SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
1982 SEMINAR PAPERS

Editor, Kent Harold Richards

ISBN: 0-89130-607-2
ISSN: 0145-2711

Printed in the United States of America

THE LEGITIMIZING ROLE OF THE TEMPLE IN THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE[+]

John M. Lundquist
Brigham Young University

> Thus, if the ancient Mesopotamian historian is to give any meaningful account of his materials at all he must of a necessity relax the stringent claim of "what the evidence obliges us to believe" and substitute for it a modest "what the evidence makes it reasonable for us to believe," for it is only by taking account of evidence which is suggestive, when the suggestion is in itself reasonable, rather than restricting himself to wholly compelling evidence, that he will be able to integrate his data in a consistent and meaningful presentation. In replacing "what the evidence obliges us to believe," with "what the evidence makes it reasonable for us to believe" the historian--at the peril of his right to so call himself--leaves, of course, except for details of his work, the realm of knowledge to enter that of reasonable conjecture. This may not be altogether palatable to him, but since the nature of his materials allows him no other choice the best he can do is to accept it as gracefully as possible and with full awareness of its consequences in terms of limited finality of the results possible to him.[1]

> I may be accused here of ideationalism, or something vile like that, but that is all right with me. My current research centers on religious systems expressed in art. In my estimation, there was strong ideological motivation in these early societies, particularly as embodied in religious systems, and this is something that materialist archaeologists tend to ignore. If some of these scholars found themselves transported to some of these societies they pretend to reconstruct, they would not recognize, I suspect, much around them.[2]

I

It is the thesis of this paper that the state, as we presently understand that term as applying to archaic societies (I will presently give a number of attempts to define this term) did not come into being, indeed could not have been perceived to have come into being in ancient Israel before and until the temple of Solomon was build and dedicated. Solomon's dedicatory prayer and the accompanying communal meal represent the final passage into Israel of the "divine charter" ideology that characterized state polities among Israel's ancient Near Eastern neighbors. (I will discuss shortly the implications of the Deuteronomic dating of 1 Kings 8 for the above claim.)[3] In the ancient Near East temple building/rebuilding/restoring is an all but quintessential element in state formation, and often represents the sealing of the covenant process that state formation in the ancient Near East presumes.[4] We find significant earlier vestiges of temple symbolism

---

[+]See end of paper for list of abbreviations.

[1]Thorkild Jacobsen, "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," *Toward the Image of Tammuz and other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture*, (ed. William L. Moran; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970) 133-34.

[2]Michael Coe, "Comments on Professor Sanders' Paper," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, (ed. Charlotte B. Moore; Supp. to BASOR, 20; Cambridge: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1974) 117.

[3]George E. Mendenhall, "The Monarchy," *Int* 30 (1975) 166-68. John Bright Fs.

[4]"The ideal of the covenant is then prevalent everywhere in the traditions of this occasion, and we may thus conclude that Solomon at the dedication festival actually renewed the covenant with Yahweh." Geo Widengren, "King and Covenant," *JSS* 2 (1957) 8.

(à la my Typology below) in earlier moments in Israelite history, at the mountain in the time of Moses, during the time of the Conquest, as recorded in Joshua 8 and 24, and in fact, according to Menahen Haran: "In general, any cultic activity to which the biblical text applies the formula 'before the Lord' can be considered an indication of a temple at the site, since this expression stems from the basic conception of the temple as a divine dwelling place and actually belongs to the temple's technical terminology."[5] However, only with the completion of the temple in Jerusalem is the process of imperial state formation completed, making Israel in the fullest sense "like the other nations."[6] The ideology of kingship in the archaic state is indelibly and incontrovertibly connected with temple building and with temple ideology.

It is important to note at this stage that I am not attempting to introduce the temple as the central feature in a "prime mover" hypothesis concerning the origin of the state. The process of early state formation is a very fluid one, a process that can go either forward or backward.[7] I am not introducing the temple as the primary cause of state formation, but rather as an integrative, legitimizing factor that symbolizes, and I believe in the ancient mind would have symbolized, the full implementation of what we today call the "state."[8]

---

[5] *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 26.

[6] 1 Sam 8:20. See also George E. Mendenhall, "The Monarchy," 157.

[7] See the views of Richard N. Adams, "The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses," *The Early State* (ed. Henri J. M. Claessen and Peter Skalnik; Studies in the Social Sciences, 32; The Hague: Mouton, 1978) 22; George E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) 188-89; for summaries of the various prime mover theories of state origins, see J. Stephen Athens, "Theory Building and the Study of the Evolutionary Process in Complex Societies," *For Theory Building in Archaeology* (ed. Lewis R. Binford; Studies in Archaeology; New York: Academic Press, 1977) 353-57, with a valuable chart on p. 354.

[8] Relatively rare in scholarship is the attempt by scholars to define analogues to the term "state" from ancient sources. For Mesopotamia we have the description of "primitive democracy" for the Protoliterate period by Thorkild Jacobsen, for which he chooses "the relatively noncommittal term 'Kengir League' " in place of "state" or "nation." See "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," 140. Also noteworthy is Jacobsen's contribution to *Before Philosophy, The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, An Oriental Institute Essay; Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972, 137-99, under the title "The Cosmos as a State." Here as elsewhere ("Foreword," in Robert McC. Adams, *Heartland of Cities, Surveys of Ancient Settlements and Land Use on the Central Floodplain of the Euphrates*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, xiv) he recognizes the state primarily as the "monopoly of violence," or, quoting Max Weber, a community becomes a state when it "successfully displays the monopoly of a legitimate physical compulsion. See *Before Philosophy*, 156. For Jacobsen, in Mesopotamian myth Anu and Enlil "embody, on a cosmic level, the two powers which are the fundamental constituents of any state: authority and legitimate force." Ibid. Similarly Robert McC. Adams, writing from the evidence of the preliterate Uruk period remains of the central Euphrates floodplain of Iraq: "Among its features were: deities whose cults attracted pilgrimages and voluntary offerings; intervals of emergent, centralized, militarily based domination of subordinate centers that had been reduced to the status of clients, alternating with other intervals of fragile multicenter coalition or local self-reliance . . ." (*Heartland of Cities*, 81). "A better case can be made that the primary basis for organization was of a rather more traditional kind: religious allegiance to deities or cults identified with particular localities, political subordination resting ultimately on the possibility of military coercion, or a fluid mixture of both" (Ibid., 78). Dr. Mendenhall's characterization of the transition from the Federation to the State in ancient Israel states that "when a population emerges from a community to a political monopoly of

Recently I have been engaged in an attempt to identify commonalities in the temple practices/ideologies of the various ancient Near Eastern traditions. My main purpose in such an endeavor has been to construct a model or typology that will assist scholars in understanding "the social foundations of ancient polytheism,"[9] insofar as ancient temples can be seen to embody and to express central and crucial elements of such systems. The purpose of such a typology is to allow for "explanatory power in dealing with a set body of data." It will "point beyond the surface to the underlying patterns and processes; it will explain as well as identify."[10] It is true that I conclude that the main, if not all of the elements of the following typology were accepted by and taken into the religious system of ancient Israel—and this at a time far antedating the introduction of the monarchy. Folker Willeson wrote many years ago that "if the temple ideologies of the different nations are able to display certain traits, common throughout the whole ancient world, it may be a special branch of the Chaos-Cosmos ideology."[11] This is the ideology that I attempt to identify and describe in what follows. I introduce the typology here because it will play an interpretive role later in this paper.[12]

---

force, it almost inevitably imitates models best known and most accessible to it" ("The Monarchy," 159). He further writes: "The foundation of the community had nothing to do with a social agreement concerning divine legitimacy of social power structures--this entered from paganism with David and Solomon--but with common assent to a group of norms which stemmed from no social power" (*Tenth Generation*, 195). His definition of the state which Israel took over from its neighbors during the period of the united monarchy is then ". . . the maximization of human control. It is the divine power incarnate in the state or even the person of the king which guarantees the success of the daily economic activities of the subjects, just as it is the king who guarantees the military protection with the same divine delegated authority" (Ibid., 192). Perhaps the most suggestive formula for an ancient definition of the state comes from the Sumerian King List, which yields the formula "the state = a king (invested with kingship by the gods) + a (capital) city." This most important point can be deduced, I believe, from Giorgio Buccellati's "The Enthronement of the King and the Capital City in Texts from Ancient Mesopotamia and Syria," *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1964) 54-61. This introduces us to the controversial problem of the role of urbanism in the origin of the state, an issue to which I will return later. For the present, see Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, 52-129, and especially 75-81. Buccellati found that texts from Syria, including the OT, come closer to the Sumerian than to the Akkadian formulas of expressing what I call above a definition of state polities in the ancient Near East. Although I will introduce highly sophisticated evidence below for the proposition that Israel did not achieve state formation until the monarchy, and thus that the period of Judges cannot be considered a time of state formation in Israel, it is probable that the OT gives us this very picture in a manner highly reminiscent of the stylistic simplicity of the Sumerian King List. The very refrain of Judges, "in those days there was no king in Israel; everyone did what was right in his own eyes," tells us that this period cannot be considered the time of Israelite state formation, either according to ancient views, or our own, while the theme of 1 Samuel 8, "give us a king, that we may be like the other nations," alerts us to the fact that, in the ancients' views as well as the views of modern research, a state polity is being introduced.

[9]George E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation*, 192.

[10]Lee Daniel Snyder, "Modeling and Civilization: Can There Be a Science of Civilization?" (*Abstract for International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilization*, Typescript, 1982, 1-2).

[11]"The Cultic Situation of Psalm LXXIV," *VT* 2 (1952) 290.

[12]Perhaps a more succinct definition of what I mean by "ideology" is the following: "The central value system is constituted by the values which are pursued and affirmed by the *élites* of the constituent sub-systems and of the organizations which are

II

The Typology

1. The temple is the architectural embodiment of the cosmic mountain.

2. The cosmic mountain represents the primordial hillock, the place which first emerged from the waters that covered the earth during the creative process. In Egypt, for example, all temples are seen as representing the primordial hillock.

3. The temple is often associated with the waters of life which flow from a spring within the building itself--or rather the temple is viewed as incorporating within itself such a spring or as having been built upon the spring. The reason that such springs exist in temples is that they were perceived as the primeval waters of creation, *Nun* in Egypt, *Abzu* in Mesopotamia, *Tĕhôm* in Israel. The temple is thus founded upon and stands in contact with the waters of creation. These waters carry the dual symbolism of the chaotic waters that were organized during the creation, and of the life giving, saving nature of the waters of life.

