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A PILLAR AT PETRA
The primary purpose of this inquiry is to ascertain the significance of the sacred stones and pillars among the Hebrews and to discover the basis of the conflict over the cult practice in Israel. The importance of the wider investigation in the general field of the Western Semites is at once recognised when we consider their close association with the Hebrews, and accordingly, the characteristic elements of the cult among the Western Semites will be carefully sought out. The problems which properly belong to the wider field of ethnic and cultural relationships beyond the area of the Western Semites will not be purposely introduced into this limited inquiry. By the phrase "stone and pillar" we mean to indicate particularly the Masseboth, but the breadth of the phraseology is designed to include kindred sacred stones which may have had similar meaning and purpose, even though such were designated by diverse technical terms. It is intended by the phraseology of the title to limit the scope of the inquiry, as far as possible, to stones that were placed in position by man and to which were imputed a sacred significance. We exclude as alien to our purpose the larger field of megalithics as well as the phenomena which belong more specifically to the study of amulets and charms.

One may fully realise the difficulty of making a rigid classification of the stones which had sacred value in the ancient world, and yet some division is necessary in order
to limit the research. The difficulty of overlapping ideas may require some deviation from the particular purpose but only insofar as such seems necessary. The sacred stones under consideration had certain characteristics by which they may be distinguished and we readily detect certain distinctions in the Old Testament terminology, as for example the dividing line between the terms "sur" and "ében" is clearly indicated. The natural boulders possessed their sacredness quite independent of anything that man did, whereas the value of the Masē-bōth was found in the fact that they were "set up" on the basis of some intelligent response to the affairs and experiences of life, which made the act seem appropriate. Being artificial in position, the pillar demanded interpretation, thus challenging the intellect and memory and ordinarily indicating that some unseen factor was also figuratively set up which afforded the basis of symbolism. Thus we may readily perceive the distinction as well as the superior value of the conventional stones in relation to the natural boulders. The sacred stones in their true and unwrought form are to be distinguished from carved images representing the crystallisation of a particular concept, necessarily confined and limited, which either transformed them into idols or transferred them to the realm of art. It is easily perceived that the unfashioned pillars could more readily be associated with any level of religious thought. The pillars under discussion were ordinarily identified with a place which conditioned their value and some distinction ought to be made between them and the holy magical
stones which might readily fulfill their mission, even when transported from place to place. We must think of the pillars of the public Semitic cult as being properly linked with permanent values and stable conceptions in the community.

The writer has, as far as possible, made a careful first-hand study of the archaeological evidences relating to the subject. The geographical area was visited in 1929, again in 1931, and from March to August 1933 a special period of research in Palestine and Transjordania, including Petra, was devoted to this particular purpose. The accessible evidence bearing directly on the problem was studied on the field, while the various excavations in progress were visited for the purpose of acquiring a more general view of the civilisation contemporary to the cult practice, and also various prehistoric remains were visited and studied. Opportunity has been taken to observe the primitive survivals in the East with regard to religious customs and conceptions through the visitation of shrines and the witnessing of ceremonies.

Library research has been made along several lines of approach. It has been the writer's objective to make as complete a study of the archaeological evidences as possible, not confining himself to the matters dealing directly with the sacred stones but also to consider the broader background of the religious culture and civilisation, and accordingly, much reading has been done in the literature of archaeological discovery and interpretation. The comprehensive field of the origin and history of religious practice has been given a
place of general importance in his reading for its illuminative value in the study of the religion of the Semites, while the history of the Hebrew religion required more specific research, but specialised study has been pursued in the literature dealing with the interpretation of the stone and pillar cult. Books relating to religious folklore among primitive peoples especially among the Semites have been investigated in an effort to determine the value and probable relationship between ancient and modern Semitic practice. The cult narratives in the Old Testament have been studied in the light of critical scholarship with the aid of critical and exegetical commentaries, and the contribution of recent archaeological research with regard to the historical value of the framework of the narrative attributed to the patriarchal and conquest periods has been considered in relation to the various passages studied. The bibliography has been arranged chiefly to give the books and articles referred to in the foot-notes, though some references which the notes make clear may not be found in the bibliography, while a few books may be listed which escape mention in the foot-notes.

The nature of the evidences renders the subject difficult, since both the literary and the archaeological evidences are fragmentary and the primitive survivals, practised in late times, have been subjected to numerous influences. The available evidence pertaining to the practice by which the Hebrews were influenced or in which they participated is neither patent nor obvious, but must be sought out, sifted, and analysed.
The difficulty of the subject has not been greatly modified by the fragmentary treatment of the problems by a large number of writers who in the development of the broader outlines of religion found occasion to insert a paragraph on Stone Worship, but lasting obligation is due a great company of research scholars who have each in their turn brought forth things new and old for the simplification of the problems relating to the sacred stones. The entire range of the subject is complicated due to the association of the sacred stones with diverse tribal customs and experiences, and to the wide specialisation, as well as to the syncretism of ideas.

The importance of this inquiry, from the standpoint of Hebrew religion, is sufficiently emphasised in the Old Testament, and the wider importance of the subject in the field of Semitic religion is indicated by the fragmentary references found in secular literature while the significant archaeological discoveries of the last half century have served to bring into vivid light the emphasis which the Western Semites placed upon sacred stones. Much of the modern literature on the subject has been rendered obsolete in many details through recent archaeological discoveries. A solution of the question is almost a prerequisite to an understanding of the history and religion of the Hebrews, and it is needless to say that the problem deserves investigation from varied viewpoints. The writer has been impressed in his research with the tremendous importance of the question and he is convinced that the significance of the Massëbôth in relation to the Hebrews has not
been fully comprehended. He begins this study humbly, realising the difficulty of the subject which to treat superficially could only result in confusion, but if he should succeed in his desire to make even a small contribution, he shall feel that his labours have not been in vain.

The reader will recognise that the nature of the subject makes it difficult to find a method of procedure which would permit a full treatment and at the same time prevent multiple mention of the same evidences, but as far as possible we have endeavoured to avoid duplication. Perhaps the chief difficulty lies in the evaluation of the evidences, in which there has been much difference of opinion, and to this problem the writer has devoted the first three chapters, dealing not only with the particulars but also to set forth what seems to him to be the relative value of the various classes of information. A brief treatment of the antiquity, origin, and development has been set forth in chapters four, five, and six, while chapters sixteen and seventeen have been devoted to a detailed study of what may be considered the two most important pillar-shrines of the Hebrews, namely, Bethel and Gilgal. With the exception of the last chapter, the remainder treats of the conceptions, relationships, and practices associated with the sacred stones. The final chapter is an attempt to understand the conflict over the pillars in Israel. The conclusion that the Massēbōth were theocratic symbols representing the heritage of Israel under the protection and blessing of Jehovah, and that the conflict was due to the effort to
establish the peculiar heritage of the Hebrews in Palestine as over against the rival claims of the Ba'alim with long standing traditions of local self-determination, has been set forth as a general principle. In this interpretation, the heritage must, of course, be regarded in the broad sense including all that was conceived to have been handed down from the fathers, together with the additions which were regarded as by the gift and command of their Divine Benefactor, of which may be mentioned their social, religious, political, and economic inheritance. The fact that the pillars were theocratic symbols provided the basis for superstitious conceptions on the part of the ignorant, while the relation to the heritage explains their association with the fertility cult. A great variety of adaptations were easily possible since they represented the government and protection of the deity.

The writer is aware that this theory constitutes a new approach to the subject and that in some points it offers a radical departure. However, he believes that there is sufficient evidence for this point of view and that it deserves to be propounded and considered as set forth in the following pages.
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AN EVALUATION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

As archaeological research progresses, it is to be expected that new light will make it possible to estimate the validity and the importance of the earlier data. The discrimination of values, which has been made possible through the accumulation of evidence, serves to modify some of the results of the pioneer archaeologists. Several early excavations in Palestine brought to light groups of pillars which were at the time designated as relating to the religious cult, and indeed, such findings were widely accepted and sometimes given fanciful interpretations. The more recent discovery of the stone pillars at Megiddo, which were unmistakably identified as hitching posts and roof supports of King Solomon's stables, constitutes a unique contribution to our knowledge of standing pillars, and the discovery quickly led to the identification of certain other pillars as secular which had been formerly regarded as Maaseboth.

Concerning the pillars at Tell es-Safi, we note that suspicion as to their sacred character is not a new thing. The equal levels of the tops of the pillars together with the signs of rubbing on the exposed surfaces, which were at the height which horses would mark in the rubbing of their shoulders, support the presumption as to the secular nature of the erection.

With reference to the double row of standing stones at Taanach, Guy states that Sellin's photographs show a very

1. Guy, New Light from Armageddon, CIQ No. 9, p. 42.
2. Cf. Vincent, Canaan, p. 103; Bliss & Macalister, Excav. in Pal. 1898-1900, p. 32.
5. Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, 6th edit. p. 214, regards the pillars as belonging to a large house.
striking resemblance to the hitching posts at Megiddo, while
in an old re-used wall at Taanaah have been found three large
stones similar to those at Megiddo with tie-holes through their
corners. Likewise, the two pillars at Taanaah were evidently
of a secular structure, though sometimes they have been com-
pared with the two pillars at the entrance to King Solomon's
temple, but we must now conclude that they have a closer associa-
tion with his stables than with his temple.

In view of the unpreparedness of the excavators, as
indicated by Watzinger, one may be able to understand the reason
for the earlier interpretation as sacred of the pillars at Meg-
iddo. The so-called Massébôth must now be discredited in the
light of the more recently discovered secular pillars in the
same vicinity. Along with the pillars at Tell el-Hesy, which
were recognized by Bliss as being definitely out of the cate-
gory of sacred stones, must also be classified the row of five
pillars in the supposed Semitic temple at Gezer which Macalister
from the time of discovery regarded with doubt. Such a conclu-
sion has force when we consider the lack of cult objects in as-
sociation with the precincts of the supposed temple.

We may well conclude with Thomsen that what the ex-
cavators thought were cult places frequently had no right to
be so named, and that the pillars were of secular significance,
being used either as supports for the roof, to prevent a wall
from bulging, in connection with an oil press, as hitching posts in a stable, or in some other profane installation. Such a conclusion is in agreement with Albright who indicates that the High Place at Gezer, with its Mæsebôth and other cult objects, remains unique, since nearly all other supposed High Places, which have been excavated, have been proved conclusively to be without sacred significance.

Sellin uncovered pillars at Balata, but the evidence is fragmentary and unsatisfactory, though we may agree with Thornsen that they were probably Mæsebôth. By excavating at the ascent of Mount Gerizim opposite Balata, Weltner, in 1931, found a small room in the middle of which was a standing stone, and associated with it what was thought to be an altar and a cylinder for incense offering, which discovery has been interpreted as having some relation to the fertility cult.

The five prostrate pillars excavated by Mackenzie at Beth-Shemesh in 1912, doubtless had a sepulchral association in view of their similarity to other stones found there in definite relationship to the tombs. In 1928, Grant uncovered at Beth-Shemesh several interesting stones, one of which was one and one-half metres in length and in circumference, tapering at both ends and chip-dressed from hard limestone, but the meagre associated remains make the evaluation of the discovery difficult.

1. Archaeology and the Bible, p.27.
7. See fig.12.
Considerable importance may be attached to the pillar discovered by Rowe in the excavations at Beth-Shan, the sacred character of which cannot be doubted, being found in the precincts of the Canaanite temple of the fifteenth century B.C. About three and one-half feet away from the pillar was found a bakenlibation bowl, and the inference is drawn that these perhaps were connected by a channel. In the same room with the sacred pillar, a stone base built against the west wall was supposedly the pedestal upon which the famous stela of Mekal was placed. The unusual association of the Canaanite pillar with the Egyptian stela of Mekal has led some to regard the combination as an indication of a transition from the Baalébân to the definite representation of the deity, but it perhaps only represents the Egyptian method of proclaiming that the ancient laws and customs of the city under the tutelage of Mekal would be respected and that the affairs of the community would be administered without any violation of the sacred traditions which were represented by the pillar. We have here the first archaeological evidence which shows a Canaanite pillar linked with the symbol of a foreign government, though it is probable that such combinations were frequent during the period of Egyptian domination of the cities of Palestine. It is of importance that the pillar was found inside a fifteenth century Canaanite temple where a highly developed altar ritual was indicated by the cult remains.

4. Rowe, B.J., Dec. 1927, p.423; Rowe, PEFQ, 1929, p.84.
The pillar sanctuary at Gezer, excavated by Macalister and dated around the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C., covered an area of about one hundred and fifty feet by one hundred and twenty feet, in which was a row of ten pillars of variable height and shape extending about a hundred feet north and south in practically a straight line which constituted the central feature of the sanctuary. The sacred significance of the monoliths is sufficiently well-attested by their association with a great variety of cult values, which cannot be doubted, even though the exact interpretation of the same may be open to question. Gressmann associates the alignment at Gezer with the royal stelae at Asshur, doubting the cult value of the Gezer pillars, and Watzinger takes the same attitude. It may be possible that the pillars at Gezer bear some analogy to the stelae of the kings mentioned above, but even so, they must be considered in the light of the associated cult remains. The point has been well emphasised by Cook who says, "What to the modern mind seems to be of merely political or secular interest was often the centre of religious beliefs and practices among early or primitive peoples." In discounting the cult value of the pillars at Gezer, Gressmann says that the altar is missing, but such is a matter of opinion which is not fully borne out by the reports of the excavation. The large rectangular block of stone with a depression in its upper surface must have had some cult importance. The size of the cavity forbids the idea that

4. Denkmäler Palästinas, p.64.
5. Religion of Ancient Palestine, p.89.
6. Ibid.
it was a socket for an 'asherah, and the fact that the socket showed no signs of wear discredits the possibility that a stone monolith was set in it. It may have been a laver for ablutions, but it is more probable that the block was simply a slaughter stone, or altar, and as such the winding gutter executed upon the upper edge of the block without any communication with the central cavity was designed to prevent the spilling of the sacrificial blood on the ground. The chief suggestion of Macalister against the possibility of it being an altar was based on the fact that the stone had been dressed with metal tools, but this can be scarcely regarded as an objection for it is doubtful whether the Hebrew prohibition against the practice of dressing altar stones was applicable universally among the Semites. As that as it may, it is difficult to explain this socketed stone standing in relation to the pillar alignment on any other basis than that of cult importance. Furthermore, there was a hard baked bank of earth to the south of the alignment in which were embedded a number of human skulls, much injured and broken, with no trace of the other parts of the bodies, and one may agree with Macalister as to the possibility of this being the remains of an earthen altar.

As to the sacred significance of the pillars at Gezer, considerable importance must be attached to the fact that the various pillars did not have the same value. The second pillar had smooth spots upon it, due probably to repeated kissing or

3. Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.46.
7. Bible Sidelights, p.56.
anointing, and, except for a small spot on number five, the 1 others do not share this feature. Also the spacing between the seventh and eighth pillars indicates the possibility of some mystical value in the grouping of the pillars. Furthermore, the seventh pillar in the alignment was not native to the environment and doubtless found its way to Gezer through some exploit analogous to that of King Mesha of Moab, who relates, among other feats, that he captured the Ariel of Dodah, removed it from Aseroth of Gad, and dragged it before Chemosh in Pecloth.

The sacred character of the Gezer pillars does not depend upon any single item, but the combination of a mass of evidence serves to confirm the fact that it was a place of Canaan-ite cult practice. The probable sacrificial nature of the infant jar-burials and the cistern-like pit with the remains of apparently sacrificial human and animal bones should not be considered apart from the large number of cult objects, such as the brazen serpent and the phallic emblems, all of which taken together offer a formidable argument to the effect that the place was the scene of gross and immoral religious practice. Moreover, the relationship of the pillar alignment to the pre-Semitic sacred cave, with its rock-cut place of sacrifice and orifice opening into the roof of the cave where the sacrificial pig bones were found, does not appear to have been accidental.

1. Gezer, Vol.11., p.335; Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, 6th edit., p.219, confuses pillars numbers two and seven.
2. See Gezer, Vol.11., p.393; Bible Sidelights, p.63.
7. See Bible Sidelights, p.75.
11. Bible Sidelights, p.46.
Some have seen a relationship between the pillars and the fortress on the hill nearby. The association of a fortress with High Place pillars appears to have been quite the customary practice among the Semites. The pillars at Petra as well as those at Bab ed-Dra'a were related in location to a fortress or citadel, while the Old Testament indicates that the term "Massebah" was sometimes practically synonymous with a military station.

The relation of the pillars to the fortress at Gezer is what we should expect in the light of our knowledge of the ancient association of religion with governmental and military affairs.

In addition to the pillars brought to light through excavation, there are several other places of the cult which were found on the surface without digging. The famous High Place at Petra, which was discovered to the modern world in 1906, stands in relationship to two upright monoliths carved and still attached to the native rock. Associated with these pillars of problematical date are the other unmistakable evidences of cult practice nearby, including two rock-cut altars. The relationship of the pillars to the High Place will be treated in a later discussion, but it may be pointed out here that the pillars, standing approximately one hundred feet apart and twenty feet in height at the entrance to the High Place, must have had some significance similar to that of the pillars which stood in the fore-court of King Solomon's Temple. The conjecture has been made that other Masseboth were associated with the High Place.

2. See Albright, AASSR, Vol.VI., p.73; Robinson, Sarcophagus, p.122.
4. Robinson, op.cit., p.120ff.
5. See page 7ff.
On the west side of the rectangular court are two blocks carved out of the native rock with steps ascending which give every appearance of having been twin altars serving different purposes. However, it has been suggested that the north block, instead of being an altar, was the pedestal of a massive idol-piller. Such a conclusion is based chiefly on the cuttings on top of the block, but the objections to the suggestion render it extremely improbable, while the carvings may be explained on some other basis. The suggestion, that such were designed to fit an artificial framework for the support of a Massebah, ought to be considered in the light of the irregularities; for example, there are no cuttings on the southwest corner, while the west arm of the depression, out on the north-west corner, is considerably longer than the others. One would naturally think that uniformity would have been the keynote of cuttings intended to support a framework, while one might suppose that a rectangular depression forty-three inches long, fourteen inches wide, and four inches deep, does not offer the most likely dimensions for a pillar socket. We cannot escape the fact, as Curtiss has suggested, that the steps on the east side of the block definitely suggest an altar significance, the top step being the widest, forming a platform on which the officiating priests might stand. Many suggestions have been made as to the nature of the

1. See fig. 3.
service at the two altars, but the suggestion is probably nearer the truth, which indicates that the chief altar was used for burnt sacrifices, while the "round altar" was used for the offering of libations. It may be that the Arab viewpoint, in which the north block is regarded as the "altar of burnt offering" and the south block as the "altar for the dispensing of the blood" may not be founded entirely on "tourist-lore" as Dalman supposes. Be that as it may, it is to contradict the explanation, which would most readily occur to practical minded observers, if we contend that the "apparent altar" was designed as the pedestal for a Massebah.

Among the various ideas offered in explanation of the raised platform in the great court of the High Place, it has been suggested that it may have been an idol pedestal. If we are to assume that something was a pedestal for a Massebah, then it is certainly more reasonable to suppose that the raised platform served this purpose, rather than the stepped elevation with its cavity and peculiar cuttings. However, in view of the fact that two majestic pillars, which were wrought with great expense of labour, stand at the entrance to the High Place, the search for a pillar pedestal in the court of the sanctuary becomes less important. Whether the raised platform in the sunken court was a table where the worshippers partook of a sacred meal, or a place for bloodless gifts for the deity, or for an altar of incense,

---

or the place occupied by one bringing the sacrificial victim, or the place where the victims were slain, or the pedestal for an idol, we cannot tell; though the size of the platform might indicate that it was designed for the slaughter place of human victims.

The carefully constructed High Place at Petra, as Robinson observes, may stand as the exponent of religious rites practised long prior to its actual construction, and it may be true, as Hoskins has suggested, that the High Place existed there in the time of Moses, but, in any case, there can be very little doubt that the Nabataeans were responsible for the grandeur of the High Place with its pillars as we find it today. We know very little about the ritual practice of either the Edomites or the Nabataeans, except what we may assume from a study of comparative religion. It is possible, as Nielsen suggests, that certain scholars have been too ready to assign cult value to the archaeological remains at Petra, but of the High Place with the pillars, no one can doubt the sacred character. The "snake" tower, may ante-date all other shrines in Petra, and Robinson regards it as originally Edomitic. As to the significance of this unusual structure, one may be left to conjecture, but it is perhaps not too much to suppose that it served the same purpose in an earlier period as the pillars of the High Place in a later time under a different dynasty, and it may be that the snake tower was the symbol of divine authority in the Kingdom

7. See Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monuments, p.34.
of Edom, being a variation in form of the Miggēbeth.

A characteristic Semitic High Place has been found at Bab ed-Dra'a, five hundred feet above the Dead Sea, near Kerak. The group of notable archaeologists, who made the discovery, were practically unanimous in regarding the High Place as the religious centre for the Cities of the Plain in the time of the Semitic occupation, which was abandoned after the Early Bronze Age. A group of seven limestone monoliths, found on the edge of an open-air settlement, were without doubt sacred cult stones or Miggēbeth, which is clearly indicated by the fact that they are entirely isolated and could not have belonged to any sort of structure, while the particular type of stone is not native to the neighbourhood and the monoliths must have been dragged for miles. The settlement contained a fortress over a thousand feet in length, surrounded by a massive wall, ten to fifteen feet thick. If the pillars at lān ed-Dra'a belonged to the centralized shrine of a group of cities, as the evidence indicates, then we may suppose that the fortress represents the united military program of the several cities, but, in any case, the relation of the pillars to the fortress serves to confirm what we have observed elsewhere, as to the political and military importance of the pillars. Around the edge of the fortress and settlement are numerous burials mostly indicated by cairns or small stone circles which are contemporary with the settlement as indicated by the pottery. We find here the usual

7. See p.78.
association of the sanctuary and necropolis, and Mallon suggests a connection between the shrine and the tombs.

At Ader there is a standing monolith about fifteen feet high and nearby are the remains of two others originally about the same size. The pottery remains of the ruins of Ader are of the same date as that of Bāb ed-Dra'a, which leads to the inference that both of the shrines were of the Early Bronze Age. Near the monolith of Ader have been discovered the ruins of a Moabite temple, in which, by the side of a flight of stairs leading up from the portico to the holy place, was a fallen monolith of the same dimensions, as far as preserved, as that of the pillar of Ader, but the temple itself was perhaps of later date. The early date of the monoliths, discovered in this region, is of considerable importance, since it shows that the pillar practice was a well developed custom prior to the time of the Old Testament patriarchs.

Various isolated pillars have been found, especially in Transjordania, but, on account of the fact that these have very little associated remains, their significance must remain largely enigmatic. An unusual stone pillar, called Hajr el-Mansūb, ought to be mentioned since it stands in association with dolmens and stone-circles at el Mareighāt east of the Jordan.

7. Conder, op.cit., p.73.
A few miles east of the Jordan, slightly north of the Dead Sea, an ancient necropolis was excavated in 1933 by M. Moshe Stekelis who uncovered a large dolmenic burial ground, covering some twelve hundred square meters. The excavation revealed some nine tumuli and almost two hundred megalithic tombs of the cist type. The orderly arrangement of the tombs in groups, with a tumulus in the middle of each group and large stone circles surrounding or adjacent to them, is interesting especially in light of the fact that beside some of the tombs are oval or circular hearths with cinders and cracked stones. The pottery found in this necropolis is of the same type as that of the neighbouring ruins of Teleilat Ghassul, which belongs to an early stage of the Bronze Age dating back to the second half of the third millennium B.C. or perhaps earlier. The discovery is of considerable importance in this study, since it possibly indicates the sanctuary-nature of a very early Semitic burying ground.

At Serabit in Sinai in the vicinity of a temple of the fifteenth century B.C., Petrie found several types of standing stones. Of the many small standing stones found in the vicinity, it is significant that they were not found in places out of sight of the temple grounds. Groups of stones, set upright on the hard rock surface, were arranged to form enclosures which were straggled over a wide area and did not appear as settlement huts, but, being found in the neighbourhood of the shrine, were regarded as sacred stones for lack of a more feasible explanation, and Petrie interprets them as examples

2. Ibid.
3. See fig.1.
5. Researches in Sinai, p. 67.
of sacred sleeping shelters to which the devotees resorted in order to invite oracular dreams. The many standing stones, found by Petrie in the region of the Wady Serabit, were of wide variety in size, ranging from only a few inches to two feet high, and were often supported by other stones to make them stand on end. In the mountains north-east of Magha'reh, a stone twelve feet high, erected on the top of a conical peak, can be seen against the sky-line from a great distance. Currelly, associated with Petrie, found a great number of stones near Mount Sinai which were set upright on the most striking hills and passes of the mountains. Regardless of the purpose of such stones erected on strategic mountain points, we may assume that they were useful to the traveller as land-marks.

With reference to the interpretation of the archaeological remains of the wide variety of stones and pillars found in the region of the Western Semites, one may be reminded of the necessity of forming conclusions with care. A massive stone wall may tell its own story of siege and defense, while an engineering feat, such as the tunnel of Siloam, is obvious in its purpose, but a simple stone set upright may be subject to a variety of interpretations. The normal changes of a few thousand years plus the iconoclastic zeal of reformers have rendered difficult the problem of locating and distinguishing Semitic sanctuaries, especially on the surface, while the excavation work in the region of our inquiry has been confined to a few mounds incompletely explored, but we may regard the evidence in hand as the treasure of good fortune relating to this most important field of research.

1. Researches in Sinai, p.63.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
II.

SACRED STONES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Apart from the etymological significance of the characteristic Old Testament term, "Massebah", the word manifestly had a technical value. The meaning of this word has been a matter of some confusion, having frequently been translated "image" and sometimes regarded as a technical term applied to a stone which was thought to be the abode of a spirit, but the problem of the meaning of this word will become clearer as we proceed. Reference is made in the Old Testament to the Massebah as a worthy and cherished emblem among the Hebrews, while Canaanite Masseboth are condemned, and the actual destruction of the Baal pillars is recorded. The Israelites are represented as frequently setting up Baal pillars thus provoking the jealousy of Jehovah, and the iconoclastic zeal of certain reformers was directed especially against the Masseboth of the Bamoth. Mention is made of the Masseboth of certain foreign nations, the destruction of which appears as especially significant in the fall of the said nations, while Jehovah is represented as sponsoring the destruction of the Masseboth of Israel in judgment against her. Strict regulations are

1. From the Hebrew root יָשָׁב meaning "something set upright".
2. A.V.
4. Exod. 23:24; 34:13; Deut. 7:5; 12:3.
5. II Kings 3:2; 10:26,27.
7. II Kings 17:9-11.
8. Asa (II Chron. 14:3; cf. I Kings 15:11ff.); Jehoram (II Kings 3:2) Jehu (II Kings 10:26,27); Ezekiah (II Kings 18:4; II Chron. 31:1); Josiah (II Kings 23:14; II Chron. 34:3ff.)
9. Egypt (Jer. 43:13); Phoenicia (Ezek. 26:11).
indicated, with reference to the erection and usage of the
Massébah among the Hebrews, which modern scholars have inter-
preted as amounting to absolute prohibition. There is a possi-
bility that a Massébah stood in the fore-court of the Temple
at Jerusalem and also one may have been erected by Jacob in
connection with his purchase of a parcel of land near Shechem,
both of which are rendered "altar" according to the Masoretic
text.

In slightly varied form the word has been translated
"garrison" having special reference to some feature of Philis-
tine domination over Hebrew territory, while the same form is
used with reference to a threatened captivity in which the party
mentioned is to be driven from his "station". In another pass-
age, the word is rendered "army" in behalf of which the Lord
is represented as encamping about His house. In Isaiah the
word has been translated "substance". Another word with the
same root meaning has been variously translated "garrison",
"officer", "deputy", and "pillar".

1. Lev. 26:1 forbids the erection of a Massébah "to bow down unto
   it". Deut. 16:22 forbids the erection of a Massébah "which
   Jehovah thy God hateth". See below, p. 194.
3. Cf. II Kings 12:10, according to LXX.
4. Cf. Gen. 33:20, according to the use of the verb.
5. See Gunkel, Genesis, p.29c; Kautzsch, Relig. Israel, HDB, Ex-Vol.
P.620.
8. Zechariah 9:8, n.]\]^\^.
9. Isa. 6:13, n.]\]^\^.
10. D.XXX renders "arwékhâma", see below, page 86.
11. I Sam. 13:4; II Sam. 8:6.
13. I Kings 22:147. cf. 1
The common word "ében" is frequently used to designate the sacred stone as at Bethel, Gilgal, and elsewhere. The same word is applied to the inscribed stones, the stones of an altar, and the stone idols.

The word " sû r", ordinarily translated "rock", is especially applicable to natural crags and rock surfaces. It is frequently used as a divine title and is often found in poetic passages, but it is never indicative of the sacred pillar stones, though it is properly applied to sacred rock surfaces.

The term "yad" is sometimes used in connection with stone erections, though the ordinary meaning of the word is "hand". A pile of small stones is termed in the Hebrew "gal" and may be translated "heap". It is uncertain whether "Gilgal" signified a stone circle, though, in the archaeological remains, we find that the stone circles as well as rectangular enclosures were very common in ancient times. The Massebah at Bethel was called "Beth Elohim" but the designation appears unique in Hebrew practice and it is probably a mistake to apply the term to sacred stones in general. Another word translated "pillar".

1. Gen. 28:22; Josh. 4:3; 24:26; Gen. 31:45; Judg. 9:5; 18; I Sam. 6:14; 7:12; I Kings 18:31; Isa. 28:16. 7
2. Exod. 34:1; Deut. 27:18. 8
3. Exod. 20:25. 9
4. Deut. 29:17; Ezek. 20:32. 10
5. 7
6. Deut. 22:37; II Sam. 22:32; Ps. 18:2; 28:1; Ps. 71:3; Isa. 26:4. 11
7. Deut. 32:13; Ps. 27:5; Isa. 8:14. 12
8. See below p. 118. 13
10. 7
11. I Sam. 15:12; II Sam. 18:18. 15
12. 7
13. Gen. 31:46; Josh. 7:26; 8:29. 16
14. Josh. 4:13; 5:9. 17
15. Gen. 28:22; יִפְקָד יִפְקָד יִפְקָד יִפְקָד יִפְקָד. 18
indicates that it often had a sacred or symbolic significance, though the term does not connote the material character of the pillar indicated, and it comprehends a wide variety. It is used to designate the two pillars which stood in front of King Solomon's Temple, and it was a pillar, thus called, by which it was the custom in Jerusalem for the king to stand. Moreover, the same term is applied to the pillars of fire and cloud in the Wilderness, as well as the supporting pillars of the Tabernacle and of the Temple. A single large stone might sometimes be called "mizbēah", a "place of slaughter", but more generally the term implies a group of stones, though it may signify simply an altar of earth.

The pre-Islamic Arabs designated, by the term "mizbāb", a stone which was a kind of an altar upon which the blood of the sacrifice was smeared, and, at the same time, it appears to have had some idol significance. The etymological meaning of the word is the same as that of the Hebrew Massēbah.

The Old Testament represents the stones at Gilgal and Bethel as being quite small, though large monoliths are sometimes indicated in other passages. The shape of the stones in the Old Testament were apparently of great variety, though in Arabia they were perhaps generally rectangular, while often, especially in the north, the specialised stone was of conical

---

1. I Kings 7:21; II Kings II:14.
3. Exod. 27:10.
5. I Sam. 14:35.
8. WBS, Relig. Sem., p. 203f.
9. Gen. 28:18; Josh. 4:5.
form. The Old Testament pillars appear to have always been unattached to the foundation upon which they rested, though at Petra we find the pillars hewn out of solid rock and un-detached from the surface. As to the location of the pillars, they were frequently associated with the sanctuaries, but also beside graves which were not necessarily related to a place of worship, which conforms to the well known practice among the Phoenicians. The national boundaries are recognised as offering appropriate locations for the erection of Masṣēḇōṯ, and in some cases they were probably associated with a military fortress. The Maszebah appears to have had a counterpart in the Asherah, especially in Canaanite practice and in the idolatrous defections of Israel, though the association is never approved in Hebrew practice by the Old Testament writers. A mysterious term, also associated with idolatry and translated "sun-pillar", is mentioned with apparent disapprobation in connection with Hebrew worship.

Some relationship may be recognised between the Hebrew terminology and certain archaeological remains. The archaeological monolithic pillars, menhirs, or simple upright stones belong in the same class with the Maszebah. Groups of stones, forming a circle or rectangular enclosure sometimes called "cromlechs", are not so easily identified in the Old Testament. The most common megalithic remains are the dolmens found in great numbers, especially east of the Jordan, which, in their

5. II Kings 23:14; Deut. 12:3.
6. ⅣⅡⅡⅡ
7. Lev. 26:30; Isa. 17:8; Ezek. 6:14; II Chron. 34:4.
simplest form, consist of two uprights supporting a flat table stone, but cannot be positively identified in the Bible narratives, and, in any case, their relation to this study is largely incidental. No mention is definitely made in the Old Testament concerning cavities artificially cut in the sacred stones, which, in the archaeological remains, are found both on horizontal and vertical surfaces and designated "cup-marks". It has been suggested that the tradition of the Menhir persists in the shapely form of Egyptian obelisks and in the masonry imitation of monolithic pillars like Trajan's Column, and such may well be true in the light of the consummate form of the pillars of King Solomon's temple. Howbeit, considerable variation in the form of pillars is to be observed among those found in the excavations; some are cylindrical, others have bulged centers, or diminishing diameters at one extremity in the fashion of a cone, and the Old Testament confirms the fact of variety in size and shape of the sacred stones.

The Old Testament evidences, relating to the pillar cult, are of great importance, especially since ancient extra-Biblical information about such stones is meagre, as Thomsen has pointed out. Evans indicates the necessity of the Biblical sources in order to understand the true inward significance of the Mycenaean cult. Surely, we must recognize the value of the Old Testament evidences. Since the theory, that the patriarchal narratives are merely faithful pictures of the life of Israel in the ninth and eighth centuries, has been shown to

5. Cf. WRS, Relig. Sem., pp.201,204.
be inconsistent with recent archaeological research data, it is possible that the cult narratives of the same may not be entirely fictitious. Moreover, the internal evidences suggest that the narratives are vitally linked to the early period indicated. The problem involved in the present inquiry relates especially to the vital realities of the experiences of the Hebrews, and one may feel assured that there is ample historical basis to permit entry into the holy places with Israel with the prospect of becoming acquainted in some measure with the experience of the spiritual peers of mankind in those far off days.

