

Jordan in the Biblical Tradition: An Overview of the Tradition with Special Reference to the Importance of the Biblical Literature for the Reconstruction of the History of the Ancient Territories of the State of Jordan

Next to Palestine, the territories of the present Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan may be the best known from the literature of the Old Testament. Already in the Book of Genesis, several passages allude to the early history of this part of the Near East. We may mention the ethnic jokes in Gen. 19 about the origins of the nations of the Moabites and the Ammonites both considered the offspring of an illegitimate connection between Lot and his daughters. The Edomites are believed to be the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob. In the following books of the Pentateuch these three nations continue to play a role — mostly not a very positive one — in the role of biblical Israel, right down to the very end of the petty states of Juda and Israel in 722 and 587 BC respectively.

Thus the Edomites deny the Israelites, when they escaped from Egypt the right to pass through their territory, forcing them to circumvent the Edomite territory and to wander in the desert to the east of Moab (Numbers 20-21). Following this diversion, the Israelites were forced to confront Sihon, the king of the Amorites living next to the Moabites. Sihon was totally defeated and his country colonized by the Israelites (Num. 21). In the same passage a poem is quoted that is supposed to draw on Sihon's conquest of Heshbon and the surrounding territory (Num. 21:27-30). Heshbon had been destroyed, but was now being rebuilt. As a consequence of their victory, the Israelites settled in the area formerly controlled by Sihon, and soon proceeded to also conquer Bashan to the north of Sihon's country (Num. 21:31-35). Balakh, the king of the Moabites, when frightened by Sihon's fate called upon the sorcerer Balaam that he should curse Israel, that he might be able to chase them out of his country (Numbers 22-24). It is well known how Balaam's black magic worked. His cursing Israel turned into a blessing of Israel. After the conclusion of the migrations in the desert, the Israelites distributed the territory to the east of the River Jordan between their kinsmen. This area became the tribal homes of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and parts of Manasseh (Numbers 32, cf. also Joshua 13).

After their settlement in Canaan the Israelites continued to fight against their neighbors to the east, all of them — according to the Book of Judges — oppressors of Israel. Thus the fat king of the Moabites, Eglon, was killed by the Israelite champion Ehud (Judges 3). Also the Ammonites are said to have oppressed Israel, but were soundly beaten by another Israelite hero, Jephtha (Judges 10-11). The Ammonites were also active when Saul, the first king of Israel was elected. Saul liberated the people of the city of Jabesh from the attack of Nahash, the king of Ammon (1 Samuel 11). This defeat did not satisfy the Ammonites. Soon after another king of Ammon provoked David to attack and conquer his land (2 Samuel 10-12). This was indeed a very convenient act because it provided David with the opportunity of getting rid of his rival, Bathsheba's husband Uriah, who was killed before the walls of Rabba, present day 'Ammān. David also conquered Moab and slaughtered a large percentage of its male population.

These ancient nations of Jordan never went into total oblivion. However, after David's time the Aramaeans come into focus of the attention of the biblical historiographers. Thus in the days of Hazael of Damascus the Aramaeans are supposed to have conquered the country of Gilead, and every single Israelite possession to the east of the Jordan River (2 Kgs. 10:32-33).

This is plain bible story and in itself rather unproblematic. More details could be called upon to illustrate the relationship between biblical Israel and its eastern neighbors. This relationship also had its bright moments. Thus the Moabite woman Ruth became the ancestress of David, the future mighty king of Israel. The problems arise as soon as we begin to ask if this is real history or "only" — in quotation marks — a story?

This question can be answered in two different ways. One way to go will take a long time and involve a meticulous comparison of the many biblical passages concerning the east with mostly archaeological evidence from Jordan.

