

Questions about Monotheism in Ancient Israel: Between Archaeology and Texts

Elizabeth Bloch-Smith

Abstract

Archaeologists offer different perspectives and new and multiple types of evidence to the discussion of emerging monotheism in late eighth to sixth century B.C.E. Israel. Two examples exemplify how archaeology clarifies the historical context in which texts were produced and received, and demonstrates the religious practices of the period. The first example considers the effects of the later eighth century Assyrian campaigns on centralization of the cult in Jerusalem and in prophetic exhortations. In the second example, excavation of the royal Judahite fort of Arad situated on the nation's southern border revealed religious worship at a temple in a military outpost including animal sacrifice and the veneration of massebot ("standing stones"). These two archaeological studies contribute to our understanding of emerging monotheism both in practice and as depicted in biblical texts.

Keywords: Sennacherib, Arad, monotheism, archaeology, Bible

Archaeologists offer different perspectives and new and multiple types of evidence to the discussion of emerging monotheism in late eighth to sixth century B.C.E. Israel.¹⁾ Two examples exemplify how archaeology clarifies the historical context in which texts were produced and received, and demonstrates religious practices of the period. The first example considers the effects of the later eighth century Assyrian campaigns on centralization of the cult in Jerusalem and prophetic exhortations. In the second example, excavation of the royal Judahite fort of Arad situated on the nation's southern border revealed religious worship at a temple in a military outpost including animal sacrifice and the veneration of massebot ("standing stones"). These two archaeological studies contribute to our understanding of emerging monotheism both in practice and as depicted in biblical texts.

Assyrian Campaigns and the Centralization of the Israelite Cult

During an approximately thirteen year period in the later eighth century, Assyrian campaigns led by Tiglath-Pileser III, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon II devastated cities and towns

of Israel, Philistia, and Judah. As claimed by Tiglath-Pileser III in his Summary Inscription 13, “[the land of Bit Humria,] all [of whose] cities I leveled [to the ground] in my former campaigns, [...] I plundered its livestock, and I spared only (isolated) Samaria.”²⁾ However, archaeology demonstrates that not all settlements suffered the same fate. The Assyrian army traversed the major highways attacking strategic and administrative sites situated along these roads. Some sites the army utterly devastated while others suffered the destruction of their city gate and nearby walls, occasionally also palaces, and storehouses. Compromising the city’s fortification perhaps sufficed for the population to concede defeat, or, it may have marked with humiliation a city that surrendered. Sites to be utilized as administrative centers, such as Megiddo and Samaria, suffered little, if any, destruction. This evidence reveals Assyrian claims of widespread devastation to be an exaggerated boast but also demonstrates the extent of Assyrian destruction and the seemingly miraculous salvation of Jerusalem.³⁾

A more detailed look at the evidence begins with the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser III. According to biblical and Assyrian texts, in the initial foray into the area in 734 B.C.E., the so-called “Syro-Ephraimite War,” Tiglath-Pileser III proceeded along the coast as far south as Gaza, destroying Philistine and Judahite strategic sites along the way (Summary 8).⁴⁾ Assyria next subjugated the territory of Samaria and north, “all the cities of Bit-Humria except Samaria” (Annal 18). 2 Kings 15:29 lists towns in Upper Galilee and Assyrian Annals 18 and 24 add towns in Lower Galilee.⁵⁾ With the conquered territory reconfigured into Assyrian provinces, Israel was reduced to a rump state centered on Samaria. Partial and complete destruction levels attributed to Tiglath-Pileser III throughout the territory of Israel include along the coast (Acco, Shiqmona, Dor, Tell el-Qudadi, Ashkelon) and through the north (Dan, Hazor, Chinnereth/Tel Kinerot/Tell el-Oreimeh, Beth-Shean, Tel Rehov, Geshur/ Bethsaida, En Gev, Chinnereth). The Assyrians devastated Hazor but only selectively damaged the sites of Dan, Chinnereth, and Beth Shean. Not every settlement burned or was abandoned. Villages continued through the end of the Iron Age (Tel Par, Rosh Ha’Ayin, Horbat Eli, Nahal Barqai), though in some cases with a reduced, impoverished population (Yoqneam).⁶⁾