III.

THE RELATION OF THE PRESENT TO THE PAST.

Modern superstitious conceptions and practices, in relation to sacred stones among the so-called "Primitive Semites Today", necessarily bear some relationship to the past, since the superstitious folk-lore of today is an accumulation of the ages, but it is a mistake to speak of the "well known conservatism of the East" as if to imply that the most ancient Semitic religious practices had remained unchanged until modern times. Clermont-Ganneau must have forgotten the inevitable modifications of the religious upheavals and political revolutions of nearly three millennia, when he said, "These Mākāms, as Deuteronomy calls them, which Manasseh rebuilt, and against which the prophets in vain exhausted their invectives, are word for word, thing for thing, the Arabic Mākāms, whose little white-topped cupolas are dotted so picturesquely over the mountain horizon of central Judea". Curtiss tells us that it is from the "ignorant minds" of today with "notions that lack sharpness of definition", which furnish us "the most perfect mirror of ancient views" about divine beings, and that there are multitudes, who, least affected by Judaism, Christianity, or Islam, have preserved the most antique ideas and customs. It hardly seems probable that ignorant minds with notions not sharply defined would preserve anything very accurately, yet it is true that ignorant minds of today as well as yesterday are readily susceptible to the flowing tides of superstition. Be

1. Quoted from Conder, Tent-Work in Palestine, p.304ff.
2. Primitive Semitic Religion Today, p.94.
that as it may, one must not interpret the basic religious ideas of a vigorous intellectual type, such as that from which the Hebrew prophets sprang, by the lowest mentality of any age, though it is well recognised that even the Hebrew race had its share of ignorant and superstitious minds from the beginning, just as every other civilisation has had. There is, of course, 1 a certain truth in the statement of Curtiss that "the seats of ancient Canaanitish heathenism had power to master the Israel­ itish conquerors of Canaan", but such a statement must be modified, since the conquered people allied with the High Places became only partially the conquerors in religion, and it must be admitted that Judaism came out of the battle after having paid a great price, resulting in many scars, but they had broken the shackles of Canaanitish heathendom. With reference to the Gezer 2 sanctuary practices, Frazer says, "In this as in many other dark places of superstition, the present is the best guide in the interpretation of the past; for while the higher forms of religious faith pass away like clouds, the lower forms stand firm and indestructable like rocks". The rocks of the lower forms of religious faith may be porphyritic, yet it is too much to say that they are indestructable, for it is well known that certain crude religious practices of the past have been broken by a higher faith.

We have been reminded that, in order to get the earlier phases of the pillar cult among the Semites, we must turn to the pre-Islamic Arabs, but this is questionable not only in

view of the uncertainty of the original home of the Semites, but also in the light of a comparative study of religious development. If, for example, we take the case of Christianity apart from the authenticated primitive documents, it would be hazardous to declare whether the Protestant or Catholic practice preserved most faithfully the practice of the apostles, and a Catholic apologist would doubtless dispute the claim that the newest practice of the Reformation is, in fact, older than the Catholic practice.

MoCown has provided us with the best clue to the interpretation of modern hagiology of popular origin, when he points out that it throws light on the "fundamental interests and longings of the human heart and the means which have been spontaneously developed to satisfy them". The real importance of the modern so-called primitive religion is not that it reveals the most ancient customs and outward forms of religious practice, but that it does reveal the basic religious instincts and yearnings of the human heart in seeking the security and succour of the superhuman, and especially is this manifest under the stress of the mysterious and unusual experience in individual or community life. One thing significant about the modern primitive Semitic practice is that the same religious effect is not dependent on an identical mode of procedure, and, as Palgrave has indicated, the Arab when left to himself does not see why Christian, Jewish, Moslem, and pagan creeds and forms should not all be equally true and estimable. That it is on this basis we should expect in modern Arab religion a syncretism of faith and practice which we find in actual fact.

1. Muslim Shrines in Palestine, AASOR, 1923, p.47.
Much of the late tradition and usage is manifestly an adaptation or corruption of the more ancient tradition and usage of the Old Testament times, and accordingly, as far as the latter throws light on the subject, it is to be preferred as more authoritative. The inferiority of the Arab tradition in contrast to the archaeological data is well illustrated in the stone at Sa'diyeh, east of the Sea of Galilee, which is known to the natives as Job's Stone. Schumacher and others, in the light of the Arab tradition, associated the stone with the ancient worship of the Phoenicians, but the marks which were observed on the stone, served later to identify it with Rameses II. The Arab tradition and practice should not be regarded as a key to the interpretation of either the archaeological data or the Scriptural narrative. However, the vast amount of information, which has been so carefully collected by patient research students from the field of modern traditions and customs in Semitic lands as well as similar information collected from savage tribes in other parts of the world, has its proper value for comparative purposes but such ought always to be used as a clue rather than a key to the ancient ideas and customs.

1. Across the Jordan, p.191.
2. See Paton, Early History of Palestine and Syria, p.127.
IV.

THE COMMON USE OF SACRED STONES AMONG THE WESTERN SEMITES.

The use of sacred stones appears to have been common to all branches of the Semitic family as indicated by such examples as the Black Stone of Mecca, the Nabataean pillars, the bas-reliefs of Phoenician territory, the Hebrew Massébôth, as well as the pillars of the Semites of Babylonia. It is difficult to know just why the use of sacred pillars was so common among the various groups of the Semites. It has been suggested by Petrie that the Semitic invasion, especially of the Amorites, introduced the use of the Massébah in Palestine, and it is probably true that the Neolithic Troglodytes, or Aborigines of Canaan, were not acquainted with the sacred pillars. Sayce thinks the kinship of the Semitic languages indicates that the families speaking the Semitic tongue perhaps once lived in a compact community, and we may suppose that the origin of the custom of setting up pillars may be as ancient as the origin of their language. If this be true, Duessaad is probably in error when he says that the custom of erecting sacred stones was adopted by the Israelites from the Canaanites. It is doubtless fair to assume, on the ground of Semitic kinship, that we are dealing with a common custom which had its inception at a time when the various branches of the Semitic family were in the process of development. No one need be surprised to find that the Hebrews inherited many things in common with their Semitic neighbours, which fact is strongly emphasised in the Old Testament.

4. Races of the Old Testament, p.70.
5. Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israelite, p.222
though, as has been pointed out by Barton, similarity of custom does not necessarily invalidate their unique spiritual conceptions. It is doubtless true that "the air that blew over the great plains of Babylonia was not quite the same which swept over Bethel or Jerusalem", but such does not minimise the fact that the life and religion of the Hebrews have "substantial analogies" among other peoples. How could it be otherwise? We know that the founder of the kingdom of Edom was regarded as the twin brother of Jacob. The Ishmaelites who settled in the north of the Arabian peninsula were the descendants of Abraham, who was also the father of the descendants of Keturah in Midian. Moab and Ammon traced their ancestry to Lot, and the Moabite Stone confirms the close kinship of the Moabites and Hebrews. It is significant that Eleazar of Damascus was so closely associated with Abraham's house as to be at one time the heir-apparent, and Jacob found his wives among his kindred in the region of Syria, while other evidences confirm the close relationship of the Aramaeans to the Hebrews in custom and language. The Phoenicians on the north were in friendly alliance with Israel, especially at the beginning of the kingdom, and recent discoveries have shown close kinship with Israel in literature. In view of such facts there is no reason to doubt that the sacred stones were a part of the common heritage of the several Semitic families and date back in origin beyond the horizon of history. In limiting this discussion to the

2. Rogers, Relig. of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 181.
4. Sayce, Early Israel, p. 33.
study of the Western Semites, we are dealing perhaps not only with the nearest kin but also with the nearest neighbours of the Hebrews. The ordinary classification distinguishes between the Northern and the Southern Semites, while the Northern Semites are divided into further groups, one of which has been designated as the Western Semites, including the Hebrews, Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Canaanites, Amorites, Phoenicians, and Carthaginians. This underlying ethnic community with similar customs, language, and habit of mind must be considered, however, in the light of the fact that a sense of separateness and individual peculiarities marked these various nations and distinguished them sharply from each other, in accordance with which, we find them at the beginning of history emphasising their differences and exalting their special claims.

The problem as to the origin of sacred stones is a difficult one, though of considerable importance, since it is unlikely that the subsequent practice completely escaped the influence of the originative impulses. Various theories of origin have been advanced which may be briefly enumerated and evaluated.

Certain writers have believed that the conventional stones of the Semites were regarded as rude phalli and in such resemblance is to be found the origin of the pillar as a sacred symbol. That phallicism found a place in ancient times as a specialised development need not be denied, but the claim that Semitic religion originated in such needs more testimony than has been given, and the appeal to modern psychology does not improve the supposition. The flaws of degeneracy reveal a diversity of obsessions in every historical era, but this is not sufficient warrant to postulate a universal social dogma, and it is important to remember that life is a house of many windows and is endowed with a complexity of desires and interests. The evidence of confusion in the phallic differentiation probably indicates that the entire conception was adventitious, and, at least, there is no plausibility in the advocacy which would designate it as the initiative motive in the pillar cult.

2. Cf. Barton, op.cit., chapter III.
5. See Lagrange, Etudes, p.190; Cook, Notes to 3rd Ed., p.688.
Another theory has been advanced to the effect that
the standing stone was originally chosen by the Semites as
being the nearest approach to the human form, and that this
rudimentary statue was regarded in the earliest times as a
supernatural man. Contrary to this view is the fact that
several pillars may stand together where only a solitary deity
is worshipped, and objection may be made on the ground that it
is not a primitive idea to represent a human body or any of its
parts. The combination of the Egyptian stele of Mekal with
the Canaanite Massahah at Beth-Shan has been thought to indi­cate a transition, actually discovered in the process, from
the Massahah to the definite anthropomorphic representation
of the deity. Such an interpretation minimises the most sig­nificant feature of the Beth-Shan combination, for the stele
of Mekal is plainly an Egyptian proclamation, published in an
appropriate place and in the characteristic manner of the Egypt­ians. It has been well said, that, even when the arts had
made considerable progress, the Semites felt no need to fashion
their sacred symbols into the likenesses of the gods. It has
been supposed that while the pillar was originally intended as
an image, instead of developing according to the skill of the
ancient sculptors which would seem to be the normal evolution
if originally chosen with regard to human likeness, the form
was renounced and it became the abode of a spirit. Howbeit,

4. See Rowe, MJ, June 1928, p.147.
if to represent the human body had been the fundamental motive of the sacred stones, then the difficulty of diverting the chief development into a different channel would probably require the equivalent of a new beginning. It appears certain that the prototype of the consummate pillars of Jerusalem and Tyre did not, in the germinative stage, appear in the guise of an anthropomorphic simulacrum.

It has been widely accepted as a principle in Semitic religion, that the religious structure originated in the conception that the whole world of earth, water, air, and sky was animated with divine life, and that the sacred stones thus received sanctity. The varying modifications of this theory account for a large part of the literature dealing with the origin of the sacred stones. The idea may sound plausible, but it is when we attempt to trace the course of development that the postulate becomes difficult. It may be a simple matter to comprehend the adoration of the spirits of nature, incarnate in animals and trees, but, as pointed out by Constenau, it is a different thing when we face the problem of the origin of the sanctity of stones. We may assume that the natural rock boulders, from which echoes and other mysterious sounds were heard, or from which living water sprang, were regarded as sacred, but, when we attempt to transfer this conception to the conventional stones, it requires a complete

1. I Kings 7:15f.
2. Herodotus, II, 44.
6. See JFM & JMF, ibid.
forfeit of the original idea. Furthermore, we cannot escape the implications of the fact that, among the Semites the instances of the worship of rocks and stones, in situ, are neither numerous nor prominent.

The theory, that the sacred stones were chosen on the basis of convenience for ritual purposes, is indeed significant, but it must not be taken as a universal criterion of the practice, since it is largely based on the late Arab identification of the idol and the altar. The Arab practice, instead of indicating the original status, more probably signifies a final crystallisation in the given community, and, while this desert consummation did not obtain wide specialisation, as in the case of the more cultured centres, yet it could scarcely be less than a gnarled maturity. We cannot conclude from the Arab evidence that the stone was chosen in the beginning on the solitary basis of convenience for ritual purposes any more than we might regard the Massébôth, which marked the Cyprian graves, as indicative of a universal memorial origin. It is perhaps best to recognise the importance of the Arab practice without assigning it a universal scope. In any case, the evidence is secure that a close bond existed between the altar and the pillar, as is plainly indicated in the narratives of the Old Testament, though this does not necessarily imply that they were identical in the beginning.

Certain stones enjoyed the distinction of having fallen from the sky, but it hardly seems necessary to say that not all can be explained as having developed from the mystery of meteorites. However, it must be recognised that not only meteorites but also stone fossils and stalactites had some place in the development.

That the originative idea was derived from the shape of the mountains, has against it the fact that the stone did not ordinarily resemble the mountain, and also it would seem strange to erect the conventional representation alongside, or on the summit of the original prototype. It has been suggested that the sacred pillar represented the reduction of the Ziggurat, which, in turn, was a reduction of the earth mountain.

The cosmological conception of the Ziggurat may have sometimes been applied to the conical stone, but the idea is too abstract to explain the origin of a practice which flourished on so large a scale; furthermore, the reduction of an advanced theological symbol to a mere pillar does not seem plausible on the face of it.

The use of standing stones, in connection with the burial of the dead in the earliest times, has been thought to

2. At the entrance of a dolmen near Tell Hum, the writer picked up a limestone nodule, five and one-half inches in circumference, three inches long, and egg-shaped, which had all over the surface, magnificently perfect fossils of small flowers and grass-seed pods. Its relation to the dolmen may be of no importance, but it doubtless possesses the basic potentialities of the portable baetyls of magical fame.
5. See Exodus 24:4; Robinson, Sarcophagus, p.120.
6. See Lagrange, ibid.
provide the clue as to the origin of the pillar. It is, at least, highly significant that the pillars were associated with graves in a very early period, and it is probable that the gravestones played some part in the early development of the cult, though, certainly, only a part. It must not be forgotten that the sacred stones were comprehensive in their relation to the affairs of the community and frequently were not linked with graves.

It has been well said that it is impossible to trace a river to its source, for the farther up-stream we go, the more brooks and streams we find, until we discover that a river has not a single source but many. Explorers in the field of religious origins have sometimes mistaken a shoal, or a bend in the stream for the fountain-head. The probability is that multiple causes were operative to emphasise in the primitive mind the unique value of certain stones, yet, there was certainly, at some point, the development of a conventional importance which gave unity in the midst of diversity, the basis of which was perhaps the real or imaginary connection between certain stones and the ancestral heritage.

1. Kennedy, HDB, p.730, suggests the possibility that consideration for the dead may lie at the basis of the pillar cult. Thomassen, Palästina und seine Kultur, p.31, thinks that menhirs, such as those found in relation to dolmens, are probably memory stones, and that the Manseboth in the next age also served such a purpose. Mackenzie, PEFQS, Oct. 1912, p.175, proposes that the pillar was originally set up to some remote ancestor who was afterwards held in veneration as the head of the family of which the pillar became the sacred heirloom.

VI

DEVELOPMENT AND DIFFUSION.

The tendency of a community to rally around the relics of ancestral greatness is a well known characteristic of man in every stage of civilisation. The Wailing Wall in Jerusalem is a modern example of such, with its pageantry of Jewish mourning for the ancient ancestral heritage which has suffered pollution and desolation; the stones most ancient are the stones most cherished, being kissed and fondled with ardent passion and devotion, while great lamentations and urgent prayers are made in the name of the ancient worthies of Israel in behalf of and in the hope of a restoration of the heritage. Another illustration of the same fact is to be observed in the annual Jewish festival at Meiron, west of Safed, where, associated with the graves of certain celebrated Rabbis, are three pillars of stone, which, at the festival of the "Great Burnings", become the centre of frenzy and emotion on the part of Jews from distant lands as well as from all over Palestine. It merely illustrates how a permanent symbol of the ancestral heritage of honour and achievement may become a rallying point and a religious incentive. This tendency in the human race, to venerate whatever may be associated with cherished history, is sufficiently illustrated by the multitudinous churches and mosques that have been built on historical sites in Bible Lands.

2. Cf. II Chron. 16:14; 21:19; Isa. 57:9; Jer. 34:5.
3. Just outside the Zion Gate in Jerusalem, may be seen today an old pillar (see fig.25.), formerly belonging to some ancient structure. The writer saw a group of native women pause in the presence of this unseemly stone and reverently kiss it, which was explained to him by some native men in the vicinity as being "very ancient".
and, indeed, the most culturally advanced people in the world are known to rally around their monuments of national and community exploits. It is not strange that the graves of heroes in primitive times became centres of veneration. Stones perhaps became associated with the ancestral heritage in various ways; for example, a meteorite excited deep curiosity and became increasingly important through succeeding generations, while, on the other hand, the convenience of ordinary stones in certain localities led to an early adaptation of such to the necessities of human experience, some of which were in a special way related to the heritage of the tribe. Thus, particular stones achieved prominence in a community very naturally in connection with the tendency of man to inquire into and to use the material objects which came to hand. The stones which were thus set apart for whatever reason, in the due course of time, were clothed with the mysteries of the most venerable antiquity. Such stones naturally became the visible tokens of authority in the problems of human relationships and served as sanctions in the internal affairs of the tribe, as well as in inter-tribal transactions; accordingly, there clustered about the sacred stones important customs, imperatives, rights, and names which were dynamic in tribal esprit de corps, and provided an incentive to religious exercises. The tribal sheikh would naturally associate himself with the ancestral stone as a visible sanction of his authority to administer the affairs of the heritage, and it became the proper place for judicial proceedings, while, at the same time, it was a suitable

place for the making of vows and the taking of oaths; in which case, the consequent fitting penalty for unfaithfulness might be the forfeiture of the normal rights in the heritage. The curses, blessings, and promises of the deity were associated with the stones, while the religious beliefs and practices would also be identified with such relics of the past. This is in line with the well known fact that the treasured heritage of religious, social, political, and economical values of the Semites was always firmly anchored in the sacred past. A sense of kinship with the mysterious past gave sanctity to antiquity and served to preserve the customs, traditions, and imperatives of the tribe, while the desire to share in the ancestral heritage and a fear of the consequent evils involved in a departure from the ancestral paths caused them to regard their heritage as a stream coming out of the realm of the venerable years. Doubtless, in the early times, the sacred stones were regarded as the silent messengers from the realm of hallowed traditions.

The interaction between tribes served greatly to stimulate the importance of the sacred stones, and continued to enhance the tribal value of the stones through a long period of time, contributing to the crystallisation of the conventional practice. In the historical period, the results of reciprocal influences may be observed in the entire range of the evidence. The course of development in the different tribes was neither identical nor simultaneous, but a high susceptibility is to be expected in the contagion of a simple

1. Even a wine-press, a threshing-floor, or a well might be invested with sanctity and become a place of enchantment through the hallowed influence of the past.
custom operating in a field of natural tendency, and the interaction would serve only to mature that which was already evident. Therefore, it would be an error to say that one tribe originated sacred stones and others borrowed the practice. Thus we may suppose that reciprocal tribal influences played a part not only in the development, but also in the wide distribution of the conventional practice, and yet the process was silent and unobtrusive, spreading from one field of natural tendency to another.

The recognition that the development was in the field of natural inclination through the stimulation of cultural interaction may help us to understand the paradox of the seeming universal derivation from a "single simplified source" and the apparent independent origination in certain regions. It is not impossible to think of the monoliths of western Europe as having some link with the east, due to the transmission of a simple idea through the ordinary contact of the old world which only served, however, to influence a field of natural tendency. The argument which supposes the Semitic origin of British megaliths, the Egyptian origin of all megaliths, or that they are due to the maritime exploits of an early race of metal seekers, does not seem to comprehend the fact that the field of natural tendency

1. Massingham, Review of G.E. Smith, Diffusion of Culture, London Times, Nov. 19, 1933, says that the idea of cultures springing up spontaneously and without contacts from one another, has been abandoned as demonstrably untrue.
2. Graham Callander, Lecture to the League of Prehistorians, Reported in "Scotsman", March 16, 1933, indicated that there is evidence that "the Scottish stone circle was conceived and perfected in Scotland."
3. See Petrie, Eastern Explorations, p. 27.
5. See G.E. Smith, Ancient Egyptians, p. 176; Migration of Early Culture, p. 78.
facilitated and conditioned the distribution. Macalister has pointed out that the wide area of distribution, and the many gaps which it presents, requires some other solution than that the megalithic monuments are to be regarded as the work of a single wandering race. It is not reasonable, nor is it necessary, to suppose that the races of the earth were once united in a universal cult of sacred stones, and equally absurd is the suggestion that the wide diffusion of sacred stones is based on a phase of man's religious development toward higher forms of belief.

There is no valid reason for assigning the stone monuments of the Western Semitic lands to any fabulous people, since there is nothing against the probability of Semitic origin, and, indeed, the emphatic Semitic characteristic in the use of sacred pillars indicates that they were not dependent in their cult upon megaliths of a prior civilization.

In the course of the wide specialization of the sacred stones in the later periods, the process by which stones achieved sacredness was greatly modified, and ordinary stones were found

2. Cook, Relig. Pal., p.11, indicates that they need not be attributed to any "decisive migration, whether from east to west, or the reverse".
5. It is true that ancient monuments would excite curiosity (cf. Cook, Relig. Pal., p.9), but it is probable that even the Hebrews were not ignorant of the general signification of sacred stones. Also, the distinct traces of the chisel may be against any general relationship to the Zuzim or the Rephaim (Cf. P.& C., Art in Sardinia & Judea, Vol.I,p.268.)
7. See Hall, Ancient History of the Near East, p.441, with reference to the name "ANTIU" as the "pillar-folk".
suitable for immediate induction into the realm of sanctity. Ceremonial investiture became a frequent occurrence, depending on the particular circumstances, though some stones in late times perhaps achieved sacredness according to the primitive process. Specialisation of meaning was inevitable, after the custom had received recognition, and, in like manner, specialised reasons for the ascription of sanctity to stones are plainly to be observed in the later period. Accordingly, there is no necessity to suppose that the narratives, such as

1. that which associates the stones at Gilgal with Joshua, were

2. aetiological in conception.

---

1. Josh. 4:3.
2. See Gray, Sacrifice in O.T., p.103; Offord, PEQ, 1919, p.129.
VII

CUP-CAVITIES IN THE SACRED STONES.

It is well known that cup-marks are found in great profusion in the geographic environment of the ancient Semites. It is because they are frequently associated with the archaeological Menhirs, appearing on the vertical as well as the horizontal surfaces of such, that the interpretation becomes vital in the study of the Pillar Cult. Since the cup-marks on the Menhirs apparently bear some relationship to those found on the natural rock surfaces, it becomes necessary to investigate the question from a general point of view. The variety of places where cup-marks are found, together with the wide difference in size, shape, and arrangement of the cavities, confronts the archaeologist as one of the most difficult questions, relating to the early culture of man. Cup-marks are sometimes found singly and isolated but more frequently in groups. Perhaps their most characteristic association is with caves, but they are often found in connection with dolmens and rock-hewn tombs, as well as on the bare rock surfaces.

It is certain that the majority of cup-marks in the region of our investigation are of great antiquity. Wherever cup-marks appearing on rock surfaces have any connection with other remains that can be definitely dated, those remains are assigned to the pre-Semitic race. The evidence at Gezer seems to indicate that cup-marks may have been the peculiar expression of the Troglodytes; and at Tell Zakariya the debris, accumulated

above a large cup-mark, contained the early types of Israelite pottery, which indicates that the cup-mark antedated the Hebrews. The collocation of the cup-marks with a standing stone at the mouth of the Troglodyte crematorium cave, which was afterwards used as a burial place by the earliest Semites, shows a transition from the cup-marked surface to the standing stone, since the standing stone was erected on top of an accumulation of about a foot of earth over the group of cup-marks. The cup-marked rock surface was perhaps superseded by the standing pillar prior to the time of Abraham, and this conforms to the suggestion that the cup-marks were made by people in the Neolithic stage of culture.

While the cup-marks definitely belong to a high antiquity, it is important to observe that it is not an uncommon thing to find them adapted to modern use. Small cup-marks may be observed on numerous grave stones of the Hebrews, Arabs, and Christians in the vicinity of Jerusalem. In a tomb shrine at Beit Ta'amir, there is a natural stone just inside the entrance, which stands elevated above the average floor level in which is a circular cup-mark, probably belonging to antiquity, about the size of a coffee cup, and is kept filled with water. Just inside the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem in the tomb sanctuary of Sheikh Lulu, a stone with a large antique cavity is built into the wall with the cavity on a vertical plane, and the worshippers come to reverently rub their hands inside the cavity. At

7. See fig. 23.
Sarepta large cup-marks, apparently of ancient construction have been adapted to a secular purpose and used as evaporation basins for the production of salt from the Mediterranean Sea water. The writer saw two Bedouin women using an ancient cup-hole, on the cliff above the amphitheatre at Amman, for the purpose of pounding grain. Of course, the modern use of the more ancient cup-marks must be regarded as an adaptation of a relic to current experience and does not explain its significance in antiquity, but the fact is important in that it shows the tendency of the later inhabitants to adopt and adapt, to their own purposes, features which belonged primarily to their predecessors.

The question as to whether cup-marks were originally designed for secular or religious purposes is difficult to determine, but it is probable that, in the period of their earliest development, the cup-marks were primarily secular conveniences, and it may be that in such a period, the distinction between the secular and the sacred was not clearly drawn. In the large pot-cavities around the prehistoric caves at Megiddo, evidence in the form of ash remains indicates that some were used for cooking, and it seems reasonable to suppose that cup-cavities may have been invented for the every-day conveniences of the desperate and hard life of the cave dwellers. It only follows as a natural consequence that what had been useful in daily life should find a place in the religious culture. It is probable that the first adaptation of cup-marks from a secular to a sacred use, was in behalf of the dead. At

1. See fig. 34.
2. See fig. 33.
3. Kittel, (Studien, p.131,) thinks the cup-marks were originally made for libations.
least, there was a very early tendency to associate cup-marks with burial caves and dolmens. The convenience of cup-marks for the reception of liquid offerings in behalf of the dead or the deity would quickly become apparent to those who found them useful in their own experience. Accordingly, in the sacred places consecrated by Neolithic man, we find the splendid examples of cup-marks adapted to sacred purposes, as for example in the cave chamber at Gezer, where the cups are arranged in a purposed pattern of three concentric ovals, which Macalister termed a gigantic table of offering. The relation of cup-marks in the Neolithic period to religious and funerary rites had given them a mystical and symbolic significance long before the advent of the Semites, and, when the Semites appeared on the scene, the cup-marks were the typical and permanent characteristic of both the secular and religious culture of their predecessors.

The Semitic invaders with their more advanced culture had little need for the cup-marks, but the values of a previous culture are seldom completely neglected by the succeeding civilisation, especially when the relic is of an indestructable type. To some extent the cup-marks were perhaps adapted to various uses by the Semites, but the problem that especially confronts us in this study is to determine why cup-marks are found on the standing stones of the Semites.

2. Conder, Survey of Eastern Palestine, p.268, fig. 113; Cf. Handcock, Archaeology, p.18.
The various interpretations of cup-marks as stellar maps, neighbourhood maps, gaming tables, or a primitive mode of writing have been applied to cup-marks on rock surfaces, but such ideas do not satisfactorily explain the lateral cup-marks on Menhirs. Certain writers have regarded the lateral cup-marks as representative of the feminine principle, but it has been pointed out that the channels between the holes contradict this interpretation. With reference to the statement of Herodotus that he saw in Syria pillars which had a feminine designation, it is difficult to know just what he meant, but we may be sure that what he saw belonged to the later and more imaginative Greek period, and does not signify in any case that the cup-marks were symbols of a female deity, worshipped by the Aborigines. We may dismiss the possibility that cup-marks were sex symbols, except perhaps in some rare cases. The conjecture, that the cup-mark represented an eye, perhaps the eye of the deity, or served as a magical charm against the evil-eye, could hardly be used to explain the lateral cup-marks with connecting channels. A widely accepted theory as to the significance of lateral cup-marks on Maṣṣēḇôṯ is that they were for the purpose of receiving libations of blood or oil, rubbed on, as an offering to the numen supposed to reside in the stone.

4. ii, 106.
5. Engraved with ὑφαίνειν ἀγάλατον.
This theory, however, is hardly tenable in view of the fact that the lateral cup-marks do not appear to have received the supposed treatment; for example at Gezer, certain stones showed signs of ritual treatment where no cup-marks existed, while there was no evidence that unguents had been applied to the cup-marks.

The connecting lines on the vertical surface between the cup-marks could scarcely have the same practical use as the interconnected cup-marks on a horizontal plane, such as at Artuf. Vincent is doubtless correct when he indicates that the cup-hollows on the Menhirs were put to no practical use, and his suggestion that they were symbolic of offerings to the deity is worthy of consideration, at least, we may agree that they were symbolic in nature. The connecting lines between the cup-marks on lateral surfaces show conclusively that the purpose was symbolic, since the connecting lines could have no practical value.

It seems probable, however, that the lateral cup-marks, instead of being emblematic of offerings to the deity, were symbolic of the heroic past, the cup-marks being the chief relic of environmental antiquity. One may suppose that the cup-marks on the standing stones were copied from a horizontal surface even to the inclusion of the gutters. Vincent is right in regarding the presence of the cup-holes in the High Place area at Gezer as significant of a possible connection between the primitive Neolithic sanctuary and that of the new race. It is well known that the Semites gave great attention to the venerable past.

There is, indeed, nothing to contradict the possibility that the vertical cup-marks on some of the pillars at Gezer were in the

---

1. Vincent, Canaan, p.111.
2. Cf. Kittel, Studien, p.130, who regards them as having a similar purpose.
3. Canaan, p.129; cf. the contrary, Lods, Israel, p.94.
stone before being quarried, and if such be the case, it implies that the Semitic Gezerites favourably regarded the stones, which bore the characteristic marks of their predecessors. It has been suggested that the cavities on the Menhir at el-Mererat may be tribal marks, but the cup-marks on the pillars at Gezer were perhaps placed on the pillars for the same reason that the pillars were placed near the sacred cave of the Troglodytes.

The cup-marks found on the top of Menhirs, such as the one found by Gonder near Amman, may well have been used for libations or as receptacles for holding water. There can scarcely be any doubt that the Semites adapted the horizontal cup-marks to ritual purposes, as the portable tables of offerings found in every strata at Gezer, as well as the shallow saucers in the shrine of the kings at Serabit indicate. The Old Testament does not speak of the use of cup-marks in a religious or secular capacity, either among the Canaanites or the Hebrews, which fact, however, does not indicate that cup-marks were not in use in Old Testament times, but it may indicate that the cup-marks played neither an important nor an outrageous part in the religious life of the first millenium B.C. in Palestine.

In ancient times, graves were frequently marked with Menhirs, stone-circles were sometimes associated with the necropolis, dolmens were linked with various stone and pillar arrangements, while often, many stones of various sizes were heaped upon the grave. In our inquiry as to the relation of sacred stones to burial places, we may assume that dolmens in their original conception, were designed as tombs. As such, they have been erected in various parts of the world over a wide period of time. In the area of the Western Semites, they are generally attributed to the end of the Neolithic period, though they may perhaps properly be related to the same epoch as the cist burials at the necropolis of Teleilat Ghassul, which belonged to an early stage of the Bronze Age, as indicated by the bronze implements discovered there in the recent excavations.

The early age of the dolmens, found in association with pillars, indicates the high antiquity of the link between graves and standing stones. The question arises as to whether dolmens served any cult purpose. If they were the objects of iconoclastic zeal, such might indicate that they had some important ritual significance. The fact that they are especially numerous east of the Jordan, while their scarcity in western Palestine

2. See Smith, Migration of Early Culture, p.78; Tallgren, Antiquity, June 1933, p.201; Peet, Stone and Bronze Age in Italy and Sicily, p.275; Macalister, ERE, Vol.XI., p.881.
5. Cf. Thomsen, Palestina und seine Kultur, pp.31, 45.
is conspicuous, suggests iconoclasm, though there may be other plausible explanations.

We may discount, as scarcely worthy of attention, the suggestions that dolmens are the explanation of Abraham's altar at Shechem, Jacob's "gate of heaven", Hosea's reference to altars as "heaps in the furrows of the field", or Isaiah's mention of the "table for Gad", for such passages find better explanation apart from dolmens. It is true that there is some evidence to indicate that dolmens had a cult importance. Since dolmens are cup-marked and associated with stone-circles, their sacred value is emphasised, and in view of the fact that their true importance was sepulchral, we may suppose that they were associated with the cult of the dead and perhaps frequently used as altars.

The possible adaptation of the flat stone roof of the dolmens for altar purposes may be indicated by the fact that the people of Belu use stone offering places made of piled up stones with a flat top-stone. The several theories of the modern Bedouins suggest the possible uses to which dolmens may have been adapted in times past, namely, as ancient graves, places of sacrifice, and as Beit el Ghul, "ghoul's house". The Arab version of the

2. See Gray, ibid.
7. Conder, ibid.; Isa. 65:11.
11. See Perry, Megalithic Culture of Indonesia, p.26.
12. See Vincent, Canaan, p.256.
ghoul houses may have some bearing on the passage in Deuter-
onomy which speaks of the abominations of the backsliding
Israelites who sacrificed unto devils, provoking God to anger.
Such may have some support in the various traditions, concern-
ing the haunts of demons, which lend plausibility to the sup-
position that the hole drilled in the entrance of some of the
dolmens was designed to allow the spirit free access to and
egress from the tomb. The story of Balaam's sacrifices must
bear some relation to the Moabite dolmens, though it is im-
probable that this narrative was aetiological in conception,
since, as Sayce has pointed out, it is almost inconceivable
that a Jewish fabricator of prophecies would make a Gentile
diviner the mouth-piece of Jehovah. Therefore, we find some
basis for the conclusion that some of the dolmen structures
were actually built during the period of the Hebrew approach
to Canaan through Transjordania. Howbeit, while the dolmens
were ordinarily graves of important personages, there was some
ritual practice associated with them, and it is possible that
the dolmen structure provided an altar pattern which may serve
to explain the simple structures which do not appear to have
been sepulchral.

