneau: *Les Fraudes archéologiques en Palestine*, Paris, 1885.
- Conder, C. R.: *Heth and Moab*, London, 1883.
- Cook, S. A.: *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, London, 1930.
- : *The Old Testament, a reinterpretation*, London, 1936.
- Cooke, G. A.: *Qorah and Kir-heres in the Moabite Stone*, *The Expository Times*, Edinburgh, 1901/2.
- : *A Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903.
- Cornill, C. H.: *Miszelle*, ZAW 1917/8, Giessen, 1918.
- Cowley, A. E.: *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch*, Oxford, 1910.
- : *The Aramaic Papyri of the fifth Century B. C.*, Oxford, 1923.
- Cross, F. M. and Freedman, D. N.: *Early Hebrew Orthography*. New Haven, Connecticut, 1952.
- Crowfoot, J. W.: *An Expedition to Bālūt'ah*, PEFQ 1934, London, 1934.
- Curtis, E. L. and Madsen, A. A.: *The Books of Chronicles*, Edinburgh, 1910.
- Dalman, G.: *Arbeit und Sitte I*, 2, Gütersloh, 1928.
- : *Arbeit und Sitte V*, Gütersloh, 1937.
- Davidson, B.: *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, London.
- Davis, J. D. and Gehman, H. S.: *The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, Philadelphia, 1944.
- De Groot, Joh.: *I Samuel*, Groningen, 1934.
- Deimel, A.: *Pantheon Babylonicum*, Romae, 1914.
- Delitzsch, F.: *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXVII.
- : *The Psalms*, vol. III, translated from the German by F. Bolten, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXI.
- De Vaux, R.: *La Palestine et la Transjordanie au IIe millénaire*, ZAW 1938, Berlin, 1938.
- : *Notes d'histoire et de topographie Transjordanienues*, *Vivre et Penser I*, Paris 1941.
- : *Une Mosaïque Byzantine à Ma'in (Transjordanie)* R.B. 47, Paris, 1948.
- Dhorme, E.: *Abraham dans le cadre de l'Histoire*, R.B. 40, Paris, 1931.
- Donner, H.: *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Staates Moab in der zweiten Hälfte des 8. Jahrh. v. Chr.*, MIO V, Berlin, 1957.
- Dossin, G.: *Les Archives Epistolaires du Palais de Mari*, Syria XIX, Paris, 1938.
- : *Signaux Luminaux au pays de Mari*, *Revue d'assyriologie*, 35, Paris, 1938.

- Dossin, G.: Une Correction à la ligne 12 de la stèle de Méša, Syria XXVIII, Paris, 1951.
- Dowling, D. E.: Kerak in 1896, PEFQ 1896, London, 1896.
- Drioton, E.: A propos de Stèle du Balou'a, R.B. 42, Paris, 1933.
- Driver, G. R.: Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, Edinburgh, 1936.
- Driver, S. R.: Deuteronomy, Edinburgh, 1902.
- : The Book of Genesis, London, 1905.
- : Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, Oxford, 1913.
- Duhm, B.: Das Buch Jesaja, Göttingen, 1914.
- Duncan, J. G.: Jebel Sawāda: a probable site for mount Nebo, PEFQ 1927, London, 1927.
- Edelkoort, A. H.: Numeri, Groningen, 1930.
- : De Christusverwachting in het Oude Testament, Wageningen, 1941.
- : Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Amsterdam, 1937.
- Eissfeldt, O.: Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Tübingen, 1934.
- : Die Komposition der Bileam-Erzählung. Eine Nachprüfung von Rudolphs Beitrag zur Hexateuchkritik, ZAW 1939, Berlin, 1939.
- Epstein, E.: Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1942.
- Euler, K. F.: Königtum und Götterwelt in die Altaramäischen Nord-syriens, ZAW 1938, Berlin, 1938.
- Ewald, H.: The History of Israel, vol. II, London, 1870.
- : The History of Israel, vol. III, London, 1871.
- : The History of Israel, vol. IV, London, 1871.
- : The History of Israel, vol. V, London, 1874.
- Galling, K.: Biblisches Reallexikon, Tübingen, 1937.
- : Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels, Tübingen, 1950.
- Garstang, J. Joshua Judges, London, 1913.
- Gaster, T. H.: The Chronology of Palestinian Epigraphy, PEFQ 1937, London, 1937.
- Gemser, B.: De Beteekenis der Persoonsnamen voor onze kennis van het leven en denken der oude Babyloniërs en Assyriërs, Wageningen, 1924.
- : Die Psalmen III, Groningen, 1949.
- : Be'ēber Hajjardēn: in Jordan's Borderland, V.T. II, Leiden, 1952.
- : Hebreuse Spraakkuns, Pretoria, 1955.
- Giesebrecht, F.: Das Buch Jeremia, Tübingen, 1907.
- Ginsberg, H. L.: Judah and the Transjordan States from 734 to 582 B.C.E., Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume, English Section, New York, 1950.
- Glueck, N.: The Annual of the American Schools for Oriental Research, XIV, New Haven, 1933.
- : The Annual of the American Schools for Oriental Research, XV, New Haven, 1934.