I shall confine my discussion of this point to a couple of examples. King Sihon ruled Heshbon at the time of the Israelite exodus. According to traditional scholarship this exodus happened shortly before 1200 BC. As far as I know, no substantial evidence has been found of a LBA city at Tall Ḥisbān.¹ This is a situation often encountered by biblical archaeologists working in Palestine. Locations that according to the Bible relate to the history of Israel did not exist at exactly the time and place indicated by the biblical narrative. I only have to mention the case of Jericho, which the Israelites are supposed to have conquered ca. 1200 BC in spite of the fact that Tall as-Sultān — ancient Jericho — in the Late bronze Age was not inhabited at all. This would of course have made the conquest of Jericho much easier.²

The second case has to do with the sorcerer Balaam, now also known from the Dayr 'Allā inscriptions, probably dating from the seventh century BC.³ It seems likely that the central figure of the narrative in Numbers 22-24 did not belong to the Late Bronze Age. It is far more reasonable to think that he lived sometime during the first part of the first millennium BC. Moreover, the poems attributed to this Balaam end with a note about the kittim who will on ships come and conquer Assyria. An otherwise unknown German professor, Karl Ilgen, said already two hundred years ago: This note can hardly refer to anybody else except Alexander the Great and his Macedonians and their conquest of Syria and Mesopotamia.⁴ The reformer Martin Luther understood it to be a prophecy about the Romans.⁵

It will be possible to deal with the many biblical references to the territories of present day Jordan in the same manner. As a matter of fact, biblical information has little to do with the realities of the southern Levant at the end

of the Bronze Age or in the beginning of the Iron Age. Let us just refer to one example that shows the lack of any precise historical information among the biblical references to the territory of the state of Jordan in the Iron Age. According to the narrative in 2 Kings 22 an anonymous king of Israel of the house of Omri was killed in a battle against the Aramaeans, who are described as the lords of Gilead. If this really happened, it would have been many years before this territory came under the sway of the Aramaeans. Something that only happened in the days of Hazael (cf. 2 Kgs. 10:32-33).

I will, however, leave the subject and address the problem of historical information in the Bible from the angle of modern investigations into the ancient territories of Palestine. Any person, who is acquainted with the present climate of biblical historical studies will know of the North American archaeologist William G. Dever's many complaints because of the so-called "revisionists".⁶ Apart from the author this tag covers scholars like Thomas L. Thompson from Copenhagen, Philip R. Davies from Sheffield in England, or Keith W. Whitlam from Stirling in Scotland.⁷ I can only say that within biblical studies the debate has become so acrimonious that it is at the present difficult to discuss historical problems at all. The discussion turns really acid when the subject has to do with the historicity of the Old Testament. The fundamental recent criticism of the concept of historicity in combination with the literature of the Old Testament has been dubbed anti-Jewish, bordering on anti-Semitism.⁸ It has been seen to be politically dangerous because it questions the right to use the Hebrew Bible to legitimize their claim on the soil of Palestine as is common in certain Jewish and Christian circles.

It is true that recent developments in the study of an-

¹ Cf. for convenience Lawrence T., Geraty, art. "Hesban", in *OEANE*, 3, pp. 19-22. Because of this evidence Geraty proposes to look for ancient Heshbon elsewhere.

² Jericho is probably the most extensively excavated place in Palestine. So far three expeditions have been active here, a German one led by Ernest Sellin and Watzinger, two British, one led by John Garstang, the second by Kathleen Kenyon. At the present a fourth expedition is active, a joint Palestinian-Italian venture. Cf. on the first season Nicolo Marchetti and Lorenzo Nigro (eds.), *Quaderni di Gericho I* (1998). *Scavi a Gerico, 1997: Relazione preliminare sulla prima campagna di scavi e prospezioni archeologiche a Tell es-Sultan, Palestine* (Università di Roma "La Sapienza", 1999).