1. The Arabs think the dolmens at el-Mareighât are haunted and
erect stone pillars in the vicinity as a propitiation. Cf.
Conder, PEFQS, 1882, p.73.
2. Deut. 32:17.
4. Thompson, Semitic Magic, p.90, quotes, "0 thou evil demon,
turn thee to get hence; 0 thou that dweltest in ruins,
get thee to thy ruins". Perry, Megalithic Culture of
Indonesia, p.57, says that in Keisar the ghosts of the
dead are supposed to live in the lofts of old houses.
5. See Paton, Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead, p.2; Evans,
8. See Macalister, PEFQS, 1900, p.224; Conder, PEFQS, 1882,
It has been thought that stone-circles and enclosures, in relation to graves, were magical in significance for the protection of the dead or the worshippers from the power of external demons, but, in any case, the circles associated with burial places must have been the scenes of religious ceremonies, as at the necropolis at Teleilat Ghasul, which appears to have been a sanctuary as well. There is a large stone-circle, approximately fifty-five metres in diameter associated with the necropolis, implying some religious importance, while some significance must be attached to the arrangement of the burial cists in relation to the general network of stone enclosures.

Burial places appear to have been associated with worship from the earliest times down to the present day. As to the significance of the connection between graves and sanctuaries, there are several possible solutions. The linking of the church and the cemetery as in the case of our civilisation may have been based on nothing more than the logical suitability of such as a gathering place for the rendering of devotion to the deity. It is perhaps impossible for man to divorce his religious experience from his emotions in times of bereavement, and consequently a natural link was realised in the union of the sanctuary and necropolis. It may be that

3. Through the kindness of M. Stekelis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, the writer had the privilege of observing the necropolis in the process of excavation.
4. The Sabeans had a special veneration for the two great pyramids, believed by them to be the sepulchres of Seth and Idrées; see Palgrave, Narrative of a Year’s Journey, Vol.II., p.258.
5. The hill-top Wely is ordinarily linked with a tomb; cf. Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion Today, p.78; Paton, AASOR, Vol.I., p.62. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, p.179, says the Takhati meet to celebrate the ritual of their cult in the cemetery.
ritual practice at the burial places only indicates the normal
regard for the dead. It is, at least, an unsatisfactory dic-
tum which would make the combination of a grave with a sanc-
tuary the sure proof of ancestor worship. The great burnings
for the departed kings of Judah have been interpreted as evi-
dence of ancestor worship by the Hebrews, but the practice was
more likely the burning of many spices as funeral rites in
honour of the kings. However, one need not deny that the cult
of the dead was one of the most ancient and most firmly entrench-
ed perils which beset the prophetic religion of Israel, and that
centuries of conflict centred around the persistent practice.
The reference in the Psalm to the sin of Baal-peor seems con-
clusive that the rites of that place consisted, at least in
part, of sacrifices to the dead. The abominations of Baal-peor
echo throughout the Bible, and many of the Hebrew prohibitions
were apparently aimed at the cult of the dead, which would in-
dicate that such rites were extensively practised among the
neighbours of Israel. Doughty says, "There is a sacrifice for
the dead which I have seen continued to the third generation.
I have seen a sheykh come with devout remembrance to slaughter
his sacrifice and to pray at the heap where his father or his

1. See Vincent, Canaan, p.269ff., concerning the careful method
   of burial practised by the ancients.
3. See II Chron. 16:14; 21:19; Jer. 34:5.
   be a protest against the defilement of the holy places
   by dead bodies.
7. See Num. 25:1-5; Deut. 4:3; Josh. 22:17; cf. Rev. 2:14.
9. Charles, Eschatology, p.23ff., thinks the tithing pledge of
   Deut. 26:14 indicates sacrifice to the dead, but Margo-
   llouth, ERE, Vol. I., p.446, says it suggests the provision
   of sustenance rather than sacrifice.
father's father lies buried." The Hindus are enjoined by 1
the Vedas to offer cakes to the ghosts of their ancestors as far back as the third generation; this ceremony takes place on the day of the new moon in every month and they also make a daily offering of water. The prophetic rebuke of those who "remain among the graves and lodge in the vaults" indicates necromancy, or necrophilism. Isaiah's reference to those, who seek unto the dead through familiar spirits and wizards "that chirp and that mutter", if considered: in connection with the familiar spirits and wizards fostered by Manasseh, might indicate that an important part of Josiah's reform was directed against cult practice related to necromancy. The modern cult of spiritism illustrates the human susceptibility to any supposed approach to the spirits of the dead, and it is significant that the ancient as well as the modern cult had mediums through whom they sought the departed spirits.

It appears that the ceremonial importance of the burial places was perhaps due to a variety of impulses. Some of the rites may be explained as merely an exaggeration of the universal reaction to violent grief, while others may have been based on such desires as to communicate with the dead, to provide sustenance for them, or to show due respect and

3. Isa. 8:19.
7. Cf. Cook, Notes to 3rd Edits., p.605. Some of the rites appear to be no more than a sign of mourning. See Isa. 22:12; Amos 8:10; Micah 1:16; Jer. 7:29; Ezek. 7:18.
honour to them, but there is also evidence from which we may infer the custom of offering sacrifices for the purpose of propitiation of, or communion with the dead, and superstitious tendencies perhaps led to the development of strange rites. However, the pillar erected over a grave must have originally signified the jurisdiction and protection of the deity over the sacred area as well as to serve a memorial purpose.

The question arises as to whether the veneration of the dead was fundamental in the stone and pillar cult. We may assume that all ancestral relics and customs were sacred and that ancestral graves were especially so; gravestones must have been very suitable as tribal sanctions, and as the natural gathering places for the renewing of the bonds of tribal solidarity, which would tend to give them a symbolic importance in relation to the traditions and customs of the tribal heritage. Therefore, even if we consider the question entirely apart from the possibility of ancestor worship, we cannot dismiss the suggestion that the sanctity of ancestral tombstones played some part in the development of the pillar cult. Howbeit, we must remember that man's religious emotions and instincts have always

1. Burial tumuli perhaps sometimes represented the votive offerings of the community, and the degree of hate or esteem with which the deceased was regarded determined in some measure the size of the tumuli.

2. Cf. WRSD, Relig. Sem., p.322. Bertholet, History of Hebrew Civilisation, p.78, thinks the small stone pillar at the entrance of the Gezer cave may indicate worship of the dead. Cook, Relig. Pal., p.14, suggests that the line was perhaps not always clearly drawn between care for the dead, cults of the dead, and cults of the gods.

3. Kennedy, HDB, p.731, indicates the possibility that desires, on behalf of the dead, may lie at the beginning of the pillar cult. Paton, Spiritism, p.261, thinks the pillars originated in ancestor worship. See H.P. Smith, Relig. of Israel, p.30.
been inspired by a variety of experiences, and other evidences are too insistent to permit the thought that gravestones offer more than a partial explanation of the conventional sacred stones.
ASTRONOMICAL CONCEPTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PILLARS.

In the Old Testament, we find reference to cult objects, called hammānim, which were denounced by the Biblical writers. In the most frequent interpretation of these they are regarded as images, or pillars dedicated in the worship of the sun. It has been suggested that they were miniature obelisks which represented the sun’s rays and were symbols of the sun god called Baal-hammān in Phoenician inscriptions. On the other hand, the hammānim have been thought to be incense altars, and several limestone altars of incense have been found in Palestine in recent years which have been interpreted by Albright as the archaeological type of such. To such an interpretation, W. R. Smith is inclined, in connection with the theory that the sacred pillars were sometimes equipped with an arrangement for consuming the fat of the sacrifice. It may be said that the evidence is not sufficient to be decisive, and the exact definition of the hammānim must remain uncertain.

The fact that the obelisks of the sun god in Egypt are called Maṣṣēboth seems to be against the idea that the hammānim were obelisks of the sun god, and we are perhaps safe in discounting the theory that they were pillars of the same character as the Maṣṣēboth.

1. Lev. 26:30; Isa. 17:18; 27:19; Ezek. 6:14, 6; II Chron. 14:5; 34:4, 7.
4. In etymology, the word may be associated with something hot.
7. See Jer. 43:13.
8. Kay, ERE, Vol. VIII, p. 488, thinks the hammānim probably represented the Maṣṣēboth with solar associations. Likewise, McCurdy, Jewish Ency., Vol. X, p. 38. To the contrary, see Offord, JQR, 1919, p. 126. The evidence indicates that they were sometimes inscribed, see Cook, Relig. Pal., p. 163.
The suggestion that the orientation of the Phoenician temples indicates worship of the sun-god, and that shrines, such as that at Serabit, with the entrance toward the west are to be associated with the worship of the goddess of Night, can, at most, only be regarded as clues. The two stone columns, found in the Phoenician "Temple of the Giants" in the island of Gozo, are referred to by Sayce as "pillars of the sun", and, as further examples, he mentions the two pillars of Solomon's temple, as well as the two columns of gold and emerald of the temple of Melkarth in Tyre. While it is well known that sun worship was practised among the Semites, it is largely a matter of conjecture as to the astronomical significance of the twin pillars of the Phoenician temples. Benzinger suggests that the columns at the temple entrance bear a relationship to the earth mountain peaks between which the sun every day comes and goes, while Jeremias thinks that, inasmuch as the temple reflects the throne of God, the pillars represent the two turning points (solstices) of the Zodiac. The idea has been advanced that they were "sky supports" personified and that twins signify the contrast between day and night, the twinhood of the sky being sometimes expressed in terms of the sun and moon.

Bent tells us that the decorated side of the monoliths at Aksum was always toward the rising sun, and, since the monoliths were related to altars, the inference is drawn that they

---

7. O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East, Vol.II., p.188.
were associated with sacrifices to the sun. Dushara has been thought to be a sun-god, which would indicate some astronomical association with the pillars at Petra, but, insofar as such may be based on the name, Dushara, it remains uncertain. In view of the fact that the chord of the alignment at Gezer faces east, some have thought that the worship at that sanctuary was associated with the rising sun, but Macalister has pointed out that the curve of the alignment was probably unintentional, being hardly perceptible until plotted on paper.

According to Jeremias, the Semitic immigrants, in their teaching and culture, emphasised the earthly phenomena of life and death, dependent, according to them, on the course of the stars. Toussaint tells us that, toward the close of the third millenium, the bamoth had been provided with the new material of the cult, and that in the same period the Babylonian gods, in astral character, had been introduced in Canaan. On the other hand, Moore regards the worship of the heavenly bodies in the sphere of Canaanite religion as having come in under Assyrian influence in the seventh century, and that it flourished under Manasseh, but was temporarily suppressed with other foreign religions by Josiah. However, in view of place-names such as Beth-Shemesh, it appears that the sun-god was known in Palestine at an early date.

1. G.A. Smith, Historical Geography, 7th Edit., p.628, suggests that name may mean "lord of the Shara" (Mount Seir.)
4. Les Origines de la Religion d'Israël, p.166.
The Menhirs and stone-circles generally possess features which lend plausibility to the idea of some relation to the observance of the heavenly bodies in connection with other features of the cult. The divisions of the day are still marked by the Egyptian peasants, by putting a stick upright in the ground and marking where its shadow falls. In contrast to this, the Banks Islanders use a very round stone, called "sun-stone", around which they wind red braid and which they decorate with owl feathers to represent rays, singing the while, in a low voice, the proper magic spell by which their purpose is to make sunshine. It can scarcely be doubted that stone pillars were sometimes used by ancient people to mark the movement of the heavenly bodies in the determination of seasons. It is also highly probable that the advanced astrological conceptions of some of the Semites were symbolically represented in pillar groupings.

4. See Lagrange, Etudes, p. 191, N. 5, for the suggestion that seven stones signified the seven planets. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 290, thinks the stones of Sinai and Gilgal were associated with the twelve signs of the Zodiac.
5. See p. 144 f.
THE EXTENT AND BASIS OF PHALLICISM.

The extent of the phallic idea, in connection with the sacred stones as well as the basis upon which the conception was founded, must claim our attention, since the evidence indicates that the stones were sometimes adapted to such a meaning. It may be said at the outset that the temptation, on the part of some writers, has been to imagine too much in this field, where, by the aid of imagination, one might transform the entire scheme of ancient civilisation into one grand phallic pattern.

Generally speaking, we may discount any argument which is based on the shape of the stone, unless the resemblance can be substantiated without the aid of imaginative conjecture. The fitting of an upright pillar in a socket ought not to be regarded as evidence of intention, on the part of the ancients, to form the brutal realism of a similaerum priapi, since such a fitting can more readily be explained from a practical point of view. With respect to the vertical cup-marks, the examples of connecting channels should be sufficient to discount the theory that cup-marks were generally representative of the feminine principle.

There is no satisfactory evidence to indicate that the people of Gezer attempted any phallic realism in the form, position, or markings of the stone pillars of the alignment, though the numerous little phallic emblems found at Gezer suggest that phallicism played a part in the cult of the High Place. It is true that one must recognise the possibility that such a conception

2. See Vincent, Canaan, p.113.
3. See Kittel, Studien, p.130, N.1.
may have been assigned to the monoliths by those who venerated
the less imposing symbols, but such an argument is somewhat
precarious. Other explanations are easily advanced to account
for the form and marking, as for example, the conical shape of
pillars number four and eight, and the grooved top of pillar
number one, which have been thought to suggest phallic realism.

Peters relates the discovery of a large collection of
phallic emblems at Nippur, which seem to show the development
of the crude representation into the conventional conical sym-
bol. It is significant that this discovery led Peters to re-
gard the cones as representative of the masculine principle,
while, in certain other areas, the cone has been associated
with the goddess, which contradiction serves to emphasise the
confusion characteristic of the development of the phallic idea.

It is well known that the cone was associated with Ashtarte at
Byblos, as well as with Aphrodite at Paphos. Some of the coins
of the Cilician city, Mallus, exhibit a female deity and a coni-
cal stone, which fact suggests that the conical stone was the
emblem of the mother-goddess. However, Hogarth found in a
sacred grove in Cyprus a conical stone with a phallus attached,
which indicates that the specialised values of the conical stone

1. See Vincent, ibid.; Macalister, ibid.; Macalister, PEFQS, 1903,
p.27; Cook, Relig. Pal., p.81.
2. JPOS, Vol.XLI., p.132, N.1; p.142.
4. Lagrange, Études, p.192, points out that many of the sacred
stones are absolutely of neuter form, and that the sym-
bolism does not apply universally.
5. It is interesting that pine-cones were associated with the
fertility cult in Greece, see Nilsson, Greek Religion, p.91.
7. See Frazer, op.cit., p.82; cf. Benzinger, op.cit., p.323, who
suggests that, if the cone shown on the coin of Byblos is
indeed a Massebah, then it must be in the nature of a
phallus.
do not permit a general conclusion, as to the meaning, on the basis of the form. In view of the fact that the cone in that area has been found to be associated with other cults, it has been pointed out that it was an error on the part of those who regarded every conical stone excavated in Cyprus to be related to Aphrodite.

The theory has been proposed that the hand was the euphemistic symbol of the phallus, which the pillar was believed to represent. It may be said that the archaeological data is not convincing. The frequency of the hand, depicted on Carthaginian stelae, is well known. The religious character of the inscribed stelae from Carthage, on which one hand and occasionally two are represented, is quite evident. The hand is an emblem of adoration and prayer in Sardinian art, and there are hundreds of stelae dedicated to Tanit, which have no inscriptions save the hand outstretched and uplifted in prayer. It is significant that the uplifted hand is usual in giving a blessing and the hand is also a symbol of faithfulness. Canaan speaks of hands imprinted with blood on the doors of shrines which signs are intended to protect against evil. Among the modern Semites, the hand is usually a protective symbol; even the living hand has the same use, and when one is threatened by evil not of this world, he thrusts out his hand, palm foremost, and cries, "Five in the face of the enemy". The "hand" which Saul set up for himself in Carmel south of Hebron after

4. See C.I.S., I. tab. 47, 48, 49.
he had conquered the Amalekites, suggests the idea of his power
over an enlarged dominion. Barton thinks that "hand" in
Isaiah 57:8 means "phallus", but Smith rightly designates such
an interpretation of this passage as conjecture.

The testimony of Lucian, concerning a pair of phalli
of great size, which he saw standing in the vestibule of the
temple at Hierapolis, does not teach us much. The reputed in-
scription probably indicates to us, according to Hartland, that
under Greek influence the pillars were identified as phalli and
their erection ascribed to a Greek writer. Lucian reminds us
that the natives were not sure as to the meaning or use of the
pillar, and perhaps the most significant thing that we may learn
from him is the evident confusion in the understanding of the
pillars at the time of his visit. Howbeit, there is no reason
to doubt that the pillars at Hierapolis were at that time inter-
preted by some as phalli. We are told that, in the ceremonial
of Bacchus, there was a procession of the phallus, while, in
the secret rites of Adonis at Byblos, the ritual penalties
sometimes required prostitution, and, out of the proceeds of
the traffic, a sacrifice to Aphrodite was paid. The abomin-
able rites of a decadent society, here referred to, reveal to
us very little as to the true meaning of the sacred stones,

1. I Sam. 15:12; see, Pederson, Israel, p.251.
4. The Syrian Goddess, p.57, par.16.
5. "I, Dionysus, dedicated these phalli to Hera, my step-mother."
6. ERE, Vol.IX, p.819;
7. The Syrian Goddess, p.68, par.38; see WRS, Relig.Sem., p.457.
8. The story of the scorpion as a monitor to keep the stylites
awake is highly typical of oriental imagination, and weak-
ens the value of the information received by Lucian, (see
The Syrian Goddess, ibid.).
but show unmistakably the depraved conceptions which must have played some part in the attribution of phallic meaning to the pillars.

There are certain cases of isolated stones which indicate a phallic conception, such as the Sardinian menhir mentioned by Mackenzie, but recognised by Cook to be of Roman date. The stone block from Sardinia, with a carved phallus on it, does not signify a general conception. The representations, described by Schneider, are late carvings belonging to the Byzantine times, and it is questionable whether they have any cult significance. One need not be surprised to find such aberrations in religious guise from the earliest epoch down to the present time. When the Protestants took the town of Embrun in 1585, they found, among the relics of the principal church, a depraved symbol which was associated with the traditional first bishop of Lyons, while other similar cases of the same period in Europe are known. The earliest example of what has been thought to be a phallic pillar is the Hajr el Mansub, the top of which is wrought, but the interpretation is not secure, and, as Thomsen suggests, it may be a late work on the stone. Budde has well said that too often the

1. PEF Annual, Vol.I.,p.36, refers to a menhir with female breasts in an environment of dolmens at Tamuli.
2. Religion of Palestine, p.20.
5. See Trumbull, Threshold Covenant, p.230.
7. Fortunately, the historical evidence forbids the theory that such emblems were fundamental to Christianity.
phallic significance is arrived at through a forced explanation, for instance, Sellin lays stress on a stone from Petra with three round holes, which he regards as representing the eyes and vulva of a deity, concerning which Budde asks to the point, "Why not the eyes and the mouth?" Of the gravestones among the late Moslems, the male form which is crowned with a turban, does not have the importance which Eerdmans supposes, and his suggestion, that the Hebrew sepulchral monuments were phallic symbols, is not well taken. There is some question as to the phallic importance of the memorial stones found among the Khasis of Assam, which were set up to perpetuate the memory of the dead, though the upright stones are significant of the males, and the flat table stones of the females. It has been thought that the twin columns, twin cones, or twin posts of the Phoenician world, which we also find in Solomon's temple, as well as in Greece and ancient Babylonia, are symbolic of the androgynous nature of the deity, but such a supposition lies entirely in the realm of speculation.

Various Old Testament passages have been cited as indicative of the phallic conception, but most of the references are obscure and the phallic inference is, at least, uncertain. Many of the interpretations may be dismissed as entirely too imaginative, as for example, the interpretation by Jeremias of the custom of swearing by putting the hand under the thigh.

1. O.L.Z., 1912, Vol.XV., Col.469. However, Sellin confesses that he takes the phallic meaning to be only a probability.
3. Ibid.
5. Stones have been sometimes regarded as husbands and wives by people in various parts of the world. See Tyler, P.C., Vol.II.,p.162.
The use of the term, "hand", in Isaiah, as well as in the case of Absalom and Saul, is of uncertain meaning, though it evidently signifies some cherished portion belonging to, or desired by those to whom it relates, and therefore may be good or bad according to the particular case. The reference in Isaiah to the ancestry of Israel is plainly metaphorical, and does not imply a phallic symbolism as indicated by the contrast of the verbs. One passage in Ezekiel seems to refer to phallic worship, but such can be disputed. The famous slur of Jeremiah with reference to stock and stone parentage may perhaps be associated with phallicism, and a certain literalness may be implied in the statement, but the use of the verb leaves some doubt as to whether a female emblem is indicated in the passage. Other references have been cited but may be dismissed as mere conjecture and altogether the case for phallicism is not strongly supported in the Old Testament.

It is evident that the phallic conception, as a general explanation of the Masseboth, lacks confirmation, and most of the exponents of the theory recognise its insufficiency, though we may infer from the evidences that at times it became quite prominent. With Cook, we may regard it as secondary in religion, and we must agree with Kay that it was a subsidiary and an occasional interpretation of the standing stones.

1. II Sam. 18:18. 2. Isa. 57:8
5. 6. Isa. 51:1, 2.
7. Ezek. 16:17.
10. 11. cf. Frazer, Adon bar, Attis, Osiris
The question arises as to the basis of phallicism. Some have thought that it arose out of a purely religious point of view, but, with reference to the Canaanites, we find evidence of the grossest and most immoderate sensual pleasures, and it is clear that this form of religion was far from spiritual perception. Trumbull thinks that the finding of phallic emblems in the earliest remains is an indication that phallicism was not a primitive conception of a religious truth. The Ashtarte plaques are usually found in the Bronze Age, but also in the Israelite stratum. The form and postures indicate a goddess of lust and shame, whose rites, we know, were practised in various lands. Just how such crudeness developed is difficult to determine. One may suppose the early existence of a simple and inoffensive desire for the fruitfulness of the heritage, and that this desire was expressed in holy covenanting with God around the sacred symbols of religion. Such symbols were naturally susceptible to the influences of degeneracy, which, as far as we know, was the characteristic of every period of human society, and the onslaught of the cultivated vice of a maturing civilisation, in some regions, broke down the resistance to crude immorality, resulting in the consecrated orgies. Regardless of the primitive point of view, one can scarcely deny that the cult of prostitution was a decadence. If, in primitive times, the fruitfulness of the heritage was regarded as the evidence of

2. Cf. Thomsen, Palästina und seine Kultur, p. 47.
5. See Thomsen, op. cit., p. 43.
God's favour and the true basis for the offering of sacrifices of joy, while barreness in the heritage caused them to implore the deity for a renewal of the reproductive forces, then we may suppose that the pristine purity of this conception of worship was easily transformed into a base vulgarity under corrupting influences. Sayce thinks the consecrated orgies of the Istar cult in Babylonia, with its revolting features, spread westward to Syria and beyond, and that the corrupting influence of this cult was responsible for the abominations that cause the Greek writers, as well as the Hebrew prophets, to stand aghast at the violation of social decency, enjoined as religious duties. However, others have been impressed with the Greek influence in late times. It is probable that the crude symbolism and the depraved orgies spread, through contagious interaction between the various centres of profligacy both east and west. Such interaction may serve to explain the confusion evident in the use of phallic symbols, though confusion would perhaps be natural in conceptions that were extraneous rather than inherent in the cult. The sanctuary at Gezer, with its crude emblems of shame, confirms what we find in ancient literature concerning the nature of the cult that shocked the sensibilities of even the secular writers in that far off day. Howbeit, the very fact that such was shocking to the Greek writers, as well as to the Hebrew prophets, is sufficient proof that it was not

3. Herodotus, II, 49, expresses his belief that the idea of the Bacchus ceremonial was from Phoenicia.
4. It is plainly evident that the deities were made to serve the cause of vice, and the devotees were initiated by impure rites. See Driver, HDB, Vol.I.,p.168f.
the ordinary in religious practice. Whether the wholesome reaction against the perverted performance was characteristic of a minority or a majority of the people of any period, it seems certain that the protesting group was always sufficiently strong to prevent a definite definition of the sacred symbols on the basis of phallicism; and accordingly, it was never quite known, even among the phallic devotees, whether the stone ought to be masculine and the wood feminine, or vice versa, and perhaps frequently the same stone may have been used interchangeably in the designation of sex.

In view of the goodly Massēbōth of the Great High Place at Petra, one may inquire why the many other sanctuaries of the Petra area are not equipped with pillars. The character of the remains found at Petra forbids the conjecture that such formerly existed at all the sanctuaries, since there is no probability of iconoclastic destruction, nor is there an indication that they disappeared under the weathering of the centuries. Commenting on the significance of this inequality among the sanctuaries at Petra, Robinson suggests that the Great High Place, with its two pillars on Obelisk Ridge, is the only High Place in the area that can be regarded as a public sanctuary, and that the other places are merely private burial chapels, the owners of which were not able to afford pillars. The pre-eminence of the Great High Place over all the other sanctuaries in the community cannot be questioned, but the evident importance of some of the other High Places will not permit the supposition that the distinction is based on the difference between public and private sanctuaries. Robinson seems to forget this theory of private Mortuary Chapels when he comes to a discussion of the roofed-in chambers of some of the subsidiary High Places which he thinks may be equivalent to the "Houses of the High Places" mentioned in the Old Testament. The distinction which Robinson rightly emphasized by his incorrect designations, must needs claim our attention.

1. See fig. Frontispiece.
2. Sarcophagus, p.150.
We may agree with Dalman that the pillars on Obelisk Ridge are to be associated with the citadel or castle structure, probably of Nabataean origin, situated between the pillars and the altars, but it does not follow that the pillars, being related to the citadel, were alien to the Great High Place, as suggested by him, since we cannot suppose that the builders failed to consider the relevancy of the fortress to the pre-eminent sanctuary which it adjoins. Dalman's effort to divorce the pillars from the High Place sanctuary on the basis of the intervening structure deserves comment, in that he recognised the importance of the "citadel" in the scheme of structure on Obelisk Ridge, but his contention, that the pillars have no relation to the High Place, is not well-considered, and indeed we may suppose that the presence of the intervening structure lends emphasis to the importance of the Great High Place which has been fitly called the Royal Sanctuary of Edom. One may object to the suggestion of the learned scholar who supposes that the pillars may have been associated with a subsidiary sanctuary on the same elevation rather than with the Great High Place, for surely so great a distinction, as these splendid pillars imply, could only belong to the sanctuary which was unquestionably grander in location than any other in the vicinity could possibly be.

To what then shall we ascribe the distinction between the Great High Place with its mighty pillars and the other numerous High Places of the Petra area with no pillars at all? The intervening structure, which has been called the "citadel", provides

1. Petra und seine Felsheiligtumer, p.182.
3. Ibid.
5. Dalman, ibid.
the clue, which doubtless indicates that it was a kind of "Tri-
bunal" High Place, a "High" place indeed, with jurisdiction
over the other High Places which were certainly public but mani-
festly subsidiary to the "High" place. The implication of
this suggestion is that the pillars were associated with the
regnant house, which would also aptly explain the relation of
the intervening structure to the area. It would not be a
strange thing to suppose that the pillars at Petra represented
the divine sanction of government over the national heritage,
and, since the deity was closely associated with the ruling
house, it is probable that the pillars were significant of
the Royal House. The house of royal authority was usually
thought of in connection with the sanctuary of the deity, as
has been pointed out by Kittel, who says it was for this rea-
on that the great temples of the gods were located in the capi-
tals of Empires, such as Babylon and Nineveh; likewise, we
find the gigantic halls and magnificent temples of the State
in Memphis and Thebes; in Broussa, the capital of the Caliphs,
was located the sanctuary of the Ottoman Turks; and in Moscow,
the national cathedral stood beside the great palace of the
Czars. This tendency is in line with the fact that justice
was uniformly dispensed under religious sanction and protection,
as has been suggested by Kennedy. We may suppose, therefore,
that the pillars possessed more than mere architectural impor-
tance at the entrance to the Great High Place at Petra, and that
they certainly did not definitely represent the deity, since

1. Great Men and Movements, p.137.
they are located, so to speak, in the vestibule of the sanctuary, but the sanction of the deities was invoked upon these pillars and served to sanctify what the pillars signified.

The clue to the meaning of the Canaanite pillars perhaps may be indicated in the significance of the Hebrew word, Baal, which may be translated, "Possessor", "Master", "Lord", etc., and the dominion implied is exercised over a local heritage. The pillars of Baal seem to have been indicative of the jurisdiction thus signified. The entire area of the jurisdiction of the Baal was sometimes conceived to be throbbing with his spirit, influence, or numen, but the true significance of the stone was that it represented a government "set-up" over a particular area which was by divine sanction and right. From our point of contact with the Old Testament, it would be difficult to determine the exact development of these petty dominions. The modern shrine in Palestine is conceived of as a place where some saint once stood, or was buried, and this saint, or wely, is recognised to have been human, and to have played a heroic part as a man in the affairs of the community in by-gone days. The Makám is the central point from which the influence of this ancient worthy extends, which, in the case of a powerful sheikh, is thought to be dominant sometimes for a distance of twenty miles. It

2. Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon.
3. See C. & R., Hebrew Religion, p.170, who suggests that the land belonged to the Baalim, and, while they might differ among themselves in importance and power, the locality of each god owed allegiance to him and no other. Vincent, Canaan, p.145, says that the sanctuary indicated the proprietorship of the god over the domain.
4. "Makám" signifies "standing place".
seems reasonable to suppose that the Baal pillars once marked the venue of a powerful sheikh who exercised lordship over the surrounding areas, and upon the pillars was invoked the divine sanction and protection against any who should be disposed to question or violate the rights and authority of the master of the heritage. In the process of time, a cult of the heritage was developed which preserved the title "lord of the possession", and perhaps, in some cases, the name of the heroic sheikh of the community was also preserved. However, such names seem to have been little more than lordly titles, as for example, the name of the tutelary deity of Tyre, Melkarth, means "king of the city". In any case, the Baal, or Master of the heritage, usurped the divine prerogatives, and the later sheikhs were subject to him and found their prosperity and protection by the favour of the Baal under whose sanction the customs and privileges of the community were regarded as inviolate. The sacred stone may have originally been the gravestone of the heroic master, or a so-called "boundary" stone, but, regardless of the exact origin, it was significant of dominion over the heritage. The place of the pillar, accordingly, became the point from which the law of the community proceeded, and the place for the administration of justice, as well as a religious shrine. Concerning the asylum of the holy place, Frazer has suggested that the refugee became the possession of the numen who would avenge himself for an affront upon his property.

However, in ancient times, the Laqebah of the Baal signified a jurisdiction over an area much wider than the small enclosure

where the pillar stood, for as has been suggested, the extent of dominion was often thought to be as far as the eye could see, and it may be that the original reason why the refugee fled to the sacred place was because the lord of the possession administered justice by the pillar in the name of the deity. The fact that the Hebrew code permits the violation of the asylum, if it is known that the fugitive was a wilful murderer, seems to suggest a court of justice rather than an avenging numen.

There is considerable evidence to indicate that the pillar was associated with the idea of jurisdiction. The narrative, concerning the coronation of King Jehoash, related that the king "stood by a pillar as the manner was", and, while the reason for the custom is not elucidated, we have other instances from which we may draw conclusions. When King Josiah made a covenant before the Lord with the people, concerning his reform program, it is stated that, in the making of the covenant, he stood by the pillar, which is called in the Hebrew, "Ammūd". The same term is also used to designate the pillars of King Solomon's temple, which pillars were significantly named Jachin, "He shall establish", and Boaz, "In it is strength". Just what was conceived to be the object which would be established, and the thing which possessed strength, remains a puzzle, but such ideas are frequently used in the Old Testament with reference to the kingdom of Israel ruled over by the house of David. In connection with the "manner", or "lawful custom", of the king of Israel to stand by a pillar, we are reminded of the tradition preserved by Homer respecting the dignity and royal importance.

---

2. II Kings, 11:14.
3. II Kings, 23:3.
of the position beside the pillar in the time of Ulysses of whom it is written, "The monarch by a column high enthroned etc.". In Hittite hieroglyphs, the ideograph for "king" and "country" is an elongated cone repeated once for "king" and twice or more for "country". The ideograph, according to Sayce, was perhaps suggested by the conical rocks which rise from the ground near Urgub and Utoh Hissar in southern Cappadocia, but another suggestion has been made that the prototype of the ideograph is to be found among similar hills south of Merash where numerous cones of considerable height, investing the landscape with a strange aspect, occur in a region of volcanic formation. Perhaps it would be difficult to determine with certainty the exact nature of the prototype of the ideograph but it is significant that "king" and "country" were thought of in relation to an elongated cone. Such a consideration may throw light upon the pillars at Gezer, and indeed, Macalister, in commenting on the lack of uniformity of the stones at Gezer, suggests that it is unlikely that the stones formed one scheme, erected all at one time as some have thought, but rather, that under the auspices of the successive "kings" of Gezer, they were added one by one. The foreign texture of the seventh pillar in the alignment may indicate more than the "successive kings of Gezer", and at least, permits the possibility of the dominion of the Gezer king over other petty kings of the surrounding district, or it may suggest the central shrine of a league of kings. This latter suggestion has a parallel in the case of the tribal

1. Odyssey, XXIII, 93, from Burder, Oriental Customs, p.382.
3. See Kyle, Explorations at Sodom, p.75.
7. See Bible Sidelights, p.29; cf. Sayce, Early Israel, p.290.
8. Moabite Stone, line 17.
must be related to the joy of the reclamation and extension of his sovereignty by the will and sanction of his god, Chemosh. The question arises as to the meaning of the word “Ariel”. The context of the Moabite stone implies that the word indicated a symbol of national glory, which supremacy was figuratively made subject to Mesha when he dragged them in triumph before his god, Chemosh. The word is used in a passage of Isaiah in which the Ariel is to be brought low, and seems to relate to the symbol of the supremacy of Israel. When the Ariel of Israel is brought low, then it shall be unto Jehovah as Ariel, or a sign of His supremacy. The relation of the term Ariel to the word which means "lion" seems also to indicate the idea of supremacy or mastery. We may suppose that what Mesha meant by his statement was that he captured the symbols of Israelite supremacy and that he had gloriously humbled their emblem of dominance. It seems reasonable, in the light of the Moabite inscription, to suppose that Benaiah's exploit was to overthrow certain symbols of government in the national sanctuary of Moab, Ariels which were symbolic of the national honour and sacred heritage of Moab. The fact, that these emblems of the nation would be jealously guarded by a garrison of the king's chosen soldiers, may help us to comprehend the importance attached to Benaiah's daring feat.

