

# THE ROLE OF BETHEL IN THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVES FROM JACOB TO JEROBOAM I

W. J. DUMBRELL  
Moore College, Sydney

The ancient city of Bethel<sup>1</sup> was located in the central hill country of Palestine, on the main north-south ridge road. In Joshua's distribution the city was allotted to Benjamin (Josh. 18:22), but it seems to have been lost to the Canaanites in the Judges period and to have been reconquered by the Ephraim tribes who thereafter kept it. As is well known it had venerated patriarchal associations. Abram had built an altar there, having Bethel on the west and Ai on the east.<sup>2</sup> Judging from the tombs which have been found in the immediate vicinity, the site was holy ground, even in patriarchal times.<sup>3</sup> The city had been founded c. 2000 B.C., had been destroyed by a tremendous conflagration in the 13th century B.C. with no fewer than four destructions occurring during the twelfth century B.C.<sup>4</sup>

The biblical importance of Bethel is attested by its appearance in material traditionally assigned to all three sources (J.E.P.) and by its association with two patriarchs, Abram (Gen. 12:8), and Jacob (Gen. 28 and 35). It is, however, in the Jacob cycle that the city really becomes prominent. It is at Bethel (Gen. 28:10ff.), as Jacob journeys from Beer-Sheba to Haran, that God speaks to him in a dream in which Jacob sees a 'ladder' set up on earth with its top reaching to heaven and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it. God identifies himself with the 'God of the Fathers' and renews the promises previously given to the Patriarchs. Jacob awakes, realizes that this has been a theophany, and that the place at which he has slept has been the 'house of God', and the 'gate of heaven'. Taking the stone which he has used for a pillow, he sets it up, anoints it,<sup>5</sup> and calls the name of the place Bethel. If God will bring him home in safety, then He will be his God, and the stone which Jacob has set up will be God's house, and Jacob will give a tenth of his substance to the God who has appeared to him.

While Jacob is with Laban the God of Bethel again appears to him (Gen. 31:13), directing him to return to the land of his nativity and in Gen. 35 then to move from Shechem to Bethel and there to establish an altar to the God who had appeared to him on his journey north. Jacob now charges his household to

put away their 'strange gods', to purify themselves, and to change their garments. They do this, surrendering not only their 'strange gods' but also their ear rings, all of which Jacob buries under the oak which was near Shechem. They reach Bethel, Jacob builds the altar, and calls the place El Bethel. God again appears to Jacob, names him as Israel, reveals himself also as El Shaddai, renews the patriarchal promises and Jacob again sets up a pillar of stone and anoints it, calling the name of the place Bethel (cf. Gen. 35:1-15).

Earlier this century it had been the problem of the place name which had evoked scholarly discussion. Thus Eissfeldt<sup>6</sup> had taken up the question as to whether Bethel was a place name or a divine name and had suggested that the God of Bethel was originally a Canaanite deity who had only subsequently been assimilated to Yahwistic conceptions by the incoming Israelites. Here the key texts were Gen. 31:13 and Gen. 35:7 where those who were disposed to advocate a divine name as being on view saw the content as referring to 'the god Bethel' and 'god Bethel' respectively, while those who argued for a place name took Gen. 35:7 as 'God of Bethel' and usually explained Gen. 31:13 as resulting from an elision, where the present text *hā'ēl bêt-ēl* represented *hā'ēl 'ēl bêt-'ēl* (or else read at Gen. 31:13 with the *LXX* etc. *'ānōkī hā'ēl hannir'eh 'ēlēkā bebêt-'ēl*.) Eissfeldt himself judged that the Genesis contexts supported Bethel as a place name though evidence of a deity Bethel as worshipped was, he felt, provided by later prophetic material. Certainly Jacob's conditional vow at Gen. 28:10ff. makes sense only if that was an initial El appearance to him, and in that context Bethel is obviously a place name. Gen. 35:7 appears to indicate that only on his second visit did Jacob name the place Bethel (omitting with the versions the initial *'ēl* of the Hebrew text *'ēl bêt-ēl* in that verse), though he had worshipped the deity there previously and we may thus take such references as Gen. 31:13 as anticipatory of the final resolution. Additionally, Eissfeldt pointed out that neither the J nor the P source made use of the 'El Bethel formula and this reduced the probability of its use by E as a divine name.