- Glueck, N.: *The Annual of the American Schools for Oriental Research*, XVIII-XIX, New Haven, 1939.
- : *The River Jordan*, London and Redhill, 1945.
- : *The Other Side of the Jordan*, New Haven, 1945.
- : *Go View the Land*, Basor 122, Baltimore, 1951.
- : *The Annual of the American Schools for Oriental Research*, XXV-XXVIII, Part I and Part II, New Haven, 1951.
- Gordon, C. H.: *Ugaritic Handbook*, Roma, 1947.
- : *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, Ventnor, N.J. 1953.
- Goslinga, C. J.: *Het Boek Josua*, Kampen, 1937.
- : *Het Boek der Richteren II*, *Het Boek Ruth*, Kampen, 1938.
- : *De Boeken van Samuel*, Kampen, 1948.
- : *Het Boek der Richteren I*, Kampen, 1951.
- Gray, B.: *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1952.
- Gray, G. B.: *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. I Edinburgh, 1949.
- Gray, J.: *The Canaanite God Horon*, JNES vol. VIII, Chicago, 1949.
- : *Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice*, V.T. II, Leiden, 1952.
- Gressman, H.: *Altorientalische Texte zum A.T.*, Berlin, 1926.
- Grollenberg, H. en Van Deursen, A.: *Atlas van de Bijbel*, Amsterdam-Brussel, MCMLV.
- Gunkel, H.: *Genesis*, Göttingen, 1902.
- : *Geschichtschreibung im A.T.*, R.G.G. II, Tübingen, 1928.
- : *Die Psalmen*, Göttingen, 1926.
- Gurney, O. R.: *The Hittites*, London, 1952.
- Haag, H.: *La Campagne de Sennachèrib contre Jérusalem en Toi*, R.B. 58, Paris 1951.
- Haller, M.: *Die Fünf Megilloth*, H.A.T. 18, Tübingen, 1940.
- Hammershaimb: *Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Shamra; eine morphologische und syntaktische Untersuchung des Verbums in den alphabetischen Keilschrifttexten aus dem alten Ugarit*, Kopenhagen, 1941.
- Harding, L.: *Some Objects from Transjordan*, PEFQ 1937, London, 1937.
- : *Recent Discoveries in Jordan*, PEFQ 1958, London, 1958.
- Harper, R. F.: *The Code of Hammurabi King of Babylon*, London Chicago, 1904.
- Harris, Z. S.: *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, New Haven, Connecticut, 1939.
- Heinisch, P.: *Das Buch Genesis*, Bonn, 1930.
- : *Das Buch Numeri*, Bonn, 1936.
- Hill, G.: *The Dead Sea*, PEFQ 1900, London, 1900.
- Holzinger, H.: *Genesis*, Tübingen, 1898.
- : *Numeri*, Tübingen, 1903.
- Hommel, F.: *The Ancient Hebrew Ancient Tradition as illustrated by the Monuments*, London/Brighton, 1897.
- : *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1907.
- : *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III, I, 1*, München, MCMXXVI.