The kinship between the Hebrew terms, "Nēṣīb" and "Massēbāh", is well-known, and the former may be translated

1. Isa. 29:1-2.
2. "Nēṣīb".
3. II Sam. 23:20.
to mean "garrison", "officer", "governor", or "overseer". The difficulty remains as to the correct translation of certain passages which have been usually rendered garrison. When Jonathan smote the nëšib of the Philistines at Geba, the Philistines seemingly heard about it afterwards by the intention of Jonathan and gathered together for battle, also Saul blew the trumpet of war throughout all Israel, and the implication appears to be that Jonathan's act was a declaration of war, an insult rather than a slaughter, for which Israel was had in abomination by the Philistines. If Jonathan smote a menhir instead of a garrison of soldiers of the Philistines that was in Geba, it would have been an overt act equivalent to an attack on the government represented. On the basis of the Septuagint rendering of the word nëšib, McCurdy thinks it probably indicated a pillar erected as a symbol, or trophy of Philistine domination. One may well suppose that the "dominion" pillar was so regularly associated with the garrison, which kept the land in subjection, that the people of Israel thought of the garrison in terms of the pillar and the pillar in terms of the garrison, and, accordingly, the word may have been used to signify both interchangeably, which probably accounts for the confusion attached to the word in the several passages.

To say that "bones, not stones", were what Jonathan broke, does not close the argument, for, if he smote the "stones", he would have to smite "bones" in self-defence. On the basis

1. I Sam. 10:5; II Sam. 8:14.
4. It is significant that the Septuagint renders ἱππαρχον by ἀναχέλα.
6. See WT39 Varieties, PEFS, 1882, p. 266; see I Sam. 14:15.
7. The temple at Balata may have originally been used for military purposes. See Burrows, From Pillar to Post, JFCOS, Vol. XIV, 1934, p. 50.
of the facts set forth above, we may regard it as highly prob-
1 able that, when David set up Nēṣibīm in Edom such included not
only pillars, but also garrisons and governors, and that the
pillars were symbolic of David's jurisdiction over the subdued
area which he exercised through proper representatives and un-
der military protection. Likewise, the same word, used to
designate Solomon's provision officers, stationed in the sev-
eral districts, probably implies that the headquarters of such
officers were given official sanction by an upright stone,
which was erected with formal religious and military ceremony.
With reference to the erections of David in Edom, we know that
it was a prevalent custom of the rulers of Egypt, Assyria,
and other nations to set up monuments as signs of their victorious
advance into the conquered borders of the enemy, while ordin-
arily the evidence indicates that upon such signs were invoked
the divine sanction and the divine curse against those who
might violate the right of the victor in the conquered heri-
tage. The pillar, in such cases, carried the name of the rul-
ing house, which was usually linked with the national deity,
and, accordingly, the pillars are not to be thought of as
without religious importance. It may be that such an idea is
preserved in the figure of speech used by the prophet Daniel
who represents the Messiah's kingdom as a stone, cut out of
the mountain without hands, which breaks in pieces the composite
image, symbolising the kingdoms of the world. It is not with-
out significance that Ezekiel, when speaking of the victory of

1. II Sam. 8:14.
2. I Kings 4:7f.
5. Ezek. 26:11.
Nebuchadnezzar over the Phoenicians, declares that the Massë-
both of their strength would go down to the ground. One is
tempted to see a relation between the word for "strength" in
this passage and the Boaz pillar of King Solomon's temple, and
likewise it is interesting to note that Josephus translates the
Ebenezer stone by the Greek word meaning "strong", which led
Clermont-Ganneau to think that the stone must have borne, in
certain Hebrew manuscripts, the name Azaz with a final Zain in-
stead of a Resh. In any case, the Ebenezer was a victory
stone, showing the new limits of Hebrew jurisdiction by the
power of God, and, while it had a military significance, it
had also a deep religious value.

In a very real way the stone of Mecca, with its re-
ligious importance, has never been purely religious, but also
implied a governmental jurisdiction of military and political
importance, and the devotees, who faced toward the sacred stone
in their devotions, at the same time pledged their allegiance
to the supreme military command for conquest with the sword.
It was a centre of authority from which the laws governing all
affairs of life should go forth.

It is of some importance to know that pillars have
been used in widely separated areas and periods of time in
association with the ruling house of the community. At the
"Shrine of the Kings" at Serabit in Sinai, the only perfect
one of the memorial stones contains a prayer for the principal

1. "Naxuvov
3. I Sam. 7:12.
5. See Petrie, Researches in Sinai, pp.69,72,
people of an expedition. In both the Iliad and Odyssey, the Elders of the Assembly are mentioned as sitting in solemn conclave on the stone seats arranged in circles. The people of Nias, off the coast of Sumatra, erect stones before the dwellings of chiefs and other persons of rank. The Lion-Gate of Mykenai, which has above the gate a lion rampant on either side of a pillar, may suggest a similar concept. In Italy, every patrician's house had a tower and the possession of a tower was the great distinction of the nobles. In front of the New Palace at Potsdam built by Frederick the Great are two pillar towers which were doubtless erected in conformity to the traditions which indicated the pillar as the emblem of a patrician, or patriarch. In the ancient custom of crowning the king by a pillar, we may suppose that the pillar was significant of the heritage over which he was to rule and the sanction of the deity was invoked, likewise the curse of the deity was pronounced upon any who should violate the divinely anointed.

The unusual combination of the Canaanite Massebah with the Egyptian stele of Mekal at Beth-Shan indicates in a peculiar way the value of the pillar from the point of view of the Egyptian government. This Egyptian stele was set up around the fifteenth century B.C. when the city was under the control of a garrison from Egypt. In order to properly indicate the relationship existing between the local government

1. Iliad, B.XVIII; Odyssey, B.VIII; see Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, p.115.
4. The deity, represented by the beasts, guards the heritage of the pillar.
5. See Medici Art Series, Florence, p.120.
7. See Rowe, MJ, June 1928, p.147.
and the foreign garrison, the Egyptian stele was set up close by the Canaanite Maassebah. It is certainly probable that the stele signified governmental policy rather than religious worship on the part of the Egyptians. This proclamation was of double significance, implying, in the first place, the superiority of Egyptian authority over the city, and secondly, indicating the Egyptian policy of non-interference with the local existing order represented in the Maassebah under the sanction of the venerable Mekal, the tutelary deity of the city. The framework of the organised life of the community was not to be violated by the Egyptian garrison as long as the community submitted to the suzerainty of Egypt. This is in line with what we know through the Tell el 'amarra letters that the stationing of an Egyptian force in these Syrian cities did not interfere with the ordinary operation of the local government.

At Beth-Shean the most ancient social customs, political organisation, religious beliefs and rituals, as well as every other phase of the community heritage found authority in the Maassebah under the sanction of Mekal, and all this was honoured by the foreign garrison. It seems plain that what the Egyptians intended to signify by the setting up of their stele in the same room with the Canaanite Maassebah was that they claimed the right to supervise the existing government and customs of the community without any purpose to overthrow the established

1. Compare the combination at Beisan with II Sam. 17:13, which Macalister suggests may indicate the purpose to drag the stones, that represented the interest of the city, into the river (Gzer, II, p.392).

2. With reference to the Semitic social system, it may be regarded as "embracing all aspects of life and thought - social, economic, political, and religious -" (Cook, Notes to 3rd Edit., p.50).
habits of the people. However, the religious importance of
the pillar is clearly indicated by its position in the temple
and its association with the basalt libation bowl discovered
nearby.

The stele of Naram-Sin, king of Agade, must have re-
presented the extension of his heritage by military conquest.
The star emblems above the cone indicated the divine sanction
and were the confirmation of asserted right to the heritage.
It is definitely a stele of supremacy achieved by valour in a
difficult region by the will of the deity whose sanction is
invoked upon the cone. There is no need to introduce the
hypothesis which would connect the cone with the Ziggurat,
though such a conception may have been involved in the mind
of this conqueror with reference to the divine sanction. The
prophet's cherished dream of the Massebah on the border of
Egypt, is likely based on a similar concept to that revealed
by the cone of supremacy on the stele of Naram-Sin. The Masse-
bah, which would stand at the border of Egypt, must have been
regarded as significant of the possession of that land as an
heritage of the people of Jehovah, and it is important to ob-
serve that the pillar is to be a sign and a witness that the
land is under the jurisdiction of Jehovah, and they shall cry
unto Him because of oppressors, and He shall send deliverance.

1. See Rowe, ibid.
2. See Delaporte, Mesopotamia, p.31, fig.4.
3. The astral gods represented may be regarded as "regents of the
   world"; see Jeremias, O.T. in Light of Ancient East, Vol.I,
4. See Sidney Smith, Early History of Assyria, p.64.
5. See Lagrange, Etudes, p.192; King, Egypt and Western Asia, p.219.
6. Isa. 19:19; see King, op.cit., p.159.
It is necessary, of course, to remember that the conception of the relation of the deity to the heritage was not identical in all cases.

1 With reference to the Jacob-Laban dispute, Driver suggests that the narrative describes something more than a mere agreement between two individuals, and that the representative ancestors of the Israelites and Syrians, respectively, seem to be regarded in it as fixing the border between territories occupied afterwards by their descendents, the site of which must have been on some eminence which was called Mizpah, and the Massebah was erected on the height thus designated. For the present discussion, it is not important to consider whether the boundary compact was between individuals or nations, but it is significant that the narrative locates the Massebah on an outlook point in the area of the debatable borderland between Hebrew and Aramaean tribes. It seems sufficiently plain that the narrator is concerned with the respective heritages of the disputants and that a stone pillar and a stone heap, upon which was invoked religious sanction, indicated the claims of the separate parties. The stones in question were put under the protection of the deity who was expected to punish those who violated the sanctity of the compact. In the light of such considerations, Contenuau's suggestion of a "cult of the homeland", in connection with the pillars, is interesting, in which he

sees the stone the symbol of the land and its substance, in a form that is permanent. Ramsay tells us that one important use of the pillar was to indicate a guardianship over common property, and we may well suppose that the religious sanction was such as to involve severe penalties for any violation, but doubtless the essential nature of the sanction was variously interpreted, according to the intellectual and religious environment.

The Kudurrus, so-called "Boundary Stones", indicated the right to certain property, which, by the design of the stone, was placed under the protection of the gods whose wrath was invoked against anyone who might infringe the specified rights and privileges of the estate mentioned. They were, in a certain sense, the guardians of the property, and all the gods were frequently invoked in behalf of a single Kudurru, which was ordinarily kept in the house of the owner of the estate or in the temple. The Kudurrus were not used to mark the boundary, yet they enumerate the exact position and size of the estate. One of the Kudurrus found by M. de Morgan, and referred to by King, records the grant of a number of estates near Babylon by Nuzimaruttash, a king of the 3rd Dynasty, to the god Marduk. They were assigned by the king to the service of the temple of Marduk at Babylon. All the crops and produce from the land were granted for the supply of the temple and were exempt from taxation. The text also records a similar

2. See King, op.cit., p.256.
4. Ibid.
gift of land to a private individual which was also tax free. The following words of the inscription are significant, "Whensoever in the days to come, the ruler of the country or one of his governors, etc., shall make any claim with regard to these estates, or shall attempt to impose payment of tithe or tax upon them, may all the great gods whose names are commemorated, or whose arms are portrayed, or whose dwelling places are represented on this stone curse him with an evil curse and blot out his name". The two important facts about these Kudurrus are that they designate a heritage under indenture, and that they are committed to the gods for vindication. It is not to be supposed that such stones ever achieved the nature of a fetish, yet they possessed a character sufficiently religious to inspire awe and sentimental regard. The fact, that such stones were sometimes placed in the temple of the gods, suggests their super-secular status. In any case, the Kudurrus provide an illustration of stones being used to signify a heritage which was under the tutelage of the deity, and we may suppose that the idea was not unknown among the Western Semites.

1. Compare the practice of MacDonald, King of the Isles, who delivered the rights of their lands to his vassals in the isles and continent, with up-lifted hands and bended knees, on the black stones; and in this posture, before many witnesses, he solemnly swore that he would never recall those rights which he then granted; and this was instead of his great seal. From Frazer, F.O.T., Vol.II, p.405.

2. King, ibid.
THE PILLAR NAMES.

It is important to note that Hebrew pillars were ordinarily given names, and, in some cases, it appears that the name of the pillar was fundamental to its value. In the brief account which tells of the pillar of Absalom, the narrator regards it of the greatest importance that Absalom "called the pillar after his own name". The two pillars, which stood in front of King Solomon's temple, are not interpreted, but the fact is emphasised that one was called Jachin and the other Boaz. It is evident that the pillars at Sinai, as well as those at Gilgal, were each designated by the name of a tribe. The pillar of Jacob was called Bethel, while the stone of Samuel was called Ebenezer, and we have various other examples of stones that were given names. The Canaanite pillars were evidently called by the names of the local Baalim, as indicated by the command to "destroy the names" of the gods out of the place, in accordance with which custom we find the name Mekal associated with the pillar at Beth-Shan. Among the Israelites, the Lord is represented as choosing out a place "to put His name there". It is to be observed that, while a pillar might bear the name of a man, tribe, house, nation, or even an experience, the name of the deity was always either implicitly or explicitly related thereto.

1. II Sam. 18:18.
2. I Kings 7:21.
3. Exod. 24:4; Josh. 4:3.
5. I Sam. 7:12.
6. Josh. 15:16 (Eben Bohan); I Kings 1:9 (Stone of Zoheleth).
10. Cf. I Sam. 7:12; I Kings 7:21; Gen. 28:22; Josh. 4:5; 24:27.
The question arises as to why the names of the pillars were considered so important. The suggestion has been made that the pillar names are the evidence of animistic conceptions, but such a conjecture is perhaps based chiefly on the opinion that things primitive are generally associated with animistic ideas. Of course, it is well known that, among the Semites, great importance was attached to names, and a name was considered to be significant of the character of the bearer, but such does not necessarily imply animism. A name, according to the ancient conception, has been defined by Giesebrecht as something parallel to the man, relatively independent of its bearer, something which at once describes and influences him, and of great importance for his weal or woe. Sometimes the name of a particular god was studiously kept secret, lest it be abused through being invoked in an improper way, or by an improper party. Frequently the name of a person was changed, which was ordinarily based on a change in his character or his mission in life, in conformity with which, we find in the Book of the Revelation that, "to him that overcometh", the promise is made to give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it." Pedersen thinks that the names promised to the eunuchs in Jehovah's house may be considered as "name-pillars". The suggestion has some force in the light of the pillar of

2. Exod. 34:14, says that Jehovah's name is "Jealous" and that such is His character. See Pedersen, Israel, p.252.
3. From Kautzsch, Relig. of Israel, HDB, Extra-vol., p.640.
5. Rev. 2:17. Ψάφος involves the idea of suffrage.
7. Isa. 56:5.
Absalom, concerning which he said, "I have no son to keep my name in remembrance." We know that a good name was regarded as a precious heritage among the Hebrews, and that the perpetuation of the name was regarded as a duty. The name proclaimed the character of the soul, and the pillar proclaimed the name, but the supposition is not warranted which regards the soul of man as literally residing in his name. The memorial idea may partially explain the association of names with pillars, but it is evident that not all name pillars are to be explained as memorials.

Pedersen has well suggested that, if the word "nesīb", which is used to describe what David set up in Edom, implies a pillar, then, such pillars placed the name of David over the conquered territory. It is not necessary to suppose that the "name pillars", erected by the Babylonian and Assyrian kings, were thought to offer essential immortality to such kings, but unquestionably the pillars implied the temporal dominion of their name ruling over the realm where the pillars were set up. In a theocratic realm, such as that of Israel, the name of the ruling house implied the name of the deity, and when David set up the pillars of his name in Edom, it also signified that the territory was under the jurisdiction and name of Jehovah, whose anointed servant David was. The kingly house of David might properly be spoken of as the house of

1. II Sam. 18:18.
4. Pedersen, Israel, p.251, says that the pillar is equal to the name, and the name is equal to the soul.
6. II Sam. 8:6,13,14.
God, just as the throne of David was established by the divine prerogative and was linked with the throne of God. The house of God was conceived of, primarily, as the place of His name, and His name over the realm implied His right to dominion, as well as His obligation to defend and bless the heritage. In like manner, a pillar bearing the name of a man, tribe, or nation implied the valour and honour of such.

1. See II. Sam. 7:13-9.
2. Cf. I Kings 8:16ff.; II Sam. 7:13ff.
3. Pedersen, op. cit., p. 251, suggests that in the "hand", which Saul set up in Carmel (I Sam. 15:12) lay the valiant deed of Saul and also his name and honour.
4. In I Sam. 13:3-4, it is related that Jonathan smote the Nēṣāb of the Philistines and as a result Israel "was had in abomination with the Philistines."
An artificially placed stone naturally inspires the question, "What does it mean?" and accordingly, memories must necessarily cluster around the sacred stones, regardless of the purpose for which they were erected. The writer of the narrative in the Book of Joshua recognises the inescapable question, which the children would ask their fathers, "What mean these stones?" It is clear that sacred stones often became memorials, simply because the mind of man continually inquired into the meaning of the past. All men of every age, endowed with the faculty of memory, must have felt the tendency to associate material objects with the memory of important phases of life. Grave stones are perhaps the most patent examples of stones set up in the service of memory in the earliest times, but even a grave stone might become a shrine. The Jewish festival of the "Great Burning" at Meiron, in association with the three grave pillars of celebrated Rabbis, is an illustration of the transformation of memorials into "altars". The Masseboth of around 1000 B.C., from Cyprus, set up at graves, were, generally speaking, large stones from the river bed shaped by natural forces, and particularly chosen by those who erected them. We may infer that such Masseboth were symbolic of some religious conception as well as memorials of the dead, though the particular symbolism is beyond our ken.

2. See Thomsen, Palästina und seine Kultur, pp.31,45.
In the Phoenician realm, the Massebah was generally used to designate grave places, indicating a memorial significance. However, in the Maltese Islands, certain megalithic remains, which have sometimes been attributed to the Phoenicians, seem to represent the sanctuary of a heroic cult, as illustrated by the pillar cell of Hagiar Kirn at Malta, where the conical stone is associated with the structure in funeral relationship. It is manifestly impossible to lay down a rule with reference to the exact value of burial Masseboth.

The stelae of the kings at Assur, dating from the fifteenth century B.C., were unquestionably memorials. The pillars at Beth-Shemesh, doubtless, had some memorial significance, especially in view of their sepulchral association. Such pillars as those at Gilgal, Ebenezer, and perhaps at Gezer, as well as that of Absalom, and at Rachel's tomb clearly served some memorial purpose, regardless of whatever additional importance they may have had. Howbeit, the phrase, "mere memorials", is not apt in describing the Biblical conception of the stones, for even such stones as those at Gilgal are indicated as being related to the great sanctuary of the early days of Israel, and the narrative suggests that the stones

1. See Kennedy, H.D.B., p.730; Thomsen, Realllex, Vorg., Bd.VIII, p.142; Cooke, North Semitic Inscirp., p.60.
3. See Handcock, Archaeology, p.338, who says that it is only the concomitant circumstances which justify the attribution of a religious significance to particular stones.
7. I Sam. 7:12.
9. II Sam. 18:18.
11. See WRS, Relig. Sem., p.203.
12. It should be clear that a stone may be more than a mere memorial without being regarded as an idol.
represent the faithfulness of God to the tribes of Israel.
The pillar in the covenant between Jacob and Laban cannot be
disassociated from its memory value, yet it is not represented
as a "mere" memorial, but as a witness stone in the solemn cov­
enant in the making of which sacrifice was fitting, and the
violation of which God would punish. Likewise, the Masssebah
at Bethel was, in one sense of the word, a memorial, but it is
set forth in the narrative as that which bears the name of God,
is associated with the promise of God, and becomes a sanctuary
suitable for worship and the making of vows.

The question arises as to whether memorial stones were
a late development. Such is indicated by Gunkel, who says, that
the Massâbôth were once sacred stones, but were finally mere
memorials. It is probable that the memorial idea was known to
man long before the dawn of history. It is true that the
early memorials were variously interpreted and were always in
some way related to the deity, but they were memorials never­
theless. We are informed that it was an ancient custom "to
build or repair temples, synagogues, etc., in order to be re­
membered." We know that there was an early marked tendency
in man toward the invention of symbols, and all his faculties
were doubtless exercised in connection with his desires,

1. See Josh. 4:21ff.
4. The Legends of Genesis, p.106.
6. Written thought developed from such.
ambitions, obligations, and fears, but, even though other
ideas were frequently associated with such monuments as
grave stones, etc., we cannot deny that they had a memorial
value.

1. Among Assyrian conquerors, it was customary to offer sacri-
fices in connection with the establishment of memorials.
See Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, p.657.
2. In Homer's Iliad, XXIII, we find that he regarded some of
the antique stones of his day as having had a memorial
value:
"On either side
Where narrowest is the way, and all the course
Around is smooth, rise two white stones, set there
To mark the tomb of someone long since dead,
Or form a goal for men in ages past."

From Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, p.118.
VOTIVE STONES.

Stones were frequently erected by the worshipper to represent his pledged faithfulness to the deity, as well as his appreciation or expectation of a goodly portion of the divine favour. The practice of the modern Arabs, in erecting little stone pyramids which they call Meshâhed, or "witnesses", is an example of this idea. The "witnesses" are erected in view of the Wely at the point where the pilgrim first sees the sacred place and where he makes his prayer in honour of the saint, who may be reminded of the piety of the man who honours him, so that on Judgment Day the saint may plead for him. These 'rab structures, according to Gressmann, have the same meaning as the pieces of clothing hung on the holy trees, which offerings evidently are votives as well as testimonies. The same author suggests that a relationship exists between the modern "witness" pillars and the stones in the Old Testament, which were used as witnesses in a covenant. A large number of Nabataean inscriptions consist only of the name of the engraver with a word equivalent to "hail" prefixed, the whole being simply scratched on the rock. It has been suggested that the idea of all inscriptions of this kind is exactly the same as the common oriental idea of tying a rag to a sacred tree. The inscriber wished to call the attention of his deity to himself, and to the fact that he remembered him in the hope, of course, that he would be remembered in turn. The Masgîdâ of

3. Ibid.
4. Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monuments, p.77.
the Nabataeans was perhaps ordinarily associated with the same idea. According to Lagrange, the Masgēdā, in altar form, was a votive altar and not for sacrifice. The panels in the Sik at Petra are regarded by some as idols or symbols of the deity, but the Nabataean epigraphic evidences do not sustain the supposition. The votive idea seems to have been comparatively important in the point of view of the Nabataeans at Petra, where various inscriptions have been found, such as the following:

"Remembered be Hayyu, son of Balitu, in goodness and peace before Dūshara". Of similar significance is the inscription at Khalasa, which reads, "This is the place which Nuthairn made for the life of Aretas, King of the Nabataeans". The votive stelae are well known among the Phoenicians, some of which are inscribed with a legend indicating unmistakably the purpose of these who set them up. The following will indicate the general character of such inscriptions; "To the Lord Baal Hamon, which Hanno, son of Adonball, etc., has vowed because he heard his voice, may he bless".

Gressmann thinks that some of the small carved stones at Petra are in remembrance of pious pilgrimages to the city. With reference to a panel at Petra with ten reliefs, or niches, associated together and of varying sizes, it has been suggested that they represent the devotion of a group in appreciation of

2. Etudes, p.207.
3. See Cook, Notes to 3rd. Edit., p.569, who regards the Masgēdā as the vehicle of worship.
8. Cf. Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monuments, p.73.
the goodness of Dusares in some special experience. Robinson calls our attention to the tomb in the Turkmaniya Valley which has an inscription stating that the monument with the great and little halls inside of it, as well as the garden, is sacred and dedicated to the deities, and that nothing whatever is to be altered, neither is any one to be buried in the tomb, nor to have any use of it except those designated in the official papers. It must be recognised that any such monuments in ancient times, regardless of their primary purpose, were closely associated with the deity, for every sacred symbol, if not dedicated to the god, at least involved his blessing or his curse.

Sacred stones were doubtless frequently placed over the graves of the famous dead in ancient times. The same custom is known to be practised by the Jews in modern times, as for example, Jewish pilgrims visiting the grave of a notable Jewish astronomer in Prague by the name of Loef, piously cast a pebble on his grave, concerning which, it is said that it is a great honour to a Jew for one to place a pebble on his grave. The significance of the heaps over ancient graves, in addition to the practical value as a protection to the body of a dead person, was no doubt also a sign of the devotion on the part of those who placed the stone in behalf of the honoured dead. On the other hand, the stones of the heap over a grave might imply the hatred of those who placed the stones for a culprit on his grave. A story is told in explanation of a stone heap

1. Lods, Israel, p.95, thinks the groups represent deities and should be assigned to a time when the personality of the local divinity was not yet fully differentiated, and when it was uncertain whether one or several deities inhabited the spot in question.
2. Sarcoophagus, p.88.
at Hisám Abu Zena as follows: "Abu Zena spurred his horse to death here and the grave is marked by a heap of stones to which every passer-by adds his pebble in hatred of the hard-hearted rider". Of similar significance is the practice of modern pilgrims as they approach the "Devil-pillars" at the entrance of Wady Muna towards Medefeh where the devil, according to tradition, made his stand against Abraham. The pilgrim collects seven small stones and ceremoniously casts them at the pillars which represent the devil. Though the motive is different, the custom is the same as that practised by the Arabs, who, when travelling along the main routes of the country, find a stone monument erected by a fellow Moslem compatriot, they piously add a stone to the mass.

It is a well known custom among the Semites to set up stones on the way to the holy place in what might be called "wayside devotion", which is practised by the modern inhabitants at Petra. Petrie found many standing stones in the vicinity of the Wady Serabit, which are only a few inches to a couple of feet in height, and it is significant that they were not found in places out of sight of the temple ground, probably indicating that they had some votive purpose. We may suppose that a wide usage of stones prevailed to signify the appreciation, expectation, obligation, or rights of the individual in the heritage, under the name of the deity.

6. Whitehouse, HDB, Vol.III, p.881, thinks Absalom's pillar may have been a votive stone erected in anticipation of his attempt to seize the throne.
Concerning the modern practice, one cannot resist the temptation to compare it with the boundary heap erected at the covenant place of Jacob and Laban, which heap appears to have been the contribution of the tribesmen, at the ceremony, as an evidence of their pledge and concurrence with regard to the treaty. It is stated that Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar, and he said unto his brethren, "Gather stones," and they took stones and made a heap, which indicates that every man in the tribes made a contribution to the heap of the covenant. Many of the stone heaps over the graves of ancient worthies doubtless represented the votive contributions of the various members of the tribe. It has been thought that the stone heaps over graves may have been intended to prevent the spirit of the departed from coming forth from the grave to disturb the living, and such a conception may have had some place, but many of the dolmen burials had a hole cut in the stone, apparently to permit the spirit free access to, and egress from the tomb. If the hole in dolmens was a free door to the spirit, then it is hardly possible that the heaps over dolmens were designed to smother the spirit, but, more likely, represented votive contributions. Sometimes it has been thought that the heap was chiefly designed to suppress the spirit of those who had suffered death by violence, whose spirit it was thought to be especially detrimental to the living, but the tumuli over graves cannot all be explained on the basis of violent deaths, and it is more likely that these were the graves of notables.

1. Gen. 31:45f.
2. Hanauer, Folklore of Holy Land, p. 100f. regards the custom as especially applicable to malefactors.
who were either much despised or greatly loved. The body of the King of Ai, as well as that of Achan and of Absalom, was covered with a great heap of stones and it is probable that those, who raised the heap, ceremoniously vowed their hatred of such characters.

1. Josh. 8:29.
3. II Sam. 18:17.
We find many examples of rites and ceremonies celebrated, in association with the sacred stones, constituting a maze of tangled and conflicting elements, which make it difficult to trace the development. Moreover, even where the external formalities are clearly discerned, it is sometimes difficult to perceive the inner truth of the ceremonies.

One of the earliest and perhaps most fundamental features of the cult practice is that which related the sacred stones to some contractual obligations and relationships. The ritual and ceremony, associated with the making and fulfilment of vows, have apparently always held an important place in Semitic cult practice. The climax of Jacob's experience at Bethel was reached in the making of a vow which was associated with the Massebah, and it is probable that the great importance of Jacob's return to Bethel was the fulfilment of his earlier vow. In the treaty between Jacob and Laban, the contracting parties gave their oaths, the curses of the deity were invoked upon the stones, and sacrifices were offered. Herodotus describes a ritual of the sacred stones in which, when two men swear friendship, they stand on either side of a third party, who with a sharp stone makes a cut on the inside of a hand of each near the middle finger, and, taking a piece from their dress,

1. Hill, JHS, Vol. XXXI, p. 56, says that the development from the primitive religion to the weird syncretistic systems of the Roman age is hopelessly obscure, in so far as the inner truth is concerned.

2. See Judges, 11:30ff; 1 Sam. 1:11; 2 Sam. 15:8; Ps. 66:13.

3. Gen. 28:22; See Driver, Genesis, p. 266.


6. III, 8.
dips it in the blood of each and moistens therewith seven stones
lying in the midst, calling the while on Bacchus and Urania.
In a village in the Druze Mountains, there are upright stones
between which bridal couples must walk, while in Brittany the
great menhirs are intimately connected with peasant supersti-
tion relating to the marriage ceremony, and numerous examples
of legends which relate the pillars to wedding rites have been
cited by various authors. Ohnesfalsch-Richter sees, in the
custom attached to the Paphian monoliths, a direct relationship
to the Biblical traditions concerning the ratification by oaths
of covenants and treaties in the presence of the sacred stones.
It appears that an obligation or contract made in association
with the sacred stones was duly recognised in the law code of
the community, and one who refused to honour such an engagement
involved not only his standing in the community but his portion
in the heritage, while in addition he came under the curse of
the gods, by whose names the contract was sealed. The sacred
stone remained a continuing witness to the obligation until it
was duly performed. The modern Semites insist on a literal
fulfilment of vows in every particular, and their vows are
either paid when the benefit has been received, or at the an­
annual festivals when solemnity and merry-making are mingled in
the ceremony of performance. Evans thinks that in the most

2. Cf. Conder, Heth and Moab, p.204.
3. O-R, Kypros, p.167, says that in the Paphos district, to this
day, troth is literally pledged by joining hands through
an orifice.
4. Ibid.
5. When the Arabs at Petra make a vow, they pile up a heap of
stones anywhere in sight of the holy mountain as a witness.
Cf. Curtiss, op.cit., p.94.
primitive form of the Mycenaean cult the offerings were simply placed on the sacred stone, and he states that he actually saw egg offerings placed on top of a sacred stone in Finnish Lapland, which is in accordance with the explanation given to the writer by the keeper of a tomb-shrine in Palestine who stated that the stone was the place where the offering was laid.

The Old Testament does not tell us with what ceremony the stones at Gilgal were placed in position, with what rites the Ebenezer of Samuel was erected, but we may be sure that the ceremony of inauguration, in connection with such stones, was with much fervent display of patriotism and religious ceremony. A study of other ceremonies of patriotic religious significance permits us to suppose that the induction of tribal or national sacred stones was accompanied by sacrifice, the making of vows, anointing, religious dances, and the invoking of the divine name with blessings and curses upon the pillar. The pillar-shrines were the scenes of coronation ceremonies in which the king took his place by the pillar where royal oaths were taken.

Of the stirring scenes associated with the sacred pillars may be mentioned the ceremony of destruction of the hated pillars which was an eminently important political and religious act, performed with even greater fervour than the modern book-burnings. The great Hebrew leaders are frequently represented as beginning their public careers by the performance of a kind of sacred ritual of destruction, in which

2. See Conder, Heth and Moab, p.217, with reference to the holy stone which Elagabalus carried in procession through the streets of Rome.
we hear the echo of crashing Massëbôth and the crackling flames devouring the Asherim. According to the Old Testament, one of the most important commissions held by Israel, when they entered the land of Canaan, was the urgent command to break down the Massëbôth of the Canaanites, along with other cult furniture of the High Place, and one may infer that the accomplishment of this destruction was with great religious demonstration. There is definite ritual importance in the exploits of Josiah, in which with great ceremony he burned the Asherim, break in pieces the Massëbôth, stamped the High Places to powder, defiling them with the bones of men, and slew the priests of the High Place, all of which was related to the turning of the nation to Jehovah. The best extra-Biblical glimpse afforded us of the ceremonial treatment of conquered cult symbols is to be found in the boast of King Mesha of Moab, as recorded on the Moabite Stone, which relates how he dragged the Ariels of foreign gods in the dust before Chemosh, the national god of Moab.

In most cases, at least where the sacred stone was regarded as an altar or an idol, it appears that blood was smeared or poured on the stone, as for example in the Arabian practice. Various applications of liquids to the sacred stones with diverse purposes were evidently an important part of the ritual, which probably consisted, according to the particular custom, of blood, water, honey, milk, oil, or wine. As we have seen above, there was a ceremony of desecration of sacred

1. II Kings 23:4ff.
2. II Kings 23:25.
5. See Gardner, ERE, Col. XI, p. 870; Driver, Genesis, p. 310; Ps. 16:4; Gen. 28:18; 35:14; WRS, Kinship and Marriage, p. 50; Trumbull, Blood Covenant, p. 238.
6. See p. 133
stones, and likewise we find a ceremony of purification and reconsecration of the defiled stone, as in the case of the man who washed and anointed the idol which had been polluted by the Moslems.

The idol stones were sometimes gaily attired, especially in the late practice. The custom of kissing and fondling the stones, as well as that of bowing down to them, was perhaps ordinarily associated with idolatry, though not necessarily so. Omar Ibn Khatab is reported to have exclaimed, while standing before the Kaaba in Mecca, "I know thou art a mere stone that can neither hurt nor help me, nor should I kiss thee had I not seen Mohammed do the same." With this knowledge that Mohammed, the prophet of pure monotheism, kissed the stone at Mecca, it appears that the fervent kissing of stones did not always imply idolatry, but sometimes indicated loyalty and sincerity in behalf of that which the stone represented. Pillar number two in the alignment at Gezer was marked by several smooth spots, and pillar number five had a similar spot on it. Whether these smooth spots were made by fondling or by anointing is largely a matter of conjecture, but it is probable that they were the result of unusual devotion bestowed upon the stones, inasmuch as we find modern parallels of such at the Wailing Wall, and at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Just why these two stones at Gezer were selected for such attention, in preference to the other stones of the alignment, remains an enigma. It has

been suggested that pillar number two was the most ancient, or perhaps the fetish stone, while the others were votive stones, though this would not account for the special devotion shown to pillar number five. If, as some think, the pillars were related to the rulers of Gezer, then we may suppose that the reigns, represented by pillars two and five, were unusually favourable in the popular estimation.