However, argued Eissfeldt, both Amos and Hosea provided clear evidence for a cult of a deity Bethel. The deity worshipped at the sanctuary concerned was other than Yahweh (on the basis of Amos. 3:14) and Eissfeldt pointed also to the use of the verb *dārash* at Amos 5:4 of resort to Bethel, a verb which was usually associated with seeking Yahweh. Though mainly drawing upon

Amos and Hosea Eissfeldt drew attention to Jer. 48:13 and the later Elephantine material<sup>7</sup> and concluded that Bethel was a pre-Israelite deity who had later become assimilated to Yahweh as the city had become Israelite. The memory of the original cult, however, had never been forgotten and it had been revived under Jeroboam I, so much so that by the second half of the eighth century B.C. the god Bethel was regarded by Yahwistic prophets as a distinctive Canaanite deity.

It cannot be said, however, that the evidence of Amos and Hosea is unequivocal. At Amos 5:4ff. the verb *dārash* is certainly used metaphorically and Bethel is certainly a place name there as the linked names of Gilgal and Beer-Sheba indicate, as does the use of the verbs '*ābar* and *bô*' (this line of argument would also dispose of Amos 4:4 and Hosea 4:15). The phrase 'altars of Bethel' at Amos 3:14 hardly implies a deity since correspondingly at Hosea 10:8 'their altars' can be used where the contextual reference is to high places. At Hosea 10:15 if Bethel is retained (LXX reads 'house of Israel') the noun is to be treated as accusative and not nominative and thus the translation is 'so shall it be done unto you at Bethel'. In the difficult Jacob section of Hosea (12:4-7, 12:12-14) the God of Israel to whom Jacob made supplication at Bethel was '*Elohim* who is identified in the same context as the God of the Exodus to whom the Israelites are exhorted to return. The point which is being made in the context is not that the God of Bethel was other than Yahweh but that at the moment Baal and others are being worshipped there. It is generally agreed, finally, that the Bethel names in the Elephantine material are theophoric but this is surely the development of a later hypostatization since as W. F. Albright points out the theophoric element Bethel does not appear in personal names until after 600 B.C.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps with Assyrian encouragement this later hypostatization had begun at the old northern shrine and had been aimed at counteracting the then growing interest in Jerusalem.

It is of course possible that the Genesis material presents us with narratives whose purpose in part is to legitimate an older Canaanite shrine taken over by incoming Israelites.<sup>9</sup> The imagery of Gen. 28 is susceptible to such a reconstruction redolent as it is with Ancient Near Eastern conceptions of divine/humane encounter.<sup>10</sup> Jacob's unconscious incubation seems to interdict a temple there, though if El manifestations had taken place at existing Canaanite shrines then more developed underlying conceptions might be suggested. But all that is speculative and we must operate on the evidence which lies before us which is that

at Bethel Jacob entered upon a new experience with which the covenant name Israel was to be associated (Gen. 35:10).

Gen. 35 presents us with the account of the movement from Shechem to Bethel, occasioned, we are to understand, by the incident of Gen. 34. To some, this account as it now stands has seemed strangely ritualistic and programmatic and A. Alt<sup>11</sup> has therefore suggested that Gen. 28 and Gen. 35 are two related accounts dealing with the same aetiology, with Gen. 35 complementing Gen. 28. The difficulty inherent in the present account, Alt advances, is that Gen. 35 begins with a Shechem setting which has just been the subject of special divine attention (Jacob had built an altar there, calling it *El Eloehe Yisra'el*, Gen. 33:20) yet preparations in Gen. 35 are being made for a movement to Bethel. We might have expected the aetiology of Shechem to have been extended by narration, but what we appear to have, continued Alt, is a shift of religious influence from Shechem to Bethel reflected in this narrative whose primary concern is to give an imprimatur for a religious pilgrimage in what must have been the period of the early divided kingdom, commencing at Shechem (and arising out of the demise of that site as a sanctuary, under Jeroboam I) and continuing on to Bethel, and if Amos and Hosea are to be followed thence to Gilgal and Beer-Sheba. It is thus, Alt continued, that our attention is drawn in Gen. 35 to the divesting at Shechem of 'strange gods', a practice elsewhere associated with Shechem at Joshua 24:23, while the aetiological note of pilgrimage if it does not stem directly from the Hebrew text is clear from the LXX addition to v. 4 *kai apōlesen auta heōs tēs sēmeron hēmeras*.<sup>12</sup> To the ritual notes we may add further the purificatory elements of Gen. 35:2.