Approximately twelve years later, the Assyrian Kings Shalmaneser V and Sargon II laid siege to and conquered Samaria in 722-21 B.C.E. completing the transformation of the independent kingdom of Israel into Assyrian provinces. The Bible (2 Kgs 17:5-6; 18:9-11), the Assyrian Great “Summary” Inscription, and the Nimrud Prism all recount the events.⁷⁾ Archaeology demonstrates that the Assyrians destroyed select, prominent, Israelite heartland towns (Dothan, Shechem, Tell el-Far’ah (N)) but spared the capital city of Samaria for use as an administrative center.⁸⁾

In addition to Samaria, Sargon II claims to have vanquished cities as far south as Philistine Gaza, and boastfully refers to himself as “subduer of the land of Judah which is far away.”⁹⁾ Archaeology attests to no destruction of Philistine towns though Sargon II claims to have conquered cities as far south as Gaza and battled at Raphia as recorded in the “Great ‘Summary’

Inscription” and the Annals 53-57, as depicted on palace wall reliefs, and as marked with a memorial stele at Ashdod.¹⁰⁾

While details vary, both the Assyrian and biblical sources mention Sennacherib’s 701 B.C.E. campaign and siege of Jerusalem during the reign of King Hezekiah. The Bible acknowledges that “King Sennacherib of Assyria marched against all the fortified towns of Judah and seized them” (2 Kgs 18:13; Isa 36:1) while Sennacherib boasts “I besieged 46 of his fortified walled cities and surrounding smaller towns, which were without number” and deported over 200,150 persons.¹¹⁾ Both biblical and Assyrian sources mention a ransom paid to spare Jerusalem, with Hezekiah minimizing the payment (2 Kgs 18:14-16) and Sennacherib elaborating and detailing the range of items and individuals comprising the payment.¹²⁾ The salient fact is that numerous fortified towns and cities fell to the Assyrians but Jerusalem emerged unscathed.

Attribution of destruction levels to Sennacherib rests on pottery correlations, *lmlk* stamps, and Sennacherib’s iconographic record of the conquest of Lachish. Sennacherib depicted the gruesome conquest of Lachish in 701 B.C.E. on stone carved reliefs lining his Nineveh palace walls. This royal portrayal of the battle enabled the Lachish excavators to date pottery in the destruction level to the very end of the eighth century and then through pottery correlations with other sites to attribute other destructions to Sennacherib as well. Scholars consider the storejar handles stamped with *lmlk*, “belonging to the king,” retrieved from the Lachish destruction debris and many other sites in Judah, to be an administrative mechanism initiated by Hezekiah to amass supplies in anticipation of his rebellion against Assyria.¹³⁾

Sennacherib secured lowland, Shephelah, and northern Negev sites at road junctions to encircle the highlands and isolate Jerusalem (Beit Mirsim, Batash, Beth Shemesh, Aitun/‘Eton). Excavation and survey throughout the region demonstrate disruption and abandonment but not wide-spread destruction. Though not the case, both Assyria and Judah foster the impression of extensive devastation, for the Assyrians in order to enhance their military prowess and for the Judahites to celebrate the miraculous, divine deliverance of Jerusalem. Sennacherib’s campaign, while not as devastating as described, targeted Shephelah forts, which had the effect of isolating Jerusalem, precluding Egyptian military assistance, and disrupting east-west commerce. Comparable to earlier campaigns, some cities were selectively destroyed with only the city gate, nearby buildings, and public buildings targeted while other, like Lachish, were laid waste. Some sites, including fortified towns in the hills north of Jerusalem, continued without disruption.¹⁴⁾ Farmsteads, situated off the major routes, also escaped Assyrian assault. No eighth to seventh century farmstead from Samaria in the north to Hebron in the south evidenced destruction, though the Shephelah suffered wide-spread abandonment. During the protracted sieges and battles, Assyrian soldiers likely availed themselves of food and supplies from farmsteads throughout the region but the rural population survived the military campaigns.¹⁵⁾

Reviewing the archaeological evidence illustrates the extent and magnitude of Assyrian

devastation, providing a backdrop for late eighth and early seventh century royal policies and prophetic activity. The Assyrians did not utterly ravage the country; they traversed major roads destroying forts and administrative centers. Except to attack the capital cities of Samaria and Jerusalem and proximate prominent towns, Assyrian armies refrained from entering the highlands. Villages, hamlets and farmsteads were not targeted, though some settlers, especially in the Shephelah, abandoned their homes at Sennacherib's campaign.