- Horsfeld, G. et Vincent, L. H.: Une Stèle Egypto-Moabite au Balou'a, R.B. 41, Paris, 1932.
- Jacob, B.: Das Erste Buch der Tora — Genesis, Schocken Verlag, 1934.
- Jastrow, M. A.: Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, New York, 1950.
- Jean, C. F.: Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest, Leiden, 1954.
- Jenni, E.: Das Wort 'Ölām im A.T., Berlin, 1953.
- Jensen, P.: Die Götter Kemos und Melek und die Erscheinungsformen Kammus und Malik des assyrisch-babylonischen Gottes Nergal, Z.A. XLII, Berlin und Leipzig, 1934.
- Jeremias, A.: The O.T. in the light of the Ancient East I and II, London, New York, 1911.
- Jirku, A.: Der angebliche assyrische Bezirk Gile'ad, ZDPV 51, Leipzig, 1928.
- : Durch Palästina und Syrien, ZDPV 53, Leipzig, 1930.
- : Die Aegyptische Listen Palästinensischer und Syrischer Ortsnamen, Leipzig, 1937.
- : Teileilāt Ghassūl und die Chronologie von Early Minoan I, Biblica 29, Roma, 1948.
- Josephus, Fl.: The Works of Flavius Josephus translated by W. Whiston, New York and Melbourne.
- Kamphausen, A.: Philister und Hebräer zur Zeit David, ZAW 1886, Giessen, 1886.
- Karge, P.: Rephaim, Paderborn, 1925.
- Keil, C. F.: The Prophecies of Jeremiah, vol. I, translated from the German by D. Patrick, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXXIII.
- : The Prophecies of Jeremiah, vol. II, translated from the German by J. Kennedy, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXXIV.
- : The Twelve Minor Prophets vol. I, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXXIV.
- : The Books of the Kings, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXXVII.
- : The Books of Chronicles, translated from the German by A. Harper, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXXVIII.
- Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, F.: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXV.
- : The Books of Samuel, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXII.
- : Commentary on the Pentateuch III, translated from the German by J. Martin, Edinburgh, MDCCCLXXX.
- Kenyon, K.: Digging Up Jericho, London, 1957.
- King, L. W.: Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, XXIV, London, 1908.
- Kittel, R.: Die Bücher der Könige, Göttingen, 1900.
- : Geschichte des Volkes Israel I, Stuttgart, 1932.
- : Geschichte des Volkes Israel II, Gotha, 1925.
- : Biblia Hebraica, Stuttgart, 1937.

- Kittel, R.: Die Bücher der Kronik, Göttingen, 1902.
- Koehler, L.: Die Morgenröte im A.T., ZAW 1926, Giessen, 1926.
- : Hebräische Vokabeln III, ZAW 1940/1, Berlin, 1940/1.
- : Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, Leiden, 1953.
- König, E.: Hebräer und Semiter.
- Koopmans, J.: Bibliotheca Orientalis IX, Leiden, 1952.
- Kraeling, E. G.: The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri, New Haven, 1953.
- Krausz, S.: Städtenamen und Bauwesen, ZAW 1908, Giessen, 1908.
- Krenkel, M.: Das Verwandtschaftswort 'am, ZAW 1888, Giessen, 1888.
- Kritzinger, J. D. W.: Q^hal Jahwe, Kampen, 1957.
- Kroeze, J. H.: Genesis Veertien, Een Exegetisch-historische Studie, Hilversum, 1937.
- Kupper, J.: Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari, Paris, 1957.
- Landersdorfer, M.: Die Bücher der Könige, Bonn, 1927.
- Landes, G. M.: The Fountain at Jazer, Basor 144, Baltimore, 1956.
- Landsberger, B.: Die Eigenbegrifflichkeit der Babylonische Welt, Islamica II, Lipsiae, 1926.
- Lemaire, R. P. P.: Mosaïques et Inscriptions d'el-Mekhayet, R. B. 43, Paris, 1934.
- Leupold, H. D.: Exposition of Genesis, Ohio, 1942.
- Lidzbarski, M.: Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik I, Weimar, 1898.
- : Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik II, Giessen, 1908.
- Luckenbill, D. D.: Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia I, Chicago, 1926.
- : Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia II, Chicago, 1927.
- Luther, B.: Die israelitischen Stämme, ZAW 1901, Giessen, 1901.
- Macalister, R. A. W.: The Craftmen's Guild of the Tribe of Judah, PEFQ 1905, London, 1905.
- Mackenzie, D.: Dibon, The City of King Mesha and the Moabite Stone, PEFQ. 1913, London, 1913.
- Mandelkern, S.: Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Lipsiae, 1896.
- Marti, K.: Das Dodekapropheten, Tübingen, 1904.
- Mazar, B.: The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine, V.T. Suppl. IV, Leiden, 1957.
- Meissner, B.: Babylonien und Assyrien I, Heidelberg, 1920.
- : Könige Babyloniens und Assyriens, Leipzig, 1926.
- Merrill, S.: East of the Jordan, London, 1881.
- Meyer, Ed.: Kritik der Berichte über die Eroberung Palästinas, ZAW 1881, Giessen, 1881.
- : Der Krieg gegen Sihon und die zugehörigen Abschnitte, ZAW 1885, Giessen, 1885.
- Meyer, R.: Probleme der hebräischen Grammatik, ZAW 1951, Berlin, 1951.
- Montgomery, J. A. and Gehman, H. S.: The Books of Kings, Edinburgh, 1951.