We know that, in the developed practice, most cult places had priests who were prominent in the ritual and received certain fees, and it is probable that the various pillars may have become specialised under the priestly influence, and one pillar would sometimes be more closely associated with certain rites than with others. It is improbable that a pillar was assigned a special priest, except in cases where the sacred stone may have served as an altar or an idol. In a Samaritan manuscript, the scribe speaks of the "priests of the stone", concerning which Gottheil regards "ében" as the equivalent of "Mizbēah" and thinks it refers to the priests of an altar of stones. Be that as it may, the developed cult of the High Places was under the supervision of the priests whose guidance in the matter of ritual was of great importance. In some cases, the Massēbah may have been reserved for the ceremonial performance of the political head of the community, as in the case of the brazen altar in the Temple at Jerusalem, which Ahaz

1. Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.58.
4. Gottheil, Dating of their Manuscripts, JBL, Vol.XXV, p.34.
5. לְהֵן אַלֶּחְנָּן.
6. The expression might be equivalent to כֹּהֵן לְהֵן.
7. The comparison is made with Gen. 49:24. לאַלֶּחְנָּן.
reserved especially for himself "to inquire by", and, indeed,
W.R. Smith thinks the brazen altar so reserved was identical
with one of the two pillars called Jachin and Boaz. The pil­
lar in the Canaanite temple at Beth-Shan, being associated with
a basalt libation bowl, evidently received ritual attention,
but it is important to note that elsewhere in the temple was
carried out the developed ritual of the great altar. We may
suppose that the rites connected with the pillar in that temple
were related to special ceremonies, as indicated by its isola­
tion of the pillar from the main altar as well as by its assoc­
iation with the stela of Mekal, and it is possible that the
stone may have been reserved for the ruler of the city "to in­
quire by".

The offering of human sacrifice was widely practised
among the Western Semites, and the archaeological evidence in­
dicates that the pillar-shrines were frequently the scenes of
such sacrifice. In a stratum of earth, underlying the High
Place of the pillar alignment at Gezer, was found a cemetery
of infants who were probably not over a week old when deposit­
ed in large earthen jars for burial, while, in the middle of
the first cave-chamber at Gezer, was discovered a limestone
block, appearing as a rude altar, upon which lay an infant
skeleton, perhaps the last offered sacrifice, unremoved.

Frazer discounts the idea of infant sacrifice, supposing that
they were natural deaths and were buried in the sanctuary in
hopes that the souls of the buried babies would pass into the

---

1. II Kings 16:15.
2. Relig. Sem., p.487.
5. Cf. Macalister, PEQ, 1903, p.24; Gezer, II, p.382; Vincent,
op.cit.,p.118.
sacred stocks and stones, and from them dart into the bodies of the would-be mothers who resorted to the sanctuary, which conclusion he bases on certain similar ideas current in central Australia. On the other hand, Driver interprets the remains as representative of the grim rites performed in honour of the numen loci, and Macalister indicates that we have here evidence of the widespread custom of devoting the first born to the deity. It may be that such is an illustration of the practice condemned by Micah in his famous question, "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" Other interesting examples of infant jar burials may be mentioned as having been discovered, especially at Megiddo and Taanach, but it is possible that such are to be distinguished from those at Gezer. The transition at Gezer from the burial of human remains in the foundations of the houses to the use of the symbolism of the extinguished lamp between two bowls creates a strong presumption in favour of the conclusion that the infants were sacrificed, especially since we note the rapid decline of the practice of human foundation deposits in the period following the Hebrew conquest, and, contemporaneous with such decline, the appearance of the substituted symbolism. Moreover, the infant burials were of a single age group and some of them displayed marks of fire, while there is overwhelming evidence of child-sacrifice in the environment to be

1. Modern Research, p.88.
4. See Sellin, Tell Ta'annek, p.35f.; Guy, OIC, No.9, p.11.
drawn from other sources. The suggestion has been made that the seventh pillar in the alignment at Gezer perhaps originally belonged to the shrine of the Jebusites in Jerusalem, and may have been associated with the place where Abraham offered Isaac. Howbeit, it is possible that the infants at Gezer were sacrificed in fulfilment of some covenant obligation, and that the authority and constraint under which the barbaric rites were accomplished were in some way related to the pillars. In a cave at Gezer, along with fourteen other skeletons, was found the severed body of a female with the lower half missing, which may be an illustration of the unfortunate faithfuls, mentioned by the writer of Hebrews as having been "sawn asunder". We are told that the sacrificial victims of the Saracens were from the choicest part of the booty, and that, by preference, a handsome boy was selected for sacrifice. The inscription of King Mesha of Moab related that, after his victory against Israel, he devoted seven thousand Israelitish prisoners to 'Ashtor-Chemosh. It appears that the place of sacrifice of captive victims, following war exploits, was at the tribal pillar shrines, especially since the sacrifices were frequently in the performance of vows which had been sworn in the presence of the pillars prior to the battle, and doubtless, the occasion of the sacrifice was associated with a triumphant tribal celebration.

2. Heb. 11:37.
3. Cf. WRS, Relig.Sem.,p.491. The rock-hewn altar at Baalbek may have been a place of human sacrifice, according to Bliss, PEFQS,1902,p.172. With reference to Samuel's slaughter of Agag at Gilgal (I Sam.15:33), see Kittel, History of Hebrews, Vol.II,p.117, N.3; WRS,op.cit.,p.492.
5. Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, p.160, thinks that, when children were sacrificed, their cries of pain were perhaps drowned by the piping of flutes or the blare of trumpets, while the parents stood by, dressed as for a festival.
The pillars were the pledge of divine protection over the heritage of the tribe, while, at the same time, they signified the obligations due to the deity, and therefore it is not strange that the pillar shrines were chosen as the place for human sacrifice.

Strange ceremonies were associated with the sacred stones, some of them spectacular, and many were doubtless the accretions due to superstitious invention. Such novel proceedings, as that of the seven day siege of "stone-sitting" by the priest at Hierapolis, were perhaps multiplied with various meanings. In the West India Islands the natives show great devotion toward three stones, one being profitable for crops, another for child-birth, and the third for sunshine and rain. In Greece the efficacy of certain stones was recognised, as in the case of Orestes who sat on the stone of "Zeus Kappotas" and was cured of his madness, and as a parallel to this conception may be mentioned the "sobering stone" at Thebes. Not entirely different is the story associated with the shrine of El Khudr near Solomon's Pools where deranged persons of all three faiths are taken to kneel on the holy flag-stone, upon which, according to tradition, a Greek priest long ago, while administering the Holy Communion, spilled the sacred elements on the stone. A prevalent practice among the superstitious of

2. In certain areas, it is evident that rites were celebrated in keeping with the phallic idea. See WRS, Relig. Sem., p.212, N.2; Hartland, ERE, Vol.IX, p.619.
modern times is that of passing between poles to interpose a barrier between themselves and the ghost. It is probable that wherever witchcraft and magic were practised, stones were adapted to serve such. In Finland on some mythical hill, a great stone was believed to exist wherein were hollows into which the magician charmed the diseases of his patients. Rabbi Isaac Lural of Tiberius is said to have believed that a transmigrated soul was in a hole in the wall, and was crying that he should pray on its behalf. It appears that ceremonial and magical rites were sometimes performed for the purpose of invoking a spirit to take possession of a holy stone. The practice of sleeping in a pillar shrine, for the purpose of obtaining oracular dreams, was perhaps common when the cult was at its height, though such might be carried out at any sacred place regardless of whether it contained a sacred stone or not.

It is clear that the value of the sacred stones has been greatly confused through the centuries, and the many mixed ideas and superstitions have served to obscure rather than to elucidate the problem. Cook has well pointed out that the sacred stones, by their very nature, are "apt to be made the convenient centre of ideas from the vaguest to the most profound, and at different stages of culture". We may be certain

1. Until recently efficacy was attributed to the act of passing between two columns in the Mosque al-Aqsa in Jerusalem. See Fr. 15.
8. Notes to 3rd Edit., p.571.
that both immoral and idolatrous practices were sometimes the chief features of certain sacred stones, and that even the touching of such stones was equivalent to idolatry or had some phallic value, according to the interpretation of the devotees. It is perhaps sufficient to remark that the ritual has always been conditioned upon the social and political customs, intellectual and religious standards, as well as by the psychological reactions to external phenomena, such as mysterious happenings, impending disaster, and notable triumphs, while the influence of neighbouring tribes served continually to modify and syncretise the practice. Examples of ritual, pertaining to the pillar cult, may be gleaned from the practice of the lowest and crudest savagery and ignorance, as well as from that of people of highest spiritual perceptions.
THE BETHEL MASSEBAH OF JACOB.

1 The term used to designate the place where Jacob spent
the night at Bethel has sometimes been regarded as intended to
imply an established sanctuary prior to Jacob's arrival, but,
while the term might be rendered "the sanctuary", it may also
signify the place "suitable for spending the night." In any
case, the term in Old Testament usage does not ordinarily imply
a sanctuary as such. The expression of Jacob, on awaking from
his sleep, indicates his realisation of the sacredness of the
place, and it is only logical that to Jacob the place seemed
dreadful, or, as Spurrell suggests, "glorious". Dillman thinks
that Jacob's astonishment was due to his discovery of Jehovah in
some other place than at Beersheba where his father Isaac wor­
shiped him, but, from what we know of the early religion of
the Hebrews, the suggestion is not well considered, for, in what
Skinner calls the "standing paradox" of the early religion of
Israel, we must recognise that, in the conception of the pat­
riarchs, there was no contradiction in "the unity of Jehovah
amidst the multiplicity of his local manifestations." It has
been pointed out by Welch that Jehovah was not regarded as
bound to any place but a free personality who might meet Jacob
at Bethel even as he met Moses at Sinai. The suggestion,
that Jacob's astonishment implies that he had unwittingly slept
in an established sanctuary, must be regarded with caution,

8. Religion of Israel, p.10.
since his dream-vision was sufficient to provide the basis of the
surprise thus expressed. The question as to whether Bethel was
a sacred place prior to the time of Jacob cannot be determined
with certainty by either the literary or archaeological evidences.
From the digging at Beitin the pottery allows the conclusion that
the first occupation of that site may be dated prior
to 1800 B.C., which conforms to the Old Testament tradition,
indicating that a city called Luz existed there before the time
of Jacob, but such throws no light upon the origin of the sanctu­

ty. It is true that we have reference to the fact that Abra­
ham built an altar near Bethel, which makes it possible to
suppose that Jacob may have recognised the remains of such an
altar. Many scholars suppose that the sanctuary at Bethel was
Canaanite in origin but was taken over by the Hebrews and bap­
tised with the narrative of Jacob's experience, but it is to be
noted that the sanctuary of Bethel was among the unique sanctu­
tuaries of Israel in having a reputed connection with the patri­
archs, and perhaps Shechem was the only other sanctuary of
Israel which had a sacred stone reputedly of patriarchal ori­
gin. One may agree with Kittel that there is no difficulty
in believing that the Canaanites adopted sanctuaries founded
by the patriarchs, but there is no clear evidence that Bethel

1. Lenormant, Baetylia, D.A., i.p.643, says Jacob was indifferent
to the neighbourhood superstitions when he slept on the stone.
3. Skinner, Genesis, p.378, refers to Josh. 16:2 to say that
Luz was distinct from Bethel, but later overshadowed by
the more famous sanctuary. Cf. G.A. Smith, Bethel, EB,
Vol.I., Col.552, to the contrary.
5. Cf. Dussaud, Les Origines, p.222; Baudissin, ibid.; Schmidt,
Covenant, EB, Vol.I., Col.932, says Israel's right to the
land was justified by the fiction of a promise given to
mythical ancestors.
6. Cf. Welch, Religion of Israel, p.12, see Welch, Code of Deuteronomy,
p.211.
was a Canaanite sanctuary. The theory that every important
Israelite sanctuary had a prior history among the Canaanites
is not borne out by such religious centres as Gilgal and Shiloh.

The term used to describe the stone, which Jacob set up
for a pillar, is of considerable importance, and the use of the
plural of this ordinary term implies that the pillow stones were
simply gathered at random from the common lot available in that
vicinity. On awaking the next morning, he took one of those
same common stones and set it up for a pillar. Such an obser-
3
vation is fatal to the argument of Wainwright who seeks to in-
terpret the stone at Bethel as a meteorite, in support of which
he offers certain parallels in the terminology of the Bethel
narrative with the ideas in Egypt and elsewhere which were some-
times associated with meteorites. Since the stone at Bethel
was regarded as merely one of the stones of the place with no
unusual features in texture, colour, or shape, it is clear that
the narrator of the Bethel episode in the life of Jacob was
either ignorant of any supposed meteoric origin, or else, he
purposely repudiated the tradition. As to the possibility of
the stone being associated with meteoric traditions without the
narrator knowing the fact, we may remark that, if the narrator
used terminology which implied a meteorite, he could not have
been ignorant of the implications. The supposition that the
narrative was designed to obscure the tradition has against it
not only the question as to the purpose or necessity of refuting

1. See Cooke, Bethel, HDB, p.278.
2. Gen. 28:18;
4. Wainwright, ibid, suggests that it may have been a substitute
for a meteorite in the form of the Omphalos, but Cook
(Zeus,p.192) thinks that the Omphalos was perhaps ori-
ginally a mound of earth in which the navel-string of
Zeus was deposited.
such, but also the problem as to how a fictitious narrative of a late date could be so successful as to register an easy triumph over the original traditions, which would have surely clustered around a stone foreign to the environment and so unusual in appearance as a meteorite. It is of conclusive importance to observe that the tradition, which satisfied the people in the days of the Kings in Israel, did not regard the stone as being different from the other stones of the community. Therefore, the uniqueness of the stone at Bethel must have been founded upon some other reason than that of its essential character.

In connection with the use of the term "eben" to designate the stone at Bethel, one may refer to the supposition of Peters that the word "rook", as a divine title in Hebrew literature, has its counterpart in the character of the worship at Bethel. It is well known that the Hebrew term "ében", used to denote the stone at Bethel, is never used as a divine title in the Old Testament, while the term "sûr", frequently used as a name of God as well as a poetic figure of speech, is never used to indicate the sacred pillars. It has been thought that the "Stone of Israel", mentioned in Jacob's dying blessing to his sons, was used as a divine title, but the interpretation of the passage is very uncertain, and, since it is never used

1. Presentation Vol. to Toy, p.239; cf. Hertzberg, Der Heilige, JPOS, Vol.XII, p.35.
2. 
5. Gunkel, op.cit.,p.290, regards "Stein Israels" as a name for Jehovah from Bethel, and "Fels Israels" as God's name from Jerusalem.
elsewhere as a divine name, we cannot justifiably render this obscure passage as such. It is easy to understand how the term "sūr", used to designate great natural rocks, was more suitable as a poetic figure for refuge, strength, or safety than the term "ében", which was applicable to the common stones of the field.

The term used to specify the ladder of Jacob's dream is not used elsewhere in the Old Testament. It is derived from the root, which suggests the idea of being elevated or lofty, while the context indicates that it was something stationary for the time being. The word used to signify the relation of the ladder to the earth clearly emphasises the stationarity of the ladder which remained in place while the angels were ascending and descending. This does not seem to have much in common with the Australian idea which regards a shooting star as the discarded rope on which a dead man climbed into heaven.

It appears to have been a widespread idea among the ancient Greeks that the celestial track of the "Milky Way" was a "soul way", the "up-hill path to the summit of the heavenly vault", and such a conception has been especially ascribed to Pythagoras.

A study of the names used to describe the Milky Way has been

1. The verse has been explained "from thence, i.e. from God, Joseph became the guardian in defence of his people in Egypt"; see Spurrell, op.cit.p.397. We may render it, "by the name of the guardian of the heritage (i.e. stone) of Israel." By the latter interpretation, the stone of Israel would imply the stone at Bethel as a heritage stone.
2. Cf. Ps. 27:5; 61:3; 71:3; 18:2; Isa.26:4; 32:2; Deut.32:4.
3. See Wainwright, op.cit., p.34.
made by certain scholars, which indicates that all over the word it has been regarded as a celestial path. With reference to the Egyptian practice, the small ladders found in the tombs of the Ancient and Middle Empires, as well as the later ladders painted on papyri and deposited in the tombs, may have been derived from a more practical analogy than that of meteorites.

It may be that the symbolism of the soul ladder, belonging to the various civilisations of the Mediterranean, bears some relationship to the fact that no other conception could offer the equivalent realism. Such a suggestion finds emphasis in examples like that of Otos and Xphialtes, who essayed to pile Ossa on Olympus and Pelion on Ossa, in order that the sky might be climbable, with reference to which Pindar wrote "stretching in haste, a ladder to the steep sky."

The conception of the possibility of reaching heaven by piling mountain on top of mountain might lend some plausibility to the supposition that the water-shed, just north of Bethel, rising in the form of a rocky crest, is to be associated with the ladder of Jacob. However concerning the theory that the ladder was suggested by the physical features of the locality, Skinner remarks that such seems to be a fanciful explanation to one who has never visited the spot. Another explanation of the ladder has been advanced to the effect that it was a Babylonian Ziggurat, which filled Jacob's mind in

2. The Basutos of South Africa call it the "way of the gods", while the North American Indians regard it as the "path of spirits"; see Cook, op.cit., p.38.
5. See Peters, Presentation Vol. to Prof. Toy, p.235.
7. To the writer who has visited the place several times, the explanation remains fanciful.
anticipation of his journey to his mother's home in the land of Ziggurats. The ladder has also been thought of in connection with the stepped altar of the Egyptians, where the god or the king ruled from the top of a flight of steps. It is perhaps sufficient to say that all such clues are unsatisfactory, except that they reveal the widespread conception of communication between heaven and earth, and doubtless it would be unsafe to go beyond the following statement by Dillman, "This ladder symbolises the thought that heaven and earth, God and man, stand in communication; that God sways the earth from heaven by the agency of His spirit and guides the destinies of man."

The phrase, "gate of heaven", which Jacob used to describe the place in which he slept, also has certain parallels in the ancient cosmological conceptions. The two tropic signs, Capricornus and Cancer, were called the "gates of the sun", and it was supposed that through these gates souls passed to and fro between heaven and earth. In Egypt meteorites were regarded as a means of opening the gates of heaven to the faithful. With regard to the possible astronomical significance of Jacob's "gate of heaven", we may say what has already been said about the ladder, that regardless of the various associations of the figure, it is based on the most appropriate realism familiar to man's secular experience. The suggestion that this phrase

3. Gunkel, Legends of Genesis, p. 105, suggests that polytheism comes peeping forth from behind the narrative in the form of angels.
5. See Cook, Zeus, p. 41.
6. Wainwright, PEFQ, Jan. 1934, p. 44.
7. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 290, indicates that the gate of heaven is a natural idea just as one would expect a gate in a sanctuary.
refers to a dolmen has nothing to support it. It is probable that the narrative simply implies that Jacob regarded the place as a real and proper "sanctuary where heaven opens to men and true intercourse with the upper world is made possible." Since the "place" was regarded as the gateway to heaven, it is perhaps best to conclude that the expression is simply poetic realism used to describe the place where the vision of heavenly things came within the ken of Jacob.

The question has been raised as to whether, when Jacob put the stone under his head for a pillow, he purposed to practice a primitive form of incubation; in answer to which, it may be said definitely that there is nothing in the narrative to support the theory. Gunkel reminds us that it was by accident that Jacob lighted upon the place, and casually he took of the stones for a pillow. Lenormant says that the contact with the stone became for Jacob the cause of a divine vision, though he had been indifferent to the superstitions of the neighbourhood when he laid his head on the stone to sleep. It is highly improbable, in view of Jacob's surprise, to suppose that his dream vision had anything in common with the practice, such as that related by Evans, concerning a modern shrine in Macedonia, where devotees sometimes spend the night in quest of sacred influences for the shaping of their dreams. The rectangular enclosures formed of upright stones, discovered by Petrie at Serabit near Sinai and interpreted as having been

5. Genesis, p.288.
used as sleeping shelters for the purpose of obtaining some
vision from the deity, may be an interesting example of a well
known custom among the Semites of seeking to multiply oracular
dreams. Nevertheless, such an interpretation of the experience
of Jacob at Bethel must be regarded with caution, since it is
manifestly not based on exegesis, but on questionable analogies.
The central importance of the dream vision of Jacob in his ex-
perience at Bethel is fully emphasised in the narrative, but
the theory of incubation is strongly contradicted by the causa-
tive elements, which are fundamental in the fabric of the episode.

The possibility of Jacob's pillar having been a pre-
historic megalithic monument may be discounted on the basis of
the size of the stone, which, Fergusson has thought, was prob-
ably not as large as the head that was laid upon it. One need
not essay to give the dimensions of the Bethel pillar, yet the
tradition that regarded it as suitable for a pillow may be deem-
ed sufficient to place it outside the category of megalithic
monuments. The conjecture that the masses of weather-worn rock
in the Bethel area gave rise to the story of Jacob's pillow and
pillar may well be doubted, since the neighbourhood of Bethel
is not unique in Palestine as a place of weather-worn rocks with
"weird and artificial aspect". The suggestion that the rugged
rock formations around Bethel provide the exact counter-part
of the modern Arab "witness piles" and that Jacob's pillar is
thus reproduced in the present day examples, ought to be con-
sidered in the light of the fact that, after several mill-
eniums, the topography of the area has doubtless changed con-
siderably.

1. See Peters, Early Hebrew Story, p.112.
The archaeological researches in the vicinity of Bāb ed-Dra'a revealed a row of monolithic Massēbōṯ in connection with a shrine, belonging to the Semitic population, which occupied the five oases at the southern end of the Dead Sea in the third millennium B.C., at which site the occupation ceased around the beginning of the second millennium, from which discovery it is clear that the Semites had sacred pillars long prior to the time of Jacob. Therefore, when Jacob set up a Massebah at Bethel, he was acting in accordance with a well established custom in that vicinity. It is probable that the use of the Massebah was not a new thing to the Israelites, when they arrived in Canaan, and the assumption of Peters, that rock worship received canonisation in Israel at Bethel, has no more to support it than if a similar claim were applied to Gilgal. The fact that Bethel had a special appeal in Israel does not infer that it offered a new departure in religion, but the prestige of the place is perhaps best explained on the basis of the association of the stone with the founder of the Israelite nation through whom the right of Israel to the heritage of Canaan found confirmation.

It is important to inquire into Jacob's reason for erecting a Massebah at Bethel. It has frequently been thought that pillars were habitually set up following a theophany. No one need minimise the importance of Jacob's vision in relation to his act of setting up a pillar, but, if we take it as a rule that Massēbōṯ and theophanies constituted a formula in Jacob's experience, then we are faced with the problem of some very strange omissions. Jacob was honoured with other theophanies,

1. Albright, Archaeology and the Bible, p.137.
which the narrators did not deem suitable to be associated with
the erection of Massēbōth, notably his experiences at Peniel and
Mahana'im, whereas, a theophany is not recounted as the initiat­ing
cause in the erection of the Ma'sēbāh in connection with the
treaty between Jacob and Laban on the Hebrew-Aramaean border,
neither is there a theophany associated with the death of Rachel.
If we are to take the evidence of the Old Testament narratives,
the fundamental condition for the erection of a Massēbāh was
quite independent of theophanies, and therefore it is necessary
to seek some other clue as to the motive for the setting up of
the Massēbōth.

In so far as the Old Testament evidence is concerned,
it appears that the erection of Massēbōth always bore some def­
inite relationship to the peculiar heritage of those by whom
they were erected. In this connection, it must be pointed out
that the heritage of a tribe involved more than real estate and
included their religious, social, and political customs as well
as their beloved dead. In the dispute between Jacob and Laban,
it is clear that the definition of their respective heritages
was the chief reason for the covenant. The Massēbāh erected
over the grave of Rachel stood in relation to the beloved dead,
and such was always a treasured heritage among the Semites.
The twelve tribal pillars set up by Moses at the foot of Mount
Sinai were definitely related to the heritage of the tribes in
the Promised Land, including their relationship to the divine

4. Gen. 31: 41-44. 5. Gen. 35:20; It has been assumed by some scholars that the
Massēbāh of Genesis 35:14 was erected over the grave of
Deborah mentioned in verse 8. See Moore, E.B., Vol.III,
Col.2975.
government, concerning which they engaged in solemn covenant while gathered around the pillars. The twelve tribal stones at Gilgal were peculiarly related to the conquest of Israel's promised heritage under the sanction and power of their God.

In the light of the above references, it is not strange to find that the central feature of Jacob's dream vision at Bethel, following which he set up a Maššèbah, indicated Jehovah's gift of the heritage to him and his heirs. This was the re-affirmation of the promise, which had been made to Abraham and to Isaac, and it was the confirmation of Jacob's claim to the birthright inheritance of his father's house. It is to be expected that Jacob's purpose in setting up a Maššèbah would bear some relation to this central fact of his experience in that place. It is a patent error in the interpretation of this narrative to think only of the theophany, while entirely losing sight of the purpose of the heavenly vision which is the foundation of the entire narrative. It must be observed that the divine promise involved not merely the land, but also the providential protection and guidance of Jacob, as well as the promise of a great family of descendants who would possess the land. That the entire experience centred around the birthright heritage is indicated not only in the particular narrative, but also in the preliminary phases of the narrative which relates the involved experience of Jacob's obtaining the ancestral blessing. The reason for the omission of any mention of Maššèboth in connection with Jacob's religious experiences at Peniel and Mahanaaim may be understood by the fact that such experiences

were not definitely related to the promised heritage. Ginzberg introduces the suggestion, with reference to the statement "the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed", that the land whereon Jacob lay seemed to be the whole of Palestine, which God had folded together and put under him. One need hardly suppose that the land was folded into a package, yet it is necessary to recognize that "the land whereon thou liest" implied the entire land of promise. Furthermore, when Jacob erected the pillar, he intended that the entire heritage was to be dedicated to Jehovah, as evidenced by his vow to tithe the increase of the heritage and to pay the tithe at Bethel. Jacob's tithing vow was the proper corollary to his vision, since both the vision and the vow related to the heritage, and it is to be noted that the vow as well as the vision was related to the pillar. Ferguson refers to the dream of Jacob as that which became the title of the Israelites to the land of Canaan. However, it appears that the pillar was peculiarly related to the ancestral heritage, the right to which had been confirmed by the dream-vision to Jacob and his heirs.

Keeping in mind what has been said in the preceding argument, we may proceed to a consideration of the term "Beth- Elohim", or "Bethel", the latter being applied to the city and

1. The suggestion that in Gen. 33:20, the "Mizbeah" of the Massoretic text was originally "Massebah", does not conflict with the above in view of Jacob's land purchase. See Kennedy, Altar, HDB, Vol.I, p.75.
5. See Driver, Book of Genesis, p.266; see Josh, 16:2. The distinctions often made between the longer and shorter forms of the term are of little importance in this argument, since in effect they are the same. The argument that "Bethel" was offensive to the redactors as claimed by Dussaud, Les Origines, p.224, and others, rests on assumptions.
the former to the sanctuary as well as to the Massebah. The question has been widely discussed as to whether the phrase, "Beth-Elohim" was applied by Jacob to the erected stone or to the place in which it was erected. The argument seems unnecessary. The narrative applies the term to both the stone and the place, and indeed, it could hardly be otherwise, for the name took possession of the entire vicinity. The structure must needs be thought of in terms of the place. The Massebah finds its value in its place, and accordingly, the stone in its place is indicated by the name, but both the pillar and the place had larger typical relationships. By reason of the ladder of divine communication, the place was the "gate of Heaven", permitting true intercourse with the upper world, while in a figure of speech, it represented the entire land of promise. It is to investigate the significance of the name as applied to the pillar that we shall concern ourselves at this point.

The view held by some that Jacob was not a historical character and that Ya'akob was the old numen of the sacred stone at Bethel, which was worshipped by Israel and somehow gave its name to the worshipping tribe as well as to the surrounding district, may be ignored; for in order to maintain such a theory, we must dispute the archaeological evidence which tends to confirm the historicity of the patriarchs. The use of the term "Bethel" in the Elephantine papyri as a part of certain compound

1. Skinner, Genesis, p.377, thinks the term was first applied to the stone and afterwards extended to the sanctuary as a whole.
5. See Albright, Archaeology and Bible, p.130ff. For use of Ya'qob-el, see Albright, JPOS, Vol.XII., pp.254,257; contrary to Robinson, History of Israel, Vol.I., pp.52,91.
words has been advanced as proof that Bethel was the name of a
god in common use among the Jews in that late period. Even if
such could be unquestionably determined, it would not affect the
narrative in Genesis which conclusively indicates that, in the
time of the early kings of Israel, the term was not used as a
divine title by the Hebrews in Palestine. However, the fact
must not be overlooked that the interpretation of the above men-
tioned compound words remains a disputed question. One may
feel that the problem ought always to be considered in the light
of parallel usage, as for example, Beth-Peor, Beth-Dagon, Beth-
Shemesh, etc.; and such parallels in Egypt are also sufficiently
emphatic.

The use of the term in connection with the Massah has been regarded as proof of the god-animated idea in Israel.
Lagrange quotes Weinelt as saying that the conception of Jacob
in the use of the term Bethel was that the stone was the body
of the god just as the human body is the dwelling place of the
soul. One may quite understand how the term might imply "the
envelope of God", but since the context of the particular nar-
rative, as well as the wider context of the Hebrew conception
of God refutes this interpretation of the term, we are constrain-
ed to examine other possibilities. It is true that Gunkel,
who regards E and J as, on the whole, pre-prophetic, thinks that
the collections in Genesis have much that was offensive to the

1. See G & R, History of Israel, Vol.II., p.165; Toussaint, Les
3. Toussaint, ibid.
5. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p.290; Evans, JHF, Vol.XXI.,p.132; WRS,
Relig. Sem.,p.205.
7. See Kittel, Studien, p.117.
prophets, but regardless of the date of the Bethel narrative, we must agree with Kennedy that, in its present form, it does not represent the crude conception of God. The term must have been worthy of a lofty conception at the time when the narrative received its present form, even though to some sav­ants in this far off time it must needs be interpreted as nothing less than that of crude heathenism.

The supposition that "Bethel" necessarily meant the "envelope of God" should be considered in the light of the fact that the Hebrew word "beth" had a wide range of meaning, and its etymological relation to "ben" perhaps gives us the clue to its fundamental value. Very frequently the term is used to indicate the sum total of persons and things which were collectively regarded as belonging under the same name. In all cases in the Old Testament it is necessary to interpret the word in the light of the context. To "build a house" sometimes meant to "build up a name" or to have offspring. The frequent occurrence of such phrases, "house of bondage", "house of Israel", "house of Judah", "house of David", "stubborn house", etc., as well as the ordinary use of the term to indicate family lineage may indicate the close relationship of "beth" to "banah".

2. Pillar, HDB, p.730.
3._jet
4. 1
5. See Gesenius's, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, pp.115,128.
6. e.g., a man's wife, children and domestics, as well as his wealth.
7. See Gen. 18:19; 15:2; 31:14; 7:1; I Sam. 2:35; 20:16; 25:18; II Sam. 7:16; Num. 7:12; Isa. 7:1; Esther 8:1; cf. Matt. 23:14.
8. Deut. 25:9; Ruth 4:11.
11. II Sam. 2:4.
15. 1
What are we to understand by the phrase, "house of God", as used by Jacob? The expression, "this stone shall be the house of God", in the view of Skinner, means "a place of worship". That such was involved in the expression can scarcely be denied, but that such was not all the language was intended to convey is indicated by the larger context. The pillar was more than the mark of a sanctuary, being definitely the sign and witness of a heritage devoted to Jehovah, implying not only His presence, but also His government, and the supremacy of His name over the house of the promise. Wellhausen has said that "the land is Jehovah's house, where he lodges, and entertains the nations", yet, if we understand the passages in Hosea, Jehovah's house is not regarded as merely the land, but the house is rather that which Jehovah has "built" and which bears His name.

One may expect to find some relationship between the phrase "house of God" as used by Jacob, and the similar phraseology applied to the temple in Jerusalem. In recording the remarks of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, the narrator, while recognising the temple as a place where God would surely manifest Himself, though not His abode in the narrow sense of the term, is careful to emphasise that the temple is pre-eminently the "house of God's name". It is repeated in five consecutive verses that the house is for the "name" of the God of Israel. The language of verses 12 and 13 in the same narrative

2. "House of God" as used by Jacob may have indicated that which was known under the name of God. See Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, Vol.I., p.283, who point out that Elohim is used in the Protasis instead of Jehovah, as constituting the essence of the vow.
5. It is true that "the sanctity of the land did not depend on that of the temple", see Wellhausen, op. cit. p.22.
is evidently designed to voice the fine distinctions which might properly be made concerning the nature of the house, while the word translated "habitation" definitely has a cosmological significance, and it is for poetic enunciation of the same fact that Solomon introduces the query and the answer of verses 27-29. It is not sufficient to wave aside this statement of Solomon by saying that it represents the thought of a very late period, since the evidences from other Semitic peoples justify the conception long prior to the time of Solomon.

With regard to Jacob's act of pouring oil on the pillar, various explanations have been offered, such as that it proves the Massebah to be an object of worship, being the habitation of a numen, or a survival in form of such belief. Some think the anointing oil transformed the stone into an altar, conveyed spiritual values to it, was an act of purification, a greeting of dedication, a sign of honour, or to make it clean and sweet smelling. The narrative, which relates Jacob's dream vision prior to his flight from Laban pertaining to the increase of Jacob's flocks and the command to return to Canaan, seems to associate the anointing of the stone with the vow of Jacob, at least the event in retrospect leaves only two clear features in outline: namely, the pillar anointed, and the vow made to God.