What was the import of these devastating campaigns? The combined destructions, loss of independence for the northern kingdom, and seemingly miraculous salvation of Jerusalem provided a major impetus for Yahwistic cultic centralization in Jerusalem. Punishment perpetrated by the Assyrians for northern Israelites' alleged infidelity to Yahweh's covenant justified the cultic reforms. Jerusalem's salvation, along with the destruction of most other cultic and administrative centers, confirmed her status as Yahweh's chosen city with Hezekiah as the divinely-ordained terrestrial ruler. Centralizing the cult with its resources in Jerusalem also facilitated royal provisioning in preparation for a revolt against Assyria. The cumulative Assyrian campaigns culminating in 701 B.C.E. fostered Hezekiah's initiative to centralize the cult in Jerusalem. These devastating campaigns also added urgency to the eighth century prophetic pleas, such as those of Isaiah and Hosea, for Israelites to reform their ways lest Yahweh subject them to Assyria as punishment (Isaiah 8:5-8a; Hosea 9:3). In this example, archaeological evidence vividly illustrates the context for Hezekiah's religious reforms and the prophets' pleas for Israelite adherence to the covenant.

The Arad Temple and Massebot ("Standing Stones") in the Yahwistic Cult

The royal fortress at the site of Arad on Judah's southern border incorporated a temple dated by the excavators from the late tenth through the seventh century (see below for further discussion of the dates).¹⁶⁾ A royally sponsored border temple for Yahweh focused on a massebah ("standing stone") raises questions regarding royal centralization of worship in Jerusalem, representations of Yahweh, and the diversity of beliefs and practices in pre-exilic Israel. We begin with the archaeological evidence from Arad and then turn to the broader issue of standing stones in Yahweh's cult. As in the previous example, archaeological evidence provides both the historical context for understanding the biblical text and examples of Israelite cultic features, in this case a temple and massebot.

One entered the temple from the east into a large courtyard (12.0 x 7.5 m) with an auxiliary room along the northern side. Within this courtyard stood an altar fashioned of unhewn stones in mud mortar (2.40 x 2.20 x 1.5 m high). In the vicinity of the altar lay an incense burner, a large lamp, three Judean Pillar Figurine fragments, and a small bronze figurine of a crouching lion, probably a Mesopotamian weight.¹⁷⁾ One crossed the courtyard to enter a narrow broad room (10.5 x 2.9 m) with benches along the western and southern walls. In the center of the

rear wall of this room, along the central axis of the temple, steps led up into a recessed niche (1.80 x 1.10 m). Within the niche stood an arched limestone stele considered a *massebah*, standing .90 m high, with a flat face, rounded back and sides, and remnants of red paint adhering to one side. Two additional stones, both characteristically shaped but smaller and composed of flint, had been plastered into the niche walls. While all three perhaps functioned as *massebot*, it is equally plausible that one or two of the flint stones were constructional stones with no cultic significance. Two carved stone incense altars with burnt organic remains on top, measuring .50 m and .30 m high, originally flanked the niche entrance.¹⁸⁾ The two incense altars permit, though in no way prove, the likelihood that two stones stood in the niche.

Archaeologists fail to agree on dates for the temple's construction and demise. The disagreement results from collapse of part of the structure into an underlying water system and problematic pottery assemblages from the temple proper and the strata immediately preceding and succeeding it. While the excavator argued for a two stage decommissioning by Kings Hezekiah and Josiah in accordance with their cultic reforms (2 Kgs 18, 23), other archaeologists proposed either a single decommissioning or destruction in conjunction with the rest of the fort. All that can be argued with conviction is that the temple existed for an indeterminate period beginning perhaps as early as the tenth or ninth century and lasting perhaps as late as the early sixth century.¹⁹⁾ All agree that during the second half of the eighth century a royal shrine functioned with at least one and likely two *massebot* standing in the niche.