³ Cf. on this Jacob Hoftijzer and Gerrit van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla (Documenta et Monumenta Orientalia Antiqui, 19; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976).*

⁴ On Ilgen (1763-1834) cf. Bodo Seidel, *Karl David Ilgen und die Pentateuchforschung im Umkreis der sogenannten Urkundenhypothese. Studien zur Geschichte der exegetischen Hermeneutik in der späten Aufklärung (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 213; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1993).* Ilgen on Num. 24:24, quoted in Seidel, *Karl David Ilgen*, p. 173.

⁵ In his note in the margin to his translation of the Old Testament (Wittenberg, 1545).

⁶ Dever's contributions are far too many to list in this place. Among the recent attacks on the "revisionist" I may mention his "Ar-

chaeology, Ideology, and the Quest for an 'Ancient' or 'Biblical' Israel", *Near Eastern Archaeology* 61:1 (1998), pp. 39-52.

⁷ Representative works by these scholars include Philip R. Davies, *In Search of "Ancient Israel"* (JSOTS, 148; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1992); Niels Peter Lemche, *Prelude to Israel's Past. Background and Beginnings of Israelite History and Identity* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), and *The Israelites in History and Tradition* (Library of Ancient Israel; London/Louisville, KY: SPCK/Westminster John Knox, 1998), Thomas L. Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People. From the Written and Archaeological Sources* (SHANE, 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), *The Bible in History. How Writers Create a Past* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1999), and Keith W. Whitlam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel. The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996).

⁸ To illustrate the "level" of the recent debate I may refer to William G. Dever in his "Revisionist Israel Revisited: A Rejoinder to Niels Peter Lemche", *CR:BS* 4 (1996), pp. 35-50, p. 42, denouncing the revisionists because of "their antipathy to Judaism (akin to Wellhausen's jaundiced view)" — a remark that takes for granted that Julius Wellhausen was an anti-semitic, a view of Wellhausen commonly held in conservative academic circles but none the less contrary to evidence. He characterizes Whitlam in this way: "several of Whitlam's statements border dangerously on anti-Semitism; they are certainly anti-Jewish and anti-Israel", "Archaeology, Ideology, and the Quest for an 'Ancient' or 'Biblical' Israel".

cient Palestinian history will remove the historical foundation of the State of Israel. It is also true that historical Israel was no more and no less than a petty kingdom that dominated central and northern Palestine between, say 900 and 700 BC. It may have been founded by a dynasty of Arab rulers, by Omri (whether he was a historical person or not is immaterial, his name is most likely Arabic, 'Umar)⁹, and Omri's famous son Ahab (also considered to be an Arabic name by the German scholar Martin Noth)¹⁰. After the fall of Samaria in 722 BC Israel only survived in the memory of its past greatness. It was in biblical tradition transformed into a mighty kingdom that once upon a time ruled all of Palestine, most of present day Jordan, and in the distant past large most of Syria.

Recent developments within historical studies of ancient Palestine have effectively shown that the Old Testament has little to say as far as the history of the Bronze and Iron Ages is concerned. It seems likely that historiographers of a Jewish religious and national orientation put the biblical history together in the last part of the end of the first millennium BC.¹¹ The main subject of the history of Israel in the Old Testament is not the past of the Jewish people. It is a story containing admonitions and prophecies that concern the generation that lived at the time when the biblical literature was composed. It is a nationalistic program. It is possible that history was invoked in order to support the nationalistic claims of the Maccabees who had revolted against their Greek masters.¹² When we study the history of Palestine we must abstain from paraphrasing the biblical narrative. The result of such a paraphrasing of the biblical text will be that we automatically side with its religious and nationalistic goals.

When and why did the change of orientation of biblical historical studies happen? A generation ago textbooks such as the histories of Israel by Martin Noth and

John Bright — not to speak about the writings of William Foxwell Albright — were more or less rationalistic paraphrases of the biblical version of Israel's history.¹³ The history of Israel was considered to be the history of Palestine (and of Jordan as well). Now only one generation later, all of this has to be given up.

Without first realizing it, archaeologists provided the material for a historical deconstruction of the biblical narrative because of the amount of problems created by archaeological material. The destruction of the biblical narrative understood to represent history writing followed in many steps.