- Moore, G. F.: Judges, Edinburgh, 1903.
- Morris, W. D.: 'rj'1, The Expository Times, vol. 40, Edinburgh, 1928/9.
- Morton, Wm. H.: Report of the Director of the School in Jerusalem, Basor 140, Baltimore, 1955.
- Mowinkel, S.: Der Ursprung der Bileamsage, ZAW 1930, Giessen, 1930.
- Mulder, E. S.: Die Teologie van die Jesaja-Apokalipse, Groningen, 1954.
- Murphy, R. E.: A Fragment of an Early Moabite Inscription from Dibon, Basor 125, Baltimore, 1952.
- Musil, A.: Arabia Petraea I, 1907.
- Nestle, E.: Miscellen, ZAW 1896, Giessen, 1896.
- Neufeld, E.: The Hittite Laws. Translated into English and Hebrew with commentary, London, 1951.
- Nöldeke, T.: Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab, Kiel, 1878.
- Noordtzijs, A.: Het Boek der Psalmen, Kampen, 1923.
- : Het Boek Kronieken II, Kampen, 1938.
- : Het Probleem van het Oude Testament, Kampen.
- : Het Boek Numeri, Kampen, 1941.
- Noth, M.: Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, Stuttgart, 1928.
- : Numeri 21 als Glied der „Hexateuch“-erzählung, ZAW 1940/1, Berlin, 1940/1.
- : Israelitische Stämme zwischen Ammon und Moab, ZAW 1944, Berlin, 1944.
- : Beiträge zur Geschichte des Ost-Jordanlandes III, BBLA, Stuttgart, 1949.
- : Geschichte Israels, Berlin 1954.
- Nougayrol, J.: Le Palais royal d'Ugarit III. Textes, Paris, 1955; Planches, Paris, 1955.
- Nowack, W.: Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis, Göttingen, 1900.
- : Kleine Propheten, Göttingen, 1903.
- Oesterley, W. G. E. and Robinson, T. H.: Introduction to the O.T., London, 1934.
- Olmstead, A. T.: History of Assyria, New York, London, 1923.
- : History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest, New York, London, 1939.
- Oppenheim, A. L. and others: The Assyrian Dictionary, vol. 6, Chicago, Glückstadt, 1956.
- Palache, J. L.: Het Karakter van het Oud-Testamentische verhaal, Amsterdam, 1925.
- Palmer, E. H.: The Desert of the Tih and the Country of Moab, PEFQ 1871, London, 1871.
- Pedersen, J.: Israel its Life and Culture I-II, London, 1926.
- Pfeiffer, R. H.: Introduction to the O.T., London, 1953.
- Poebel, A.: Das appositionell Bestimmte Pronomen der 1. Pers. sing. in den westsemitischen Inschriften und im A.T., Chicago, 1932.
- Prätorius, F.: *hlk* und *jlk*, ZAW 1882, Giessen, 1882.