The Arad *massebot*, erected in the architectural equivalent of the Jerusalem temple holy-of-holies, demonstrate that the Jerusalem kings sponsored a temple where Israelites venerated *massebot*. Military correspondence found in the fort confirms the identity of the deity manifest in the large *massebah* as Yahweh, the sole deity invoked in the correspondence ("A blessing to Yahweh for you" (#16), "May Yahweh seek your welfare" (#18), and "I have blessed you to Yahweh" (#21)). Theophoric names with the elements El (Elyashib, Elisha) or Yahu/Yehu (Hananyahu, Ge'alyahu, Azaryahu, Eshyahu, Shemaryahu, Yehukal, Malkiyahu, Yermiyahu, Nehemyahu) also attest to the kingdom's patron deity manifest in the temple niche.²⁰⁾

If a second *massebah* stood in the niche, Yahweh may not have been alone. Based on the two incense stands and four Judean Pillar Figurines found in the temple, and A/asherah's association with Yahweh including in his Jerusalem temple (2 Kgs 23:6), the second, smaller *massebah* likely stood for A/asherah.

Whatever its precise dates, the Arad temple significantly impacts discussions of Israelite religion. A sanctuary outside of Jerusalem, built and maintained by the royal court, challenges the Deuteronomistic ideal of a centralized cult with a single legitimate site at which to offer sacrifices to Yahweh. Furthermore, the *massebah* in the focal niche joins the cherubs in Jerusalem and calves in the Dan and Bethel temples (1 Kgs 12: 28-30) as marking Yahweh's presence. Perhaps this *massebah* functioned like the one invoked in Isaiah's oracle, to represent Yahweh establishing and guarding the southern border of his territory and his people (Isa

19:19-20). While the temple may have been dismantled as part of a religious reform, its very existence as a royally-sponsored temple and site for sacrifices, the fact that it isn't mentioned in the Bible, and the venerated/worshipped massebot challenge the biblical narrative.

Given the difficulties in dating biblical passages, the following understanding of massebot in the Yahwistic cult suggests the evolution of one practice representative of broader developments. From the Middle Bronze Age and into the Iron Age, Israelites and their predecessors and neighbors erected massebot in various contexts east and west of the Jordan River, in shrines or temples (Umayri, Shechem, Bull Site, Hazor, Atarot, Arad), public space such as the city gateway (Dan, Bethsaida), a domestic, outdoor courtyard (Rehov), and a street/path (Lachish).²¹⁾ Throughout the region, erecting massebot appears to have greatly diminished by the late eighth century (based on a paltry sample of less than 15 good examples from the twelfth through the eighth century).

Biblical texts mention massebot, both acceptable Yahwistic examples and objectionable stones to other gods, in the Jacob stories (Gen 28:16-18; 31:45, 51-2), Hosea (3:4; 10:1-2), Micah (5:12), Isaiah (19:19-20), Israelite law codes (Exod 23: 24; Deut 12: 2-3; 16: 21-22), and the Deuteronomistic History (2 Kgs 3:2; 18:4; 23:13-14). Sanctioned biblical massebot served multiple functions. As markers of divinity, sanctioned massebot marked divine presence either in a theophany or as an unseen eternal witness — Yahweh, Elohim, and ancestral gods (Gen 28:11-18; 31:44-53; 35:13-15). Massebot also staked divine proprietary claim to land, functioning as a form of divine homestead and boundary stone (Gen 31:52; Isa 19:19-20). A stone also served as a shrine or divine residence, as Jacob proclaimed, "This is none other than the abode of God" (Gen 28:17). In a non-explicitly divine capacity, massebot memorialized the twelve tribes at Sinai (Exod 24:4b) and prominent individuals including Rachel and King David's son Absalom (Gen 35:20; 2 Sam 18:18).