The first to go were the Hebrew patriarchs, who were removed from history. North American scholars had for a long time remained loyal to the idea that there once lived an Abraham, an Isaac, or a Jacob somewhere in Palestine.¹⁴ In the 1970s the North American situation changed dramatically,¹⁵ rather late since it had already been accepted among German scholars as early as the beginning of the 19th century that the traditions of the patriarchs have nothing to do with history.¹⁶ Seen in isolation the removal of the patriarchs from the scene of history has little to do with Palestinian or Jordanian archaeology. It is impossible to demonstrate the existence or non-existence of a single family on the basis of archaeology.

Archaeology did not contribute much to the dissolution of the hypothesis that claimed Israel in the Period of the Judges to have been organized as a tribal leagues consisting of twelve tribes who carried the names of the sons of the patriarch Jacob.¹⁷ The dissolution of the league — or Amphictyony — as it was called in those days followed in the 1970s as the consequence of biblical historical studies. It was not caused by archaeological considerations.¹⁸ It, however, taught us that the impression gained from the Old Testament of a unit-

⁹ Cf. Martin Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT, III, 10; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928 [reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966], p. 63, and p. 222 n. 7. Noth traces this interpretation back to Theodor Nöldeke.

¹⁰ *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, p. 63, 222.

¹¹ Cf. Niels Peter Lemche, "The Old Testament-A Hellenistic Book?" *Scandinavian Journal for the Old Testament* 7 (1993), 163-193.

¹² Cf. my proposal in "Because They have Cast away the law of the lord of hosts" — Or: "We and the Rest of the World". The Authors Who "Wrote" the Old Testament, in Thomas L. Thompson (ed.), *Changing Perspectives in Biblical Interpretation I (JSOTS/Copenhagen International Seminar)*; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999/2000 [in print].

¹³ Cf. the textbooks by Martin Noth, *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950), and John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London: SCM, 1960). Albright's major work in this direction is his *From the Stone Age to Christianity. Monotheism and the Historical Process* (1940; Second edition with a new introduction Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1957).

¹⁴ Cf., e.g., William F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra. An Historical Survey* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), and especially Bright, *A History of Israel*, pp. 60-93.

¹⁵ With the almost simultaneous publication of Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives. The Quest for the Historical Abraham* ((Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 133; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974), and John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1975).

¹⁶ Thus by Wilhelm Martin Lebrecht de Wette, in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, I-II (Halle: bey Schimmelpfennig und Compagnie, 1806), Band II, *Kritik der Bücher Mose als Quelle der Geschichte*.

¹⁷ Cf. on the Israelite Amphictyony Martin Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT, 4,1; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930 [reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966]). The theory was subsequently adopted by almost every Old Testament scholar with a few exceptions (notably Otto Eissfeldt and Georg Fohrer).

¹⁸ Cf. Niels Peter Lemche, *Israel i Dommertiden. En oversigt over diskussionen om Martin Noths "Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels"* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1972), A. D. H. Mayes, *Israel in the Period of the Judges* (*Studies in Biblical Theology* 55, 29; London: SCM, 1974; C. H. J. de Geus, *The Tribes of Israel. An Investigation into Some of the Presuppositions of Martin Noth's Amphictyony Hypothesis* (*Studie Semitica Neerlandica*, 18; Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976).

ed Israel that conquered Palestine (and parts of Jordan) has nothing to do with historical events at the end of the Late Bronze Age and in the beginning of the Iron Age.