1. Contrast י"ע and י"ב בד
2. ס"ל CONTRAST
5. See Gray, Sacrifice in O.T., p.124.
6. See Kennedy, HDB, p.731; see Thomasen, Palästina und seine Kultur, p.45.
9. See Kittel, Studien, p.117.
It has been supposed that the anointing oil was a
civilised substitute for a more primitive custom of blood of­
fering, but, it ought to be pointed out, that the later civi­
lisation of the Hebrews did not indicate any revulsion against
blood, and one must naturally ask whether oil had no other sacred
use before it became a conventional substitute for blood. We
know that the ancient Semites were very precise in their dis­
tinctions pertaining to elements suitable in the various rituals.
Offerings of milk were customary as libations among the Arabs
and Carthaginians, while in Babylonia, milk and honey were used
in the dedication of a new image, but both were prohibited in
the Hebrew cultus, which suggests that liquids had different
values, and we may infer that the distinctions were in vogue
long prior to the prohibitions. It is not easy to reconcile
the fact that wine was obligatory in the Hebrew ritual with the
explanation of the absence of milk and honey in the Hebrew prac­
tice entirely on the basis of their quality of fermentation.
That water was used in the Hebrew ritual can scarcely be denied,
though a full understanding of its place in the ceremonial re­
main a question. It is clear, that in the earliest times of
which we have evidence, a variety of liquids was used in ritual

2. Cf. Ezek. 44:15.
3. Thomsen, op.cit.,p.50, supposes that in the oldest age were
used fluid or fruit offerings, after which were developed
blood offerings and burnt offerings.
9. Num. 15:5; cf. Kennedy, EB, Vol.IV., Col.5308; cf. Moore, EB,
Vol.IV.,Col.4209.
10. Cf. Num. 19:18; I.Sam. 7:6; I Chron. 11:18; cf. Lagrange,
Etudes, p.167; Benzinger, EB, Vol.IV, Col.4880.
pouring and smearing with a diversity of meanings. The ques-
tion as to whether all such Semitic ritual may be referred to
an ultimate, identical source and meaning, is extremely precar-
ious and must rest on a basis that is highly theoretical.

As to the exact significance of the anointing of stones
mentioned by classical writers, it is difficult to determine.
The anointing was perhaps sometimes a sign of honour, as well
as for purification, or, in some cases, may have been related
to phallicism.

The anointing oil was used in the Mosaic period in the
dedication of both men and things to the immediate service of God,
and the New Testament indicates the same idea with reference to
persons in the expression "unction of the Holy Spirit". It was
with the holy anointing oil that the priests were hallowed, and
the king in Israel was called "the Lord's anointed". An early
incident of the anointing of kings is revealed in one of the
Tell el Amarna letters, in which the Prince of Nuhassi mentions
that Thothmes III poured oil on his grandfather's head, when
he established him as ruler over the kingdom. In view of this
custom of the Pharaoh to anoint his vassal kings in Syria, at
a time almost contemporaneous with the period of Jacob, we are

2. See Driver, Genesis, p.267; cf. Conder, Heth and Moab, p.204.
4. An idol which had been defiled by the Moslems in the last
days of heathenism at Medina was washed and then anointed.
See WRS, ibid.
5. See an interpretation of Peters cited by Lagrange, Etudes,
p.191, N.f.
6. Cf. A.Macalister, HDB, Vol.III, p.592; see Lev.8:11; Exod.30:26;
40:10. The tabernacle and its furniture were anointed "to
sanctify them".
enabled to see that oil was commonly used in that early period in consecration and confirmation rites. With reference to the anointing of persons, Kennedy suggests that it effected a transference to the person anointed a part of the essential holiness and virtue of the deity, in whose name and by whose representative, the rite was performed.

Jacob's act of anointing the pillar at Bethel may perhaps best be explained on the assumption that it represented a treasured hereditary heritage under the name and protection of the ancestral deity. We are indebted to Lagrange for his recognition of the relationship between Jacob's act and that of the Assyrian kings, who, when in the restoration of a temple, came upon the dedication stone which was inscribed with the name of the founder, anointed it with oil before reinstating it in its place. The analogy is appreciated by Cook, who has pointed out that the anointing with oil, in the case of the Assyrian foundation tablets, was done in behalf of the name of the founder. One need not suppose that Jacob recognised the stone upon which he slept to be a relic of the altar of Abraham, though such is not impossible. Howbeit, it is sufficiently plain that, when the tribes had settled in Canaan, they regarded this stone as the foundation stone of the "house of Israel" in association with the "name" of the God of their fathers. That Israel knew the significance of such foundation stones may be inferred from the metaphor of Isaiah with

1. Anointing, HDB, p.35.
3. Driver, Genesis, p.268, N.1, objects to the comparison.
reference to the tried stone for a foundation laid in Zion.

The exact reason for the choice of oil in such a rite, one can not know with certainty, but perhaps we may find the clue in the statement of Cook, who regards the oil as being sometimes the symbol or vehicle of sacred power. That a name should be associated with ritual performance need not be considered a strange thing in the light of the ancient symbolism used by the writer of the Book of the Revelation, in which the faithful are represented as pillars in the temple, upon whom shall be written the name of God. We know that among the ancient Semites a name was of vital importance, and the name of the deity was of utmost sanctity and significance.

In the light of all the evidence, it is probable that Jacob's pillar represented the ancestral heritage, the title to which belonged to Jacob and his heirs, through the inheritance of the promise and the direct confirmation of the same by Jehovah in a special theophany. Jacob's vow indicates that the place of the pillar was to become a place of worship where the tithe might be suitably rendered to Jehovah, to whom the entire heritage of Israel was to be devoted, bearing his name and claiming his protection. In the anointing of the stone, we may see an act of worship in association with the validation of a vow, and also the honouring of the name of the deity under whose dominion and protection the preservation, guidance, and success of the house of Jacob was now committed. We know that Bethel, as a sanctuary, had a long history and that in its

---

1. Notes to 3rd Edit., p.583.
2. Rev. 3:12.
4. See Cooke, Bethel, HDB, p.278.
later period, it became notorious as a place of idolatry and unfaithfulness to Jehovah. The linking of the name of the deity with the ancestral heritage gave emphasis to the altar service, for the Semites always regarded their blessings as a stream coming out of the venerable past, in the light of which, we may understand why the ancestral blessing was of such great importance and the Ancient of Days was a title worthy of the deity.

2. The ancient Semites greatly valued family history and even in modern times, the orientals have great regard for ancient lineage. See Hanauer, Folk-lore, p.311.
THE TWELVE STONES AT GILGAL.

In the Old Testament, we find evidence that there were several places called by the name Gilgal, but there is no definite indication that any other places, which may have been known as Gilgal, were associated with sacred stones except the Gilgal near Jericho in the Jordan Valley. The Samaritans point out a row of stones on Mount Gerizim which they associate with the stones of Joshua, but we may agree with Dalman that these were employed in a Justinian construction after having been used formerly in the Samaritan temple. Sellin surmises that the twelve stones from the Jordan may have been taken to the vicinity of Mount Gerizim, but the difficulty of carrying the stones from the Jordan to Mount Gerizim serves to emphasise the improbability. The conclusion appears safe that the Gilgal, of the twelve stones taken from the Jordan was near Jericho.

From the passage in Joshua, it has been supposed that two sets of stones were set up by Joshua, one group being erected in the middle of the river on the spot where the priests had stood. Various critical theories have been advanced to explain the significance of these apparently different transactions. The supposition, that twelve stones were set up in the river bed in honour of the river-god, would require the conclusion that they were set up prior to the time of Joshua, in view of our

1. See Offord, PEQGS, 1919, p.128.
5. From Dalman, ibid.
knowledge of Joshua’s conception of Jehovah as the God whose 
dominion was exercised over rivers as well as over the land. 
It need not be regarded as a strange thing, if an alignment of 
stones were set up by Joshua in the river bed at the point of 
entry into Canaan and the place of the manifestation of the 
power of God, in this dramatic sequel to the promise made to 
Jacob at Bethel. Indeed, the word used to designate the place 
where the feet of the priests stood, may indicate that the stones 
were originally set up as Massebōth in the river-bed. The re­
lation of verse nine to the context makes it possible to sup­
pose that the verse is a parenthesis; if so, the original sense 
of the narrative indicated that the stones were first set up as 
Massebōth in the river-bed, and then removed to Gilgal where 
they remained "unto this day". In this case, the idea of a 
second group of Massebōth, left standing in the midst of the 
Jordan, is an accidental textual creation which was naturally 
retained in the Septuagint and Vulgate versions. Howbeit, we 
may regard the supposed alignment of stones in the Jordan as 
too uncertain and too obscure to be of any value in a study of 
the stone cult, and, in so far as the narrative indicates, the 
significance of the river alignment was identical in meaning with 
the group set up at Gilgal.

An important question arises as to whether the twelve 
stones which are known to have existed at Gilgal were, in fact, 
placed there by the Israelites. It has been suggested that

3. יָֽ֥שָׁו
4. If a parenthesis, then the original idea would be obtained by 
reading it, "even twelve stones raised up by Joshua in 
the midst of the Jordan, in the place where the feet of 
the priests, which bare the Ark of the Covenant, stood."
Joshua's experience with the Prince of Jehovah's host, in which he was told to put off his shoes because the place was holy, is a clue upon which to base an argument that the sanctuary at Gilgal was a pre-Israelite Cromlech. As an argument against the supposition that the stones at Gilgal formed a striking prehistoric monument which required explanation, one may point out the fact that the tradition, concerning the stones at Gilgal, implies that they were of no striking size, since each was thought to have been carried on a man's shoulder. Moreover, the part played by Gilgal in the early history of Israel reveals all the warmth of response that one would expect in connection with a direct tradition, and we may be quite certain that the importance and meaning of a "Plymouth Rock" would not soon be forgotten, while the problem of inventing one might be more difficult than it appears. Be that as it may, it is certain that a group of stones stood at Gilgal near Jericho and the Jordan, and its cult importance in the history of Israel demands our attention.

The first impression of the name Gilgal, in association with the twelve tribal stones has led to the supposition that the stones were arranged in a circle. The fact, that numerous stone circles are found in the archaeological remains of Palestine, has furnished evidence to support the theory that the name Gilgal was derived from a circle of stones. It is true that we have many archaeological examples of stone circles,

1. Josh. 5:15.
4. Josh. 4:15; see Gray, op.cit., p.104.
6. See Baudissin, ZDMG, LVIII, p.424f.
but, as Thornsen has pointed out, we are not able to connect a stone circle with any place called Gilgal. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the individual stones of the archaeological examples of stone circles were, technically speaking, sacred stones, but more likely the stones were simply used to form the enclosure of a sacred area. It is certain that the Maṣṣābōth of the Semites were ordinarily arranged in a straight line, as for example, the alignment at Gezer. At one time it was thought that a circle of sacred stones had been found at Tell es-Safi, but the secular character of those stones has been proved. The supposed stone circle at Beitin is perhaps only a round hollow which originated in a natural manner in the limestone formation. The Old Testament does not tell us that Israel ever used stone circles, and, in the Hebrew, Gilgal does not mean a circle.

If the term Gilgal was ordinarily derived from a stone circle, then the explanation of the term in the Old Testament narrative, as having been derived from the idea of "the reproach of Egypt rolled away", must have seemed irrelevant to contemporary scholars. Dalman says that, in view of the derivation of the word Gilgal, which means "to roll", it might indicate anything which could be easily rolled, but he calls attention to the fact that, in the tradition of Joshua, the stones were carried on the shoulders of men, and, therefore, the term could not refer

2. It is probable that the stone circles were sacred primarily as a collective unit.
3. Cf. Petrie, Eastern Explorations, p.27.
4. See Vincent, Canaan, p.111.
5. Cf. Thomsen, ibid.
to the rolling of the stones. Such would seem to have some weight against Baudissin's theory that Gilgal means "Zusammenrollung", or the collective stones rolled together, who doubts that the term indicates "round stones" except in the secondary meaning. The interpretation, based on the idea that the reproach of Egypt had been rolled away, is, at least, a possible explanation of the meaning of the word, for such a rolling away of the reproach might properly be thought of as figuratively parallel to the rolling diminuendo of thunder which seems to be suggested in the use of the word by the Psalmist. Baudissin states that the name could stand for the whirling wind, or the rolling of thunder, while it was sometimes applied to a district. The mosaic map of Madeba in Moab depicts Gilgal with the stones standing in moities of six, and, according to this order, they were reported in the seventh century. On the basis of this arrangement, it has been suggested that there might be a mystic- al connection in this design, related to the statement in Deuteronomy setting forth the blessing and cursing of two groups, of six each, of the tribes, as well as a connection with the placing of the shew bread, "set in two rows, six in a row", which the Jerusalem Talmud explains as a tribal symbol. It must be admitted that the late evidence relating to the size

1. Dalman, op.cit., p.5.
4. Ps. 77:19.
5. Ibid; see Bertholet, History of Hebrew Civilisation, p.113, with reference to Gilgal as "Hill of Foreskins", in Josh. 5:2.
8. Qfford, ibid.
and arrangement of the stones is somewhat dubious. It is possible that the stones, seen in late times, were not the original stones, and indeed the measurements given by certain Rabbis of the second century, which indicate that each stone measured over two cubic metres, would imply that they were different in size from those in the Biblical tradition, though it is to be noted that the measurements given by the Rabbis are of doubtful understanding, but other testimony, coming from the seventh century, tells us that they were so large that two men could scarcely lift them. In connection with the possibility that the original stones did not survive, it is perhaps significant to note that, during the period of the Judges, "Eglon, the King of Moab, smote Israel and possessed the city of palm trees", forcing Israel to serve him eighteen years. From the Moabite stone, we are reminded that the kings of Moab rejoiced in the capture of the sacred symbols of enemy states and sometimes dragged them in triumph before Chemosh in the national shrine of Moab. In view of the exploits of King Mesha, as recorded on the Moabite stone, we are enabled to comprehend the possibility that King Eglon of Moab removed the original stones at Gilgal and set up others to his own liking. At least, one can not fail to note that the stones at Gilgal were called "pēsilîm" only at the time when King Eglon's headquarters were adjacent to Gilgal. It can hardly be doubted that the "pēsilîm", referred to, were at the Gilgal shrine, and that the name implied a slur rather than to

1. See Dalman, op.cit., p.5.
4. See Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.60.
designate an adjacent quarry, and, if the word indeed was meant to cast aspersion on the pillars then standing at Gilgal, the reasonable explanation would be that they were associated with the Moabite king, who, at the time, was in possession of the area. The logical sequel to the deliverance of Israel from the oppression of Moab would be the substitution of other pillars at Gilgal for the "pēsilim" set up by King Eglon.

As to the symbolical significance of the number twelve in relation to the stones at Gilgal, it has been thought that the number was mystically connected with the twelve signs of the Zodiac, which were also associated with the twelve tribes of Israel. Jeremiae thinks that the new world was symbolically built in the direction of the twelve stones, corresponding to the twelve stations of the Zodiac. The question, as to the relation of the tribal number to the Zodiacal number, can not be definitely determined. König suggests that the number of the tribes may have originated substantially as indicated in the Book of Genesis, in spite of the opinion to the contrary held by many recent commentators. The assembly of the tribes at Sinai, where the twelve tribal pillars were first erected, was apparently for the sanctification of a mutual alliance, and the solemn covenant was sealed through sacrificial ritual in the name of the God under whose banner they were united. It must be recognised that the conclusion, that the twelve tribes had their origin as indicated in the Old Testament, does not prevent their

3. Ibid.
4. Josephus, Wars, V.,v.5, says the twelve loaves on the table signified the circle of the Zodiac and the year.
association with the mystical significance of the number twelve. It is of some importance to note that we have no examples of Canaanite High Places with twelve pillars. Some have tried to make the alignment at Gezer conform to the Zodiacal number, but the alignment there did not contain more than eleven stones. However, twelve seems to have been an orthodox number in the sacred stone practice of Israel, and it is evident that the number was of mystical as well as of tribal significance. In connection with the twelve tribal stones of Israel, one may be reminded that the gates of Heaven were conceived of as twelve in number. The association of the tribal stones with the twelve gates of Heaven naturally recalls the fact that the pillar at Bethel was associated with the gate of Heaven which may bring the stone at Bethel into a closer symbolical relationship with the stones at Gilgal than we had expected.

On the basis of the etymological association, Baudis-sin links Gilgal with idols and supposes that each stone of the twelve was a "god-stone", which he regards as also the case with all the old Palestinian cromlechs, but it must be noted that his argument is theoretical and by no means conclusive. As has been suggested by Gray, if the Gilgal was a circle of many stones, not all the stones were actual altars, and perhaps none of the stones of the circle was such. We may add that if not an altar, then not a "god-stone". One may feel safe in the conclusion that the great stone circles of ancient

Palestine were used to form a sacred enclosure, ordinarily, in connection with the graves of the tribal leaders, and it is probable that, while the circle, as such, had some mystical importance, the individual stones of the circle were distinct from the holy stones, or sacred stones, of the shrine.

It is interesting, though perhaps not of unusual importance, that the stones at Gilgal were not called Massebôth, but were denoted by the more common word, which was frequently used in the references to the sacred stones. There is no need to suppose that the narrator deliberately refused to use the term Massebah, as has been suggested, for the term, even in late times, was not anathematized in Israel. Furthermore, the use of the word, to indicate the place where the feet of the priests stood, would imply that the stones were Massebôth.

The Old Testament narrative definitely speaks of these stones as having a memorial purpose, but the consideration of that which was to be memorialised is important in the interpretation of the stones. While most sacred stones must have had some memorial value, it would doubtless be improper to define any of the ancient sacred stones as "mere" memorials. In conformity with the significance of the Massebah, mentioned by the prophet, which would stand on the border of Egypt, as well as the Ebenezer of Samuel of which it was said, "Hitherto hath the

1. See Thomsen, op.cit., p.337.
2. 135
3. See Gray, op.cit., p.103.
5. 185
Lord helped us", the stones at Gilgal were the sign of God's faithfulness in His providential fulfilment of the promise made to the patriarchs, to give the land to Israel, and a proper sequel to the pillar erected by Jacob at Bethel. As such, the place of the pillars at Gilgal was a fitting sanctuary for the offering of sacrifice and the coronation of kings, as well as a judicial station for the dispensing of justice. The fundamental importance of the stones at Gilgal, as theocratic symbols, is borne out in the narrative which insists upon the fact that the hand of the Lord is mighty and that He is to be feared forever, while the coalition of the pillars implied the solidarity of the tribes under the government of Jehovah.

1. I Sam. 7:12.
2. I Sam. 15:21.
3. I Sam. 11:15.
4. I Sam. 7:16.
THE RELATION OF THE MASEBAH TO THE ASHERAH.

It is sufficiently clear that the Masebah was ordinarily a pillar of stone, while the Asherah was of wood, though it is possible that there were certain exceptions to this rule. As to the origin of the Asherah, the evidence does not allow positive conclusions. It has been thought that the Asherah in earliest times was perhaps merely a convenience for marking the boundary of the sanctuary, or that it was used as a ritual convenience upon which the sacrifice was impaled, but the evidence for such conclusions is insufficient. It has been commonly believed that the Asherah was the conventional substitute for a living tree, but such may be doubted on the basis of what we know of the Semitic attitude toward sacred symbols. The substitution of a dead post for a living tree would be equivalent to the substitution of stagnant for living water. It does not seem probable that a dead trunk or limb took the place of a sacred tree, especially since living trees were available or could have been planted in the appropriate spot. The Asherah was frequently set up beneath the living tree, while the custom of planting trees was something entirely different from that of setting up Asherim.

1. II Kings 10:26 refers to the burning of a Masebah; Dussaud, Les Origines, p. 223, points out that the limestone of Palestine is easily chipped off by the heat of a hot fire. cf. Cook, Notes to 3rd ed., p. 261, Note 1; Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine, p. 220, refers to an Asherah of stone in Cyprus.


3. Barton, Poles and Posts, ibid., points out that the Assyrian kings sometimes impaled their captives. Cf. fig. 27.


5. II Kings 17:10.

It is important to observe that the term "Asherah" was applied not only to a wooden post, but was also the name of a goddess. Though the use of the term in the latter sense has been doubted, the fact is now well established. The question arises as to whether the term was applied first to the goddess and then to the post as her symbol, or vice versa. The evidence is not sufficient to permit a definite answer, and it involves a problem in religious philosophy with respect to the priority of the emblem to the deity. At least, we may be confident that the wooden post was not always regarded as the goddess, in essence, for the evidence indicates that the Asherah was sometimes definitely distinguished from the goddess. Budde thinks that under the force of the Deuteronomic law the Asherah was hypostatised for the religious horror of later times into a heathen divinity, while Barton supposes that the name of the sacred post was transferred to the goddess in some parts of the Semitic world. The statement of Kennedy is probably the key to the problem, in which he supposes that in an early age the wooden posts was the symbol of the goddess Asherah, which, bearing her name, passed by gradual stages into the anthropomorphic image of the deity. The goddess Asherah was apparently, at some stage in the development, absorbed by Ashtoreth. Doubtless, the

1. Kennedy, Asherah, HDB, p.56.
2. WRS, Relig. Sem. p.188.
7. Asherah, HDB, p.56.
symbol and the goddess were in all periods of time frequently
confounded together, for it is well known that the treatment of
sacred objects as the gods themselves has many parallels. The
feminine significance of "Asherah" is sufficiently clear, re-
gardless of whether it referred to the goddess or to her symbol.

The Asherim, like the Naasėbōth, were probably of a
great variety in appearance and the former were undoubtedly var-
iously fashioned, though not necessarily always so. The posts
frequently represented on the Cypriot and Phoenician gems and
seals are usually regarded as Asherim, though the conclusion is
based on inference, and, as has been pointed out, it is likely
that any attempt to interpret the Canaanite Asherim by the un-
certain symbols represented on the gems would result in falla-
cious conclusions. It is probable that in the early consort-
ship of Baal with the "lady of vigor and joy", that her symbol
was not fashioned in any way, but the tendency to do so would
hardly be resisted as the cult developed. Budde mentions the
fact that the Asherim are distinguished from idols in the Old
Testament, while Kittel finds no authority for interpreting the
Asherah as referring to an image, and it may be that even a
carved Asherah was not regarded as an idol so much as an abom-
inable thing.

2. Cook, Notes to 3rd Ed. p.562.
3. See Benzingier, Heb. Arch., p.325; C-E, Hypoc., p.141; Lagrange,
   Itudes, p.119ff.; Haspero, Struggle of the Nations, p.160,
   N.1, points out that the word was sometimes masculine.
4. I. Kings 15:13; II.Kings 21:7; see, Moore, Asherah, EB, Vol.I.,
   Col.331, N.1.
5. See Vincent, Canaan, p.144, fig.93.
7. Cook, Notes to 3rd Ed. p.561.
8. See Kennedy, Asherah, HEB, p.50; Jevons, Introduction, p.135.
10. II. Chron. 24:16.
The use of the Asherah in the cult is not clear, though it is reasonable to suppose that the fruitfulness of animals as well as of the soil was the special function of the goddess. The idea has been expounded by Lagrange that the cult involved not only the bounty of good, but also all the evil seductions of a depraved moral sense. The Asherah, as the symbol of the goddess of fruitfulness, doubtless indicates to us the reason why it was sometimes transformed into a fashion that was shocking to the sensibilities of the spiritually minded among the Hebrews, for which even the queen-mother could not be excused.

The Asherah was not a part of Israelite worship. It was entirely absent from the list of the means of worship ascribed to the patriarchs, while we have no proof that before the time of Ahaz, the Asherah was used in Judah in the service of Jehovah. The use of the Asherah in the northern Kingdom is mentioned in Kings as almost exclusively in connection with Baal worship. Two passages refer to the Asherah in Israel in connection with the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin. The traditions of the Old Testament testify to the fact that the Asherah was foreign to the religion of Jehovah and was not the natural accompaniment of the Hebrew Masssebah. It is difficult to suppose that, if the Asherah had been the natural counterpart of the Hebrew Masssebah, all inference of the same should have escaped the patriarchal narrative. Furthermore, in the prophetic references to the legitimate Masssebah of Israel, there is no

1. Etudes, p.139.
8. II. Kings 13:2-6; 23:15 with reference to Samaria and Bethel.
inkling of its relationship to an Asherah. It is true that the Asherah was introduced into the Hebrew worship by the renegade element of Israel, who, however, were never able to overcome the opposition which was felt throughout the history of Israel. The Deuteronomatic writers, as has been indicated by Benainger, knew that the pole was an idol or "shame-picture" of Asherah or Ash-tarte, which is indicated by the reference to the "abominable thing" of the queen-mother, and they also knew the relation of the Asherah to Baal, as we may infer from the command of King Josiah to the High Priest to "bring forth out of the temple of Jehovah all the vessels that were made for Baal and for the Asherah, etc." Likewise, the slur against Manasseh indicates as much, which says that he set the graven image of Asherah in the house, concerning which Jehovah had said to David and to Solomon, "In this house and in Jerusalem will I put my name forever."

It seems reasonable to conclude, regardless of the original significance of the Asherah, that in the time of Israel it was the symbol of the Canaanite goddess of fertility, being a regular part of the furniture of the Canaanite High Places in association with the pillars of Baal, and while the Baal pillars were symbols of the proprietorship and jurisdiction of the Baals in their respective dominions, the Asherah represented the goddess, whose chief function in association with the Baalim was that of fruitfulness. It is also probable that the goddess, represented by the Asherah, was resorted to as a fortune-teller as well as for other more or less incidental purposes which were

6. See Kennedy, Asherah, HDB, p.56.
thought to be associated with her office as the mother-goddess. The Asherim were never regarded as suitable in the sanctuaries of Jehovah, though at certain times they were introduced into the national cult even in the royal sanctuaries at Samaria, Bethel, and Jerusalem, in connection with infidelity and apostacy. Since the Asherah represented a goddess, the presence of her symbol in a Baal sanctuary was not regarded as limiting or conflicting with his rights and power over the dominion, but rather for the enrichment and fruitfulness of the heritage over which he presided. The Maasebah represented the dominion under the jurisdiction of the particular deity, but the Asherah was the peculiar emblem of the goddess, whose special function was to promote the fruitfulness of the area as the proper consort of the god.

THE RELATION OF THE PILLAR TO THE ALTAR.

Both the archaeological and literary evidence serve to emphasise the fact that the altar and the pillar were closely associated in the cult practice among the Western Semites. In the Old Testament we find that Jacob set up a pillar in the same vicinity where Abraham had previously erected an altar, and when Jacob returned to Bethel after his sojourn in Haran, he built an altar in the same neighbourhood. At the covenant sacrifice near the foot of Mount Sinai, Moses erected an altar in association with twelve tribal pillars. The heathen pillars and altars, against which the prophets of Israel protested, were associated together in the High Places. In the prophetic vision of Isaiah, relating to Egypt as a heritage of the Lord, the Ma‘asebah and the altar were thought of as complementary to each other, even though they were separated in geographic location. At Petra we find the great High Place with its altars and pillars associated together, and at Beth-Shan the Canaanite Ma‘asebah is located in the temple with the great altar, while at Gezer the alignment of pillars stood in close relation to a great stone block with an unusual cavity, which was evidently a slaughter stone. However, we must not conclude that the altar and the Ma‘asebah were always indispensable to each other in the cult practice, for, according to

7. Cf. Robinson, Sarcophagus, p.120ff.
the Old Testament tradition, Abraham and Isaac built altars without the benefit of Massëbôth, while the pillars, such as that of Absalom, were not thought of in association with altars.

Sometimes the values of the pillar and the altar seem to be merged in one structure. The altar on Mount Carmel, which was repaired by Elijah in his famous contest with the Baal prophets, was constructed of twelve tribal stones, giving the altar a symbolical significance as well as practical value for ritual purposes. It has been thought that Elijah's altar was "simply a circle marked out by twelve standing stones and a trench", but we know, through Tacitus, that at least in a later time when Vespasian wanted to consult the oracle on Mount Carmel, he found there simply an altar in the open air. Dalman thinks the twelve stones of Elijah's altar are not to be associated with the Sinai and Gilgal ideas, since there are no connecting traditions. Nevertheless, the narrative seems to suggest the merging of the idea of the tribal pillars in the construction of that particular altar. The great altar constructed by the Transjordan tribes on the borders of the Jordan seems to have combined symbolism with suitableness for sacrifice. With reference to the altar of the Transjordan tribes, Conder suggests a connection with the "witness" pillars of the modern Arabs, but the cases are not parallel, for the Arab "witnesses" are in no sense to be mistaken for altars. Scholars have sought to account for this strange altar by supposing that the narrative was modified to harmonise with the fundamental

1. I Kings 18:31.
2. WRS, Relig. Sem., p.379, Note 1.
3. See Contenau, La Civilisation Phénicienne, p.128.
4. Der Gilgal, p.11.
6. PEQJS, 1882, p.140.
1 postulate of the late writers. It is true that "an altar is a
2 strange erection if it is only to be used as a monument", never-
theless, a votive altar is not a thing unheard of, and Elijah's
altar on Mount Carmel might well have served a purpose without
ritual use. It was a "pattern" altar which the Transjordan
tribes erected, and as such perhaps implied the governmental pre-
rogatives, being a sign of theocratic authority. The tribes
having renounced rebellious intent, the altar was allowed to stand
unused as a witness of the right of the Transjordan tribes to
share in the theocratic blessing of Jehovah. Whatever modifi-
cations the narrative may have suffered, which tells of the al-
tar of the Transjordan tribes, the present form of the narrative
certainly implies that it was not contrary to Hebrew practice to
combine in one structure the values of the Massebah and the altar.

The Arab practice which has been so fully investigated
by scholars, indicates that the Massebah and the altar among the
Arabs were practically identical. The ritual of the Arabian
idol-altar led to the supposition that "the rude Arabian usage
is the primitive type out of which all the elaborate altar cere-
monies of the more cultivated Semites grew." The chief evi-
dence upon which the conclusion is based is to be found especi-
ally in the fact that libations of the same kind are applied
to both the altar and the rude stone pillar. However, altars
and pillars were not the only factors upon which blood was
sprinkled or smeared in the Semitic ritual. In the celebration

1. See Kennedy, Altar, HDB, Vol.I., p.75; cf. Cook, Notes to 3rd
Ed., p.569.
Sem., p.201.
4. WRS, = ibid.
5. WRS,op.cit.,p.236f. (It is not strange that there was no burnt sacri-
fice in connection with an idol-altar.)
of the Passover by the Samaritans on Mount Gerezim the blood of the sacrificial lambs is put on the tents, and other ritual applications among the Semites indicate that the argument is not entirely comprehensive. A sacred factor that has been ritually treated is not necessarily a part of the altar. It has been recognised by Smith that after the altar and the pillar were distinct, the pillars continued to receive the ritual blood, but, as Lagrange points out, the problem remains as to why it was thought necessary to distinguish the sacred stone from the altar. The differentiation becomes more problematical when we consider that it took place in areas widely separated. If we suppose that the original idea of the sacred stone was to provide a house for the deity while drinking the blood of the sacrifice, then any differentiation of the sacred stones would probably retain the altar as the abode of the deity, but, ordinarily, wherever the evidence permits one to interpret the sacred stones as the habitat of the deity, the implication is that such was the pillar rather than the altar. One may be inclined to think that the primitive mind would have regarded it as impolite to keep the god waiting in an adjacent pillar for his portion of the precious blood, while such gushed from the throat of the victim on a stone which was not his proper abode.

7. Bensinger, Heb. Arch., p.318, remarks that where a holy rock was the abode of the numen, it was naturally the altar and did not need any other.
Kittel, in contrast to Smith, thinks the Massebah is a differentiation of the sacrificial stone and he makes mention of the slaughter stone of King Saul, which he regards as the oldest kind of a Massebah, through which Yahweh was satisfied as soon as the blood touched the stone. Kennedy also prefers to think that the pillar was a differentiated form of the most ancient altar and that the cause of the differentiation was probably to commemorate, as well as to appease, the dead.

It is probably true, as Benzinger says, that the Massebah, or even the Asherah, sometimes was put in the place of the altar, but that is an entirely different thing from the supposition which would identify them in origin. The fact that a stone was sacred, in the sense of being an altar stone, does not imply that it was equivalent to a Massebah. It has been thought that the statement in I Samuel, concerning the first altar of Saul, had reference to the great slaughter stone and that Saul's altar was not different from Arabian Nob, but Gray is correct in saying that the great stone of Saul, in virtue of its relation to the service of the deity, was a sacred stone but not sacred as being the residence of the deity. It is probable that Saul's slaughter stone was never regarded in the class with the conventional Massebah, since it was used only

---

2. I. Sam. 14:32.
6. Cook, Relig. Pal., p. 17, points out that while the Hebrew altar (Mizbeah) is primarily a place of sacrificial slaughter, the term domes to be used more loosely and the Massebah may have been used as an altar.
7. 14:35; cf. H.P. Smith, Commentary on Samuel, p. 117.
on one occasion and then apparently had no further importance.

The term "Massebah" indicates something different from the term "Mizbēah", and, as has been pointed out by Whitehouse, it is quite evident that Mizbēah belongs to early as well as late Hebrew. On the basis of etymology, the value of the Maseebah was independent of the sacrifice and the same fact is borne out by the archaeological evidence, which finds illustration in the burial Maseebah as well as the conical stone, which by its very shape, was not suitable as a slaughter stone.