Alt's argument, coupled with the force of the LXX addition to v. 4 is an interesting one but there are difficulties. Firstly, the immediate context of Gen. 35 is ignored whereby Gen. 34 provides the rationale for the move to Bethel. Secondly, if as is generally done, Gen. 35 is assigned to the E source, it seems difficult indeed to suppose that whatever is represented by this common source ascription and which is generally admitted to be of northern prophetic provenance, would endeavour in this way to legitimate a practice which Alt argues is post-Jeroboam I, since the northern prophets, after some initial support, roundly condemned Jeroboam's religious policy. Moreover, to apply Alt's own criterion of gradual historicization Gen. 35 at the time of writing would seem to reflect an old pilgrimage, if that view is to be adopted, and a shift of emphasis from Shechem to Bethel arising out of the Abimelech incident of Judges 9 might have been more conceivable, all the more so since the capture of

Bethel is recorded in Judges I and the LXX substitution of Bethel for Bochim at Judges 2:5 reflects the importance of Bethel as a Judges period sanctuary. Additionally it is Bethel in the Genesis narratives which is the sustained focus of interest and while there is a narrative connection between Shechem and Bethel afforded by Gen. 34, apart from Gen. 35 there is no other biblical context which links Bethel and Shechem.<sup>13</sup>

The episode of the Benjaminites wars in Judges 20-21 gives us some indication of the importance of Bethel at that time and H. J. Kraus has plausibly argued that the narrative of Judges 20:17-28 provides evidence for the fact that at that time Bethel was the central tribal sanctuary.<sup>14</sup> The Israelites 'go up' to Bethel and 'inquire' of Yahweh, they weep and they fast and they sit 'before Yahweh' there after the second defeat at Gibeah while we are expressly told that the ark was at Bethel 'in those days' and that no less a personage than Phinehas the son of Eleazar ministered unto the ark. It is true that the language of the whole chapter is pervasive of Holy War associations, with its weeping and fasting and sacrifices etc. and this has given ground for others to suggest that the passage simply treats of a temporary location of the ark at Bethel during the period of the Benjaminites Wars.<sup>15</sup> It is true that the period of the Judges ends with an emphasis upon the Shiloh sanctuary and that the Tent has been at Shiloh as early as Josh. 18:1, and we are cognisant that not every movement of the ark is to be associated with a sanctuary change, but the plain sense of the passage renders Kraus' conclusions here reasonable. It is of course the case that we know too little about the question of the central sanctuary (or centrality in fact) in the Judges period to do more than suggest the possibilities. To account for final movement to Jerusalem some such schema as progression from Shechem to Gilgal to Bethel to Shiloh etc. is often advanced but one wonders whether rather than the sites involved, what may have been of the essence was the cultic activities connected with them. It may well have been the case that during the period of the conquest and settlement any one of a number of sites, singled out in some way by divine activity at them, may have done duty for the time being as a 'central sanctuary'. What appears to have determined centrality in the earlier period was not so much the site but the presence of the ark, a position which Nathan's oracle in II Sam. 7 appears to endorse. If the Bethel of the Judges period then was not a sanctuary central in the way in which Kraus would argue it may well have been one of the number of legitimate sites at which centralized activities could have been conducted and to which the great pilgrimages could have been directed.