Archaeology, however, played a major part when the Israelite conquest came into focus of scholarship. We should remember that as late as the 1960s, two major hypotheses concerning this conquest dominated the field. One hypothesis followed the biblical version of Joshua's conquest of Canaan closely. Albright and many North American scholars endorsed it.¹⁹ The second hypothesis was further removed from the picture of the Hebrew conquest of Palestine presented by the Book of Joshua. It says that the Israelites entered Palestine as mostly peaceful semi-nomads, herders of sheep and goats. At a later stage of the Israelite settlement, they turned into conquerors. This hypothesis found favor among many European scholars — the most important being Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth.²⁰ Both hypotheses presuppose that Israel was a nation distinguishable from other nations of the ancient Near East, with its own religion and tradition. The North American variant of the settlement hypothesis had one major disadvantage. This hypothesis could only agree with archaeological facts if it acted like the bed of Procrustes. Thus it reckoned great cities of Palestine to have been destroyed by the invading Israelites although these cities did not exist at the time of the Israelite invasion.²¹ I suppose that this is common knowledge and need not dwell on this theme at this occasion.

However, also the European variant had to be revised in light of archaeological evidence. It is an ironic fact that it was a student of Albright, George Mendenhall, who first proposed to substitute the notion of a foreign — Israelite — conquest with another model. In 1962 Mendenhall published a small study on the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine.²² In it he argued that the Israelite com-

munity that arose in Palestine around 1200 BC did not result from a major invasion. It originated among the pre-Israelite population of Palestine and was the result of a social and religious revolt among the poor and destitute people of Canaan otherwise known as *ḥabiru*, i.e. Hebrews. It was the peasant population — by far the majority of the Palestinian society — that turned against their masters in order to establish the society of Yahweh, the God of Israel. Subsequently Mendenhall's hypothesis was revised and elaborated upon by Norman K. Gottwald.²³

Mendenhall and Gottwald based their idea on two observations. The first one concerned the already mentioned lack of accordance between archaeology and Bible, the second had to do with the fact that the material culture of the indigenous population of Palestine did not change in a substantial way during the transition from Canaanite to Israelite dominance. Without denying the existence of many local traditions as far as the material culture was concerned, this variation did not represent the kind of ethnic change that marks out the arrival of a foreign nation, not to say a nation that traced its roots back to Egypt. And an additional note: the authors of the Book of Joshua forgot to mention that the Egyptians in those days still ruled Palestine, or at least large stretches of this country.²⁴

In short, Old Testament scholarship has generally accepted that the biblical narrative about the conquest of Palestine has little or nothing to do with the events of the LB-EI transition. It is a tale from another time with its own setting and intentions.²⁵

Now, it is important that the discrepancy between Bible and archaeology does not end here. The verdict that the biblical narrative is story and not history is equally valid when we proceed to the period of the Judges and the time of the Hebrew kingdoms, particularly the time of David and Solomon. The debate about the historicity of the

¹⁹ Cf., e.g. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 276-281. Cf. also his depiction of the archaeological evidence in his *The Archaeology of Palestine* (1949; revised and reprinted; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), pp. 112-120. Yehezkiel Kaufman formulated a much more crude version of the hypothesis of the Israelite conquest in his *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine* (Jerusalem: Magness, 1953).

²⁰ Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina", (1925; reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I; München: C.H. Beck, 1953, pp. 89-125) (E.T. "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine", in Albrecht Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* [Sheffield: JSOT, 1989], pp. 133-169, and "Erwägungen über die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina" (1939; reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften*, I, pp. 126-175). Cf. also Martin Noth, *Geschichte Israels*, pp. 67-82.

²¹ The famous cases are Jericho, Ai and Gibeon. Jericho was not inhabited at the moment of conquest, Ai had been destroyed for a thousand years, and Gibeon had not yet been founded. A convenient review of the evidence can be found in the NEAEHL I and II. John Bright's handling of the evidence about Ai is typical of the period, *A History of Israel*, p. 119.

²² "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine", *BA* 25 (1962), pp. 66-87 (reprint in Edward F. Campbell and David Noel Freedman [eds.], *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, III [Garden City, NY: Doubleday,

1970], pp. 100-120, cf. also his *The Tenth Generation. The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1973).

²³ Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh. A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll, NT: Orbis Books, 1979).