- Pritchard, J. B. and others: *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the O.T.*, Princeton, 1950.
- Procksch, O.: *Die Genesis*, Leipzig, 1924.
- : *Jesaja I*, Leipzig, 1930.
- Rahlf's, A.: *Septuaginta I*, Stuttgart, 1943; *II*, 1943.
- Reed, W. L.: *A Recent Analysis of Grain from Ancient Dibon in Moab*, Basor 146, 1957.
- Reifenberg, A.: *Ancient Hebrew Seals*, London, MCML.
- Ricciotti, G.: *Geschiedenis van Israel I*, uit het Italiaans vertaald door M. Constanza, Turnhout, 1949.
- Richter, G.: *Untersuchungen zu den Geschlechtregistern der Chronik*, ZAW 1914, Giessen 1914.
- Ridderbos, J.: *De Profeet Jesaja I*, Kampen, 1926.
- : *Het Godswoord der Profeten II*, Kampen, 1932.
- : *De Kleine Profeten I*, Kampen, 1952.
- : *De Kleine Profeten II*, Kampen, 1949.
- : *Het Boek Deuteronomium I*, Kampen, 1950.
- Ridderbos, N.: *Het O.T. en de Geschiedenis I*, GTT 57, Kampen, 1957.
- : *Het O.T. en de Geschiedenis II*, GTT 58, Kampen, 1958.
- Robinson, T. H. and Horst, F.: *Die Zwölf Kleinen Profeten*, Tübingen, 1938.
- Robinson, W.: *Record and Revelation*, Oxford, 1938.
- Rosenthal, F.: *Die Aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen*, Leiden, 1939.
- Rostovtzeff, M.: *Caravan Cities*, translated by D. and T. Talbot Rice, Oxford, 1932.
- Rothstein, J. W. and Hänel, J.: *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, Leipzig, 1927.
- Rowley, H. H.: *The Rediscovery of the O.T.*, London, 1945.
- : *From Joseph to Joshua*, The Schweich Lectures 1948, London, 1951.
- : *Bibliotheca Orientalis XI*, Leiden, 1952.
- Rudolph, W.: *Zum Text des Buches Numeri*, ZAW 1934, Giessen, 1934.
- : *Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua*, BZAW 68, Berlin, 1938.
- : *Jeremia*, Tübingen, 1947.
- : *Esra und Nehemia*, Tübingen, 1949.
- : *Chronikbücher*, Tübingen, 1949.
- Ryckmans, G.: *Het oude Arabië en de Bijbel*, JEOL 14, Leiden, 1955-1956.
- Saggs, H. W. F.: *The Nimrud-Letters. Part II, Relations with the West. Iraq 17*, 1955.
- Saller, S. J. and Bagatti, B.: *The Town of Nebo (Khirbet el-Mekhayyet) with a brief survey of other ancient Christian Monuments in Transjordan*, Jerusalem, 1949.
- Šanda, A.: *Die Bücher der Könige, I*, Münster, 1911; *II*, 1912.
- Savignac, M. R.: *Sur les pistes de Transjordanie Meridionale*, R.B. 45, Paris, 1936.
- Schick, C.: *Bericht über eine Reise nach Moab*, ZDPV 2, Leipzig, 1879.
- Schmidt: *The River Arnon*, JBL, 1903, Philadelphia, 1903.