4. The temple is associated with the tree of life. (The above four taken together constitute what I call a "primordial landscape," which we can expect to see reproduced architecturally and ritually in ancient Near Eastern temple traditions.)[13]

5. The temple is built on separate, sacral, set apart space.

6. The temple is oriented toward the four world regions or cardinal directions, and to various celestial bodies such as the polar star. Astronomical observation may have played a role in ancient temples, the main purpose of which was to regulate the ritual calendar. Since earthly temples were viewed as the counterparts of heavenly temples,[14] this view also would have contributed to the possible role of temples as observatories.

---

comprised in the sub-systems. By their very possession of authority, they attribute to themselves an essential affinity with the sacred elements of their society, of which they regard themselves as the custodians. By the same token, many members of their society attribute to them that same kind of affinity . . . . The *élites* of . . . the ecclesiastical system affirm and practice certain values which should govern intellectual and religious activities (including beliefs). On the whole, these values are the values embedded in current activity. The ideals which they affirm do not far transcend the reality which is ruled by those who espouse them. The values of the different *élites* are clustered into an approximately consensual pattern." (Edward Shils, "Centre and Periphery," *Selected Essays by Edward Shils*, Chicago: Center for Organization Studies, Department of Sociology, 1970, 3 [sic]).

[13]For the presence of such a "landscape" in the mythical texts from Ras Shamra, see Frank Moore Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research," *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*, Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; Jerusalem: The Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology, 1981, 170-72.

[14]Bruno Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, Vol. 2, Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek, 4; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1925, 107-12, 409-10; for this imagery in the OT and in the texts from Ras Shamra, see David Noel Freedman, "Temple Without Hands," *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*, 21, 28; and Frank Moore Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research," Ibid., 170.

7. Temples, in their architectonic orientation express the idea of a successive ascension toward heaven.[15] The Mesopotamian ziggurat or staged temple tower is the best example of this architectural principle. It was constructed of various levels or stages. Monumental staircases led to the upper levels, where smaller temples stood. The basic ritual pattern represented in these structures is that the worshippers ascended the staircase to the top, the deity was seen to descend from heaven, and worshippers and deity were then thought to meet in the small temple which stood at the top of the structure.

8. The plan and measurements of the temple are revealed by God to the king or prophet, and the plan must be carefully carried out. The Babylonian king Nabopolassar stated that he took the measurements of Etemenanki, the temple tower in the main temple precinct at Babylon, under the guidance of the Babylonian gods Shamash, Adad, and Marduk, and that "he kept the measurements in his memory as a treasure."

9. The temple is the central, organizing, unifying institution in ancient Near Eastern society.

A. The temple is associated with abundance and prosperity, indeed is perceived as the giver of these.[16]

B. The destruction or loss of the temple is seen as calamitous and fatal to the community in which the temple stood. The destruction is viewed as the result of social and moral decadence and disobedience to god's word.

10. Inside the temple and in temple workshops images of deities as well as living kings, temple priests, and worshippers are washed, anointed, clothed, fed, enthroned, and symbolically initiated into the presence of deity, and thus into eternal life. Further, New Year rites are held at which time texts are read and dramatically portrayed which recite a pre-earthly war in heaven, the victory in the war by the forces of good, led by a chief

---

[15]"The Sumerians and their successors found a special significance in the height of the temples." (Eric Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," *The Labyrinth*, ed. S. H. Hooke, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1935, 60).

[16]These ideas are clearly expressed in Neo-Sumerian temple hymns, particularly in the Cylinder inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash and in the Keš Temple Hymn. For the latter see Gene B. Gragg, "The Keš Temple Hymn," in *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns* (ed. Ake W. Sjöberg and E. Bergmann; Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 3; Locust Valley: J. J. Augustin, 1969) 168 (lines 22-30) and 173 (lines 90-95). For Gudea see F. Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften* (Vorderasiatischen Bibliothek, 1; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1907) 86-141. Many years ago Julius A. Bewer wrote an article in which he compared the religious and social role of the temple as it is depicted in the Cylinder inscriptions of Gudea with similar associations in the prophecies of Haggai. Gudea attributes wide reaching social, legal, and economic reform as well as agricultural abundance to the building of the temple (see point # 15, below). Bewer's article ("Ancient Babylonian Parallels to the Prophecies of Haggai," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 35 [1919] 128-33) retains considerable value. Of course, such claims of prosperity in temple hymns and building dedications may be fictional, as has been proved, for example, for the prices claimed by Shamshi-Adad I in his dedicatory inscription for the "Enlil" temple in Ashur. In this case, we are dealing not with genuine piety, but with political propaganda. See Albert Kirk Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, 1 (Records of the Ancient Near East; ed. Hans Goedicke; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972) 20-21.

deity, the creation and establishment of the cosmos, cities, temples, and the social order. The sacred marriage is carried out at this time.

11. The temple is associated with the realm of the dead, the underworld, the afterlife, the grave. The unifying feature here is the rites and worship of ancestors. Tombs can be and in Egypt and elsewhere are essentially temples (cf. the cosmic orientation, texts written on tomb walls which guide the deceased into the afterlife, etc.). The unifying principle between temple and tomb can also be resurrection. In Egyptian religion the sky goddess Nut is depicted on the coffin cover, symbolizing the cosmic orientation (cf. "Nut is the coffin.").

12. Sacral, communal meals are carried out in connection with temple ritual, often at the conclusion of or during a covenant ceremony.

13. The tablets of destiny (or tablets of the decrees) are consulted both in the cosmic sense by the gods, and yearly in a special temple chamber, *ubšukinna* in the Eninnu temple in the time of Gudea of Lagash. It was by this means that the will of deity was communicated to the people through the king or prophet for a given year.

14. God's word is revealed in the temple, usually in the holy of holies, to priests or prophets attached to the temple or to the religious system that it represents.

15. There is a close interrelationship between the temple and law in the ancient Near East. The building or restoration of a temple is perceived as the moving force behind a restating or "codifying" of basic legal principles, and of a "righting" and organizing of proper social order.

16. The temple is a place of sacrifice.

17. The temple and its ritual are unshrouded in secrecy. This secrecy relates to the sacredness of the temple precinct and the strict division in ancient times between sacred and profane space.

18. The temple and its cult are central to the economic structure of ancient Near Eastern society.[17]

It is evident that at least one major function of ancient temples is missing from this list.[18] The most obvious feature that is missing is the political function of the temple in the ancient Near East (George E. Mendenhall, Private Communication). In terms of the present paper, the temple plays a legitimizing political role, and serves as "the ritual functioning system that establishes the connection between deity and king." (George E. Mendenhall, Private Communication). I will thus add to the typology an

---

[17]This list constitutes a revision of that which appears in John M. Lundquist, "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology," *The Quest for the Kingdom of God, Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1982) and John M. Lundquist, "The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East," *The Temple in Antiquity* (Religious Studies Center Monograph Series; ed. Truman G. Madsen; Provo, UT: Brigham Young University, In Press). In both these studies I provide extensive validations for the typology.

[18]Of course, there may be many such missing; but as Snyder writes: "A good model need not be perfect in every detail as long as it stimulates empirical testing and refinement, but until the model is relatively complete, effective testing is impossible." ("Modeling and Civilization: Can There Be a Science of Civilization?" Typescript, 1981.)

additional item: "The temple plays a legitimizing political role in the ancient Near East," or, as stated above: "The ideology of kingship in the archaic state is indelibly and incontrovertibly connected with temple building and with temple ideology." It is this latter permutation of this latest addition of my typology that I will now continue to develop in the present paper.

III

It is necessary now to discuss the issue of state formation as it relates to ancient Israel. Theories of state formation have been widely tested on ancient and ethnographic populations,[19] but have only recently begun to be applied to ancient Israel. I am not aware of any published archaeological field projects within Palestine that have gone into the field with an explicit research strategy in which hypotheses of state origins in the country were tested, in the way say, that Henry Wright has field tested and refined his ongoing hypotheses in Iraq and Iran,[20] or in the way that Robert McC. Adams has tested and refined theories of state origins over many years of surface survey in Iraq.[21]

A number of recent publications have succeeded in demonstrating that Israelite society during the period of the Judges should be classified as a chiefdom, taking the three-fold evolutionary schema of Service (tribe, chiefdom, archaic civilization) as a model.[22] Mendenhall, for example, characterizes Israel during this period as "an oath-bound unity of the village populations of ancient Palestine that was oriented first toward the realization of the ethical rule of Yahweh as the only Suzerain, and secondly toward the avoidance of the reimposition of the imperialism of the foreign-dominated regimes of the Palestinian power structures--the city-states.[23]

In one of the most interesting and challenging claims made in recent years for the ability of field archaeology to reconstruct the social structure of ancient societies, Colin Renfrew presented a list of twenty features characteristic of chiefdoms "not one of . . . which cannot be identified in favorable circumstances from the archaeological record."[24] This list includes:

1. a ranked society.
2. the redistribution of produce organized by the chief.
3. greater population density.
4. increase in total number of society.
5. increase in the size of individual residence groups.

---

[19]Claessen and Skalnik, *The Early State*, 109-530; Henry T. Wright, "Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State," *Origins of the State, The Anthropology of Political Evolution* (ed. Ronald Cohen and Elman R. Service; Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1978) 49-68.

[20]"Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State," 57-66.

[21]*Heartland of Cities*, 27-51. Evidently the researches of Prof. Lawrence Stager on the distinctions between highland and lowland villages during Iron Age Palestine will go far to correct this deficit, once they are more fully published.

[22]Elman R. Service, *Origins of the State and Civilization* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975) 303-8; James W. Flanagan, "Chiefs in Israel," *JSOT* 20 (1981) 47-73; Frank S. Frick, "Religion and Sociopolitical Structure in Early Israel: An Ethno-Archaeological Approach," *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers* (Vol. II; ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature/Scholars Press, 1979) 233-53; George E. Mendenhall, "Social Organization in Early Israel," *Magnalia Dei, Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. Frank Moore Cross, et al.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976) 132-51.

[23]"Social Organization in Early Israel," 136.

[24]"Beyond a Subsistence Economy: The Evolution of Social Organization in Prehistoric Europe," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 73.

6. greater productivity.
7. more clearly defined territorial boundaries or borders.
8. a more integrated society with a greater number of socio-centric statuses.
9. centers which coordinate social and religious as well as economic activity.
10. frequent ceremonies and rituals serving wide social purposes.
11. rise of priesthood.
12. relation to a total environment (and hence redistribution)--i.e., to some ecological diversity.
13. specialization, not only regional or ecological but also through the pooling of individual skills in large cooperative endeavors.
14. organization and deployment of public labor, sometimes for agricultural work (e.g., irrigation) and/or for building temples, temple mounds, or pyramids.
15. improvement in craft specialization.
16. potential for territorial expansion--associated with the 'rise and fall' of chiefdoms.
17. reduction of internal strife.
18. pervasive inequality of persons or groups in the society associated with permanent leadership, effective in fields other than the economic.
19. distinctive dress or ornament for those of high status.
20. no true government to back up decisions by legalized force.[25]

Flanagan concluded his recent study with the statement that "most of the elements of Renfrew's list of twenty characteristics of chiefdoms cited above can be documented in Israel. These indicate both the presence of chiefs and the absence of a strong centralized monopoly of force equipped with laws during the time of Saul and the early years of David."[26]

Numerous theories have been propounded to define the state and to account for its emergence. These theories can be roughly divided into two classes: the "prime mover" theories, according to which a single variable, such as irrigation works, population growth, religious influence, trade, or environmental factors, is posited as the primary

---

[25]Renfrew, 73.