We hear nothing much more of Bethel until the division of the Kingdom but that it is still prominent is clear from its appearance at I Sam. 7:16 as one of Samuel's circuit stops, while its continued sanctuary status is attested and uncontroversial by I Sam. 10:3. It is, however, with the activities of Jeroboam I that Bethel assumes new prominence and to that episode we must now turn. We wish to do no more than to assess the significance of Jeroboam's cultic actions after the secession, but it is an interesting fact that he is first incited by Ahijah of Shiloh to rebel (I Kings 11:29ff.), the very same prophet who so roundly condemns him at I Kings 14:1-9. The latter passage explains that this condemnation has been occasioned by Jeroboam's cultic idolatry, and there is mention of other gods and molten images, references which are customarily taken to refer to the calves of I Kings 12. Though the language at I Kings 14 is general the customary exegesis is explicitly supported by the specific condemnation of the calves at II Kings 10:29 and while all of this is condemnation from a later point of view it is none the less condemnation of specific historical activities bound up with the calves and is not thus to be dismissed as theologically coloured and without foundation.

The narrative of I Kings 12:25ff. is a clear polemic against Jeroboam's cult establishments. Verse 25 is introductory; verses 26-28 record the motives of the king and the installation of the calves; verses 29-30 refer to their placement; verse 31 to the non-levitical nature of the priesthood at the centres; verse 32 to the establishment of the feast of the eighth month, while verse 33 concludes the section. Literary analysis of the passage is very much controverted and is bound to be coloured by preconceptions as has been pointed out.<sup>16</sup> Undoubtedly the passage reports an historical incident, however, and on that basis we proceed.

Several factors of interest in the total account call for discussion. The first of these is the question of supposed prophetic ambivalence to the establishment of the northern kingdom. Ahijah initially had taken the initiative (I Kings 11:29ff.) and then when Jeroboam had acted had roundly condemned him, while general prophetic disapproval of the venture is clearly expressed in I Kings 13.<sup>17</sup> Was the northern kingdom generated by prophetic animosity to the south stemming from the Shilonic circle? Certainly we may say that neither the Davidic monarchy nor the Jerusalem sanctuary would have found axiomatic acceptance in the north,<sup>18</sup> though some have cogently argued that the explanation of prophetic ambivalence was to be found in opposition to Jeroboam's rival cult establishments. While prophets, it is argued, would have been willing to acquiesce in a political

division they would not countenance religious division.<sup>19</sup> On this view the issue hinged solely on Jerusalem centrality—the bull symbols were not a factor.

It is difficult to credit, however, such a neat prophetic dichotomy between politics and religion. Ahijah at I Kings 11:38 had assured Jeroboam of Yahweh's conditional blessing and the promise of an enduring dynasty, but surely the essential factor in such a dynastic arrangement was a successful nexus between church and state and appropriate sacral support. The generation of a new dynasty could only have been conceived of within a framework of a fragmented religious structure. It seems incredible to suppose that when so much difficulty had been experienced with the Jerusalem monarchy, when the development of an adoptionist theology in the south had led to the dismantling of the older tribal league structure, when the north had been so disenchanting with a Solomon whose policies Rehoboam was determined to continue, when in fact so many antipathies had been built up, that Ahijah should so readily assume that the new kingdom would come south for the pilgrimage festivals etc. Furthermore Jeroboam comes out of the narratives as one who was bent upon redeeming what he could of the older tribal structure rather than as one who would throw what is left of it to the winds.<sup>20</sup>

Then, if Jeroboam's purpose was to create an alternate central shrine, why did he set up two? Why both Bethel and Dan? If the principle of static centrality as bound up with Jerusalem had been accepted by all Israel, why did Jeroboam feel so free, not only to oppose Jerusalem, but to vitiate this new theological principle of the one shrine by the two new foundations in his own kingdom? If it is the principle of centrality which is at stake it is surprising that the historian has no specific pronouncement on the issue to make. It is the 'other gods' which worry him and even if when the Kings historian is writing Jerusalem centrality has ceased to be a burning issue it is surprising that the appropriate underscoring of the perils of religious division was not made had centrality in fact been the issue.<sup>21</sup> It is the probable case that many factors—sanctuaries, priesthoods, iconographies, local rivalries—were compounded in the process of the division of the kingdoms, and none of these can be ignored.