- Schmölkel: Der Gott Dagon, Ursprung, Verbreitung und Wesen seines Kultes, Heidelberg, 1928.
- : Ur, Assur en Babylon. Drie Millenia in het Tweestromenland. Vertaald en van aantekeningen voorzien door Dr. F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl, Amsterdam, 1951.
- Schrader, E. and others.: Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, I, Berlin, 1889; II, Berlin, 1890.
- Schrader, E.: Die Keilinschriften und das A.T., dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern und H. Winckler, Berlin, 1903.
- Schroeder, F. W. J.: Das erste Buch Mose, Berlin, 1944.
- Schultze: Ein neuer Meilenstein und die Lage von Jazer, PJB 28, Berlin, 1932.
- Schwally, F.: Die Reden des Buches Jeremia gegen die Heiden, ZAW 1888, Giessen, 1888.
- : Über einige palästinische Völkernamen, ZAW 1898, Giessen, 1898.
- Sellin, E.: Geschichte des Israelitisch-Jüdischen Volkes, Leipzig, 1924.
- : Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Leipzig, 1925.
- : Das Zwölfprophetenbuch II, Leipzig, 1930.
- : Israelitisch Jüdische Religionsgeschichte, Leipzig, 1933.
- : Theologie des Alten Testaments, Leipzig, 1936.
- Simons, J.: Opgravingen in Palestina, Roermond-Maaseik, 1935.
- : Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists relating to Western Asia, Leiden, 1937.
- Skinner, J.: Genesis, Edinburgh, 1910.
- Smend, R.: Anmerkungen zu Jes. 24-27, ZAW 1884, Giessen, 1844.
- Smit, G.: Ruth, Ester en Klaagliederen, Groningen, 1930.
- Smith, G. A.: Heshbon, Cheyne T.K. and Black, J. S.: E.B. III, London, MCMII.
- : The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, Twentieth Edition, London, New York, Toronto.
- Smith, H. P.: The Books of Samuel, Edinburgh, 1912.
- Stade, B.: Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik, Leipzig, 1879.
- : Wo entstanden die genealogischen Sagen über der Hebräer? ZAW 1881, Giessen, 1881.
- : Nachwort des Herausgebers zu Meyer, Die Berichte über die Eroberung Palaestinas, ZAW, 1881, Giessen, 1881.
- Steuernagel, C.: Das Deuteronomium und das Buch Josua, Göttingen, 1923.
- : Der 'Adslun, ZDPV 48, Leipzig, 1925.
- Stevenson, W. B.: Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, Oxford, 1924.
- Streck, M.: Assurbânipal und seine Nachfolger, VAB VII, vol. I, II, III, Leipzig, 1926.
- Tadmor, H.: The Correct Rendering of Akkadian *dāku*, JNES XVII, Chicago, 1958.
- Tallquist, K.: Akkadische Götterepitheta, Helsinki, 1938.
- Thatcher, G. W.: Arabic Grammar of the written Language, London, 1942.

- Thiersch, H.: Diban, ZDPV 37, Leipzig, 1914.
- Thomsen, P.: Bericht über Geographie und Topographie des Alten Palästina, ZDPV 37, Leipzig, 1914.
- : Bibliotheca Orientalis VIII, Leiden, 1951.
- Torczyner, H.: Presidential Address, JPOS 16, Jerusalem, 1936.
- : The Lachisch Letters, London, 1938.
- Tristram, H.: The Land of Moab, New York, 1873.
- Tufnell, Iraq XV, 1953.
- Tushingham, A. D.: Excavations at Dibon in Moab, 1952-1953, Basor 133, Baltimore, 1954.
- Van der Leeuw, G.: De Godsdiensten der Wereld I, Amsterdam, 1948.
- Van Deursen, A.: Palestina het Land van den Bijbel, Baarn, Tweede druk.
- Van Gelderen, C.: Het Boek Amos, Kampen, 1933.
- : Bijbelsch Handboek, het Oude Testament, Kampen, 1935.
- : Het Boek der Koningen, II, Kampen, 1936.
- Van Gelderen, C. en Gispén, W. H.: Hosea, 1953.
- Van Selms, A.: Ezra en Nehemia, Groningen, 1935.
- : Kronieken I, Groningen, 1939.
- : Kronieken II, Groningen, 1947.
- : Veelheid van Name by Judese Konings, HTS, 1951, Pretoria, 1951.
- : Die Stad in die Israelitiese Voorstellingslewe, HTS 1952, Pretoria, 1952.
- : Die „Gemengde Huwelik“ in die O.T., HTS 1953, Pretoria, 1953.
- : Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature, London, 1954.
- : The Canaanites in the Book of Genesis, OTS XII, Leiden, 1958.
- Van Zyl, A. H.: Die Vestigingsgeskiedenis van die Stamme buite die beloofde land, HTS 1959, Pretoria, 1959.
- Verhoef, P. A.: Die Vraagstuk van die Onvoltooide Voorsegginge in verband met Jesaja 1-39, Amsterdam, 1950.
- Vogt, E.: „Filius Tāb'el (Is. 7, 6), Biblica 37, Roma, 1956.
- Vollers, K.: Der Name Moab, Z.A. 21, Strassburg, 1908.
- Volz, P.: Die Biblischen Altertümer, Stuttgart, 1925.
- : Der Prophet Jeremia, Leipzig, 1928.
- Von Rad, G.: Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel, Zürich, 1951.
- Von Soden, W.: Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik, Roma, 1952.
- Vriezen, Th. C.: Oud-Israëlitische Geschriften, Den Haag, 1948.
- : Hoofdpijnen der Theologie van het O.T., Wageningen, 1949.
- : Bibliotheca Orientalis VIII, Leiden, 1951.
- Vriezen, Th. C. en Hospers, J. H.: Palestine Inscriptions, Leiden, 1951.
- Wade, G. W.: The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, London, 1929.
- Wainwright, G. A.: Caphtor-Cappadocia, VT VI, Leiden, 1956.
- Warren, C.: Expedition to the East of the Jordan PEFQ 1869, London, 1869.
- Waterman, L.: Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire, vol. I, Michigan, 1930; vol. II, 1931.
- Weidner: Šilkan(he)ni, König von Mušri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II, AfO XIV, 1941-1944, Berlin-Graz.