In sketching the probable development of the altar, Kennedy suggests that the primitive conception of the nomad Semites was to bring their offerings into relationship with the natural holy places where direct contact was made with the residing numen, and that a great step in advance was taken when it was conceived that the deity could be persuaded to take up residence in a structure set up by the worshipper. In any case, it certainly seems probable that the earliest ritual was not in relationship to artificial structures, and that the materials spontaneously offered in the earliest mode of worship were undoubtedly of a great variety in form, which may explain the variety in later artificial structures. Such a supposition tends to argue against any theory which seeks to derive the developed ritual apparatus from a single factor. Jevons supposes that the heap was perhaps in use prior to the pillar, and that the

1. See Tyler, Primitive Culture, Vol. II., p. 163, for the example of the rude stones used by the Shanars of Tinnevelly, which are thrown away or neglected after having been used to receive the sacrifice.
primitive heap developed into a table, becoming an altar in the specified sense of the word, while the pillar, which in the beginning had the same purpose as the heap, remained in use as the object in which the god manifested himself when the blood was dashed on it. One may prefer to think with Barton that it was in imitation of rocks and crags, which were considered sacred, that altars and High Places such as those at Petra and elsewhere were hewn out. The evidence that the pillar and the altar were identical in the earliest form of the cult is, at least, insecure, even though it is not always possible to entirely distinguish between the form of the altar and the Massebah. The evidence indicates that there was no exact definition of the form of either the altar or the Massebah from which there could be no variation. Among the Hebrews the altar might be built of field stones or of earth and be equally approved so long as certain fundamental regulations as to the sanctity of the altar were observed. The fundamental conception as to the suitability of an altar among the Semites was based neither on materials nor dimensions, but the important thing was a convenient and unpolluted place of sacrifice; and temporary emergency altars, such as the slaughter stone of Saul at Michmash, were never regarded as unseemly in the cult. It is true that there was a conventional type of structural altar among the Hebrews in which the stones of the altar were apparently arranged so as

3. I. Sam. 6:14, seems to suggest that a great stone at Beth-Shemesh was used as an altar of burnt offering, but for a probable explanation otherwise, see Gray, Sacrifice in O.T., p.120. See also Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches in Palestine, 1873-1874, Vol.II., p.213, for an interesting comment on the location of the great stone.
to form a hollow centre for earth-filling, but at the same time a wide freedom in the altar structure is plainly evident. Likewise, the Massebôth were of great variety in form and size as well as in grouping, but the fact that there was apparently an overlapping in form, which made it possible sometimes to combine the altar and the Massebah, does not argue that the pillar was originally the altar or that it was the prototype of the vast variety of altar structures. It may be true that the pillars of Solomon's temple were used as altars, but, of course, such a conclusion must be regarded as an opinion based on an exegetical problem. Contrary to the suggestion of Duseaud, the statement of Hosea, with reference to Israel's period of desolation, does not indicate that sacrifice was a rite connected with the Massebah, for the repeated use of the connective serves to distinguish the various items, though there is no reason to suppose that they were unrelated. Certain niche cones have been found at Petra with a channel around in which the liquid offerings could flow away, while not far distant was the probable slaughter stone, but the archaeological data mentioned is of uncertain interpretation, and even if we have here the equivalent of a Massebah around which was poured the sacrificial blood, it only reveals what we already know that the

4. Les Origines, p.222.
5. 314; see Harper, Amos and Hosea, p.220.
6. YW!
8. e.g., on one cone at Petra was an inscription which called it a tombstone even though no tomb has been found near it. See Gressmann, A.B.A.T., p.125.
Massebah sometimes received ritual treatment. It need not be doubted that all the High Place furniture, including the Massebah as well as the Asherah and the fashioned stones, were frequent recipients of the sacrificial blood and we can be sure that they received the holy anointing oil.

Spoer thinks the term "gal" in the narrative of the covenant between Jacob and Laban indicates the equivalent of the dolmen and he proposes a connection with dolmens in the evolution of the altar, supposing that the account of the compact suggests that the primitive stone altar was enlarged by the addition of other stones in the forming of a dolmen altar. However, it has been pointed out by Gray that the narrative suggests the collection of many small stones rather than a few great ones, as implied by the use of the verb which is used elsewhere to indicate the gathering of sticks, etc. As a matter of fact, the narrative of the covenant between Jacob and Laban does not necessarily imply that either the heap or the pillar was regarded as an altar. Since the major purpose of the narrator was apparently to set forth the importance of the heap and the pillar as witnesses to the boundary compact, the details of the method of sacrifice were not deemed essential to the narrative. The mention of the slaughter was regarded as the fitting consummation of the story but an expansion of the details would have resulted in an unnecessary anti-climax. Neither the position

2. ZAW, 1908, p.275 ff.; Gen. 31:46 ff.
4. Jer. 7:18; I. Sam. 20:38.
5. See WRB, Relig. Sem., p.202, who argues that, since no other altar appears, the heap upon which the parties to the compact ate together must have been such.
nor the description of the altar at Gilgal has been given, but it is not probable that Gilgal was the altar, for, as Gray points out, the distinctive preposition used to specify sacrifice on the altar is never used with reference to Gilgal and it is likely that none of the twelve tribal stones were used as altars, but that the altar was adjacent to the group of sacred stones.

It is of some importance to observe that the sacred stones were sometimes offered on the altar. A coin of the second century A.D. from Adraa depicts a baetyl on an altar, while other coins suggest the same idea. Contenau supposes that the baetyl were offered on the altar for the veneration of the faithful. It must be admitted that the interpretation of such evidence is problematic, but if the structures in question are actually altars, then we must suppose that the objects on the altar were offered to the deity, and it is probable that such objects represented some intangible possessions, which were, in such a manner, dedicated to the deity. It seems clear that the altar was the ritual instrument where the devotion of the people to the deity was manifested, and their faithfulness to him proven. Gray regards the sacred stone as having the double aspect of the home of the deity and the instrument of his service, which he thinks "may perhaps account for the rarity among

1. Sacrifice in the O.T., p.104 f.
2. Exod. 20:24; Gen. 22:9; Deut. 12:27.
3. Hill, Catalogue of Greek Coins of Arabia, etc., Plate III., No. 5.
5. La Civilisation Phenicienne, p.125.
7. The prophets frequently denounced the altar service, not to condemn the altar as an instrument of faithful service, but to disclaim against iniquity at the altars. Cf. Hosea 8:11; 12:11; Amos. 4:4 ff.
8. Sacrifice in the O.T., p.125.
the Hebrews of the use of the single stone altar, and for the form of the early Hebrew law", but such a conclusion would probably infer an early tendency to abolish the Massebah, which does not seem to be the case. If the altar was the place where the people gave evidence of their faithfulness to the deity by bringing choice portions of the increase of the heritage for ritual presentation to the deity thus imploring his goodness and mercy, then the proper complement to the altar would be some visible sign and witness of the guardian faithfulness of the deity over the people and the heritage committed to them. In the passage in Isaiah it is very clear that the pillar is for a sign and a witness of Jehovah's jurisdiction over the heritage and His faithfulness to His people, to whom, when they cry because of the oppressors, He shall send deliverance. Also in this passage we find that the altar is the proper complement of the Massebah, for the Egyptians are represented as rendering sacrifice, oblation, and the fulfillment of vows at the altar. Thus it appears that in the mind of the prophet the altar and the Massebah stood in antipodal relationship to each other. A survey of the pillar evidences seems to indicate, generally speaking, that the pillar in some way signified the faithfulness of the deity as the guardian of the heritage, which has been pointed out elsewhere. It is of course evident that the exact conception of the relation of the deity to the pillar was conditioned by the intellectual, religious, and moral standards of the interpreters. One must allow for interpretations by the vulgar, but such does not vitiate the fact that the proper value

2. Isa. 19:19.
4. See p. 71 ff.
of the pillar, at least in Hebrew times, upon which the name of the deity was invoked, was as a sign and a witness of the jurisdiction and faithfulness of the deity. Thus, both the pillar and the altar served as intermediaries between the material world of the worshipper and the intangible world of the being, who presided over the heritage and to whom worship was addressed. It is true that the pillar was applicable to a multiplicity of divine providences, just as the altar was applicable to a vast variety of ritual with diverse intentions. It was not necessary that the pillar should be directly associated with the altar; as for example, the Ebenezer of Samuel, which represented the providential faithfulness of God to the tribes of Israel, was perhaps not locally associated with an altar but it implied an altar as the logical counter-part of the complementary devotion and faithfulness between man and God. In a theocratic form of government, it is likely that no Massebah was permitted to be erected in association with a place of sacrifice except by theocratic permission or decree, since the faithfulness of the deity theoretically was only realised by the people through the government of the Lord's anointed. Therefore any pillar erected privately as a sign of divine protection amounted to rebellion against the established theocracy, and such may be a partial explanation of the strict Deuteronomic regulation, concerning the erection of Massebôth. It is probable that the shrines which had Massebôth were vested with the power of self-determination and it is likely that such were contrary to theocratic principles except at the royal sanctuaries. The custom of the Semites of

2. I. Sam. 7:12.
3. Deut. 16:22.
facing toward the seat of religious authority while engaging in their devotions, as for example the requirement of Moslems to face the holy stone of Mecca, implies the rebellious nature of a rival Masjed.

It is to be observed that in ancient times worship was seldom offered to a deity outside of his recognised dominion. To send a man into exile was equivalent to saying, "Go serve other gods". It is clear that to be subject to an alien theocracy was to be in subjection to a foreign god. There may have been more than one reason for this conception but it can scarcely be doubted that, in a strictly theocratic realm, the rendering of homage to a foreign god would be objectionable on political as well as religious grounds, for such would amount to an insult to the national deity and render the offender liable to punishment for treason against the theocracy. Therefore, apart from all superstitious ideas, the observance of the proprieties of worship in a foreign land was strictly good sense. In the light of this conception, we are enabled to understand the close relationship of the altar to the theocratic pillars, for every altar was necessarily subject to the authority symbolised in the pillar of the theocratic realm in which it was erected. The rigidity of this idea made it necessary for Naaman, who desired to worship Jehovah in Syria, to solve the problem of

1. In the blessing of King Solomon at the dedication of the temple it is clear that the efficacy of the prayers of the people was regarded as dependent on their loyalty to the theocratic government which should be indicated by facing toward the temple in their devotions, cf. 1. Kings 8:30 ff.
2. The Samaritans at their Passover celebration use a prostrate column as a "Mihrâb" to indicate the direction of the sacred rock on the summit of Mount Gerizim. See fig. 14.
3. 1. Sam. 26:19.
territorial dominion. by taking some earth from the theocratic realm of Jehovah, upon which to build an altar to Him, without conflicting with the rights of the gods of Syria. That this viewpoint was not entirely based on the thought that worship would be futile if addressed to any other god than such as was indigenous to the soil upon which the altar was erected, is indicated by the fact that David, who sensed the problem of worship outside the recognised realm of Jehovah, found no difficulty in setting up the worship of Jehovah on the soil which he had conquered from the Jebusites. The land of a strange god was perhaps frequently regarded as an unfit place to erect a sanctuary purely from the religious point of view, but there were political or theocratic reasons as well. The conquered territory was placed under the jurisdiction of the god of the conquerors without any scruple as to the insult to the prior gods as is shown, for example, by the astral symbols over the heritage cone of Naram-Sin, which was set up in the mountains of a conquered realm. Ordinarily, the conquerors did not suppress former worship, but they did not hesitate to introduce the worship of their own deities. The political problem of worship was keenly felt by the Hebrews in captivity. The fact that under the rule of King Darius the prayers of Daniel were regarded as an act of treason indicates the political problem which confronted the non-conformist in worship. It was not only perilous to engage in the worship of Jehovah while sojourning in a foreign land, but sometimes it was even necessary to

2. I. Sam., 26:19.
3. See WRS, Relig. Sem., p.93.
5. Dan. 6:7. Of course, this was by royal decree on occasion.
6. Exod. 8:26. Evidently Hebrew worship in Egypt was illegal at that time.
worship foreign gods or to suffer the consequences as was the case under the dominion of Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon, when the death penalty was meted out to those who neglected to worship the golden image which the king had set up. The long continued custom of submitting to theocratic authority in the matter of worship may have emphasised the fear of supersitious minds who believed that calamity would befall them for failure to properly worship the gods of the land. A dominion, pillar upon which the name of a deity had been officially and ceremonially invoked was sufficient authority for the worship of the deity so named in that realm. The Massebah to Jehovah was the warrant for serving Him at His altar, while the pillars of the Baalim of Canaan were a constant invitation to the Israelites to serve the altars of the Canaanite gods. One must recognise that the problem of the relationship between the altar and Massebah is a difficult one, but it appears that the most reasonable solution is to be found in the conclusion that they were complementary to each other.

2. II Kings 17:26.
3. Bertholet, History of Hebrew Civilisation, p.147, says it was the duty of Israel to render tribute to the gods of the country. Certainly such was the case wherever the dominion of such gods was unchallenged, but according to the tradition their dominions were challenged from the beginning, though with only partial success. See Driver, Deuteronomy, I.C.C., p.150.
THE RELATION OF THE DEITY TO THE MASSÉBOTH.

The exact relationship of the deity to the sacred stones constitutes a difficult problem, which is accentuated by the fact that the extra-Biblical literary evidences are fragmentary and vague, but various clues are available from which we may reach some general conclusions. It appears sufficiently clear that, among the Semites, stone objects, including the Massébah, were frequently bowed down to and worshipped. The Old Testament leaves no room to doubt the prevalence of idol worship, which was the great temptation of Israel, and there is no reason to suppose that the graven images, spoken against in the Second Commandment, were confined to private use as some have suggested. It is important to note that while Massébóth sometimes served as objects of worship, yet they are ordinarily sharply distinguished from the fashioned stone.

The testimony of Clement of Alexandria, to the effect that the Arabs worshipped a stone, might imply that the stone was regarded as a deity, in esse, but one may consider the other evidences as too demanding to feel the temptation to make a general application of this statement. The evidence as to the Arabian practice, which has been so carefully studied by Semitic

2. Exod. 32:1.
3. Exod. 20:4,5.
4. See WRS, Relig. Sem. p.209; Barton, Semitic Religion, p.293; thinks the Commandment only prohibits expensive idols. Evans, JHS, Vol.21,p.132, says only graven images were condemned; Sayce states that the Second Commandment forbade art of any kind (Early History of Hebrews,p.192) and that the graven and molten images of Dan were in defiance of the Commandment (p.281).
5. Deut. 7:5.
scholars, certainly indicates that the rude stones were regarded as idols in some sense of the word, and at least it appears that a close association caused the Arabs to think of the deity in terms of the sacred stones, but one may wonder whether there may have been more variety in the Arabian practice than has been supposed, especially since we find examples of ritual, such as that described by Herodotus, where two deities were invoked in connection with a compact between two persons, while seven sacred stones were smeared with blood. The grouping of several pillars in the worship of a single deity still stands in need of explanation, if we are to identify the stone and the deity, unless we adopt the unsuitable hypothesis that several stones were set up in order to offer the god some choice in the matter of his accommodation. One may be inclined to see some symbolism in the use of seven stones, mentioned above, especially since the number seven was a mystical number of perfection and often had a cosmic significance. Equally problematic are the variable panel groupings of the Nabataeans, which some think had a value corresponding to that of the cross of the Christians, the symbol of the Nabataeans being not only the sign

2. iii, 8.
3. Dussaud, Les Origines, p.227, regards this as proof that a group of stones may incorporate the same god and that several gods may be in one pillar, but he ought first to show that the two gods invoked were supposed to become embodied in the stones.
4. WRS, Relig. Sem. p.210, apparently on the basis of logic, disallows the motion that the stone was regarded as a simulacrum of the god, since a plurality of stones frequently stand together in the worship of one god, but the same logic ought to be applied to the notion that such pillars were "god-boxes".
5. Cf. Muir, Life of Mahomet, p.XV. with reference to the seven circuits of the Kaaba as emblematical of the revolution of the planetary bodies.
of their religion, but also of their civilisation. The suggestion has been made that Dushara may mean the "god-pillar", but such rests upon the interpretation of A'ra, which is uncertain. The tablets described by Doughty, some of which are inscribed to one god having two or three symbols, are exceedingly strange if they were meant to represent the god. It is true that all religious symbols have sometimes been over-venerated just as in Christian lands the cross has sometimes had the value of a fetish, while, with many, the cross has been a "vehicle" of worship, if not the object of such. The symbol and the god have often been naively identified, as Gunkel suggests, but this does not prove that the proper value of the pillar is to be discovered in such identification. Concerning certain stones in the Mecca vicinity, Doughty was told by the Moslems that such stones were oracles "in the days of ignorance" and that Sheytan spake out of them, but it does not appear that the use of movable stones as oracles was a common Semitic practice, for the evidence indicates that natural boulders and rock caverns were regarded as more suitable for such a purpose. It is apparent that we must even interpret the inferences of the classical writers with some reserve; for example, the statement of Maximus Tyrius, that the Arabians venerated a god unknown to him, but that he had seen the statue of the god which was a quadrangular stone, may properly be regarded as a confession of ignorance on the part of the said writer in so far

1. See Cook, Religion of Palestine, p.18, Note 2.
2. Arabia Deserta, Vol.I., p.120f.
3. See Cook, Notes to 3rd Ed. p.569, who suggests that the Nabataean Hasgêdâ was the vehicle of worship; cf. Relig. Pal., p.17.
7. Taylor, Translation of "Dissertations, Diss. 38, p.194."
as the relationship of the god to the stone is concerned, for he says that he saw the stone but did not know the Arabian conception of the deity. The outward practice of the modern ceremonies at Mecca might lead an uninitiated observer to call it stone worship, for certainly the outward signs of such are present, but one must recognise that the Black Stone of Mecca, as used today, is a symbol of Moslem religion and patriotism, while the apparent veneration of the stone is an act of consecration. It has been pointed out that in Arabian poetry not all the sacred stones were identified with the deity, but the ansab are spoken of as standing beside the god or round him. It may be, as Smith says, that the distinction between one stone and the rest is not primitive, but, at least, we must recognise that the distinction existed in the period upon which we must rely for our information.

It is probable that the sacred stones were sometimes regarded as crude representations of some part of the deity. With reference to Pliny's famous statement about the Syrian worship of Hadad in which mention is made of the reins, eyes, and fingers of Hadad, we must recognise with Lagrange that Pliny did not say that the particular parts of the deity were actually represented; yet, if the stone was called by the name of a certain part of the body of the deity, it is not difficult to believe that such members may have been, in other cases, actually represented. It is doubtless true that "it is not

2. WRS, Relig. Sem., p. 211, Note 1.
3. Cook, Notes to 3rd Ed. p. 573, gives translation of a passage from the Naca'id, which indicates the distinction.
4. Ibid.
5. Etudes, p. 190.
a primitive idea to represent the human body or any of its parts" but it must also be recognised that the stone cult at its height in the history of the Western Semites cannot be classed as primitive in the usual sense of that word. Smith thinks that it was "a natural exercise of the artistic faculty to indicate on the stone the fact that the god was present, and this may account for some of the anthropomorphic representations. The phallic symbols certainly did not represent the proper value of the pillar, but it is sufficiently clear that such symbolism was somewhat prevalent.

In the Graeco-Roman period we are confronted with a variety of "holy" stones, called baetyls, which are variously described as possessing the powers of animation, locomotion, and audible speech, as well as the capacity to change in size and colour. They were sometimes concealed in the vestments, or carried in the hand, and such holy stones had divine honours paid to them, while they were also applied to all kinds of magical purposes. One may classify the sacred stones of this period under a single head, but it is clear that there was considerable variation in the ideas as to the relation of such stones to the deity. Some of them were evidently regarded as meteorites, but even stones which were reputed to have fallen from heaven were variously interpreted as to their relationship to the deity. The rude stone that stood near Gythion in Laconia was known as Zeus Kappotès and the name indicates that the stone was regarded as essentially the god. On the

3. Evans, JHS, Vol.XXI,p.118,reminds us that in the Mycenaean cult the divine symbol of the double axe was frequently carved on the sacred stones.
7. i.e. Zeus fallen down from Heaven, see Evans, ibid.
other hand, we are told in legend that Astarte actually picked up and consecrated an aerolite in a Tyrian shrine, which implies that the stone was not identified with the deity but only consecrated by her, and it is clear that the goddess was not in the stone but outside and distant from it. The stone, which Eusebius claimed to have seen as a globe of fire leap down from above, was thought to be possessed with strange powers and essentially magical. The meteoric stones in Egypt, according to Wainwright, were regarded especially as that by which the gates of heaven were opened, or as instruments by which the faithful might attain to the presence of the gods. In Cretan legend we are told that a baetyl was swallowed by Kronos under the belief that it was his son, suggesting to us a novel relationship, reversing the conception of the stone as the dwelling place of the god. Such evidences are sufficient to show the confusion in the conception as to the relation between the baetyls and the deities, and it is probable that there was no orthodox creed as to the part the gods were supposed to play in connection with such stones. The stone which Elagabalus brought from Carthage and honoured with a procession through the streets of Rome, being magnificently arrayed in silk vestments for the occasion, was certainly, in some sense of the word, an idol, but who can say whether the stone was regarded as essentially divine, a god-box, an image, or a magical gift of the gods? The Christian writer, Arnobius, tells of his own heathen life as a stone worshipper with flattering words and "asked benefits

2. Conybeare, ibid.
3. PEFGN, Jan. 1934, p.32ff.
4. Conybeare, op.cit., p.113; Lenormant, Baetylia, D.A., Vol.I., p.642ff., indicates that this was the material form of the Cretan Zeus.
from the senseless thing", which indicates that the stone was either regarded as the deity, or possessed with power and authority to act for the god. The practice of adoring holy stones was widespread in the Greek world as indicated in the testimony of Theophrastus, through whom we learn that in the fourth century B.C. the sacred stones in the streets were venerated.

It is said that the word "baetulos" is derived from the Semitic term "bethel", but this cannot be regarded as definite. It is important to observe that there was only one Semitic pillar called Bethel, and, in so far as the Hebrew practice is concerned, the name of the pillar at Bethel was unique. It is a strange fact, if this word, which was never applied to more than one stone among the Hebrews, became universalised as a generic term for sacred stones in other realms. Apart from the etymological problem, the question remains as to whether the Graeco-Roman holy stones are to be linked with the Semitic Masséboth in meaning and cult practice. On the assumption that Bethel meant "god-envelope", it is clear, as indicated above, that the baetyls were not always regarded as such; therefore, if

1. See Frazer, op.cit., p.73.
5. See Wainwright, op.cit., p.38.
6. The fact that "Bethel" was peculiarly related to a community serves to confirm the uniqueness of the term; for if all sacred stones were thus designated, why was the term exalted in a single locality?
we recognise a connection in terminology, the basis of association of meaning remains obscure. The particular Mašebeh called Bethel was undoubtedly in existence as a Mašebeh at the time when the Old Testament account was written, and it must not have been regarded in that period as a stone fetich. We know that the Hebrew conception of the Mašebeh, such as that envisioned by the prophet as standing on the border of Egypt, was not on the same level with the Graeco-Roman baetyls. Lodz calls attention to the fact that there are no examples among the Israelites of portable sacred stones. The idea has been advanced that the stone tablets in the Ark of the Covenant were not inscribed with the Ten Commandments, being considered either meteorites of specimen stones from the holy mountain which were in the nature of fetiches, but such conjecture hardly deserves the attention it has received. A definite difference between the Massebah and the baetyl has been observed by notable scholars. It is to be noted that the baetyls were considered to be vitally capable of wonder-working and essentially wonderful in origin, while the Massebah, such as that at Bethel, has no tradition of wonder-working power, and its essential character was not different from the common stones. It appears that a comparison of the baetyl with the Massebah only serves to confuse the meaning of the Semitic pillar cult, but it is possible that the confusion existed in a comparatively early period. It

1. See Cook, op. cit., p.27.
6. WRS, Relig. Sem. p.210, N.1; Driver, Genesis, p.268, N.1; Lagrange, Etudes, p.194, says the baetyls are an indication of the superstitious fury of the Graeco-Roman epoch.
may be that the magical baetyl is an analogy to the smooth stones of the valley, which were adored by the back-sliding Israelites. In spite of this fact, one may find it difficult to conclude that the Semites did not indulge in metaphysical speculation, for our earliest knowledge of the Semites indicates the contrary, as is shown by the Ziggurat of Babylonia. It is significant that when metaphysical thought languishes, the vagueness of fetishism flourishes and the symbols of religion become "et ratio in obscura", as was the case when Taditus thought to describe the Paphian cone. In view of this fact, one may feel uncertain as to the popular conception of the relation of the stone to the god, except where the clearest testimony is available, and this caution may be applied to the sacred stones of every period.

Numerous writers have believed that the proper value of the sacred stone is to be found in the supposition that it was conceived to be the abode of a numen. The extent to which this conception was prevalent in the Semitic pillar cult is, at least, uncertain. In the Roman religion, the numina were not gods; they had no personality, and their sex was indeterminate. They were not conceived of as possessing human shape, and it was only in action that numina manifested themselves. According to Halliday, "the worship of numina leaves no room for a personal tie between the worshipper and the object of

1. Isa. 57:16.
4. See Tyler, op.cit., p.167, who points out that it might be misleading to assume too much in view of the multifarious ideas prominent in the stone cult among different races.
worship*, the latter being an object of awe and reverence but having neither passions nor sympathies toward man. The Semitic religion, as far as we are able to discern its earliest history, stands in striking contrast to such a conception.

The Semitic religion, in its proper value, placed the emphasis upon personal relationships. It need not be argued that the Semites were free from vague superstitions, but it appears that the Massēbōth were primarily associated with gods that were conceived to be personal, possessing a continuity of character through succeeding generations and entering fully into all the relationships of the tribe. If we assume that the Semites realised a relationship to a personal, thinking, passionate deity, exercising jurisdiction over a particular tribe, then it appears that the proper value of the pillar was not for the benefit of a vague nature-numen. The Canaanite Baalim bore a closer likeness to a tribal sheikh than to a nature power. It is doubtless true that a power, invisible to man, was felt in the phenomena of the world in the life, growth, and productivity of nature, but the Semites apparently regarded such as being under the control of a personal deity whose activity was not confined to a single manifestation in nature, as was the case among the Aryans. Even among the Hebrews the deity might manifest himself in a burning bush, or under an oak tree, or in the lightning and thunder on the top of a mountain, but the significant fact is that the same god manifested himself in these several ways and places, being always a personal god interested in the affairs of his people.

1. See Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, p.243, who indicates that the names of Semitic deities suggest such ideas as kingship, etc.
3. Exod. 3:2.
Various references in the Old Testament have been taken as indicative of animistic conceptions on the part of the Hebrews. It is undoubtedly true that the tendency to personify trees and other natural phenomena has been widespread among the peoples of the world, but it is extremely doubtful whether the Old Testament offers any evidence of such conceptions among the Hebrews. For example, one may feel that it is irrelevant to compare the Caucasian story of a grove of trees, moving from one place to another to hide a hero from his enemies, with an Old Testament account such as that of David's battle sign of the mulberry trees. Be that as it may, it must be remembered that a simple field stone "set up" was, by its very nature, primarily a symbol, and as such, must be regarded as unrelated to the natural phenomena characteristic of trees, fountains, and crags, which would be frequently deified by people who were under the sway of animistic ideas.

The prohibition in Exodus, forbidding the use of a tool upon altar stones, has been explained on the basis that the stones were regarded as numen-possessed and that the use of the tool upon such stones amounted to an assault on the numen, or, at least, might tend to disturb it and cause it to take flight. However, the passage has been given a different interpretation, as for example, Kennedy suggests that simplicity is the dominant note of the law in this fundamental passage, and in like vein, Kautzsch regards the prohibition as

2. See Evans, JHS, Vol. XXI., p. 133f.
3. II Sam. 5:24.
plainly intended, by way of protest, against innovation that
had crept in. One may find sufficient ground to doubt whether
this prohibition applied to the Semites generally. We are
informed that this law was observed by the Hebrews until the
very end of the Jewish nation, and even the altar of burnt of-
fering in Herod's temple required unhewn stones, whereas, we
find a general disregard of this injunction among other Sem-
ites, as in the case of the rock hewn altars of Petra and other
numerous examples in Palestine and Syria. That the injunction
did not apply to the Massëbôth of the Canaanites in the second
millenium B.C. is well borne out by the archaeological data.
Macalister associates the pillars at Gezer with the Old Testa-
ment prohibition, but the stones at Gezer are generally cup-
marked and grooved, and the surfaces of the stones are smoother
on the western face, all of which indicates that no thought
was taken of the possibility of disturbing the numen. The
pillar number seven had evidently been dragged from some dis-
tant place by means of a rope, and one can scarcely associate
such treatment with the idea that it was the habitat of a numen.
The large stone with the squared cavity, which was manifestly
the slaughter stone, leaves no doubt as to the fact that the
Semitic Gezerites disregarded, or were ignorant of the regu-
lation against cutting the stones of an altar. The fact that
such High Places as those at Petra and Gezer were not affected
by the supposed ancient Semitic taboo, while, during the same

1. Cf. Josephus, Wars, v.v.6; see Gray, Sacrifice in the O.T.
of. Prip-Möller, PEQ, 1929, p.223ff.
5. Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.60.
6. Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.60.
7. See Macalister, op.cit., p.420, for evidence that the taboo
against cutting a stone was not valid in the Neolithic period
at Gezer.
periods, the Hebrews observed it, lends plausibility to the conjecture, that it was never applicable to the Semites generally. 1

It has been emphasised by Gray that the bringing together of stones in an altar structure would be quite as distasteful to the numen as the practice of tooling, and that the idea which supposed a stone to be the residence of a numen must have weakened before the period of the altar of composite stones. 2

The prohibition against the stepped altar has also been thought to imply the presence of a numen in the altar, but strangely enough, the regulation seems only to apply to the Hebrews, as the numerous stepped altars in the Semitic area testify. 3

Bertholet states that "the conception that a supersensuous being likes to take up his abode in a stone is fully attested by finds in layers belonging to the Canaanite period" and, as the example of such discoveries, he cites the natural rock altar at Taanach in association with the Old Testament aversion to the stepped altar. The logic of his statement of the attestation probably supports the negative of his argument, for, apparently such altars were constructed by people who had no compunction about going up steps to the altar, since there is no evidence that the Canaanite priests wore "linen breeches." 5

In view of the prevalent use of the stepped altars among the Semites, it is probable that the Hebrew prohibition was in the nature of a protest against the heathen custom which may have had an undesirable interpretation contrary to the Hebrew conception of

1. Sacrifice in the O.T., p.126.
2. Exod. 20:26.
the altar. Kennedy suggests that the law was promulgated from motives of decency. In any case, it may signify no more than a sense of fitness in relation to the sanctity of the altar, and the argument is precarious which regards the regulation as for the protection of a numen.

Various other hints have been taken as proof that the sacred stones in Israel were conceived to be numen-possessed, such as the implications of the word "bethel" and Jacob's act of anointing the pillar. H.P. Smith is very certain that the witness stone of Joshua was conceived to be essentially personified in order to serve as a witness in the cause of Jehovah. Likewise, the same scholar thinks the witness stone of Jacob and Laban must be regarded as animated by a spirit. Pedersen interprets this stone as indicative of the power of the Israelites to concentrate a psychical element into a material object, and he points out that all the outward manifestations of the Israelite cult, such as altars, Masseboth, circumcision, and the Sabbath are regarded as witnesses to, or tokens of, the union of souls. The fact that circumcision and the Sabbath were regarded as witnesses of the covenant between Israel and Jehovah may throw some light on the use of Masseboth as witnesses. It is, of course, true that the conception of feeding the god with the blood of the sacrifice, which was poured on the ground or on the altar stone, was known

2. Paton, Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead, p.234, thinks that the heaps of stones placed over graves were designed to protect the living from the ghosts of the dead, See p.101.
5. Religion of Israel, p.21.
7. Ibid.
among the Semites, though it must be admitted that it is largely a matter of conjecture in the interpretation of such ritual as to the relationship in the minds of the idolaters between the god and the stone, or the ghabghab. Furthermore, it is important to note that the main stream of belief, which culminated in the Hebrew prophets, conceived of the deity as the most high God, and the Semitic custom of leaving their sanctuaries exposed to the sky may have some bearing on the problem. In any case, the widely accepted theory, as to the relation of the deity to the sacred stones to the effect that the proper value of the stones lay in the fact that they were numen-possessed or god-inhabited, ought to be regarded in the light of the Semitic cosmological conceptions, in which the sphere of activity of the deity was in heaven as well as on earth.

On the Knossian signet ring, cited by Evans, there is portrayed a female worshipper, standing before a sacred pillar, while hovering near and above the pillar is an anthropomorphic representation of the deity. It is interpreted to indicate that the god had been brought down by ritual incantations so as to temporarily possess the stone pillar. However, the further evidence from Mycenaean art, which portrays the god as haunting the sacred seats and feasting in their celestial groves, does not confirm the interpretation that when the god descends to the sanctuary of the altar or the pillar and hovers in the air near the worshipper, that there is any purpose to inhabit the pillar. The gem clearly shows that the fellowship between the supernal being and the worshipper is not conditioned upon.

1. Cf. Deut. 32:38; see WRS, Relig. Sem., p.205.
2. See Lagrange, Etudes, p.192.
5. Evans, op.cit.,p.124.
the union of the hovering spirit with the stone. The Mycenaean art indicates that the gods haunted the sacred place and came near to the worshippers to commune with them, but does not show the exact relationship of the deity to the pillar except by inference especially in the light of Hebrew literature. The importance of the sacred stone as the abode of the deity is greatly lessened when we consider the fact that among the Semites the manifestation of the deity was not dependent upon any particular physical factor, be it stone, tree, mountain, or fountain.

It has been postulated concerning Jacob’s Massebah at Bethel that the ceremony implies more than the narrative states, and Kay says that the unstated implications are founded on the fact that the Masseboth are found associated with altars and Asherahs, playing a part in cult practice. However, it appears that enough is plainly stated in the case of the pillar at Bethel to account for its religious importance. One of the arguments which has been advanced in support of the idol significance of Jacob’s pillar is that such was the universal conception, but this amounts to begging the question. We know that among the Semites there was prevalent idol worship, and Biblical passages might be multiplied in testimony of that fact but this does not, by any means, imply a universal concept.

Howard indicates that, after extensive personal inquiries among a great variety of heathen worshippers, including the most degraded types in India, China, and among the devil worshippers in Ceylon, he found no basis to justify the assumption that

3. Cf. WRS, Relig. Sem., p.204.
the stone, in front of which they worshipped, was supposed by them to contain, in esse, the god to which their worship was addressed. Benzinger regards the story of Gideon as implying the idea of a numen associated with the rock, simply because the offering was placed on the rock, but such an interpretation appears improbable, especially in view of Gideon's ruthless destruction of the Baal symbols. Indeed, one may question the assumption of Kautzsch, that the earlier usage of the Massebah was as the abode of the numen loci, which inference he bases upon the fact that the Massēbōth are regarded in the Old Testament as the symbol and pledge of the nearness of God. Handcock is perhaps nearer the truth when he suggests that some of the sacred stones may have been originally the outward sign and seal of a business contract, which was solemnised by invoking the gods and uttering imprecations on any possible violator; and the tangible and visible symbols of agreement would ordinarily be infected with the religious odour of the agreement itself. It is probable that the deity was thought to linger near the sacred stone, yet it is doubtful whether he was expected to enter into the stone. In the Old Testament we find that landmarks were placed under the rule and protection of the deity and curses were invoked upon any who might violate them. In like manner, roads leading from city to city were probably put under divine protection by the setting up of stones which later were used to mark distances, thus becoming milestones, and on the Roman imperial roads, in late times, such were

2. Judg. 6:27f.
placed under the guardianship of the imperial god incarnate in
the emperor.

In view of the widely diversified usage of the sacred
stones, it appears that their development was, from the practi-
cal point of view, playing a part in the various human relation-
ships. The true nature of the Maṣṭebah, in its relation to the
deity, was probably to signify that which had been placed under
the name and protection of the deity. The invoking and conse-
oration of the name of the deity upon the pillar implied his
right to govern as well as his obligation to maintain and pro-
tect that which was signified in the pillar. Accordingly the
pillars might have a wide variety of specialised meaning, for
many important phases of life were thus placed under the juris-
diction of the deity, such as covenants between men or nations,
vows, laws, customs, governments, rulers, the rights and obli-
gations of individuals in the community, and the beloved dead,
as well as the entire material heritage of a tribe. The Deut-
eronomic law enjoins upon the Israelites the duty to destroy
the names of the heathen gods, and we may infer that the places
designated were under the protection of the names of the Canaan-
ite deities. In the light of this argument, we are able to un-
derstand why a plurality of pillars were often set up together,
for the several pillars might signify various factors and feat-
ures of human as well as mystical relationships which were placed
under the name and government of the deity. The steleae erected
to the dead by their descendants, or by a man on his own behalf
was to invoke the protection of the deity. The pillars of the

2. Deut. 12:3.
4. II Sam. 18:18.
Canaanite sanctuaries were doubtless that upon which had been invoked the name of the deity, together with curses upon any who might violate the sanctity of the place or his ritual regulations, or his right of dominion over the area.