[26]"Chiefs in Israel," 69. We must keep in mind the very vigorous opposition that was raised against Renfrew's claims for archaeology at the conference in Cambridge where he presented the above list of features. Ruth Tringham rejected outright the ability of archaeologists to recognize ten of the items on the list from the archaeological record, and granted the remaining items only with "very rigorous backup information on the environment, economy, and technology. . . ." (Ibid., 88). On a more general level, she accused Renfrew of "very simplistic use of ethnographic analogy which would make many an anthropologist shudder." (Ibid., 89). As such, Tringham was mirroring the stinging criticisms made against what he considered the overoptimistic and naive use of ethnographic data by archaeologists by Edmund Leach, in his now famous, "Black Box" summary lecture at the 1971 Sheffield seminar on the explanation of culture change. (*The Explanation of Culture Change: Models in Pre-history* (ed. Colin Renfrew; Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973) 761-71. Leach's criticisms were answered by D. H. Mellor at the same conference ("Do Cultures Exist?" Ibid., 59-72). The point is that biblical scholars and Syro-Palestinian archaeologists should exercise care and discrimination in the extent to which they adopt models from other disciplines for application to biblical problems. There is always the danger expressed by Michael Coe, who said that "archaeologists tend to be somewhat retrograde in the models which they adopt from other fields of study." (*Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 116).

moving force in the development of complex social organization;[27] the other main class of theories tend to be cybernetic or systemic in nature, "in which multiple possible sets of causes in the ecology, economy, society and intersocial environment may singly or in combination produce more permanent centralized hierarchies of political control."[28] Claessen and Skalnik offer the following *working definition* (emphasis theirs) of the state: "the early state is the organization for the regulation of social relations in a society that is divided into two emergent social classes, the rulers and the ruled." They then offer the following "main characteristics of the early state:

1. There is a sufficient *number* of people to make possible social categorization, stratification and specialization.
2. Citizenship is determined by residence or birth in the *territory*.
3. The *government* is *centralized*, and has the necessary sovereign power for the maintenance of law and order, through the use of both authority and force, or at least the threat of force.
4. It is *independent*, at least de facto, and the government possesses sufficient power to prevent separatism (fission), and the capacity to defend its integrity against external threats.
5. The productivity (level of development of the productive forces) is developed to such a degree that there is a *regular surplus* which is used for the maintenance of the state organization.
6. The population shows a degree of *social stratification* that emergent social classes (rulers and ruled) can be distinguished.
7. A *common ideology* exists, on which the legitimacy of the ruling stratum (the rulers) is based.[29]

Gregory Johnson has defined the state as "a differentiated and internally specialized decision making organization which is structured in minimally three hierarchical levels."[30] In his essay published in 1978 Henry Wright defined the state as "a society with specialized decision-making organizations that are receiving messages from many different sources, recoding these messages, supplementing them with previously stored data, making the actual decisions, storing both the message and the decision, and conveying decisions back to other organizations. Such organizations are thus internally as well as externally specialized."[31] This definition, by the way, underlines the extraordinary role of record keeping in early states and points us toward a recognition of the complexity of the bureaucratic structure that we can expect to find. It also raises the question of the place of writing in the origin of the state. Certainly in the ancient Near East we have writing in each example of state formation. As Adams has written, writing and other forms of craftsmanship guaranteed that "a highly significant segment of the population must have been given or won its freedom from more than a token or symbolic involvement in the primary processes of food production."[32] On the role of writing in

---

[27]J. Stephen Athens, "Theory Building and the Study of Evolutionary Process in Complex Societies," 353-57; Henry Wright, "Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State," 49-52.

[28]Ronald Cohen, "State Origins: A Reappraisel," in *The Early State*, 70; see also Henry Wright, "Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State."

[29]"The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses," 21, 639-40. Emphasis theirs.

[30]Quoted in Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, 76.

[31]"Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State," 56.

[32]Adams, *Heartland of Cities*, 80: Mendenhall has emphasized the great dependence that the burgeoning monarchy of Israel would have had on an extensive scribal bureaucracy, the lack of which in traditional Israelite society would have necessitated David and Solomon turning to the well-established Jebusite bureaucracy to

general as a concomitant of state origins Lawrence Krader has written: "The relation between the formation of the state and the development of script, of writings, is not a chance correlation, but a coordination with interacting consequence in the service of the former."[33] Finally, Ronald Cohen's recent definition of the state emphasizes it as "a centralized and hierarchically organized political system in which the central authority has control over the greatest amount of coercive force in the society. Sub-units are tied into the hierarchy through their relations to officials appointed by and responsible to a ruler or monarchical head of state. These officials maintain the administrative structure of the system and attempt to ensure its continuity by having among them a set of electors who choose and/or legitimate a new monarch."[34]

According to Service "there seems to be no way to discriminate the state from the chiefdom stage." He then quotes Sanders' and Marino's *New World Prehistory* (p. 9): "Differences between chiefdoms and states are as much quantitative as they are qualitative."[35] Claessen and Skalnik distinguish the state from chiefdoms in the latter's lack of a "formal, legal apparatus of forceful repression," and also its incapacity to prevent fission.[36] Cohen sees fission as the main feature that distinguishes chiefdoms in comparison with states: "The state is a system that overcomes such fissiparous tendencies. This capacity creates an entirely new kind of society. One that can expand and take in other ethnic groups, one that can become more populous and more powerful without necessarily having any upper limits to its size or strength."[37]

If we compare Renfrew's list of characteristics of chiefdoms, above, with the definitions of the state that have been cited, it would be possible to conclude that the only, or perhaps better the major, features that distinguish the two would be the presence of stratified society in the state, in the place of ranked society in the chiefdom,[38] and the inability of the chiefdom to enforce its will legally or by force; in other words, the chiefdom lacks the monopoly of force (Renfrew's point #20, but see below). Otherwise it would probably be fair to say, a la Sanders and Marino, that the state constitutes "more of the same." This comes out in a rather interesting way in Wright's successive working models of his field work in southwestern Iran. His Figure 5 (p. 60) emphasizes, for example, "*Increasing* population," "*Increasing* competition for land," while Figure 6 (p. 62) develops a model of "*Increasing* population," "*Increasing* demand for goods," "*Increasing* interregional exchange," "*Increasing* competition." His Figure 7 (p. 64), his working model for 1970, emphasizes "*More* specialization in herding," "*More* demands by nomads for goods and food," "*More* raiding," "*More* grain production in lowlands."[39] Thus it seems that even though the variables that he tested changed as his successive field work established certain variables as untenable or irrelevant, the field

---

fill this need. See "The Monarchy," 159-62. See also Ronald Cohen, "State Origins: A Reappraisal," 36-37.

[33]"The Origin of the State Among the Nomads of Asia," *The Early State*, 104.

[34]"State Origins: A Reappraisal," 36.

[35]*Origins of the State and Civilization*, 304.

[36]"The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses," 22.

[37]"State Origins: A Reappraisal," 35; any more formal study of the development of the state in ancient Israel than the present one will have to deal with the issue of fission with regard to the break-up of the Israelite monarchy in the time of Jeroboam. What does this say for the nature of the Israelite state? Does it disqualify the monarchy of David and Solomon from the category of early state? Flanagan, by the way, sees David "on the boundary line between chiefdom and kingdom." ("Chiefs in Israel," 67).

[38]For this distinction, see Service, *Origins of the State and Civilization*, 44-46, quoting Fried.

[39]"Toward an Explanation of the Origin of the State." Of course, his working models are much more complicated and extensive than the excerpts given here. Emphasis added.

work also apparently demonstrated an evolutionary increase in these variables in the development from a chiefdom to the state.

One of the most interesting archaeologically based studies of the transition from chiefdom to statehood in recent years, and one that I feel has great potential for application to field work based tests of hypotheses of state formation in ancient Israel's homeland (evidently it will demand this type of field testing, following the example of Henry Wright, Adams and others, before major progress will be made in bringing ancient Israel into the orbit of primary state formations) is that of William T. Sanders and Joseph Michels and others on the Kaminaljuyu Project, at the site of Kaminaljuyu, in the Valley of Guatemala. Sanders gave a tentative summary of some of the results of the field work, especially as they relate to the problem of state formation, at the conference on Reconstructing Complex Societies.[40] I am going to summarize what appear to be the main points of Sanders' article, especially as they relate to his views of chiefdoms and the state. I will also make reference to comments made on Sanders' paper at the conference by Martin Diskin.[41]

The majority of Sanders' conclusions that will be quoted here refer to the following archaeological phases at Kaminaljuyu: Terminal Formative (Verbena-Arenal Phases--100 B.C.-300 A.D.); Early Classic (Aurora Phase--300-500 A.D.); Middle Classic (Amatle I--500-700 A.D.); Late Classic (Amatle II--700-1000 A.D.). (97). To begin with, Sanders introduces the problem of the relationship between civilization and the state. He defines civilization as "a large, internally complex society. By internally complex we mean that a civilization is a society composed of many sub-societies each with its own value systems and life styles, and that these distinctions are based primarily on differences in occupation, wealth, and political power. By large, we mean societies at least with populations in the tens of thousands. There is also a growing tendency among cultural anthropologists interested in complex societies to consider a state level of political organization as one of their fundamental characteristics."[42] Sanders defines the state "as a political system involving adjucative [*sic*] power and explicit manifestation of force." (98).

Sanders evidently sees the chiefdom stage of political development prevailing at Kaminaljuyu through the Terminal Formative period, at which time the transition to the state begins, with full state formation completed by Late Classic times. A number of features stand out as characterizing a chiefdom form of political development at Kaminaljuyu: Chiefs can often mobilize much greater expenditure of public resources for the building of temples and tombs than on personal residences for themselves. (109). It is toward the end of the Terminal Formative that larger expenditures of labor begin to be devoted to the building of "elite residential platforms." (109). In general though, it is the ability of the leader of a state to exercise "adjudicative rather than mediating functions," to "command the control of strategic resources (particularly agricultural land)," and to demand a greater "scale and sophistication of civic buildings" that distinguishes the state from a chiefdom. (109). Further, the chiefdom seems to place a much greater emphasis on the funerary cult, "with the implications that ancestral spirits or chiefs themselves were the main objects of worship rather than high gods." (110). This pattern would support the assumption that "the political system was still structured along

---

[40]"Chiefdom to State: Political Evolution at Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 97-113, 118-19.