²⁴ Cf. on the appearance of Israel and the end of the Egyptian presence Donald B. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1992, pp. 257-280. Redford still adheres to a reconstruction of the Israelite settlement not far removed from the one proposed by Albrecht Alt.

²⁵ The reconstruction of a very different archaeological scenario from the one proposed by Albright's generation by archaeologists like Israel Finkelstein has been most decisive. Cf. his *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988), and the collection of studies edited by Israel Finkelstein and Nadav Na'aman, *From Nomadism to Monarchy. Archaeological & Historical Aspects of Early Israel* (Jerusalem/Washington DC: Israel Exploration Society/Biblical Archaeology Society, 1994). It is an interesting fact that William G. Dever in spite of his harsh criticism of the "revisionists", side with them as far as he feels compelled to abandon the traditional immigration models. Cf. his *Recent Archaeological Discoveries and Biblical Research* (Seattle: University of Washington, 1990), pp. 37-84.

judges of the Old Testament is more or less over. The question of the united Hebrew kingdom remains.

I suppose that the present controversy between the departments of antiquity at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv University is well known. In Tel Aviv two important archaeologists, Israel Finkelstein and David Ussishkin, advocate a negative view on the historicity of this period of the Israelite empire — in spite of a sometimes ferocious opposition from their more conservative colleagues in Jerusalem.²⁶ This controversy has already reached the headlines in newspapers and has been mentioned in television programs. It is not yet settled. On the contrary, the recent publication of the Tel Dan inscription including its mentioning of a *byt dwd* (“House of David” or “house of Dod”?) has sharpened the confrontation between scholars who believe in the historicity of David and Solomon and those who do not find evidence for it.²⁷ I shall leave the debate at this point.²⁸

The debate among biblical scholars has led to a point where several Old Testament scholars can no more support the view that the Old Testament is a historical source about the ancient history of the Jewish people. Nobody can say with one hundred percent certainty that no historical information can be found in the Old Testament. However, even if such information should be present, it is placed within a narrative framework that is legendary. It

makes it extremely difficult to dig out tiny bits of historical information here and there. We still have to look for criteria that will enable the scholar in a written document like the Old Testament to distinguish between historical information and literary invention. Such criteria may not exist. The conclusion is that the historian cannot use the Old Testament to “prove” that something “really happened”.

On the other hand, the evidence of archaeology might not be of much help. Archaeology cannot prove, e.g. that the Israelites conquered the kingdom of Sihon, the king of Hesbon. This is certainly the case if Heshbon did not exist as a wealthy city at that time. The Old Testament has little to contribute to the history of Palestine in the Iron Age, and far less to the history of Palestine in the Bronze Age. Its contribution to the history of the territory of present day Jordan is at best negligible.

At the end of this paper I will conclude with a final example of the discrepancy between biblical story and archaeology. This note was inspired by Pat McGovern’s paper included in this volume and is food for thought. According to the Old Testament, thousands of Jews returned from Babylonia after Cyrus’ conquest of that city. However, if this really happened, where do we find their Babylonian cooking pots? I cannot remember having seen a single one in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.

²⁶ Cf., e.g. Israel Finkelstein, “The Archaeology of the United Monarchy: An Alternative View,” *Levant* 28, 1996, 177-87, and the rejoinder by Amihai Mazar, “Iron Age Chronology: A Reply to I. Finkelstein,” *Levant* 29 (1997), pp. 157-67.

²⁷ Cf. Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh, “An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan,” *IEJ* 43 (1993), pp. 81-98, and The Tel Dan

Inscription. A New Fragment, *IEJ* 45 (1995), 1-18.

²⁸ For easiness of reference to this discussion, cf. Volkmar Fritz and Philip R. Davies (eds.), *The Origins of the Ancient Israelite States (JSOTS, 228; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996, and Lowell K. Handy (ed.), The Age of Solomon. Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium (SHANE, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).*