It is of course the case that when the substance of the Kings narratives were drawn together in exile, attachment to the Davidic monarchy and the centrality of Jerusalem were articles of faith and platforms on which the post-exilic community was to be erected. It must remain an open question, however, whether this was so at the time of the division of the kingdom and it could

be plausibly argued that in establishing two centres Jeroboam was in fact returning to an older view of 'mobile' centrality, a view which seems to have been presupposed in the initial equivocation about the temple project expressed in II Samuel 7. There is much to be said for casting Jeroboam into the role of a religious conservative, endeavouring to stem the tide of the new theology which emanates from Jerusalem and seeking to reverse what he took to be a ruinous policy of administrative and religious centrality. The two centres which he chose had impeccable credentials. Bethel, as we have seen, was a patriarchal foundation, while Dan was an important shrine of the Judges period. Though the priesthood he appointed is stigmatized as non-levitical (I Kings 12:31), Dan at least was staffed with a Mosaic priesthood (Judg. 18:30) and it is difficult to credit Jeroboam with the appointment of ruffians.<sup>22</sup> He would obviously have taken action against Jerusalem-orientated clergy but would doubtless, in view of the antiquity of Bethel and Dan, have been unwilling seriously to have disturbed existing sanctuary traditions.

So far as Jeroboam's 'feast' is concerned we are told that he 'ordained' a feast on the fifteenth day of the eighth month (I Kings 12:32) but the account goes on to imply that far from innovating, Jeroboam was carefully adhering to accepted norms (i.e. it was 'like unto the feast that is in Judah') with the only departure being the change of venue. It is to be doubted whether in such an uncertain period Jeroboam would have taken the risk of altering the festival calendar, particularly when the success of his revolt had in a large measure been made possible by the significant changes in the old tribal structure which had been effected by Solomon.<sup>23</sup>

In a context of circumspect preservation of that which was old it is curious that Jeroboam should have been so much at fault in the choice of his iconography. He is clearly condemned for this by the same Ahijah who had initially supported him and yet it is difficult to imagine that the choice of the bull symbol was either provocative or innovatory. Compounding our difficulty is the clear condemnation which the bull symbol receives in the narrative of Exodus 32, a narrative which appears to be a sharpened polemic against Jeroboam since there are too many points of similarity between Exodus 32 and I Kings 12 to be merely coincidental.<sup>24</sup>

Here it is to be noted that source criticism of Exodus 32 attributes the chapter substantially to the E strand.<sup>25</sup> If the usual arguments adduced for that purpose are correct, or in more general terms if the content of Exodus 32 has been substantially

shaped in the northern prophetic circles, then it should follow that this polemical chapter could hardly have been known to Jeroboam in its final form.<sup>26</sup> Depending as he did upon prophetic support he would surely not have chosen a counter iconography that would have brought immediate condemnation. On the contrary, we must suppose that there must have circulated in the north traditions associated with the venerated name of Aaron which endorsed the bull. It is very possible that these had long been associated with the shrine of Bethel.<sup>27</sup> Perhaps all these factors conditioned his choice of iconography for he was faced with a dilemma. Bethel was clearly his counter to Jerusalem. That emerges by its position of emphasis within I Kings 12 and 13 and within the eighth century prophets. It was never, however, intended to be a sole sanctuary and the choice of Dan was meant to underscore that, for it is hard to escape the conclusion that Ahijah's role in the revolt stems from Shilonic rejection of Jerusalem as the sole centre. Bethel and Dan both had impressive backgrounds. Bethel certainly had had Aaronic contact (Judges 20:27-28) and the priesthood at Dan was seemingly Mosaic. And yet in his endeavour perhaps to get back to an older theological stance to centrality Jeroboam lacked the very ingredient with which in the past the principle of centrality had been bound up, namely the Ark. Confronted by this dilemma he chose the bull, an item which at least in popular thought had an Aaronic and an Exodus background. He thus allotted a key cultic role to an old symbol, which, whatever other merits it may have possessed, was not in the main stream of Israel's faith history. However innocuously his actions were intended they brought an immediate prophetic response and Bethel, particularly, was condemned in I Kings 13. In this way the dilemma of Jeroboam became the sin of Jeroboam son of Nebat 'who caused Israel to sin'.<sup>28</sup>