[41]"The Costs of Evolution," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 113-16.

[42]p. 97; Thus "civilization" implies "the state." Thus also Anatolii M. Khazanov, "Some Theoretical Problems of the Study of the Early State," *The Early State*, 89: "Civilization is a broader concept than the state. Aside from the latter it also embraces a written language . . . and the concept of towns. . . . The obvious fact is that the contemporary state, like any more or less developed state of the past, presupposes a civilization."

kinship lines." (110). Sanders argues that a series of ceremonial platforms of the Arenal Phase, although implying "the ability of a leader to amass labor for ceremonial construction," (and thus implying the state), nevertheless "strongly suggests that these were funerary temples dedicated to dead chiefs or lineage ancestors rather than to high gods," (thus implying a chiefdom) (103). As matters develop during the Terminal Formative, population increased considerably, a situation that leads to political instability in a chiefdom, because of its tendency "to be stable only on the lowest levels of political integration" (111). At this point we reach the stage of a "paramount chiefdom," involving a much greater population, when "unusually able and vigorous men with great charismatic power achieve a paramount position during their own lifetime, and sometimes this paramountcy survives through the reigns of a number of succeeding chiefs, but generally involves a period of less than 100 years in total length" (111).

One of the most interesting phenomena, appearing during Early/Middle Classic times and heralding the advent of the state, is the introduction of large, centralized monumental building projects, with the architecture modelled after a major adjacent culture. Sanders writes that the style of the architecture is a "slavish imitation of the architecture of the great site of Teotihuacan in central Mexico implying a very close, special relationship between the two sites" (106). Along with a deemphasis on the funerary cult, there seems to be the introduction of high gods, "particularly the imported god Tlaloc, from Teotihuacan," and a corresponding "reorganization of ceremonialism towards temple construction" (111). Sanders writes in general of a major ideological change during this time, apparently attributable to the infuence of cultural and religious influences coming from Teotihuacan. In response to a question posed during the discussion period at the conference "whether the similarity in architecture between Teotihuacan and Kaminaljuyu was the result of foreign invasion of people living there or a result of imitation by the local people," Sanders replied "that there was a drastic architectural reorganization. There was a sudden shift from the style of the buildings in the main civic center of a community which had a long tradition of elite culture with its own sculptural and architectural style. The centers were abandoned; and the new center, a massive acropolis, was built in foreign style. Simultaneously with this was the introduction of the Tlaloc religious cult from Teotihuacan. But whereas at Teotihuacan there were several avatars of Tlaloc, there was only one of these versions found in foreign areas; and it is the same one whether at Tikal or Kaminaljuyu. There seems to have been a highly organized religious system which came in and replaced the native religion, and many of the religious artifacts disappeared. . . ." (121).

More generally Sanders speaks of enormous increases in population from Middle Formative to Late Classic times, necessitating great structural changes "if the society were to hold together" (111). One such change was "the disappearance of the ranked lineage type pattern," (111) a situation expanded by Martin Diskin in his comments to Sanders' paper: "But the shift from rank society . . . to stratified society is best seen in the economic sphere where specialization and exchange mechanisms signal class or caste distinction and mobility is increasingly curtailed."[43]

During the Late Classic population in the Valley of Guatemala doubled, but at the same time "there is clear evidence of a retraction of population, in which many slope areas were abandoned and settlement was concentrated in a few prize agricultural portions of the valley, where soils were deep and fertile and where erosion was a minor problem" (107). Intensive agricultural practices are introduced at this time. It appears that the people of the Late Classic occupied perhaps 35% of the amount of land that had been farmed during the Terminal Formative. This led to a social setting in the Late Classic of "intense competition over land resources; on the intrasocial level this would produce unequal access to land, patron-client relationships and social stratification. On the intersocietal level competition would lead to intense warfare and increasing

[43]"The Costs of Evolution," 115.

centralization of political authority" (113). Martin Diskin elaborated these developments by positing "political control and monopoly of power . . . over the producers"; the "peasant group . . . subject to the superior power of a political elite," and "its alternatives severely restricted"; "with the growth of new social forms, the costs are borne by ever increasing levies in the forms of taxes, services, and what Wolf generally calls 'rent.' This condition, that of rent payer, becomes irreversible. Usually this is so not only because of the power of the state . . . but because local production patterns become 'adjusted' to state needs and less and less toward self-sufficiency."[44] In his response to the comments on his paper, Sanders elaborated the theory behind such developments further: ". . . one of the interesting things that archaeologists have indicated in many chronological sequences, or cultural historical sequences, is a general reduction in the quality of the average technology of individuals as one proceeds through time . . . as the political system gets more highly stratified, as the holdings of the peasants get smaller, and as they contribute more and more to the system, obviously their purchasing power declines, and one may get an overall decline in peasant technology." Sanders then generalized this principle into a distinguishing feature defining one of the differences between a chiefdom and a state. We would note the movement "from a chiefdom level, where the individual still has a fair amount of independent action and the farmer, in particular, an ability to produce surpluses to a highly evolved political state where there is a class of people who are really living on the bare subsistence level, getting very close to Wolf's caloric minima and replacement level" (118).

The implications for ancient Israel of some of the patterns of cultural evolution at Kaminaljuyu, as suggested by Sanders, seem very obvious to me, although it is not my purpose in this paper to attempt to draw out these implications. Especially important seem the problems of marshalling of strategic resources, particularly for public building, in the chiefdom and the state; the role of funerary cult in Palestine during chiefdom and state,[45] with the attendant implications for the worship of ancestors in a kin-based religious setting; massive architectural undertakings under foreign aegis in connection with major ideological re-adjustment as the society is transformed from a chiefdom into a state; population trends and changes in social structure, especially at the top; the introduction of charismatic leaders during the "paramount chiefdom" stage, at a time when population has increased considerably (of course, the issue of charismatic leadership during the period of the Judges in Israel has been extensively studied[46]); comparative agricultural usage in chiefdom and state, and patterns of land use intensification; the comparative role of peasants in chiefdom and state, including the resource flow between rulers and ruled and other evidence of class division; technology at the village peasant level in chiefdom and state.[47] Finally, the study of the political evolution has

---

[44]"The Costs of Evolution," 114.

[45]W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 5th ed. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1968, 102-4, with notes; W. Boyd Barrick, "The Funerary Character of 'High Places' in Ancient Palestine; A Reassessment," *VT* 25 (1975) 565-95, and Abraham Malamat, "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Geneologies," *JAOS* 88 (1968) 173, n. 29.

[46]Abraham Malamat, "Charismatic Leadership in the Book of Judges," *Magnalia Dei, Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, 152-68. Malamat writes, interestingly, of the process of the "routinization of charisma," (164) that results in the monarchy.

[47]Many of these issues are treated in some length by George E. Mendenhall, particularly in "The Monarchy," and in "Social Organization in Early Israel." Also valuable is Flanagan's "Chiefs in Israel," and Frick, "Religion and Sociopolitical Structure in Early Israel: An Ethno-Archaeological Approach," whose study is the first, as far as I am aware, to apply a theory of Israelite chiefdom to the archaeological evidence. Especially interesting in Frick's study is his discussion of Iron Age I agricultural practices, which

suggested that "the structure, functioning and evolution of early states of all times and places show marked similarities. These findings give us reason to believe that it may be possible to develop a generally acceptable definition of the early state and to infer some of its basic characteristics."[48] While we must observe the cautions of Flanagan that "Human societies are not so easily typed, and thus the factors interrelating processual phenomena militate against facile generalizing,"[49] we can still welcome the extent to which ancient Israel's cultural history has been brought into the general pattern and discussion of tribe--chiefdom--state, and applaud continued attempts to refine our knowledge of this process.

IV

In introducing the temple as an institution of ancient Near Eastern society[50] and its role in state formation I want to emphasize a fundamental principle laid down by Barbara Price: "By definition the processes of state formation--pristine or secondary--involve major institutional transformations resulting in turn from significant bioenergetic change."[51] Price relies primarily on two types of data, architecture and settlement patterns, to provide reliable measures of the extensive bioenergetic changes that state formation represents. "The greater the energy encapsulated in a piece of data, the more reliable will be its evidence, the greater the number of problems for which its application will be relevant and valid. . . . Stronger evidence of social, political, and economic [I would add, religious] processes can be derived from other kinds of material evidence, such as architecture, assuming that it is its scale or mass rather than its style that is emphasized."[52] And finally, "'A building,' if appropriately analyzed, is thus theoretically capable of providing information on a fairly wide range of problems."[53] Similarly for

---

appear to have been oriented toward subsistence, rather than toward the needs of a centralized bureaucracy, which fits the picture from Kaminaljuyu (244-46). Also of great interest is Normal K. Gottwald, "Early Israel and the 'Asiatic Mode of Production' in Canaan," *Society of Biblical Literature 1976 Seminar Papers*, ed. George MacRae, Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature/Scholars press, 1976, 145-54. Gottwald's discussion can benefit by seeing the Asiatic Mode of Production within the wider theory of state origins, as is done, for example, by Claessen and Skalnik, "The Early State: Models and Reality," *The Early State*, 643, 647-49, and by being more specific in placing "Early Israel" at some defined point along the Chiefdom--State spectrum, as Flanagan, Frick, Mendenhall, and I have attempted to do. Also of interest here is the view of Barbara Price concerning the data from Kaminaljuyu, that Kaminaljuyu represents a secondary state, developing from a ranked society under pressure from the primary state, centered at Teotihuacan. Is it possible that the Israelite monarchy, is, technically, an example of a secondary state, developed from a ranked society under the pressure of the Philistine/Phoenician states that surrounded it? See Barbara Price, "Secondary State Formation: An Explanatory Model," *Origins of the State*, 170-79. Such a view could be read into Mendenhall, 'The Monarchy," 157-60. See also Claessen and Skalnik, "Limits: Beginning and End of the Early State," *The Early State*, 626: "State formation is *not* caused by war, but is greatly *promoted* by war, or by the threat of war and by social stress" (emphasis theirs), and Abraham Malamat, "Charismatic Leadership in the Book of Judges," 164. See also G. W. Ahlstrom, "Where Did the Israelites Live?" *JNES* 41 (1982) 133-38.

[48]Claessen and Skalnik, "The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses," 5.

[49]"Chiefs in Israel," 49.

[50]One of the "Great Organizations" described by A. Leo Oppenheim in *Ancient Mesopotamia, Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, Rev. ed. Comp. by Erica Reiner, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977, 95-101, 106-9.

[51]"Secondary State Formation: An Explanatory Model," 166.

[52]Ibid., 164-65.