It must be recognised that it was an easy transition from the above conception of the relation of the deity to the pillars to various other ideas according to the mental, moral, and religious status of the interpreters. It is well known that even in modern times figurative representations, or symbols, have been regarded by the ignorant as realities. Reville has well pointed out that the symbol may lose its nature and pretend to all the reality of that which, at first, it only signified. It was little by little that the ignorant people identified it with the real object of their worship. Tyler has supposed that idols developed from that which was originally intended to serve as a sign or representative of some divine personage, and that the tendency to identify the symbol and the symbolised led to it being treated as a living, powerful being. Howbeit, in the Old Testament the pillar was regarded as a sign and witness of the government and protection of the deity over some heritage greatly treasured by his devotees.

1. The History of Religions, p.124.
THE BASIS OF THE CONFLICT IN ISRAEL.

The discussions in the foregoing chapters have doubtless made sufficiently clear the tremendous importance in Hebrew history of the conventional sacred stones. In the Old Testament such stones are inseparably linked with the treasured lore and cherished history of the notable patriarch and founder of the nation, the great law-giver and deliverer, the incomparable military hero of the conquest period, and the renowned judge and prophet of the transition period at the beginning of the Kingdom. In the fore-court of the glorious temple of King Solomon stood the pillars called Jachin and Boaz, which were doubtless equivalent to Maṣṣēḇōṯ. The uncompromising prophets of reform jealously cherished the Maṣṣēḇah of Jehovah as legitimate and worthy of the most noble conceptions in Israel. Notwithstanding, such is only a part of the story, for the Maṣṣēḇōṯ were as strongly hated as they were fervently cherished. According to the tradition, the urgent demand of the conquest period was to destroy the Canaanite Maṣṣēḇōṯ, while fierce denunciation and passionate destruction of the High Place pillars were the ever recurring features of Hebrew history. Regardless of how we interpret the evidence, it cannot be denied that the pillars played a vitally important part in the religious and political history of the Hebrews.

1. Gen. 28:18; 31:45.
4. I Sam. 7:12; 11:14.
7. Exod. 23:24; 34:13; Deut. 7:5; 12:3.
which warrants the conclusion that the meaning attached to the pillars involved that which was fundamental in the life of the nation.

There was perhaps little, or no important difference in the outward appearance between the pillars of the Hebrews and the Canaanites. We know that the sacred stones were sometimes specialised in appearance, but the fact that the pillar at Bethel was an ordinary stone of the environment, while the stones at Gilgal were water worn from the Jordan-bed indicates that there was no regulation as to size or shape to distinguish the Hebrew pillars.

As we have already observed, the pillar was evidently a theocratic symbol of the government of the deity over the heritage, and, in this sense, the Hebrew and Canaanite Massēbōth served the same purpose, but this does not mean that the religious ideas of the Hebrews, in relation to the pillars, were identical with the conception of their neighbours. The Israelite pillars were the warrant of Jehovah's right to govern, and His obligation to defend the heritage, according to the faithfulness of the Israelites to their covenant vows, while the Canaanite pillars were associated with the names of the local Baalim. The Hebrew pillars were the imperatives of loyalty to the theocratic government as well as to the social and religious institutions, which were peculiarly enjoined by the laws of Jehovah, but there was certainly an inescapable difference between the Hebrew and Canaanite imperatives.

2. For example, the quadrangular stone of the Arabians and the conical stone of certain other communities.
At this point in our study, we are able to discern the reason for the absence of any mention of the pillars in the narratives relating to Abraham and Isaac. We know that many tribes claimed a place in the family of Abraham, but Jacob was the peculiar pledge of the inheritance of Israel. A pillar set up by Abraham would be open to dispute as to whether it related to the peculiar heritage of Israel, but the pillars of Jacob were indisputably Israelitish. Therefore, it was not of any consequence in the narratives to mention the pillars that may have been erected by Abraham or Isaac, but it was important to clearly indicate that the peculiar ancestral blessing of God rested upon the lot of Jacob.

The groups of twelve pillars, erected at Sinai and Gilgal show the union of the distinct heritages of the several tribes of Israel under the theocratic government of Jehovah. The assumption, that the Hebrew pillars are represented in the Old Testament as mere memorials, has been shown to be incorrect, since the theocratic value of the pillars is fully emphasised in the narratives. The Old Testament recognises the indissoluble relationship between the pillar and the altar, the latter being the instrument of ritual, and the former the warrant of the right and obligation to render the altar ritual unto Jehovah, by whose favour Israel obtained the heritage, and under whose protection and blessing they expected prosperity.

1. Trumbull, Blood Covenant, p.268, says, "Jacob, perhaps, had more tolerance than Abraham, for perverted religious symbols". Dillman, Genesis, Vol.II, p.227, suggests that perhaps the need for such signs of the divine presence belonged to a later stage of religious development.

and safety. Thus, the pillar was not only the sign of the
theocratic government of Jehovah over the heritage, but also
the witness of the vow to serve Him at the altar.

In view of the almost universal consent of critical
scholars, that the Hebrew Massēbah was placed under an absolute
ban through the triumph of the high spiritual influence of the
eighth century prophets, one should be cautious in the advance-
ment of a contrary conclusion, yet the writer feels constrained,
in the light of the evidence, to suggest that the Massēbah, per
se, was never forbidden in the history of the Hebrews. It is
ture that the Massēboth, which stood contrary to the govern-
ment and religion of Jehovah, were denounced and intermittently
destroyed, but the altars were also intolerable to the prophets
under certain circumstances, though we need not suppose that al-
tars, as such, were forbidden. Micah represents the destruc-
tion of the Massēboth of Israel by the hand of Jehovah, but the
cities are also to be destroyed under the same judgment, while
the popular conception of sacrifice is sternly repudiated by
the same prophet.

Referring to the Israelite captivity, Hosea speaks

of the temporary separation of Israel from all the legitimate

1. See Hosea 8:11.
2. Some have thought that Amos 5:21-23 indicates a repudiation of
the cultus, in toto, but Kittel (Religion of People of Is-
rael, p.137) points out that the prophet would have welcomed
the ceremonials as necessary expressions of piety, when ac-
 companied by a sincere heart and upright conduct, and, doubt-
less, the prophet’s hatred of sacrifice and prayer should be
assigned to the fact that the ceremonial side of the cultus
had sunk to the level of Nature-religion.
4. The destruction is clearly comprehensive of both lawful and un-
lawful things. Cf. WRS, C.T. in Jewish Church, p.354f.
5. Micah, 6:7,8. JMPS, Micah, p.126, states that the utterance does
not imply that the prophet thought of Jehovah as displeased
with sacrifice, per se.
6. Cf. Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.64.
privileges of national independence in government and worship under Jehovah. Some interpreters have thought, since the Massebah is included, that this passage amounts to a repudiation of the Massebah by the prophet, but the Massebah is regarded, along with the other factors mentioned, as legitimate and natural, against which Hosea enters no protest even as he enters none against marriage. It is evident that the deprivation was a thing to be sadly deplored in the estimate of the prophet, but he regarded the prospective experience as that which was designed to give Israel a new spirit, after which these necessary features of her normal life would be restored.

In view of Isaiah's declamation against idolatry, some scholars have been suspicious of the apparent approval of the Massebah by the said prophet and have sought to dispose of the problem by supposing that the particular Massebah had no religious significance, but we cannot escape the fact that the writer was looking forward to a conversion of Egypt to the religion of Jehovah, at which time, it should be the heritage of Jehovah indeed, with the people participating in the altar.

1. Cf. WRS, Prophets of Israel, p.98.
2. Robertson (Early Relig. of Israel, p.239) ingeniously classifies these deprivations of Israel into two groups, naming king, sacrifice, and ephod as legitimate; and prince, pillar, and teraphim as illegitimate, but Macalister (ERK, Vol.XI, p.880) says it is to violate the meaning of Hosea to suppose that he repudiates the pillar in this passage. Cf. WRS, O.T. in Jewish Church, p.226.
service under the legitimacy of the theocratic Massebah. In this ideal picture of the extension of the religion and government of Jehovah over a foreign country, it appears that the Massebah, as well as the altar, was essential to the program, and any supposition that places this Massebah outside the category of things necessary to the establishment of the jurisdiction of Jehovah in Egypt must ignore the implications of the text. By the combined testimony of Isaiah and Hosea, the conclusion is fully confirmed that in the period of the culmination of Israel's history the Massebah was cherished along with the altar, and it is clear that neither of these writers intended to convey the idea of Masseboth as mere memorials.

The argument has been advanced that such passages, as may represent the Massebah to be a cherished feature of the national religion, are pre-Deuteronomistic and do not affect the application of the higher conception which triumphed in the reform under Josiah. Certain scholars have assumed that the reference in Isaiah preserves a spiritual conception, unacceptable to the Deuteronomic writers, but how shall we reconcile such with the admission that later influences affected the chapter in which it occurs? Among the prophets who set themselves to purify the worship of Jehovah and to free the land

1. Isaiah does not allude to the altar and temple of the Jewish colony at Elephantine, for such was not in the "midst of the land", but on the southern frontier, as pointed out by Gray, Isaiah, Vol. I, p. 339. See Ezek. 30:6.
2. The fact that the altar and the Massebah were separated by the distance of the radius of Egypt does not impair the significance of the Massebah (see Gray, op. cit., p. 338), for the entire land was to be devoted to Jehovah. (Cf. Robertson, op. cit., p. 237.)
4. See Whitehouse, ibid.
from the idolatry of the High Places, it is doubtless true that Isaiah was the greatest, but, if Isaiah aimed at the abolition of the Massébâh in relation to the religion of Jehovah, then it is indeed strange that the later writers were content with the passage in which the cherished Massébâh was attributed to him. If we assume that the supposed movement for the abolition of the Massébâh was born after the time of Isaiah, where shall we place Isaiah in the scale of religious thought? Furthermore, if the reform of Josiah was contrary to the spirit of Isaiah, then to whom shall we give the credit for the preparation for the reform? If, as Dussaud says, at the time of the drafting and redaction of the text, the writers were forced to obscure the memory of the Massébôth and to turn the faithful away from them, they why do we find the great prophets, who unquestionably despised idolatry, still cherishing the Massébâh of Israel?

The general assumption is that the Levitical and Deuteronomic codes formally prohibit the Massébâh, but the only passages upon which such a conclusion might be based are clearly regulations as to the erection and use of the Massébâh rather than the outlawry of Massébôth, as such. The reference

2. Gunkel, Legends of Genesis, p.140, says we must assume the existence of the higher sentiment even prior to the appearance of the prophets.
3. Les Origines, p.222.
4. Kuenen, Relig. of Israel, Vol.I, p.394, insists that the "Umdeutung" of the sacred stones began very early, and says that it is not only unproved, but very improbable that stone worship prevailed in the time of Samuel; in support of which, he cites the fact that Jehovah is called "Rock" in the Old Testament.
6. Lev. 26:1; Deut. 16:22. Other passages are frequently cited, but are clearly inapplicable.
to the prohibited pillar in Leviticus is manifestly modified and conditioned by the phrase "to bow down unto it". The prohibition against the worship of a Massebah is equally as positive as the injunction against all other forms of idolatry mentioned in the passage, and proves that the Massebah was sometimes turned into an idol, but other passages in the Old Testament show that it was not necessarily an idol, which serves to confirm the probability that the sacerdotal code only intended by this law to regulate the use to which the standing stone should be adapted. The particular law in Deuteronomy is also regulative rather than completely prohibitive of the Massebah, unless we entirely ignore the modifying second clause of the verse. For example, the following verse says: "Thou shalt not sacrifice unto Jehovah thy God any bullock, or sheep", which would be strange indeed, if we ignored the modifying clause which clearly indicates regulation rather than prohibition. The sheep with a blemish is forbidden as "an abomination to Jehovah"; likewise, the Massebah "which Jehovah hateth" is proscribed, but it does not follow that the Massebah as such was forbidden. The writer of the passage assumes that the modifying clause would be understood, and doubtless the

1. Moreover, the Phoenician grave Masseboth were not idols, and real doubt must be entertained as to whether the pillars at Gezer were such.
2. Driver, Introd. to Literature of O.T., p.83, says it was prohibitive, and that if Isaiah had known this passage, he would not have adopted the Massebah as the symbol of conversion to the true faith. It is a strange thing if the most cherished symbol of the great prophet became a thing so utterly despised and that through the influence of his own prophesying.
4. "Wherein is blemish, or any evil-favouredness: for that is an abomination unto the Lord thy God".
5. Gray, Isaiah, Vol.1, p.338, says that we cannot safely argue that the Deuteronomic school would have condemned such Masseboth as are mentioned in Genesis 31:45; 35:20; II Sam. 18:18.
distinction between the "abhorred pillar" and the "cherished pillar" was well known in Israel. From the Levitical code, we learn that the Maasebah which was adapted to idolatrous practice was hated of Jehovah, and we may be confident that there were various hateful abominations frequently associated with the Maaseboth. Any symbol set up to signify religious or political authority, independent of the theocratic government of Jehovah, was equivalent to rebellion, and there can be no question that whatever represented the dominion of the Baalim over the land was hated of Jehovah. Furthermore, there is evidence that the Maaseboth were sometimes adapted to phallicism in the realm of Canaan, and it is possible that pillars of certain shapes were abhorred. It may be that the "hated pillar" of Deuteronomy simply indicates that which was associated with the name of Baal, since the preceding verse forbids the setting up of an Asherah near the altar of Jehovah. On the other hand, the injunction could be interpreted to apply to pillars erected at any altar except the "high altar" of a Royal Sanctuary, for, if the pillar was a theocratic symbol, then the setting up of such at a local altar would be interpreted as an act of rebellion against Jehovah. Howbeit, numerous passages may be cited where the narrators unquestionably assign the reason for the intolerance, of the particular pillars mentioned, to the fact that they were related to the enemies of Jehovah. We also

4. See I Kings 18:40; Deut. 12:3.
5. I Kings 15:13 relates a horror of unmentionable shame set up by Maachah, the grandmother of Asa. See O-R, Kypros, p.146.
9. Cf. Exod. 23:24; 34:12,13; Deut. 7:5; 12:3; II Kings 3:26,27. See Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of Christian Era, p.223, who says that the opposition to pillars was, at first, because they belonged to foreign religions.
find frequent references to pillars which were set up by the
idolatrous Israelites, and which were, in turn, destroyed by
the leaders of reform, but in all such cases the condemned
Maaseboth were alien to the true heritage of Israel, being
associated with depravity, idolatry, and rebellion.

Some significance must be attached to the fact that
King Josiah is represented as standing by the pillar, when he
engaged in the solemn covenant prior to his destruction of the
pillars of the High Places. Therefore, it appears that the law­
ful pillars of the theocratic government of Jehovah were excepted
when Josiah, standing by the pillar, covenanted with the people
for the destruction of pillars. We certainly cannot escape
the implications that the 'Ammud, by which Josiah stood according
to lawful custom, was a true theocratic symbol, the authority
of which in religious and political affairs was flaunted by the
rival authorities represented in the pillars of the High Places.

As an argument in favour of the theory of utter aban­
donment and condemnation of the Maasebah by the late writers,
it has been suggested that in certain instances the term "Maas­
sebah" was deliberately changed to "Mizbeah", or "Mizpah". It
is true that the verb in some cases would permit the substi­
tution of Maasebah in the place of the Mizbeah of the Massoretic
Text, but even if we suppose that changes were made, it does

1. I Kings 14:23; II Kings 17:10; 18:14; 23:14; II Chron. 14:3;
31:11.
2. Albright, BASOR, No. XIV, p. 6, speaks of the licentious cult
of Baal-peor, and the darker practices of Sodom as appli­
cable to High Place festivals, even at Bab ed-Dra'a.
There is no conjecture with respect to the similar in­
fluences affecting Israel.
4. "\(\text{Ammud} \)"
5. In II Kings 11:14, with reference to the coronation of Joash,
he is represented as standing by the pillar "according to
lawful custom", \(\text{standing by the pillar} \) indicating that the
pillar was a theocratic symbol.
not follow that the change was due to any aversion toward the former term. If the term had been so odious as to lead later writers to scruple to change it, we may wonder why the change was not made in the other passages associated with Jacob.

The assumption that the destruction of the High Place Messēboth was due to a transition in thought from fetishism to monotheism has been the cause of much confusion as to the significance of the Messēboth among the Hebrews. The interpretation of the reform under Josiah as the culmination of a gradual process in religious thought in which the Messēboth were recognised as incongruous relics of crude ancestral conceptions of which the new prophets of monotheism were ashamed cannot be maintained, for, if the eighth century marked the advent of monotheism in Israel, we cannot escape the fact that Hosea and Isaiah had something to do with the advance, and yet, they failed to see that the Massēbah was inconsistent with the new doctrine they preached. One may be inclined to doubt that the high moral and religious ideas of the Hebrews were first realised in the eighth century. It is perhaps of some importance to note the statement of Albright that the particular period, prior to the eighth century, was unfruitful of monotheistic tendencies in the ancient world, whereas, in the middle period of the second millennium B.C., such tendencies were prominent.

1. Offord, PEFQS, 1919, p.126, in arguing that the term "Massēbah" became obnoxious to the prophets, disposes of the problem of the pillar on the Egyptian border by supposing that the prophet had no objection to the term in connection with a Jehovah shrine outside of Palestine.

2. Dillman, Genesis, Vol.II, p.266, refutes Wellhausen's suggestion, that a late writer was induced by the bad odour of the term "Messēbah" to change it to Mizpah in Gen. 31:149, on the basis of the fact that "Massēbah" is left untouched in other verses of the narrative.

3. Archaeology and the Bible, p.163ff.
among various peoples of the East. Furthermore, the prophetic movement did not profess to be a creative movement in the primary sense, but a religious and social reformation in which there was a marked tendency to "return" to the simple life of the forefathers. The abundant evidence of the introduction of high moral and religious ideas into Canaan, in the period of the Conquest, according to Kyle, raises a very strong presumption in favour of the moral and religious ideas attributed by the Old Testament to the patriarchs.

If we assume that the Hebrew Mašeubah was a fetish in the time of Jacob, which was revalued by such prophets as Isaiah and Hosea, being transformed into a sacred symbol of the higher faith, then on what ground is it necessary to suppose that even the re-baptised terminology was obnoxious? Skinner's line of reasoning is interesting in connection with the Mašeubah and the cairn, of Gen. 31:44ff., in which he says, "Since I always avoids the word Mašeubah, we assume first of all that the Mašeubah belongs to E and the cairn to J", but we may ask why J associated Jacob with a cairn in the covenant with Laban? Did the term "gal", indeed, represent a higher stage of thought than Mašeubah from the viewpoint of J?

Baudissin says that the memorial stones, at least in later times, were called Mašeboth, but that the term "gal" used in

3. Kyle, ibid., quotes Max Muller to the effect that the civilisation of patriarchal Palestine was fully equal to that of Egypt, implying the possibility of lofty moral and religious conceptions of the patriarchs.
4. Skinner, Genesis, p.378, says the Mašeubah was originally a fetish, though finally a memorial, and in the latter harmless sense, the term is freely used by E but never by J, who only mentions it in connection with Canaanitish worship.
6. ZDMG, LVIII, p.410ff.
the narrative, is probably connected with the Old Testament expression for idols, and, on this basis, the inference would be that the Massebah represented a higher conception than the gal. To what then shall we assign the aversion of J to the term "Massebah"?

1. Certain writers have called attention to the fact that a distinction is made in the Old Testament as to the character of the kings, according to their attitude towards the Massēbōth and the High Places, but how could we expect it to be otherwise, since the question of the demoralising influences of the independent pillar-shrines was a flaming political issue of the times, resulting in civil and religious strife as well as wholesale bloodshed? The Old Testament representations as to the destruction of the Massēbōth prior to the time of King Josiah have been denied, but Kittel gives credibility to the controverted statement that Hezekiah attacked the High Places with their Massēbōth and Asherim, on the basis, that, apart from the Hezekiah reform, we cannot fully understand the counter-movement under Manasseh. The record indicates that, following the death of Hezekiah, a violent reaction set in and Manasseh sided with the popular party, which led to the restoration of the High Places with the Asherim and Massēbōth. We cannot escape the implication that the reign of Manasseh was not only a black scourge against the spiritual religion of Jehovah, but also a dark night of dissipation of the theocratic ideal of

3. See Kautzsch, ibid.
government. When King Josiah came to the throne, the forces of degeneracy and dissolution had brought the nation to the precipice, where only a courageous reform under a daring leader could hope to avert national disaster and decay. It is impossible to suppose, as has been suggested, that the Deuteronomistic reform was due to the fact that the religious thought of the populace had long outgrown that against which it was directed; for, when Josiah launched his campaign of reform against the unholy authority of the High Places with their scarlet shame of religious prostitution and black horror of child-sacrifice, it does not appear that crude conceptions had been outgrown, but that the situation in connection with the High Places had grown worse instead of better toward the end of the pre-exilic period. Macalister reminds us that such reforms were never more than temporary, and it is certain that the reform of Josiah resulted in ultimate failure, for the pages of Jeremiah bear eloquent testimony to the retrograde, while Ezekiel gives us glimpses of the idolatrous depravity which competed successfully against the religion of Jehovah during the reign of the weak and unworthy son of Josiah, who, under the stress of Egyptian domination, followed in the steps of his great-grandfather, Manasseh. The cult of the Southern Kingdom has been termed, "severely puritanic," but if we are to assign any importance to the stern prophetic

1. Cf. Welch, Religion of Israel, p.16; see Gunkel, Legends of Genesis, p.106.
denunciations of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, then we must suppose that the Puritanic sway had greatly deteriorated by the time such prophets came on the scene. The assumption of Kay, that a transition had taken place in Israel between the time of the writing of Hosea and that of Isaiah 66:1, on the basis that the latter reference indicates that Hebrew thought had outgrown superstitious regard for stone, is very weak. The conception of a God in Heaven was perhaps not a new thing in Semitic religion a thousand years prior to the time of Isaiah, and the value of the passage is nil, in so far as it may be thought to mark the boundary of stone worship in Israel. Moreover, we know that, during the first centuries of the Christian era, the sway of belief in evil spirits was over men like a dreadful scourge, which fact ought to be considered in connection with the assumption that designates Josiah as the boundary between fetish worship and high spiritual conceptions. If we grant that there was stone worship in Israel, we surely must suppose that there were reforms prior to the eighth century, for most achievements have been gained through advance following counter-movements.

That there was a violent attack directed against the pillar shrines during the reign of Hezekiah, which was overcome

2. Isa. 66:1.
4. The Old Testament evidence indicates such.
5. Cook, Ethical Monotheism, p.8, says, "A judicious treatment of the history of religion must take into account the facts that point to some progressive development, as also those that suggest a 'return', since it not infrequently happens that, instead of a return, old elements re-appear in new form."
by a counter-movement under the sanction of Manasseh which in turn was followed by the reform of Josiah, cannot be questioned from the historical point of view. The reason for this continuing conflict was perhaps more complicated than the records show. Let us, for the moment, forget the religious significance of the High Places and consider the political question. Apparently, the chief issue, from the political point of view, was based on two conceptions of government, one of which insisted upon centralisation of authority, while the other party was content to please the local communities by a policy of non-interference in their particular affairs. It has been well said that, "the only unifying force which Israel possessed lay in her worship of Jehovah, and if she lost her grip on that she fell an easy prey to the oppressors." One may easily realise that, "Baalism with its village patriotism offered no cohesive influence", but rather tended to dissipate the unity of the nation. The Mashebah, being the symbol of the assumed sovereign right of the High Place to determine its own policies apart from the interference of the centralised government, served to defeat the cause of national solidarity, even though the place was a nominal Jehovah shrine. This tendency of the High Places, with their independent religious authority, made it essential from the beginning of the national aspirations of Israel to restrict them. Such effort appears never to have been entirely successful but remained a continual political

1. Of course, the political and religious problems must not be separated from the standpoint of the theocratic conception for the two were intertwined.
3. Ibid.
issue, and there is no reason to doubt the Biblical conception
that the history of Israel from its beginning was checkered
with intermittent suppressions of the independent, High Places,
followed by a gradual relaxation of governmental discipline
under weak rulers with the consequent return of the old prob­
lem and its peril to the life of the nation. With reference
to the period of the Judges, it is eminently true, as certain
1 scholars have said, that, "It was not an accident that apostacy
meant oppression and fidelity brought deliverance, it arose out
of the very fact of the situation". The intermittent correc­
tion of the High Place peril, under the leadership of the
forces of centralisation, was clearly recognised by the writ­
ers of the history of Israel as the secret of national progress,
and it is no wonder that they measured the various kings accord­
ing to their attitude towards the pillar shrines.

There are those who assign the aversion of Josiah
toward the Massëbôth of the High Places entirely to religious
considerations, and no one need deny the religious significance
of the reform, but we must not forget that the reform was funda­
mental to Josiah’s policy of centralisation of governmental
affairs. The conflict over the principle of centralisation
appears to have been not unknown prior to the period of Josiah,
and indeed it would be a strange thing if there had been no
such conflict in the making of the nation. The statement has

1. O. & R. ibid.
2. It was not the High Place, as such, that invoked the prophetic
   scorn but the independent nature of the High Place, serving
   the cause of disintegration both in religion and government.
4. The authority and jurisdiction of the High Places rested upon
   inalienable custom, or upon the sanction of some great
   historical or mythical hero.
been made that sanctuaries like Shiloh had a special pre-eminence and served as a symbol both of royal power and still more of the oneness of Israel in the worship of her God. It appears probable that the favourable reception of the reading of the newly discovered Book of the Law in the time of Josiah was due to the fact that it conformed to the traditional principles of the Hebrew nation which were familiar in the folklore of the people and had been successfully evoked in other crisis periods.

The question as to the attitude of the Hebrew leaders toward the Canaanite pillar shrines at the time of the Conquest is disputed, but the pre-invasion command, enjoining the Hebrews to destroy the Canaanite pillars, should not be waved aside as spurious without considering the psychological probability of such a policy from the military and political viewpoint. If we grant the historicity of the invasion under the strong military leadership of Joshua, we are faced with the strong presumption that the symbols of the dispossessed government would be furiously destroyed, even if such tradition were lacking in the Old Testament. The evidence that the Hebrews invaded the land under the conviction of a divine commission increases the credibility of the traditions concerning a pre-invasion attitude. Moreover, the purpose of the invasion was not to subject.

1. Regardless of our interpretation of the altar of the Trans-Jordan tribes, (Josh. 22:19), it can scarcely be denied that the narrative is intended to set forth an attitude of rebellion against the theocratic government.

2. Exodus 34:13, etc.

3. This may appear in conflict with the theory of late centralisation of the cult in Israel, but it is probably true that there has been a tendency to exaggerate the unilateral course of evolution toward cult centralisation, as suggested by Albright, (Archaeology and the Bible, p.160), as well as to minimise the importance of the contrary evidence such as Shiloh and its sanctuary.
the inhabitants of Canaan to Hebrew domination but to destroy 1 the inhabitants and to supplant them, bringing new religious conceptions, social customs, and political program. It may be argued that it was not characteristic of that period to adopt an iconoclastic attitude toward religious shrines, but we know from the Moabite Stone that King Mesha of Moab found sweet delight in humbling enemy shrines. Howbeit, according to their own traditions, the Hebrews were great iconoclasts and the ever recurring story is that which tells of the destruction of altars, pillars, etc., and it is perhaps true that this tendency accounts for the scarcity of religious monuments in Palestine. Israelite religion, from the beginning, abhorred images and the contrast with other nations is so forceful as to stimulate the probability of their early iconoclastic tendencies. It seems necessary to give credence to the claim of the Old Testament writers that when fresh orders were given for the destruction of the High Places, the authority and precedent for such action lay in the ancient law of the Conquest period.

In addition to the political problem of the pillar shrines, we must also recognise the religious problem, and, in so far as the reform was based on a higher spiritual conception, we may best understand it by observing that against which it reacted. The recent excavations have contributed

1. The nature of the invasion was different from that of a great foreign power, for the Hebrews were looking for a home rather than for tribute.
much to our knowledge of the character of religion which was exalted in the High Places. Macalister remarks that the nature of the worship at Gezer was parallel to the celebration so fiercely denounced by Isaiah and other writers. The results of the excavation of Gezer, according to G.A. Smith, illustrate the religious customs and moral abominations which Israel encountered from the time of their entry into Palestine up to the very end of the History of Israel. In commenting on the Gezer sanctuary, Peters was impressed by the pitiful and tragic evidences of the truthfulness of the prophets of Israel in their description of the religion of Canaan, as indicated not only by the remains of child-sacrifice, but also the emblems of that obscene sex cult which "permeated also the religion of Israel and threatened to bring on Israel the wrath of God and the destruction of the state." The grossness and seductiveness of the whole fabric of the worship of Ashtoreth along with the practical deification of the sexual passion, according to certain scholars, provide our point of view in regarding the Biblical attitude toward the cult. In the light of such facts, no one need doubt that the popular religion of Israel was deeply affected by contact with Canaanitish idolatry and abominations. Moreover, we find in the Old Testament that there was often in Israel officially recognised Baal worship as well as heathen innovations conducted on a large scale, while, along

2. Isa. 57:3ff.
3. From Macalister, Bible Sidelights, p.53.
5. JFM, & JEPS, Semitic Religion, NSBD, p.822.
with the lapses of the masses into heathen worship, the Bibli­
cal record marks many of Israel's kings as renowned idolaters. 1
One must agree with Robinson that "in the process of time the
Hebrews joined with the Canaanites in their worship of Baal", and that, especially after the revolt of the ten tribes under
Jeroboam, the religion of the Northern Kingdom became mixed and
the minds of the people were confused resulting in religious
syncretism. The conclusion can scarcely be doubted which esti­
mates the prophetic hatred of the pillar shrines, from the re­
ligious point of view, on the basis of the corrupting influences
fostered by the High Places, derogatory to the religion of Je­
hovah. As far as we are able to sketch the religious history
of the Hebrews, the lower and the higher levels of religion
were ever present and continually in conflict. The writer is
of the opinion that it is a great error in the study of Hebrew
religion to account for all movements on the basis of an assumed
necessary and measured progress. It is to contradict the prin­
ciples of stratification, which are always manifest in human
society, to suppose that the crude undercurrent which was so
triumphant during certain periods of the history of Israel in­
validates the testimony concerning the prior exalted spiritual
conceptions. The progress of religion always moves in two

directions. The Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans

1. Sarcophagus, p.163.
2. I Kings 12 and 13.
3. Cook, Ethical Monotheism, p.7, says that the lower as well as
the higher levels of religion, which the Old Testament has
set forth in black and white, find parallel in the history
of Christendom. Kautzsch, HDB, Extra-vol.,p.613, remarks
that we have "no right to saddle the religion of Israel with
these derelictions than we have to hold Christianity res­
ponsible for all the heathen superstitions which still
continue to prevail even in Christian nations".
sketched the progress in one direction in which man moved from the higher to the lower in religion, and, from all we know of religious history, we have no reason to dispute nor grounds to refute Paul's philosophy of reversed progress. Any judicious examinations of Hebrew history must surely reveal the fact that the religious development of Israel continually moved in two directions, resulting in continual conflict. The crudest conceptions as to the meaning of the pillars as well as the most shameful conceptions, doubtless played a part in the conflict. The pillar shrines which were dedicated to Jehovah, such as Bethel and Gilgal, in the later period were equivalent to heathen shrines, and the heathen practice was also introduced into the city of Jerusalem and into the temple itself. Under such circumstances, any reform, even in Jerusalem, necessitated a warfare against the local shrines. We must recognise the fact that the peril of contamination was very real to the spiritual leaders of Israel and was faced first by Moses and Joshua, as well as by the prophets in the last days of the Kingdom.

Thus it appears that the conflict was the result of the effort to establish the peculiar heritage of the Hebrews.

2. Murray, Five Stages in Greek Relig., p.91, says that certain transitions in Greek religion resulted in moral degradation.
4. Kennedy, HDB, Vol.IV, p.396, summarises the peril of the local sanctuaries under two heads: firstly, the ever increasing admixture of heathen Canaanite elements with the purer and more spiritual elements of the true Hebrew cultus; and secondly, the multiplicity of local Baalim exerting a baneful influence on the Mosaic doctrine of the unity of Jehovah.
5. By the "heritage", we mean the aggregate of Israel's economic possessions, social customs, religious laws and rituals, as well as their political economy.
in Palestine, as over against the rival claims of the Baalim with long standing traditions of local self-determination. The anvil of protest never ceased to ring in Israel against that which contradicted the doctrine of the tribal solidarity in the possession of a peculiar heritage divinely given, and under the protection and jurisdiction of Jehovah. On that anvil of protest was beaten out the resistent character of the Jews which has been their chief characteristic in later ages. The difficulties in the way of perpetuating a separate people were very real, especially since the Hebrews shared a common language and a common external civilisation with their neighbours, using somewhat the same technical expressions in their rituals, and somewhat similar sacred furniture in their sanctuaries. Howbeit, the pronounced tendency of Israel to backslide must be set over against the more pronounced blows of the prophets on the anvil which demanded uncompromising devotion to Israel's peculiar heritage and unrelenting hatred of all internal and external enemies of that which they considered to have been divinely given to Israel. Though it be burnt, as a terebinth, and as an oak, whose stock remaineth when they cast their foliage, yet that which was represented in the Massebah of Israel still endures, being preserved in "the holy seed".

1. Isa. 57:11.
2. Isa. 6:13.
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