So far as the later influence of Bethel is concerned it seems now established that it remained in the hands of Jeroboam for something like ten years only and that it was lost to the south when Abijah captured and held the so-called 'Bethel bulge' (II Chron. 13).<sup>29</sup> It may be conjectured that Bethel remained with the south until its recapture by Joash of Israel (II Kings 14). This would certainly explain the absence of polemic against Bethel in the narrative accounts. By Jeroboam II's time Bethel had become a 'royal sanctuary' (Amos 7:13). The shrine continued to exercise a powerful influence during the exile (II Kings 17:28) and in the immediate post-exilic years (Zech. 7:2). It appears to have been destroyed for unknown reasons c. 500 B.C.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

1. There is the problem of the original place name here. Gen. 35:6 identifies Bethel with Luz as does Josh. 18:13, yet Josh. 16:2 distinguishes them. For a survey of the evidence cf. C. Mackay, "From Luz to Bethel", *EQ*, 34 (1962), 8-15.
2. Perhaps Bethel was originally the name of the sanctuary and Luz the name of the city. F. S. North, "Aaron's Rise in Prestige", *ZAW*, 66 (1954), 191-199 suggests an original location between Bethel and Ai for the sanctuary.
3. J. L. Kelso directed excavations on the site in 1954, 1957 and 1960, cf. "The Fourth Campaign at Bethel", *BASOR*, 164 (1961), 5-19.
4. Cf. G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, 2nd. ed., Rev. (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 85ff.
5. On this context and the place of the *maššēbah* in the period cf. Carl F. Graesser, "Standing Stones in Ancient Palestine", *BA*, 35 (1972), 34-63.
6. O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel", *Kleine Schriften*, I (Tübingen, 1962), 206-233. J. P. Hyatt, "The Deity Bethel and the Old Testament", *JAOS*, 59 (1939), 81-98 argued for Eissfeldt's position also.
7. At best Jer. 48:13 would provide evidence for a post-exilic hypostasis and would thus coincide with the Elephantine evidence temporally. Jer. 48:13 may, however, be a personification of the site. For a recent appraisal of the Elephantine material cf. Bezael Porter, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley, 1968), pp. 165ff. J. P. Hyatt, *JAOS*, 59 supplies other extra-biblical material.
8. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1953), pp. 168ff.
9. Note the criticism, however, of this customary position which is levelled by Menahem Haran, "The Religion of the Patriarchs", *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, IV (1965), 30-55, esp. p. 34.
10. Eduard Nielsen, *Shechem, A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 307ff. surveys the parallel evidence.
11. In his "Die Wahlfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel", *Kleine Schriften*, I (München, 1953) pp. 79ff., J. A. Soggin, "Zwei umstritten e Stellen aus dem Überlieferungskreis um Shechem", *ZAW*, 73 (1961), 78-87 extends Alt's thesis programmatically, finding in the Genesis context three elements, i) Renunciation of foreign gods; ii) Pilgrimage; iii) The 'terror of God' (v. 5) i.e. the Ark. His last point is a little difficult to credit. Soggin, however, puts the pilgrimage into the Judges period, agreeing that Bethel was a significant centre of that period.
12. Cf. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 234ff. for a discussion of the implications of the LXX reading.
13. J. N. M. Wijngaards, "The Dramatization of Salvific History in the Deuteronomistic Schools", *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, XVI (1969), p. 12, note 3 also dissents from Alt's conclusions, and advances the further reason that the renunciation of idolatry finds in Joshua 24 its complete explanation within the Shechemite covenantal festival rites without reference there to Bethel.
14. H. J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 147ff.