Sanders, who relies heavily on the evidence of architecture, settlement patterns and craft specialization to measure the evolution of civilization, "civic architecture clearly relates to the institutional characteristics of any culture, so that the changing patterns of civic architecture of archaeological sites in a given area should provide important clues. . . ."[54]

The introduction of the concept of civic architecture as an important clue to some of the central distinguishing features of ancient civilization must also at the same time introduce us to the "tell" as the main target configuration of a given ancient civilization that the archaeologist will be interested in investigating.[55] Of course this does not mean that the archaeologist explores the tell to the exclusion of its hinterlands--its resource area. An effective approach to the understanding of complex society in its formative periods requires a balance between the investigation of the "central city or the urban complex," and "the relations of the urban center to its surroundings and the effects of the urban system on the entire region."[56] An archaeological study of the temple in the ancient society will however, in general, locate us on the mound itself, perhaps indeed on an acropolis within or on the mound itself, which acropolis will often, but not always be located at the rough geographical center of the mound.[57] What I am getting at here is that the temple stands at the "center" of ancient Near Eastern societies, not necessarily at the geographical center for, as Edward Shils writes: "The central zone is not, *as such*, a spatially located phenomenon. It almost always has a more or less definite location within the bounded territory in which the society lives. Its centrality has, however, nothing to do with geometry and little with geography."[58] The ideological or sociological center of ancient societies does not necessarily stand at the geographical center. "The centre, or the central zone, is a phenomenon of the realm of values and beliefs, which govern the society. It is the centre because it is the ultimate and irreducible; and it is felt to be such by many who cannot give explicit articulation to its irreducibility. The central zone partakes of the nature of the sacred."[59] It is in this sense that I believe that temples often stood at the "center" of ancient Near Eastern society, including Israelite Society in the time of the temple of Solomon.[60]

It should be noted however that none of my studies of the origins of the state referred to above had any role for the temple in the process of state formation. Although I want to reemphasize that I am not introducing the temple as a prime mover hypothesis for state origins, I do feel that its exclusion in state formation hypotheses is a mistake. In response to the opening quote of this paper, which originally appeared as a criticism by Michael Coe of William Sanders "materialist" ignoring of religious systems, Sanders replied that he ignored these factors "since this type of study does not lead to

---

[53]Ibid.

[54]"Chiefdom to State," 98.

[55]G. Ernest Wright, "The Tel: Basic Unit for Reconstructing Complex Societies of the Near East," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 123-30.

[56]Charles Redman, "Research Design for a Regional Approach to Complex Societies," *Reconstructing Complex Societies*, 133, 136.

[57]For sketch views of a variety of configurations which major mounds in Syria assume, especially noting the relationship of an acropolis to the remaining area encompassed within the fortification wall, see W. J. van Liere, "Capitals and Citadels of Bronze Age Syria in their Relationship to Land and Water," *AAAS* 13 (1963) Fig. 3A, B, C.

[58]"Centre and Periphery," 1. Emphasis his.

[59]Shils, Ibid.

[60]See also Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map is Not Territory* (SJLA; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978) 98-101, 107-19; 186-89.

scientific generalization."[61] Combining the influence Sanders grants to civic architecture with the textual evidence that we have for the importance of the temple in ancient Near Eastern society, we can indeed formulate testable hypotheses with regard to the role of the temple and other religious/ideological values in ancient society. Perhaps this is what Robert McC. Adams had in mind in faulting the reconstructions of Wright and Johnson for omitting "in the face of overwhelming evidence not only of its importance as a historic force elsewhere but of incontrovertible archaeological evidence that it was the predominant preoccupation precisely in the Uruk period . . . any concession of a special role for religion and religious institutions."[62]

The central position of temple building/rebuilding/restoring in the royal inscriptions of the kings of ancient Western Asia is well known.[63] In general the pattern for these kingdoms would seem to be similar, a pattern that would also fit the Israelite state under Solomon: the state is not necessarily fully formed immediately upon the accession to kingship of a given charismatic figure. As with Israel in the time of David, state formation began in that time, but was not finalized until the reign of his successor. Further, the process of temple building/rebuilding/dedication does not necessarily take up the king's main attention in the first year or two of his reign. If we may take the Babylonian Year Names as an example of this, in most cases the first few years were taken up with building/rebuilding walls, defeating remaining enemies, in general solidifying their control over their kingdom. Then, in the case of Sumuabum, the first king of the First Dynasty of Babylon, for example, it is the fourth year that bears a name connected with temple building; in the case of his successor, Sumulael, it is the seventh; in the case of his successor Sabium, the eighth; in the case of Hammurapi, it is the third.[64]

In most cases under discussion here we will be dealing, strictly speaking, with secondary state formations, and not with pristine states. And, as I suggested above, this is in all probability the correct designation also for Israel under David, Solomon, and their successors. But, as Price maintains: "All by definition are equally states."[65] The examples that I will refer to here for the role of the temple in state formation will come from polities that in my opinion can bear either the pristine or secondary state designation.

To begin with I would like to introduce an example that represents a conflation of evidence for the importance of temples in the state from two different periods of the history of southern Iraq during the third millennium B.C. I am referring to the Temple Oval at the Early Dynastic I-II site of Khafaje in the Diyala Valley (an archaeological example) and the Cylinder inscriptions of Gudea of Lagash (ca. 2143-2124 B.C.), which describe the process of building a temple to the god Ningirsu.

Although separated in time, these two bodies of evidence both bear the same witness to what Mallowan calls "the fantastically extravagant effort Early Dynastic man was prepared to go" to please his god.[66] The site of Khafaje, of which Mound A was excavated by an Oriental Institute team during the 1930's, lies just to the east of Baghdad, on the Diyala River. The extra-ordinary development of this temple dominated

---

[61]"Chiefdom to State," 119.

[62]*Heartland of Cities*, 77.

[63]A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 108-9.

[64]A. Ungnad, "Datenlisten," *RLA* 2 (1938) 174-78; for the surviving year names of the Sargonic Dynasty, which, along with the First Dynasty of Babylon can be considered a secondary state, see Ibid., 133-34.

[65]"Pristine states achieve this level of integration through systemic operation of essentially autochthonous processes; secondary states, as defined, reflect regular processes of interaction/competition of expanding states vis-a-vis non-state organized populations." ("Secondary State Formation: An Explanatory Model," 170).

[66]Max E. L. Mallowan, "The Early Dynastic Period in Mesopotamia," *CAH* I/2 (1971) 270.

city plan fits into the late Early Dynasty I and Early Dynasty II when so many changes took place that were to characterize the era of "primitive monarchy" of the earliest historical Sumerian states. The "implosive" (R. McC. Adams) process of urbanization, the building of the first city walls at Uruk, large scale palace architecture and monumental temple platforms further characterize the E.D. I and II periods in southern Mesopotamia. This was a period of major state development.[67] As far as Gudea is concerned, he was the second governor of the most important post-Akkad, pre-Ur III state in southern Mesopotamia. The building materials for the temple he built came from as far away as the Amanus Mountains, Ebla, and the Jebel Bishri.[68]

The Temple Oval at Khafaje dominated a city settlement that was surrounded by a 6 to 8 meter wide defense wall. A number of other important temples, chief among them the many levels of the Sin Temple, and sections of private houses were also excavated. The building process involved in the ancient construction of the Temple Oval was truly phenomenal. The Oval is surrounded by a double wall which enclosed an area of about 8,000 square meters. This area was prepared for the construction of the temple by being excavated to a depth of over 8 meters. Then clean, sandy soil was brought into the excavation site from elsewhere, and laid into the pit. The excavators estimated "a volume of not less than 64,000 cubic meters [of sandy soil], the equivalent of $6\frac{1}{2}$ million basket loads as soil is carried nowadays."[69] The foundation walls of the oval were then raised on the sand base, the sand being limited to the area encompassed by these walls.[70] The original excavation for the foundations of the Temple Oval cut through earlier, apparently Early Dynastic levels of houses, but there was also evidence that parts of the foundations had been founded on a reclaimed swamp.[71] This "staggering amount of labor" was "entirely preliminary to the brickmaking and the erection of the massive structure itself."[72]

What was the meaning of such a procedure? Ellis writes that "I know of no ancient text that explains the reason for this."[73] I have attempted elsewhere[74] to connect such a practice with temple ideology attested in Egypt at a much later period. A. J. Spencer has written of the enormous expenditure of labor that went into fulfilling the "mythological requirements" of temples in the Late and Ptolemaic Periods.

---

[67]Edith Porada, "The Relative Chronology of Mesopotamia, I, *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology* (ed. Robert W. Ehrich; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965) 161-63; Robert McC. Adams, "Patterns of Urbanization in Early Southern Mesopotamia," *Man, Settlement and Urbanism* (ed. Peter J. Ucko et al.; Cambridge: Schenkman, 1972) 735-50; William W. Hallo and William Kelly Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971) 42-46.

[68]Adam Falkenstein, Eva Strommenger, "Gudea," *RLA* 3 (1971) 676-78.

[69]Henri Frankfort, *Oriental Institute Discoveries in Iraq, 1933/34, Fourth Preliminary Report of the Iraq Expedition* (OIC, 19; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935) 32. (Unfortunately, I was unable to consult the final report for the temple Oval, *OIP* 53). See also Pinhas Delougaz, Harold D. Hill, and Seton Lloyd, *Private Houses and Graves in the Diyala Region* (OIP 88; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967) 24-25.

[70]Henri Frankfort, *Fourth Preliminary Report*, 32-33.

[71]Henri Frankfort, *Progress of the Work of the Oriental Institute in Iraq, 1934/35, Fifth Preliminary Report of the Iraq Expedition* (OIC 20; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936) 15-17.

[72]Ibid., 17.

[73]Richard S. Ellis, *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia* (Yale Near Eastern Researches, 2; New Haven: Yale University Press) 12, and 6-34 for descriptions of various building rites connected with temples.

[74]"What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology."

> The construction of the vast temple enclosure walls in undulating brickwork is an obvious example. Another effect, closely related to the substructure of the peripteral temples, is the development of a new style of foundation for large cult temples in the Late Period . . . . The entire area to be occupied by a Late-Period temple was dug out into an enormous rectangular pit, which was then lined with strong brick retaining walls and filled up to the top with sand. Over this sand bed were laid several courses of stone to create a platform on which to build the temple.[75]

Attested examples of this type of structure have been found in the Delta and in Upper Egypt. Fortunately, this building procedure is given a mythological foundation in an Edfu text which describes the building of the temple there: "He excavated its foundation down to the water, it being filled up with sand according to the rule, being constructed of sandstone as an excellent work of eternity."[76] Thus, "The temple had to rest on a bed of sand, as a representation of the primaeval mound, and it was desireable that this sand should extend down to the subsoil water, as the Mound (emphasis his) had stood in the Nun."[77] Thus in this case we have a textual attestation for the enormous amount of work that Egyptians in this period were prepared to undertake in order to fit the temple building to mythological presuppositions. As Spencer writes, "The effects of religious belief on architecture were not, as some have claimed a vague symbolism . . . ."[78]

The same hold true, I believe, for a case such as the Temple Oval, particularly when we consider the extent to which mythological traditions of ancient Mesopotamia viewed temples as being founded in and arising out of the sweet waters of the abyss, the home of the god of wisdom Enki. I have given considerable evidence for this connection elsewhere.[79] A fairly common Sumerian phrase states that the temple's *temen* (foundation) "is sunk into the *abzu*."[80] One Neo-Sumerian hymn exhibits a kind of inner or chiastic parallelism of the first two words of two successive lines which, as I have tried to show elsewhere,[81] very possibly approaches the primeval mound-temple ideology of Egypt. Line 4 of this hymn begins "Abzu, shrine," (*abzu èš*), while line 5 begins "House, holy mound," (*é du$_6$-kù*), where *èš* and *é* are synonymous and *abzu* and *du$_6$-kù* are synonymous.[82] The reclaimed swamp on which the Temple Oval was built could thus take on a greater significance in the light of the above.