By the second half of the eighth century, the prophets Isaiah and Micah, both from Judah and prophesying during the reign of King Hezekiah, differed in opinion regarding massebot. Isaiah accepted Yahwistic massebot as a divine witness (Isa 19:19-20); Micah opposed them as objects of worship (Mic 5:12). If this Micah passage dates to the later eighth century, then it constituted an early condemnation of Yahwistic massebot — though Yahweh is presumed but not explicitly identified.

The seventh to sixth century Deuteronomistic Historian condemned massebot as stones associated with foreign gods or erected by Israelites in imitation of indigenous rituals (2 Kgs 10: 26-27; 17: 9-11; 23: 13-14). Several factors suggest that the attacks were polemical and the references likely secondary and late. Standing stones occur in association with the fixed phrase "on every lofty hill and under every leafy tree" (1 Kgs 14: 23; 2 Kgs 17: 10) and they figure in Hezekiah and Josiah's cultic reforms but no king, except Rehoboam, explicitly erects them (1 Kgs 14: 23; 2 Kgs 18: 4; 23: 13-14). Their denigration as a practice of the dispossessed nations conveniently ignores Jacob and Moses.

However, even as the Deuteronomistic Historian denounced massebot to foreign gods, select, possibly time-honored Yahwistic stones were sanctioned by referring to them not as a massebah but as a “stone/’eben.” Sanctioned stones represented Yahweh and the twelve tribes: Joshua’s twelve “stones” at the Jordan River (Josh 4: 4-9), the stone erected at Shechem to witness Yahweh’s covenant with the people (Josh 24: 25-27), and King Saul’s “stone of help” marking Yahweh’s presence at the territorial boundary (1 Sam 7: 12). This evasive maneuver protected revered Yahwistic standing stones by referring to them by another name.

The Arad temple and massebot further our understanding of the evolving practices and beliefs of the eighth through the sixth century Yahwistic cult. Jerusalem royalty sanctioned and sponsored a second temple located on Judah’s southern border. Comparable to Jeroboam’s temples at Dan and Bethel on Israel’s northern and southern borders, the Jerusalem and Arad temples marked Judah’s northern and southern borders. The one or two stones in the focal niche, the holy-of-holies counterpart, stood for the patron deity of the kingdom, Yahweh, and perhaps Asherah the goddess or her powers as a subsumed aspect of the god.²²⁾ Among the contemporary prophets, Isaiah similarly sanctioned the custom while Micah railed against it. Even though the Deuteronomistic Historian disparaged the tradition, a new designation applied to select stones rendered them acceptable.

Conclusions

Archaeology, as an independent witness to ancient Israel, enables reconstructing the historical context for the production of Bible texts and in which they are to be understood. The devastating Assyrian campaigns formed the backdrop for Hezekiah’s reforms and prophetic oracles. In the Tel Arad example, archaeology supplies material correlates for Israelite features such as massebot and a temple (not mentioned in the Bible) and the actual features and practices to which biblical authors and editors were responding. As the two case studies demonstrate, studying the physical remains together with the literary record provides insight into actual practices of the late eighth through the sixth centuries, the historical circumstances that shaped those actions, and the evolution of Yahwistic cultic practices through the last centuries of the Davidic kingdom.

Notes

- 1) All dates cited are B.C.E.
- 2) L. Younger, “Tiglath-pileser III” in W. Hallo ed. *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill, 2000, pg. 292.
- 3) Further details published in Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, “Assyrians Abet Israelite Cultic Reforms: Sennacherib and the Centralization of the Israelite Cult” in J. David Schloen