15. Cf. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 103ff. It should be noted, however, that Shilo at Judges 21:19 is located in terms of Bethel and not vice versa.
16. By Sadao Asami in his unpublished Harvard Th.D. dissertation, "The Central Sanctuary in Israel in the 9th Century B.C." (Harvard, 1964), p. 243.
17. As is well known the LXX presents virtually two assessments of Jeroboam's revolt. The first, which is generally taken to reflect a more authentic text than the M.T. of I Kings 11:26-12:24 accords him no part in the revolt but merely a subsequent acceptance of leadership. This is entirely consonant with I Kings 11:29ff. where the revolt seems to have been triggered by prophetic activity. The second assessment, a discursive addition to I Kings 12:24a vilifies Jeroboam but it is generally recognized as a secondary expansion. On the textual question involved see most recently Ralph W. Klein, "Once More: Jeroboam's Rise to Power", *JBL*, 92 (1973), 582-4.
18. David's reign had shown the reality of the north/south differences. Moreover Solomon's recourse to Gibeon (I Kings 3) raises doubts about Jerusalem's position at the commencement of his reign.
19. Sadao Asami in his work referred to above stresses the notion of prophetic acceptance of the doctrine of the centrality of the Jerusalem sanctuary as a *sine qua non*. *Op. cit.*, p. 265.
20. F. M. Cross Jr. in "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs", *HTR*, 55 (1962), 225-259 has argued strongly for Jeroboam's stance as a reformer who attempted to 'outarchaize' Jerusalem.
21. All the more so if the books of Kings are accepted as part of a wider Deuteronomic history, for whom, it is usually argued, centrality was a basic issue, i.e. Jerusalem as *the* sanctuary.
22. For a discussion of the phrase *miq̄sôt hā'ām* in I Kings 12:31 cf. M. Aberbach and L. Smolar, "Aaron, Jeroboam and the Golden Calves", *JBL*, 76 (1967), 129-140. *Mōsheh* is the preferred reading at Judg. 18:30. Whether 'levitical' at this time would have meant much more than 'Davidic' is a difficult question to decide.
23. S. Talmon, "Calendar-Reckoning in Ephraim and Judah", *VT*, 8 (1958), 48-74 argues that in choosing the eighth month Jeroboam was reverting to an established northern calendar based upon prevailing climatic and agricultural conditions.
24. Aberbach and Smolar, *op. cit.*, point to thirteen points of correspondence between Exodus 32 and I Kings 12-14.
25. So, most thoroughly, W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 18-22.
26. It would certainly make more sense to argue on this ground alone that Exodus 32 in its final form was a southern production. Formally, S. Lehming, "Versuch zu Ex. XXXII", *VT*, 10 (1960), 16-50 has also advocated this.
27. The bull was, of course, an old El symbol. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild", *ZAW*, 58 (1940-41), 190-215 has argued that both the ark and the bull were 'Führer' symbols. The ark had been brought in by the Joseph tribes but the bull was an indigenous Canaanite symbol, projected back in Exodus 32 to Sinai. Both symbols co-existed and there need have been no incompatibility between them. J. Dus some-

what fancifully in "Ein richterzeitliches Stierbildheiligtum zu Bethel", *ZAW*, 77 (1965), 266-286, advances the view that Exodus 32 conceals an incident which had arisen as a result of the destruction of the Bethel cult image in tribal strife over competing symbols. Neither of these views is acceptable since neither takes account of the peculiar position of the ark in Israel's history. It is customarily argued that the calves of Jeroboam were a podium for the deity and not images of the deity. Whether there is merit in that or not, whatever the original intention may have been they quickly became images. For a discussion of this latter question cf. Lloyd R. Bailey, "The Golden Calf", *HUCA*, 42 (1971), 97-115.

28. F. Dummermuth, "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen", *ZAW*, 70 (1958), 59-98 reaches similar conclusions to those advanced here.
29. Cf. F. M. Cross Jr. and G. E. Wright, "Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah", *JBL*, 75 (1956), 202-226.