The Gudea hymns "give a vivid picture of the ideology behind the temple building, and they are the best examples which an be found on Sumerian soil."[83] Many scholars

---

[75]A. J. Spencer, "The Brick Foundations of Late-Period Peripteral Temples and their Mythological Origin," *Glimpses of Ancient Egypt, Studies in Honor of H. W. Fairman* (ed. John Ruffle, G. A. Gaballa, and Kenneth A. Kitchen; Orbis Aegyptiorum Speculum; Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1979) 133.

[76]Ibid.

[77]Ibid., and see point # 2 in my typology, above.

[78]Ibid.

[79]"The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East," drawing especially on the temple foundation hymns of Gudea, and on Neo-Sumerian temple hymns. The same picture is found in the *Enuma elish*.

[80]A. Falkenstein, "Sumerische Bauausdrücke," *Or* 35 (1966) 236.

[81]"The Common Temple Ideology of the Ancient Near East."

[82]Åke W. Sjöberg and E. Bergmann, *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns, Texts from Cuneiform Sources* 3 (Locust Valley: J. J. Augustin, 1969) 17, 50. For *du$_6$-kù*, "shining (holy) mound" see A. Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon*, II/3 (Rome: Verlag des Päpstl. Bibelinstitutes, 1934) 459.

[83]Arvid S. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, A Task for Gods and Kings," *Or* 32 (1963) 58.

have recognized the relevance of the Gudea inscriptions to the OT.[84] Kapelrud has pointed out the main parallels between traditions of temple building in which "the gods" are the main protagonists, as in the *Enuma elish*, and the Baal Cycle from Ras Shamra, and those in which kings are the center of attention, as with Gudea, Moses, and Solomon.[85] With the former the main elements are: "1. A victorious god after battle; 2. He wants to have his own temple; 3. Permission asked from the leading god; 4. Master builder set to work; 5. Cedars from Lebanon, buiding-stones, gold, silver, etc. procured for the task; 6. The temple finished according to plan; 7. Offerings and dedication, fixing of norms; 8. A great banquet for the gods." In those instances where kings are depicted as temple builders, Kapelrud found the following elements: "1. Some indication that a temple had to be built; 2. The king visits a temple overnight [incubation]; 3. A god tells him what to do, indicates plans; 4. The king announces his intention to build a temple; 5. Master builder is engaged, cedars from Lebanon, building-stones, gold, silver, etc. procured for the task; 6. The temple finished according to plan; 7. Offerings and dedication, fixing of norms; 8. Assembly of the people; 9. The god comes to his new house; 10. The king is blesed and promised everlasting domination."[86] (One would have to add to this list, also, a great banquet for all the people.)

The the purposes of this paper, the most important aspect of temple building, its legitimizing role in the establishment of a dynasty, is most clearly expressed in the Gudea Cylinder B. Once the temple had been completed, it was necessary that its god, Ningirsu, should be led inside and formally installed as "king." (B II 5, B V 1). Ningirsu, in his turn, had in the meantime been carried to the Temple of the Abyss of Enki in Eridu, the most ancient and honored temple in Sumer, to receive the legitimizing approval of Enki for the temple that Gudea was building in Lagash.[87] Ningirsu then returns from Eridu and is majestically ushered into his temple during the New Year festival.[88] During this festival, the sacred marriage rite is carried out between Ningirsu and Bau, the destinies are fixed, and a communal meal is shared by the inhabitants of the city.[89] The gate through which Ningirsu would have been led into the temple was at the same time one of the city gates. This was the *ká.ki.lugal.ku$_6$*, "the gate through which the king (Ningirsu) enters." Next to this gate stood a pillar (^{giš}*tí*), "a heavenly *nir* that extends to heaven."[90]

To return to Cylinder B, Gudea, depicted as a priest who leads the processions, prayers and sacrifices, receives his kingship in perpetuity from Ningirsu. One of the key passages is B VI 14-18, which reads, in Falkenstein's translation: ". . . dass (Ningirsus) Stadt, das Heiligtum Girsu, Gereinigt, der 'Thron der Schicksalsentscheidung' aufgestellt, dass Szepter langer Tage geführt werde, dass der Hirte Ningirsu für Gudea das Haupt

---

[84]In addition to Kapelrud, and Bewer, cited above, see Richard D. Barnett, "Bringing the God into the Temple," *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*, 11, and Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 35, 248-50.

[85]"Moses is 'to a great extent depicted in royal categories'," Kapelrud, ibid., 61, quoting Ivan Engnell.

[86]Kapelrud, ibid., 62.

[87]A II 11, B III 9. And see E. Douglas van Buren, "Foundation Rites for a New Temple," *Or* 21 (1952) 293, 296-97, and Richard S. Ellis, *Foundation Deposits*, 7-8.

[88]A Falkenstein, *Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš* (AnOr 30; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1966) 120.

[89]Falkenstein, ibid.

[90]References to the Gudea Cylinders are taken from F. Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften*, abbreviated *SAK*. See also A. Falkenstein, *Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš*, 121, 137 and Gudea Cylinder A XXV 5-8). According to Deimel, ^{giš}*tí* is a "biegsame Stange; Rippe; Pfeil (*mit Bronze dazu verarbeitet*): *Šumerisches Lexikon*, II/1, 150, emphasis added.

(wie) eine schöne Krone zum Himmel erhebe . . . ."[91] Another passage, important for the thesis presented here, is B VIII 13-19, where Ningirsu is presented as having returned from Eridu (again, the introduction of Eridu as the main, legitimizing temple center in the ideology which underlies the Gudea Cylinders), and "der Thron in der 'wohlgebauten' Stadt gefestigt werde, dass für das Leben des guten Hirten Gudea die Hand (zum Gebet) an den Mund geführt werde . . . ."[92] Here we have the ultimate "legitimizing" connection, bringing together all the main factors that I believe were involved in the establishment of the "divine charter" ideology in ancient Near Eastern state polities: the god in his temple, which temple was built by divine instruction by the king of the city after it was duly authorized and approved by Enki of the "Temple of the Abyss" in Eridu; then the king, the "good shepherd" was handed a scepter of perpetual rule, guaranteeing the authority and legitimacy of his throne; all of this carried out, of course, in the temple itself (which of course, as mentioned above, underscores the priestly functions of the king, at least in this tradition).[93]

Thus we have an ancient theory of state origins, centered around the building of a temple to the main deity of the city, and the establishment of a dynastic system through this means. The Gudea inscriptions give us perhaps the clearest view of this process (the fact that they may give us a fanciful and idealized picture,[94] does not detract from their value as a theoretical statement of an ideology, a "constitution" if you will, a statement of how things should be, as viewed through the eyes of temple poets, the intellectuals of that day). The site of Khafaje, as an example, begins to show us how this theory would have been carried out architecturally, how the architecture of the temple would have related to the city plan as a whole,[95] and what the implications of this arrangement would be for the economic role of the temple in the city.[96]

Leaving the evidence introduced above, we should mention in passing that two of the most famous religious epics of ancient Near Eastern literature, the *Enuma elish* and the Baal Cycle from Ras Shamra, give us a similar temple centered view of state origins, a view in which the legitimizing decisions of the cosmic deities are transferred to earth and to the earthly monarch, the whole process symbolized by and centered in the building

---

[91]A Falkenstein and W. van Soden, *Sumerische und Akkadische Hymnen und Gebete* (Bibliothek der alten Welt; Zurich: Artemis, 1953) 170.

[92]Ibid., 172.

[93]Of course, Gudea is not strictly a *lugal*, "king," but an *ensi*, "governor." For a discussion of the evolution of these terms in ancient Sumerian texts, along with an emphasis upon the priestly functions of the *en*, see Thorkild Jacobsen, *Toward the Image of Tammuz*, 375.

[94]Samuel Noah Kramer, *The Sumerians, Their History, Culture and Character* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963) 137-40.

[95]It is interesting to note here that the best preserved city gate at Khafaje was found situated just to the northwest of the Temple Oval, so that entry into the city gate at this point would have given one a direct view of the gate of the Temple Oval itself. See *OIP* 88, 24-25 and Plate I.

[96]This is a question that I am not discussing here, although it is well known that temples served, among other things, as treasuries, and that they were often looted, either by the local king in order to pursue warfare or other foreign policy ventures (2 Kings 16:8), or by conquerors (1 Kings 14:25-26). The Eninnu, built by Gudea, had a "treasury," which apparently served both as his own royal treasury and as temple treasury. It is described as being filled with various precious and semi-precious stones and metals. See A. Falkenstein, *Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš*, 131. According to Edmond Sollberger, the possibility exists that there was a "marked evolution from simplicity to luxury" in the furnishings and treasures found in temples during the third millennium B.C. See "The Temple in Babylonia," *Le Temple et le Culte* (CRRA 20; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archeologisch Instituut, 1975) 34.

of a temple. Of great interest here is a point made by Jonathan Z. Smith in his critique of Mircea Eliade's views of "Center" symbolism: "Eliade has not, to my knowledge, dwelt on the significance of the fact that the Babylonian creation epic, *Enuma elish*, is not so much a cosmogony as it is a myth of the creation of a temple."[97] With regard to the Baal Cycle, we have the recent statement of Frank Moore Cross: "Ba'l founded his temple on Mount Ṣāpōn in order to make manifest his establishment of order, especially kingship among the gods. The earthly temple of Ba'l manifested not only Ba'l's creation of order, but at the same time established the rule of the earthly king. There is thus a tie between the temple as the abode of the king of the gods and the temple as a dynastic shrine of the earthly king, the adopted son of the god. The temple and kingship are thus part of the 'orders of creation,' properly the eternal kingship of the god of order, the eternal dynasty of his earthly counterpart."[98]

If we thus use the above statement of Cross as a summary description of the temple centered state polity, keeping in mind the evidence from Gudea, the evidence of the extraordinary, "fantastically extravagant" (Mallowan) building practices associated with temples as at Khafaje, referring at the same time to my typology, above, especially points 1-4 (the "primordial landscape"), then I think that we can begin to answer the question of how a building can play such an important role in legitimizing centralized, monarchical, dynastic authority in the ancient Near Eastern state.[99]

---

[97] *Map is Not Territory*, 99.