- Weiser, A.: *Die Profetie des Amos*, Giessen, 1929.
—: *Einleitung in das A.T.*, Göttingen, 1949.
Weiss, P. F. D.: *Die Teofore Geografiese name van die O.T.*, Kaapstad, Pretoria, 1952.
Wellhausen, J.: *Moab*, Cheyne, T.K. and Black, J.S.: E.B. III, London, MCMII.
—: *The Composition of the Hexateuch*.
Wildeboer, G.: *Het Oude Testament*, Groningen, 1908.
Wilson, C.: *Address Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Fund*, PEFQ 1899, London, 1899.
Winnett, F. G.: *Excavations at Dibon, 1950-1951*, Basor 125, Baltimore 1952.
Wright, G. E. and Filson, F. V.: *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*, Philadelphia, 1945.
Würthwein, E.: *Der Text des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart, 1952.

1. Kh. el-Medeiyyineh.
2. Maḥaiy.
3. Kh. el-‘Akûzeh.
4. Kh. en-Njājir.
5. Kh. edh-Dhubāb.
6. Kh. Khāneq en-Naṣārā.
7. Kh. Medtnet er-Rās.
8. R. Umm Suwāna.
9. R. ‘Alendā.
10. Medeibt’.
11. R. eṣ-Ṣireh.
12. Q. Nāṣer.
13. R. el-Mārī.
14. R. Khushm eṣ-Ṣireh.
15. Kh. el-Meidān.
16. Kh. et-Tellsah.
17. el-Kerak.
18. el-Miṣna.
19. el-Medeiyyineh.
20. Kh. Bālū‘ah.
21. Kh. Miṣ‘ar.
22. Q. Abū el-Kharaq.
23. Q. el-‘Āl.
24. es-Sāliyyeh.
25. Kh. el-Jemeil.
26. ‘Arā‘ir.
27. Dhībān.
28. ‘Aleiyān.
29. er-Remeil.
30. ‘Aliyā.
31. el-Kōm.
32. R. Abū Sighān.
33. R. Mleḥleb.
34. Kh. el-Ḳurējāt.
35. Kh. ‘Aṭārūs.
- 35a. R. ‘Aṭārūs.
36. Kh. Umm Laḥwad.
37. Kh. el-Hūmeh.
38. Kh. el-Libb.
39. Q. ez-Za‘ferān.
40. Kh. el-Medeiyyineh.
41. Kh. el-Heṛī.
42. Kh. ed-Deleilat esh-Sherqīyeh.
43. Ma‘īn.
44. Kh. et-Teim.
45. R. el-Meshrefe.
46. Mādebā.
- 46a. Ḳirjātajim.
47. Jalūl.
48. Zobāyer el-Qaṣṭal.
49. Kh. el-Mekhayyet.
50. R. el-Heṛī.
51. Tell el-‘Azeimeh.
52. Teleilat Umweis.
53. Kh. ‘Ayūn Mūsa.
54. Kh. Qurn el-Kibsch.
55. Kh. esh-Shech Dschāyil.
56. Umm el-‘Amad.
57. Heṣbān.
58. Tell Iktanū.
59. el-‘Āl.
60. Kh. er-Rufaiseh.
61. Kh. el-Jadudeh.
62. Jāwah.
63. Tell el-Ḥammām.
64. Tell el-Kefrein.

E d o m

IJJĖ-HĀ^aBĀRİM?

ER RUWEIHAN





"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

S. B. 148: N. DELHI.