- ed. *Exploring the Longue Durée: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009, pp. 35-44.
- 4) H. Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introduction, Translations and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994, pp. 176-79.
 - 5) Younger, "Tiglath-pileser III" pp. 286, 288, 291, 292; Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III* pp. 81-83, 201-03.
 - 6) Z. Gal, "Tel Par" *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 15 (1995) 33; H. Hizmi, "Horbat 'Eli" *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 18 (1998) 51-52*, 74-75 (Hebrew); R. Avner-Levy and H. Torge, "Rosh Ha-'Ayin" *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 19 (1999) 40*, 58-59; S. Givon, "Nahal Barqai" *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 15 (1995) 88-90; "Nahal Barqai 1996-1997" *Hadashot Arkheologiyot* 110 (1999) *55-56, 73-74 (Hebrew); A. Ben-Tor, "Jokneam" in E. Stern ed. *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993, pg. 807.
 - 7) L. Younger, "Sargon II" in W. Hallo ed. *Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill, 2000, pp. 296, 297.
 - 8) R. Tappy, *The Archaeology of Israelite Samaria*. Vol. 2, *The Eighth Century B.C.E.* HSS 50. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2001, pp. 222-26, 572-75.
 - 9) Younger, "Sargon II" pp. 296-98.
 - 10) H. Tadmor, "Fragments of an Assyrian Stele of Sargon II" in M. Dothan ed. *Ashdod*, vols. 2-3, *The Second and Third Seasons of Excavations, 1963, 1965, Soundings in 1967, Atiqot* English Series 9-10. Jerusalem: Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums, 1971, pp. 192-97.
 - 11) M. Cogan, "Siege of Jerusalem" in W. Hallo ed. *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill, 2000, pg. 303.
 - 12) Ibid.
 - 13) N. Na'aman, "Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah and the Date of the LMLK Stamps" *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979) 61-86; http://www.lmlk.com/research/lmlk_corp.htm.
 - 14) A. Mazar, "Three Israelite Sites in the Hills of Judah and Ephraim" *Biblical Archaeologist* 45 (1982) 174-176.
 - 15) Some rural dwellers may have been relocated by the Judahite royal administration (B. Halpern, "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century B.C.E.: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability" in B. Halpern and D. Hobson eds. *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, 11-107. JSOTSupp 124. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1991, pg. 27).
 - 16) Y. Aharoni, "Excavations at Tel Arad: Preliminary Report on the Second Excavation Season, 1963" *Israel Exploration Journal* 17 (1967); Miriam Aharoni, "Preliminary Ceramic Report on Strata 12-11 at Arad Citadel" *Eretz Israel* 15 (1981) 181-204

- (Hebrew); Zev Herzog, Miriam Aharoni, Anson Rainey, and Shmuel Moshkovitz, "The Israelite Fortress at Arad" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 254 (1984) 1-34.
- 17) An additional pillar figurine fragment was found in the small room in the southeast corner of the courtyard. Raz Kletter, *The Judean Pillar Figurines and the Archaeology of Asherah*. BAR International Series 636, Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1996, pp. 211-12; Herzog, *et al.*, "The Israelite Fortress at Arad" 16, fig. 20.
- 18) Y. Aharoni, "Excavations at Tel Arad" 247-49; Y. Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple" *Biblical Archaeologist* 31 (1968) 20-32.
- 19) Herzog, *et al.*, "The Israelite Fortress at Arad" 1-34; Y. Yadin, "A Note on the Stratigraphy of Arad" *Israel Exploration Journal* 15 (1965) 180; O. Zimhoni, "The Iron Age Pottery of Tel 'Eton and its Relationship to the Lachish, Tell Beit Mirsim and Arad Assemblages" *Tel Aviv* 12 (1985) 84-86; A. Mazar and E. Netzer, "On the Israelite Fortress at Arad" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 263 (1986) 87-90; D. Ussishkin, "The Date of the Judean Shrine at Arad" *Israel Exploration Journal* 38 (1988) 149-51; Z. Herzog, "The Stratigraphy of Israelite Arad: A Rejoinder" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 267 (1987) 77-79; Z. Herzog, "The Date of the Temple at Arad: Reassessment of the Stratigraphy and the Implications for the History of Religion in Judah" in A. Mazar ed. *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan*. JSOTSupp 331. Sheffield, 2001, pp. 161-62.
- 20) D. Pardee, "Arad Ostraca" in W. Hallo ed. *The Context of Scripture III: Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2002, pp. 81-85; Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981, pp. 30-31, 35-38, 42.
- 21) See Z. Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallaxic Approaches* (London: Continuum, 2001) for discussion of many of these examples.
- 22) M. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans and Dearborn, MI: Dove Booksellers, 2002, pp. 47-48.