[98] "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research," 174. I have devoted considerable space in my article "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology," to validations derived from *Enuma elish* and the Baal Cycle.

[99] Of course, the "fantastically extravagant" effort that went into the temple building means corvee labor, and extensive oppression of the masses by the ruling classes, which is what we expect in the early state, at least at certain levels of its evolution. See Claessen and Skalnik, "The Early State: Theories and Hypotheses," 20-21. But remember point # 7 in Claessen and Skalnik's "main characteristics of the early state," above: "A *common ideology* exists, on which the legitimacy of the ruling stratum (rulers) is based." Elsewhere (*The Early State*, 640) they elaborated this point, adding that the "basic concept [of the common ideology] is the principle of reciprocity between the ruler in the center and his subjects living for the greater part in agrarian communities . . . ." We would assume that the oppressive labor requirement imposed by the building of the Temple Oval would have transgressed this "principle of reciprocity," and of course, in the matter of the succession to the kingship of Israel, following Solomon's death, we know that this principle was broken, and we have a record of the acrimonious negotiations which accompanied its breaking, and the subsequent division of the kingdom (1 Kings 12). But we must also remember two important factors that relate to this point: 1. "By their very possession of authority, they [*the elites*] attribute to themselves an essential affinity with the sacred elements of their society, of which they regard themselves as the custodians. By the same token, *many members of their society attribute to them that same kind of affinity.*" (Edward Shils, "Centre and Periphery," 3. Emphasis added.) And 2. "The common man, lastly, remains an unknown, the most important unknown element in Mesopotamian religion." (A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 181). Therefore we must assume the probability that temples played unifying, integrating, positive, genuinely pious roles in the ancient community, and that, to some extent, perhaps impossible to define, even corvee would not have been viewed as an entirely onerous duty in connection with temple building. For a view of the positive, pious aspects of Mesopotamian temple establishments, see J. N. Postgate, "The Role of the Temple in the Mesopotamian Secular Community," *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*, 813-18, 820-21. Postgate gives evidence for the general horror that would have been felt in the community at the sacking of the temple treasuries (815 and note 18).

Before leaving this section I would like to refer to two additional pieces of evidence that support the thesis of the paper. First is the stele of the Assyrian noble Bel-Harran-bel usur, who, sometime during the reign of Shalmaneser IV, founded his own, presumably independent city in the desert west of Ninevah. So great was the weakness of the central power at this time that Bel-Harran-bel-usur was able to claim total independance on his stele, calling in the first instance on the Babylonian gods Marduk and Nabu, ignoring Ashur and ignoring the Assyrian king. He himself claims to have established the freedom of the city, exempting it from certain taxes and establishing certain endowments. We can safely call this foundation a secondary state, I believe. In the stele itself, after he has named the gods who have authorized his new city, we read: "Bel-Harran-bel-usur . . . who fears the great gods, they have sent and,--the mighty lords, at their exalted word and by their sure grace, I founded a city in the desert, in a waste. From its foundation to its top I completed it. A temple I built and I placed a shrine for the great gods therein. Its foundation I made firm as the mountains are set down, I established its foundation (walls) for all eternity. Dur-Bel-Harran-bel-usur I called its name,--in the mouth of the people, and I opened up a road to it. I inscribed a stele, the images of the gods I fashioned on it, in the divine dwelling place I set it up."[100] This seems, to me at least, to point out the centrality of the temple building in state formation, even in so ephemeral a polity as Dur-Bel-Harran-bel-usur was.

The second piece of evidence that I would like to introduce here is the thesis of the very important recent article of Richard D. Barnett.[101] Barnett, starting off from Solomon's prayer of dedication for the Jerusalem temple (1 Kings 8), examines evidence from Hittite and neo-Hittite gateway reliefs which illustrate the process by which the gods of these cities were ritually and ceremoniously invited into the city and installed, whereby they took up their residence in the city's temples. The reliefs generally show a procession of nobles and soldiers, male and female worshipppers, approaching the seated deity of the city where a feast is in process. In the case of Carchemish, the "worship at the gate" motif appears to have terminated at the chief temple itself, although the excavations were not able to demonstrate this conclusively. Especially interesting is the building inscription of Azitawadda which states at one point "Having built this city and having given it the name of Azitawaddiya, I have established Ba'l-*Kmtry*[š] in it. A sacrific(ial order) was established for all the molten images . . . May Ba'l-*Kmtry*[š] bless Azitawadda with life, peace, and mighty power over every king . . . ."[102] I have pointed out above the possibility that the temple gate at Lagash through which Ningirsu was introduced into the Temple was also one of the main city gates, and the fact that the Temple Oval was built directly adjacent to a main city gate. The process of memorializing the introduction of a city's gods into their temples, in some cases temples that were built just inside the city gate (as at Alaca Huyuk for example), by means of wall reliefs that depict a sacral procession with banquet (see my point # 12 of the typology, above, and "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology," for a description of the role of sacral meals in covenant ceremonies) further supports the thesis that temple building was central to the ancient state formation process.

V

Ancient Israel developed from a chiefdom to a (in all probability secondary) state during a period of about two generations, covering the span of the Iron Age IC period (about 1000-918 B.C.). As I suggested above, the process of evolution from chiefdom to state is graphically recounted in the OT, in terms that are familiar to the modern student

---

[100] *AR* 1, 295-96; A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951) 167-69, and 203-4 for Bel-Harran-bel-usur's decline under Tiglath-pileser III.

[101] "Bringing the God Into the Temple," 10-20.

[102] *ANET* 3rd ed., 654.

of such processes in ancient societies. From the refrain that ends the book of Judges,[103] to Samuel's admonitions concerning the institution of kingship in I Samuel 8,[104] to Nathan's (first) oracle to David in 2 Samuel 7 informing him that he should not build a house for Yahweh,[105] to the night vision/dream of Solomon during the incubation at the high place of Gibeon where he presumably received the instructions that he should build the temple,[106] to the actual building and dedication of the temple the OT gives us an extraordinary and apparently unmatched ancient narrative of the tensions, debates, political and theological argument that accompanied the advent of the dynastic state. Again, the state was not "caused" by the introduction of the temple and the accompanying divine charter ideology; the temple is a symbol of a "major institutional transformation," resulting "from significant bioenergetic change," (Barbara Price, above, note 51), and thus signals to us, as I believe it did to the Israelites of that period and to their neighbors that they had achieved a state, "like all the other nations."[107] We might as well take the ancient record at its own word.

But what of the Temple of Solomon? The "cosmic-universal rule"[108] implied by the Israelite monarchy demanded a temple that incorporated the same cosmic symbolism as did temples in the surrounding region. I believe that Albright's description and interpretation of the various cosmic features in the Temple of Solomon, such as the two pillars, Jachin and Boaz, the Sea, the twelve bulls, the altar of burnt offerings, and the platform, *kîyôr*, on which, according to the Chronicler Solomon stood while uttering the prayer of dedication (2 Chr 6:12-13), have not been effectively either superseded or refuted.[109] In spite of whether Jachin and Boaz served as structural columns within a bit Hilani porch,[110] or whether they were free standing pillars, which has been the

---

[103]Robert G. Boling, *Judges, Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (AB 6A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1975) 256, 258, 273, 293; but see also Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 169-70, with notes. The debate over the editorial strand to which these passages should be assigned and the view of the monarchy that they represent is irrelevant to my argument, which is simply that the passages reveal self-knowledge on the part of the Israelite editors of various stages of political evolution and the implications of these stages for the Israelite community.

[104]See Moshe Weinfeld, ibid., and William McKane, *I and II Samuel, Introduction and Commentary* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press, 1963) 66-69; see also P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *I Samuel, A New Translation* (AB 8; Garden City: Doubleday, 1980) 156-62. I have suggested above, note 47, the possibility that Israel represents a secondary state that was formed under the pressure of the Philistine/Phoenician states surrounding her. McCarter (ibid., 160) writes that: ". . . it might be argued that a king is requested out of military necessity. Israel's pre-monarchical institutions have become inadequate to cope with new political realities, especially the Philistine threat." But he rejects this explanation.

[105]William McKane, *I and II Samuel*, 217-19, and Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 194, for the presumed Deuteronomic editing of vs. 13a, and 247-48. See also Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) 241-64.

[106]Arvid Kapelrud, "Temple Building, A Task for Gods and Kings," 59-60, and Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 250-54.

[107]1 Sam 8:20. See P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel*, 160-62; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 243, and George E. Mendenhall, "The Monarchy," 157.

[108]Frank Moore Cross, ibid., 265.

[109]William Foxwell Alright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 138-50, with notes.

[110]Jean Ouellette, "The Basic Structure of Solomon's Temple and Archaeological Research," *The Temple of Solomon* (ed. Joseph Gutmann; American Academy of Religion, Society of Biblical Literature Religion and the Arts, 3; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) 8-11, with notes.

opinion of most scholars,[111] it is undeniable, in my opinion, that they had a major symbolic purpose in relationship to the sanctuary. Pillars built with such symbolic purpose would probably point us toward free standing structures, and we can generally agree with S. Yeivin that "a custom of erecting twin columns in front of the facades of temples (without any architectural relation to the building) was current in the western part of the Fertile Crescent (the area of Israel, Phoenicia, Syria) at least since the XIIIth century B.C.E. and till the IInd century C.E."[112]

The symbolic purposes played by such pillars could well have included those mentioned as possibilities by Albright, namely, "they may have been regarded as the reflection of the columns between which the sun rose each morning to pour its light through the portico of the Temple into its interior,"[113] or that, "Like the Egyptian, 'djed' symbol they may also have denoted 'endurance,' 'continuity,' in which case their dynastic role would become self-evident."[114] It is this latter that I think is especially important in the light of the thesis of this paper. I assume that the pillars played a major role in legitimizing the temple and the dynasty of David in the minds of the people. In other words the pillars, Jachin on the south, carrying the message that Yahweh had established the dynasty and the temple, and Boaz on the north, carrying the message that the power that emanates from the sanctuary is that of Yahweh.[115] An old suggestion by R. B. Y. Scott seems most interesting and relevant here. Scott drew upon an example from Cylinder A of Gudea of Lagash, as well as other Near Eastern evidence to demonstrate the hypothesis that the words "Jachin" and "Boaz" were parts of two inscriptions, "of which the opening words came to designate the pillars on which they appeared."[116] The relevant passage in Gudea is A XXII 24-XXIV 7, where Gudea has stones brought into the temple precinct and fashioned into six steles each of which bears a sentence name. These were set up on the temple terrace, apparently surrounding it, at various gates leading into the temple, and inside the temple itself. One of these, which was stationed at the *ká.sur.ra.* gate, was called, in Thureau-Dangin's translation: "der Herr des Sturmes Enlil, welcher nicht seinesgleichen hat, blickt mit günstigem Auge auf Gudea, den Grosspriester [en] Ningirsus."[117] The next stele mentioned, stationed toward the rising sun, bore the name: "der König der (brausenden) Wirbelwinde Enlil, der Herr, der nicht seinesgleichen hat, hat in seinem reinen Herzen erwählt Gudea, den Grosspriester Ningirsus."[118] The following stele, erected at *šu.ga.lam*, the main entrance to Eninnu,[119] bore the name "der König, durch den die Welt ruht, hat befestigt den Thron Gudeas, des Grosspriester Ningirsus."[120] Thus each of these steles bore an inscription that identified the ruling dynast with the chief god of the city, and, particularly in the case of the stele at the *šu.ga.lam* gate, specifically legitimized the throne of Gudea.

---

[111] Ibid., 7, with notes.

[112] "Jachin and Boaz," *PEQ* 91 (1959) 20. But note also the bronzed pillar that stood near the gate through which Ningirsu would have been led into the Eninnu temple in Lagash: see above, note 90. The phenomenon is not limited to the Levant.

[113] *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 143, and notes. See also H. Van Dyke Paranuk, "Was Solomon's Temple Oriented Toward the Sun," *PEQ* 110 (1978) 28-33.

[114] Ibid.

[115] John Gray, *I and II Kings, A Commentary* (2nd ed.; The Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 187.

[116] "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," *JBL* 58 (1939) 146.

[117] *SAK* 115.

[118] Ibid.

[119] A. Falkenstein, *Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš*, 140-41.

[120] Ibid. I would also like to recall the "bronzed" pillar that stood outside the gate "through which Ningirsu enters" the temple. See note 90, above.

R. B. Y. Scott's suggested reconstruction for the inscription on Jachin was: "He (Yahweh) will establish the throne of David, and his kingdom to his seed forever." And for Boaz: "in the strength of Yahweh shall the king rejoice," or some such, drawing on language well known from the Psalms.[121] In Scott's more recent discussion of the same problem he wrote that "It seems probable that the names of the pillars in Solomon's royal temple, where he officiated as high priest, were derived from the initial words of dynastic inscriptions like that of Gudea."[122] This view seems to me by far the most reasonable and the most likely explanation of the pillar's significance, adding more evidence for the legitimizing political role of the temple and its appurtenances, and allowing us to see more clearly just how a building could have played such a role in ancient societies.

One additional role played by pillars in the ancient Near East, that of witnesses of covenant ceremonies, can be proposed. Widengren has pointed out the central role of the king in Israelite covenant making during the period of the monarchy. He found three main elements present in such ceremonies: 1) the king plays the central role, calling the assembly and reading from the book of the law; 2) the king himself appears "before the Lord," thus assuming the role of high priest; and 3) "The covenant is made in the temple."[123] I have argued elsewhere for the centrality of the role of the temple in ancient Near Eastern covenant rituals ("What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology"). Covenants are sealed in temples or near pillars standing near temples, and thus derive their binding efficacy on the ancient society from the temple's authoritative, legitimizing position within the society. We have a classic example of the role of a pillar, presumably either Jachin or Boaz, in the covenant renewal ceremony of Josiah, as recorded in I Kings 23:2-3: "The king went up to the House of the Lord, with all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem: priests, prophets, and all the people, small and great. And he read in their ears all the words of the book of the law which had been found in the House of the Lord. The king stood by the column and made a covenant before the Lord . . . ."[124] The pillar must play here the same legitimizing role that I have described for the state itself. The process of "state renewal" in Israel, which is after all what the covenant making process is during the period of the monarchy, and what we have also on other occasions where the pillars play a similar role (I Kings 11), derives its power from the temple.[125]

The temple was finished in Solomon's eleventh year (ca. 959), in the eighth month (Bul), and dedicated the following year in the seventh month (Ethanim). The eleven month delay between completion and dedication could well be attributed to Solomon's

---

[121] "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," 148-49.

[122] *IDB* 2. 781.

[123] "King and Covenant," 3.

[124] "King and Covenant," 5-7. See also George E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BAR* 3, 35: "Provision for deposit in the temple and periodic public reading," with the accompanying explanation: "Since the treaty itself was under the protection of the deity, it was deposited as a sacred thing in the sanctuary of the vassal state . . . ." See also John Gray, *I and II Kings*, 188, where he writes that "On the evidence of the association of the pillars with the covenant in the two passages in Kings, Jachin and Boaz might be survivals of the standing stones of witness to the covenant at the central sanctuary, cf. Josh. 24.26f. . . ." And see Widengren, "King and Covenant," 12-17.

[125] Of course, it was obvious that Jeroboam would have to found new temples that would legitimize his dynasty, also under the aegis of Yahweh, as he intended. His choice of shrine centers and of symbols represents an archaizing attempt to establish a temple cultus that would have all the appearance of legitimacy in the eyes of his subjects that the Jerusalem temple held. See Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 73-75.

wish to dedicate the temple at the New Year, during the Feast of Tabernacles.[126] We must distinguish here between Spring and Fall New Year's festivals. In Israel there was an older, Spring New Year, and a more recent Fall New Year, the latter, "falling on the New Year common to Canaan and Egypt, in Israel became the great feast of the era of kingship . . . ."[127] Generally speaking, the New Year in the Mesopotamian tradition began in the Spring, with the modification that there may have been a cultic year that began in the Fall. The Babylonian Akitu Festival, for example, took place mostly in Nisan, earlier in Adar.[128] Thus while it is technically correct that "sanctuaries are dedicated at the Near Year," according to De Moor, we must distinguish temple dedications/festivals that took place at the Spring New Year, such as the Gudea Eninnu Temple and the *Enuma elish*/Akitu in Babylon, and those that took place during the Fall New Year, such as the Baal Temple at Ras Shamra, and the Temple of Solomon.[129]

With regard to Solomon's prayer of dedication of the Jerusalem Temple itself, most authorities are agreed that large parts of the prayer in I Kings 8 are the work of the later Deuteronomic editor. Gray sees vss. 1-11 as preserving an authentic account of what actually happened on that occasion, and vss. 62-66 as reflecting "a genuine tradition of the significant assembly of the sacral community Israel at the dedication of the new central sanctuary, but this is the work of the Deuteronomistic compiler . . . ."[130] Montgomery sees "the original elements of the story" contained in vss. 1, 3, 5, and 6.[131] It is important here to note the importance of post-dedication post-New Year public feasts in all the traditions that have been discussed above: Gudea, Babylonian (*Enuma elish*), Ugaritic, etc.[132] Most authorities assume that vss. 62-66 have been worked over by the Deuteronomic editor, and that the numbers are too large.[133] Weinfeld see vss. 12-13 as a summary of the original prayer, which he compares with similar statements in the dedicatory prayers of Gudea and Esarhaddon.[134]

Two important Deuteronomic elements in the prayer of Solomon are the "name theology," as seen in vss. 17, 18, 19, 20, 44, 48, where the temple is seen as having been built to the "name" of Yahweh, rather than as his actual dwelling place. Contrast this

---

[126]"He was obeying a venerable Oriental tradition according to which sanctuaries had to be dedicated preferably on New Year." (Johannes C. De Moor, *New Year With Canaanites and Israelites, Part One: Description*, Kamper Cahiers; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1972, 18). See also John Gray, *I and II Kings*, 206-8, and James A. Montgomery, *The Book of Kings, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ed. Henry Snyder Gehman; ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1951) 186-88. Montgomery would excise *behāg* "as a backreference from v. 65." (187.

[127]Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 123, with notes and 238.

[128]Svend Aage Pallis, *The Babylonian Akîtu Festival* (Copenhagen: Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri, 1926) 27-30. And see H. Hunger, "Kalender," *RLA* 5 (1977) 297-303.

[129]For Ras Shamra, see further Johannes De Moor, *New Year With Canaanites and Israelites, Part Two: The Canaanite Sources*. See also H. W. Fairman, "Worship and Festivals in an Egyptian Temple," *BJRL* 37 (1954-55) 187: "The traditional time for the dedication of a temple was either on the eve of New Year's Day, or on New Year's Day . . .the ceremonies on the temple roof on New Year's Day included the annual rededication of the temple and its gods: the union with the sun not only brought renewal of fertility and welfare to Egypt, it renewed for another year the life and powers of Edfu, Horus, and the gods who lived with him in the temple."

[130]*I and II Kings*, 203.

[131]*The Book of Kings*, 186.

[132]See "What is a Temple? A Preliminary Typology," and item number 12 of my typology, above.

[133]See 2 Chr 29:31-36 for a similar event with more manageable numbers and Montgomery, *The Book of Kings*, 199-200, for additional examples.

[134]*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 35-37.

with Pss 74:2 and 76:3, where the Temple on Mount Zion is seen as the dwelling place of Yahweh, "an earlier conception," more in line with Near Eastern views of temples.[135] The other Deuteronomic feature of the prayer that stands out strongly is the view that the temple is a house of prayer, rather than a cultic center, the actual dwelling of Yahweh. Vss. 41-43 are especially important here, where Yahweh will listen to the prayers of foreigners who come to the temple to honor his name.[136] The important point that I want to make, in the light of the Deuteronomic argument, is that the pre-Deuteronomic sources of the OT that make reference to the Temple of Solomon place that edifice in the pattern well known to us from other ancient Near Eastern temple traditions.[137] To put it another way, the Deuteronomic argument is largely irrelevant as far as the main thesis of this paper is concerned: the Israelite state (a pre-Deuteronomic polity), was capped by a legitimizing temple/cult system that was intimately related to other such systems in the Near East.[138]

*List of Abbreviations used in this paper that are not identified in the Society of Biblical Literature, "Instructions to Contributors," or otherwise identified in the paper:

AAAS Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes. Damascus.

CRRA Compte Rendu de la . . . Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale.

OIC Oriental Institute Communications. Chicago.

RLA Reallexikon der Assyriologie. Berlin.

---

[135]Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 194-98. See also Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 254.

[136]Weinfeld, ibid., 37, 195-99.

[137]Ibid., 250-55, and Arvid Kapelrud, "Temple Building, A Task for Gods and Kings."

[138]Only as the present paper was finished did I receive a copy of Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh, A Sociology of Liberated Israel* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1979). See, for example, 371-74. Also of exceptional value is G. W. Ahlstrom, "Heaven on Earth--At Hazor and Arad," *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity, Essays in Conversation with Geo Widengren* (ed. Birger A. Pearson; American Academy of Religion and the Institute of Religious Studies, UCSB, Series on Formative Thinkers, I; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975) 67-83, with many references.